

Exponents for Concentration of Measure and Isoperimetry in Product Spaces

Lei Yu*

May 17, 2022

Abstract

In this paper, we provide variational formulas for the asymptotic exponents of the concentration function in the product probability space. The variational formulas for the exponents are expressed in terms of relative entropies (which are from information theory) and optimal transport cost functionals (which are from optimal transport theory). Moreover, in the concentration of measure regime, our variational formula is in fact a dimension-free bound on the concentration function, which is valid for any finite dimensions. Our proofs in this paper are based on information-theoretic and optimal transport techniques, and our results verify an intimate connection among information theory, optimal transport, and concentration of measure.

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

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 any Lipschitz function depending on many parameters is almost constant. 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 many authors including Milman, Gromov, Maurey, Pisier, Schechtman, Talagrand, Ledoux, and others. In information theory, concentration of measure is known as the *blowing-up lemma* [1, 2], which was employed by Gács, Ahlswede, and Körner to prove the strong converses of two coding problems in information theory.

In this paper, we focus on the problem studied previously by Talagrand in [3], i.e., a generalized version of concentration of measure in the product space, in which 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 setting in concentration of measure, the probability of A is not necessarily restricted to be greater than $1/2$. Such a problem is in fact closely related to isoperimetric problems, where the latter is to minimize the measure of the “boundary” of A , instead of the measure of the enlargement. The measure of the “boundary” is defined to be the

*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).

right-derivative of the probability of A^t with respect to t at $t = 0$. Hence, roughly speaking, this generalized version of concentration of measure can be also considered as a generalization of isoperimetric problems. At least, the results for the former can be used to bound the latter.

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 $P_Y \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y})$ be two distributions where the subscripts X and Y indicate which spaces the distributions are defined on. 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 make one of the following two assumptions 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 (*generalized*) *concentration function* as for $a \in [0, 1], t \geq 0$,

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

where the set A is assumed to satisfy either Assumption 1 or 2. Define the *concentration exponent functions* as¹ for $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) := -\frac{1}{n} \log \Gamma^{(n)}(e^{-n\alpha}, n\tau)$$

$$E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) := -\frac{1}{n} \log \left(1 - \Gamma^{(n)}(e^{-n\alpha}, n\tau) \right).$$

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 the exponential are the same.

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

$$C(P_X, P_Y) := \min_{P_{XY} \in \Pi(P_X, P_Y)} \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim P_{XY}} [c(X, Y)]. \quad (1)$$

Any $P_{XY} \in \Pi(P_X, P_Y)$ attaining $C(P_X, P_Y)$ is called an *OT plan*. The minimization problem in (1) is called *Monge–Kantorovich’s OT problem* [4]. 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 . Denote $C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{W} \sim Q_W} [C(Q_{X|W=\hat{W}}, Q_{Y|W=\hat{W}})]$.

1.1 Dimension-free Bound

We first provide the bounds for finite dimensions. 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 . Given P_X, P_Y , and c , we define

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

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

$$\check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau) = \inf_{\substack{Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}, Q_W: \\ D(Q_{X|W}||P_X|Q_W) \leq \alpha, \\ C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) > \tau}} D(Q_{Y|W}||P_Y|Q_W). \quad (2)$$

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

Theorem 1 (Dimension-free Bound). *It holds that*

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

²The existence of the minimizers are well-known; see, e.g., [4, 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 “ $(X, Y) \sim P_{XY}$ ”.

This lower bound is elegant in the following sense. This lower bound for concentration of measure is expressed in terms of two fundamental quantities—“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 condition.

Another lower bound for $E_1^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau)$ for the case in which \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are finite, $P_X = P_Y$, and $a = 1/2$ (i.e., $\alpha = \frac{1}{n} \log 2$), was provided by Alon, Boppana, and Spencer in [5], which is expressed as the usual rate function in the large deviations theory but with optimization over Lipschitz functions involved. Interestingly, the Alon-Boppana-Spencer bound was also shown to be asymptotically tight. Hence, their bound coincides ours for the finite alphabet case.

1.2 Asymptotic Exponents

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 $L(Q'_X, Q_X) = \inf\{\delta > 0 : Q'_X(A) \leq Q_X(A_\delta) + \delta, \forall \text{ closed } A \subseteq \mathcal{X}\}$, which is compatible with the weak topology.

Assumption 1: We assume that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{Q'_X, Q_X, Q_Y : L(Q_X, Q'_X) \leq \epsilon} \{C(Q'_X, Q_Y) - C(Q_X, Q_Y)\} = 0.$$

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) .

Assumption 2: We assume that $\check{\varphi}_X(\tau) > 0$ for all $\tau > 0$, where

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

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 [6] in studying the asymptotics of Strassen’s optimal transport problem), then Assumption 1 holds.

If \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the same Polish space and $c = d$, where d is a metric on this Polish space, then for some choices of (d, P_X) , Assumption 2 holds. For example, if (d, P_X) satisfies that

$$C(Q_X, P_X) \leq \sqrt{\gamma D(Q_X \| P_X)}, \forall Q_X \tag{3}$$

for some constant γ , then Assumption 2 holds. The inequality in (3) is known as the *Talagrand inequality*. It is well-known that (3) is valid when $\gamma = 2$ and d is the Hamming metric. Such a special form of (3) is known as *Pinsker’s inequality*.

The following theorem shows that the bound in Theorem 1 is asymptotically tight under Assumption 1.

