

# Cramér's Theorem

Large Deviations and Queues—Damon Wischik

**Theorem 1** *Let  $(X_n, n \in \mathbb{N})$  be a sequence of independent random variables each distributed like  $X$ , and let  $S_n = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ . Let  $\Lambda(\theta) = \log \mathbb{E}e^{\theta X}$ , and let  $\Lambda^*(x) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \theta x - \Lambda(\theta)$ . Suppose that  $\Lambda$  is finite in a neighbourhood of zero. Then for any measurable set  $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$*

$$-\inf_{x \in B^\circ} \Lambda^*(x) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in B\right) \quad (1)$$

$$\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in B\right) \leq -\inf_{x \in B} \Lambda^*(x). \quad (2)$$

*Proof.* We first establish the upper bound (1) for closed half-spaces, i.e. sets of the form  $[x, \infty)$  and  $(-\infty, x]$ . We then extend it to all closed sets. We then establish the lower bound (2).

*Upper bound for closed half-spaces.* Write out the probability we wish to estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in [x, \infty)\right) &= \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq nx) = \mathbb{E}1_{S_n - nx \geq 0} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}e^{\theta(S_n - nx)} = e^{-n\theta x} (\mathbb{E}e^{\theta X})^n \quad \text{for all } \theta \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality is known as the Chernoff bound. Assume for the moment that  $x \geq \mathbb{E}X$ . Taking logarithms,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in [x, \infty)\right) &\leq \inf_{\theta \geq 0} \{-\theta x + \Lambda(\theta)\} \\ &= -\sup_{\theta \geq 0} \{\theta x - \Lambda(\theta)\} \\ &= -\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \{\theta x - \Lambda(\theta)\} \\ &= -\Lambda^*(x). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

To see that the supremum can be taken over  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$  in (3), note that

$$\Lambda(\theta) = \log \mathbb{E}e^{\theta X} \geq \log e^{\theta \mathbb{E}X} = \theta \mathbb{E}X \quad \text{by Jensen's inequality}$$

and hence that  $\theta x - \Lambda(\theta) \leq \theta(x - \mathbb{E}X)$ ; thus  $\theta x - \Lambda(\theta) \leq 0$  whenever  $\theta \leq 0$ , and so the supremum in (3) is attained for  $\theta \geq 0$ . Finally, note that  $\Lambda^*(x)$  is increasing in  $x > \mathbb{E}X$ , since for any  $y \geq x$

$$\Lambda^*(x) = \sup_{\theta \geq 0} \theta x - \Lambda(\theta) \leq \sup_{\theta \geq 0} \theta y - \Lambda(\theta) = \Lambda^*(y).$$

Thus we have proved that for  $x \geq \mathbb{E}X$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in [x, \infty)\right) \leq -\inf_{y \in [x, \infty)} \Lambda^*(y). \quad (4)$$

It remains to deal with the case  $x < \mathbb{E}X$ . In this case, trivially,

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in [x, \infty)\right) \leq 0$$

since  $\mathbb{P}(X > x) = 0$ . These facts and  $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{E}X) = 0$ , using Jensen's inequality as before, and that  $\Lambda^*(\cdot)$  is clearly non-negative; hence that  $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{E}X) = 0$ . This implies that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in [x, \infty)\right) \leq 0 = \inf_{y \in [x, \infty)} \Lambda^*(y).$$

So we have proved that (4) holds also for  $x < \mathbb{E}X$ . The proof of the upper bound for sets of the form  $(-\infty, x]$  follows by considering the random variable  $-X$ .

