

Stability of Talagrand's Gaussian Transport-Entropy Inequality

Dan Mikulincer

Geometric and Functional Inequalities in Convexity and Probability

Weizmann Institute of Science

Based on joint work with Ronen Eldan and Alex Zhai

Geometry and Information

Throughout, $G \sim \gamma$ will denote the standard Gaussian in \mathbb{R}^d .

Definition (Wasserstein distance between μ and γ)

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \gamma) := \inf_{\pi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\|x - y\|^2] \right\}^{1/2}$$

where π ranges over all possible couplings of μ and γ .

Definition (Relative entropy between μ and γ)

$$\text{Ent}(\mu || \gamma) := \mathbb{E}_{\mu} \left[\ln \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(x) \right) \right].$$

Remark: if $X \sim \mu$ we will also write $\text{Ent}(X || G)$, $\mathcal{W}_2(X, G)$.

Throughout, $G \sim \gamma$ will denote the standard Gaussian in \mathbb{R}^d .

Definition (Wasserstein distance between μ and γ)

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \gamma) := \inf_{\pi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\|x - y\|^2] \right\}^{1/2}$$

where π ranges over all possible couplings of μ and γ .

Definition (Relative entropy between μ and γ)

$$\text{Ent}(\mu || \gamma) := \mathbb{E}_{\mu} \left[\ln \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(x) \right) \right].$$

Remark: if $X \sim \mu$ we will also write $\text{Ent}(X || G)$, $\mathcal{W}_2(X, G)$.

Throughout, $G \sim \gamma$ will denote the standard Gaussian in \mathbb{R}^d .

Definition (Wasserstein distance between μ and γ)

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \gamma) := \inf_{\pi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\|x - y\|^2] \right\}^{1/2}$$

where π ranges over all possible couplings of μ and γ .

Definition (Relative entropy between μ and γ)

$$\text{Ent}(\mu || \gamma) := \mathbb{E}_{\mu} \left[\ln \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(x) \right) \right].$$

Remark: if $X \sim \mu$ we will also write $\text{Ent}(X || G)$, $\mathcal{W}_2(X, G)$.

Throughout, $G \sim \gamma$ will denote the standard Gaussian in \mathbb{R}^d .

Definition (Wasserstein distance between μ and γ)

$$\mathcal{W}_2(\mu, \gamma) := \inf_{\pi} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{\pi} [\|x - y\|^2] \right\}^{1/2}$$

where π ranges over all possible couplings of μ and γ .

Definition (Relative entropy between μ and γ)

$$\text{Ent}(\mu || \gamma) := \mathbb{E}_{\mu} \left[\ln \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(x) \right) \right].$$

Remark: if $X \sim \mu$ we will also write $\text{Ent}(X || G)$, $\mathcal{W}_2(X, G)$.

Talagrand's Inequality

In 96' Talagrand proved the following inequality, which connects between geometry and information.

Theorem (Talagrand's Gaussian transport-entropy inequality)

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Then

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \gamma) \leq 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma).$$

It is enough to consider measures such that $\mu \ll \nu$.

Talagrand's Inequality - Applications

- By considering measures of the form $\mathbb{1}_A d\gamma$ the inequality implies a (non-sharp) Gaussian isoperimetric inequality.
- The inequality tensorizes and may be used to show dimension-free Gaussian concentration bounds.
- If f is convex, then applying the inequality to $e^{-\lambda f} d\gamma$ yields a one sided Gaussian concentration for concave functions.

Talagrand's Inequality - Applications

- By considering measures of the form $\mathbb{1}_A d\gamma$ the inequality implies a (non-sharp) Gaussian isoperimetric inequality.
- The inequality tensorizes and may be used to show dimension-free Gaussian concentration bounds.
- If f is convex, then applying the inequality to $e^{-\lambda f} d\gamma$ yields a one sided Gaussian concentration for concave functions.

Talagrand's Inequality - Applications

- By considering measures of the form $\mathbb{1}_A d\gamma$ the inequality implies a (non-sharp) Gaussian isoperimetric inequality.
- The inequality tensorizes and may be used to show dimension-free Gaussian concentration bounds.
- If f is convex, then applying the inequality to $e^{-\lambda f} d\gamma$ yields a one sided Gaussian concentration for concave functions.

Talagrand's Inequality - Applications

- By considering measures of the form $\mathbb{1}_A d\gamma$ the inequality implies a (non-sharp) Gaussian isoperimetric inequality.
- The inequality tensorizes and may be used to show dimension-free Gaussian concentration bounds.
- If f is convex, then applying the inequality to $e^{-\lambda f} d\gamma$ yields a one sided Gaussian concentration for concave functions.