Theorem 2 (Exponent $E_1^{(n)}$). *The following hold.*

1. Under Assumption 1, for all $\alpha > 0, \tau > 0$, 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 1, it holds that for any $\tau > 0$,

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

where

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

Moreover, if additionally, \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the same Polish space and $c = d$, where d is a metric on this Polish space, then under Assumptions 1 and 2, it holds that for any $\tau > 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) = \check{\varphi}(\tau)$.

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 vanishes and a sequence that subexponentially approaches one.

We next focus on the common setting in the study of concentration of measure. That is, \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the same Polish space, the cost function c is set to the metric d on this space, and a is set to $\frac{1}{2}$ (equivalently, $\alpha_n = \frac{1}{n} \log 2$). For this setting, $t \mapsto 1 - \Gamma^{(n)}(\frac{1}{2}, t)$ is known as the *concentration function*. In this setting, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$. By Theorem 2, under Assumption 1, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) = \check{\varphi}(\tau)$. In fact, for this setting, Alon, Boppana, and Spencer in [5] provided an alternative expression for $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau)$ when \mathcal{X} is finite.

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

$$\varphi(\tau) = \inf_{Q_Y: \|Q_Y - P_X\|_{\text{TV}} > \tau} D(Q_Y \| P_Y), \quad (4)$$

where $\|Q_Y - P_X\|_{\text{TV}} := \sup_A Q_Y(A) - P_X(A)$ is the total variation (TV) distance. For the case of $P_X = P_Y$, such a function was investigated in [7, 8]. It was shown in [7] that $\varphi(\tau) \geq L(\tau) := \min_{p \in [0, 1-\tau]} D_2(p \| p + \tau)$ for any $P_X = P_Y$, where $D_2(p \| q) := D((p, 1-p) \| (q, 1-q))$ is the binary relative entropy function. Moreover, the lower bound $L(\tau)$ is tight when $P_X = P_Y$ is atomless [8]. In other words, atomless distributions $P_X = P_Y$ are the worst distributions in the sense that their concentration exponents are the smallest among all distributions. Furthermore, obviously, $\varphi(\tau)$ in (4) characterizes the best tradeoff between the relative entropy and the TV distance, which strengthens the well-known Pinsker's inequality.

We next provide a simple dimension-free bound, under the assumption of the Talagrand inequality. We still assume that \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the same Polish space, the cost function c is set to the metric d on this space, and a is set to $\frac{1}{2}$. We additionally assume that the Talagrand inequality $C(Q_X, P_X) \leq \sqrt{\gamma D(Q_X \| P_X)}$ holds for some constant γ . Then, we can obtain a dimension-free bound

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\alpha, \tau) &\geq \inf_{\substack{Q_X, Q_Y \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}): \\ C(Q_X, P_X) \leq \sqrt{\gamma \alpha}, C(Q_X, Q_Y) > \tau}} D(Q_Y \| P_Y) \\ &\geq \inf_{Q_X: C(P_X, Q_X) > \tau - \sqrt{\gamma \alpha}} D(Q_X \| P_X). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

When d is the Hamming metric, the last line is further lower bounded by $L(\tau - \sqrt{\gamma \alpha})$. By Theorems 1 and 2, the lower convex envelope of the bound in (5) has benefits that it is not only valid for all dimensions n (i.e., dimension-free), but also asymptotically tight as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the common setting $\alpha = \frac{1}{n} \log 2$.

We next derive the asymptotic expression of $E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau)$. To this end, we need the following assumption.

Assumption 3: There exists a metric d on \mathcal{X} such that

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \sup_{y, x, \hat{x}: d(x, \hat{x}) \leq r} |c(\hat{x}, y) - c(x, y)| = 0.$$

Theorem 3 (Exponent $E_0^{(n)}$). *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 3, for all $\alpha, \tau > 0$, it holds that*

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

where

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

with the supremum taken over all W defined on finite alphabets.

A special case of this result in which \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} are both finite was proven by Ahlswede and Zhang [10] by using the inherently typical subset lemma proven in [9]. Theorem 3 generalizes Ahlswede and Zhang's result. In fact, the proof of Theorem 3 also generalizes their proof.

1.3 Connection to Strassen's Optimal Transport

In this paper, we provide an dimension-free bound for the concentration function, and also characterize or bound the exponents of the concentration function. Our results extend Alon, Boppana, and Spencer's in [5] and Ahlswede and Zhang's in [10]. Furthermore, the concentration function is closely related to Strassen's optimal transport problem, in which we aim at characterizing

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

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

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

Therefore, if $\Gamma^{(n)}(a, t)$ is characterized, then so is $\mathcal{G}_t^{(n)}(P_X, P_Y)$. In fact, the asymptotic exponents of $\mathcal{G}_t^{(n)}(P_X, P_Y)$ were already characterized by the author in [6].

1.4 Notations and Organization

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 (or distributions) defined respectively on \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . Here P_X and P_Y can be thought of as the distributions of two random variables respectively taking values in \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . We also use Q_X, R_X to denote distributions on \mathcal{X} . In particular, if $X \sim Q_X$ is discrete, we use the same notation Q_X to denote the probability mass function of X . 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 transition probability measure (or Markov kernel) $P_{Y|X}$, 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 $P_X P_{Y|X}$. 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 .

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 $(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z}), \Sigma(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})))$.

