

Exact Exponents for Concentration and Isoperimetry in Product Polish Spaces

Lei Yu*

September 19, 2022

Abstract

In this paper, we derive variational formulas for the asymptotic exponents of the concentration and isoperimetric functions in the product Polish probability space. These formulas are expressed in terms of relative entropies (which are from information theory) and optimal transport cost functionals (which are from optimal transport theory). Our results verify an intimate connection among information theory, optimal transport, and concentration of measure or isoperimetric inequalities. In the concentration regime, the corresponding variational formula is in fact a dimension-free bound on the exponent of the concentration function. The proofs in this paper are based on information-theoretic and optimal transport techniques. Our results generalize Alon, Boppana, and Spencer's in [4], Gozlan and Léonard's [14], and Ahlswede and Zhang's in [3].

Index terms— Concentration of measure, isoperimetric inequality, optimal transport, information-theoretic method, exponent

1 Introduction

Concentration of measure in a probability metric space refers to a phenomenon that a slight enlargement of any measurable set of not small probability will always have large probability. In the language of functional analysis, it is equivalent to a phenomenon that the value of any Lipschitz function is concentrated around its medians. The concentration of measure phenomenon was pushed forward in the early 1970s by V. Milman in the study of the asymptotic geometry of Banach spaces. It was then studied in depth by V. Milman and many other authors including Gromov, Maurey, Pisier, Schechtman, Talagrand, Ledoux, etc. In particular, Talagrand [22] studied the concentration of measure in product spaces equipped with product probability measures, and derived a variety of concentration of measure inequalities for these spaces. In information theory, concentration of measure is known as the *blowing-up lemma* [1, 18], which was employed by Gács, Ahlswede, and Körner to prove the strong converses of two coding problems in information theory.

It is worth mentioning that Marton is the first to introduce information-theoretic techniques, especially transportation-entropy inequalities, in the study of the concentration of measure [18], which yields an elegant and short proof for this phenomenon. By developing a new transportation-entropy inequality, Talagrand extended her idea to the case of Gaussian measure and Euclidean metric [23]. Since then, such a textbook beautiful argument became popular and emerged in many books, e.g., [17, 21, 26]. By replacing the “linear” transportation-entropy inequality in Marton’s argument with the “nonlinear” version, Gozlan and Léonard obtained the sharp dimension-free bound on the concentration function [14]. In other words, their bound corresponds to the asymptotic exponent of the concentration function. Furthermore, Gozlan [13] also used Marton’s argument to prove the equivalence between the Gaussian bound on the concentration function and

*L. Yu is with the School of Statistics and Data Science, LPMC, KLMDASR, and LEBPS, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China (e-mail: leiyu@nankai.edu.cn). This work was supported by the NSFC grant 62101286 and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities of China (Nankai University).

Talagrand's transportation-entropy inequality. Dembo [10] provided a new kind of transportation-entropy inequalities, and used them to recover several results of Talagrand [22].

Ahlsweide and Zhang [3] focused on the isoperimetric regime of the concentration problem, in which they assumed the set to be small enough such that its enlargement is small as well. In fact, in this regime, the problem turns into an isoperimetric problem where the difference between the enlargement and the original set is regarded as the "boundary" of the set. They characterized the asymptotic exponents for this problem by using information-theoretic methods.

In this paper, we investigated the concentration (or isoperimetric) problem in the product Polish space. Specifically, we minimize the probability of the t -enlargement (or t -neighborhood) A^t of a set A under the condition that the probability of A is given. Here, different from the common setting in concentration of measure, the probability of A is not necessarily restricted to be around $1/2$. The probability of A could be small or large. We use Marton's idea to derive a dimension-free bound (expressed in the variational form) for this problem in the concentration regime, which is exponentially sharp when the probability of A is not too large (not close to 1) and the probability of A^t is close to 1. This bound sharpens Gozlan and Léonard's bound [14] especially for the setting in which the probability of A is exponentially small. It also sharpens the well known Talagrand's concentration inequality in [22]. Furthermore, based on Ahlsweide and Zhang the inherently typical subset lemma [2, 3], we also characterize the asymptotic exponent for the problem in the isoperimetric regime in which the probabilities of A and A^t exponentially vanish.

We now introduce the mathematical formulation. Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be Polish spaces. Let $\Sigma(\mathcal{X})$ and $\Sigma(\mathcal{Y})$ be respectively the Borel σ -algebras on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} that are generated by the topologies on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ denote the sets of probability measures (or distributions) on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} respectively. Let $P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and $P_Y \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$. In other words, P_X and P_Y are respectively the distributions of two random variables X and Y . Let $c : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ be lower semi-continuous, which is called a *cost function*. Denote \mathcal{X}^n as the n -fold product space of \mathcal{X} . For the product space $\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ and given c , we consider an additive cost function c_n on $\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ given by

$$c_n(x^n, y^n) := \sum_{i=1}^n c(x_i, y_i) \quad \text{for } (x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n,$$

where c given above is independent of n . Obviously, c_n is lower semi-continuous since c is lower semi-continuous.

For a set $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$, denote its t -enlargement under c as

$$A^t := \bigcup_{x^n \in A} \{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n : c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq t\}.$$

To address the measurability of A^t , we assume that either of the following two conditions holds throughout this paper.

1. For lower semi-continuous c , we restrict A to a closed set.
2. If \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the same Polish space and $c = d^p$, where $p > 0$ and d is a metric on this Polish space, then A can be any Borel set.

For the first case, since \mathcal{X}^n and \mathcal{Y}^n are Polish, for closed A , the set A^t is an analytic set and hence, universally measurable. If we extend $P_Y^{\otimes n}$ to the collection of analytic sets, then $P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^t)$ is well defined. Hence, for this case, we by default adopt this extension to avoid the measurability problem. For the second case, for any Borel set A , A^t is always Borel (since it is countable intersections of Borel sets $\bigcup_{x^n \in A} \{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n : c_n(x^n, y^n) < t + \frac{1}{k}\}, k = 1, 2, \dots$).

Define the *isoperimetric function* as for $a \in [0, 1], t \geq 0$,

$$\Gamma^{(n)}(a, t) := \inf_{A: P_X^{\otimes n}(A) \geq a} P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^t), \tag{1}$$

where the set A is assumed to satisfy either of two conditions above. We call $(a, t) \mapsto 1 - \Gamma^{(n)}(a, t)$ as the *concentration function*, which is a generalization of the usual concentration function $t \mapsto 1 - \Gamma^{(n)}(\frac{1}{2}, t)$ in the theory of concentration of measure. Define the *isoperimetric* and *concentration exponents* respectively as¹ for $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) &:= -\frac{1}{n} \log \Gamma^{(n)}(e^{-n\alpha}, n\tau) \\ E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) &:= -\frac{1}{n} \log \left(1 - \Gamma^{(n)}(e^{-n\alpha}, n\tau) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In fact,

$$\Gamma^{(n)}(e^{-n\alpha}, n\tau) = e^{-nE_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau)} = 1 - e^{-nE_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau)}.$$

In this paper, our results involve the optimal transport (OT) cost functional, which is introduced now. The *coupling set* of (P_X, P_Y) is defined as

$$\Pi(P_X, P_Y) := \left\{ P_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) : \begin{aligned} &P_{XY}(A \times \mathcal{Y}) = P_X(A), \forall A \in \Sigma(\mathcal{X}), \\ &P_{XY}(\mathcal{X} \times B) = P_Y(B), \forall B \in \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}) \end{aligned} \right\}.$$

Distributions in $\Pi(P_X, P_Y)$ are termed *couplings* of (P_X, P_Y) . The *OT cost* between P_X and P_Y is defined as²

$$C(P_X, P_Y) := \min_{P_{XY} \in \Pi(P_X, P_Y)} \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim P_{XY}}[c(X, Y)]. \quad (3)$$

Any $P_{XY} \in \Pi(P_X, P_Y)$ attaining $C(P_X, P_Y)$ is called an *OT plan*. The minimization problem in (3) is called the *Monge–Kantorovich’s OT problem* [26]. The functional $(P_X, P_Y) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) \mapsto C(P_X, P_Y) \in [0, +\infty)$ is called the *OT (cost) functional*. If \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the same Polish space and $c = d^p$, where $p \geq 1$ and d is a metric on this Polish space, then $W_p(P_X, P_Y) := (C(P_X, P_Y))^{1/p}$ is the so-called *p-th Wasserstein distance* between P_X and P_Y . For the n -dimensional case, $W_p(P_{X^n}, P_{Y^n}) := (C(P_{X^n}, P_{Y^n}))^{1/p}$ with $c_n(x^n, y^n) = \sum_{i=1}^n d^p(x_i, y_i)$ is the *p-th Wasserstein distance* between P_{X^n} and P_{Y^n} for the product metric $d_n(x^n, y^n) = c_n(x^n, y^n)^{1/p}$ where $p \geq 1$.

Furthermore, for another distribution P_W on a Polish space \mathcal{W} , the conditional coupling set of Markov kernels (or transition probabilities) $P_{X|W}$ and $P_{Y|W}$ is defined as

$$\Pi(P_{X|W}, P_{Y|W}) := \left\{ \begin{aligned} &P_{XY|W} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} | \mathcal{W}) : \\ &P_{XY|W=w} \in \Pi(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w}), \forall w \in \mathcal{W} \end{aligned} \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} | \mathcal{W})$ denotes the set of Markov kernels from \mathcal{W} to $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. The *conditional OT cost* between Markov kernels (or transition probability measures) $P_{X|W}$ and $P_{Y|W}$ given P_W is defined as

$$C(P_{X|W}, P_{Y|W} | P_W) := \min_{P_{XY|W} \in \Pi(P_{X|W}, P_{Y|W})} \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y, W) \sim P_{XY|W} P_W}[c(X, Y)], \quad (4)$$

where $P_{XY|W} P_W$ denotes the joint probability measure induced by P_W and $P_{XY|W}$. The conditional OT cost can be alternatively expressed as³

$$C(P_{X|W}, P_{Y|W} | P_W) = \mathbb{E}_{P_W}[C(P_{X|W}, P_{Y|W})].$$

The measurability of $w \mapsto C(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w})$ follows since it is the composition of measurable functions $w \mapsto (P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w})$ and $(Q_X, Q_Y) \mapsto C(Q_X, Q_Y)$.

¹Throughout this paper, the base of log is e . Our results are still true if the bases are chosen to other values, as long as the bases of the logarithm and exponential are the same.

²The existence of the minimizers are well-known; see, e.g., [26, Theorem 1.3]. Furthermore, when the (joint) distribution of the random variables involved in an expectation is clear from context, we will omit the subscript “ $(X, Y) \sim P_{XY}$ ”.

³In other words, the minimization in (4) can be taken in a pointwise way for each w . For optimal $P_{XY}^{(w)}$ attaining $C(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w})$, the measurability of $w \mapsto P_{XY}^{(w)}(B)$, $B \in \Sigma(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$ can be addressed by measurable selection theorems, e.g., [6, Proposition 7.50].

1.1 Dimension-Free Bound on Concentration Exponent

We first provide a dimension-free bound on the concentration exponent $E_1^{(n)}$. To this end, for two distributions P, Q defined on the same space, we denote $D(Q\|P) := \int \log(\frac{dQ}{dP})dQ$ as the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence or relative entropy of Q from P . Denote the conditional version $D(Q_{X|W}\|P_{X|W}|Q_W) = D(Q_{X|W}Q_W\|P_{X|W}Q_W)$.

Given P_X, P_Y , and c , we define

$$\phi(\alpha, \tau) := \inf_{\substack{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), Q_Y \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}): \\ D(Q_X\|P_X) \leq \alpha, C(Q_X, Q_Y) > \tau}} D(Q_Y\|P_Y). \quad (5)$$

Denote $\check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$ as the lower convex envelope of $\phi(\alpha, \tau)$, which can be also expressed as

$$\check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau) = \inf_{\substack{Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}, Q_W: \\ D(Q_{X|W}\|P_{X|W}|Q_W) \leq \alpha, \\ C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) > \tau}} D(Q_{Y|W}\|P_{Y|W}|Q_W), \quad (6)$$

where W is an auxiliary random variable defined on a Polish space. However, by Carathéodory's theorem, the alphabet size of Q_W can be restricted to be no larger than 4. In fact, the alphabet size can be further restricted to be no larger than 3, since it suffices to consider the boundary points of the convex hull of

$$\{(D(Q_{X|W=w}\|P_X), D(Q_{Y|W=w}\|P_Y), C(Q_{X|W=w}, Q_{Y|W=w}))\}_{w \in \mathcal{W}}.$$

We now provide a dimension-free bound⁴ for $E_1^{(n)}$. The proof is provided in Section 2.

Theorem 1 (Dimension-Free Bound). *It holds that for $\alpha, \tau \geq 0$,*

$$E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau). \quad (7)$$

This bound is elegant in the following sense. This is a bound for the concentration exponent, but is expressed in terms of two fundamental quantities from other fields—"relative entropy" which comes from information theory (or large deviations theory) and "optimal transport cost" which comes from the theory of optimal transport. Hence, this shows an intimate connection among concentration of measure, information theory, and optimal transport. Furthermore, in the following subsection, we will show that this bound is asymptotically tight under certain conditions.

The first bound like the one in (7) was first derived by Marton [18, 19], which was improved by Gozlan and Léonard [14]. However, their bounds are only valid for the case that c is a metric or the composition of a metric with a convex function, since the triangle inequality is used as a key step in their proofs. Our proof relies on the chain rule for OT costs, instead of the triangle inequality, leading to that our bound in (7) is better than Gozlan and Léonard's. When their bounds are valid and α is close to zero, e.g., $\alpha = \frac{1}{n} \log 2$ (i.e., $a = \frac{1}{2}$), our bound and theirs do not differ too much, and as $n \rightarrow \infty$, they coincide asymptotically. However, if α is bounded away from zero, our bound is usually asymptotically tight but theirs are not. We next provide more details above Gozlan and Léonard's bound. To this end, we first introduce a mild assumption.

Assumption 1: (Positivity Condition) $\check{\varphi}_X(\tau)$ is strictly positive for all sufficiently small (equivalently for all) $\tau > 0$, where

$$\varphi_X(\tau) := \inf_{Q_X: C(P_X, Q_X) > \tau} D(Q_X\|P_X). \quad (8)$$

An equivalent statement of Assumption 1 is that given P_X , if $C(P_X, Q_X)$ is bounded away from zero, then so is $D(Q_X\|P_X)$. In other words, given P_X , convergence in information (i.e., $D(Q_X\|P_X) \rightarrow 0$) implies convergence in optimal transport (i.e., $C(P_X, Q_X) \rightarrow 0$).