If $\gamma_{a,\Sigma} = \mathcal{N}(a, \Sigma)$, in \mathbb{R}^d :

- $\text{Ent}(\gamma_{a,\Sigma} || \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{Tr}(\Sigma) + \|a\|_2^2 - \ln(\det(\Sigma)) - d \right)$
- $\mathcal{W}_2^2(\gamma_{a,\Sigma}, \gamma) = \|a\|_2^2 + \left\| \sqrt{\Sigma} - I_d \right\|_{HS}^2$

In particular, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\gamma_{a,I_d}, \gamma) = 2\text{Ent}(\gamma_{a,I_d} || \gamma).$$

These are the only equality cases.

If $\gamma_{a,\Sigma} = \mathcal{N}(a, \Sigma)$, in \mathbb{R}^d :

- $\text{Ent}(\gamma_{a,\Sigma} || \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{Tr}(\Sigma) + \|a\|_2^2 - \ln(\det(\Sigma)) - d \right)$
- $\mathcal{W}_2^2(\gamma_{a,\Sigma}, \gamma) = \|a\|_2^2 + \left\| \sqrt{\Sigma} - I_d \right\|_{HS}^2$

In particular, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\gamma_{a,I_d}, \gamma) = 2\text{Ent}(\gamma_{a,I_d} || \gamma).$$

These are the only equality cases.

Gaussians

If $\gamma_{a,\Sigma} = \mathcal{N}(a, \Sigma)$, in \mathbb{R}^d :

- $\text{Ent}(\gamma_{a,\Sigma} || \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{Tr}(\Sigma) + \|a\|_2^2 - \ln(\det(\Sigma)) - d \right)$
- $\mathcal{W}_2^2(\gamma_{a,\Sigma}, \gamma) = \|a\|_2^2 + \left\| \sqrt{\Sigma} - I_d \right\|_{HS}^2$

In particular, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\gamma_{a,I_d}, \gamma) = 2\text{Ent}(\gamma_{a,I_d} || \gamma).$$

These are the only equality cases.

If $\gamma_{a,\Sigma} = \mathcal{N}(a, \Sigma)$, in \mathbb{R}^d :

- $\text{Ent}(\gamma_{a,\Sigma} \parallel \gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{Tr}(\Sigma) + \|a\|_2^2 - \ln(\det(\Sigma)) - d \right)$
- $\mathcal{W}_2^2(\gamma_{a,\Sigma}, \gamma) = \|a\|_2^2 + \left\| \sqrt{\Sigma} - I_d \right\|_{HS}^2$

In particular, for any $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\gamma_{a,I_d}, \gamma) = 2\text{Ent}(\gamma_{a,I_d} \parallel \gamma).$$

These are the only equality cases.

Define the deficit

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) = 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) - \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \gamma).$$

The question of stability deals with approximate equality cases.

Question

Suppose that $\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu)$ is small, must μ be close to a translate of the standard Gaussian?

Note that the deficit is invariant to translations. So, it will be enough to consider centered measures.

Define the deficit

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) = 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) - \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \gamma).$$

The question of stability deals with approximate equality cases.

Question

Suppose that $\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu)$ is small, must μ be close to a translate of the standard Gaussian?

Note that the deficit is invariant to translations. So, it will be enough to consider centered measures.

Define the deficit

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) = 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) - \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \gamma).$$

The question of stability deals with approximate equality cases.

Question

Suppose that $\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu)$ is small, must μ be close to a translate of the standard Gaussian?

Note that the deficit is invariant to translations. So, it will be enough to consider centered measures.

Theorem (Fathi, Indrei, Ledoux 14')

Let μ be a centered measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \gtrsim \min \left(\frac{\mathcal{W}_{1,1}(\mu, \gamma)^2}{d}, \frac{\mathcal{W}_{1,1}(\mu, \gamma)}{\sqrt{d}} \right)$$

The 1-dimensional case was proven earlier by Barthe and Kolesnikov.

However:

Theorem

There exists a sequence of centered Gaussian mixtures $\{\mu_n\}$ on \mathbb{R} , such that $\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu_n) \rightarrow 0$. but $\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu_n, \gamma) > 1$.

Theorem (Fathi, Indrei, Ledoux 14')

Let μ be a centered measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \gtrsim \min \left(\frac{\mathcal{W}_{1,1}(\mu, \gamma)^2}{d}, \frac{\mathcal{W}_{1,1}(\mu, \gamma)}{\sqrt{d}} \right)$$

The 1-dimensional case was proven earlier by Barthe and Kolesnikov.

However:

Theorem

There exists a sequence of centered Gaussian mixtures $\{\mu_n\}$ on \mathbb{R} , such that $\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu_n) \rightarrow 0$. but $\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu_n, \gamma) > 1$.

Bounding the Deficit

In the 1-dimensional case, Talagrand actually showed

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\varphi'_{\mu} - 1 - \ln(\varphi'_{\mu})) d\gamma > 0,$$

where φ is the transport map $\varphi_{\mu} = F_{\gamma}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$.

