

LARGE DEVIATIONS FOR EMPIRICAL MEASURES OF MEAN-FIELD GIBBS MEASURES

WEI LIU AND LIMING WU

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we show that the empirical measure of mean-field model satisfies the large deviation principle with respect to the weak convergence topology or the stronger Wasserstein metric, under the strong exponential integrability condition on the negative part of the interaction potentials. In contrast to the known results we prove this without any continuity or boundedness condition on the interaction potentials. The proof relies mainly on the law of large numbers and the exponential decoupling inequality of de la Peña for U -statistics.

AMS 2010 Subject classifications. Primary: 60F10, 60K35; Secondary: 82C22.

Key words and Phrases. Large deviations, empirical measure, U -statistics, interacting particle systems, McKean-Vlasov equation, mean-field Gibbs measure.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider a mean-field interacting system of n particles at positions x_1, \dots, x_n in a separable and complete metric space (S, ρ) (say Polish space) confined by a potential $V : S \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$. The interaction between the particles is given by a family of Borel-measurable interaction potentials $W^{(k)} : S^k \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ between k -particles, where $2 \leq k \leq N$, and $N \geq 2$ is fixed (necessarily $n \geq N$). The mean-field Hamiltonian or energy functional $H_n : S^n \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is given by

$$H_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n V(x_i) + n \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)}) \quad (1.1)$$

where

$$U_n(W^{(k)}) = \frac{1}{|I_n^k|} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k} W^{(k)}(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k}) \quad (1.2)$$

is the U -statistic of order k ,

$$I_n^k := \{(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k \mid i_1, \dots, i_k \text{ are different}, 1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_k \leq n\}$$

and $|I_n^k|$ denotes the number of elements in I_n^k (equal to $n!/(n-k)!$).

The mean-field Gibbs probability measure P_n on S^n is defined by

$$dP_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \frac{1}{Z_n} \exp(-H_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)) m(dx_1) \cdots m(dx_n) \quad (1.3)$$

The first author is supported by the CSC and NSFC(11731009, 11571262).

where m is some nonnegative σ -finite measure on S equipped with the Borel σ -field $\mathcal{B}(S)$, and

$$Z_n := \int_S \cdots \int_S \exp(-H_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)) m(dx_1) \cdots m(dx_n) \quad (1.4)$$

is the normalization constant (called *partition function*).

When $N = 2$, this model is called mean-field of *pair interaction*, and when $N > 2$, it is called mean-field of *many-bodies interaction*.

The main objective of this paper is to study the large deviations of the empirical measure

$$L_n(x^n; \cdot) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}(\cdot)$$

of configuration $x^n = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, under the mean-field measure P_n . We will simply denote $L_n(x^n; \cdot)$ by L_n when there is no likelihood of confusion.

In the case $S = \mathbb{R}^d$, P_n is just the equilibrium state (or the invariant probability measure) of the system of n interacting particles described by:

$$dX^n(t) = \sqrt{2}dB_t - \nabla H_n(X^n(t))dt, \quad (1.5)$$

where $X^n(t) := (X_1^n(t), \dots, X_n^n(t))^T$ (\cdot^T means the *transposition*) takes values in $(\mathbb{R}^d)^n$, $B_t = (B_t^1, \dots, B_t^n)$, B_t^1, \dots, B_t^n are n independent Brownian motions taking values in \mathbb{R}^d . It is well-known that when n goes to infinity, $L_n(X^n(t); \cdot)$ converges to the solution of the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov equation (the so-called propagation of chaos), under quite general condition [18].

A classical problem is to establish conditions for the existence of a macroscopic limit of the empirical measures L_n as the number of particles $n \rightarrow +\infty$. It is well-known that the large deviation principle (LDP in short) provides a strong exponential concentration with the speed n in terms of some explicit rate function, which is very useful for the study of the macroscopic limit and microscopic phenomena in statistical mechanics. In the case of pair interaction (i.e. $N = 2$), Léonard established for the first time in [15, 1987] the LDP for the empirical measure L_n under the Gibbs measure P_n in the weighted weak convergence topology, when $\nu \rightarrow \iint W^{(2)}(x, y) d\nu(x) d\nu(y)$ is continuous in some appropriate topology and it is bounded by some weighted function satisfying the strong exponential integrability condition. By means of the weak convergence approach developed in Dupuis and Ellis [9], Dupuis et al. established in [10] an LDP in the case of pair interaction, by assuming that $W^{(2)}$ is lower bounded and lower semi-continuous (l.s.c. in short), which generalized the result obtained in [15]. For more results in this field the reader is referred to [1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 14, 17] and the references therein.

The purpose of this paper is to establish the LDP for the empirical measures L_n under a more general condition that $W^{(k)}$, $2 \leq k \leq N$ are only measurable and their negative parts $W^{(k), -}$ satisfy the strong exponential integrability condition, which generalizes the previous results in [10] and [15]. We first obtain the LDP with respect to the weak convergence topology, then with respect to the Wasserstein metric by using Sanov's theorem for the Wasserstein metric established by Wang et. al in [21]. Our main tools are the law of large numbers (LLN in short) for the U -statistics and an exponential inequality for U -statistics issued of de la Peña decoupling inequality.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we will first briefly introduce some notations and definitions concerning the LDP, and then present our main results. The proofs are presented in the third section.

2. MAIN RESULT

2.1. Preliminaries. We recall the definition of a rate function on a Polish space S and the LDP for a sequence of probability measures on $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$.

Definition 2.1 (Rate function). *I is said to be a rate function on S if it is a lower semi-continuous function from S to $[0, \infty]$ (i.e., for all $L \geq 0$, the level set $[I \leq L]$ is closed). I is said to be a good rate function if it is inf-compact, i.e. $[I \leq L]$ is compact for any $L \in \mathbb{R}$.*

A consequence of a rate function being good is that its infimum is achieved over any non-empty closed set.

We denote by $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$ the space of probability measures on S .

Definition 2.2 (LDP). *Let $\{\nu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of probability measures in $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$.*

(a) *$\{\nu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is said to satisfy the large deviation lower bound with the speed n and a rate function I if for any open subset $G \in \mathcal{B}(S)$,*

$$l(G) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \nu_n(G) \geq - \inf_{\nu \in G} I(\nu); \quad (2.1)$$

(b) *$\{\nu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is said to satisfy the large deviation upper bound with the speed n and a rate function I if for any closed subset $F \in \mathcal{B}(S)$,*

$$u(F) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \nu_n(F) \leq - \inf_{\nu \in F} I(\nu); \quad (2.2)$$

(c) *$\{\nu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is said to satisfy the large deviation principle with the speed n and a rate function I if both (a) and (b) hold, and I is good.*

The LDP characterizes the exponential concentration behavior, as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, of a sequence of probability measures $\{\nu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in terms of a rate function. This characterization is via asymptotic upper and lower exponential bounds on the values that ν_n assigns to measurable subsets of S .

