

# Large deviations for intersection measures of some Markov processes

Takahiro Mori\*

## Abstract

Consider an intersection measure  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$  of  $p$  independent (possibly different)  $m$ -symmetric Hunt processes up to time  $t$  in a metric measure space  $E$  with a Radon measure  $m$ .

We derive a Donsker-Varadhan type large deviation principle for the normalized intersection measure  $t^{-p}\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$  on the set of finite measures on  $E$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , under the condition that  $t$  is smaller than life times of all processes.

This extends earlier work by W. König and C. Mukherjee [KM13], in which the large deviation principle was established for the intersection measure of  $p$  independent  $N$ -dimensional Brownian motions before exiting some bounded open set  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ .

We also obtain the asymptotic behaviour of logarithmic moment generating function, which is related to the results of X. Chen and J. Rosen [CR05] on the intersection measure of independent Brownian motions or stable processes.

Our results rely on assumptions about the heat kernels and the 1-order resolvents of the processes, hence include rich examples. For example, the assumptions hold for  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $2 \leq p < p_*$  when the processes enjoy (sub-)Gaussian type or jump type heat kernel estimates, where  $p_*$  is determined by the Hausdorff dimension of  $E$  and the so-called walk dimensions of the processes.

**Keywords:** intersection measure; large deviations; heat kernel

## 1 Introduction and main results

### 1.1 Introduction

Let  $p$  be an integer greater than or equal to 2,  $E$  be a locally compact, separable metric space and  $m$  be a Radon measure on  $E$  with  $\text{supp}[m] = E$ . Let  $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(p)}$  be  $p$  independent irreducible Hunt processes on  $E$ , with life times  $\zeta^{(1)}, \dots, \zeta^{(p)}$ , respectively. We do not require that all  $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(p)}$  have the same law. For each  $t > 0$ , under the condition that all life times  $\zeta^{(1)}, \dots, \zeta^{(p)}$  are less than  $t$ , the intersection measure  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$  is formally written as

$$\ell_t^{\text{IS}}(A) \text{ “} = \text{” } \int_A \left[ \int_{[0,t]^p} \prod_{i=1}^p \delta_x(X^{(i)}(s_i)) ds_1 \cdots ds_p \right] m(dx) \quad \text{for } A \subset E \text{ Borel.} \quad (1.1)$$

Here and in the following, the superscript “IS” means “InterSection”.

The intersection measure is firstly introduced by Le Gall [LG92], when the processes are independent Brownian motions. The large deviation result for the intersection measures are obtained by König and Mukherjee [KM13], for the case of independent Brownian motions before exiting a bounded domain  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  with a smooth boundary with  $N - p(N - 2) > 0$ . This is roughly written as an asymptotic behavior of the conditional probability

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left( \frac{1}{t^p} \ell_t^{\text{IS}}; \frac{1}{t} \ell_t^{(1)}, \dots, \frac{1}{t} \ell_t^{(p)} \right) \approx \boldsymbol{\mu} \mid t < \tau^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \tau^{(p)} \right) \approx \exp \left\{ -t \sum_{i=1}^p \|\nabla \psi_i\|_{L^2}^2 \right\} \quad (1.2)$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . (See Definition 1.6 for a precise definition of the large deviation principle.) Here  $\ell_t^{(i)}$  and  $\tau^{(i)}$  are the occupation measure and the exit time from  $D$  of independent Brownian motion  $X^{(i)}$  respectively, and  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in \mathcal{M}_f(D) \times (\mathcal{M}_1(D))^p$ , a tuple of a finite measure

\*Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto, 606-8502, JAPAN. tmori@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp

and  $p$  probability measures on  $D$ , is of the form  $\psi_i = \sqrt{\frac{d\mu_i}{dm}} \in H_0^1(D)$  and  $\frac{d\mu}{dm} = \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{d\mu_i}{dm}$ , where  $H_0^1(D)$  is the Sobolev space with zero boundary condition in  $D$ .

The aim of this paper is to prove Theorem 1.7, in which we extend such large deviation results (1.2) for intersection measures to general Markov processes on metric measure spaces, replacing  $H_0^1(D)$  and  $\|\nabla \cdot\|_{L^2}^2$  by Dirichlet forms  $(\mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \mathcal{E}^{(i)})$  and replacing  $\tau^{(i)}$  by the life times  $\zeta^{(i)}$  of the corresponding Hunt processes  $X^{(i)}$ . Main tools of such generalization are Dirichlet form techniques (see [FOT11] for instance).

The asymptotics of the logarithmic moment generating function

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E}[\exp\{\theta \ell_t^{\text{IS}}(E)^{1/p}\}] \quad \text{for } \theta > 0 \quad (1.3)$$

is calculated in [Che04] for the case of independent Brownian motions, and in [CR05] for the case of independent stable processes. In these papers, they point out that the limit in (1.3) is related to the best constants of the Gagliardo-Nirenberg type interpolation inequalities. Our second result is to obtain the logarithmic moment generating functions of intersection measures for more general processes. In Proposition 1.8, we calculate a limit similar to (1.3) and represent it as a variational formula.

We emphasise that, so far, the analysis of the intersection measure is limited to the cases that the processes are independent Brownian motions or stable processes.

In the next Section 1.2, we introduce our assumptions and give some examples in Section 1.3. In Section 1.4, we introduce some notations about intersection measures, and we state our main results on large deviations in the following Section 1.5. In Section 2, we give basic lemmas and calculations, used in the proof of our main results. From Section 3 to Section 6, we will prove our main results, respectively. In Section 7, we will check the examples in Section 1.3 satisfy the assumptions.

This paper is based on the author's master thesis (unpublished, available only at Kyoto university).

## 1.2 Assumptions

Let  $p$  be an integer with  $p \geq 2$ . Let  $X$  be an irreducible  $m$ -symmetric Hunt process on  $E$ , with life time  $\zeta$ . Let  $p_t(x, dy)$ ,  $t > 0$  be its transition probability and  $\{T_t\} = \{T_t : t \geq 0\}$  be the associated strongly continuous contraction semigroup of symmetric, Markovian linear operators on  $L^2(E; m)$ . Let  $R_1$  be the 1-order resolvent of  $\{T_t\}$ . By the Markovian property of  $\{T_t\}$ ,  $R_1$  can be considered as an operator on  $L^\infty(E; m)$ .

We now make six assumptions on  $X$ :

**(A1)**  $X$  has the following tightness property:

$$\text{for all } \varepsilon > 0, \text{ there exists a compact set } K \text{ such that } \sup_{x \in E} R_1 1_{K^c}(x) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (1.4)$$

**(A2)** For each  $t > 0$  and  $x \in E$ , the measure  $p_t(x, dy)$  on  $E$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $m(dy)$ , and its density  $p_t(\cdot, \cdot)$  is continuous and uniformly bounded on  $E \times E$ .

**(A2')** For each  $t > 0$  and  $x \in E$ , the measure  $p_t(x, dy)$  on  $E$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $m(dy)$ , and its density  $p_t(\cdot, \cdot)$  is *uniformly* continuous and uniformly bounded on  $E \times E$ .

**(A3)** There exist  $\rho > 0$ ,  $t_0 > 0$  and  $C > 0$  such that

$$C^{-1}t^{-\rho/2} \leq \int_E p_t(x, x)m(dx) \leq Ct^{-\rho/2} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, t_0]. \quad (1.5)$$

(A4) There exist  $\mu \in (2, \frac{2p}{p-1})$ ,  $C > 0$  and  $t_0 > 0$  such that

$$\|T_t\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty} \leq Ct^{-\mu/2} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, t_0]. \quad (1.6)$$

Here  $\|\cdot\|_{1 \rightarrow \infty}$  is the operator norm from  $L^1(E; m)$  to  $L^\infty(E; m)$ .

(A5)  $X$  satisfies

$$\sup_{x \in E} \int_E R_1(x, y)^p m(dy) < \infty \quad (1.7)$$

and

$$\limsup_{\delta \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in E} \int_E R_{1,\delta}(x, y)^p m(dy) = 0, \quad (1.8)$$

where

$$R_1(x, y) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} p_t(x, y) dt, \quad R_{1,\delta}(x, y) = \int_0^\delta e^{-t} p_t(x, y) dt \quad \text{for } x, y \in E.$$

We say that  $X$  satisfies Assumption **(A)** if  $X$  satisfies **(A1)**, **(A2)**, **(A3)**, **(A4)** and **(A5)**. We say that  $X$  satisfies Assumption **(A')** if  $X$  satisfies **(A1)**, **(A2')**, **(A3)**, **(A4)** and **(A5)**. When we need to clarify constants, we denote the above assumptions as **(A3;  $\rho, t_0, C$ )**, **(A4;  $\mu, t_0, C$ )**, **(A;  $\rho, \mu, t_0, C$ )** and **(A';  $\rho, \mu, t_0, C$ )**.

*Remark 1.1.*

- i) When  $E$  is compact, clearly (A2) and (A2') are equivalent.
- ii) If  $m(E) < \infty$ , the ultra-contractivity (A4) implies the tightness (A1); see [TTT17] for example.
- iii) In the proof of [CR05, Theorem7], Chen and Rosen used a stronger condition than (A2'), namely the global Lipschitz continuity of  $p_t(\cdot, \cdot)$ .
- iv) [BBCK09, Theorem 3.1] says that the ultra-contractivity (A4) implies the existence of the bounded and continuous density on  $E \setminus N$ , where  $N$  is a properly exceptional set.

### 1.3 Examples

Let  $(E, d)$  be a locally compact, separable, bounded and connected metric space. For simplicity, suppose  $\sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in E\} = 1$ . Let  $m$  be a finite measure on  $E$  with  $\text{supp}[m] = E$  and  $X$  be an  $m$ -symmetric Hunt process on  $E$  with the transition density  $p_t(\cdot, \cdot)$ .

In view of the proof of [FOT11, Exercise 4.6.3], the connectivity of  $E$  and the absolute continuity of  $p_t$  imply the irreducibility of  $X$ .

Suppose that there exist positive constants  $t_0, c_1, \dots, c_4, d_f$  and  $d_w$  such that the following (1.9), (1.10) and either (1.11) or (1.12) hold:

- The uniformly volume growth condition:

$$c_1^{-1} r^{d_f} \leq m(B(x, r)) \leq c_1 r^{d_f} \quad \text{for all } x \in E \text{ and } 0 < r \leq 1. \quad (1.9)$$

- The on-diagonal heat kernel lower bound estimate:

$$c_2 t^{-d_f/d_w} \leq p_t(x, x) \quad \text{for all } x \in E \text{ and } t < t_0. \quad (1.10)$$

- The (sub-)Gaussian type heat kernel upper bound estimate:

$$p_t(x, y) \leq c_3 t^{-d_f/d_w} \exp \left\{ -c_4 \left( \frac{d(x, y)^{d_w}}{t} \right)^{1/(d_w-1)} \right\} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in E \text{ and } t < t_0. \quad (1.11)$$

- The jump-type heat kernel upper bound estimate:

$$p_t(x, y) \leq c_3 \left\{ t^{-d_f/d_w} \wedge \frac{t}{d(x, y)^{d_f+d_w}} \right\} \quad \text{for all } x, y \in E \text{ and } t < t_0. \quad (1.12)$$

Then, as we will see in Section 7, Assumption **(A)** holds if

$$d_s - p(d_s - 2) > 0,$$

where  $d_s := 2d_f/d_w$  is the so-called spectral dimension. Many processes satisfy the above conditions. Here are some examples.