We denote $x^n = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ as a sequence in \mathcal{X}^n . Given $n \geq 1$, the *empirical measure* (also known as *type* for the finite alphabet case) for a sequence $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ is

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

where δ_x is Dirac mass at the point $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The *empirical joint measure*, denoted by T_{x^n, y^n} , for a pair of sequences $(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ is 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 T_X and T_Y to respectively denote empirical measures of sequences in \mathcal{X}^n and \mathcal{Y}^n , and T_{XY} to denote an empirical joint measure of a pair of sequences in $\mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$. For an empirical measure T_X (resp. an empirical joint measure T_{XY}), the *type class*³ $\mathcal{T}_{T_X}^{(n)}$ or \mathcal{T}_{T_X} (resp. the *joint type class* $\mathcal{T}_{T_{XY}}^{(n)}$) is defined as the set of sequences having the same empirical measure T_X (resp. T_{XY}), i.e., $\mathcal{T}_{T_X}^{(n)} := \{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n : T_{x^n} = T_X\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}_{T_{XY}}^{(n)} := \{(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n : T_{x^n, y^n} = T_{XY}\}$). In other words, if we denote the empirical measure mapping as $\ell : x^n \mapsto T_{x^n}$, then the type class $\mathcal{T}_{T_X}^{(n)} = \ell^{-1}(T_X)$. Note that a type class consists of all permutations of any given vector in this set. For a sequence x^n with empirical measure T_X , we denote $\mathcal{T}_{T_{Y|X}}^{(n)}(x^n) := \{y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n : T_{x^n, y^n} = T_{XY}\}$.

We use $B_\delta(z) := \{z' \in \mathcal{Z} : d(z, z') < \delta\}$ and $\overline{B}_{\leq \delta}(z) := \{z' \in \mathcal{Z} : d(z, z') \leq \delta\}$ to respectively denote an open ball and a closed ball. We use \overline{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 $D_{\leq \epsilon}(P_X) := \{Q_X : D(Q_X \| P_X) \leq \epsilon\}$ 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 ,

$$\sqrt{2D(Q_X \| P_X)} \geq \|Q_X - P_X\|_{\text{TV}} \geq \mathsf{L}(Q_X, P_X), \quad (6)$$

which implies for $\epsilon \geq 0$,

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

The first inequality in (6) is known as Pinsker’s inequality, and the second inequality follows by definition.

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

³The concept ‘‘type class’’ was usually defined for the finite alphabet case [11], but here we use the same terminology to denote the same concept for the general space.

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

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2-4, we respectively prove Theorems 1-3.

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 $c_n(A, B) = \inf_{x \in A, y \in B} c_n(x, y)$. 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,

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

Since any probability measure on a Polish space is tight, we have that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist compact set B such that $Q_{X^n Y^n}(B) > 1 - \epsilon$. By the semi-continuity of c and compactness of B , we have that $\inf_{(x^n, y^n) \in B} c_n(x^n, y^n)$ is attained, and hence, $\inf_{(x^n, y^n) \in B} c_n(x^n, y^n) > t$. This further implies that $C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) > t$. 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,

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

Note that this lower bound depends on the dimension n . We next single-letterize this bound, i.e., make it independent of n . By the chain rule,

$$\begin{aligned} D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) &= \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{X_k | X^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}}) \\ D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) &= \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k | Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{Y^{k-1}}). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

We also have a similar chain rule for the OT cost. To show it, we need the following ‘‘chain rule’’ for coupling sets, which is well-known in OT theory; see the proof in, e.g., [12, Lemma 9].

Lemma 1 (“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 $Q_{X_i Y_i|X^{i-1}Y^{i-1}W} \in \Pi(P_{X_i|X^{i-1}W}, P_{Y_i|Y^{i-1}W})$, $i \in [n]$, we have*

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

By the lemma above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & C(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n}) \\ &= \inf_{Q_{X^n Y^n} \in \Pi(Q_{X^n}, Q_{Y^n})} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}c(X_k, Y_k) \\ &\leq \inf_{Q_{X_k Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}}), k \in [n]} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}c(X_k, Y_k) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \inf_{Q_{X_1 Y_1} \in \Pi(Q_{X_1}, Q_{Y_1})} \mathbb{E}_{(X_1, Y_1)} [c(X_1, Y_1) + \dots \\ &\quad + \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_{n-1} Y_{n-1}|X^{n-2}Y^{n-2}} \in \\ \Pi(Q_{X_{n-1}|X^{n-2}}, Q_{Y_{n-1}|Y^{n-2}})}} \mathbb{E}_{(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1})|X^{n-2}Y^{n-2}} [c(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1}) \\ &\quad + \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_n Y_n|X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} \in \\ \Pi(Q_{X_n|X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y_n|Y^{n-1}})}} \mathbb{E}_{(X_n, Y_n)|X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} [c(X_n, Y_n)]] \dots] \\ &\leq \inf_{Q_{X_1 Y_1} \in \Pi(Q_{X_1}, Q_{Y_1})} \mathbb{E}_{(X_1, Y_1)} [c(X_1, Y_1)] + \dots \\ &\quad + \sup_{Q_{X^{n-2}Y^{n-2}} \in \Pi(Q_{X^{n-2}}, Q_{Y^{n-2}})} \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_{n-1} Y_{n-1}|X^{n-2}Y^{n-2}} \in \\ \Pi(Q_{X_{n-1}|X^{n-2}}, Q_{Y_{n-1}|Y^{n-2}})}} \mathbb{E}_{(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1})|X^{n-2}Y^{n-2}} [c(X_{n-1}, Y_{n-1})] \\ &\quad + \sup_{Q_{X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} \in \Pi(Q_{X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y^{n-1}})} \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_n Y_n|X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} \in \\ \Pi(Q_{X_n|X^{n-1}}, Q_{Y_n|Y^{n-1}})}} \mathbb{E}_{(X_n, Y_n)|X^{n-1}Y^{n-1}} [c(X_n, Y_n)] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y^{k-1}}), \quad (10)$$

where in (8) and (9), Lemma 1 is applied, and in the last line above,

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

and

$$\begin{aligned} & C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \\ &:= \mathbb{E}_{(\hat{X}^{k-1}, \hat{Y}^{k-1}) \sim Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}} C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}=\hat{X}^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}=\hat{Y}^{k-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