⁴The terminology "dimension-free bound" here indicates that the tuple of the normalized enlargement parameter τ , the (normalized) exponent of $P_X^{\otimes n}(A)$, and the (normalized) exponent of $1 - P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^{n\tau})$ verifies the same inequality for all n . This concept is weaker than that in [13] and reduces to the latter when $P_X^{\otimes n}(A)$ is fixed to be around $1/2$, c is set to d^2 , and the bound on the exponent of $1 - P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^{n\tau})$ in the inequality satisfied by the tuple is the quadratic form. Hence, the "dimension-free bound" here could be satisfied by a much larger class of probability metric spaces, than that in [13].

The function $\varphi_X(\tau)$ characterizes the best possible tradeoff between the relative entropy and the OT cost. Assumption 1 holds if the following “linear”⁵ *transportation-entropy inequality* holds:

$$W_p(P_X, Q_X) \leq \sqrt{\gamma D(Q_X \| P_X)}, \forall Q_X \quad (9)$$

for some constant γ . It is well-known that (9) is valid when $\gamma = 2$ and d is the Hamming metric or when $\gamma = 2$, d is the Euclidean metric, and P_X is the standard Gaussian measure. The former is known as *Csiszár–Kullback–Pinsker (CKP) inequality*, and the latter is known as *Talagrand inequality*.

The generalized inverse of $\check{\varphi}_X$ is for $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\varphi}_X^-(\alpha) &:= \inf \{ \tau \geq 0 : \varphi_X(\tau) \geq \alpha \} \\ &= \inf \{ \tau \geq 0 : D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \geq \alpha, \forall Q_{XW} : C(P_X, Q_{X|W} | Q_W) > \tau \} \\ &= \inf \{ \tau \geq 0 : C(P_X, Q_{X|W} | Q_W) \leq \tau, \forall Q_{XW} : D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) < \alpha \} \\ &= \sup_{Q_{XW} : D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) < \alpha} C(P_X, Q_{X|W} | Q_W) \\ &= \hat{\kappa}_X(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\kappa_X(\alpha) := \sup_{Q_X : D(Q_X \| P_X) < \alpha} C(P_X, Q_X). \quad (10)$$

Assumption 1 can be equivalently stated as $\hat{\kappa}_X(\alpha) \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$.

We now introduce Gozlan and Léonard’s bound. We assume that \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the same Polish space and $P_X = P_Y$, the cost function $c = d^p$, and $a = \frac{1}{2}$. For this case, $C = W_p^p$. Then, by using the triangle inequality, it can be obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau) &\geq \inf_{\substack{Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}, Q_W : \\ W_p^p(P_X, Q_{X|W} | Q_W) \leq \hat{\kappa}_X(\alpha), \\ W_p^p(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) > \tau}} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\ &\geq \inf_{\substack{Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}, Q_W : \\ W_p(P_X, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) > \sqrt[p]{\tau} - \sqrt[p]{\hat{\kappa}_X(\alpha)}}} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\ &\geq \check{\varphi}_X((\sqrt[p]{\tau} - \sqrt[p]{\hat{\kappa}_X(\alpha)})^p). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

By Theorem 1, the expression in (11) is a lower bound on $E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau)$, which is just Gozlan and Léonard’s bound [14]. Under Assumption 1, as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, this bound converges to $\check{\varphi}_X(\tau)$. Moreover, under the assumption of the transportation-entropy inequality, it holds that $\check{\varphi}_X(\tau) \leq \frac{\tau^{2/p}}{\gamma}$, which implies that (11) is further lower bounded by

$$\left(\frac{\sqrt[p]{\tau}}{\sqrt[p]{\gamma}} - \sqrt{\alpha} \right)^2, \quad (12)$$

recovering the Gaussian bound. Refer to [18, 19, 22, 23] for many such bounds. Note that the enlargement under $c = d^p$ is

$$A^{n\tau} := \bigcup_{x^n \in A} \{y^n : \sqrt[p]{\sum_{i=1}^n d^p(x_i, y_i)} \leq r\},$$

where $r = \sqrt[p]{n\tau}$. So, when expressed in r , the bound in (12) corresponds to $1 - \Gamma^{(n)}(e^{-n\alpha}, n\tau) \geq \exp \left[-n \left(\frac{r}{\sqrt[p]{n\gamma}} - \sqrt{\alpha} \right)^2 \right]$. For $p = 1$, it reduces to $\exp \left[-n \left(\frac{r}{\sqrt{n\gamma}} - \sqrt{\alpha} \right)^2 \right]$, and for $p = 2$, it reduces to $\exp \left[-n \left(\frac{r}{\sqrt{n\gamma}} - \sqrt{\alpha} \right)^2 \right]$.

⁵Rigorously speaking, W_p is bounded by a linear function of \sqrt{D} , rather than a linear function of D .

1.2 Improvement of Talagrand's Concentration Inequality

The lower bound in (12) with $\gamma = 2$ holds for many pairs of (P_X, c) . Talagrand [22] showed that this bound (in fact, the one with a worse factor) for the Hamming metric and $p = 1$ is implied by the following inequality (see [22, p. 86]):

$$P_X^{\otimes n}((A^t)^c)^{1-\lambda} P_X^{\otimes n}(A)^\lambda \leq e^{-\lambda(1-\lambda)2n\tau^2}, \quad \forall A, \lambda \in [0, 1].$$

This kind of inequalities are the so-called *Talagrand's concentration inequalities*. We now provide an improvement of this inequality which will be shown to be exponentially sharp.

Given P_X, P_Y , and c , we define for $\tau, \lambda \geq 0$,

$$\phi_\lambda(\tau) := \inf_{Q_X, Q_Y: C(Q_X, Q_Y) > \tau} (1-\lambda)D(Q_Y \| P_Y) + \lambda D(Q_X \| P_X).$$

Denote $\check{\phi}_\lambda(\tau)$ as the lower convex envelope of $\phi_\lambda(\tau)$.

Theorem 2 (Improvement of Talagrand's Concentration Inequality). *It holds that for any $\tau, \lambda \geq 0$, $t = n\tau$, and any A ,*

$$P_Y^{\otimes n}((A^t)^c)^{1-\lambda} P_X^{\otimes n}(A)^\lambda \leq e^{-n\check{\phi}_\lambda(\tau)}. \quad (13)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{n} \log (P_Y^{\otimes n}((A^t)^c)^{1-\lambda} P_X^{\otimes n}(A)^\lambda) \\ & \geq \inf_{\alpha \geq 0} \lambda \alpha + (1-\lambda) \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau) \\ & = \inf_{\substack{\alpha \geq 0, Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}, Q_W: \\ D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha, \\ C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) > \tau}} \lambda \alpha + (1-\lambda) D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\ & = \inf_{\substack{Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}, Q_W: \\ C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) > \tau}} \lambda D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) + (1-\lambda) D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\ & = \check{\phi}_\lambda(\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

□

From the alternative expression of $\check{\phi}_\lambda(\tau)$ in (14) and for each α , choosing λ such that $\frac{\lambda}{\lambda-1}$ is a subgradient of $\alpha' \mapsto \check{\phi}(\alpha', \tau)$ at α , we obtain the inequality in (7) from the inequality in (14) (or equivalently, the one in (13)). Hence, Theorem 2 is in fact equivalent to Theorem 1, and the asymptotic tightness of (7) is equivalent to the exponential sharpness of (13).

1.3 Asymptotics of Concentration Exponent

We next prove that the bound in Theorem 1 is asymptotically tight under the following assumptions. Denote the Lévy-Prokhorov metric on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ as $L(Q'_X, Q_X) = \inf\{\delta > 0 : Q'_X(A) \leq Q_X(A_\delta) + \delta, \forall \text{ closed } A \subseteq \mathcal{X}\}$ with $A_\delta := \bigcup_{x \in A} \{x' \in \mathcal{X} : d(x, x') < \delta\}$, which is compatible with the weak topology.

Assumption 2: We assume that there is a function $\delta(\epsilon) : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ vanishing as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ such that

$$\inf_{Q'_X: L(Q_X, Q'_X) \leq \epsilon} C(Q'_X, Q_Y) \geq C(Q_X, Q_Y) - \delta(\epsilon)$$

holds for all (Q_X, Q_Y) . In other words, $\inf_{Q'_X: L(Q_X, Q'_X) \leq \epsilon} C(Q'_X, Q_Y) \rightarrow C(Q_X, Q_Y)$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ uniformly for all (Q_X, Q_Y) .

Obviously, if the optimal transport cost functional $(Q_X, Q_Y) \mapsto C(Q_X, Q_Y)$ is uniformly continuous under the Lévy-Prokhorov metric (which was assumed by the author in [28] in studying the asymptotics of Strassen's optimal transport problem), then Assumption 2 holds. The following two examples satisfying Assumption 2 were provided in [28].

1. (Countable Alphabet and Bounded Cost) \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are countable sets and c is bounded (i.e., $\sup_{x,y} c(x,y) < \infty$).
2. (Wasserstein Distance Induced by a Bounded Metric)⁶ $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$ is a Polish space equipped with a bounded metric d , i.e., $\sup_{x,y} d(x,y) < \infty$. The cost function is set to $c = d^p$ for $p \geq 1$, and hence, $C = W_p^p$.

The following theorem shows that the bound in Theorem 1 is asymptotically tight under Assumption 2. The proof is provided in Section 3. For a function $f : [0, \infty)^k \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ with $k \geq 1$, denote the *effective domain* of f as

$$\text{dom} f = \{x^k \in [0, \infty)^k : f(x^k) < \infty\}.$$

By definition, $\text{dom} \check{f} = \text{dom} \hat{f} = \text{dom} f$ if f is monotonous in each parameter (given others).

Theorem 3 (Asymptotics of $E_1^{(n)}$). *The following hold.*

1. Under Assumption 2, for any (α, τ) in the interior of $\text{dom} \check{\phi}$, it holds that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) = \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$.
2. Let (a_n) be a sequence such that $e^{-o(n)} \leq a_n \leq 1 - e^{-o(n)}$ (and hence $\alpha_n = -\frac{1}{n} \log a_n \rightarrow 0$). Then, under Assumption 2, it holds that for any τ in the interior of $\text{dom} \check{\phi}$,

$$\lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}(\tau),$$

where

$$\varphi(\tau) := \phi(0, \tau) = \inf_{Q_Y : C(P_X, Q_Y) > \tau} D(Q_Y \| P_Y). \quad (15)$$

The condition $e^{-o(n)} \leq a_n \leq 1 - e^{-o(n)}$ implies that the sequence (a_n) does not approach 0 or 1 too fast, in the sense that the sequence (a_n) is sandwiched between a sequence that subexponentially approaches zero and a sequence that subexponentially approaches one.

The most interesting case might be the case that (\mathcal{X}, P_X) and (\mathcal{Y}, P_Y) are the same Polish probability space and the cost function c is set to d^p with $p \geq 1$ and d denoting a metric on this space. In other words, $C = W_p^p$. We now remove Assumption 2 from Theorem 3 and obtain the following theorem. Furthermore, to further simplify Statement 2 of Theorem 3, we need Assumption 1. The proof of the following theorem is provided in Section 4.

Theorem 4 (Asymptotics of $E_1^{(n)}$ for Wasserstein Distances). *Assume that $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$ is a Polish space equipped with a metric d . Assume $P_X = P_Y$ and $c = d^p$ for $p \geq 1$. Then, the following hold.*

1. For any (α, τ) in the interior of $\text{dom} \check{\phi}$, it holds that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) = \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$.
2. Let (a_n) be a sequence such that $e^{-o(n)} \leq a_n \leq 1 - e^{-o(n)}$ (and hence $\alpha_n = -\frac{1}{n} \log a_n \rightarrow 0$). Then, for any τ in the interior of $\text{dom} \check{\phi}_X$, it holds that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}_X(\tau),$$

and under Assumption 1,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}_X(\tau),$$

where φ_X is defined in (8). In particular, under Assumption 1, for any τ in the interior of $\text{dom} \check{\phi}_X$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) = \check{\phi}_X(\tau).$$

⁶The second example satisfying Assumption 1 follows by the fact that the Wasserstein distance induced by a bounded metric d is equivalent to the Lévy–Prokhorov metric in the sense that $L^{p+1} \leq W_p^p \leq L^p + d_{\max}^p L$ where $d_{\max} = \sup_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}} d(x, x')$ is the diameter of \mathcal{X} [12].

Statement 2 in Theorem 4 is not new; see Proposition 4.6 and Theorem 5.4 in [15]. A consequence of these results is that given (α_n) such that $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) > 0$ holds for all $0 < \tau < \tau_{\max}$ (i.e., exponential convergence) if and only if Assumption 1 holds.

In fact, for this setting of $a = \frac{1}{2}$, Alon, Boppana, and Spencer in [4] provided an alternative expression for $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau)$ when \mathcal{X} is finite (Assumption 1 is automatically satisfied for this case). The equivalence between their expression and $\check{\varphi}_X(\tau)$ is proven in Section 1.5.

Example (Hamming Metric): When $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y}$ and c is the Hamming metric, i.e., $c(x, y) = \mathbb{1}_{\{x \neq y\}}$, by duality of Wasserstein metric, we have

$$\varphi(\tau) = \inf_{Q_Y: \|Q_Y - P_X\|_{TV} > \tau} D(Q_Y \| P_Y),$$

where $\|Q_Y - P_X\|_{TV} := \sup_A Q_Y(A) - P_X(A)$ is the total variation (TV) distance. For the case of $P_X = P_Y$, such a function was investigated in [5, 24]. It was shown in [24] that $\varphi(\tau) \geq L(\tau) := \min_{p \in [0, 1-\tau]} D_2(p \| p + \tau)$ for any $P_X = P_Y$. Here L is increasing in τ , and $L(0) = 0$, $L(1) = +\infty$. Moreover, the lower bound $L(\tau)$ is tight when $P_X = P_Y$ is atomless [5]. In other words, atomless distributions $P_X = P_Y$ are the worst in the sense that their concentration exponents are the smallest among all distributions. For the case of $P_X = P_Y$, by using the inequality $\varphi(\tau) \geq L(\tau)$, we can obtain a bound on $\phi(\alpha, \tau)$ as follows: $\phi(\alpha, \tau) \geq L([\tau - L^{-1}(\alpha)]^+)$ where $[x]^+ := \max\{x, 0\}$. This bound is also tight for atomless distributions $P_X = P_Y$ and any $\alpha \geq 0$, $0 \leq \tau < 1$. (Note that by definition, $\phi(\alpha, 1) = \infty$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$.) Moreover, when $\tau \uparrow 1$, this bound approaches $L(1 - L^{-1}(\alpha))$ which is finite for all $\alpha > 0$ and infinite for $\alpha = 0$. This indicates a significant difference between the case $\alpha = 0$ and the case $\alpha > 0$.

1.4 Asymptotics of Isoperimetric Exponent

We next derive the asymptotic expression of $E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau)$. Define

$$\psi(\alpha, \tau) := \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha} \inf_{Q_Y | XW: \mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)] \leq \tau} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W), \quad (16)$$

with the supremum taken over all W defined on finite alphabets. The alphabet size of W can be restricted to be no larger than 2, which will be proven in Section 1.5 by using the dual expression for ψ . Based on ψ , the asymptotic expression of $E_0^{(n)}$ is characterized in the following theorem.