1. Let  $E$  be the closure of a bounded Lipschitz domain  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  with  $N = 2$  or  $3$ , i.e., there exist positive constants  $R$  and  $\Lambda$  such that, for every  $z \in \partial D$ , there exists a Lipschitz function  $\psi_z : \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\text{Lip}(\psi_z) \leq \Lambda$  and  $B(z, R) \cap \partial D$  is represented as a part of the graph of  $\psi_z$ . Let  $X$  be the reflecting Brownian motion on  $E$ , i.e., a Hunt process on  $E$  with the Dirichlet form

$$\mathcal{F} = W^{1,2}(E), \quad \mathcal{E}(f, f) = \int_E |\nabla f|^2 dm \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{F},$$

where  $W^{1,2}(E)$  is the Sobolev space on  $E$ . Then (1.9), (1.10) and (1.11) hold with  $d_f = N$  and  $d_w = 2$ . For details, see [GSC11, Theorem 3.10] for instance.

2. Let  $E$  be a compact complete Riemannian manifold  $(M, g)$  with the dimension  $N$  and the nonnegative Ricci curvature, and  $m$  be the volume measure of  $(M, g)$ . Also let  $X$  be the Brownian motion on  $(M, g)$ , i.e. a Hunt process on  $E$  with the Dirichlet form

$$\mathcal{F} = W^{1,2}(M), \quad \mathcal{E}(f, f) = \int_E |\nabla f|^2 dm \quad \text{for } f \in \mathcal{F},$$

where  $W^{1,2}(M)$  is the Sobolev space on  $(M, g)$ . Then (1.9), (1.10) and (1.11) hold with  $d_f = N$  and  $d_w = 2$ . See [LY86] for details.

3. Let  $(E, d, m)$  be a compact  $RCD^*(K, N)$  space with  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $N \in [1, \infty)$ , which generalizes the notations that “the Ricci curvature being bounded from below by  $K$ ” and “the dimension being bounded from above by  $N$ ”. (For precise definitions, see [AGS14] for instance.) Suppose (1.9) holds with  $d_f = N$  and  $X$  is the Brownian motion on  $E$ , i.e. a Hunt process on  $E$  with the Dirichlet form

$$\mathcal{E}(f, f) = \frac{1}{2} \inf \left\{ \liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_E |\nabla f_j|^2 dm : f_j \in \text{Lip}(E), f_j \rightarrow f \text{ in } L^2(E; m) \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f \in L^2(E; m) : \mathcal{E}(f, f) < \infty\},$$

where

$$|\nabla f_j|(x) := \limsup_{y \rightarrow x, y \neq x} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{d(x, y)} \quad \text{for } x \in E$$

is the local Lipschitz constant of  $f_j$ . Then (1.9), (1.10) and (1.11) hold with  $d_f = N$  and  $d_w = 2$ . See [JLZ16] for details.

4. Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  be the compact Sierpiński gasket,  $d$  be the Euclidean distance, and  $m$  be the Hausdorff measure  $\mathcal{H}^\alpha$  of  $E$  with  $\alpha = \log 3 / \log 2$ . Also let  $X$  be the Brownian motion on  $E$ . Then (1.9), (1.10) and (1.11) hold with  $d_f = \log 3 / \log 2$  and  $d_w = \log 5 / \log 2$ . See [BP88] for details, and see [Bar98] for other diffusions on fractals.
5. Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a bounded  $C^{1,1}$  open subset, i.e., there exist positive constants  $R$  and  $\Lambda$  such that, for every  $z \in \partial E$ , there exists a  $C^1$ -function  $\psi_z : \mathbb{R}^{N-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\|\psi_z\|_\infty \leq \Lambda$ ,  $\text{Lip}(\nabla \psi_z) \leq \Lambda$  and  $B(z, R) \cap \partial E$  is represented as a part of the graph of  $\psi_z$ .

For  $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ , let  $X$  is a symmetric  $\alpha$ -stable process before exiting  $E$ . Then (1.9), (1.10) and (1.12) hold with  $d_f = N$  and  $d_w = \alpha$ . See [CKS14] and [Zha02] for details.

6. Let  $E \subset \mathbb{R}^N$  be a compact set and suppose  $m$  satisfies (1.9) with  $d_f > 0$ . For  $\alpha \in (0, 2)$  and a measurable function  $c : E \times E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$0 < M^{-1} \leq c(x, y) = c(y, x) \leq M < \infty \quad \text{for } m\text{-a.e. } x, y \in E,$$

we can define the regular Dirichlet form

$$\mathcal{F}^\alpha := \left\{ u \in L^2(E; m); \int_{E \times E} \frac{(u(x) - u(y))^2}{|x - y|^{N+\alpha}} m(dx)m(dy) < \infty \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}^\alpha(u, v) := \int_{F \times F} \frac{c(x, y)(u(x) - u(y))(v(x) - v(y))}{|x - y|^{N+\alpha}} m(dx)m(dy) \quad \text{for } u, v \in \mathcal{F}^\alpha.$$

An associated Hunt process  $X$  is called a stable-like process on  $E$ , and it satisfies (1.10) and (1.12) with  $d_f = N$  and  $d_w = \alpha$ . See [CK03] for details.

*Remark 1.2.*

- i) When  $E$  is unbounded, some assumptions are not trivial. For example, Brownian motion on entire space  $\mathbb{R}^N$  does not satisfy Assumption (A3).
- ii) In example 2 and 3, we cannot relax the compactness of  $E$ . Indeed, on  $RCD^*(K, N)$ , Assumption (A3) implies the compactness of  $E$ . See [JLZ16, Theorem 3.1].

## 1.4 Intersection measures

Before stating our main results about large deviation principles, we introduce some definitions and notations about intersection measures.

Let  $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(p)}$  be independent  $m$ -symmetric Hunt processes, starting at  $x_0^{(1)}, \dots, x_0^{(p)} \in E$  with the life times  $\zeta^{(1)}, \dots, \zeta^{(p)}$ , respectively. Suppose each  $X^{(i)}$  has the transition density  $p_t^{(i)}(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Fix their starting points  $x_0 = (x_0^{(1)}, \dots, x_0^{(p)}) \in E^p$ . The normalized probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$  up to time  $t > 0$  is defined by

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t(F) := \frac{\mathbb{P}(F \cap \{t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}\})}{\mathbb{P}(t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)})} \quad \text{for } F \subset \Omega.$$

The occupation measure  $\ell_t^{(i)}$  of  $X^{(i)}$  up to time  $t > 0$  is defined by

$$\ell_t^{(i)}(A) := \int_0^t 1_A(X^{(i)}(s)) ds$$

for  $A \subset E$ , on the event  $\{t < \zeta^{(i)}\}$ . Note that  $t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)}$  is in  $\mathcal{M}_1(E)$ , the set of probability measures on  $E$ . For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the approximated occupation measure  $\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{(i)}$  of  $X^{(i)}$  up to  $t$  is defined by

$$\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{(i)}(A) := \int_A \left[ \int_{[0, t]} p_\varepsilon^{(i)}(X^{(i)}(s), x) ds \right] m(dx)$$

for  $A \subset E$ , on the event  $\{t < \zeta^{(i)}\}$ . Note that  $t^{-1}\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{(i)}$  is in  $\mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E)$ , the set of sub-probability measures on  $E$ .

**Definition 1.3.** For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the approximated (mutual) intersection measure  $\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}}$  of  $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(p)}$  up to  $t$  is defined by

$$\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}}(A) := \int_A \left[ \int_{[0, t]^p} \prod_{i=1}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}(X^{(i)}(s_i), x) ds_1 \cdots ds_p \right] m(dx)$$

for  $A \subset E$ , on the event  $\{t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}\}$ .

Note that  $\ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}$  is in  $\mathcal{M}_f(E)$ , the set of finite measures on  $E$  equipped with the vague topology.

**Definition 1.4.** Fix  $t > 0$ . If the family of random measures  $\{\ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}; \varepsilon > 0\} \subset \mathcal{M}_f(E)$  converges in distribution as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  with respect to the probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ , we write the limit as  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$  and call it the (mutual) intersection measure of  $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(p)}$  up to  $t$ .

As in (1.1), the intersection measure  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$  can be formally written as

$$\ell_t^{\text{IS}}(A) \text{ “} = \text{” } \int_A \left[ \int_{[0,t]^p} \prod_{i=1}^p \delta_x(X^{(i)}(s_i)) ds_1 \cdots ds_p \right] m(dx)$$

for  $A \subset E$ , on the event  $\{t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}\}$ . Here  $\delta_x$  is the Dirac delta function at  $x$ . For the case of Brownian motion, there are several ways of constructing the intersection measure. See [LG92] and [KM02] for example. The following proposition ensures that the intersection measure also exists in our setting. We will prove this in Section 3.

**Proposition 1.5** (Existence of the mutual intersection measure). *Suppose each  $X^{(i)}$  satisfies (1.7) of Assumption (A5) and let  $t > 0$ . Then, there exists a random measure  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}} \in \mathcal{M}_f(E)$  such that, in the vague topology of  $\mathcal{M}_f(E)$ ,*

$$\ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}} \rightarrow \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \quad \text{in distribution, as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

with respect to the probability measure  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ .

Furthermore, for all  $f \in C_K^+(E)$  and all integer  $k \geq 1$ , it holds that

$$\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle \rightarrow \langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle \quad \text{in } L^k(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t), \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (1.13)$$

## 1.5 Main results: Large deviations

We first recall a definition of the large deviation principle. Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a topological space and  $\{\mathbb{P}_t\}_{t>0}$  be a family of probability measures on a common sample space.