For translated Gaussians, $\varphi_{\gamma_{a,1}}(x) = x + a$, which shows the equality cases.

We will take a different route.

Bounding the Deficit

In the 1-dimensional case, Talagrand actually showed

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\varphi'_{\mu} - 1 - \ln(\varphi'_{\mu})) d\gamma > 0,$$

where φ is the transport map $\varphi_{\mu} = F_{\gamma}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$.

For translated Gaussians, $\varphi_{\gamma_{a,1}}(x) = x + a$, which shows the equality cases.

We will take a different route.

Bounding the Deficit

In the 1-dimensional case, Talagrand actually showed

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\varphi'_{\mu} - 1 - \ln(\varphi'_{\mu})) d\gamma > 0,$$

where φ is the transport map $\varphi_{\mu} = F_{\gamma}^{-1} \circ F_{\mu}$.

For translated Gaussians, $\varphi_{\gamma_{a,1}}(x) = x + a$, which shows the equality cases.

We will take a different route.

Bounding the Deficit - the Föllmer Drift

Our central construct will be the Föllmer drift, which is the solution to the following variational problem:

$$v_t := \arg \min_{u_t} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} [\|u_t\|^2] dt,$$

where u_t ranges over all adapted drifts for which $B_1 + \int_0^1 u_t dt$ has the same law as μ .

We denote

$$X_t := B_t + \int_0^t v_s ds.$$

Bounding the Deficit - the Föllmer Drift

Our central construct will be the Föllmer drift, which is the solution to the following variational problem:

$$v_t := \arg \min_{u_t} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} [\|u_t\|^2] dt,$$

where u_t ranges over all adapted drifts for which $B_1 + \int_0^1 u_t dt$ has the same law as μ .

We denote

$$X_t := B_t + \int_0^t v_s ds.$$

Bounding the Deficit - the Föllmer Drift

The process v_t goes back at least to the works of Föllmer (86'). In a later work by Lehec (12') it is shown that if μ has finite entropy relative to γ , then v_t is well defined and that:

1. v_t is a martingale, with $v_t(X_t) = \nabla \ln \left(P_{1-t} \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(X_t) \right) \right)$.
2. $\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma) = \text{Ent}(X||B.) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[|v_t|^2] dt$.
3. In the Wiener space, the density of X_t with respect to B_t is given by $\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(\omega_1)$.
4. If $G \sim \gamma$, independent from X_1 ,

$$X_t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} tX_1 + \sqrt{t(1-t)}G.$$

Bounding the Deficit - the Föllmer Drift

The process v_t goes back at least to the works of Föllmer (86'). In a later work by Lehec (12') it is shown that if μ has finite entropy relative to γ , then v_t is well defined and that:

1. v_t is a martingale, with $v_t(X_t) = \nabla \ln \left(P_{1-t} \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(X_t) \right) \right)$.

2. $\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma) = \text{Ent}(X||B.) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[|v_t|^2] dt$.

3. In the Wiener space, the density of X_t with respect to B_t is given by $\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(\omega_1)$.

4. If $G \sim \gamma$, independent from X_1 ,

$$X_t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} tX_1 + \sqrt{t(1-t)}G.$$

Bounding the Deficit - the Föllmer Drift

The process v_t goes back at least to the works of Föllmer (86'). In a later work by Lehec (12') it is shown that if μ has finite entropy relative to γ , then v_t is well defined and that:

1. v_t is a martingale, with $v_t(X_t) = \nabla \ln \left(P_{1-t} \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(X_t) \right) \right)$.
2. $\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma) = \text{Ent}(X.||B.) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[|v_t|^2] dt$.
3. In the Wiener space, the density of X_t with respect to B_t is given by $\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(\omega_1)$.
4. If $G \sim \gamma$, independent from X_1 ,

$$X_t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} tX_1 + \sqrt{t(1-t)}G.$$

Bounding the Deficit - the Föllmer Drift

The process v_t goes back at least to the works of Föllmer (86'). In a later work by Lehec (12') it is shown that if μ has finite entropy relative to γ , then v_t is well defined and that:

1. v_t is a martingale, with $v_t(X_t) = \nabla \ln \left(P_{1-t} \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(X_t) \right) \right)$.
2. $\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma) = \text{Ent}(X.||B.) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[|v_t|^2] dt$.
3. In the Wiener space, the density of X_t with respect to B_t is given by $\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(\omega_1)$.
4. If $G \sim \gamma$, independent from X_1 ,

$$X_t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} tX_1 + \sqrt{t(1-t)}G.$$

Bounding the Deficit - the Föllmer Drift

The process v_t goes back at least to the works of Föllmer (86'). In a later work by Lehec (12') it is shown that if μ has finite entropy relative to γ , then v_t is well defined and that:

1. v_t is a martingale, with $v_t(X_t) = \nabla \ln \left(P_{1-t} \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(X_t) \right) \right)$.
2. $\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma) = \text{Ent}(X.||B.) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}[|v_t|^2] dt$.
3. In the Wiener space, the density of X_t with respect to B_t is given by $\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(\omega_1)$.
4. If $G \sim \gamma$, independent from X_1 ,

$$X_t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} tX_1 + \sqrt{t(1-t)}G.$$

Proof of Talagrand's Inequality

Proof of Talagrand's Inequality (Lehec).