Theorem 5 (Asymptotics of $E_0^{(n)}$). *Assume that \mathcal{X} is a compact metric space (which hence is Polish) and \mathcal{Y} is an arbitrary Polish space. Assume that c is bounded. Under Assumption 2, for any (α, τ) in the interior of $\text{dom}\psi$, it holds that*

$$\lim_{\alpha' \uparrow \alpha} \psi(\alpha', \tau) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \lim_{\tau' \uparrow \tau} \psi(\alpha, \tau'). \quad (17)$$

The proof of Theorem 5 is provided in Section 5. By checking our proof, the lower bound in (17) does not require the compactness of \mathcal{X} and the boundness of c , but requires Assumption 2. Furthermore, to make it consistent with the expression of ϕ which is expressed in terms of relative entropies and the OT cost, the infimization in (16) can be written as the infimization over $Q_{Y|W}$ such that $C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq \tau$.

A special case of Theorem 5 in which \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} are both finite was proven by Ahlswede and Zhang [3] as a direct consequence of the inherently typical subset lemma [2]. In fact, the proof of Theorem 5 is also based on the inherently typical subset lemma, but requires more technical treatments since the space is much more general.

1.5 Dual Formulas

We now provide dual formulas for ψ in (16) and variants of ϕ in (5) and φ in (15). The main tool used in deriving dual formulas is the Kantorovich duality for the optimal transport cost and the duality for the I-projection. In the following, for a measurable function $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we adopt the notation $P_X(f) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f dP_X$.

We define a variant of ϕ as for $\alpha, \tau \geq 0$,

$$\phi_{\geq}(\alpha, \tau) := \inf_{\substack{Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}), Q_Y \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}): \\ D(Q_X \| P_X) \leq \alpha, C(Q_X, Q_Y) \geq \tau}} D(Q_Y \| P_Y).$$

Then, $\phi_{\geq}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \phi(\alpha, \tau) \leq \lim_{\tau' \downarrow \tau} \phi_{\geq}(\alpha, \tau')$. Hence, for all (α, τ) in the interior of $\text{dom} \check{\phi}$, $\check{\phi}_{\geq}(\alpha, \tau) = \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$. We next derive a dual formula for ϕ_{\geq} .

Theorem 6. *For all $\tau, \alpha \geq 0$,*

$$\phi_{\geq}(\alpha, \tau) = \inf_{\substack{(f, g) \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \times C_b(\mathcal{Y}): \\ f+g \leq c}} \sup_{\lambda > 0, \eta > 0} \lambda \tau - \log P_Y(e^{\lambda g}) - \eta \alpha - \eta \log P_X(e^{\frac{\lambda}{\eta} f}).$$

Moreover, for all (α, τ) in the interior of $\text{dom} \check{\phi}$, $\check{\phi}_{\geq}(\alpha, \tau) = \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$.

Define a variant of φ as

$$\varphi_{\geq}(\tau) := \phi_{\geq}(0, \tau) = \inf_{Q_Y: C(P_X, Q_Y) \geq \tau} D(Q_Y \| P_Y).$$

As a consequence of Theorem 6, we have a dual formula for φ_{\geq} .

Corollary 1. *For all $\tau \geq 0$,*

$$\varphi_{\geq}(\tau) = \inf_{\substack{(f, g) \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \times C_b(\mathcal{Y}): \\ f+g \leq c}} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda(\tau - P_X(f)) - \log P_Y(e^{\lambda g}).$$

Moreover, for all τ in the interior of $\text{dom} \check{\varphi}$, $\check{\varphi}_{\geq}(\tau) = \check{\varphi}(\tau)$.

When $P_X = P_Y$, we define a variant of φ_X as

$$\varphi_{X, \geq}(\tau) := \inf_{Q_X: C(P_X, Q_X) \geq \tau} D(Q_X \| P_X).$$

For this case, we can write $\varphi_{X, \geq}$ as follows.

Proposition 1. *When $P_X = P_Y$ and $c = d$ with d being a metric, we have for any $0 \leq \tau < \tau_{\max}$,*

$$\varphi_{X, \geq}(\tau) = \inf_{1\text{-Lip } f: P_X(f)=0} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda \tau - \log P_X(e^{\lambda f}). \quad (18)$$

Moreover, for all τ in the interior of $\text{dom} \check{\varphi}_X$, $\check{\varphi}_{X, \geq}(\tau) = \check{\varphi}_X(\tau)$.

Based on the dual formula in (18), we next show the equivalence between our formula $\check{\varphi}_X(\tau)$ and Alon, Boppana, and Spencer's in [4]. When (\mathcal{X}, P_X) and (\mathcal{Y}, P_Y) are the same finite metric probability space, the cost function c is set to the metric d on this space, and a is set to $\frac{1}{2}$ (equivalently, $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{n} \log 2$), Alon, Boppana, and Spencer in [4] proved an alternative expression for $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau)$ which is

$$r(\tau) := \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda \tau - L_G(\lambda).$$

Here $G = (\mathcal{X}, d, P_X)$ denotes the metric probability space we consider, and $L_G(\lambda)$ denotes the maximum of $\log P_X(e^{\lambda f})$ over all 1-Lipschitz functions⁷ $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $P_X(f) = 0$.

Theorem 7. *For a finite metric probability space $G = (\mathcal{X}, d, P_X)$ and all $\tau > 0$, $\check{\varphi}_X(\tau) = r(\tau)$.*

We now provide a dual formula for ψ .

Theorem 8. *For all $\tau, \alpha \geq 0$,*

$$\psi(\alpha, \tau) = \sup_{f_w + g_w \leq c, \forall w \in \{0, 1\}} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \inf_{\eta > 0} \sup_{w \in \{0, 1\}} \eta \alpha + \eta \log P_X(e^{\frac{\lambda}{\eta} f_w}) - \lambda \tau - \log P_Y(e^{-\lambda g_w}),$$

where $(f_w, g_w) \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \times C_b(\mathcal{Y}), \forall w$. Moreover, the alphabet size of W in the definition of ψ (in (16)) can be restricted to be no larger than 2.

⁷Call $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ 1-Lipschitz if $|f(x) - f(x')| \leq d(x, x')$ for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$.

1.6 Connection to Strassen's Optimal Transport

We have characterized or bounded the concentration and isoperimetric exponents. Our results extend Alon, Boppana, and Spencer's in [4], Gozlan and Léonard's [14], and Ahlswede and Zhang's in [3]. Furthermore, the concentration or isoperimetric function is closely related to Strassen's optimal transport problem, in which we aim at characterizing

$$G_t^{(n)}(P_X, P_Y) := \min_{P_{X^n Y^n} \in \Pi(P_X^{\otimes n}, P_Y^{\otimes n})} \mathbb{P}\{c_n(X^n, Y^n) > t\}$$

for $t \geq 0$. By Strassen's duality,

$$\begin{aligned} G_t^{(n)}(P_X, P_Y) &= \sup_{\text{closed } A \subseteq \mathcal{X}} P_X^{\otimes n}(A) - P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^t) \\ &= \sup_{a \in [0,1]} a - \Gamma^{(n)}(a, t). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Therefore, if $\Gamma^{(n)}(a, t)$ is characterized, then so is $G_t^{(n)}(P_X, P_Y)$. In fact, the asymptotic exponents of $G_t^{(n)}(P_X, P_Y)$ were already characterized by the author in [28]. Moreover, it has been shown in [28] that it suffices to restrict A in the supremum in (19) to be “exchangeable” (or “permutation-invariant”). In other words, A could be specified by a set B of empirical measures in the way that a sequence x^n is in A if and only if its empirical measure is in B . Hence, the supremum in (19) can be written as an optimization over empirical measures. From this point, we observe that if $a \mapsto \Gamma^{(n)}(a, t)$ is convex, then the set A in the definition of $\Gamma^{(n)}(a, t)$ (see (1)) can be also restricted to be “exchangeable”. We conjecture that this conclusion holds not only for this special case, but also for any other cases. If this is true, then central limit theorems can be applied to derive the limit of $\Gamma^{(n)}(a, t_n)$ with a fixed and t_n set to a sequence approaching $C(P_X, P_Y)$ in the order of $1/\sqrt{n}$, just like central limit results in derived in [28].

1.7 Notations and Organization

Throughout this paper, for a topological space \mathcal{Z} , we use $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$ to denote the Borel σ -algebra on \mathcal{Z} generated by the topology of \mathcal{Z} . Hence $(\mathcal{Z}, \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}))$ forms a measurable space. For this measurable space, we denote the set of probability measures on $(\mathcal{Z}, \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}))$ as $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$. If we equip $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ with the weak topology, then the resultant space is a Polish space as well. For brevity, we denote it as $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z}), \Sigma(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})))$.

As mentioned at the beginning of the introduction, \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are Polish spaces, and P_X and P_Y are two probability measures defined respectively on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . We also use Q_X, R_X to denote another two probability measures on \mathcal{X} . The probability measures P_X, Q_X, R_X can be thought as the push-forward measures (or the distributions) induced jointly by the same measurable function X (random variable) from an underlying measurable space to \mathcal{X} and by different probability measures P, Q, R defined on the underlying measurable space. Without loss of generality, we assume that X is the identity map, and P, Q, R are the same as P_X, Q_X, R_X . So, P_X, Q_X, R_X could be independently specified to arbitrary probability measures. We say that all probability measures induced by the underlying measure P , together with the corresponding measurable spaces, constitute the *P-system*. So, P_X is in fact the distribution of the random variable X in the *P-system*, where the letter “*P*” in the notation P_X refers to the system and the subscript “*X*” refers to the random variable. When emphasizing the random variables, we write $X \sim P_X$ to indicate that X follows the distribution P_X in the *P-system*. For a random variable (a measurable function) f from \mathcal{X} to another measurable space \mathcal{Z} , the distribution $P_{f(X)}$ of f in different systems is clearly different, e.g., it is $P_X \circ f^{-1}$ in the *P-system*, but it is $Q_X \circ f^{-1}$ in the *Q-system*.

We use $P_X \otimes P_Y$ to denote the product of P_X and P_Y , and $P_X^{\otimes n}$ (resp. $P_Y^{\otimes n}$) to denote the n -fold product of P_X (resp. P_Y). For a probability measure P_X and a regular conditional distribution (transition probability or Markov kernel) $P_{Y|X}$ from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} , we denote $P_X P_{Y|X}$ as the joint probability measure induced by P_X and $P_{Y|X}$. We denote P_Y or $P_X \circ P_{Y|X}$ as the marginal distribution on Y of the joint distribution $P_X P_{Y|X}$. Moreover, we can pick up probability measures or transition probabilities from different

probability systems to constitute a joint probability measure, e.g., $P_X Q_{Y|X}$. For a distribution P_X on \mathcal{X} and a measurable subset $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, $P_X(\cdot|A)$ denotes the conditional probability measure given A . For brevity, we write $P_X(x) := P_X(\{x\})$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$. In particular, if $X \sim P_X$ is discrete, the restriction of P_X to the set of singletons corresponds to the probability mass function of X in the P-system. We denote $x^n = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ as a sequence in \mathcal{X}^n . Given x^n , denote $x_i^k = (x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k)$ as a subsequence of x^n for $1 \leq i \leq k \leq n$, and $x^k := x_1^k$. For a probability measure P_{X^n} on \mathcal{X}^n , we use $P_{X_k|X^{k-1}}$ to denote the regular conditional distribution of X_k given X^{k-1} induced by P_{X^n} . For a measurable function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, sometimes we adopt the notation $P_X(f) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f \, dP_X$.

Given $n \geq 1$, the *empirical measure* (also known as *type* for the finite alphabet case in information theory [9, 11]) for a sequence $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ is

$$L_{x^n} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$$

where δ_x is Dirac mass at the point $x \in \mathcal{X}$. For a pair of sequences $(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$, the *empirical joint measure* L_{x^n, y^n} and *empirical conditional measure* $L_{y^n|x^n}$ are defined similarly. Obviously, empirical measures (or empirical joint measures) for n -length sequences are discrete distributions whose probability masses are multiples of $1/n$.

We use $B_\delta(z) := \{z' \in \mathcal{Z} : d(z, z') < \delta\}$ and $B_{\delta]}(z) := \{z' \in \mathcal{Z} : d(z, z') \leq \delta\}$ to respectively denote an open ball and a closed ball. We use \bar{A} , A° , and $A^c := \mathcal{Z} \setminus A$ to respectively denote the closure, interior, and complement of the set $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$. Denote the sublevel set of the relative entropy (or the divergence “ball”) as $D_{\epsilon]}(P_X) := \{Q_X : D(Q_X \| P_X) \leq \epsilon\}$ for $\epsilon \geq 0$. The Lévy-Prokhorov metric, the TV distance, and the relative entropy admit the following relation: For any Q_X, P_X ,

$$\sqrt{2D(Q_X \| P_X)} \geq \|Q_X - P_X\|_{\text{TV}} \geq L(Q_X, P_X), \quad (20)$$

which implies for $\epsilon \geq 0$,

$$D_{\sqrt{2\epsilon]}(P_X) \subseteq B_{\epsilon]}(P_X).$$

The first inequality in (20) is known as Pinsker’s inequality, and the second inequality follows by definition [12].

For $(X, Y) \sim Q_{XY}$, the mutual information between X and Y is denoted as $I_Q(X; Y) = D(Q_{XY} \| Q_X \otimes Q_Y)$. Denote the conditional mutual information as

$$I_Q(X; Y|W) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_W}[D(Q_{XY|W} \| Q_{X|W} \otimes Q_{Y|W})].$$

For discrete random variables $(X, Y) \sim Q_{XY}$, the (Shannon) entropy

$$H_Q(X) = - \sum_x Q_X(x) \log Q_X(x),$$

and the conditional (Shannon) entropy

$$H_Q(X|Y) = - \sum_{x,y} Q_{XY}(x, y) \log Q_{X|Y}(x|y).$$

In fact, for discrete random variables, $I_Q(X; Y) = H_Q(X) - H_Q(X|Y)$.

We use $f(n) = o_n(1)$ to denote that $f(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. We denote $\inf \emptyset := +\infty$, $\sup \emptyset := -\infty$, and $[k] := \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Denote \check{g} as the lower convex envelope of a function g , and \hat{g} as the upper concave envelope of g .

Throughout this paper, we use the following convention.