**Definition 1.6** ([DZ98], Section 1.2).

- A function  $I : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is said to be a rate function (resp. a good rate function) if the set  $I^{-1}[0, \alpha]$  is closed (resp. compact) for all  $\alpha \geq 0$ .
- We say that a family of  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued random variables  $\{Z_t\}$  satisfies the large deviation principle (LDP in abbreviation) as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  with probabilities  $\{\mathbb{P}_t\}$ , scale  $t$  and a rate function  $I$  if, for all Borel sets  $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{X}$ , it holds that

$$- \inf_{x \in \text{int}(\Gamma)} I(x) \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_t(Z_t \in \Gamma) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_t(Z_t \in \Gamma) \leq - \inf_{x \in \bar{\Gamma}} I(x).$$

Let  $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(p)}$  be as in Section 1.4 and suppose each  $X^{(i)}$  has the associated regular Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{E}^{(i)}, \mathcal{F}^{(i)})$ .

We introduce some notations about large deviation rate functions. The bottom of the spectrum  $\lambda_1^{(i)}$  of  $X^{(i)}$  is defined by

$$\lambda_1^{(i)} := \inf \left\{ \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) : \psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \int_E \psi^2 dm = 1 \right\}.$$

We define the function  $I^{(i)} : \mathcal{M}_1(E) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  by

$$I^{(i)}(\mu) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) & \text{if } \psi = \sqrt{\frac{d\mu}{dm}} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$



for  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ , and define the function  $J^{(i)} : \mathcal{M}_1(E) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  by  $J^{(i)} := I^{(i)} - \lambda_1^{(i)}$ . We define the function  $\mathbf{J} : \mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_1(E))^p \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  by

$$\mathbf{J}(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) := \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^p J^{(i)}(\mu_i) & \text{if } \psi_i = \sqrt{\frac{d\mu_i}{dm}} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)} \text{ and } \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{d\mu_i}{dm} = \frac{d\mu}{dm}, \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1.14)$$

for  $(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in \mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_1(E))^p$ .

We now state the main theorem of this paper. We will prove it in Section 4.

**Theorem 1.7** (Large deviation principle). *Suppose each  $X^{(i)}$  satisfies Assumption (A). Then the tuple*

$$\left( \frac{1}{t^p} \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, \frac{1}{t} \ell_t^{(1)}, \dots, \frac{1}{t} \ell_t^{(p)} \right) \in \mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_1(E))^p$$

*satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , with probability  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function  $\mathbf{J}$ .*

Note that each occupation measure  $t^{-1} \ell_t^{(i)}$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  with probability  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function  $J^{(i)}$  (see Section 2). It can be regarded as a special case  $p = 1$  of the above theorem.

For the proof the main theorem, Proposition 4.3 plays an important role. This proposition roughly says that the approximated intersection measure  $\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}}$  is a “good” approximation of the intersection measure  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$ .

Our second result is another application of Proposition 4.3, which is an extension of [CR05, Theorem 1] in some sense. We will prove this in Section 6.

**Proposition 1.8** (Asymptotics of the moment generating function). *Suppose each  $X^{(i)}$  satisfies Assumption (A';  $\rho^{(i)}, \mu^{(i)}, t_0, C$ ). Let  $h \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$  be nonnegative and compactly supported. Then, for any  $\theta > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp \{ \theta \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p} \} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E \psi^{2p} \cdot h dm \right)^{1/p} - p \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}.$$

Chen and Rosen consider the stable processes on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and show this formula by using the Fourier transformation method, but we use Proposition 4.3 instead. Compare our Lemma 6.3 and [CR05, Theorem 6].

## 2 Preliminaries

Before proving main results, we state some basic facts and give some easy calculations.

### 2.1 Lemmas for our assumptions

The following lemma is obtained from our assumptions, which forms some sufficient conditions for our main results.

**Lemma 2.1.**

1. Assume Assumption (A2). Then (1.5) implies that the following eigenfunction expansion of the heat kernel; there exist  $L^2$ -normalized and essentially bounded  $\psi_n$  and nonnegative  $\lambda_n \uparrow \infty$  such that,  $T_t \psi_n = e^{-\lambda_n t} \psi_n$  for all  $t > 0$ ,  $n \geq 1$  and

$$p_t(x, y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\lambda_n t} \psi_n(x) \psi_n(y) \quad \text{for all } t > 0, \quad (2.1)$$

where the convergence is  $L^2$  and locally uniformly in  $E \times E$ .

Furthermore, there exist an integer  $N \geq 1$  and a positive constant  $C$  such that

$$\|\psi_n\|_\infty \leq C\lambda_n^{\rho/2} \text{ and } C^{-1}n^{1/\rho} \leq \lambda_n \leq Cn^{1/\rho} \text{ for all } n \geq N. \quad (2.2)$$

Here  $\rho$  is the constant as in (1.5).

2. (1.6) implies that, for all  $\delta > 0$  there exists  $C_\delta > 0$  such that

$$\|f\|_{2p}^2 \leq C_\delta \|f\|_2^2 + \delta \mathcal{E}(f, f) \text{ for all } f \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (2.3)$$

3. The first inequality (1.7) in Assumption (A5) implies that the mappings

$$(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\varepsilon_1}) \hookrightarrow L^2(E; m), L^p(E; m) \quad (2.4)$$

are compact embeddings.

Furthermore, under (1.6), the mappings

$$(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\varepsilon_1}) \hookrightarrow L^2(E; m), L^{2p}(E; m) \quad (2.5)$$

are compact embeddings.

*Proof.* For (2.1), see [Dav07, Theorem 7.2.5]. For (2.2), see [dHS85]. For (2.3), use [CKS87, Theorem 2.16] and Hölder's inequality.  $\square$

*Remark 2.2.* Assume Assumption (A2). In the proof of Proposition 4.3 and Theorem 1.7, we only use (1.4), (1.7), (1.8), (2.1), (2.2), (2.3) and (2.5).

## 2.2 Basic facts and calculations

### 2.2.1 Basics on large deviations

We recall basic definitions and facts on large deviations. In this subsection, let  $(\mathcal{X}, d)$  be a separable metric space,  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a Hausdorff topological space,  $\{(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P}_t)\}_{t>0}$  be a family of probability spaces. We also let  $\{Z_t\}_{t>0}$  and  $\{Z_{t,m}\}_{t>0}$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$  be families of  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued random variables.

**Theorem 2.3** (Contraction principle, [DZ98, Theorem 4.2.1]). *Let  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be a continuous function. Consider  $\{Z_t\}$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  with probabilities  $\{\mathbb{P}_t\}$ , scale  $t$  and a good rate function  $I$ . Then,  $\{f(Z_t)\}$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  with probabilities  $\{\mathbb{P}_t\}$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function*

$$\bar{I}(y) := \inf_{x \in f^{-1}(y)} I(x) \text{ for } y \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

**Definition 2.4** ([DZ98], Definition 4.2.14). We say that  $\{Z_{t,m}\}_t$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$  are exponentially good approximations of  $\{Z_t\}_t$  with respect to probability measures  $\{\mathbb{P}_t\}$  if, for every  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_t(d(Z_{t,m}, Z_t) > \delta) = -\infty.$$

**Theorem 2.5** ([DZ98], Theorem 4.2.16). *Suppose that for every  $m$ ,  $\{Z_{t,m}\}_t$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  with probabilities  $\{\mathbb{P}_t\}$ , scale  $t$  and a good rate function  $I_m$ , and that  $\{Z_{t,m}\}_t$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$  are exponentially good approximations of  $\{Z_t\}_t$  with respect to probability measures  $\{\mathbb{P}_t\}$ . Assume that the function*

$$\tilde{I}(x) := \sup_{\delta > 0} \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{z \in B(x; \delta)} I_m(z) \text{ for } x \in \mathcal{X}$$

is a good rate function, and assume that for every closed set  $F \subset \mathcal{X}$ , it holds that

$$\inf_{x \in F} \tilde{I}(x) \leq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{x \in F} I_m(x).$$



Then  $\{Z_t\}$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  with probabilities  $\{\mathbb{P}_t\}$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function  $\tilde{I}$ .

**Lemma 2.6** (Varadhan's integral lemma, [DZ98, Theorem 4.3.1]). *Let  $\phi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function. Suppose  $\{Z_t\}$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  with probabilities  $\{\mathbb{P}_t\}$ , scale  $t$  and a good rate function  $I$ . If*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E}_t[e^{\gamma t \phi(Z_t)}] < \infty$$

for some  $\gamma > 1$ , then it holds that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E}_t[e^{\gamma t \phi(Z_t)}] = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \{\phi(x) - I(x)\}.$$

### 2.2.2 Large deviation principles for occupation measures

We recall large deviation principles for the occupation measures of  $m$ -symmetric Hunt processes, proved in [FOT11], Section 6.3, and we make some remarks about it.

Let  $E$  be a locally compact, second countable Hausdorff space,  $m$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite Radon measure on  $E$  with  $\text{supp}[m] = E$  and  $X$  be an  $m$ -symmetric Hunt process on  $E$  with the associated regular Dirichlet form  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})$  on  $L^2(E; m)$ . Let  $\ell_t, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t, J$  be introduced in Section 1 and omit index <sup>(i)</sup>. We state the large deviation principle for the occupation measure  $\ell_t$  of  $X$ :

**Theorem 2.7** ([FOT11], Theorem 6.4.6). *Suppose*

- I. (Irreducibility)  $X$  is irreducible,
- II. (Resolvent strong Feller property)  $R_1(\mathcal{B}_b(E)) \subset C_b(E)$  and
- III. (Tightness) for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a compact set  $K$  such that  $\sup_{x \in E} R_1 1_{K^c}(x) \leq \varepsilon$ .

Then  $\ell_t$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  with probability  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function  $J$ .

This large deviation principle can be regarded as  $p = 1$  version of Theorem 1.7.

*Remark 2.8.*

In view of Section 6.1–6.4 in [FOT11], The resolvent strong Feller property is used for deriving the following two properties:

1. (page 347)  $R_\alpha(x, \cdot)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $m$  for each  $\alpha > 0$  and  $x \in E$ .
2. (page 348) For any function  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}^+(A)$  and for all  $x \in E$ ,  $\phi(x) > 0$ , where

$$\mathcal{D}^+(A) := \{R_\alpha f : \alpha > 0, f \in L^2(E; m) \cap C_b^+(E) \text{ and } f \neq 0\}.$$

Property 1 easily follows from our assumption (A2). Property 2 holds when  $R_\alpha f$  is lower semicontinuous for all nonnegative Borel function  $f$ , and indeed this follows from our assumption (A2) and Fatou's lemma.

### 2.2.3 Extension of the $L^2$ operator

Let  $E$  be a locally compact, second countable Hausdorff space and  $m$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite Radon measure on  $E$ .

The aim of this subsection is to show the following two propositions:

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $T$  be a symmetric, Markovian contraction linear operator on  $L^2(E; m)$ . Then, for all  $p \in [1, \infty)$ ,  $T$  can be extended to a bounded linear operator on  $L^p(E; m)$  with  $\|T\|_p \leq 1$ .*

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $\{T_t\}$  be a  $C_0$ -semigroup of symmetric, Markovian contraction linear operators on  $L^2(E; m)$ . Then, for all  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $\{T_t\}$  can be extended to a contraction  $C_0$ -semigroup on  $L^p(E; m)$ .*

The next lemma will be used in the proof of these propositions.