2.2. Main results. Throughout this paper, we assume that

$$C := \int_S \exp(-V(x)) m(dx) < +\infty. \quad (2.3)$$

Let

$$\alpha(dx) := \frac{1}{C} \exp(-V(x)) m(dx) \quad (2.4)$$

be the probability measure on S , then the mean-field Gibbs probability measure P_n can be rewritten as

$$dP_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{Z_n} \exp \left(-n \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)}) \right) \alpha^{\otimes n}(dx_1, \dots, dx_n), \quad (2.5)$$

where $\tilde{Z}_n := \frac{Z_n}{C^n}$. Without interaction (i.e. $W^{(k)} = 0$ for all k), $P_n = \alpha^{\otimes n}$, i.e. the n particles are free and identically distributed with law α .

Given a probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)$, the relative entropy of ν with respect to μ is defined by

$$H(\nu|\mu) = \begin{cases} \int_S \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}(x) \log \frac{d\nu}{d\mu}(x) \mu(dx), & \text{if } \nu \ll \mu; \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

For any probability measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)$ such that $W^{(k),-} := (-W^{(k)}) \vee 0 \in L^1(\nu^{\otimes k})$ for all $2 \leq k \leq N$, we define

$$\mathcal{W}^{(k)}(\nu) := \int_{S^k} W^{(k)}(x_1, \dots, x_k) d\nu^{\otimes k}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in (-\infty, +\infty]. \quad (2.7)$$

The free energy of the state ν is given by

$$H_W(\nu) := \begin{cases} H(\nu|\alpha) + \sum_{k=2}^N \mathcal{W}^{(k)}(\nu), & \text{if } H(\nu|\alpha) < +\infty \text{ and} \\ & W^{(k),-} \in L^1(\nu^{\otimes k}), 2 \leq k \leq N; \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

Without loss of generality we may and will assume that $W^{(k)}$ is symmetric, i.e.

$$W^{(k)}(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(k)}) = W^{(k)}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$$

for any $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in S^k$ and any permutation σ on $\{1, \dots, k\}$. We make the following assumption on the interaction potentials $(W^{(k)})_{2 \leq k \leq N}$:

(A1) For each $2 \leq k \leq N$, the function $W^{(k)} : S^k \rightarrow (-\infty, +\infty]$ is symmetric, measurable; its positive part $W^{(k),+}$ satisfies

$$H(\nu|\alpha) + \int_{S^k} W^{(k),+}(x_1, \dots, x_k) d\nu^{\otimes k}(x_1, \dots, x_k) < +\infty \text{ for some } \nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S) \quad (2.9)$$

and its negative part $W^{(k),-}$ satisfies the following **strong exponential integrability condition**

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda W^{(k),-}(X_1, \dots, X_k))] < +\infty, \quad \forall \lambda > 0 \quad (2.10)$$

where X_1, \dots, X_k are i.i.d. random variables of the common law α defined in (2.4).

Remark 2.3. (1) The simplest condition for (2.9) is: there is some measurable subset F of S with $\alpha(F) > 0$ such that $1_F W^{(k),+}$ is $\alpha^{\otimes k}$ -integrable. In fact one can take $\nu = h\alpha$, where the density $h : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is bounded, with support contained in F .
(2) Under the exponential integrability condition (2.10), if $H(\nu|\alpha) < +\infty$, then $W^{(k),-} \in L^1(\nu^{\otimes k})$. In fact, for any $\lambda > 0$, by Donsker-Varadhan variational formula (see [9, Lemma 1.4.3.(a)] in the bounded case) and Fatou's lemma (by approximating $W^{(k),-}$

with $W^{(k),-} \wedge L$, $L \uparrow +\infty$),

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda \int_{S^k} W^{(k),-}(x_1, \dots, x_k) d\nu^{\otimes k}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ & \leq H(\nu^{\otimes k} | \alpha^{\otimes k}) + \log \int_{S^k} e^{\lambda W^{(k),-}(x_1, \dots, x_k)} d\alpha^{\otimes k}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ & = kH(\nu | \alpha) + \log \int_{S^k} e^{\lambda W^{(k),-}(x_1, \dots, x_k)} d\alpha^{\otimes k}(x_1, \dots, x_k) < +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

(3) When $S = \mathbb{R}^d$, $N = 2$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-V} dx < +\infty$, our assumption **(A1)** is satisfied in the following two situations:

- (a) $W^{(2)}(x, y) = \frac{b}{|x-y|^\beta}$ with $\beta < d$, $b > 0$ (Coulomb potential if $\beta = 1$);
- (b) $W^{(2)}(x, y) = -b \log |x - y|$ with $b > 0$ and $\int |x|^p e^{-V} dx < +\infty$ for all $p > 0$.
(This interaction potential appears in random matrices, and the result in [10] does not apply for this example because of the lower boundedness assumption therein.)

In fact in both cases, $W^{(2),-}$ satisfies the strong exponential integrability condition (2.10). Taking $F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d; |x| \leq R, V(x) \geq -L\}$ for $R, L > 0$ large enough, we see that $1_F W^{(2),+}$ is $dx dy$ -integrable, then $\alpha^{\otimes 2}$ -integrable. So the condition (2.9) is verified, by part (1) of this remark.

Now we present our first main result, whose proof is given in the next section.

Theorem 2.4. *Under assumption **(A1)**, H_W is inf-compact on $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$ equipped with the weak convergence topology, and*

$$-\infty < \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_W(\mu) < +\infty. \quad (2.11)$$

Moreover the sequence of probability measures $\{P_n(L_n \in \cdot)\}_{n \geq N}$ satisfies the LDP on $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$ equipped with the weak convergence topology, with speed n and the good rate function

$$I_W(\nu) := H_W(\nu) - \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_W(\mu), \quad \nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S). \quad (2.12)$$

Furthermore, for any ν such that $\nu \ll \alpha$ and $W^{(k),-} \in L^1(\nu^{\otimes k})$, $\forall 2 \leq k \leq N$, the rate function $I_W(\nu)$ can be identified as

$$I_W(\nu) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\nu^{\otimes n} | P_n). \quad (2.13)$$

Remark 2.5. Notice that we have removed the lower semi-continuity and lower boundedness conditions on $W^{(k)}$ in [10]. Our result generalizes the known results in Léonard [15], Dupuis et al. [10].