Convention 1. When we write an optimization problem with probability measures as the variables, we by default require that those probability measures satisfy that all the relative entropies and integrals in constraint functions and the objective function exist and also are finite. If there is no such a distribution, by default, the value of the optimization problem is set to ∞ if the optimization is an infimization, and set to $-\infty$ if the optimization is a supremization.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2-5, we respectively prove Theorems 1-5. The proofs for dual formulas are given in Section 6.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a measurable subset. Denote $t = n\tau$. Denote $Q_{X^n} = P_X^{\otimes n}(\cdot|A)$ and $Q_{Y^n} = P_Y^{\otimes n}(\cdot|(A^t)^c)$. For two sets A, B , denote $c_n(A, B) = \inf_{x^n \in A, y^n \in B} c_n(x^n, y^n)$. We first claim that

$$C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) > \tau.$$

We now prove it. If $c_n(A, (A^t)^c)$ is attained by some pair (x^{*n}, y^{*n}) , then

$$C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) \geq c_n(A, (A^t)^c) = c_n(x^{*n}, y^{*n}) > \tau.$$

We next consider the case that $c_n(A, (A^t)^c)$ is not attained. Denote the optimal coupling that attains the infimum in the definition of $C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n})$ as $Q_{X^n Y^n}$ (the existence of this coupling is well known). Therefore,

$$C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) = \mathbb{E}_Q c_n(X^n, Y^n).$$

By definition, $c_n(x^n, y^n) > \tau$ for all $x^n \in A, y^n \in B$. Since any probability measure on a Polish space is tight, we have that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set F such that $Q_{X^n Y^n}(F) > 1 - \epsilon$. By the lower semi-continuity of c and compactness of F , we have that $\inf_{(x^n, y^n) \in F} c_n(x^n, y^n)$ is attained, and hence, $\inf_{(x^n, y^n) \in F} c_n(x^n, y^n) > \tau$, i.e., there is some $\delta > 0$ such that $c_n(x^n, y^n) \geq \tau + \delta$ for all $(x^n, y^n) \in F$. This further implies that $C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) \geq (1 - \epsilon)(\tau + \delta) + \epsilon\tau > \tau$. Hence, the claim above is true.

Furthermore, by definition of Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n} , we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) &= -\frac{1}{n} \log P_X^{\otimes n}(A) \\ \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) &= -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}((A^t)^c). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) &= -\frac{1}{n} \log \left(1 - \inf_{A: P_X^{\otimes n}(A) \geq e^{-n\alpha}} P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^t) \right) \\ &\geq \inf_{\substack{Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}: \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) \leq \alpha, \\ C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) > \tau}} \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Note that this lower bound depends on the dimension n . We next single-letterize this bound, i.e., make it independent of n . To this end, we need the chain rule for relative entropies and the chain rule for OT costs. For relative entropies, we have the chain rule:

$$\begin{aligned} D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) &= \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{X_k | X^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}}) \\ D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) &= \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k | Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{Y^{k-1}}). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

For OT costs, we have a similar chain rule.

Lemma 1 (“Chain Rule” for OT Costs). *For any probability measures Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n} on two Polish spaces,*

$$C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n C(Q_{X_k | X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k | Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}) \\ & := \sup_{Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}})} C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We need the following “chain rule” for coupling sets, which is well-known in OT theory; see the proof in, e.g., [29, Lemma 9].

Lemma 2 (“Chain Rule” for Coupling Sets). *For any regular conditional distributions $(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W})$, $i \in [n]$ and any $Q_{X_iY_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} \in \Pi(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W})$, $i \in [n]$, we have*

$$\prod_{i=1}^n Q_{X_iY_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} \in \Pi\left(\prod_{i=1}^n P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, \prod_{i=1}^n P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W}\right).$$

By the lemma above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) \\ & = \inf_{Q_{X^nY^n} \in \Pi(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n})} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}c(X_k, Y_k) \\ & \leq \inf_{Q_{X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y^{n-1}})} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}c(X_k, Y_k) + \inf_{Q_{X_nY_n|X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X_n|X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y_n|Y^{n-1}})} \mathbb{E}c(X_n, Y_n) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \inf_{Q_{X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y^{n-1}})} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}c(X_k, Y_k) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sup_{Q_{X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y^{n-1}})} \inf_{Q_{X_nY_n|X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X_n|X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y_n|Y^{n-1}})} \mathbb{E}c(X_n, Y_n) \right] \\ & = \inf_{Q_{X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y^{n-1}})} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}c(X_k, Y_k) \right] + C(Q_{X_n|X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y_n|Y^{n-1}} | Q_{X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y^{n-1}}) \\ & \dots \dots \dots \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where in (23), Lemma 2 is applied. \square

We continue the proof of Theorem 1. From (22), we know that for any Q_{X^n} such that $\frac{1}{n}D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) \leq \alpha$, there must exist nonnegative numbers (α_k) such that

$$D(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}}) \leq \alpha_k$$

and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k = \alpha$. Similarly, from (24), we know that for (Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) such that $\frac{1}{n}C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) > \tau$, there must exist nonnegative numbers (τ_k) such that

$$C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}) > \tau_k$$

and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \tau_k = \tau$. These lead to that for some sequence of nonnegative pairs $((\alpha_k, \tau_k))$ such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k = \alpha$, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \tau_k = \tau$, we have

$$E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k(\alpha_k, \tau_k, Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}),$$

where

$$\phi_k(\alpha_k, \tau_k, Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}) := \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}}: \\ D(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}}) \leq \alpha_k, \\ C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}) > \tau_k}} D(Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{Y^{k-1}}).$$

We now simplify the expression of $\phi_k(\alpha_k, \tau_k, Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}})$. Note that

$$C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}) > \tau_k$$

if and only if there exists a coupling $Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}$ of $(Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}})$ such that

$$C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) > \tau_k.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_k(\alpha_k, \tau_k, Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}) &= \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}}, Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}): \\ D(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}}) \leq \alpha_k, \\ C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) > \tau_k}} D(Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{Y^{k-1}}) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}}, Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}: \\ D(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \leq \alpha_k, \\ C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) > \tau_k}} D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \\ &\geq \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}: \\ D(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \leq \alpha_k, \\ C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) > \tau_k}} D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where

- in (25), we denote

$$Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} = Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} = Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}}, \quad (27)$$

and at the same time, we relax the coupling $Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}$ of $(Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}})$ to any joint distribution,

- in (26) we optimize over $(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}})$ directly, instead over $(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}})$. (In other words, we remove the constraints given in (27) from the optimization in (26).)

Recall the expression of $\check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$ in (6). If we substitute $W \leftarrow (X^{k-1}, Y^{k-1})$, $X \leftarrow X_k$, $Y \leftarrow Y_k$ into (26), then we obtain the expression in (6). In other words, (26) is further lower bounded by $\check{\phi}(\alpha_k, \tau_k)$. Therefore,

$$E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \check{\phi}(\alpha_k, \tau_k) \geq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau).$$

3 Proof of Theorem 3

Statement 1 (Case $\alpha > 0$): From the dimension-free bound in Theorem 1, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$. We next prove $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$.

We assume that \mathcal{W} is finite, and without loss of generality, we assume $\mathcal{W} = [|\mathcal{W}|] = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{W}|\}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $(Q_W, Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W})$ be an optimal pair attaining $\check{\phi}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau + \epsilon) + \epsilon$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) &\leq \alpha - \epsilon \\ C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) &> \tau + \epsilon \\ D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) &\leq \check{\phi}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau + \epsilon) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $\text{supp}(Q_W) = [m]$.

For each n , let $Q_W^{(n)}$ be an empirical measure of an n -length sequence such that $\text{supp}(Q_W^{(n)}) \subseteq [m]$ and $Q_W^{(n)} \rightarrow Q_W$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $Q_{XW}^{(n)} := Q_W^{(n)} Q_{X|W}$, $Q_{YW}^{(n)} := Q_W^{(n)} Q_{Y|W}$. Let $w^n = (1, \dots, 1, 2, \dots, 2, \dots, m, \dots, m)$ be an n -length sequence, where i appears $n_i := nQ_W^{(n)}(i)$ times. Hence, the empirical measure of w^n is $Q_W^{(n)}$.

Denote $A_w := B_{\epsilon'}(Q_{X|W=w})$ for $w \in [m]$, and $A := \{R_{X|W} : R_{X|W=w} \in A_w, \forall w \in [m]\}$ for $\epsilon' > 0$. Denote \mathcal{A} as the set of sequences x^n such that the empirical conditional measure $L_{x^n|w^n} \in A$. In other words,

$$\mathcal{A} = \{x^n : L_{x^n|w^n} \in A\} = \prod_{w=1}^m \{x^{n_w} : L_{x^{n_w}} \in A_w\}.$$

For each w , A_w is closed. Since the empirical measure map ℓ is continuous under the weak topology, $\{x^{n_w} : L_{x^{n_w}} \in A_w\}$ is closed in \mathcal{X}^{n_w} . Therefore, \mathcal{A} is closed in \mathcal{X}^n .

Similarly, denote $B_w := B_{\epsilon'}(Q_{Y|W=w})$ for $w \in [m]$, and $B := \{R_{Y|W} : R_{Y|W=w} \in B_w, \forall w \in [m]\}$ for $\epsilon' > 0$. Denote $\mathcal{B} = \{y^n : L_{y^n|w^n} \in B\}$. So, \mathcal{B} is closed in \mathcal{Y}^n .

By Sanov's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_X^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{A}) &= \sum_w Q_W(w) \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n_w} \log P_X^{\otimes n_w} \{x^{n_w} : L_{x^{n_w}} \in A_w\} \\ &\leq \sum_w Q_W(w) \inf_{R_X \in A_w^c} D(R_X \| P_X) \\ &\leq \sum_w Q_W(w) D(Q_{X|W=w} \| P_X) \\ &= D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \\ &\leq \alpha - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $-\frac{1}{n} \log P_X^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \alpha$ for all sufficiently large n . Similarly,

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \check{\phi}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau + \epsilon) + 2\epsilon \quad (28)$$

for all sufficiently large n .

Observe that⁸

$$B_0 := \{(R_{Y|W=w})_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})^m : C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | Q_W) > \tau + \epsilon\}$$

is open in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})^m$ equipped with the product topology. Since $Q_{Y|W} \in B_0$, B_0 contains the product of $F_w, w \in [m]$ for some open sets $F_w \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ such that $Q_{Y|W=w} \in F_w$. So $B_w \subseteq F_w, \forall w$, for sufficiently small ϵ' , which means in this case, $B \subseteq B_0$. Then, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Q_W} \inf_{R_X \in A_W, R_Y \in B_W} C(R_X, R_Y) &= \inf_{R_X|W \in A, R_Y|W \in B} C(R_X|W, R_Y|W | Q_W) \\ &\geq \inf_{R_Y|W \in B} C(Q_{X|W}, R_Y|W | Q_W) - \delta(\epsilon') \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\geq \tau + \epsilon - \delta(\epsilon'), \quad (30)$$

where $\delta(\epsilon')$ is positive and vanishes as $\epsilon' \downarrow 0$, (29) follows by Assumption 2, and (30) follows from $B \subseteq B_0$.

⁸This is because $R_{Y|W} \mapsto C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | Q_W)$ is the weighted sum of lower semi-continuous functions $R_{Y|W=w} \mapsto C(Q_{X|W=w}, R_{Y|W=w})$. So, $C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | Q_W)$ is lower semi-continuous as well in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})^m$ equipped with the product topology. Hence, its strict superlevel sets are open.

Using these equations, we obtain that for $L_{x^n|w^n} \in A, L_{y^n|w^n} \in B$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n}c_n(x^n, y^n) &= \mathbb{E}_{L_{x^n|w^n}, L_{y^n|w^n}} c(X, Y) \\
&\geq C(L_{x^n|w^n}, L_{y^n|w^n} | L_{w^n}) \\
&\geq \inf_{R_{X|W} \in A, R_{Y|W} \in B} C(R_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | L_{w^n}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{W \sim L_{w^n}} \inf_{R_X \in A_W, R_Y \in B_W} C(R_X, R_Y) \\
&\rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{W \sim Q_W} \inf_{R_X \in A_W, R_Y \in B_W} C(R_X, R_Y) \\
&> \tau + \epsilon - \delta(\epsilon').
\end{aligned}$$

So, if we let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed and $\epsilon' > 0$ be sufficiently small such that $\epsilon > \delta(\epsilon')$, then for sufficiently large n , we have $\frac{1}{n}c_n(x^n, y^n) > \tau$. Hence,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau + \epsilon) + \epsilon.$$

Since $\check{\phi}$ is convex, it is continuous on $(0, +\infty)^2$. We hence have that for all $\alpha, \tau > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau).$$

Statement 2 (Case $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$): The lower bound follows by the dimension-free bound in Theorem 1. We next prove the upper bound. For this case, we set $\alpha = 0$ in the proof above, and re-choose $(Q_W, Q_{Y|W})$ as an optimal pair attaining $\check{\phi}(\tau + \epsilon) + \epsilon$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned}
C(P_X, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) &> \tau + \epsilon \\
D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) &\leq \check{\phi}(\tau + \epsilon) + \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

On one hand, we choose $A := B_{\epsilon'}(P_X)$ for $\epsilon' > 0$, and then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log(1 - P_X^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{A})) &\geq \inf_{Q_X \in A^c} D(Q_X \| P_X) \\
&\geq \inf_{Q_X : L(Q_X, P_X) \geq \epsilon'/2} D(Q_X \| P_X) \\
&\geq \epsilon'^2/8,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows since

$$D(Q_X \| P_X) \geq L(Q_X, P_X)^2/2.$$

Hence, for fixed $\epsilon' > 0$, $P_X^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ exponentially fast.

On the other hand, we remain the choices of B_w and B . Similarly to (28), we obtain

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \check{\phi}(\tau + \epsilon) + 2\epsilon$$

for all sufficiently large n .

Similarly to the above, it can be shown that $\frac{1}{n}c_n(x^n, y^n) > \tau$ for sufficiently large n . We hence have that for all $\tau > 0$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}(\tau).$$

4 Proof of Theorem 4

Statement 1 (Case $\alpha > 0$): From the dimension-free bound in Theorem 1, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$. We next prove $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$.

Let $s > 0$, and $d_s = \min\{d, s\}$. Then, d_s is a bounded metric on \mathcal{X} . This is just the second example given below Assumption 2 which satisfies Assumption 2. So, by Theorem 3, when we set $c = d_s^p$, we have $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{1,s}^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau)$, where $E_{1,s}^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau)$ is the quantity $E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau)$ given in (2) but defined for $c = d_s^p$, and similarly, $\check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau)$ is the $\check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$ defined for $c = d_s^p$. Explicitly,

$$\check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau) = \inf_{\substack{Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}, Q_W: \\ D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha, \\ C_s(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) > \tau}} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \quad (31)$$

where $C_s(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W)$ is the OT cost for $c = d_s^p$.

Observe that for the same A ,

$$\begin{aligned} A^t &= \bigcup_{x^n \in A} \{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n d^p(x_i, y_i) \leq t\} \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{x^n \in A} \{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n d_s^p(x_i, y_i) \leq t\} =: A_s^t \end{aligned}$$

So, $E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq E_{1,s}^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau)$. Hence, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau)$. Taking limit as $s \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau)$. To prove Statement 1, it suffices to show that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau) = \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$ for $\alpha, \tau > 0$. On one hand, $\check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$ since $C_s(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W)$. So, it suffices to prove $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$ for $\alpha, \tau > 0$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Let $(Q_W, Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W})$ be an optimal pair attaining $\check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau) + \epsilon$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) &\leq \alpha \\ C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) &> \tau \\ D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) &\leq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3. Given (Q_X, Q_Y) ,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} C_s(Q_X, Q_Y) = C(Q_X, Q_Y).$$

Proof. Obviously, $C_s(Q_X, Q_Y) \leq C(Q_X, Q_Y)$. Hence, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} C_s(Q_X, Q_Y) \leq C(Q_X, Q_Y)$.