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $T$  be a positivity preserving linear operator on  $L^1(E; m)$ , let  $p, q \in [1, \infty]$  with  $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$  and let  $0 \leq f \in L^p(E; m)$ ,  $0 \leq g \in L^q(E; m)$ . Then it holds that*

$$T[fg](x) \leq (T[f^p](x))^{1/p} (T[g^q](x))^{1/q} \quad \text{for } m\text{-a.e. } x \in E.$$

*Proof.* We follow the proof of [EFHN15, Theorem 7.24].

Since  $T : L^1 \rightarrow L^1$  is positivity preserving, the inequality

$$ab \leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{a^p}{s^p} + \frac{1}{q} b^q s^q \quad \text{for all } a, b \geq 0 \text{ and } s > 0$$

implies that, there exists  $N \subset E$  such that  $m(N) = 0$  and

$$T[fg](x) \leq \frac{1}{p} \frac{T[f^p](x)}{s^p} + \frac{1}{q} T[g^q](x) s^q \quad \text{for all } x \in E \setminus N \text{ and } s \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ with } s > 0.$$

For each  $x \in E \setminus N$ , letting  $s \rightarrow \left( \frac{T[f^p](x)}{T[g^q](x)} \right)^{1/pq}$  and obtain the desired conclusion.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.9.* First, we extend the operator  $T$  on  $L^2$  to a bounded operator on  $L^p$ ,  $p \in [1, \infty]$ . The following arguments in Step 1 and 2 are based on those in Section 4.1 of [FT08]:

**Step 1** (Extension to a  $L^\infty$  operator).

Take  $\eta \in L^1(E; m)$  such that  $\eta > 0$   $m$ -a.e. and define  $\eta_n := (n\eta) \wedge 1$ . We extend the operator  $T$  on  $L^2(E; m) \cap L^\infty(E; m)$  to an operator on  $L^\infty(E; m)$  by

$$\begin{cases} Tf := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T(f\eta_n) & \text{for } f \in L_+^\infty(E; m), \\ Tf := Tf^+ - Tf^- & \text{for } f \in L^\infty(E; m). \end{cases}$$

Here  $L_+^\infty(E; m) = \{f \in L^\infty(E; m) : f \geq 0 \text{ } m\text{-a.e.}\}$  and  $f^+ := f \vee 0$ ,  $f^- := (-f) \vee 0$ . This extension is well-defined due to the Markov property

$$0 \leq Tf \leq 1 \text{ } m\text{-a.e., for all } f \in L^2(E; m) \text{ with } 0 \leq f \leq 1 \text{ } m\text{-a.e.}$$

of  $T$ , and is unique under the relation

$$\int f(Tg)dm = \int (Tf)gdm \quad \text{for all } f \in L^1(E; m) \cap L^\infty(E; m) \text{ and } g \in L^\infty(E; m).$$

**Step 2** (Extension to a  $L^1$  operator).

Since  $L^1(E; m) \cap L^\infty(E; m)$  is dense in  $L^1(E; m)$ , we can also extend the operator  $T$  on  $L^1(E; m) \cap L^\infty(E; m)$  to an operator on  $L^1(E; m)$ . It is easy to see that  $T : L^1(E; m) \rightarrow L^1(E; m)$  is positivity preserving, Markovian and contractive. By the Markov property of  $T$ , we can also see the following,

$$\int f(Tg)dm = \int (Tf)gdm \quad \text{for all } f \in L^1(E; m) \text{ and } g \in L^\infty(E; m).$$

**Step 3** (Extension to a  $L^p$  operator).

By the Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem, we can extend  $T$  to a bounded linear operator on  $L^p(E; m)$ , for any  $p \in (1, \infty)$ .

Next we show that the contraction property  $\|T\|_{p \rightarrow p} \leq 1$ . Let  $f \in L^p(E; m)$  and take  $E_n$  such that  $m(E_n) < \infty$ ,  $E_n \uparrow E$ . By Lemma 2.11 and the properties of the  $L^1$  operator  $T$ , we have

$$(T[f1_{E_n}](x))^p \leq (T[|f|1_{E_n}](x))^p$$

$$\leq T[|f|^p](x)(T[1_{E_n}^q](x))^{p/q} \leq T[|f|^p](x)$$

for a.e.  $x \in E$ . Taking integral and using the  $L^1$ -contractivity of  $T$ , we have

$$\|T[f1_{E_n}]\|_p^p \leq \|T[|f|^p]\|_1 \leq \|f\|_p^p.$$

Letting  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the dominate convergence theorem concludes  $\|T[f]\|_p \leq \|f\|_p$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.10.* By Proposition 2.9, we have already seen that each  $T_t$  can be extended to a contraction operator on  $L^p(E; m)$ , and hence it is sufficient to show the continuity in  $L^p$  with respect to  $t$ .

Fix  $p \in (1, \infty)$ ,  $f \in L^p(E; m)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $E$  is a Lusin space,  $L^p(E; m) \cap C_b(E)$  is dense in  $L^p(E; m)$ . Hence we can choose  $f_\varepsilon \in L^1(E; m) \cap L^\infty(E; m)$  such that  $\|f - f_\varepsilon\|_p < \varepsilon$ . Write

$$q := \begin{cases} 2p & \text{when } p \geq 2, \\ 1 & \text{when } p < 2, \end{cases}$$

and take  $\theta \in (0, 1]$  such that  $\frac{\theta}{2} + \frac{1-\theta}{q} = \frac{1}{p}$ . Then by Hölder's inequality and Proposition 2.9, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - T_t f\|_p &\leq \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_p + \|f_\varepsilon - T_t f_\varepsilon\|_p + \|T_t f_\varepsilon - T_t f\|_p \\ &\leq 2\|f - f_\varepsilon\|_p + \|f_\varepsilon - T_t f_\varepsilon\|_2^\theta \|f_\varepsilon - T_t f_\varepsilon\|_q^{1-\theta} \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon + \|f_\varepsilon - T_t f_\varepsilon\|_2^\theta (2\|f_\varepsilon\|_q)^{1-\theta} \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $\limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} \|f - T_t f\|_p \leq 2\varepsilon$ . Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  can be chosen arbitrary, we conclude  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \|f - T_t f\|_p = 0$ .  $\square$

#### 2.2.4 Permuted tensor product

In this subsection, we introduce a permuted tensor product of linear operators and discuss about them. Using this notation, we can simplify our proof of the main results.

Let  $\mathfrak{S}_k$  be the symmetric group of degree  $k$ . For bounded linear operators  $T_1, \dots, T_k$  on  $L^2(E; m)$  and for  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ , define two operators  $T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_k$  and  $T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes_\sigma T_k$  on  $L^2(E^k; m^{\otimes k})$  by

$$\begin{aligned} [T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_k](g_1 \otimes \dots \otimes g_k) &= T_1 g_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_k g_k, \\ [T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes_\sigma T_k](g_1 \otimes \dots \otimes g_k) &= T_1 g_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes T_k g_{\sigma(k)} \end{aligned}$$

for  $g_1, \dots, g_k \in L^2(E; m)$ . We say the operator  $T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes_\sigma T_k$  the permuted tensor product of  $T_1, \dots, T_k$  with respect to  $\sigma$ .

In particular, for two bounded linear operators  $S, T$  on  $L^2(E; m)$  and  $m \leq k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( [S^{\otimes m} \otimes_\sigma T^{\otimes(k-m)}](g_1 \otimes \dots \otimes g_k) \right)(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ &= S g_{\sigma(1)}(x_1) \cdots S g_{\sigma(m)}(x_m) \cdot T g_{\sigma(m+1)}(x_{m+1}) \cdots T g_{\sigma(k)}(x_k) \\ &= U_1 g_1(x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}) \cdots U_k g_k(x_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}) \\ &= ([U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_k](g_1 \otimes \dots \otimes g_k))(x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}), \end{aligned}$$

for  $g_1, \dots, g_k \in L^2(E; m)$ , where

$$U_j = \begin{cases} S & \text{when } \sigma^{-1}(j) \leq m, \\ T & \text{when } \sigma^{-1}(j) \geq m + 1, \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

and hence, for  $F \in L^2(E^k; m^{\otimes k})$ ,

$$\left( [S^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T^{\otimes(k-m)}] F \right) (x_1, \dots, x_k) = ([U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_k] F) (x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}).$$

Furthermore, if  $S$  and  $T$  have kernels  $s$  and  $t$  respectively, then by writing the kernel of  $U_j$  as  $u_j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( [S^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T^{\otimes(k-m)}] F \right) (x_1, \dots, x_k) &= ([U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_k] F) (x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}) \\ &= \int_{E^k} \prod_{i=1}^k u_i(x_{\sigma^{-1}(i)}, y_i) F(y_1, \dots, y_k) m(dy_1) \cdots m(dy_k) \\ &= \int_{E^k} \prod_{i=1}^m s(x_i, y_{\sigma(i)}) \prod_{i=m+1}^k t(x_i, y_{\sigma(i)}) F(y_1, \dots, y_k) m(dy_1) \cdots m(dy_k). \end{aligned}$$

### 2.2.5 Lemmas about nonnegative integer valued measures

In this subsection, we state some basic facts about nonnegative integer valued measures. From now on, denote  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  (resp.  $\mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$ ) as the set of nonnegative (resp. positive) integers.

The following lemma is used in the computation which yields (5.23) in Section 5.6.

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a finite set,  $\pi$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -valued measure on  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $f : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Write*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\leq \pi} := \left\{ \rho : \begin{array}{l} \rho \text{ is a } \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\text{-valued measure on } \mathcal{X} \\ \text{with } \rho(x) \leq \pi(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then, it holds that

$$\sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq \pi}} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(\pi(x), \rho(x)) = \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{s=0}^{\pi(x)} f(\pi(x), s).$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq \pi}} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(\pi(x), \rho(x)) &= \sum_{\substack{\{s_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}; \\ 0 \leq s_x \leq \pi(x) \\ \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{X}}} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(\pi(x), s_x) \\ &= \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left( \sum_{0 \leq s_x \leq \pi(x)} f(\pi(x), s_x) \right) = \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{s=0}^{\pi(x)} f(\pi(x), s). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following two lemmas are used in the proof of Lemma 2.16. They are obtained by easy inductions, so we omit the proofs.