Remark 2.6. To see the main difficulty in this LDP, let us proceed naively in the case of pair interaction: when $W(x, y) := W^{(2)}(x, y)$ is bounded and continuous, the U -statistic

$$U_n(W) = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} W(x_i, x_j)$$

is very close to $\iint W(x, y) L_n(dx) L_n(dy)$ which is continuous in L_n in the weak convergence topology (see the proof of Lemma 3.7 below). So in that case the LDP follows from the LDP of L_n under $\alpha^{\otimes \mathbb{N}}$ (Sanov theorem) and Varadhan's Laplace lemma, as shown by Léonard [15]. When W is bounded and only measurable, we do not know whether the functional $\nu \rightarrow \iint W(x, y) \nu(dx) \nu(dy)$ is continuous in the (non-metrizable) τ -topology, whereas the Sanov theorem still holds in the τ -topology. The continuity of the last functional w.r.t. some appropriate topology is a basic assumption in [15].

Remark 2.7. Since H_W is inf-compact by Theorem 2.4, there is at least one minimizer. From the point of view of statistical physics, H_W is an entropy or free energy associated to the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov equation. The uniqueness of the minimizer means that there is no phase transition for the mean-field. Below we recall some works on the uniqueness in the case of pair interaction.

For the uniqueness of the minimizer, it is sufficient to prove that H_W is strictly convex along some path $(\nu_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$ connecting ν_0 to ν_1 , for any two probability measures ν_0, ν_1 . Let ν_* be a minimizer of H_W . Then the critical equation for the minimizer is

$$\nu_*(dx) = \exp(-V(x) - 2\pi_{\nu_*} W^{(2)}(x)) m(dx) / C, \quad (2.14)$$

where

$$\pi_{\nu_*} W^{(2)}(x) := \int_S W^{(2)}(x, y) \nu_*(dy),$$

and

$$C := \int_S \exp(-V(x) - 2\pi_{\nu_*} W^{(2)}(x)) m(dx)$$

is the normalization constant.

If $S = \mathbb{R}^d$, the critical equation above is equivalent to the following stationary equation of the nonlinear McKean-Vlasov equation:

$$\Delta \nu_* + \nabla \cdot (\nu_* \nabla V) + \nabla \cdot [(2\nabla W^{(2)} * \nu_*) \cdot \nu_*] = 0, \quad (2.15)$$

where the symbols ∇ and $\nabla \cdot$ denote the gradient operator and divergence operator respectively. For the uniqueness of the solution of (2.15), the reader is referred to McCann [16] and Carrilo et al. [4]. These authors showed that H_W is strictly displacement convex (i.e. along the W_2 -geodesic) under various sufficient conditions on the convexity of the confinement potential V and the pair interaction potential $W^{(2)}$.

We also consider $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$ equipped with the Wasserstein topology, which is much stronger than the weak convergence topology. The L^p -**Wasserstein distance** ($p \geq 1$) with respect to the metric ρ on S , between any two probability measures μ and ν on S , is defined by

$$W_p(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\xi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \left(\iint_{S \times S} \rho^p(x, y) \xi(dx, dy) \right)^{1/p}, \quad (2.16)$$

where $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of all probability measures on $S \times S$ with marginal distribution μ and ν respectively (say couplings of μ and ν).

The **Wasserstein space of order p** is defined as

$$\mathcal{M}_1^p(S) = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S); \int_S \rho^p(x, x_0) \mu(dx) < +\infty \right\},$$

where x_0 is some fixed point of S . It is known that W_p is a finite distance on $\mathcal{M}_1^p(S)$ and $(\mathcal{M}_1^p(S), W_p)$ is a Polish space (see Villani [19, 20]).

Theorem 2.8. *Assume*

$$\int_S \exp\{\lambda \rho^p(x, x_0)\} \alpha(dx) < +\infty, \quad \forall \lambda > 0, \quad (2.17)$$

for some (hence for any) $x_0 \in S$. Under the assumption **(A1)**, the sequence of probability measures $\{P_n(L_n \in \cdot)\}_{n \geq N}$ satisfies the LDP on $(\mathcal{M}_1^p(S), W_p)$ with speed n and the good rate function I_W defined in (2.12).

Remark 2.9. In [10], Dupuis et al. imposed the following non-explicit condition for the LDP result above when $S = \mathbb{R}^d$ and $N = 2$: there exists a lower-semicontinuous function $\phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\phi(s)}{s} = +\infty,$$

such that for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(|x|^p) \mu(dx) \leq \inf_{\xi \in \Pi(\mu, \mu)} \left\{ H(\xi | \alpha^{\otimes 2}) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} W(x, y) \xi(dxdy) \right\}.$$

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Let P_n^* be the measure by removing the normalization constant \tilde{Z}_n from P_n presented in (2.5), i.e.,

$$dP_n^*(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \exp \left(-n \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)}) \right) \alpha^{\otimes n}(dx_1, \dots, dx_n). \quad (3.1)$$

3.1. Large deviation (LD in short) lower bound for P_n^* . First we present the law of large numbers of the U -statistic (see [13, Corollary 3.1.1]). Let X_1, X_2, \dots be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables in a measurable space $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$. Let $\Phi : S^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a symmetric and measurable function of k ($k \geq 2$) variables.

Lemma 3.1. [13, Korolyuk and Borovskich] *Assume that*

$$\mathbb{E}|\Phi(X_1, \dots, X_k)| < +\infty, \quad (3.2)$$

then

$$U_n(\Phi) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}\Phi(X_1, \dots, X_k) \quad (3.3)$$

as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ with probability 1.

Proof. For the sake of completeness, we re-present the simple proof in [13].

Let Π_n be the set of all permutations of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and \mathfrak{B}_n the σ -algebra defined by

$$\mathfrak{B}_n := \sigma \{B_n \times C_n | C_n \in \mathcal{B}(S^{[n+1, +\infty)}), B_n \in \mathcal{B}(S^n), \pi 1_{B_n} = 1_{B_n}, \forall \pi \in \Pi_n\}.$$

The σ -algebra \mathfrak{B}_n remains unchanged under any permutation in Π_n , and $\mathfrak{B}_n \supseteq \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}$ for every $n \geq 1$.