By Kantorovich duality [27, Theorem 5.10] (also given in Lemma 5),

$$C(Q_X, Q_Y) = \sup_{(f,g) \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \times C_b(\mathcal{Y}): f+g \leq c} \int_{\mathcal{X}} f \, dQ_X + \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g \, dQ_Y$$

where $C_b(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the collection of bounded continuous functions $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, let $(f^*, g^*) \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \times C_b(\mathcal{Y})$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned} f^* + g^* &\leq c \\ \int_{\mathcal{X}} f^* \, dQ_X + \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g^* \, dQ_Y &\geq C(Q_X, Q_Y) - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the boundness, $f^* + g^* \leq c_s$ for all sufficiently large s . By Kantorovich duality again,

$$C_s(Q_X, Q_Y) = \sup_{(f,g) \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \times C_b(\mathcal{Y}): f+g \leq c_s} \int_{\mathcal{X}} f \, dQ_X + \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g \, dQ_Y. \quad (32)$$

For sufficiently large s , (f^*, g^*) is a feasible solution to (32). Hence,

$$C_s(Q_X, Q_Y) \geq \int_{\mathcal{X}} f^* dQ_X + \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g^* dQ_Y \geq C(Q_X, Q_Y) - \epsilon.$$

Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} C_s(Q_X, Q_Y) \geq C(Q_X, Q_Y)$, completing the proof. \square

Since by definition, the conditional OT cost is the weighted sum of the unconditional version, given $(Q_W, Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W})$, we immediately have

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} C_s(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) = C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) > \tau.$$

So, for sufficiently large s , $C_s(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) > \tau$ which means that $(Q_W, Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W})$ is a feasible solution to the infimization in (31) with α substituted by $\alpha - \epsilon$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau) \leq D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \leq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau) + \epsilon.$$

Letting $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, we obtain $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \check{\phi}_s(\alpha, \tau) \leq \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$. This completes the proof.

Statement 2 (Case $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$): The proof for the upper bound is similar to the above for Statement 1, and hence is omitted here.

We next prove $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}_X(\tau)$. From the dimension-free bound in 3, we have for fixed τ , $E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}(\alpha_n, \tau)$. Under the condition $D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha_n$, we have

$$C(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \hat{\kappa}_X(\alpha_n).$$

Recall that κ_X is given in (10). By Assumption 2, $\hat{\kappa}_X(\alpha) \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. By the triangle inequality (since for this case, $C^{1/p}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a Wasserstein metric), we then have that for $(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}, Q_W)$ satisfying the constraints in (6),

$$\begin{aligned} C^{1/p}(P_X, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) &\geq C^{1/p}(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) - C^{1/p}(Q_{X|W}, P_X|Q_W) \\ &> \tau^{1/p} - \hat{\kappa}_X(\alpha_n)^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

We finally obtain

$$\check{\phi}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}_X((\tau^{1/p} - \hat{\kappa}_X(\alpha_n)^{1/p})^p).$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \check{\phi}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}_X(\tau)$ for $\tau > 0$. Hence, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\phi}_X(\tau)$.

5 Proof of Theorem 5

5.1 Upper Bound

5.1.1 Finite \mathcal{X}

We first consider that \mathcal{X} is a finite metric space. For this case, we extend Ahlswede, Yang, and Zhang's method [2, 3] to the case in which \mathcal{Y} is an arbitrary Polish space (but \mathcal{X} is still a finite metric space). We divide the proof into four steps.

Step 1: Inherently Typical Subset Lemma

In our proof, we utilize the inherently typical subset lemma in [2, 3]. We now introduce this lemma. Let A be any subset of \mathcal{X}^n . For any $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, define

$$A_i = \{x^i \in \mathcal{X}^i : x^i \text{ is a prefix of some element of } A\},$$

which is the projection of A to the space \mathcal{X}^i of the first i components.

Definition 1. $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$ is called *m-inherently typical* if there exist a set \mathcal{W}_m with $|\mathcal{W}_m| \leq (m+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ and n mappings $\phi_i : A_i \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_m$, $i \in [0 : n-1]$ such that the following hold:

(i) There exists a distribution (empirical measure) Q_{XW} such that for any $x^n \in A$,

$$L_{x^n w^n} = Q_{XW}$$

where w^n is a sequence defined by $w_i = \phi_i(x^{i-1})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Such a sequence is called a sequence associated with x^n through (ϕ_i) .

(ii)

$$H_Q(X|W) - \frac{\log^2 m}{m} \leq \frac{1}{n} \log |A| \leq H_Q(X|W). \quad (33)$$

For an *m-inherently typical* set A , let Q_{X^n} be the uniform distribution on A . We now give another interpretation of the *m-inherently typical* set in the language of sufficient statistics. Let $W_i = \phi_i(X^{i-1})$. First, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log |A| &= H_Q(X^n) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n H_Q(X_i | X^{i-1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n H_Q(X_i | X^{i-1}, W_i) \\ &= H_Q(X_K | X^{K-1}, W_K, K) \end{aligned}$$

where K is a random time index uniformly distributed over $[n]$ which is independent of X^n . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{X_K, W_K} &= \mathbb{E}_{(X^n, W^n) \sim Q_{X^n, W^n}} [Q_{X_K, W_K} | X^n, W^n] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(X^n, W^n) \sim Q_{X^n, W^n}} [L_{X^n, W^n}] \\ &= Q_{X, W}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Hence, the inequalities in (33) can be rewritten as

$$0 \leq I_Q(X_K; X^{K-1}, K | W_K) \leq \frac{\log^2 m}{m}.$$

The first inequality holds trivially since mutual information is nonnegative. For sufficiently large m , the bound $\frac{\log^2 m}{m}$ is sufficiently small. Hence, $I_Q(X_K; X^{K-1}, K | W_K)$ is close to zero. In this case, X_K and (X^{K-1}, K) are approximately conditionally independent given W_K . In other words, W_K is an approximate sufficient statistic for “underlying parameter” X_K ; refer to [7, Section 2.9] for sufficient statistics and [16] for approximate versions.

As for *m-inherent typical* sets, one of the most important results is the *inherently typical subset lemma*, which concerns the existence of inherent typical sets. Such a lemma was proven by Ahlswede, Yang, and Zhang [2, 3].

Lemma 4 (Inherently Typical Subset Lemma). *For any $m \geq 2^{16|\mathcal{X}|^2}$, n satisfying $((m+1)^{5|\mathcal{X}|+4} \ln(n+1)) / n \leq 1$, and any $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$, there exists an *m-inherently typical* subset $\tilde{A} \subseteq A$ such that*

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{n} \log \frac{|A|}{|\tilde{A}|} \leq |\mathcal{X}|(m+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|} \frac{\log(n+1)}{n}.$$

Step 2: Multi-letter Bound

For any $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$, denote $A_{Q_X} := A \cap \{x^n : L_{x^n} = Q_X\}$ for empirical measure Q_X . Since $A = \bigcup_{Q_X} A_{Q_X}$ and the number of distinct types is no more than $(n+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}$, by the pigeonhole principle, we have

$$P_X^{\otimes n}(A_{Q_X}) \geq P_X^{\otimes n}(A)(n+1)^{-|\mathcal{X}|}$$

for some empirical measure Q_X .

By the lemma above, given $m \geq 2^{16|\mathcal{X}|^2}$, for all sufficiently large n , there exists an m -inherently typical subset $\tilde{A} \subseteq A_{Q_X}$ such that

$$|\tilde{A}| \geq |A_{Q_X}| \cdot (n+1)^{-b}$$

where $b = |\mathcal{X}|(m+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}$. Observe that for any $B \subseteq \{x^n : L_{x^n} = Q_X\}$, we have $P_X^{\otimes n}(B) = |B|e^{n \sum_x Q_X(x) \log P_X(x)}$. Hence,

$$P_X^{\otimes n}(\tilde{A}) \geq P_X^{\otimes n}(A_{Q_X})(n+1)^{-b} \geq P_X^{\otimes n}(A)(n+1)^{-b'}$$

where $b' = b + |\mathcal{X}| = |\mathcal{X}|(1 + (m+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|})$.

Let Q_{X^n} be the uniform distribution on \tilde{A} . Then, (34) and (37) still hold, and moreover,

$$D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) = -\frac{1}{n} \log P_X^{\otimes n}(\tilde{A}) \leq -\frac{1}{n} \log P_X^{\otimes n}(A) + o_n(1).$$

If $P_X^{\otimes n}(A) \geq e^{-n\alpha}$, we have

$$D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) \leq \alpha + o_n(1). \quad (35)$$

Denote $t = n\tau$. Let $Q_{Y^n|X^n}$ be a conditional distribution such that given each x^n , $Q_{Y^n|X^n=x^n}$ is concentrated on the cost ball $B_t(x^n) := \{y^n : c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq t\}$. Then, we have that $Q_{Y^n} := Q_{X^n} \circ Q_{Y^n|X^n}$ is concentrated on A^t , which implies that $-\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^t) \leq \frac{1}{n} D_0(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) \leq \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n})$. Here $D_0(Q \| P) := -\log P\{\frac{dQ}{dP} > 0\}$ is the Rényi divergence of order 0, which is no greater than the relative entropy $D(Q \| P)$ [25]. Since $Q_{Y^n|X^n}$ is arbitrary, we have

$$-\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^t) \leq \inf_{Q_{Y^n|X^n} : c_n(X^n, Y^n) \leq t \text{ a.s.}} \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}).$$

Taking supremum of the RHS over all Q_{X^n} satisfying (34), (37), and (35), we have

$$E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \eta_n(\alpha, \tau) := \sup_{\substack{Q_{X^n}, Q_{XW} : \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) \leq \alpha + o_n(1), \\ Q_{X^n W^n} \{(x^n, w^n) : L_{x^n, w^n} = Q_{XW}\} = 1, \\ I_Q(X_K; X^{K-1}, K | W_K) = o_m(1)}} \inf_{\substack{Q_{Y^n|X^n} : \\ c_n(X^n, Y^n) \leq t \text{ a.s.}}} \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}). \quad (36)$$

where $W_i = \phi_i(X^{i-1})$. The condition $Q_{X^n W^n} \{(x^n, w^n) : L_{x^n, w^n} = Q_{XW}\} = 1$ implies $Q_{X_K, W_K} = Q_{XW}$.

Step 3: Single-letterizing the Cost Constraint

We next make a special choice of $Q_{Y^n|X^n}$. Let $\delta > 0$ and let $Q_{Y|XW}$ be a conditional distribution such that

$$\mu := \mathbb{E}_{Q_{XW} Q_{Y|XW}} c(X, Y) \leq \tau - \delta.$$

Then, for all (x^n, w^n) with type Q_{XW} with $w_i = \phi_i(x^{i-1})$ and for $Y^n \sim Q_{Y|X, W}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | x^n, w^n)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} c_n(x^n, Y^n) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} c(x_k, Y_k) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(x_k, w_k) \\ &= n \mathbb{E}_{Q_{XW}} \mu(X, W) = n\mu, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu(x, w) := \mathbb{E}_{Q_{Y|(X, W)=(x, w)}} c(x, Y)$. Hence, by Chebyshev's inequality, the probability

$$\begin{aligned}
\epsilon_n &:= \mathbb{Q}\{Y^n \notin \{x^n\}^t\} = \mathbb{Q}\{c_n(x^n, Y^n) > n\tau\} \\
&\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[(c_n(x^n, Y^n) - n\mu)^2]}{n^2(\tau - \mu)^2} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(c(x_k, Y_k) - \mu(x_k, w_k))^2]}{n^2(\tau - \mu)^2} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}_{Q_{XW}} \text{Var}(c(X, Y)|X, W)}{n(\tau - \mu)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\text{Var}(c(X, Y))}{n(\tau - \mu)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)^2]}{n(\tau - \mu)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that \mathbb{Q} denotes the underlying probability measure that induces $Q_{Y|X, W}^{\otimes n}$. Since $\mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)^2]$ is bounded, the last line (and also ϵ_n) vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

However, such a product distribution $Q_{Y|X, W}^{\otimes n}$ does not satisfy the constraint $c_n(X^n, Y^n) \leq t$ a.s. So, we cannot substitute it into (36) directly. We next construct a conditional version of $Q_{Y|X, W}^{\otimes n}$ and then substitute this conditional version into (36).

Denote $\hat{Q}_{Y^n|X^n W^n}$ as a distribution given by

$$\hat{Q}_{Y^n|(X^n, W^n)=(x^n, w^n)} = \left(\prod_{k=1}^n Q_{Y|(X, W)=(x_k, w_k)} \right) (\cdot | \{x^n\}^t)$$

for all x^n and $w_i = \phi_i(x^{i-1})$. Denote

$$\tilde{Q}_{Y^n|(X^n, W^n)=(x^n, w^n)} = \left(\prod_{k=1}^n Q_{Y|(X, W)=(x_k, w_k)} \right) (\cdot | (\{x^n\}^t)^c).$$

We can rewrite $Q_{Y|XW}^{\otimes n}$ as a mixture:

$$Q_{Y|XW}^{\otimes n}(\cdot | x^n, w^n) = (1 - \epsilon_n) \hat{Q}_{Y^n|(X^n, W^n)=(x^n, w^n)} + \epsilon_n \tilde{Q}_{Y^n|(X^n, W^n)=(x^n, w^n)}.$$

For the same input distribution Q_{X^n} , the output distributions of channels $Q_{Y|XW}^{\otimes n}$, $\hat{Q}_{Y^n|X^n, W^n}$, and $\tilde{Q}_{Y^n|X^n, W^n}$ are respectively denoted as Q_{Y^n} , \hat{Q}_{Y^n} , and \tilde{Q}_{Y^n} , which satisfy

$$Q_{Y^n} = (1 - \epsilon_n) \hat{Q}_{Y^n} + \epsilon_n \tilde{Q}_{Y^n}.$$

Denote $J \sim Q_J := \text{Bern}(\epsilon_n)$, and $Q_{Y^n|J=1} = \hat{Q}_{Y^n}$, $Q_{Y^n|J=0} = \tilde{Q}_{Y^n}$. Then,

$$Q_{Y^n} = Q_J(1) Q_{Y^n|J=1} + Q_J(0) Q_{Y^n|J=0}.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
D(Q_{Y^n|J} \| P_Y^{\otimes n} | Q_J) &= (1 - \epsilon_n) D(\hat{Q}_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) + \epsilon_n D(\tilde{Q}_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) \\
&\geq (1 - \epsilon_n) D(\hat{Q}_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$D(Q_{Y^n|J} \| P_Y^{\otimes n} | Q_J) = D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) + D(Q_{J|Y^n} \| Q_J | Q_{Y^n}),$$

and

$$D(Q_{J|Y^n} \| Q_J | Q_{Y^n}) = I_Q(J; Y^n) \leq H_Q(J) \leq \log 2.$$

Hence,

$$D(\hat{Q}_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) \leq \frac{D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) + \log 2}{1 - \epsilon_n}.$$