**Lemma 2.13.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a finite set and  $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{X}$ ,  $m \leq n$ . For  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , we define measures*

$$\pi := \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{b_i}, \quad \pi_m := \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{b_i}, \quad \pi_m^{\sigma} := \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{b_{\sigma(i)}}.$$

Then, it holds that

$$\{\rho \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq \pi} : \rho(\mathcal{X}) = m\} = \{\pi_m^{\sigma}; \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}.$$

**Lemma 2.14.** Let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$  be finite sets and  $\{(a_i, b_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . For  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , we define measures on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$

$$\pi := \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(a_i, b_i)}, \quad \pi^\sigma := \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(a_i, b_{\sigma(i)})}$$

and measure on  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$

$$\pi_{\mathcal{X}} := \pi \circ (\text{proj}_{\mathcal{X}})^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{a_i}, \quad \pi_{\mathcal{Y}} := \pi \circ (\text{proj}_{\mathcal{Y}})^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{b_i}$$

respectively. Set

$$\mathcal{M}(\pi_{\mathcal{X}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Y}}) := \left\{ \rho : \begin{array}{l} \rho \text{ is a } \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\text{-valued measure on } \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \\ \text{with marginals } \pi_{\mathcal{X}} \text{ and } \pi_{\mathcal{Y}} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then, it holds that

$$\mathcal{M}(\pi_{\mathcal{X}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Y}}) = \{\pi^\sigma; \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}.$$

The next Lemma 2.15 is used only in the proof of Lemma 5.12.

**Lemma 2.15.** Suppose  $\mathcal{X}$  be a finite set. Let  $A$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -valued measure on  $\mathcal{X}^2$  with  $n := A(\mathcal{X}^2) < \infty$ . Fix  $x_{n+1} \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then, it holds that

$$\# \left\{ \{x_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathcal{X} \mid A = \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{(x_j, x_{j+1})} \right\} \leq k \cdot \frac{\prod_{l_1 \in \mathcal{X}} \bar{A}(l_1)!}{\prod_{l \in \mathcal{X}^2} A(l)!},$$

where  $\bar{A}$  is a measure on  $\mathcal{X}$  determined by  $\bar{A}(\cdot) := A(\cdot \times \mathcal{X})$ .

*Proof.* This can be proved by similar arguments as in Chapter II.2, p.17 of [dH00].  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $T$  be finite sets,  $S^*$  be a subset of  $T$  and  $p$  be a positive integer. For each  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , fix  $F'_i \subset T$  with  $\#S^* = \#F'_i$  and fix a disjoint partition  $\{S_1^*, S_2^*\}$  of  $S^*$ . Let  $A$  and  $r$  be  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -valued measures on  $\mathcal{X}^p$  satisfying  $A(\mathcal{X}^p) = \#S^*$ ,  $r(\mathcal{X}) = \#S_1^*$  and  $r(x) \leq A(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}^p$ . Let  $\{a_j^{(i)}\}_{j \in T} \subset \mathcal{X}$  and simply denote

$$a_j = \{a_j^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^p \in \mathcal{X}^p, \quad a_{\sigma(j)} = \{a_{\sigma(j)}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^p \in \mathcal{X}^p$$

for  $j \in S^*$ . Write

$$\Psi_p(A, r, a) := \left\{ \left( \sigma_i \right)_{i=1}^p \in \prod_{i=1}^p \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i) \mid A = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma(j)}}, \quad r = \sum_{j \in S_1^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma(j)}} \right\},$$

where for two sets  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ ,  $\text{Bij}(T_1, T_2)$  is the set of bijections from  $T_1$  to  $T_2$ .

The next lemma is used in the computation which yields (5.21) in Section 5.6.

**Lemma 2.16.** If  $\Psi_p(A, r, a) \neq \emptyset$ , then it holds that

$$\#\Psi_p(A, r, a) = \#S_1^*! \#S_2^*! \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{x^{(i)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_i(x^{(i)})!}{\prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}^p} A(x)!} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \binom{A(x)}{r(x)}.$$

The next corollary is given for the comparison with (3.35) in [KM13, Lemma 3.6]. It seems that  $\prod_{i=1}^p \#(W_i \setminus S^*)!$  is missing in (3.35).

**Corollary 2.17.** *Let  $F_i, W_i \subset T$  with  $S^* \subset W_i$  and  $\#W_i = \#F_i$ . We similarly define*

$$\tilde{\Psi}_p(A, r, a) := \left\{ (\sigma_i)_{i=1}^p \in \prod_{i=1}^p \text{Bij}(W_i, F_i) \mid A = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma(j)}}, \quad r = \sum_{j \in S_1^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma(j)}} \right\}.$$

If  $\tilde{\Psi}_p(A, r, a) \neq \emptyset$ , then it holds that

$$\#\tilde{\Psi}_p(A, r, a) = \#S_1^*! \#S_2^*! \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{x^{(i)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_i(x^{(i)})!}{\prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}^p} A(x)!} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \binom{A(x)}{r(x)} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \#(W_i \setminus S^*)!.$$

□

The following proof is the same as the proof of [KM13, Lemma 3.6].

*Proof of Lemma 2.16.*

**Case 1;  $p = 1$**

In this case, we have

$$\Psi_1(A, r, a) = \left\{ \sigma \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'); \quad A = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma(j)}}, \quad r = \sum_{j \in S_1^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma(j)}} \right\}.$$

First, fix  $\sigma \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F')$ . For  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , write  $I_x := \{j \in S^*; a_{\sigma(j)} = x\}$ , then  $\{I_x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  is a disjoint partition of  $S^*$ .

There are  $\#S_1^*!$  and  $\#S_2^*!$  permutations in  $S_1^*$  and  $S_2^*$ , respectively. Take  $\tau_1 \in \mathfrak{S}(S_1^*)$ ,  $\tau_2 \in \mathfrak{S}(S_2^*)$  and set  $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathfrak{S}(S^*)$ . For each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , there are  $\binom{A(x)}{r(x)}$  ways to decompose  $I_x$  into  $S_1^*$  and  $S_2^*$ . Take  $f \in \mathfrak{S}(S^*)$  with  $f(I_x) = I_x$  for all  $x$ . Then we find that  $\sigma \circ f \circ \tau \in \Psi_1(A, r, a)$ . Except for the duplication, we obtain  $\#S_1^*! \#S_1^*! \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \binom{A(x)}{r(x)}$  many elements of  $\Psi_1(A, r, a)$  of the form  $\sigma \circ f \circ \tau$ . Hence

$$\#\Psi_1(A, r, a) \leq \#S_1^*! \#S_1^*! \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \binom{A(x)}{r(x)}.$$

For the converse inequality, fix  $\sigma \in \Psi_1(A, r, a)$ . Then clearly we can decompose  $\sigma$  as the above form, and hence

$$\#\Psi_1(A, r, a) \geq \#S_1^*! \#S_1^*! \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \binom{A(x)}{r(x)}.$$

**Case 2;  $p = 2$**

We define the marginals of measures

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(\cdot) &:= A(\cdot \times \mathcal{X}), & r_1(\cdot) &:= r(\cdot \times \mathcal{X}), \\ A_2(\cdot) &:= A(\mathcal{X} \times \cdot), & r_2(\cdot) &:= r(\mathcal{X} \times \cdot), \end{aligned}$$

and write

$$\Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)}) := \left\{ \sigma_1 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'); \quad A_1 = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(i)}}, \quad r = \sum_{j \in S_1^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(i)}} \right\}.$$

We claim that

$$H := \left\{ \sigma_1 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F_1'); \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{there exists } \sigma_2 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F_2'), \\ \text{such that } (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Psi_2(A, r, a) \end{array} \right\} = \Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)}). \quad (2.7)$$



We first prove  $H \subset \Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)})$ . Fix  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  as in  $H$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(x^{(1)}) &= \sum_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} A(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) \\ &= \sum_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} \#\{j \in S^*; \quad x^{(1)} = a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(1)}, x^{(2)} = a_{\sigma_2(j)}^{(2)}\} \\ &= \#\{j \in S^*; \quad x^{(1)} = a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(1)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the same way, we obtain the similar equality about  $r_1$ .

We next prove  $H \supset \Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)})$ . Fix  $\sigma_1 \in \Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)})$ . Since  $\Psi_2(A, r, a) \neq \emptyset$ , we can choose  $\sigma_2 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_2)$  such that

$$A_2 = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma_2(j)}^{(2)}}.$$

By the definition of  $\Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)})$ , we have

$$A_1 = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(1)}}, \quad r_1 = \sum_{j \in S_1^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(1)}}.$$

First, there exists a permutation (see Lemma 2.13)  $\tau_1 \in \mathfrak{S}(S^*)$  such that

$$A_2 = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma_2 \circ \tau_1(j)}^{(2)}}, \quad r_2 = \sum_{j \in S_1^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma_2 \circ \tau_1(j)}^{(2)}}.$$

Second, there exists a permutation (see Lemma 2.14)  $\tau'_2 \in \mathfrak{S}(S_1^*)$  such that

$$r_1 = \sum_{j \in S_1^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(1)}}, \quad r_2 = \sum_{j \in S_1^*} \delta_{a_{\sigma_2 \circ \tau_1 \circ \tau'_2(j)}^{(2)}}, \quad r = \sum_{j \in S_1^*} \delta_{(a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(1)}, a_{\sigma_2 \circ \tau_1 \circ \tau'_2(j)}^{(2)})}.$$

Similarly, we can take a permutation  $\tau''_2 \in \mathfrak{S}(S_2^*)$  which have the same property as  $\tau'_2$ . Finally, we find that  $\tilde{\sigma}_2 := \sigma_2 \circ \tau_1 \circ (\tau'_2, \tau''_2) \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_2)$  is a required bijection.

By the above claim, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \#\Psi_2(A, r, a) &= \sum_{\sigma_1 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_1)} \#\{\sigma_2 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_2); \quad (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Psi_2(A, r, a)\} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma_1 \in \Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)})} \#\{\sigma_2 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_2); \quad (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Psi_2(A, r, a)\}. \end{aligned}$$

From now on, fix  $\sigma_1 \in \Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)})$  and we will calculate  $\#\{\sigma_2 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_2); (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Psi_2(A, r, a)\}$ .