For any $(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k$, by (3.2) we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Phi(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}) | \mathfrak{B}_n] = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X_1, \dots, X_k) | \mathfrak{B}_n],$$

which yields

$$U_n(\Phi) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X_1, \dots, X_k) | \mathfrak{B}_n].$$

According to the limit theorem for reversed martingales and the 0-1 law for $\mathcal{B}_\infty = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{B}_n$,

$$U_n(\Phi) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X_1, \dots, X_k) | \mathfrak{B}_\infty] = \mathbb{E}\Phi(X_1, \dots, X_k).$$

□

We have the following LD lower bound for the empirical measure L_n under P_n^* .

Proposition 3.2. *Without any integrability condition on $(W^{(k)})_{2 \leq k \leq N}$, the following large deviation lower bound holds for $\{P_n^*\{L_n \in \cdot\}\}_{n \geq N}$:*

$$l^*(G) := \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n^*\{L_n \in G\} \geq -\inf\{H_W(\nu) | \nu \in G, W^{(k)} \in L^1(\nu^{\otimes k}), 2 \leq k \leq N\}, \quad (3.4)$$

for any open subset G of $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$. In particular, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{Z}_n \geq -\inf\{H_W(\nu) | \nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S), W^{(k)} \in L^1(\nu^{\otimes k}), 2 \leq k \leq N\}. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. Since (3.5) is obtained just by taking G as $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$ in (3.4), we only need to prove (3.4). For (3.4), it is enough to show that for any $\nu \in G$ such that $H(\nu|\alpha) < +\infty$ and $W^{(k)} \in L^1(\nu^{\otimes k})$, $2 \leq k \leq N$,

$$l^*(G) \geq -H_W(\nu).$$

Let $\mathcal{N}(\nu, \delta)$ be the open ball centered at ν in $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$ with radius δ in the Lévy-Prokhorov metric d_w such that $\mathcal{N}(\nu, \delta) \subset G$. Introduce the events

$$A_n := \{x^n = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in S^n | L_n = L_n(x^n, \cdot) \in \mathcal{N}(\nu, \delta)\},$$

$$B_n := \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) | \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{d\nu}{d\alpha}(x_i) \leq H(\nu|\alpha) + \varepsilon\},$$

$$C_n := \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) | \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)}) \leq \sum_{k=2}^N \mathcal{W}^{(k)}(\nu) + \varepsilon\}.$$

Then we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_n^*\{L_n \in \mathcal{N}(\nu, \delta)\} &\geq \int_{A_n} \left(\frac{d\nu^{\otimes n}}{dP_n^*}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \right)^{-1} d\nu^{\otimes n}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \\
&= \int_{A_n} \exp \left(- \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{d\nu}{d\alpha}(x_i) \right) \exp \left(-n \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)}) \right) \nu^{\otimes n}(dx_1, \dots, dx_n) \\
&\geq \nu^{\otimes n}(A_n \cap B_n \cap C_n) \exp \left(-n[H(\nu|\alpha) + \varepsilon] - n \left[\sum_{k=2}^N \mathcal{W}^{(k)}(\nu) + \varepsilon \right] \right) \\
&= \nu^{\otimes n}(A_n \cap B_n \cap C_n) \exp(-nH_W(\nu) - 2n\varepsilon),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

We claim that $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \nu^{\otimes n}(A_n \cap B_n \cap C_n) = 1$. Indeed, by the LLN, it is obvious that

$$\nu^{\otimes n}(A_n) \rightarrow 1 \text{ and } \nu^{\otimes n}(B_n) \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

By the LLN of U -statistics in Lemma 3.1, we also have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \nu^{\otimes n}(C_n) = 1.$$

With this claim in hand, we immediately get from (3.6) that

$$l^*(G) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n^*\{L_n \in \mathcal{N}(\nu, \delta)\} \geq -H_W(\nu) - 2\varepsilon, \tag{3.7}$$

which completes the proof since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary. \square

3.2. Decoupling inequality of de la Peña and the key lemma. We first recall the decoupling inequality of de la Peña [7, 1992].

Proposition 3.3. [7, de la Peña] *Let $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be a family of i.i.d. random variables in a measurable space $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$ and suppose that $(X_1^j, \dots, X_n^j)_{j=1}^k$ are independent copies of (X_1, \dots, X_n) . Let Ψ be any convex increasing function on $[0, +\infty)$. Let $\Phi : S^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a symmetric and measurable function of k variables such that*

$$\mathbb{E}|\Phi(X_1, \dots, X_k)| < +\infty, \tag{3.8}$$

then

$$\mathbb{E}\Psi \left(\left| \sum_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k} \Phi(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}) \right| \right) \leq \mathbb{E}\Psi \left(C_k \left| \sum_{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k} \Phi(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_k}^k) \right| \right), \tag{3.9}$$

where $C_2 = 8$ and $C_k = 2^k \prod_{j=2}^k (j^j - 1)$ for $k > 2$.

Besides the decoupling inequality of de la Peña above, we also require the following inequality.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $1 \leq k \leq n$, and $\{X_i^j; 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq k\}$ be independent random variables. For any $(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k$, let $\Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k} : S^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function of k variables, then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{(n-k)!}{n!} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k} \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k}(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_k}^k) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{(n-k+1)!}{n!} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k} \log \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{1}{n-k+1} \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k}(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_k}^k) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. For $k = 1$, (3.10) is obviously an equality. Next we prove this lemma by induction. Assume that (3.10) is valid for $k-1$. Denote the left-hand side of (3.10) by B_k and write $\sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}) \in I_n^{k-1}}$ as $\sum_{I_n^{k-1}}$ for simplicity. We have

$$B_k = \log \mathbb{E}^{X^k} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{(n-k+1)!}{n!} \sum_{I_n^{k-1}} \sum_{i_k \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}\}} \frac{1}{n-k+1} \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k}(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_k}^k) \right) | X^k \right] \right\}. \quad (3.11)$$

Given $X^k = (X_1^k, \dots, X_n^k)$, let

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}} := \frac{1}{n-k+1} \sum_{i_k : i_k \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}\}} \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k}(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_{k-1}}^{k-1}, X_{i_k}^k). \quad (3.12)$$

By the assumption of $(k-1)^{th}$ step, we get

$$\begin{aligned} B_k & \leq \log \mathbb{E}^{X^k} \left\{ \exp \left(\frac{(n-k+2)!}{n!} \sum_{I_n^{k-1}} \log \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{n-k+2} \tilde{\Phi}_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}} \right) | X^k \right] \right) \right\} \\ & = \log \mathbb{E}^{X^k} \left\{ \exp \left(\frac{(n-k+1)!}{n!} \sum_{I_n^{k-1}} \log \{ \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{n-k+2} \tilde{\Phi}_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}} \right) | X^k \right] \}^{n-k+2} \right) \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{(n-k+1)!}{n!} \sum_{I_n^{k-1}} \log \mathbb{E}^{X^k} \left\{ \left[\mathbb{E} \exp \left(\frac{1}{n-k+2} \tilde{\Phi}_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}} \right) | X^k \right]^{n-k+2} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where the last inequality follows by the convexity of $X \rightarrow \log \mathbb{E} e^X$ (a consequence of Hölder's inequality).