From (7), 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 (10),

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,

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

$$\begin{aligned} & \geq \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}}, Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}: \\ D(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \leq \alpha_k, \\ C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) > \tau_k}} D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \geq \inf_{\substack{Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}: \\ D(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_X | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \leq \alpha_k, \\ C(Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) > \tau_k}} D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where

- in (11), we denote $Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} := Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}$, $Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} := Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}}$, 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 (12) we optimize over $Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}$ directly, instead over $Q_{X_k|X^{k-1}}, Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}}$.

Recall the expression of $\check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau)$ in (2). If we substitute $W \leftarrow (X^{k-1}, Y^{k-1})$, $X \leftarrow X_k$, $Y \leftarrow Y_k$ into (12), then we obtain the expression in (2). In other words, (12) 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 2

Statement 1 (Case $\alpha > 0$): From the dimension-free bound in Theorem 2,

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

We next prove

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

Let Q_X be such that $D(Q_X \| P_X) \leq \alpha - \epsilon$. Denote $A := B_{\leq \epsilon}(Q_X)$ for $\epsilon > 0$. Obviously, A is closed. Let $\ell : x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \mapsto T_{x^n} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ be the empirical measure map. Denote $t = n\tau$, $\mathcal{A} := \ell^{-1}(A)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^t &:= \{y^n : \exists x^n \in \ell^{-1}(A) \text{ s.t. } c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq t\}, \\ \mathcal{A}^\tau &:= \{T_Y : \exists T_X \in A \text{ s.t. } C(T_X, T_Y) \leq \tau\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easily verified that $c_n(x^n, y^n) = \mathbb{E}_{T_{x^n}, y^n} c(X, Y)$. Since ℓ is continuous under the weak topology, \mathcal{A} is closed in \mathcal{X}^n .

Note that $x^n \in \ell^{-1}(A)$ if and only if $\sigma(x^n) \in \ell^{-1}(A)$ for all permutations σ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^t &= \{y^n : \exists x^n \in \ell^{-1}(A) \text{ s.t. } c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq t\} \\ &= \left\{ y^n : \exists x^n \in \ell^{-1}(A) \text{ and permutation } \sigma \text{ s.t. } \mathbb{E}_{T_{\sigma(x^n)}, y^n} c(X, Y) \leq \tau \right\} \\ &= \{y^n : \exists x^n \in \ell^{-1}(A), C(T_{x^n}, T_{y^n}) \leq \tau\} \\ &= \{y^n : \exists T_X \in A, C(T_X, T_{y^n}) \leq \tau\} \\ &= \ell^{-1}(\{T_Y : \exists T_X \in A, C(T_X, T_Y) \leq \tau\}) \\ &= \ell^{-1}(\mathcal{A}^\tau), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where (13) follows since

$$C(T_{x^n}, T_{y^n}) = \min_{\sigma} \mathbb{E}_{T_{\sigma(x^n)}, y^n} c(X, Y)$$

with the minimum taken over all permutations σ .

On one hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_X^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{A}) &\leq \inf_{Q_X \in A^o} D(Q_X \| P_X) \\ &\leq D(Q_X \| P_X) \\ &\leq \alpha - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

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

On the other hand, observe that

$$P_Y^{\otimes n}((\mathcal{A}^t)^c) = P_Y^{\otimes n}((\ell^{-1}(A^\tau))^c) = P_Y^{\otimes n}(\ell^{-1}((A^\tau)^c)).$$

Moreover, for any Q_X, T_Y , it holds that

$$\inf_{T_X \in B_{\leq \epsilon}(Q_X)} C(T_X, T_Y) \geq C(Q_X, T_Y) - \delta_\epsilon$$

for some δ_ϵ which vanishes as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. This implies that $A^\tau \subseteq \{Q_X\}^{\tau+\delta_\epsilon}$. Furthermore, by the lower semi-continuity of $T_Y \mapsto C(Q_X, T_Y)$, $\{Q_X\}^{\tau+\delta_\epsilon}$ is closed. Therefore, $\text{cl}(A^\tau) \subseteq \{Q_X\}^{\tau+\delta_\epsilon}$. By Sanov's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n} ((\mathcal{A}^t)^c) &\leq \inf_{Q_Y \in (\text{cl}(A^\tau))^c} D(Q_Y \| P_Y) \\ &\leq \inf_{Q_Y: C(Q_X, Q_Y) > \tau + \delta_\epsilon} D(Q_Y \| P_Y). \end{aligned}$$

Taking infimum over all Q_X such that $D(Q_X \| P_X) \leq \alpha$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n} ((\mathcal{A}^t)^c) &\leq \inf_{Q_X: D(Q_X \| P_X) \leq \alpha} \inf_{Q_Y: C(Q_X, Q_Y) > \tau + \delta_\epsilon} D(Q_Y \| P_Y) \\ &= \check{\phi}(\alpha, \tau + \delta_\epsilon) \end{aligned}$$