By choosing $Q_{Y^n|X^n}$ in (36) such that $Q_{Y^n|X^n=x^n} = \hat{Q}_{Y^n|(X^n, W^n)=(x^n, w^n)}$ for all x^n where $w_i = \phi_i(x^{i-1})$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_n(\alpha, \tau) &\leq \sup_{\substack{Q_{X^n}, Q_{XW}: \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) \leq \alpha + o_n(1), \\ Q_{X_K, W_K} = Q_{XW}, \\ I_Q(X_K; X^{K-1}, K | W_K) = o_m(1)}} \inf_{\substack{Q_{Y|XW}: \\ \mathbb{E}_{Q_{XW} Q_{Y|XW}} c(X, Y) \leq \tau - \delta}} \frac{1}{n} D(\hat{Q}_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{Q_{X^n}, Q_{XW}: \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) \leq \alpha + o_n(1), \\ Q_{X_K, W_K} = Q_{XW}, \\ I_Q(X_K; X^{K-1}, K | W_K) = o_m(1)}} \inf_{\substack{Q_{Y|XW}: \\ \mathbb{E}_{Q_{XW} Q_{Y|XW}} c(X, Y) \leq \tau - \delta}} \frac{D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n})}{n(1 - \epsilon_n)} + o_n(1). \end{aligned}$$

Step 4: Single-letterizing Divergences

We next complete the single-letterization. By standard information-theoretic techniques, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{Y^{k-1}}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n I_Q(Y_k; Y^{k-1} | X^{k-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}}) \tag{37} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= D(Q_{Y_K|X^{K-1}K} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{K-1}K}) \\ &= D(Q_{Y_K|X^{K-1}KW_K} \| Q_{Y_K|W_K} | Q_{X^{K-1}KW_K}) + D(Q_{Y_K|W_K} \| P_Y | Q_{W_K}) \\ &= I_Q(Y_K; X^{K-1}, K | W_K) + D(Q_{Y_K|W_K} \| P_Y | Q_{W_K}) \\ &= D(Q_{Y_K|W_K} \| P_Y | Q_{W_K}) + o_m(1) \tag{38} \\ &= D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) + o_m(1), \end{aligned}$$

where

- (37) follows since under the distribution $Q_{X^n W^n} Q_{Y|XW}^{\otimes n}$, W^k is a function of X^{k-1} , and moreover, Y_k and Y^{k-1} are conditionally independent given (X^{k-1}, W^k) for each k ;
- (38) follows since under the distribution $Q_K \otimes Q_{X^n W^n} Q_{Y|XW}^{\otimes n}$ with $Q_K = \text{Unif}[n]$, (K, X^{K-1}) and Y_K are conditionally independent given (X_K, W_K) , and hence,

$$I_Q(Y_K; X^{K-1}, K | W_K) \leq I_Q(X_K; X^{K-1}, K | W_K) = o_m(1);$$

- in the last line, $Q_{Y|W}$ is induced by the distribution $Q_{XW}Q_{Y|XW}$, and the last line follows since $Q_{Y_K|W}$ is induced by the distribution $Q_{X_K W_K}Q_{Y|XW}$, and hence, $Q_{Y_K|W} = Q_{Y|W}$. (Recall that $Q_{X_K W_K} = Q_{XW}$.)

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n}D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}}) \\
&= D(Q_{X_K|X^{K-1}K} \| P_X | Q_{X^{K-1}K}) \\
&= I_Q(X_K; X^{K-1}K | W) + D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \\
&\geq D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_n(\alpha, \tau) &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_n} \sup_{\substack{Q_{XW}: \\ D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha + o_n(1)}} \inf_{\substack{Q_{Y|XW}: \\ \mathbb{E}_Q c(X, Y) \leq \tau - \delta}} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) + o_m(1) + o_n(1) \\
&= \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_n} \psi_m(\alpha + o_n(1), \tau - \delta) + o_m(1) + o_n(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where ψ_m is defined similarly as ψ but with W restricted to concentrate on the alphabet \mathcal{W}_m satisfying $|\mathcal{W}_m| \leq (m+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}$.

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\delta \downarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \limsup_{\alpha' \downarrow \alpha, \tau' \uparrow \tau} \psi_m(\alpha', \tau') + o_m(1). \quad (39)$$

We next prove that ψ_m is upper semicontinuous. Define

$$g(\tau, Q_{XW}) := \inf_{Q_{Y|XW}: \mathbb{E}_{Q_{XW}Q_{Y|XW}} c(X, Y) \leq \tau} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W).$$

It is easy to see that $g(\tau, Q_{XW})$ is convex in (τ, Q_{XW}) . Since given m , Q_{XW} is defined on a finite alphabet, Q_{XW} is in a probability simplex (which is relatively compact). Hence, $g(\tau, Q_{XW})$ is upper semicontinuous in (τ, Q_{XW}) . By definition,

$$\psi_m(\alpha, \tau) = \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha} g(\tau, Q_{XW})$$

Let (α_k, τ_k) be a sequence converging (α, τ) as $k \rightarrow \infty$. For each k , let $Q_{XW}^{(k)}$ attain (or approximately attain) $\psi_m(\alpha_k, \tau_k)$. Hence, passing to a subsequence, we can obtain a convergent sequence $(Q_{XW}^{(k)})$, which is assumed to converge to Q_{XW}^* . Hence,

$$D(Q_{X|W}^* \| P_X | Q_W^*) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} D(Q_{X|W}^{(k)} \| P_X | Q_W^{(k)}) \leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k = \alpha.$$

Moreover,

$$g(\tau, Q_{XW}^*) \geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} g(\tau_k, Q_{XW}^{(k)}) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_m(\alpha_k, \tau_k).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_m(\alpha, \tau) &= \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha} g(\tau, Q_{XW}) \\
&\geq g(\tau, Q_{XW}^*) \\
&\geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_m(\alpha_k, \tau_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, ψ_m is upper semicontinuous.

By (39) and the upper semicontinuity of ψ_m , and letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \psi_m(\alpha, \tau) = \psi(\alpha, \tau).$$

5.1.2 Compact \mathcal{X}

We next consider compact \mathcal{X} . We first introduce a result implied by Assumption 2. By choosing Q_X, Q'_X, Q_Y as Dirac measures $\delta_x, \delta_{x'}, \delta_y$ in Assumption 2 and by the fact that $L(\delta_x, \delta_{x'}) = d(x, x')$ when $d(x, x') \leq 1$, there exists a function $\delta(\epsilon) : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ vanishing as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ such that

$$\inf_{x': d(x, x') \leq \epsilon} c(x', y) \geq c(x, y) - \delta(\epsilon) \quad (40)$$

holds for all (x, y) . In other words, $\inf_{x': d(x, x') \leq \epsilon} c(x', y) \rightarrow c(x, y)$ as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ uniformly for all (x, y) . Note that without Assumption 2, Equation (40) is still true if $c = d$.

Since \mathcal{X} is compact, for any $r > 0$, it can be covered by a finite number of open balls $\{B_r(x_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. Denote $E_i := B_r(x_i) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} B_r(x_j)$, $i \in [k]$, which are measurable. Hence, $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^k$ forms a partition of \mathcal{X} , and E_i is a subset of $B_r(x_i)$. For each i , we choose a point $z_i \in E_i$. Consider $\mathcal{Z} := \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_k\}$ as a sample space, and define a probability mass function P_Z on \mathcal{Z} given by $P_Z(z_i) = P_X(E_i)$, $\forall i \in [k]$. In other words, $Z \sim P_Z$ is a quantized version of $X \sim P_X$ in the sense that $Z = z_i$ if $X \in E_i$ for some i .

For a vector $i^n := (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \in [k]^n$, denote $E_{i^n} := \prod_{l=1}^n E_{i_l}$. Consequently, $\{E_{i^n} : i^n \in [k]^n\}$ forms a partition of \mathcal{X}^n . Similarly, for $X^n \sim P_X^{\otimes n}$, we denote Z^n as a random vector where Z_i is the quantized version of X_i , $i \in [n]$. Obviously, $Z^n \sim P_Z^{\otimes n}$.

For any measurable set $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$, denote $\mathcal{I} := \{i^n \in [k]^n : E_{i^n} \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$. Denote $\hat{A} := \bigcup_{i^n \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i^n}$ which is a superset of A , i.e., $A \subseteq \hat{A}$. On the other hand, for each $i^n \in \mathcal{I}$ and any $\hat{\tau} > 0$, the $\hat{\tau}$ -enlargement of E_{i^n} with $\hat{t} := n\hat{\tau}$ satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{i^n}^{\hat{t}} &= \{y^n : c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq \hat{t}, \exists x^n \in E_{i^n}\} \\ &\subseteq \{y^n : c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq \hat{t}, d(x_i, \hat{x}_i) \leq r, \forall i \in [n], \exists \hat{x}^n \in A, \exists x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n\} \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \{y^n : \inf_{x^n : d(x_i, \hat{x}_i) \leq r, \forall i \in [n]} c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq \hat{t}, \exists \hat{x}^n \in A\} \\ &= \{y^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \inf_{x_i : d(x_i, \hat{x}_i) \leq r} c(x_i, y_i) \leq \hat{t}, \exists \hat{x}^n \in A\} \\ &\subseteq \{y^n : \sum_{i=1}^n c(\hat{x}_i, y_i) \leq n(\hat{\tau} + \delta(r)), \exists \hat{x}^n \in A\} \\ &= A^{n(\hat{\tau} + \delta(r))}, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where

- (41) follows from the fact that $\exists x^n \in E_{i^n}$ implies $d(x_i, \hat{x}_i) \leq r, \forall i \in [n]$ for some $\hat{x}^n \in A, x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$;
- in (42) $\delta(r)$ is a positive function of r which vanishes as $r \downarrow 0$, and (42) follows by (40).

Hence,

$$\hat{A}^{\hat{t}} = \bigcup_{i^n \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i^n}^{\hat{t}} \subseteq A^{n(\hat{\tau} + \delta(r))}$$

If we choose $\hat{\tau} = \tau - \delta(r)$, then $\hat{A}^{n\hat{\tau}} \subseteq A^{n\tau}$. Combining this with $A \subseteq \hat{A}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^{n\tau}) &\geq P_Y^{\otimes n}(\hat{A}^{n\hat{\tau}}) \\ P_X^{\otimes n}(A) &\leq P_X^{\otimes n}(\hat{A}), \end{aligned}$$

which further imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{A: P_X^{\otimes n}(A) \geq a} P_Y^{\otimes n}(A^{n\tau}) &\geq \inf_{A: P_X^{\otimes n}(\hat{A}) \geq a} P_Y^{\otimes n}(\hat{A}^{n\hat{\tau}}) \\
&= \inf_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq [k]^n: P_X^{\otimes n}(\bigcup_{i^n \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i^n}) \geq a} P_Y^{\otimes n}((\bigcup_{i^n \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i^n})^{n\hat{\tau}}) \\
&= \inf_{B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}^n: P_Z^{\otimes n}(B) \geq a} P_Y^{\otimes n}(B^{n\hat{\tau}}),
\end{aligned}$$

where $B^{n\hat{\tau}} = \{y^n : c_n(z^n, y^n) \leq n\hat{\tau}, \exists z^n \in B\}$. Therefore,

$$E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau | P_X) \leq E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \hat{\tau} | P_Z),$$

where $E_0^{(n)}(\cdot, \cdot | P_X)$ is the exponent $E_0^{(n)}$ defined for distribution pair (P_X, P_Y) , and $E_0^{(n)}(\cdot, \cdot | P_Z)$ is the exponent $E_0^{(n)}$ defined for (P_Z, P_Y) .

Denote $\psi(\cdot, \cdot | P_X)$ as the function ψ defined for (P_X, P_Y) , and $\psi(\cdot, \cdot | P_Z)$ as the one defined for (P_Z, P_Y) . Since \mathcal{Z} is a finite metric space (with discrete metric), by the result proven in Section 5.1.1, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \hat{\tau} | P_Z) \leq \psi(\alpha, \hat{\tau} | P_Z).$$

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau | P_X) \leq \psi(\alpha, \hat{\tau} | P_Z) = \psi(\alpha, \tau - \delta(r) | P_Z). \quad (43)$$

We next show that $\psi(\alpha', \tau' + \delta(r) | P_Z) \leq \psi(\alpha', \tau' | P_X)$ for any $\alpha' \geq 0, \tau' > 0$. For any $Q_{Z|W}$, we define a mixture distribution $Q_{X|W}$ such that for each w ,

$$Q_{X|W=w} = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_{Z|W}(z_i | w) P_X(\cdot | E_i),$$

which implies

$$\frac{dQ_{X|W}}{dP_X}(x | w) = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_{Z|W}(z_i | w) \frac{\mathbb{1}_{E_i}(x)}{P_X(E_i)} = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_{Z|W}(z_i | w) \frac{\mathbb{1}_{E_i}(x)}{P_Z(z_i)}, \forall x. \quad (44)$$

For such $Q_{X|W}$,

$$D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) = D(Q_{Z|W} \| P_Z | Q_W). \quad (45)$$

Note that for such a construction, $Z \sim Q_Z$ can be seen as a quantized version of $X \sim Q_X$.

By (40), we have that $c(X, Y) \geq c(Z, Y) - \delta(r)$ a.s. where Z is the quantized version of (and also a function of) X . We hence have that for $Q_{X|W}$ constructed above,

$$\begin{aligned}
C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) &= \min_{Q_{XY|W} \in \Pi(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W})} \mathbb{E}_{Q_W Q_{XY|W}}[c(X, Y)] \\
&\geq \min_{Q_{XY|W} \in \Pi(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W})} \mathbb{E}_{Q_W Q_{XY|W}}[c(Z, Y)] - \delta(r) \\
&\geq \min_{Q_{ZY|W} \in \Pi(Q_{Z|W}, Q_{Y|W})} \mathbb{E}_{Q_W Q_{ZY|W}}[c(Z, Y)] - \delta(r) \\
&= C(Q_{Z|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) - \delta(r).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{Q_{Y|W}: C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq \tau'} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\
&\geq \inf_{Q_{Y|W}: C(Q_{Z|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq \tau' + \delta(r)} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking supremum over Q_{ZW} such that $D(Q_{Z|W} \| P_Z | Q_W) \leq \alpha'$, we obtain

$$\sup_{Q_{ZW}: D(Q_{Z|W} \| P_Z | Q_W) \leq \alpha'} \inf_{Q_{Y|W}: C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq \tau'} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \geq \psi(\alpha', \tau' + \delta(r) | P_Z)$$

where $Q_{X|W}$ at the LHS above is induced by $Q_{Z|W}$ as shown in (44). By (45), the LHS above is in turn upper bounded by $\psi(\alpha', \tau' | P_X)$ (by replacing the supremum above with the supremum over Q_{XW} such that $D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha'$). Hence,

$$\psi(\alpha', \tau' + \delta(r) | P_Z) \leq \psi(\alpha', \tau' | P_X).$$

For $\tau > 2\delta(r)$ (when $\tau > 0$ and r is sufficiently small), substituting $\alpha' \leftarrow \alpha, \tau' \leftarrow \tau - 2\delta(r)$ into the above inequality, we have

$$\psi(\alpha, \tau - \delta(r) | P_Z) \leq \psi(\alpha, \tau - 2\delta(r) | P_X). \quad (46)$$

Combining (43) and (46) and letting $r \downarrow 0$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau | P_X) \leq \lim_{\tau' \uparrow \tau} \psi(\alpha, \tau' | P_X).$$

5.2 Lower Bound

The proof for the lower bound is similar to that for Statement 1 of Theorem 3 given in Section 3.