Next we deal with the logarithmic term in the last inequality above. Given (i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}) ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}^{X^k} \{ [\mathbb{E} \exp(\frac{1}{n-k+2} \tilde{\Phi}_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}}) | X^k]^{n-k+2} \} \\
&= \mathbb{E}^{X^k} \{ [\mathbb{E} \exp(\frac{1}{(n-k+2)(n-k+1)} \sum_{i_k \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}\}} \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k}(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_{k-1}}^{k-1}, X_{i_k}^k)) | X^k]^{n-k+2} \} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}^{X^k} \left\{ \left[\Pi_{i_k: i_k \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}\}} \mathbb{E} [\exp(\frac{1}{n-k+2} \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k}(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_{k-1}}^{k-1}, X_{i_k}^k)) | X^k] \right]^{\frac{n-k+2}{n-k+1}} \right\} \\
&\quad \text{(by Hölder's inequality)} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}^{X^k} \left\{ \Pi_{i_k: i_k \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}\}} \mathbb{E} [\exp(\frac{1}{n-k+1} \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k}(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_{k-1}}^{k-1}, X_{i_k}^k)) | X^k] \right\} \\
&\quad \text{(by Jensen's inequality)} \\
&= \Pi_{i_k: i_k \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}\}} \mathbb{E} \exp(\frac{1}{n-k+1} \Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k}(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_{k-1}}^{k-1}, X_{i_k}^k)) \\
&\quad \text{(by the independence of } X_1^k, \dots, X_n^k) \\
&\tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging (3.14) into (3.13), we get the desired inequality (3.10). \square

Let $\{X_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be a family of i.i.d. random variables of law α . Denote by $\Lambda_n(\cdot; W^{(k)})$ the logarithmic moment generating function associated with the U -statistic of order k , i.e., for any $n \geq k \geq 2$ and $\lambda > 0$,

$$\Lambda_n(\lambda; W^{(k)}) := \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda n U_n(W^{(k)}))]. \tag{3.15}$$

Now we present our key lemma, which is a corollary of the decoupling inequality of de la Peña and Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 3.5. *If $\mathbb{E}|W^{(k)}(X_1, \dots, X_k)| < +\infty$, then for any $2 \leq k \leq n$ and $\lambda > 0$,*

$$\Lambda_n(\lambda; W^{(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{k} \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(k C_k \lambda |W^{(k)}(X_1, \dots, X_k)|)], \tag{3.16}$$

where C_k is defined as in Proposition 3.3.

Proof. Let $(X_1^j, \dots, X_n^j)_{j=1}^k$ be independent copies of (X_1, \dots, X_n) . By Lemma 3.3 (the decoupling inequality of de la Peña) and Lemma 3.4, taking $\Phi_{i_1, \dots, i_k} \equiv W^{(k)}$ for any

$(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k$, we get for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_n(\lambda; W^{(k)}) &= \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda n \frac{(n-k)!}{n!} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k} W^{(k)}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}))] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{(n-k)!}{n!} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k} \lambda n C_k |W^{(k)}|(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_k}^k))] \quad (\text{by (3.9)}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{(n-k+1)!}{n!} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in I_n^k} \log \mathbb{E} \exp(\frac{\lambda n C_k}{n-k+1} |W^{(k)}|(X_{i_1}^1, \dots, X_{i_k}^k)) \quad (\text{by (3.10)}) \\
&= \frac{n-k+1}{n} \log \mathbb{E} \exp(\frac{\lambda n C_k}{n-k+1} |W^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{k} \log \mathbb{E} \exp(k C_k \lambda |W^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k)), \tag{3.17}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by the non-decreasingness of $a \rightarrow \frac{1}{a} \log \mathbb{E} e^{aX}$ on $(0, +\infty)$ and the fact that $\frac{n}{n-k+1} \leq k$ for all $n \geq k$. \square

We have the following exponential approximation of the U -statistics.

Lemma 3.6. *Assume that for any $\lambda > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda |W^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))] < +\infty. \tag{3.18}$$

Then there exists a sequence of bounded continuous functions $\{W_m^{(k)}\}_{m \geq 1}$ such that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\{|U_n(W^{(k)}) - U_n(W_m^{(k)})| > \delta\} = -\infty. \tag{3.19}$$

Proof. For any function $W^{(k)}$ satisfying (3.18) and integer $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$, considering the truncation $W^{(k),L} := (-L) \vee (W^{(k)} \wedge L)$, we have by dominated convergence that

$$\log \mathbb{E}[\exp(m |W^{(k)} - W^{(k),L}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))] \rightarrow 0$$

as $L \rightarrow +\infty$. Then we can choose $L = L(m)$ so that

$$\log \mathbb{E}[\exp(m |W^{(k)} - W^{(k),L(m)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))] \leq \frac{1}{m}.$$

For $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $L = L(m) > 0$ fixed, we can find a sequence of bounded continuous functions $\{W_l^{(k),L}\}_{l \geq 1}$ on S^k such that $W_l^{(k),L}(X_1, \dots, X_k) \rightarrow W^{(k),L}(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ in L^1 as l goes to infinity, and $|W_l^{(k),L}(X_1, \dots, X_k)| \leq L$ (otherwise considering the truncation $(-L) \vee (W_l^{(k),L} \wedge L)$ for all $l \geq 1$). Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp(m[|W^{(k)} - W^{(k),L}|(X_1, \dots, X_k) + |W^{(k),L} - W_l^{(k),L}|(X_1, \dots, X_k)]) \\
&\leq \exp(m|W^{(k)} - W^{(k),L}|(X_1, \dots, X_k) + 2mL)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $l \geq 1$, we have by the dominated convergence