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu||\gamma) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| X_1 - B_1 \right\|_2^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_0^1 v_t dt \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right] dt = 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma).\end{aligned}$$

□

The goal is to make this quantitative.

Proof of Talagrand's Inequality

Proof of Talagrand's Inequality (Lehec).

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu||\gamma) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| X_1 - B_1 \right\|_2^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_0^1 v_t dt \right\|_2^2 \right] \\ &\leq \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right] dt = 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma).\end{aligned}$$

□

The goal is to make this quantitative.

Stability for Measures with a Finite Poincaré Constant

We say that μ satisfies a Poincaré inequality, with constant $C_p(\mu)$, if for every every smooth function f ,

$$\text{Var}_\mu(f) \leq C_p(\mu) \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\|\nabla f\|_2^2 \right].$$

We will prove:

Theorem

Let μ be a centered measure on \mathbb{R}^d with $C_p(\mu) < \infty$. Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)} \text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma).$$

Stability for Measures with a Finite Poincaré Constant

We say that μ satisfies a Poincaré inequality, with constant $C_p(\mu)$, if for every every smooth function f ,

$$\text{Var}_\mu(f) \leq C_p(\mu) \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\|\nabla f\|_2^2 \right].$$

We will prove:

Theorem

Let μ be a centered measure on \mathbb{R}^d with $C_p(\mu) < \infty$. Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)} \text{Ent}(\mu \|\gamma).$$

Measures with a Finite Poincaré Constant

The Poincaré constant is inequality for the following comparison lemma:

Lemma

Assume that μ is centered and that $C_P(\mu) < \infty$. Then

- For $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{(C_P(\mu) + 1) t}{(C_P(\mu) - 1) t + 1}.$$

- For $\frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^2 \right] \geq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{(C_P(\mu) + 1) t}{(C_P(\mu) - 1) t + 1}.$$

Proof.

Recall $X_t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} tX_1 + \sqrt{t(1-t)}G$. Hence,

$$C_p(X_t) \leq t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right] &\leq (t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla v_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= (t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)) \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

$g(t) := \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{(C_p(\mu) + 1)t}{(C_p(\mu) - 1)t + 1}$ solves

$$f(t) = t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)f'(t), \text{ with } f\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right].$$

Now apply Gromwall's inequality. □

Proof.

Recall $X_t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} tX_1 + \sqrt{t(1-t)}G$. Hence,

$$C_p(X_t) \leq t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right] &\leq (t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= (t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)) \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

$g(t) := \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{(C_p(\mu) + 1)t}{(C_p(\mu) - 1)t + 1}$ solves

$$f(t) = t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)f'(t), \text{ with } f\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right].$$

Now apply Gromwall's inequality. □

Proof.

Recall $X_t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} tX_1 + \sqrt{t(1-t)}G$. Hence,

$$C_p(X_t) \leq t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right] &\leq (t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= (t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)) \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

$g(t) := \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{(C_p(\mu) + 1)t}{(C_p(\mu) - 1)t + 1}$ solves

$$f(t) = t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)f'(t), \text{ with } f\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right].$$

Now apply Gromwall's inequality. □

Proof.

Recall $X_t \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} tX_1 + \sqrt{t(1-t)}G$. Hence,

$$C_p(X_t) \leq t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right] &\leq (t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\nabla \mathbf{v}_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right] \\ &= (t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)) \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t(X_t)\|_2^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

$g(t) := \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{(C_p(\mu) + 1)t}{(C_p(\mu) - 1)t + 1}$ solves

$$f(t) = t^2 C_p(\mu) + t(1-t)f'(t), \text{ with } f\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right].$$