By the time-sharing argument, we have

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

Letting $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, we obtain

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

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 $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$): For this case, we rechoose $A := B_{\leq \epsilon}(P_X)$ for $\epsilon > 0$. On one hand,

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

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, following proof steps similar to the above, we have $\text{cl}(A^\tau) \subseteq \{P_X\}^{\tau+\delta_\epsilon}$. By Sanov's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n} ((\mathcal{A}^t)^c) &\leq \inf_{Q_Y \in (\text{cl}(A^\tau))^c} D(Q_Y \| P_Y) \\ &\leq \inf_{Q_Y: C(P_X, Q_Y) > \tau + \delta_\epsilon} D(Q_Y \| P_Y) \\ &= \varphi(\tau + \delta_\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

By the time-sharing argument, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \leq \check{\varphi}(\tau + \delta_\epsilon).$$

Letting $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \leq \lim_{\tau' \downarrow \tau} \check{\varphi}(\tau').$$

Since $\check{\varphi}$ is convex, $\tau' \mapsto \check{\varphi}(\tau')$ is continuous on $(0, +\infty)$. We hence have that for all $\tau > 0$,

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

We next prove $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\varphi}(\tau)$ if additionally, \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are the same Polish space and $c = d$, where d is a metric on this Polish space. From the dimension-free bound in 2, we have for fixed τ ,

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

Note that the inverse function of $\check{\varphi}_X$ is \hat{g} where for $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$g(\alpha) := \sup_{Q_Y: D(Q_Y \| P_X) \leq \alpha} C(P_X, Q_Y).$$

By Assumption 2,

$$\check{\varphi}_X(\tau) > 0, \forall \tau > 0,$$

and moreover, $\check{\varphi}_X(0) = 0$, which implies $\hat{g} \rightarrow 0$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Hence, under the condition $D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha_n$, we have

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

By the triangle inequality (since for this case, $C(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a Wasserstein metric), we then have

$$C(P_X, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) \geq C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W} | Q_W) - C(Q_{X|W}, P_X | Q_W) > \tau - \hat{g}(\alpha_n)$$

We finally obtain

$$\check{\phi}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\varphi}(\tau - \hat{g}(\alpha_n)).$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \check{\phi}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\varphi}(\tau).$$

Hence, we have $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_1^{(n)}(\alpha_n, \tau) \geq \check{\varphi}(\tau)$.

4 Proof of Theorem 3

4.1 Upper Bound on $E_0^{(n)}$

4.1.1 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 [9, 10] to the case in which \mathcal{Y} is an arbitrary Polish space (but \mathcal{X} is still a finite metric space).

In our proof, we utilize the inherently typical subset lemma in [9, 10]. 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 $x^n \in A$,

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

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)

$$H_Q(X|W) - \frac{\log^2 m}{m} \leq \frac{1}{n} \log |A| \leq H_Q(X|W). \quad (14)$$

For an m -inherently typical set A , Q_{X^n} be the uniform distribution on A . We then 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,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{X_K, W_K} &= \mathbb{E}_{(X^n, W^n) \sim Q_{X^n, W^n}} [Q_{X_K, W_K | X^n, W^n}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(X^n, W^n) \sim Q_{X^n, W^n}} [T_{X^n, W^n}] \\ &= Q_{X, W}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Hence, the inequalities in (14) can be rewritten as

$$0 \leq I_Q(X_K; X^{K-1}, K|W_K) \leq \frac{\log^2 m}{m}. \quad (16)$$

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. Roughly speaking, X_K and (X^{K-1}, K) are approximately conditionally independent given W_K . In other words, W_K is a kind of approximate sufficient statistic for “underlying parameter” X_K ; refer to [13, Section 2.9] for sufficient statistics and [14] for approximate versions.

As for m -inherent typical sets, one of the most important results is the *inherently typical subset lemma* which was proven by Ahlswede, Yang, and Zhang [9, 10].

Lemma 2. (*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

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

For any $A \subseteq \mathcal{X}^n$, denote $A_{T_X} := A \cap \mathcal{T}_{T_X}$ for types T_X . Since $A = \bigcup_{T_X} A_{T_X}$ 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

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

where $b = |\mathcal{X}|(m+1)^{|\mathcal{X}|}$. Observe that for any $B \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{Q_X}$, 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, (15) and (18) 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

$$D(Q_{X^n} \| P_X^{\otimes n}) \leq \alpha + o_n(1). \quad (17)$$

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 $D(Q \| P)$ [15]. 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 right hand side over all Q_{X^n} satisfying (15), (18), and (17), we have

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

where $W_i = \phi_i(X^{i-1})$. The condition $Q_{X^n W^n}(\mathcal{T}_{Q_{XW}}) = 1$ implies $Q_{X_K, W_K} = Q_{XW}$.