First, we construct such  $\sigma_2$ 's. For each  $x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}$ , take a disjoint partition  $\{D, \bar{D}\}$  of  $\{j \in S^*; a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(1)} = x^{(1)}\}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \{j \in S_1^*; a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(1)} = x^{(1)}\} &= \bigcup_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} D(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}), \quad \#D(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) = r(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}), \\ \{j \in S_2^*; a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(1)} = x^{(1)}\} &= \bigcup_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} \bar{D}(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}), \quad \#\bar{D}(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) = A(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) - r(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}). \end{aligned}$$

There are

$$\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} \left( \frac{r_1(x^{(1)})!}{\prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} r(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})!} \frac{(A - r)_1(x^{(1)})!}{\prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} (A - r)(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})!} \right)$$

ways to choose the couple  $\{D, \overline{D}\}$ . Note that for  $x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\#\left\{ \bigcup_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} (D(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) \cup \overline{D}(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})) \right\} = A_2(x^{(2)}).$$

For fixed  $\{D, \overline{D}\}$ , take  $\sigma_2 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_2)$  such that

$$\{j \in S^*; a_{\sigma_2(j)}^{(2)} = x^{(2)}\} = \bigcup_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} (D(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) \cup \overline{D}(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})) \quad \text{for all } x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

There are  $\prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_2(x^{(2)})!$  ways to choose such  $\sigma_2$ . Then we have  $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Psi_2(A, r, a)$ . Indeed, we can find that for  $(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) \in \mathcal{X}^2$ ,

$$\{j \in S_1^*; a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(i)} = x^{(i)} \text{ for } i = 1, 2\} = \bigcap_{i=1,2} \{j \in S_1^*; a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(i)} = x^{(i)}\} = D(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}).$$

Similarly we can find that  $\{j \in S_2^*; a_{\sigma_2(j)}^{(i)} = x^{(i)} \text{ for } i = 1, 2\} = \overline{D}(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})$ . Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \#\{\sigma_2 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_2); (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Psi_2(A, r, a)\} \\ & \geq \prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} \left( \frac{r_1(x^{(1)})!}{\prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} r(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})!} \frac{(A-r)_1(x^{(1)})!}{\prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} (A-r)(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})!} \right) \prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_2(x^{(2)})!. \end{aligned}$$

We can show the converse of the above inequality. Indeed, for  $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Psi_2(A, r, a)$ , write

$$\begin{aligned} D(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) & := \{j \in S_1^*; a_{\sigma_1(j)}^{(i)} = x^{(i)} \text{ for } i = 1, 2\} \\ \overline{D}(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}) & := \{j \in S_2^*; a_{\sigma_2(j)}^{(i)} = x^{(i)} \text{ for } i = 1, 2\} \end{aligned}$$

and obtain the same partition.

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \#\Psi_2(A, r, a) \\ & = \sum_{\sigma_1 \in \Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)})} \#\{\sigma_2 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_2); (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \Psi_2(A, r, a)\} \\ & = \#\Psi_1(A_1, r_1, a^{(1)}) \prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} \left( \frac{r_1(x^{(1)})!}{\prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} r(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})!} \frac{(A-r)_1(x^{(1)})!}{\prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} (A-r)(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})!} \right) \prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_2(x^{(2)})! \\ & = m_1! m_3! \frac{\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_1(x^{(1)})!}{\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} r_1(x^{(1)})! \prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} (A_1 - r_1)(x^{(1)})!} \\ & \quad \frac{\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} r_1(x^{(1)})!}{\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} \prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} r(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})!} \frac{\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} (A-r)_1(x^{(1)})!}{\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} \prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} (A-r)(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})!} \prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_2(x^{(2)})! \\ & = m_1! m_3! \frac{\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_1(x^{(1)})! \prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_2(x^{(2)})!}{\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} \prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} r(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})! \prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} \prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} (A-r)(x^{(1)}, x^{(2)})!} \\ & = m_1! m_3! \frac{\prod_{x^{(1)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_1(x^{(1)})! \prod_{x^{(2)} \in \mathcal{X}} A_2(x^{(2)})!}{\prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}^2} A(x)!} \prod_{x \in \mathcal{X}^2} \binom{A(x)}{r(x)}. \end{aligned}$$

We can prove inductively for the case  $p \geq 3$ . □

### 3 Proof of Proposition 1.5

In this section, we give the proof of Proposition 1.5. The following proof is given by the same strategy as the proof of [Che10, Theorem 2.2.3].

In the following, we abbreviate the measure  $m(dx)$  just as  $dx$ .

Note that  $\{t < \zeta^{(i)}\} = \{X_t^{(i)} \in E\}$ . For  $f \in C_b(E)$ , we recall that

$$\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle = \int_E f(x) \left[ \int_{[0, t]^p} \prod_{i=1}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}(X^{(i)}(s_i), x) ds_1 \cdots ds_p \right] m(dx).$$

For each  $i$ , define

$$H_t^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_k) := \int_{[0, t]^k} \int_E 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) dx_{k+1} dr_1 \cdots dr_k, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $r_{k+1} = t - \sum_{j=1}^k r_j$ . Then we find that  $H_t^{(i)} \in L^p(E^k)$ . Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{E^k} \left[ \int_{[0, t]^k} \int_E 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) dx_{k+1} dr_1 \cdots dr_k \right]^p dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\ & \leq \int_{E^k} \left[ \int_{[0, t]^k} 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \prod_{j=1}^k p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) dr_1 \cdots dr_k \right]^p dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\ & \leq e^{pt} \int_{E^k} \left[ \int_{[0, t]^k} 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \prod_{j=1}^k e^{-r_j} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) dr_1 \cdots dr_k \right]^p dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\ & \leq e^{pt} \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_1^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right]^k \\ & < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.9, we have for  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ [T_\varepsilon^{(i)} \otimes \cdots \otimes_{\sigma_i} T_\varepsilon^{(i)}] H_t^{(i)} \right] dm^{\otimes k} & \leq \|f\|_\infty^k \prod_{i=1}^p \|[T_\varepsilon^{(i)} \otimes \cdots \otimes_{\sigma_i} T_\varepsilon^{(i)}] H_t^{(i)}\|_{L^p(E^k)} \\ & \leq \|f\|_\infty^k \prod_{i=1}^p \|H_t^{(i)}\|_{L^p(E^k)} < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Next, we denote

$$[0, t]_{<}^k := \{(s_1, \dots, s_k) \in [0, t]^k : s_1 < \dots < s_k\} \quad (3.3)$$

and we regard  $s_0 = 0$ ,  $s_{k+1} = t$  and  $\sigma(0) = 0$ ,  $\sigma(k+1) = k+1$  for  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^k; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^k; X^{(i)}(t) \in E \text{ for all } i] \\ & = \int_{E^k} \prod_{l=1}^k f(x_l) \prod_{i=1}^p \left\{ \int_{[0, t]^k} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^k p_\varepsilon^{(i)}(X^{(i)}(s_j), x_j); X^{(i)}(t) \in E \right] ds_1 \cdots ds_k \right\} dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\ & = \int_{E^k} \prod_{l=1}^k f(x_l) \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \int_{E^{k+1}} \left( \prod_{j=1}^k p_\varepsilon^{(i)}(z_j, x_j) \right) \left( \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} \int_{[0, t]_{<}^k} \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} p_{s_j - s_{j-1}}^{(i)}(z_{\sigma(j-1)}, z_{\sigma(j)}) ds_1 \cdots ds_k \right) \right. \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. dz_1 \cdots dz_{k+1} \right] dx_1 \cdots dx_k \\ & = \int_{E^k} \prod_{l=1}^k f(x_l) \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \int_{E^k} \left( \prod_{j=1}^k p_\varepsilon^{(i)}(z_j, x_j) \right) \left( \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} H_t^{(i)}(z_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, z_{\sigma^{-1}(k)}) \right) dz_1 \cdots dz_k \right] dx_1 \cdots dx_k \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} [T_\varepsilon^{(i)} \otimes \cdots \otimes T_\varepsilon^{(i)}] H_t^{(i)} \right] dm^{\otimes k} \\
&\rightarrow \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} [\text{id} \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{id}] H_t^{(i)} \right] dm^{\otimes k} \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

By a similar argument of (3.4), we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{x_0} [|\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon',t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle|^2; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\
&= \int_{E^2} f^{\otimes 2} \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_2} [T_\varepsilon^{(i)} \otimes T_\varepsilon^{(i)}] H_t^{(i)} \right] dm^{\otimes 2} + \int_{E^2} f^{\otimes 2} \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_2} [T_{\varepsilon'}^{(i)} \otimes T_{\varepsilon'}^{(i)}] H_t^{(i)} \right] dm^{\otimes 2} \\
&\quad - 2 \int_{E^2} f^{\otimes 2} \prod_{j=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_2} [T_\varepsilon^{(i)} \otimes T_{\varepsilon'}^{(i)}] H_t^{(i)} \right] dm^{\otimes 2}
\end{aligned}$$

and this converges to zero as  $\varepsilon$  and  $\varepsilon'$  tend to zero. Hence we have shown that  $\{\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle\}_\varepsilon$  is Cauchy in  $L^k(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t)$ , for  $k = 2$ . By using Hölder's inequality and (3.2), the case  $k \neq 2$  is derived from the case  $k = 2$ . We thus obtain for all  $k$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [|\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon',t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle|^k] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon, \varepsilon' \downarrow 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Next, we will show the existence of the vague limit. Recall that one can choose a subset  $\{f_n\}_n$  of  $C_K^+(E)$  such that

$$d_{\{f_n\}}(\mu, \nu) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \{|\langle \mu, f_n \rangle - \langle \nu, f_n \rangle| \wedge 1\} \quad \text{for } \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(E) \tag{3.6}$$

metrizes the vague topology of  $\mathcal{M}(E)$ , the space of Radon measures on  $E$ . (See Section 15.7 of [Kal83] for example.) In the following, we fix such  $\{f_n\}$  and simply denote  $d = d_{\{f_n\}}$ .

By (3.5), we can find that  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [d(\ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}, \ell_{\varepsilon',t}^{\text{IS}})] \rightarrow 0$  as  $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' \rightarrow 0$ . Take a sequence  $\varepsilon_l \downarrow 0$  such that  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t(d(\ell_{\varepsilon_l,t}^{\text{IS}}, \ell_{\varepsilon_{l+1},t}^{\text{IS}}) > 2^{-l}) < 2^{-l}$  for all  $l$ . Since  $(\mathcal{M}(E), d)$  is a complete metric space, there exists a random measure  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}} \in \mathcal{M}(E)$  such that

$$d(\ell_{\varepsilon_l,t}^{\text{IS}}, \ell_t^{\text{IS}}) \rightarrow 0; \quad \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t \text{-a.e., as } l \rightarrow \infty. \tag{3.7}$$

In particular,  $\ell_{\varepsilon_l,t}^{\text{IS}}$  converges to  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$  as  $l \rightarrow \infty$  in distribution.

Now we can find that the limit  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$  is independent of the choice of the sequence  $\varepsilon_l$ . Indeed, for a given  $f \in C_K^+(E)$  and a bounded Lipschitz function  $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have by (3.5),

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t G(\langle \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle) - \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t G(\langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle)| \\
&\leq \text{Lip}(G) \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t |\langle \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle| + |\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t G(\langle \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle) - \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t G(\langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle)| \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

and hence  $\ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}$  converges to  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$  in distribution. Here, we used the fact that a sequence of random measures  $\{\xi_n\}$  converges in distribution, if and only if, the sequence of the integral  $\{\langle f, \xi_n \rangle\}$  converges in distribution, for any function  $f$  of  $C_K^+(E)$ . (See for example [Kal02, Theorem 16.16].)