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Let Q_{WX} be such that $|\text{supp}(Q_W)| < \infty$ and $D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\text{supp}(Q_W) = [m]$. For each n , let $Q_W^{(n)}$ be an empirical measure of an n -length sequence (i.e., n -type) such that $\text{supp}(Q_W^{(n)}) \subseteq [m]$ and $Q_W^{(n)} \rightarrow Q_W$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $Q_{XW}^{(n)} = Q_W^{(n)} Q_{X|W}$. Let $w^n = (1, \dots, 1, 2, \dots, 2, \dots, m, \dots, m)$ be an n -length sequence, where i appears $n_i := nQ_W^{(n)}(i)$ times. Hence, the empirical measure of w^n is $Q_W^{(n)}$. Let $\epsilon' > 0$. Denote $A_w := B_{\epsilon'}(Q_{X|W=w})$ for $w \in [m]$, and $A := \{R_{X|W} : R_{X|W=w} \in A_w, \forall w \in [m]\}$. Denote

$$\mathcal{A} = \{x^n : L_{x^n|w^n} \in A\} = \prod_{w=1}^m \{x^{n_w} : L_{x^{n_w}} \in A_w\}.$$

As shown in Section 3, \mathcal{A} is closed in \mathcal{X}^n , and $-\frac{1}{n} \log P_X^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \alpha$ for all sufficiently large n .

Denote $t = n\tau$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^t &= \{y^n : \exists x^n, L_{x^n|w^n} \in A, c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq t\} \\ &= \{y^n : \exists x^n, L_{x^n|w^n} \in A, \mathbb{E}_{L_{x^n, y^n, w^n}} c(X, Y) \leq \tau\} \\ &\subseteq \{y^n : \exists x^n, L_{x^n|w^n} \in A, C(L_{x^n|w^n}, L_{y^n|w^n} | L_{w^n}) \leq \tau\} \\ &\subseteq \{y^n : \exists R_{X|W} \in A, C(R_{X|W}, L_{y^n|w^n} | Q_W^{(n)}) \leq \tau\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\mathcal{A}^t \subseteq \{y^n : L_{y^n|w^n} \in B\},$$

where

$$B = \{R_{Y|W} : C(R_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | Q_W^{(n)}) \leq \tau, \exists R_{X|W} \in A\}. \quad (47)$$

We next compute the exponent of $P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{A}^t)$ by using Sanov's theorem. To this end, we first convert the probability $P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{A}^t)$ to a probability of the (random) empirical measure $L_{Y^n W^n}$ with $(Y^n, W^n) \sim P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes Q_W^{\otimes n}$. Define

$$\mathcal{B} := \{(w^n, y^n) : L_{y^n|w^n} \in B, L_{w^n} = Q_W^{(n)}\}.$$

Note that for distinct w^n, \hat{w}^n with the same empirical measure $Q_W^{(n)}$, there is a permutation σ such that $\hat{w}^n = \sigma(w^n)$. Moreover, the set $\{(\hat{w}^n, y^n) : L_{y^n|\hat{w}^n} \in B\}$ is the resultant set by permuting each elements in $\{(w^n, y^n) : L_{y^n|w^n} \in B\}$ via σ . On the other hand, the distribution $P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes Q_W^{\otimes n}$ is permutation-invariant (or exchangeable). Hence, we have

$$P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes Q_W^{\otimes n} \{(\hat{w}^n, y^n) : L_{y^n|\hat{w}^n} \in B\} = P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes Q_W^{\otimes n} \{(w^n, y^n) : L_{y^n|w^n} \in B\}.$$

Moreover, the events in the probability at the LHS and RHS are mutually exclusive. Hence, for any w^n with empirical measure $Q_W^{(n)}$,

$$P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes Q_W^{\otimes n} \{(w^n, y^n) : L_{y^n|w^n} \in B\} = \frac{1}{|\{w^n : L_{w^n} = Q_W^{(n)}\}|} P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes Q_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}).$$

Furthermore, given w^n , the LHS above is $Q_W^{\otimes n}(w^n) P_Y^{\otimes n} \{y^n : L_{y^n|w^n} \in B\}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} P_Y^{\otimes n} \{y^n : L_{y^n|w^n} \in B\} &= \frac{1}{|\{w^n : L_{w^n} = Q_W^{(n)}\}| \cdot Q_W^{\otimes n}(w^n)} P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes Q_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}) \\ &= \frac{1}{Q_W^{\otimes n} \{w^n : L_{w^n} = Q_W^{(n)}\}} P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes Q_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that \mathcal{W} is finite. By the finite alphabet version of Sanov's theorem [7],

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log Q_W^{\otimes n} \{w^n : L_{w^n} = Q_W^{(n)}\} = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}_{w^n}) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes Q_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}) =: E.$$

We next estimate E . For sufficiently large n , $Q_W^{(n)}$ belongs to $B_{\epsilon'}(Q_W)$. So,

$$\mathcal{B} \subseteq \{(w^n, y^n) : L_{y^n|w^n} \in B, L_{w^n} \in B_{\epsilon'}(Q_W)\}.$$

By Sanov's theorem,

$$E \geq \inf_{R_{WY} \in \bar{B}'} D(R_{YW} \| P_Y \otimes Q_W), \quad (48)$$

where $B' := \{R_{WY} : R_W \in B_{\epsilon'}(Q_W), Q_{Y|W} \in B\}$. To simplify this lower bound, denoting

$$\hat{B} := \{R_{Y|W} : C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}|Q_W) \leq \tau + 2\epsilon\},$$

we claim that for sufficiently small ϵ' , it holds that

$$B' \subseteq \hat{B}' := \{R_{WY} : R_W \in B_{\epsilon'}(Q_W), R_{Y|W} \in \hat{B}\}, \quad (49)$$

and \hat{B}' is closed. We next prove this claim.

By Assumption 2, for any $R_{Y|W}$, it holds that given $\epsilon'' > 0$, for sufficiently small ϵ' ,

$$\inf_{R_{X|W} \in \mathcal{A}} C(R_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}|Q_W^{(n)}) \geq C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}|Q_W^{(n)}) - \epsilon''.$$

Note that the minimization in the conditional optimal transport can be taken in a pointwise way for each condition $W = w$. Combining this with the condition that c is bounded, we have that $R_W \mapsto C(R_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}|R_W)$ is continuous. So, given $\epsilon'' > 0$, for sufficiently large n ,

$$C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}|Q_W^{(n)}) \geq C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}|Q_W) - \epsilon''.$$

This implies that given ϵ'' , for sufficiently small ϵ' , $B \subseteq \hat{B}$. (Recall B is defined in (47).) Hence, $B' \subseteq \hat{B}'$.

We next prove that for sufficiently small ϵ , \hat{B}' is closed. Let $(R_{WY}^{(k)})$ be an arbitrary sequence drawn from \hat{B}' , which converges to R_{WY}^* (under the weak topology). Obviously, $R_W^{(k)} \rightarrow R_W^* = Q_W$ and $R_{Y|W=w}^{(k)} \rightarrow R_{Y|W=w}^*$ for each w . By the lower semi-continuity of $R_Y \mapsto C(R_X, R_Y)$, we have that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} C(Q_{X|W=w}, R_{Y|W=w}^{(k)}) \geq C(Q_{X|W=w}, R_{Y|W=w}^*).$$

Hence,

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}^{(k)}|Q_W) \geq C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}^*|Q_W).$$

On the other hand, by the choice of $(R_{WY}^{(k)})$, $C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}^{(k)}|Q_W) \leq \tau + 2\epsilon''$. Hence, $C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}^*|Q_W) \leq \tau + 2\epsilon''$. That is, $R_{WY}^* \in \hat{B}'$. Hence, \hat{B}' is closed. This completes the proof of the claim above.

By (49) and (48),

$$\begin{aligned} E &\geq \inf_{R_{WY} \in \hat{B}'} D(R_{YW} \| P_Y \otimes Q_W) \\ &= \inf_{R_{WY} : R_W \in B_{\epsilon'}(Q_W), R_{Y|W} \in \hat{B}} D(R_{Y|W} \| P_Y | R_W) + D(R_W \| Q_W) \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\epsilon' \downarrow 0$ and by the continuity of $R_W \in \mathcal{P}([m]) \mapsto D(R_W \| Q_W)$, we obtain

$$E \geq \beta := \lim_{\epsilon' \downarrow 0} \inf_{R_W \in B_{\epsilon'}(Q_W), R_{Y|W} : C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq \tau + 2\epsilon''} D(R_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W)$$

Let $(R_W^{(k)}, R_{Y|W}^{(k)})$ be such that

$$\begin{aligned} R_W^{(k)} &\in B_{\frac{1}{k}}(Q_W), \\ C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}^{(k)} | Q_W) &\leq \tau + 2\epsilon'', \\ D(R_{Y|W}^{(k)} \| P_Y | Q_W) &\leq \beta + \frac{1}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $R_W^{(k)}$ is in the probability simplex, by passing to a subsequence, we assume $R_W^{(k)} \rightarrow Q_W$. Since sublevel sets of the relative entropy $R_Y \mapsto D(R_Y \| P_Y)$ are compact, by the fact that for each w , $D(R_{Y|W=w} \| P_Y)$ is finite, passing to a subsequence, we have $R_{Y|W=w}^{(k)} \rightarrow R_{Y|W=w}^*$. By the lower semi-continuity of the relative entropy and the optimal transport cost functional, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} D(R_{Y|W}^{(k)} \| P_Y | Q_W) &\geq D(R_{Y|W}^* \| P_Y | Q_W), \\ \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}^{(k)} | Q_W) &\geq C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}^* | Q_W). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $R_{Y|W}^*$ satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}^* | Q_W) &\leq \tau + 2\epsilon'' \\ D(R_{Y|W}^* \| P_Y | Q_W) &\leq \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $E \geq g(\tau + 2\epsilon'', Q_{XW})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} g(t, Q_{XW}) &:= \inf_{Q_{Y|W} : C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq t} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\ &= \inf_{Q_{Y|XW} : \mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)] \leq t} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W). \end{aligned}$$

Since Q_{XW} is arbitrary distribution on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{W}$ satisfying $D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon$, taking supremum over all such distributions, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) &\geq \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon} g(\tau + 2\epsilon'', Q_{XW}) \\ &= \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau + 2\epsilon''). \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_{\mathcal{W}}$ is defined similarly as ψ in (16) but with the alphabet \mathcal{W} fixed. Letting $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ and $\epsilon'' \downarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) &\geq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \lim_{\epsilon'' \downarrow 0} \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau + 2\epsilon'') \\ &= \sup_{\epsilon, \epsilon'' > 0} \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau + 2\epsilon''). \end{aligned}$$

Note that given \mathcal{W} ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\epsilon'' > 0} \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau + 2\epsilon'') \\ &= \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon} \sup_{\epsilon'' > 0} g(\tau + 2\epsilon'', Q_{XW}) \\ &= \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon} \lim_{\epsilon'' \downarrow 0} \inf_{Q_{Y|XW}: \mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)] \leq \tau + \epsilon} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\ &= \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon} \inf_{Q_{Y|XW}: \mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)] \leq \tau} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\ &= \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau), \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where (50) follows since given Q_{XW} , $\tau \mapsto \inf_{Q_{Y|XW}: \mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)] \leq \tau} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W)$ is convex, and hence, continuous on $(0, +\infty)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) &\geq \sup_{\text{finite } \mathcal{W}} \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau) \\ &= \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \sup_{\text{finite } \mathcal{W}} \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \psi(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau). \end{aligned}$$

6 Proofs of Dual Formulas

It is well known that the OT cost admits the following duality.

Lemma 5 (Kantorovich Duality). *[27, Theorem 5.10] It holds that*

$$C(Q_X, Q_Y) = \sup_{(f, g) \in C_b(\mathcal{X}) \times C_b(\mathcal{Y}): f+g \leq c} Q_X(f) + Q_Y(g),$$

where $C_b(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the collection of bounded continuous functions $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We also need the following duality for the I-projection, which is well-known if the space is Polish since both sides in (51) correspond to the large deviation exponent.

Lemma 6 (Duality for the I-Projection). *Let $f: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable bounded above function. Then, it holds that for any real τ ,*

$$\inf_{Q: Q(f) \geq \tau} D(Q \| P) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda \tau - \log P(e^{\lambda f}), \tag{51}$$

and for any real $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$\sup_{Q: D(Q \| P) \leq \alpha} Q(f) = \inf_{\eta > 0} \eta \alpha + \eta \log P(e^{(1/\eta)f}). \tag{52}$$

The $\sup_{\lambda \geq 0}$ in (51) can be replaced by $\sup_{\lambda > 0}$.

This lemma is a direct consequence of the following lemma. The following lemma can be easily verified by definition.

Lemma 7. [8] For a measurable bounded above function f and $\lambda \geq 0$, define a probability measure Q_λ with density

$$\frac{dQ_\lambda}{dP} = \frac{e^{\lambda f}}{P(e^{\lambda f})},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} D(Q\|P) - D(Q_\lambda\|P) &= D(Q\|Q_\lambda) + \lambda(Q(f) - Q_\lambda(f)) \\ &\geq \lambda(Q(f) - Q_\lambda(f)). \end{aligned}$$

The function f in Lemmas 6 and 7 can be assumed to be unbounded, but $P(e^{\lambda f})$ should be finite for Lemma 7, $P(e^{\lambda f})$ should be finite for $\lambda \geq 0$ such that $Q_\lambda(f) = \tau$ for (51) in Lemma 6, and $P(e^{(1/\eta)f})$ should be finite for $\eta > 0$ such that $D(Q_{1/\eta}\|P) = \alpha$ for (52) in Lemma 6,

The conditional version of Lemma 6 is as follows.