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\exp(m[|W^{(k)} - W^{(k),L}|(X_1, \dots, X_k) + |W^{(k),L} - W_l^{(k),L}|(X_1, \dots, X_k)])] \\ & \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\exp(m|W^{(k)} - W^{(k),L}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))] \end{aligned}$$

as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Thus for $L = L(m)$, we can find $l = l(m)$ such that

$$\log \mathbb{E}[\exp(m[|W^{(k)} - W^{(k),L}|(X_1, \dots, X_k) + |W^{(k),L} - W_l^{(k),L}|(X_1, \dots, X_k)])] \leq \frac{2}{m}.$$

Setting $W_m^{(k)} = W_{l(m)}^{(k),L(m)}$ which is bounded and continuous, we have by the triangular inequality

$$\log \mathbb{E}[\exp(m|W^{(k)} - W_m^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))] \leq \frac{2}{m}.$$

For any $\lambda > 0$, since

$$\log \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda|W^{(k)} - W_m^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))] \leq \frac{\lambda}{m} \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(m|W^{(k)} - W_m^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))]$$

for $m \geq \lambda$ by Jensen's inequality, we see that for the sequence of bounded and continuous functions $\{W_m^{(k)}\}_{m \geq 1}$,

$$\log \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda|W^{(k)} - W_m^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))] \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.20)$$

as $m \rightarrow +\infty$.

For any $\delta, \lambda > 0$, by Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{|U_n(W^{(k)}) - U_n(W_m^{(k)})| > \delta\} \leq e^{-n\lambda\delta} \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda n U_n(|W^{(k)} - W_m^{(k)}|))]. \quad (3.21)$$

Applying Lemma 3.5, we get

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\{|U_n(W^{(k)}) - U_n(W_m^{(k)})| > \delta\} \leq -\lambda\delta + \frac{1}{k} \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(kC_k\lambda|W^{(k)} - W_m^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))]. \quad (3.22)$$

Letting $m \rightarrow +\infty$ and using (3.20), we get the desired result (3.19), since $\lambda > 0$ is arbitrary. \square

3.3. LDP of U -statistics. We begin with

Lemma 3.7. *Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables valued in S , of common law α . Assume that $(W^{(k)})_{2 \leq k \leq N}$ are measurable and satisfy the strong exponential integrability condition*

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda|W^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k))] < +\infty, \quad \forall \lambda > 0, \quad (3.23)$$

then $\{\mathbb{P}((L_n, U_n(W^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W^{(N)})) \in \cdot)\}_{n \geq N}$ satisfies the LDP on the product space $\mathcal{M}_1(S) \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$, with good rate function I defined by

$$I(\nu, z_2, \dots, z_N) := \begin{cases} H(\nu|\alpha), & \text{if } z_k = \mathcal{W}^{(k)}(\nu) \text{ for all } 2 \leq k \leq N \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.24)$$

for any $(\nu, z_2, \dots, z_N) \in \mathcal{M}_1(S) \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$.

Proof. Let $\{W_m^{(k)}\}_{m \geq 1}$, $2 \leq k \leq N$ be the sequences of bounded continuous functions as in Lemma 3.6 such that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\varepsilon(\lambda, m, k) := \log \int_{S^k} \exp(\lambda |W_m^{(k)} - W^{(k)}|) d\alpha^{\otimes k} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } m \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (3.25)$$

For any $m \geq 1$, let

$$f_m(\nu) := \left(\nu, \int_{S^2} W_m^{(2)} d\nu^{\otimes 2}, \dots, \int_{S^N} W_m^{(N)} d\nu^{\otimes N} \right),$$

$$f(\nu) := \left(\nu, \int_{S^2} W^{(2)} d\nu^{\otimes 2}, \dots, \int_{S^N} W^{(N)} d\nu^{\otimes N} \right)$$

and consider the following metric on the product space $\mathcal{M}_1(S) \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$:

$$d((\nu_1, z_2, \dots, z_N), (\tilde{\nu}_1, \tilde{z}_2, \dots, \tilde{z}_N)) := d_w(\nu_1, \tilde{\nu}_1) + \sum_{k=2}^N |z_k - \tilde{z}_k|.$$

Note that $d(f_m(\nu), f(\nu)) = \sum_{k=2}^N \left| \int_{S^k} (W_m^{(k)} - W^{(k)}) d\nu^{\otimes k} \right|$. Below we separate the proof of the LDP into three points.

1) The continuity of $f_m(\nu)$. We first prove the continuity of $f_m(\nu)$ or equivalently that of $\nu \rightarrow \int W_m^{(k)} d\nu^{\otimes k}$ on $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$ in the weak convergence topology for each $k = 2, \dots, N$. In fact let $\nu_n \rightarrow \nu$ in $(\mathcal{M}_1(S), d_w)$. By Skorokhod's representation theorem (see [3, Theorem 6.7]), one can construct a sequence of S -valued random variables Y_n of law ν_n , converging a.s. to Y of law ν . Let $(Y_n^{(i)}, n \geq 0; Y^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq k}$ be independent copies of $(Y_n, n \geq 0; Y)$. Then $Y_n^{(i)} \rightarrow Y^{(i)}$, a.s. too for each i , in other words, $(Y_n^{(1)}, \dots, Y_n^{(k)}) \rightarrow (Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(k)})$, a.s.. Thus $\nu_n^{\otimes k} \rightarrow \nu^{\otimes k}$ weakly on S^k , which implies the continuity of the functional above.

2) Exponentially good approximation of $(L_n, U_n(W^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W^{(N)}))$ by $f_m(L_n)$.

By (3.19) in Lemma 3.6, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P} \left(d((L_n, U_n(W_m^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W_m^{(N)})), (L_n, U_n(W^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W^{(N)}))) > \delta \right) \rightarrow -\infty$$

as $m \rightarrow +\infty$, i.e. $(L_n, U_n(W_m^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W_m^{(N)}))$ is an exponentially good approximation of $(L_n, U_n(W^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W^{(N)}))$.

Moreover $(L_n, U_n(W_m^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W_m^{(N)}))$ and $f_m(L_n)$ are exponentially equivalent, because the following uniform estimate holds:

$$\begin{aligned} |U_n(W_m^{(k)}) - \int W_m^{(k)} dL_n^{\otimes k}| &\leq |U_n(W_m^{(k)}) - \frac{|I_n^k|}{n^k} U_n(W_m^{(k)})| + (1 - \frac{|I_n^k|}{n^k}) \|W_m^{(k)}\|_\infty \\ &\leq 2 \left(1 - \frac{|I_n^k|}{n^k} \right) \|W_m^{(k)}\|_\infty \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then as $m \rightarrow \infty$, $f_m(L_n)$ is an exponentially good approximation of $(L_n, U_n(W^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W^{(N)}))$.