*LD upper bound for general closed sets.* Let  $F$  be an arbitrary closed set. If  $F$  contains  $\mathbb{E}X$ , then the LD upper bound holds trivially since

$$\inf_{x \in F} \Lambda^*(x) = \Lambda^*(\mathbb{E}X) = 0.$$

Otherwise,  $F$  can be written as the union  $F = F_1 \cup F_2$  where  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are closed and

$$F_1 \subseteq [\mathbb{E}X, \infty) \text{ and } F_2 \subseteq (-\infty, \mathbb{E}X).$$

Suppose  $F_1$  is non-empty, and let  $x$  be the infimum of  $F_1$ . By closure,  $x \in F_1$ . Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in F_1\right) &\leq \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in [x, \infty)\right) \\ &\leq -\Lambda^*(x) \quad \text{by the upper bound for closed half-spaces} \\ &= -\inf_{y \in F_1} \Lambda^*(y) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by monotonicity of  $\Lambda^*$  on  $[\mathbb{E}X, \infty)$ , in which  $F_1$  is contained. Similarly, by considering the LD upper bound for  $(-\infty, x]$ , where  $x$  is the supremum of  $F_2$ , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in F_2\right) \leq -\inf_{y \in F_2} \Lambda^*(y).$$

In other words, the LD upper bound holds for both of  $F_1$  and  $F_2$ . Hence, by the principle of the largest term, it holds for  $F = F_1 \cup F_2$ .

*LD lower bound.* Let  $G$  be any open set, and let  $x \in G$ . We will show that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in G\right) \geq -\Lambda^*(x). \quad (5)$$

Taking the supremum over  $x \in G$  will then yield the large deviations lower bound. We will proceed by calculating the value of  $\Lambda^*(x)$ . We will do this in two cases: first the case when  $\mathbb{P}(X < x) = 0$  or  $\mathbb{P}(X > x) = 0$ , second the case when neither holds.

Suppose that  $\mathbb{P}(X < x) = 0$ . We can calculate  $\Lambda^*$  explicitly as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^*(x) &= \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \theta x - \Lambda(\theta) \right\} = -\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \Lambda(\theta) - \theta x \right\} = -\inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \log \mathbb{E} e^{\theta(X-x)} \\ &= -\lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} \log \mathbb{E} e^{\theta(X-x)} \quad \text{since } X \geq x \text{ almost surely} \\ &= -\log \lim_{\theta \rightarrow -\infty} \mathbb{E} e^{\theta(X-x)} \\ &= -\log \mathbb{E} 1_{X=x} \quad \text{by monotone convergence} \\ &= -\log \mathbb{P}(X = x). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\mathbb{P}(X = x) = 0$ , then the lower bound in (5) is trivial. If  $\mathbb{P}(X = x) = p > 0$  then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in (x - \delta, x + \delta)\right) &\geq \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(X_1 = \dots = X_n = x) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \log p^n = \log p = -\Lambda^*(x) \end{aligned}$$

and be satisfied:  $\mathbb{P}(X > x) > 0$ , a similar argument shows that (5) holds.

Assume now that  $\mathbb{P}(X > x) > 0$  and  $\mathbb{P}(X < x) > 0$ . Again, we investigate the value of the lower bound:

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda^*(x) &= \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \theta x - \Lambda(\theta) \\ &= - \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \Lambda(\theta) - \theta x = - \inf_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \log \mathbb{E} e^{\theta(X-x)}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, the function  $g(\theta) = \Lambda(\theta) - \theta x$  satisfies  $g(\theta) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $|\theta| \rightarrow \infty$ , by the assumption that there is probability mass both above and below  $x$ ; and it inherits lower-semicontinuity from  $\Lambda$  (see Lemma 2). Any set of the form  $\{g(\theta) \leq \alpha\}$  is thus bounded as well as closed, hence compact, and so  $g$  attains its infimum (see the note at the end of this proof), say

$$\Lambda^*(x) = \hat{\theta}x - \Lambda(\hat{\theta}).$$

We will use  $\hat{\theta}$  to estimate the probability in question.

We will do this using a *tilted distribution*<sup>1</sup>. Let  $\mu$  be the measure of  $X$ , and define a tilted measure  $\tilde{\mu}$  by

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{d\mu}(x) = e^{\hat{\theta}x - \Lambda(\hat{\theta})}.$$

Let  $\tilde{X}$  be a random variable drawn from  $\tilde{\mu}$ .

Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}\tilde{X} = \mathbb{E}X e^{\hat{\theta}X - \Lambda(\hat{\theta})} = \Lambda'(\hat{\theta})$$

where the last equality comes from Lemma 2, making the assumption that  $\Lambda$  is differentiable at  $\hat{\theta}$ . (We will leave the case where it is not differentiable to Dembo & Zeitouni.) Note also that since the optimum in  $\Lambda^*(x) = \sup_{\theta} \theta x - \Lambda(\theta)$  is attained at  $\theta = \hat{\theta}$ , it must be that  $\Lambda'(\hat{\theta}) = x$ . Thus  $\mathbb{E}\tilde{X} = x$ . (This tilted random variables captures the idea of being close in distribution to  $X$ , conditional on having a value close to  $x$ .)

We can now estimate the probability of interest, using the fact that (since  $G$  is open), the set  $(x - \delta, x + \delta)$  is contained in  $G$  for sufficiently small  $\delta$ . Let  $\tilde{S}_n$  be the sum of  $n$  i.i.d. copies of  $\tilde{X}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n} - x\right| < \delta\right) &= \int \cdots \int_{|x_1 + \cdots + x_n - nx| < n\delta} \mu(dx_1) \cdots \mu(dx_n) \\ &= \int \cdots \int_{|x_1 + \cdots + x_n - nx| < n\delta} e^{-\hat{\theta}(x_1 + \cdots + x_n) + n\Lambda(\hat{\theta})} \tilde{\mu}(dx_1) \cdots \tilde{\mu}(dx_n) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(e^{-\hat{\theta}\tilde{S}_n + n\Lambda(\hat{\theta})} \mathbf{1}_{|\tilde{S}_n/n - x| < \delta}\right) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left(e^{-n(\hat{\theta}x - \Lambda(\hat{\theta}) + |\hat{\theta}|\delta)} \mathbf{1}_{|\tilde{S}_n/n - x| < \delta}\right) \\ &= e^{-n(\hat{\theta}x - \Lambda(\hat{\theta}) + |\hat{\theta}|\delta)} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\tilde{S}_n}{n} - x\right| < \delta\right).\end{aligned}$$

By the weak law of large numbers, and the fact that our tilted distribution has mean  $x$ , the term  $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$  tends to 1 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Taking logarithms and then  $\liminf$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in G\right) &\geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n} - x\right| < \delta\right) \\ &\geq -(\hat{\theta}x - \Lambda(\hat{\theta}) + |\hat{\theta}|\delta).\end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>What this means in practice is that  $\mathbb{E}f(\tilde{X}) = \mathbb{E}\left(f(X) \frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{d\mu}(X)\right)$  or, in integral notation,  $\int f(x) \tilde{\mu}(dx) = \int f(x) \frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{d\mu}(x) \mu(dx)$ .

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n} \in G\right) \geq -\Lambda^*(x).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Here are some basic properties of  $\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda^*$ . Recall that a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  is said to be *lower-semicontinuous* if  $x_n \rightarrow x$  implies that  $\liminf f(x_n) \geq f(x)$ , or equivalently that any set  $\{x : f(x) \leq \alpha\}$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  is closed. It is not hard to prove that if  $K$  is a compact set and  $\inf_{x \in K} f(x) < \infty$  then the infimum is attained at some  $\hat{x} \in K$ .

**Lemma 2 (Properties of  $\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda^*$ )** *Assume that  $\Lambda(\theta)$  is finite in a neighbourhood of  $\theta = 0$ . Then*

- i.  $\mathbb{E}X$  is finite and equal to  $\Lambda'(0)$*
- ii.  $\Lambda(0) = 0$*
- iii.  $\Lambda$  is convex and lower-semicontinuous*
- iv.  $\Lambda$  is infinitely differentiable in the interior of  $\{\theta : \Lambda(\theta) < \infty\}$ ,  
and  $\Lambda'(\theta) = \mathbb{E}(Xe^{\theta X})/\mathbb{E}e^{\theta X}$*
- v.  $\Lambda^*(\mathbb{E}X) = 0$*
- vi.  $\Lambda^*$  is non-negative, convex, and lower-semicontinuous*
- vii.  $(\Lambda^*)^* = \Lambda$*