Lemma 8. Let \mathcal{W} be a finite set and $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable bounded above function. Let P_W be a probability measure on \mathcal{W} . Then, for any real τ , it holds that

$$\inf_{Q_{X|W} : P_W Q_{X|W}(f) \geq \tau} D(Q_{X|W}\|P_{X|W}|P_W) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda \tau - P_W(\log P_{X|W}(e^{\lambda f})),$$

and for any real $\alpha \geq 0$, it holds that

$$\sup_{Q_{X|W} : D(Q_{X|W}\|P_{X|W}|P_W) \leq \alpha} P_W Q_{X|W}(f) = \inf_{\eta > 0} \eta \alpha + \eta P_W(\log P_{X|W}(e^{(1/\eta)f})).$$

Based on the duality lemmas above, we prove Theorem 6.

Proof of Theorem 6. By the definition of ϕ_{\geq} and by the Kantorovich duality,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{\geq}(\alpha, \tau) &= \inf_{\substack{Q_X, Q_Y, f, g: f+g \leq c, \\ Q_X(f) + Q_Y(g) \geq \tau, \\ D(Q_X\|P_X) \leq \alpha}} D(Q_Y\|P_Y) \\ &= \inf_{\substack{Q_X, f, g: f+g \leq c, \\ D(Q_X\|P_X) \leq \alpha}} \inf_{Q_Y : Q_X(f) + Q_Y(g) \geq \tau} D(Q_Y\|P_Y). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

By Lemma 6,

$$\phi_{\geq}(\alpha, \tau) = \inf_{f, g: f+g \leq c} \inf_{Q_X : D(Q_X\|P_X) \leq \alpha} \sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda(\tau - Q_X(f)) - \log P_Y(e^{\lambda g}). \quad (54)$$

The objective function in (54) is linear in λ and also linear in Q_X , and moreover, $\{Q_X : D(Q_X\|P_X) \leq \alpha\}$ is compact. So, by the minimax theorem, the second infimization and the supremization can be swapped [30, Theorem 2.10.2]. Hence, the inf-sup part in (53) is equal to

$$\sup_{\lambda > 0} \inf_{Q_X : D(Q_X\|P_X) \leq \alpha} \lambda(\tau - Q_X(f)) - \log P_Y(e^{\lambda g}).$$

which by Lemma 6, can be rewritten as

$$\sup_{\lambda > 0} \lambda(\tau - \inf_{\eta > 0} (\eta \alpha + \eta \log P_X(e^{(1/\eta)f}))) - \log P_Y(e^{\lambda g}).$$

Substituting this into (54) completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. By the Kantorovich–Rubinstein formula [27, (5.11)],

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{X,\geq}(\tau) &= \inf_{Q_X, 1\text{-Lip } f: P_X(f)=0, Q_X(f)\geq\tau} D(Q_X \| P_X) \\
&= \inf_{1\text{-Lip } f: P_X(f)=0} \inf_{Q_X} \sup_{\lambda\geq 0} D(Q_X \| P_X) + \lambda(\tau - Q_X(f)) \\
&= \inf_{1\text{-Lip } f: P_X(f)=0} \sup_{\lambda\geq 0} \inf_{Q_X} D(Q_X \| P_X) + \lambda(\tau - Q_X(f)) \\
&= \inf_{1\text{-Lip } f: P_X(f)=0} \sup_{\lambda\geq 0} \lambda\tau - \log P_X(e^{\lambda f}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 7. It is easy to see that $\check{\varphi}_{X,\geq}(\tau) = \check{\varphi}_X(\tau)$. If we swap the inf and sup in (18), then we will obtain $r(\tau)$. However, this is infeasible in general.

Obviously, from (18), $\varphi_{X,\geq}(\tau) \geq r(\tau)$, and by definition, $r(\tau)$ is convex. So, taking the lower convex envelope, we obtain $\check{\varphi}_{X,\geq}(\tau) \geq r(\tau)$. It remains to prove $\check{\varphi}_{X,\geq}(\tau) \leq r(\tau)$. We next do this.

By [4, Theorem 3.10], given any $\tau \geq 0$, there is a λ^* such that $r(\tau) = \lambda^*\tau - L_G(\lambda^*)$. Because the function $\lambda \mapsto \lambda\tau - L_G(\lambda)$ has a maximum at λ^* , its right derivative at λ^* is at most 0, and its left derivative is at least 0. In other words, we have $L_G^l(\lambda^*) \leq \tau \leq L_G^r(\lambda^*)$. Because $L_G^r(\lambda^*) \geq \tau$, there must be a function $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $L_g(\lambda^*) = L_G(\lambda^*)$ and $L'_g(\lambda^*) \geq \tau$. Because $L_G^l(\lambda^*) \leq \tau$, there must be a function $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $L_h(\lambda^*) = L_G(\lambda^*)$ and $L'_h(\lambda^*) \leq \tau$. Hence for any $\epsilon > 0$, there are positive integer n and nonnegative integer k such that $|\hat{\tau} - \tau| \leq \epsilon$, where

$$\hat{\tau} := pL'_g(\lambda^*) + (1-p)L'_h(\lambda^*)$$

and $p = \frac{k}{n}$.

Let $X^n \sim P_X^{\otimes n}$. Denote $f : \mathcal{X}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(x^n) = \sum_{i=1}^k g(x_i) + \sum_{i=k+1}^n h(x_i).$$

Since g, h are 1-Lipschitz, so is f (on the product space). Then, for any $\lambda \geq 0$,

$$L_f(\lambda) = kL_g(\lambda) + (n-k)L_h(\lambda).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
r(\tau) &= \lambda^*\tau - L_G(\lambda^*) \\
&\leq \lambda^*\hat{\tau} - (pL_g(\lambda^*) + (1-p)L_h(\lambda^*)) + \lambda^*\epsilon \\
&= \sup_{\lambda\geq 0} \lambda\hat{\tau} - (pL_g(\lambda) + (1-p)L_h(\lambda)) + \lambda^*\epsilon
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{\lambda\geq 0} \lambda\hat{\tau} - \frac{1}{n}L_f(\lambda) + \lambda^*\epsilon \\
&\geq \inf_{1\text{-Lip } \hat{f}: P_X^{\otimes n}(\hat{f})=0} \sup_{\lambda\geq 0} \lambda\hat{\tau} - \frac{1}{n}L_{\hat{f}}(\lambda) + \lambda^*\epsilon \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\varphi_n(n\hat{\tau}) + \lambda^*\epsilon
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

$$\geq \check{\varphi}_{X,\geq}(\hat{\tau}) + \lambda^*\epsilon, \tag{57}$$

where

- (55) follows since the objective function in it is strictly convex in λ and its derivative is zero at λ^* ;

- φ_n in (56) given by

$$\varphi_n(t) = \inf_{Q_{X^n} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}^n): C(P_X^{\otimes n}, Q_{X^n}) \geq t} D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n})$$

is the n -dimensional extension of $\varphi_{X,\geq}$, and (56) follows by Proposition 1 for the n -dimensional version φ_n ;

- (57) follows the single-letterization argument same to that used for (21).

Lastly, letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have $\hat{\tau} \rightarrow \tau$. By the continuity of $\check{\varphi}_{X,\geq}$ and (57), we have $r(\tau) \geq \check{\varphi}_{X,\geq}(\tau)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 8. We first give a dual formula for

$$\theta(\tau, Q_{XW}) := \inf_{Q_{Y|W}: C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) \leq \tau} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y|Q_W).$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(\tau, Q_{XW}) &= \inf_{Q_{Y|W}: C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) \leq \tau} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y|Q_W) \\ &= \inf_{Q_{Y|W}} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y|Q_W) + \lambda(C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) - \tau) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \inf_{Q_{Y|W}} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y|Q_W) + \lambda(\mathbb{E}_{Q_W}[C(Q_{X|W}(\cdot|W), Q_{Y|W}(\cdot|W))] - \tau) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \inf_{Q_{Y|W}} \mathbb{E}_{Q_W}[D(Q_{Y|W}(\cdot|W) \| P_Y) + \lambda(Q_{X|W}(f|W) + Q_{Y|W}(g|W) - \tau)] \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_w Q_W(w) \left[\inf_{Q_{Y|W=w}} \sup_{f+g \leq c} D(Q_{Y|W=w} \| P_Y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda(Q_{X|W=w}(f) + Q_{Y|W=w}(g) - \tau) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \sum_w Q_W(w) \left[\sup_{f+g \leq c} \inf_{Q_{Y|W=w}} D(Q_{Y|W=w} \| P_Y) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda(Q_{X|W=w}(f) + Q_{Y|W=w}(g) - \tau) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

$$= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{f_w + g_w \leq c, \forall w} \mathbb{E}_{Q_W} [\lambda(Q_{X|W}(fW) - \tau) - \log P_Y(e^{-\lambda gW})], \quad (61)$$

where

- (58) follows by the Kantorovich duality, in (59) $\inf_{Q_{Y|W}}$ is taken in a pointwise way;
- the inf and sup are swapped in (60) which follows by the general minimax theorem [20, Theorem 5.2.2] by identifying that 1) the optimal value of the sup-inf in (60) is finite (since upper bounded by $\lambda(C(Q_{X|W=w}, P_Y) - \tau)$), and 2) by choosing f, g as zero functions, the objective subfunction turns to be $Q_{Y|W=w} \mapsto D(Q_{Y|W=w} \| P_Y) - \lambda\tau$ whose sublevels are compact under the weak topology;
- (61) follows by Lemma 7 (and the supremum over f, g is moved outside of the expectation).

Substituting this dual formula for θ to ψ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\alpha, \tau) &= \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha} \theta(\tau, Q_{XW}) \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{f_w + g_w \leq c, \forall w} \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha} \mathbb{E}_{Q_W} [\lambda(Q_{X|W}(f_W) - \tau) - \log P_Y(e^{-\lambda g_W})] \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{f_w + g_w \leq c, \forall w \in \{0,1\}} \sup_{Q_{X|W}, p \in [0,1]: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | \text{Bern}(p)) \leq \alpha} \mathbb{E}_{W \sim \text{Bern}(p)} [\lambda(Q_{X|W}(f_W) - \tau) - \log P_Y(e^{-\lambda g_W})] \tag{62}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{f_w + g_w \leq c, \forall w \in \{0,1\}} \sup_{p \in [0,1]} \inf_{\eta > 0} \eta \alpha + \\ &\quad \eta \mathbb{E}_{W \sim \text{Bern}(p)} \log P_X(e^{(1/\eta)(\lambda(f_W - \tau) - \log P_Y(e^{-\lambda g_W}))}) \tag{63}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&= \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{f_w + g_w \leq c, \forall w \in \{0,1\}} \inf_{\eta > 0} \eta \alpha + \eta \max_{w \in \{0,1\}} \log P_X(e^{(1/\eta)(\lambda(f_w - \tau) - \log P_Y(e^{-\lambda g_w}))}) \tag{64}\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sup_{f_w + g_w \leq c, \forall w \in \{0,1\}} \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \inf_{\eta > 0} \max_{w \in \{0,1\}} \eta \alpha + \eta \log P_X(e^{(\lambda/\eta)f_w}) - \lambda \tau - \log P_Y(e^{-\lambda g_w}),$$

where in (62), by Carathéodory's theorem, the alphabet size of Q_W can be restricted to be no larger than 2, (63) follows by Lemma 8, and (64) follows by the minimax theorem. \square

References

- [1] R. Ahlswede, P. Gács, and J. Körner. Bounds on conditional probabilities with applications in multi-user communication. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete*, 34(3):157–177, 1976.
- [2] R. Ahlswede, E.-H. Yang, and Z. Zhang. Identification via compressed data. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 43(1), 1997.
- [3] R. Ahlswede and Z. Zhang. Asymptotical isoperimetric problem. In *Proceedings of the 1999 IEEE Information Theory and Communications Workshop*, pages 85–87. IEEE, 1999.
- [4] N. Alon, R. Boppana, and J. Spencer. An asymptotic isoperimetric inequality. *Geometric & Functional Analysis*, 8(3):411–436, 1998.
- [5] D. Berend, P. Harremoës, and A. Kontorovich. Minimum KL-divergence on complements of L_1 balls. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(6):3172–3177, 2014.
- [6] D. P. Bertsekas and S. E. Shreve. *Stochastic optimal control: the discrete-time case*, volume 5. Athena Scientific, 1996.
- [7] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley-Interscience, 2nd edition, 2006.
- [8] I. Csiszár. I-divergence geometry of probability distributions and minimization problems. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 146–158, 1975.
- [9] I. Csiszár and J. Körner. *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [10] A. Dembo. Information inequalities and concentration of measure. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 927–939, 1997.
- [11] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*. Springer, 2nd edition, 1998.
- [12] A. L. Gibbs and F. E. Su. On choosing and bounding probability metrics. *International statistical review*, 70(3):419–435, 2002.

- [13] N. Gozlan. A characterization of dimension free concentration in terms of transportation inequalities. *The Annals of Probability*, 37(6):2480–2498, 2009.
- [14] N. Gozlan and C. Léonard. A large deviation approach to some transportation cost inequalities. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 139(1):235–283, 2007.
- [15] N. Gozlan and C. Léonard. Transport inequalities. a survey. *Markov Processes and Related Fields*, 16:635–736, 2010.
- [16] M. Hayashi and V. Y. F. Tan. Minimum rates of approximate sufficient statistics. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(2):875–888, 2017.
- [17] M. Ledoux. *The concentration of measure phenomenon*. Number 89. American Mathematical Soc., 2001.
- [18] K. Marton. A simple proof of the blowing-up lemma. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 32(3):445–446, 1986.
- [19] K. Marton. Bounding \bar{d} -distance by informational divergence: a method to prove measure concentration. *The Annals of Probability*, 24(2):857–866, 1996.
- [20] L. Nirenberg. *Topics in nonlinear functional analysis*, volume 6. American Mathematical Soc., 1974.
- [21] M. Raginsky and I. Sason. *Concentration of Measure Inequalities in Information Theory, Communications and Coding*, volume 10 of *Foundations and Trends in Communications and Information Theory*. Now Publishers Inc, 2013.
- [22] M. Talagrand. Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces. *Publications Mathématiques de l’Institut des Hautes Etudes Scientifiques*, 81(1):73–205, 1995.
- [23] M. Talagrand. Transportation cost for gaussian and other product measures. *Geometric & Functional Analysis*, 6(3):587–600, 1996.
- [24] I. Vajda. Note on discrimination information and variation (corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 16(6):771–773, 1970.
- [25] T. van Erven and P. Harremoës. Rényi divergence and Kullback-Leibler divergence. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(7):3797–3820, 2014.
- [26] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*. Number 58. American Mathematical Soc., 2003.
- [27] C. Villani. *Optimal transport: old and new*, volume 338. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [28] L. Yu. Asymptotics of Strassen’s optimal transport problem. *To appear in Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et Statistiques*. Available at *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02051*, 2022.
- [29] L. Yu and V. Y. F. Tan. On exact and ∞ -Rényi common information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(6):3366–3406, 2020.
- [30] C. Zălinescu. *Convex analysis in general vector spaces*. World scientific, 2002.