3). Therefore by Sanov's theorem (the LDP of L_n) and the theorem of approximation of LDP ([8, Theorem 4.2.23]), for the desired LDP it remains to show that for any $L > 0$,

$$\sup_{\nu: H(\nu|\alpha) \leq L} d(f_m(\nu), f(\nu)) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } m \rightarrow +\infty. \quad (3.26)$$

In fact for any $\lambda > 0$, $L > 0$ and ν with $H(\nu|\alpha) \leq L$, we have by Donsker-Varadhan variational formula (see [9, Lemma 1.4.3.(a)]) and Fatou's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{S^k} |W_m^{(k)} - W^{(k)}| d\nu^{\otimes k} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(H(\nu^{\otimes k}|\alpha^{\otimes k}) + \log \int_{S^k} \exp(\lambda |W_m^{(k)} - W^{(k)}|) d\alpha^{\otimes k} \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\lambda} [kL + \varepsilon(\lambda, m, k)], \quad 2 \leq k \leq N. \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

where (3.26) follows for $\lambda > 0$ is arbitrary and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon(\lambda, m, k) = 0$ for any $\lambda > 0$. \square

3.4. Proof of Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. We divide its proof into three steps.

Step 1. $W^{(k)}$ is upper bounded. In this upper bounded case, $\mathbb{E} e^{\lambda |W^{(k)}|(X_1, \dots, X_k)} < +\infty$ for all $\lambda > 0$ by **(A1)**. By Lemma 3.7, under $\mathbb{P} = \alpha^{\otimes N^*}$, $(L_n, U_n(W^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W^{(N)}))$ satisfies the LDP on $\mathcal{M}_1(S) \times \mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ with the rate function $I(\nu, z_2, \dots, z_N)$ given by (3.24). Since $\sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)})$ is continuous in $(L_n, U_n(W^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W^{(N)}))$, and

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{E} \exp \left(-np \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)}) \right) < +\infty$$

for some $p > 1$ (in fact for all $p > 1$) by Lemma 3.5 and **(A1)**, we can apply the tilted LDP (Ellis [11, Theorem II.7.2.]) to conclude that $P_n((L_n, U_n(W^{(2)}), \dots, U_n(W^{(N)})) \in \cdot)$ satisfies the LDP, with the rate function \tilde{I} given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}(\nu, z_2, \dots, z_N) &= I(\nu, z_2, \dots, z_N) + \sum_{k=2}^N z_k - \inf_{(\nu, z_2, \dots, z_N)} [I(\nu, z_2, \dots, z_N) + \sum_{k=2}^N z_k] \\ &= \begin{cases} H(\nu|\alpha) + \sum_{k=2}^N \mathcal{W}^{(k)}(\nu) - \inf_{\nu' \in \mathcal{M}_1(S), H(\nu'|\alpha) < +\infty} \{H(\nu'|\alpha) + \sum_{k=2}^N \mathcal{W}^{(k)}(\nu')\} \\ \quad \text{if } H(\nu|\alpha) < +\infty, z_k = \mathcal{W}^{(k)}(\nu), 2 \leq k \leq N \\ +\infty, \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} H_W(\nu) - \inf_{\mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_W & \text{if } H(\nu|\alpha) < +\infty, z_k = \mathcal{W}^{(k)}(\nu), 2 \leq k \leq N \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Hence $P_n(L_n \in \cdot)$ satisfies the LDP with the rate function I_W , by the contraction principle. Notice that $H_W = I_W + \inf_{\mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_W$ is inf-compact, as I_W .

Step 2. General unbounded case. For any $L > 0$, let $W_L^{(k)} := W^{(k)} \wedge L$. Then

$$H_{W_L}(\nu) = H(\nu|\alpha) + \sum_{k=2}^N \int_{S^k} W_L^{(k)} d\nu^{\otimes k}, \quad \text{if } H(\nu|\alpha) < +\infty \text{ and } +\infty \text{ otherwise}$$

is inf-compact on $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$, by Step 1. Therefore H_W is also inf-compact since $H_{W_L}(\nu) \uparrow H_W(\nu)$ as $L \uparrow +\infty$.

For any closed subset C of $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$, we have for any $L > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_n^*\{L_n \in C\} &= \int_{S^n} 1_{\{L_n \in C\}} \exp\left(-n \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)})\right) d\alpha^{\otimes n} \\ &\leq \int_{S^n} 1_{\{L_n \in C\}} \exp\left(-n \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W_L^{(k)})\right) d\alpha^{\otimes n} \\ &\leq \exp\left(-n \inf_{\nu \in C} H_{W_L}(\nu) + o(n)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 3.7 and Varadhan's Laplace lemma. Hence we get

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n^*\{L_n \in C\} \leq - \inf_{\nu \in C} H_{W_L}(\nu),$$

which leads to

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n^*\{L_n \in C\} \leq - \inf_{\nu \in C} H_W(\nu) \quad (3.29)$$

because $\inf_{\nu \in C} H_{W_L}(\nu) \uparrow \inf_{\nu \in C} H_W(\nu)$ as $L \uparrow +\infty$ by the inf-compactness of H_{W_L}, H_W .

Taking $C = \mathcal{M}_1(S)$ in (3.29) we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{Z}_n \leq - \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_W(\nu).$$

By the lower bound (3.5) in Proposition 3.2 and the upper bound above, and the fact that $H_W(\nu) = +\infty$ once if $W^{(k)} \notin L^1(\nu^{\otimes k})$ for some $2 \leq k \leq N$, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{Z}_n = - \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_W(\nu) \quad (3.30)$$

which is a finite quantity (i.e. in \mathbb{R}) by the inf-compactness of H_W and (2.9). With this key equality (3.30) in hand, the LDP of $\{P_n(L_n \in \cdot)\}_{n \geq N}$ follows from the lower bound in Proposition 3.2 and the upper bound (3.29).

Step 3. Finally it remains to show the identification (2.13) of the rate function I_W . For any ν such that $\nu \ll \alpha$ and $W^{(k),-} \in L^1(\nu^{\otimes k})$, $2 \leq k \leq N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} H(\nu^{\otimes n} | P_n) &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}^{\nu^{\otimes n}} \left(\log \frac{d\nu^{\otimes n}}{d\alpha^{\otimes n}} + n \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)}) + \log \tilde{Z}_n \right) \\ &= H(\nu|\alpha) + \sum_{k=2}^N \int W^{(k)} d\nu^{\otimes k} + \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{Z}_n \end{aligned}$$

which yields (2.13) by (3.30), as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. □

3.5. Proof of Theorem 2.8. We first present the result of Sanov's theorem in the Wasserstein distance by Wang et. al. [21].