Now apply Gromwall's inequality. □

A Martingale Formulation

We will use the following martingale formulation:

$$Y_t := \mathbb{E}[X_1 | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

By the martingale representation theorem, for some process Γ_t , which is uniquely defined, Y_t satisfies

$$Y_t = \int_0^t \Gamma_s dB_s.$$

This implies

$$v_t = \int_0^t \frac{\Gamma_s - \mathbb{1}_d}{1 - s} dB_s.$$

A Martingale Formulation

We will use the following martingale formulation:

$$Y_t := \mathbb{E}[X_1 | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

By the martingale representation theorem, for some process Γ_t , which is uniquely defined, Y_t satisfies

$$Y_t = \int_0^t \Gamma_s dB_s.$$

This implies

$$v_t = \int_0^t \frac{\Gamma_s - \mathbb{1}_d}{1 - s} dB_s.$$

A Martingale Formulation

We will use the following martingale formulation:

$$Y_t := \mathbb{E}[X_1 | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

By the martingale representation theorem, for some process Γ_t , which is uniquely defined, Y_t satisfies

$$Y_t = \int_0^t \Gamma_s dB_s.$$

This implies

$$v_t = \int_0^t \frac{\Gamma_s - \mathbb{1}_d}{1 - s} dB_s.$$

A Martingale Formulation

It turns out that Γ_t is a positive definite matrix, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_s\|_2^2 \right] ds = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \int_0^s \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{1-t} dt,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \gamma) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_0^1 \Gamma_t dB_t - \int_0^1 dB_t \right\|_2^2 \right] = \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2] dt.$$

A Martingale Formulation

It turns out that Γ_t is a positive definite matrix, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_s\|_2^2 \right] ds = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \int_0^s \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{1-t} dt,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \gamma) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \int_0^1 \Gamma_t dB_t - \int_0^1 dB_t \right\|_2^2 \right] = \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2] dt.$$

Bounding the Deficit - Martingales

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) = 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) - \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \gamma) \geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{1-t} dt$$

Integration by parts gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) &\geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t(1-t) \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt \\ &= \int_0^1 t(1-t) \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} [\|v_t\|_2^2] dt = \int_0^1 (2t-1) \mathbb{E} [\|v_t\|_2^2] dt \end{aligned}$$

Bounding the Deficit - Martingales

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) = 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) - \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \gamma) \geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{1-t} dt$$

Integration by parts gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) &\geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t(1-t) \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt \\ &= \int_0^1 t(1-t) \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} [\|v_t\|_2^2] dt = \int_0^1 (2t-1) \mathbb{E} [\|v_t\|_2^2] dt \end{aligned}$$

Bounding the Deficit - Martingales

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) = 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) - \mathcal{W}_2^2(\mu, \gamma) \geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{1-t} dt$$

Integration by parts gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) &\geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t(1-t) \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt \\ &= \int_0^1 t(1-t) \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} [\|v_t\|_2^2] dt = \int_0^1 (2t-1) \mathbb{E} [\|v_t\|_2^2] dt \end{aligned}$$

Applying the Lemma

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) &\geq \int_0^1 (2t - 1) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^2 \right] dt \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \int_0^1 \frac{(2t - 1)(C_p(\mu) + 1)t}{(C_p(\mu) - 1)t + 1} dt \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)}\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \geq \text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma)$, this shows

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)} \text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma).$$

The other case is easier.

Applying the Lemma

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) &\geq \int_0^1 (2t - 1) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^2 \right] dt \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \int_0^1 \frac{(2t - 1)(C_p(\mu) + 1)t}{(C_p(\mu) - 1)t + 1} dt \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)}\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \geq \text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma)$, this shows

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)} \text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma).$$

The other case is easier.

Applying the Lemma

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) &\geq \int_0^1 (2t - 1) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^2 \right] dt \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \int_0^1 \frac{(2t - 1)(C_p(\mu) + 1)t}{(C_p(\mu) - 1)t + 1} dt \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)}\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \geq \text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma)$, this shows

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)} \text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma).$$

The other case is easier.

Applying the Lemma

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) &\geq \int_0^1 (2t - 1) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^2 \right] dt \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \int_0^1 \frac{(2t - 1)(C_p(\mu) + 1)t}{(C_p(\mu) - 1)t + 1} dt \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)}\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{v}_{1/2}\|_2^2 \right] \geq \text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma)$, this shows

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \frac{\ln(C_p(\mu) + 1)}{4C_p(\mu)} \text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma).$$

The other case is easier.

Further Results

Other bounds on $\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right]$, will yields different results.

For example, if $\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(\mu)) \leq d$, then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right] \geq \frac{\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right] \right)^2}{d}.$$

This gives:

Theorem

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(\mu)) \leq d$. Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \min \left(\frac{\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma)^2}{6d}, \frac{\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma)}{4} \right).$$

Further Results

Other bounds on $\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right]$, will yields different results.
For example, if $\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(\mu)) \leq d$, then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right] \geq \frac{\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right] \right)^2}{d}.$$

This gives:

Theorem

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(\mu)) \leq d$. Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \min \left(\frac{\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma)^2}{6d}, \frac{\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma)}{4} \right).$$

Further Results

Other bounds on $\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right]$, will yields different results.
For example, if $\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(\mu)) \leq d$, then