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 $(x^n, w^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_{XW}}$ with $w_i = \phi_i(x^{i-1})$ and for $Y^n \sim \prod_{k=1}^n Q_{Y | (X, W) = (x_k, w_k)}$, it holds that

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

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

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

Since $\mathbb{E} [c(X, Y)^2]$ is bounded, the last line (and also ϵ_n) vanishes as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Denote $\hat{Q}_{Y^n | X^n W^n}$ as a distribution given by $\hat{Q}_{Y^n | (X^n, W^n) = (x^n, w^n)} = \left(\prod_{k=1}^n Q_{Y | (X, W) = (x_k, w_k)} \right) (\cdot | B_t(x^n))$ for all x^n and $w_i = \phi_i(x^{i-1})$. We now rewrite $Q_{Y^n | XW}^n$ as a mixture:

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

where $\tilde{Q}_{Y^n | (X^n, W^n) = (x^n, w^n)} = \left(\prod_{k=1}^n Q_{Y | (X, W) = (x_k, w_k)} \right) (\cdot | B_t(x^n)^c)$. For input distribution Q_{X^n} , the output distributions of channels $Q_{Y^n | XW}^n$, $\hat{Q}_{Y^n | X^n, W^n}$, 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 $Q_{Y^n|X^n=x^n}$ as $\hat{Q}_{Y^n|(X^n, W^n)=(x^n, w^n)}$ where $w_i = \phi_i(x^{i-1})$, we then have

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

We next single-letterize this bound. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} D(Q_{Y^n} \| P_Y^{\otimes n}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{Y^{k-1}}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}} \| Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}} | Q_{X^{k-1}Y^{k-1}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}}) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n I_Q(Y_k; Y^{k-1} | X^{k-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n D(Q_{Y_k|X^{k-1}} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{k-1}}) \\ &= D(Q_{Y_K|X^{K-1}K} \| P_Y | Q_{X^{K-1}K}) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

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

where

- (18) follows since under the distribution $Q_{X^n W^n} Q_{Y|XW}^n$, 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 ;
- 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, $Q_{Y_K|W} = Q_{Y|W}$.

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,

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

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

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

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) \leq \limsup_{\alpha' \downarrow \alpha, \tau' \uparrow \tau} \psi_m(\alpha', \tau') + o_m(1). \quad (19)$$

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

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

4.1.2 Compact \mathcal{X}

We next consider compact \mathcal{X} . Since \mathcal{X} is compact, for any $r > 0$, it can be covered by a finite number of balls $\{B_r(x_i)\}_{i=1}^k$. Denote $E_i := B_r(x_i) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} B_r(x_j)$, which is 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, $Z^n \sim P_Z^n$.

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

$$\begin{aligned} E_{i^n}^{\hat{t}} &= \{y^n : c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq \hat{t}, \exists x^n \in E_{i^n}\} \\ &\subseteq \{y^n : c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq \hat{t}, d(x_i, \hat{x}_i) \leq r, \forall i \in [n], \exists \hat{x}^n \in A, \exists x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n\} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \{y^n : \inf_{x^n: d(x_i, \hat{x}_i) \leq r, \forall i \in [n]} c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq \hat{t}, \exists \hat{x}^n \in A\} \\ &= \{y^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \inf_{x_i: d(x_i, \hat{x}_i) \leq r} c(x_i, y_i) \leq \hat{t}, \exists \hat{x}^n \in A\} \\ &= \{y^n : \sum_{i=1}^n c(\hat{x}_i, y_i) \leq n(\hat{\tau} + \epsilon_r), \exists \hat{x}^n \in A\} \\ &= A^{n(\hat{\tau} + \epsilon_r)}, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where (20) 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 (21) ϵ_r is a positive function of r which vanishes as $r \downarrow 0$, and (21) follows by Assumption 3. Hence,

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

If we choose $\hat{\tau} = \tau - \epsilon_r$, then $\hat{A}^{n\hat{\tau}} \subseteq A^{n\tau}$. Hence, for this case,

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

which imply that

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

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 asymptotic exponent for distribution pair (P_X, P_Y) , and $E_0^{(n)}(\cdot, \cdot | P_Z)$ is the asymptotic exponent 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 4.1.1, we have

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

Therefore,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau | P_X) \leq \psi(\alpha, \hat{\tau} | P_Z) = \psi(\alpha, \tau - \epsilon_r | P_Z). \quad (22)$$

We next show that $\psi(\alpha', \tau' + \epsilon_r | P_Z) \leq \psi(\alpha', \tau' | P_X)$ for any $\alpha' \geq 0, \tau' > 0$. For any $Q_{Z|W}$, we define a distribution $Q_{X|W}$ such that $Q_{X|W=w}(\cdot | E_i) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{E_i} P_X}{P_X(E_i)}$ and $Q_{X|W=w}(E_i) = Q_{Z|W=w}(z_i)$ for all w , which means that

$$\frac{dQ_{X|W}}{dP_X}(x|w) = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\mathbb{1}_{E_i}(x) Q_{Z|W}(z_i|w)}{P_X(E_i)} = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{\mathbb{1}_{E_i}(x) Q_{Z|W}(z_i|w)}{P_Z(z_i)}, \forall x. \quad (23)$$

Then,

$$D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) = D(Q_{Z|W} \| P_Z | Q_W). \quad (24)$$

Moreover, note that $Z \sim Q_Z$ can be seen as a quantized version of $X \sim Q_X$.