To show the finiteness of  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$ , take  $g_n \in C_K^+(E)$  with  $g_n \uparrow 1_E$ . We regard  $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [\langle \cdot, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle]$  as a Radon measure on  $E$ . By combining Fatou's lemma with (3.2) and (3.4), we have

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [\langle 1_E, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [\langle g_n, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle] \leq \prod_{i=1}^p \|H_t^{(i)}\|_{L^p(E)} \cdot \mathbb{P}_t(t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)})^{-1} < \infty.$$

Finally, to prove the second half of the claim, fix  $f \in C_K^+(E)$ . By (3.7), we can take a sequence  $\varepsilon_l \downarrow 0$  such that  $\langle \ell_{\varepsilon_l,t}^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle$  converges to  $\langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle$  for  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ -a.e., as  $l \rightarrow \infty$ . By combining

Fatou's lemma with (3.2) and (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle^{2k}] &\leq \liminf_{l \rightarrow \infty} \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon_l, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^{2k}] \\ &\leq \sup_l \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon_l, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^{2k}] \leq \|f\|_\infty^{2k} \prod_{i=1}^p \|H_t^{(i)}\|_{L^p(E^{2k})} \cdot \mathbb{P}_t(t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

These inequalities imply the uniform integrability of  $\{|\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon_l, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle|^k\}$  and hence  $\langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon_l, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle$  converges to  $\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle$  in  $L^k(\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_t)$ . Therefore, by combining with (3.5), we conclude (1.13).  $\square$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.7

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1.7, assuming Proposition 4.3. Our proof is based on the proofs in Section 2.2, [KM13].

First, recall that each  $t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)}$  satisfies the large deviation principle as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , with probability  $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function  $J^{(i)}$  (Theorem 2.7). For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , define the continuous mappings  $p_\varepsilon^{(i)} : \mathcal{M}_1(E) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $\Phi : (\mathcal{M}_1(E))^p \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E))^p$  by

$$\langle f, p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu] \rangle = \int_E f(x) \left[ \int_E p_\varepsilon^{(i)}(x, y) \mu(dy) \right] m(dx) \quad \text{for } \mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E), f \in C_b(E),$$

$$\Phi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) := \left( \left( \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{dp_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i]}{dm} \right) dm; p_\varepsilon^{(1)}[\mu_1], \dots, p_\varepsilon^{(p)}[\mu_p] \right) \quad \text{for } (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in (\mathcal{M}_1(E))^p.$$

By the contraction principle (Theorem 2.3), we find that the tuple  $(t^{-p}\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}}; t^{-1}\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{(1)}, \dots, t^{-1}\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{(p)})$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , with probability  $\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function  $\mathbf{J}_\varepsilon$  which is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{J}_\varepsilon(\nu; \nu_1, \dots, \nu_p) \\ &:= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p J^{(i)}(\mu_i); (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in (\mathcal{M}_1(E))^p, \Phi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) = (\nu; \nu_1, \dots, \nu_p) \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p J^{(i)}(\mu_i); \mu_i \in \mathcal{M}_1(E), p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i] = \nu_i, \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{dp_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i]}{dm} = \frac{d\nu}{dm} \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p \{ \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i, \psi_i) - \lambda_1^{(i)} \}; \mu_i \in \mathcal{M}_1(E), p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i] = \nu_i, \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{dp_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i]}{dm} = \frac{d\nu}{dm}, \psi_i = \sqrt{\frac{d\mu_i}{dm}} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for  $(\nu; \nu_1, \dots, \nu_p) \in \mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E))^p$ .

Until the end of this section, we fix the same  $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset C_K^+(E)$  as in (3.6), and define a metric  $\mathbf{d}$  on the product space  $\mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E))^p$  as

$$\mathbf{d}((\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p), (\nu; \nu_1, \dots, \nu_p)) := d(\mu, \nu) + \sum_{i=1}^p d(\mu_i, \nu_i).$$

We denote  $\mathbf{B}_\delta$  as the open ball of radius  $\delta > 0$  in  $\mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E))^p$  with respect to the metric  $\mathbf{d}$ , and denote  $B_\delta$  as the open ball of radius  $\delta > 0$  in  $\mathcal{M}_f(E)$  or  $\mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E)$  with respect to the metric  $d$ .

Fix  $\delta > 0$ . We have

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{P}}_t \left( \mathbf{d}((t^{-p}\ell_t^{\text{IS}}, t^{-1}\ell_t^{(1)}, \dots, t^{-1}\ell_t^{(p)}), (t^{-p}\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}}, t^{-1}\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{(1)}, \dots, t^{-1}\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{(p)})) > (p+1)\delta \right)$$

$$\leq \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t (d(t^{-p}\ell_t^{\text{IS}}, t^{-p}\ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}) > \delta) + \sum_{i=1}^p \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t (d(t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)}, t^{-1}\ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{(i)}) > \delta).$$

In order to prove Theorem 1.7, it is sufficient to show the following Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.2. (See [DZ98, Theorem 4.2.16] for instance.)

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{J}$  be as in (1.14). The following three statements hold:*

1. *For every  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_f(E)$  and  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$ , it holds that*

$$\sup_{\delta > 0} \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{\mathbf{B}_\delta(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)} \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon = \mathbf{J}(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p). \quad (4.1)$$

2. *For any closed set  $F \subset \mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E))^p$ , it holds that*

$$\inf_{(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in F} \mathbf{J}(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in F} \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p). \quad (4.2)$$

3.  *$\mathbf{J}$  is a good rate function on  $\mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_1(E))^p$ .*

**Lemma 4.2.**

1. *For each  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and for any  $\delta > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t (d(t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)}, t^{-1}\ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{(i)}) > \delta) = -\infty.$$

2. *For given  $f \in C_K(E)$  and  $\delta > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t (|\langle t^{-p}(\ell_t^{\text{IS}} - \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}), f \rangle| > \delta) = -\infty. \quad (4.3)$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.1.* We first prove the upper bound of (4.1). Let  $(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in \mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E))^p$  with  $\mathbf{J}(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) < \infty$  be given. Take  $\psi_i \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  such that  $\psi_i = \sqrt{\frac{d\mu_i}{dm}} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  and  $\prod_{i=1}^p \psi_i^2 = \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{d\mu_i}{dm} = \frac{d\mu}{dm}$ . Fix  $\delta > 0$  and take  $\varepsilon > 0$  so small such that  $p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i]dm \in B_{\delta/2}(\mu_i)$  and that  $(\prod_{i=1}^p \frac{p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i]}{dm})dm \in B_{\delta/2p}(\mu)$ . This is possible, indeed, because of the inclusion  $\mathcal{F}^{(i)} \subset L^2(E; m) \cap L^{2p}(E; m)$  (assertion 3 of Lemma 2.1) and Proposition 2.10, we have for fixed  $f \in C_K(E)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i] \rangle - \langle f, \mu_i \rangle| &= |\langle f, p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2]dm \rangle - \langle f, \psi_i^2dm \rangle| \\ &\leq \|f\|_q \cdot \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] - \psi_i^2\|_p \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality and the  $L^p$ -contractivity of  $p_\varepsilon^{(i)}$  (Proposition 2.10), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \prod_{i=1}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] - \prod_{i=1}^p \psi_i^2 \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \left\| \prod_{i=1}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] - \psi_1^2 \prod_{i=2}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] \right\|_1 + \left\| \psi_1^2 \prod_{i=2}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] - \psi_1^2 \psi_2^2 \prod_{i=3}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] \right\|_1 + \dots \\ & \quad \dots + \left\| \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} \psi_i^2 p_\varepsilon^{(p)}[\psi_p^2] - \prod_{i=1}^p \psi_i^2 \right\|_1 \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \left( \prod_{l < i} \|\psi_l^2\|_p \cdot \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] - \psi_i^2\|_p \cdot \prod_{l > i} \|p_\varepsilon^{(l)}[\psi_l^2]\|_p \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \left( \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] - \psi_i^2\|_p \prod_{l \neq i} \|\psi_l^2\|_{2p} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$



Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \left\langle f, \left( \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{dp_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i]}{dm} \right) \right\rangle - \langle f, \mu \rangle \right| &= \left| \left\langle f, \prod_{i=1}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] dm \right\rangle - \left\langle f, \prod_{i=1}^p \psi_i^2 dm \right\rangle \right| \\
&\leq \|f\|_\infty \cdot \left\| \prod_{i=1}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] - \prod_{i=1}^p \psi_i^2 \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \|f\|_\infty \cdot \sum_{i=1}^p \left( \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_i^2] - \psi_i^2\|_p \prod_{l \neq i} \|\psi_l\|_{2p}^2 \right) \\
&\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

We thus obtain  $\left( \left( \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i]}{dm} \right) dm; p_\varepsilon^{(1)}[\mu_1] dm, \dots, p_\varepsilon^{(p)}[\mu_p] dm \right) \in B_\delta(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)$  and conclude

$$\inf_{\mathbf{B}_\delta(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)} \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon \left( \left( \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu_i]}{dm} \right) dm; p_\varepsilon^{(1)}[\mu_1] dm, \dots, p_\varepsilon^{(p)}[\mu_p] dm \right) \leq \mathbf{J}(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p).$$

We next prove the lower bound of (4.1). Let  $(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in \mathcal{M}_f(E) \times (\mathcal{M}_1(E))^p$  be given. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\sup_{\delta > 0} \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{\mathbf{B}_\delta(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)} \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon < \infty$ .