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right] \geq \frac{\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\|v_t\|_2^2 \right] \right)^2}{d}.$$

This gives:

Theorem

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\text{tr}(\text{Cov}(\mu)) \leq d$. Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \min \left(\frac{\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma)^2}{6d}, \frac{\text{Ent}(\mu|\gamma)}{4} \right).$$

Further Results

Two other results:

Theorem

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d and let $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be the eigenvalues of $\text{Cov}(\mu)$. Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{2(1 - \lambda_i) + (\lambda_i + 1) \ln(\lambda_i)}{\lambda_i - 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda_i < 1\}}.$$

Theorem

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d . There exists another measure ν such that

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}} \frac{\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{d}}$$

Further Results

Two other results:

Theorem

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d and let $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be the eigenvalues of $\text{Cov}(\mu)$. Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{2(1 - \lambda_i) + (\lambda_i + 1) \ln(\lambda_i)}{\lambda_i - 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda_i < 1\}}.$$

Theorem

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d . There exists another measure ν such that

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}} \frac{\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{d}}$$

Further Results

Two other results:

Theorem

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d and let $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^d$ be the eigenvalues of $\text{Cov}(\mu)$. Then

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{2(1 - \lambda_i) + (\lambda_i + 1) \ln(\lambda_i)}{\lambda_i - 1} \mathbb{1}_{\{\lambda_i < 1\}}.$$

Theorem

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d . There exists another measure ν such that

$$\delta_{\text{Tal}}(\mu) \geq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}} \frac{\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{d}}$$

Definition (Fisher information of μ with respect to γ)

$$I(\mu||\gamma) = \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\left\| \nabla \ln \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma} \right) \right\|_2^2 \right].$$

In 75' Gross proved:

Theorem (Log-Sobolev inequality)

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Then

$$2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) \leq I(\mu||\gamma).$$

Definition (Fisher information of μ with respect to γ)

$$I(\mu||\gamma) = \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\left\| \nabla \ln \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma} \right) \right\|_2^2 \right].$$

In 75' Gross proved:

Theorem (Log-Sobolev inequality)

Let μ be a measure on \mathbb{R}^d . Then

$$2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) \leq I(\mu||\gamma).$$

Define

$$\delta_{\text{LS}}(\mu) = \text{I}(\mu||\gamma) - 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma),$$

and recall

$$v_t := v_t(X_t) = \nabla \ln \left(P_{1-t} \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(X_t) \right) \right).$$

It follows that

$$\text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt = \mathbb{E} [\|v_1\|_2^2] = \text{I}(\mu||\gamma).$$

Since $\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{1-t} dt$, we get

$$\delta_{\text{LS}}(\mu) = \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt.$$

Define

$$\delta_{\text{LS}}(\mu) = \text{I}(\mu||\gamma) - 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma),$$

and recall

$$v_t := v_t(X_t) = \nabla \ln \left(P_{1-t} \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(X_t) \right) \right).$$

It follows that

$$\text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt = \mathbb{E} [\|v_1\|_2^2] = \text{I}(\mu||\gamma).$$

Since $\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{1-t} dt$, we get

$$\delta_{\text{LS}}(\mu) = \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt.$$

Define

$$\delta_{\text{LS}}(\mu) = \text{I}(\mu||\gamma) - 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma),$$

and recall

$$v_t := v_t(X_t) = \nabla \ln \left(P_{1-t} \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(X_t) \right) \right).$$

It follows that

$$\text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt = \mathbb{E} [\|v_1\|_2^2] = \text{I}(\mu||\gamma).$$

Since $\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{1-t} dt$, we get

$$\delta_{\text{LS}}(\mu) = \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt.$$

Define

$$\delta_{\text{LS}}(\mu) = \text{I}(\mu||\gamma) - 2\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma),$$

and recall

$$v_t := v_t(X_t) = \nabla \ln \left(P_{1-t} \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\gamma}(X_t) \right) \right).$$

It follows that

$$\text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt = \mathbb{E} [\|v_1\|_2^2] = \text{I}(\mu||\gamma).$$

Since $\text{Ent}(\mu||\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{1-t} dt$, we get

$$\delta_{\text{LS}}(\mu) = \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} [(\Gamma_t - \text{I}_d)^2]}{(1-t)^2} dt.$$

The Shannon-Stam Inequality

In 48' Shannon noted the following inequality, which was later proved by Stam, in 56'.

Theorem (Shannon-Stam Inequality)

Let X, Y be independent random vectors in \mathbb{R}^d and let $G \sim \gamma$.
Then, for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

$$\text{Ent}(\sqrt{\lambda}X + \sqrt{1-\lambda}Y \| G) \leq \lambda \text{Ent}(X \| G) + (1-\lambda) \text{Ent}(Y \| G).$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if X and Y are Gaussians with identical covariances.