Under Assumption 3 or equivalently,

$$\sup_{y,x,\hat{x}:d(x,\hat{x})\leq r} |c(\hat{x}, y) - c(x, y)| \leq \epsilon_r,$$

we have that $c(X, Y) \geq c(Z, Y) - \epsilon_r$ a.s. where Z is the quantized version of (and also a function of) X . We hence have

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

Therefore,

$$\inf_{Q_{Y|W}:C(Q_{X|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) \leq \tau'} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \geq \inf_{Q_{Y|W}:C(Q_{Z|W}, Q_{Y|W}|Q_W) \leq \tau' + \epsilon_r} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W)$$

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

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

where $Q_{X|W}$ at the left hand side above is induced by $Q_{Z|W}$ as shown in (23). By (24), the left hand side above is in turn upper bounded by $\psi(\alpha', \tau' | P_X)$ (by replacing $\sup_{Q_{Z|W}:D(Q_{Z|W} \| P_Z | Q_W) \leq \alpha'}$ with $\sup_{Q_{X|W}:D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha'}$). Hence,

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

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

$$\psi(\alpha, \tau - \epsilon_r | P_Z) \leq \psi(\alpha, \tau - 2\epsilon_r | P_X). \quad (25)$$

Combining (22) and (25) and letting $r \downarrow 0$, we have

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

4.2 Lower Bound on $E_0^{(n)}$

Let Q_{WX} be such that $|\text{supp}(Q_W)| < \infty$ and $D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon$. We reset $\mathcal{W} = \text{supp}(Q_W)$ and denote $\mathcal{W} = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{|\mathcal{W}|}\}$. For each n , let $Q_W^{(n)}$ be an empirical measure of an n -length sequence (i.e., n -type) such that $\text{supp}(Q_W^{(n)}) \subseteq \text{supp}(Q_W)$ and $Q_W^{(n)} \rightarrow Q_W$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let $Q_{XW}^{(n)} = Q_W^{(n)} Q_{X|W}$. Let $w^n = (w_1, \dots, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_2, \dots, w_{|\mathcal{W}|}, \dots, w_{|\mathcal{W}|})$ where w_i appears $n_i := nQ_W^{(n)}(w_i)$ times. Hence, the type of w^n is $Q_W^{(n)}$. Denote $A_w := \{R_X : R_X \in B_{\leq \epsilon}(Q_{X|W=w})\}$ for $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and $A := \{R_{X|W} : R_{X|W=w} \in B_{\leq \epsilon}(Q_{X|W=w}), \forall w \in \mathcal{W}\}$ for $\epsilon > 0$. Denote

$$\mathcal{A} := \bigcup_{R_{X|W} \in A} \mathcal{T}_{R_{X|W}}^{(n)}(w^n) = \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{W}|} \left(\bigcup_{R_X \in A_{w_i}} \mathcal{T}_{R_X}^{(n_i)} \right).$$

For each w , A_w is closed. Since ℓ is continuous under the weak topology, $\bigcup_{R_X \in A_{w_i}} \mathcal{T}_{R_X}^{(n_i)}$ is closed in \mathcal{X}^{n_i} . Therefore, \mathcal{A} is closed in \mathcal{X}^n . Observe that

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

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

Denote $t = n\tau$. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^t &:= \{y^n : \exists x^n \in \mathcal{A} \text{ s.t. } c_n(x^n, y^n) \leq t\} \\ &= \bigcup_{R_{X|W} \in A} \mathcal{T}_{R_{X|W}}(w^n)^t, \end{aligned}$$

where

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

Hence,

$$\mathcal{A}^t \subseteq \bigcup_{R_{X|W} \in A, R_{Y|W} : C(R_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | Q_W^{(n)}) \leq \tau} \mathcal{T}_{R_{Y|W}}(w^n).$$

Denote

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

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 $T_{Y^n W^n}$ with

$(Y^n, W^n) \sim P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes P_W^{\otimes n}$ for some P_W . Define

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_{w^n} &:= \bigcup_{R_{Y|W} \in B} \mathcal{T}_{R_{Y|W}}(w^n) \\
\mathcal{B} &:= \bigcup_{w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_W^{(n)}}} \{(w^n, y^n) : y^n \in \mathcal{B}_{w^n}\} \\
&= \bigcup_{R_{Y|W} \in B} \bigcup_{w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_W^{(n)}}} \{(w^n, y^n) : y^n \in \mathcal{T}_{R_{Y|W}}(w^n)\} \\
&= \bigcup_{R_{Y|W} \in B} \mathcal{T}_{Q_W^{(n)} R_{Y|W}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for distinct $w^n, \hat{w}^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_W^{(n)}}$, there is a permutation σ such that $\hat{w}^n = \sigma(w^n)$. Moreover, the set $\{(\hat{w}^n, y^n) : y^n \in \mathcal{B}_{\hat{w}^n}\}$ is the resultant by permuting each elements in $\{(w^n, y^n) : y^n \in \mathcal{B}_{w^n}\}$ via σ . On the other hand, the distribution $P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes P_W^{\otimes n}$ of (Y^n, W^n) is permutation-invariant. Hence, we have

$$P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes P_W^{\otimes n} \{(\hat{w}^n, y^n) : y^n \in \mathcal{B}_{\hat{w}^n}\} = P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes P_W^{\otimes n} \{(w^n, y^n) : y^n \in \mathcal{B}_{w^n}\}.$$

Moreover, the events at left and right hand sides are mutually exclusive. Hence, for any $w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{Q_W^{(n)}}$,

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

Furthermore, given w^n ,

$$P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes P_W^{\otimes n} \{(w^n, y^n) : y^n \in \mathcal{B}_{w^n}\} = P_W^{\otimes n}(w^n) P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}_{w^n}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}_{w^n}) &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{T}_{Q_W^{(n)}}| P_W^{\otimes n}(w^n)} P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes P_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}) \\
&= \frac{1}{P_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{T}_{Q_W^{(n)}})} P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes P_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}).
\end{aligned}$$