Proposition 3.8. *Let $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables defined on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) with values in a Polish space (S, ρ) , of common law α , then $\{P(L_n \in \cdot)\}_{n \geq 1}$ satisfies the LDP on $(\mathcal{M}_1^p(S), W_p)$ with speed n and the good rate function $H(\cdot|\alpha)$, if and only if*

$$\int_S \exp\{\lambda \rho^p(x, x_0)\} \alpha(dx) < +\infty, \quad \forall \lambda > 0$$

for some (hence for any) $x_0 \in S$.

Proof of Theorem 2.8. Since we have established the LDP of the empirical measure L_n under P_n on $\mathcal{M}_1(S)$ equipped with the weak convergence topology, it is sufficient to prove the exponential tightness of $\{P_n(L_n \in \cdot)\}_{n \geq N}$ in $(\mathcal{M}_1^p(S), W_p)$ (see [8, Corollary 4.2.6]).

For any compact subset $K \subset \mathcal{M}_1^p(S)$, and any fixed $a, b \in (1, +\infty)$ with $\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} = 1$, we have by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} P_n\{L_n \notin K\} &= \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}_n} \int 1_{\{L_n \notin K\}} \exp\left(-n \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)})\right) d\alpha^{\otimes n} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}_n} [\alpha^{\otimes n}\{L_n \notin K\}]^{1/a} \times \left(\int \exp\left(-bn \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(W^{(k)})\right) d\alpha^{\otimes n}\right)^{1/b}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n\{L_n \notin K\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{a} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \alpha^{\otimes n}\{L_n \notin K\} - \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \tilde{Z}_n \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{b} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \int \exp\left(-n \sum_{k=2}^N U_n(bW^{(k)})\right) d\alpha^{\otimes n} \\ &= \frac{1}{a} \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \alpha^{\otimes n}\{L_n \notin K\} + \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_W(\nu) - \frac{1}{b} \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_{bW}(\nu), \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

where $\inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_W(\nu)$ and

$$\inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_{bW}(\nu) := \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} \left\{ H(\nu|\alpha) + \sum_{k=2}^N \int_{S^k} bW^{(k)} d\nu^{\otimes k} \right\}$$

are finite by (2.11) in Theorem 2.4.

Note that under the exponential integrability condition (2.17), the LDP holds for L_n under $\alpha^{\otimes n}$ with respect to the Wasserstein topology by Proposition 3.8. Thus for any $L > 0$, there exists a compact subset $K_L \subset \mathcal{M}_1^p(S)$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \alpha^{\otimes n} \{L_n \notin K_L\} \leq -aL - a \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_W(\nu) + \frac{a}{b} \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1(S)} H_{bW}(\nu). \quad (3.33)$$

Plugging (3.33) into (3.32), we get

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n \{L_n \notin K_L\} \leq -L, \quad (3.34)$$

which completes the proof. □

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the referees for their careful reading of the paper and for many valuable comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

- [1] R.J. Berman, On large deviations for Gibbs measures, mean energy and Gamma-convergence, *Constr. Approx.* 48 (1) (2018) 3-30.
- [2] R.J. Berman, Large deviations for Gibbs measures with singular Hamiltonians and emergence of Kähler-Einstein metrics, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 354 (2017) 1133-1172.
- [3] P. Billingsley, *Convergence of Probability Measures*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition, 1999. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [4] J. Carrillo, R.J. McCann, C. Villani, Kinetic equilibration rates for granular media and related equations: Entropy dissipation and mass transportation estimates, *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* 19 (2003) 971-1018.
- [5] D. Chafaï, N. Gozlan, P. Zitt, First-order global asymptotics for confined particles with singular pair repulsion, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 24 (6) (2014) 2371-2413.
- [6] D.A. Dawson, J. Gärtner, Large deviations from the McKean-Vlasov limit for weakly interacting diffusions, *Stochastics* 20 (4) (1987) 247-308.
- [7] V.H. De La Peña, Decoupling and Khintchine's inequalities for U -statistics, *Ann. Probab.* 20 (4) (1992) 1877-1892.
- [8] A. Dembo, O. Zeitouni, *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*, Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability, vol. 38, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010. Corrected reprint of the second (1998) edition.
- [9] P. Dupuis, R.S. Ellis, *A Weak Convergence Approach to the Theory of Large Deviations*, Wiley, New York, 1997.
- [10] P. Dupuis, V. Laschos, K. Ramanan, Large deviations for empirical measures generated by Gibbs measures with singular energy functionals. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06928>.
- [11] R. Ellis. *Entropy, Large Deviations and Statistical Mechanics*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften Vol. 271, Springer 1985.
- [12] D. García-Zelada, A large deviation principle for empirical measures on Polish spaces: Application to singular Gibbs measures on manifolds. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.02680>.
- [13] V.S. Korolyuk, Y.V. Borovskich, *Theory of U-statistics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1994.
- [14] T. Leblé, S. Serfaty, Large deviation principle for empirical fields of Log and Riesz gases, *Invent. Math.* 210 (3) (2017) 645-757.

- [15] C. Léonard, Large deviations and law of large numbers for a mean field type interacting particle system, *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* 25 (1987) 215-235.
- [16] R.J. McCann, A convexity principle for interacting gases, *Adv. Math.* 128 (1997) 153-179.
- [17] F. Rassoul-Agha, T. Seppäläinen, *A Course on Large Deviations with an Introduction to Gibbs Measures*, vol. 162 of Graduate Studies in Mathematics. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.
- [18] A.S. Sznitman, Topics in propagation of chaos, *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1464 (1991) 165-251.
- [19] C. Villani, *Topics in Optimal Transportation*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 58, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003. xvi+370 pp.
- [20] C. Villani, *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 338, Springer Verlag, 2009.
- [21] R. Wang, X. Wang, L. Wu, Sanov's theorem in the Wasserstein distance: a necessary and sufficient condition, *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 80 (5) (2010) 505-512.

WEI LIU, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, HUBEI 430072, PR CHINA; COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCE HUBEI KEY LABORATORY, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, HUBEI 430072, PR CHINA.

E-mail address: wliu.math@whu.edu.cn

LIMING WU, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES BLAISE PASCAL, CNRS-UMR 6620, UNIVERSITÉ CLERMONT-AUVERGNE, 3 PLACE VASARELY, 63178 AUBIÈRE, FRANCE.

E-mail address: Li-Ming.Wu@math.univ-bpclermont.fr