Define

$$\delta_\lambda(X, Y) = \lambda \text{Ent}(X \| G) + (1-\lambda) \text{Ent}(Y \| G) - \text{Ent}(\sqrt{\lambda}X + \sqrt{1-\lambda}Y \| G).$$

The Shannon-Stam Inequality

In 48' Shannon noted the following inequality, which was later proved by Stam, in 56'.

Theorem (Shannon-Stam Inequality)

Let X, Y be independent random vectors in \mathbb{R}^d and let $G \sim \gamma$. Then, for any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

$$\text{Ent}(\sqrt{\lambda}X + \sqrt{1-\lambda}Y \| G) \leq \lambda \text{Ent}(X \| G) + (1-\lambda) \text{Ent}(Y \| G).$$

Moreover, equality holds if and only if X and Y are Gaussians with identical covariances.

Define

$$\delta_\lambda(X, Y) = \lambda \text{Ent}(X \| G) + (1-\lambda) \text{Ent}(Y \| G) - \text{Ent}(\sqrt{\lambda}X + \sqrt{1-\lambda}Y \| G).$$

Deficit of the Shannon-Stam Inequality

For simplicity we'll focus on the case $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$.

Now, for X, Y independent random variables, take two independent Brownian motions B_t^X, B_t^Y and Γ_t^X, Γ_t^Y as above.

We get

$$\frac{X + Y}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \Gamma_t^X dB_t^X + \int_0^1 \Gamma_t^Y dB_t^Y \right) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\frac{(\Gamma_t^X)^2 + (\Gamma_t^Y)^2}{2}} dB_t.$$

for some Brownian motion B_t .

Deficit of the Shannon-Stam Inequality

For simplicity we'll focus on the case $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$.

Now, for X, Y independent random variables, take two independent Brownian motions B_t^X, B_t^Y and Γ_t^X, Γ_t^Y as above.

We get

$$\frac{X + Y}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\int_0^1 \Gamma_t^X dB_t^X + \int_0^1 \Gamma_t^Y dB_t^Y \right) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\frac{(\Gamma_t^X)^2 + (\Gamma_t^Y)^2}{2}} dB_t.$$

for some Brownian motion B_t .

Bounding the Deficit

If $H_t = \sqrt{\frac{(\Gamma_t^X)^2 + (\Gamma_t^Y)^2}{2}}$, $\text{Ent}\left(\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}} \parallel G\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - H_t)^2]}{1-t} dt$.

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) &\geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - \Gamma_t^Y)^2]}{2(1-t)} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - \Gamma_t^X)^2]}{2(1-t)} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - H_t)^2]}{1-t} dt \\ &= \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{2\mathbb{E}[H_t] - \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_t^X] - \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_t^Y]}{1-t}. \end{aligned}$$

Manipulating the matrix square root then shows

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\Gamma_t^X - \Gamma_t^Y)^2 (\Gamma_t^X + \Gamma_t^Y)^{-1}}{(1-t)} \right] dt.$$

Bounding the Deficit

If $H_t = \sqrt{\frac{(\Gamma_t^X)^2 + (\Gamma_t^Y)^2}{2}}$, $\text{Ent}\left(\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}} \parallel \mathcal{G}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - H_t)^2]}{1-t} dt$.

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) &\geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - \Gamma_t^Y)^2]}{2(1-t)} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - \Gamma_t^X)^2]}{2(1-t)} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - H_t)^2]}{1-t} dt \\ &= \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{2\mathbb{E}[H_t] - \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_t^X] - \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_t^Y]}{1-t}. \end{aligned}$$

Manipulating the matrix square root then shows

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\Gamma_t^X - \Gamma_t^Y)^2 (\Gamma_t^X + \Gamma_t^Y)^{-1}}{(1-t)} \right] dt.$$

Bounding the Deficit

If $H_t = \sqrt{\frac{(\Gamma_t^X)^2 + (\Gamma_t^Y)^2}{2}}$, $\text{Ent}\left(\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}} \parallel G\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - H_t)^2]}{1-t} dt$.

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) &\geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - \Gamma_t^Y)^2]}{2(1-t)} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - \Gamma_t^X)^2]}{2(1-t)} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - H_t)^2]}{1-t} dt \\ &= \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{2\mathbb{E}[H_t] - \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_t^X] - \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_t^Y]}{1-t}. \end{aligned}$$

Manipulating the matrix square root then shows

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\Gamma_t^X - \Gamma_t^Y)^2 (\Gamma_t^X + \Gamma_t^Y)^{-1}}{(1-t)} \right] dt.$$

Bounding the Deficit

If $H_t = \sqrt{\frac{(\Gamma_t^X)^2 + (\Gamma_t^Y)^2}{2}}$, $\text{Ent}\left(\frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}} \parallel G\right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - H_t)^2]}{1-t} dt$.