For sufficiently large n ,

$$\mathcal{B} \subseteq \bigcup_{R_W \in B_{\leq \epsilon}(Q_W)} \bigcup_{R_{Y|W} \in B} \mathcal{T}_{R_{WY}}.$$

By Sanov's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes P_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}) \\
&\geq \inf_{Q_{WY} \in \text{cl}(B')} D(Q_{WY} \| P_Y P_W),
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

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

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

for some δ_ϵ which vanishes as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, we claim that

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

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

We assume that c is bounded. For any $R_{Y|W}$, it holds that

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

and given ϵ , for sufficiently large n ,

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

for some δ_ϵ which vanishes as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. This implies that $B \subseteq \hat{B}$ for some properly chosen δ_ϵ . 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, $R_W^{(k)} \rightarrow R_W^*$ 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,

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

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

By this claim and (26),

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes P_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}) \\ & \geq \inf_{R_{WY} \in \hat{B}'} D(R_{Y|W} \| P_Y P_W) \\ & = \inf_{R_{WY} : R_W \in B_{\leq \epsilon}(Q_W), R_{Y|W} \in \hat{B}} D(R_{Y|W} \| P_Y | R_W) + D(R_W \| P_W) \end{aligned}$$

Note that \mathcal{W} is finite. By Sanov's theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_W^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{T}_{Q_W^{(n)}}) = D(Q_W \| P_W).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}_{w^n}) \\ & \geq \inf_{R_{WY} : R_W \in B_{\leq \epsilon}(Q_W), R_{Y|W} \in \hat{B}} D(R_{Y|W} \| P_Y | R_W) + D(R_W \| P_W) - D(Q_W \| P_W) \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}_{w^n}) \\
& \geq \inf_{R_W \in \mathcal{B}_{\leq \epsilon}(Q_W), R_{Y|W} \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}} D(R_{Y|W} \| P_Y | R_W) \\
& \geq \inf_{R_W \in \mathcal{B}_{\leq \epsilon}(Q_W), R_{Y|W}: C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq \tau + \delta_\epsilon + \epsilon} D(R_{Y|W} \| P_Y | R_W)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $(R_W^{(k)}, R_{Y|W}^{(k)})$ be a $\frac{1}{k}$ -approximately optimal pair attaining the infimum above. 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

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}
& C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W}^* | Q_W) \leq \tau + \delta_\epsilon + \epsilon \\
& D(R_{Y|W}^* \| P_Y | Q_W) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}_{w^n}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{1}{n} \log P_Y^{\otimes n}(\mathcal{B}_{w^n}) \geq \inf_{R_{Y|W}: C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq \tau + \delta_\epsilon + \epsilon} D(R_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W).$$

Taking $\sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_0^{(n)}(\alpha, \tau) & \geq \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon} \inf_{R_{Y|W}: C(Q_{X|W}, R_{Y|W} | Q_W) \leq \tau + \delta_\epsilon + \epsilon} D(R_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\
& = \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon, \tau + \delta_\epsilon + \epsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_{\mathcal{W}}$ is defined similarly as ψ but with the alphabet \mathcal{W} fixed. Letting $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ and taking supremum over all finite \mathcal{W} , we obtain

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

Note that given \mathcal{W} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon', \tau + \epsilon) \\
&= \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon'} \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \inf_{Q_{Y|XW}: \mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)] \leq \tau + \epsilon} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\
&= \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon'} \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{Q_{Y|XW}: \mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)] \leq \tau + \epsilon} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\
&= \sup_{Q_{XW}: D(Q_{X|W} \| P_X | Q_W) \leq \alpha - \epsilon'} \inf_{Q_{Y|XW}: \mathbb{E}[c(X, Y)] \leq \tau} D(Q_{Y|W} \| P_Y | Q_W) \\
&= \psi_{\mathcal{W}}(\alpha - \epsilon', \tau),
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where (27) 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,

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

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] K. Marton. A simple proof of the blowing-up lemma. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 32(3):445–446, 1986.
- [3] 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.
- [4] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*. Number 58. American Mathematical Soc., 2003.
- [5] N. Alon, R. Boppana, and J. Spencer. An asymptotic isoperimetric inequality. *Geometric & Functional Analysis*, 8(3):411–436, 1998.
- [6] L. Yu. Asymptotics of Strassen’s optimal transport problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02051*, Nov. 2020.
- [7] I. Vajda. Note on discrimination information and variation (corresp.). *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 16(6):771–773, 1970.
- [8] 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.
- [9] R. Ahlswede, E.-H. Yang, and Z. Zhang. Identification via compressed data. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 43(1), 1997.

- [10] R. Ahlswede and Z. Zhang. Asymptotical isoperimetric problem. In *Proceedings of the 1999 IEEE Information Theory and Communications Workshop*, pages 85–87. IEEE, 1999.
- [11] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*. Springer, 2nd edition, 1998.
- [12] L. Yu and V. Y. F. Tan. On exact and ∞ -Rényi common information. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(6):3366–3406, 2020.
- [13] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley-Interscience, 2nd edition, 2006.
- [14] M. Hayashi and V. Y. F. Tan. Minimum rates of approximate sufficient statistics. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(2):875–888, 2017.
- [15] T. van Erven and P. Harremoës. Rényi divergence and Kullback-Leibler divergence. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(7):3797–3820, 2014.