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} 2\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) &\geq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - \Gamma_t^Y)^2]}{2(1-t)} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - \Gamma_t^X)^2]}{2(1-t)} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[(I_d - H_t)^2]}{1-t} dt \\ &= \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{2\mathbb{E}[H_t] - \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_t^X] - \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_t^Y]}{1-t}. \end{aligned}$$

Manipulating the matrix square root then shows

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\Gamma_t^X - \Gamma_t^Y)^2 (\Gamma_t^X + \Gamma_t^Y)^{-1}}{(1-t)} \right] dt.$$

Deficit of Log-Concave Measures

Fact: if X is log-concave, then $\Gamma_t^X \preceq \frac{1}{t}I_d$ almost surely.

So, if both X and Y are log-concave,

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(\Gamma_t^X - \Gamma_t^Y)^2 \right]}{1-t} dt.$$

In particular,

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, G) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(\Gamma_t^X - I_d)^2 \right]}{1-t} dt.$$

Deficit of Log-Concave Measures

Fact: if X is log-concave, then $\Gamma_t^X \preceq \frac{1}{t}I_d$ almost surely.

So, if both X and Y are log-concave,

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(\Gamma_t^X - \Gamma_t^Y)^2 \right]}{1-t} dt.$$

In particular,

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, G) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(\Gamma_t^X - I_d)^2 \right]}{1-t} dt.$$

Deficit of Log-Concave Measures

Fact: if X is log-concave, then $\Gamma_t^X \preceq \frac{1}{t}I_d$ almost surely.

So, if both X and Y are log-concave,

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, Y) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(\Gamma_t^X - \Gamma_t^Y)^2 \right]}{1-t} dt.$$

In particular,

$$\delta_{\frac{1}{2}}(X, G) \gtrsim \text{Tr} \int_0^1 t \cdot \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(\Gamma_t^X - I_d)^2 \right]}{1-t} dt.$$

The Entropic Central Limit Theorem

Let $\{X_i\}$ be *i.i.d.* copies of X and $S_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$.

Set $H_t = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (\Gamma_t^i)^2}{n}}$. Then

$$S_n \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \int_0^1 H_t dB_t.$$

Using this, we show

$$\text{Ent}(S_n || G) \leq C_X \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(H_t - \mathbb{E}[H_t])^2]}{1-t} dt,$$

where $C_X > 0$, depends on X . This can be used to prove the entropic central limit theorem.

The Entropic Central Limit Theorem

Let $\{X_i\}$ be *i.i.d.* copies of X and $S_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$.

Set $H_t = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (\Gamma_t^i)^2}{n}}$. Then

$$S_n \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \int_0^1 H_t dB_t.$$

Using this, we show

$$\text{Ent}(S_n || G) \leq C_X \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(H_t - \mathbb{E}[H_t])^2]}{1-t} dt,$$

where $C_X > 0$, depends on X . This can be used to prove the entropic central limit theorem.

The Entropic Central Limit Theorem

Let $\{X_i\}$ be *i.i.d.* copies of X and $S_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$.

Set $H_t = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (\Gamma_t^i)^2}{n}}$. Then

$$S_n \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \int_0^1 H_t dB_t.$$

Using this, we show

$$\text{Ent}(S_n || G) \leq C_X \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(H_t - \mathbb{E}[H_t])^2]}{1-t} dt,$$

where $C_X > 0$, depends on X . This can be used to prove the entropic central limit theorem.

The Entropic Central Limit Theorem

Let $\{X_i\}$ be *i.i.d.* copies of X and $S_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$.

Set $H_t = \sqrt{\frac{\sum(\Gamma_t^i)^2}{n}}$. Then

$$S_n \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \int_0^1 H_t dB_t.$$

Using this, we show

$$\text{Ent}(S_n || G) \leq C_X \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} [(H_t - \mathbb{E}[H_t])^2]}{1-t} dt,$$

where $C_X > 0$, depends on X . This can be used to prove the entropic central limit theorem.

Quantitative Entropic Central Limit Theorem

For a more quantitative result we have the formula

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Ent}(S_n || G) &\leq \frac{\text{poly}(C_P(X))}{n} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(\Gamma_t^2 - \mathbb{E} [H_t^2])^2 \right]}{1-t} dt, \\ &= \frac{\text{poly}(C_P(X))}{n} \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\text{Var}(\Gamma_t^2)}{1-t} dt,\end{aligned}$$

valid for X which satisfies a Poincaré inequality. For X log-concave, $\Gamma_t \preceq \frac{1}{t} I_d$, and

$$\text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{\text{Var}(\Gamma_t^2)}{1-t} dt \leq \text{Tr} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{t^2} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[(\Gamma_t - I_d)^2 \right]}{1-t} dt.$$

Thank You