For  $\delta > 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we pick  $(\nu^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}; \nu_1^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \dots, \nu_p^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) \in \mathbf{B}_\delta(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)$  such that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{B}_\delta(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)} \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon \geq \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon(\nu^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}; \nu_1^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \dots, \nu_p^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) - \delta. \quad (4.5)$$

By the definition of  $\mathbf{J}_\varepsilon$ , there are nonnegative,  $L^2$ -normalized  $\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  such that  $\frac{d\nu_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}}{dm} = p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)})^2]$ ,  $\frac{d\nu^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}}{dm} = \prod_{i=1}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)})^2]$  and  $\mathbf{J}_\varepsilon(\nu^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}; \nu_1^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \dots, \nu_p^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^p \{\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) - \lambda_1^{(i)}\} - \varepsilon$ . In particular,  $\{\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}\}_\varepsilon$  is bounded in  $(\mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}^{(i)}})$ . By taking a subsequence, there exists  $\psi_i^{(\delta)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  with  $\|\psi_i^{(\delta)}\|_2 = 1$ , such that  $\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}$  converges to  $\psi_i^{(\delta)}$ , as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and in  $L^2(E; m)$  and  $L^{2p}(E; m)$  and that  $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) \geq \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta)}, \psi_i^{(\delta)})$ , where we used (2.5) in Lemma 2.1. By taking  $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$  to (4.5), we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf_{\mathbf{B}_\delta} \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon \geq \sum_{i=1}^p \{\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta)}, \psi_i^{(\delta)}) - \lambda_1^{(i)}\} - \delta. \quad (4.6)$$

Now, we can see that

$$\nu_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)} \rightarrow \mu_i^{(\delta)} := (\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2 dm \quad \text{vaguely in } \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E), \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

because, for fixed  $f \in C_K(E)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \langle f, \nu_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)} \rangle - \langle f, \mu_i^{(\delta)} \rangle \right| &= \left| \langle f, p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)})^2] \rangle - \langle f, (\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2 \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \left| \langle f, p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)})^2] \rangle - \langle f, p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[(\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2] \rangle \right| + \left| \langle f, p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[(\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2] \rangle - \langle f, (\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2 \rangle \right| \\
&\leq \|f\|_q \cdot \|(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)})^2 - (\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2\|_p + \|f\|_q \cdot \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[(\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2] - (\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2\|_p \\
&\rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have  $\mu_i^{(\delta)} \in B_\delta(\mu_i)$ . Similarly we can obtain  $\mu^{(\delta)} \in B_\delta(\mu)$ .

Now we let  $\delta \downarrow 0$  and by taking a subsequence of  $\psi_i^{(\delta)}$ , there exists  $\psi_i \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  such that  $\psi_i^{(\delta)} \rightarrow \psi_i$  in  $L^2(E; m)$  and  $L^{2p}(E; m)$  and

$$\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta)}, \psi_i^{(\delta)}) \geq \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i, \psi_i), \quad (4.7)$$

where we used again (2.5) in Lemma 2.1.

Since  $\mu_i^{(\delta)} \in B_\delta(\mu_i)$ , we have for fixed  $f \in C_K(E)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle f, \psi_i^2 \rangle - \langle f, \mu_i \rangle| &\leq |\langle f, \psi_i^2 \rangle - \langle f, (\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2 \rangle| + |\langle f, \mu_i^{(\delta)} \rangle - \langle f, \mu_i \rangle| \\ &\leq \|f\|_q \cdot \|\psi_i^2 - (\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2\|_p + C\delta \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \delta \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\psi_i^2$  must be a density of  $\mu_i$ , and similarly,  $\prod_{i=1}^p \psi_i^2$  must be a density of  $\mu$ .

Therefore, by the definition of  $\mathbf{J}$  and (4.7), we have

$$\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^p \{\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta)}, \psi_i^{(\delta)}) - \lambda_1^{(i)}\} \geq \mathbf{J}(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p).$$

Combining this with (4.6), we obtain (4.1).

We next prove (4.2). Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\sup_{\varepsilon < \varepsilon'} \inf_{(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in F} \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon < \infty$  for some  $\varepsilon' > 0$ .

We repeat the argument as in the proof of the upper bound of (4.1). For  $\delta > 0$  and  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'$ , we pick  $(\nu^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}; \nu_1^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \dots, \nu_p^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) \in F$  such that

$$\inf_{(\mu; \mu_1, \dots, \mu_p) \in F} \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon \geq \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon(\nu^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}; \nu_1^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \dots, \nu_p^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) - \delta. \quad (4.8)$$

By the definition of  $\mathbf{J}_\varepsilon$ , there are nonnegative,  $L^2$ -normalized  $\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, p$  such that  $\frac{d\nu_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}}{dm} = p_\varepsilon^{(i)} [(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)})^2]$ ,  $\frac{d\nu^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}}{dm} = \prod_{i=1}^p p_\varepsilon^{(i)} [(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)})^2]$  and  $\mathbf{J}_\varepsilon(\nu^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}; \nu_1^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \dots, \nu_p^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^p \{\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) - \lambda_1^{(i)}\} - \varepsilon$ . In particular,  $\{\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}\}_\varepsilon$  is bounded in  $(\mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{E}^{(i)}})$ .

Then, by taking further subsequences, there exists  $\psi_i^{(\delta)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  such that  $\|\psi_i^{(\delta)}\|_2 = 1$ ,  $\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)} \rightarrow \psi_i^{(\delta)}$  in  $L^2(E; m)$  and  $L^{2p}(E; m)$  and that  $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \psi_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) \geq \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta)}, \psi_i^{(\delta)})$ , where we used (2.5) in Lemma 2.1. By taking  $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$  to (4.8), we have

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf_F \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon \geq \sum_{i=1}^p \{\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta)}, \psi_i^{(\delta)}) - \lambda_1^{(i)}\} - \delta. \quad (4.9)$$

Since

$$\nu_i^{(\delta, \varepsilon)} \rightarrow \mu_i^{(\delta)} := (\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2 dm \quad \text{vaguely in } \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E), \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\nu^{(\delta, \varepsilon)} \rightarrow \mu^{(\delta)} := \prod_{i=1}^p (\psi_i^{(\delta)})^2 dm \quad \text{vaguely in } \mathcal{M}_f(E), \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

we have  $(\mu^{(\delta)}; \mu_1^{(\delta)}, \dots, \mu_p^{(\delta)}) \in F$ . Hence (4.9) implies that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf_F \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon \geq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf_F \mathbf{J}_\varepsilon \geq \sum_{i=1}^p \{\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_i^{(\delta)}, \psi_i^{(\delta)}) - \lambda_1^{(i)}\} - \delta \geq \inf_F \mathbf{J} - \delta.$$

Letting  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , we obtain (4.2).

Finally we will prove 3. Fix  $a \geq 0$ . Let  $\{(\mu_n; \mu_n^{(1)}, \dots, \mu_n^{(p)})\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset \{\mathbf{J} \leq a\}$  and write  $\psi_n^{(i)} = \sqrt{\frac{d\mu_n^{(i)}}{dm}} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  and  $\frac{d\mu_n}{dm} = \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{d\mu_n^{(i)}}{dm}$ . We find that each  $\{\psi_n^{(i)}\}_n$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{F}^{(i)}$ . By (2.5), we may assume that  $\{\psi_n^{(i)}\}_n$  converges in  $L^2$  and  $L^{2p}$  to some  $\psi^{(i)} \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$ . Then, since  $\mathcal{F}^{(i)} \subset L^2 \cap L^{2p}$ , we have  $\mu_n^{(i)} \rightarrow \mu^{(i)} := (\psi^{(i)})^2 dm$  and  $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu := (\prod_{i=1}^p \frac{d\mu^{(i)}}{dm}) dm$  with respect to the metric  $d$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence  $\mathbf{J}$  is a good rate function.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.2.* We first prove 1. Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and for each  $f \in C_K(E)$ , we write  $f_\varepsilon := p_\varepsilon[f]$ . Then we have

$$\langle f, t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)} \rangle - \langle f, t^{-1}\ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{(i)} \rangle = \langle (f - p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[f]), t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)} \rangle = \langle (f - f_\varepsilon), t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)} \rangle.$$

By the contraction principle (Theorem 2.3), we can find that  $\langle (f - f_\varepsilon), t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)} \rangle$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , with probability  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function  $J_{(f-f_\varepsilon)}^{(i)}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} J_{(f-f_\varepsilon)}^{(i)}(a) &:= \inf \{ J^{(i)}(\mu); \mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E), \langle (f - f_\varepsilon), \mu \rangle = a \} \\ &= \inf_{\substack{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1; \\ \langle (f-f_\varepsilon), \psi \rangle = a}} \left\{ \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) - \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ . Hence, for  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\inf_{|a|>\delta} J_{(f-f_\varepsilon)}^{(i)}(a) = \inf_{\substack{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1; \\ |\langle (f-f_\varepsilon), \psi \rangle| > \delta}} \left\{ \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) - \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}.$$

Now we will show that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf_{|a|>\delta} J_{(f-f_\varepsilon)}^{(i)}(a) = \infty. \quad (4.10)$$

Indeed, for each  $\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  with  $\|\psi\|_2 = 1$  and  $|\langle (f - f_\varepsilon), \psi \rangle| > \delta$ , applying (2.3) with  $\delta = 1$  and we have

$$\delta < \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_q \|\psi\|_p \leq \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_q (C_1 + 1 \cdot \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi)),$$

where  $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$ . Taking infimum over such  $\psi$ , we have

$$\delta \leq \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_q (C_1 + \inf_{|a|>\delta} J_{(f-f_\varepsilon)}^{(i)}(a) + \lambda_1^{(i)}).$$

By Proposition 2.10, we have  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_q = 0$  and therefore (4.10) follows.

We have by the LDP,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t (|\langle (t^{-1}\ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{(i)} - t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)}), f \rangle| > \delta) &= \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t (|\langle t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)}, (f - f_\varepsilon) \rangle| > \delta) \\ &\leq - \inf_{|a|>\delta} J_{(f-f_\varepsilon)}^{(i)}(a). \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  and the conclusion follows from (4.10).

We next prove 2. Assume Proposition 4.3 holds. Fix  $\delta > 0$  and  $\eta > 0$ . Take  $C(\varepsilon)$  as in Proposition 4.3. By writing  $k = \lceil t \rceil$ , we have for  $t, \varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_{x_0} (|\langle t^{-p}(\ell_t^{\text{IS}} - \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}), f \rangle| > \delta; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}) \\ &\leq \delta^{-k} t^{-pk} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ \left| \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}} - \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle \right|^k; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)} \right] \\ &\leq \delta^{-k} t^{-pk} \cdot (k!)^p e^{pt} C(\varepsilon)^k \\ &\leq \delta^{-k} (t^{-1}k)^{kp} e^{pt} C(\varepsilon)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_{x_0} (|\langle t^{-p}(\ell_t^{\text{IS}} - \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}), f \rangle| > \delta; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}) \leq -\log \delta + p + \log C(\varepsilon)$$

and consequently, (4.3) follows because of

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{P}_{x_0} (t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}) = - \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_1^{(i)},$$

which is proved in [FOT11, Corollary 6.4.2].  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3** (Exponential approximation). *Suppose each  $X^{(i)}$  satisfies Assumption **(A)**;  $\rho^{(i)}, \mu^{(i)}, t_0, C$ . Then for each  $f \in C_K(E)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists positive constant  $C(\varepsilon)$ , which depends on  $p, f, t_0, C, p^{(i)}(\cdot, \cdot), \rho^{(i)}, \mu^{(i)}; i = 1, \dots, p$  and is independent of  $t$  and  $k$ , such that*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} C(\varepsilon) = 0 \quad (4.11)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}} - \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle \right|^k; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)} \right] \leq e^{pt} (k!)^p C(\varepsilon)^k \quad (4.12)$$

for all  $\varepsilon > 0, t > 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $k \geq 0$ .

As we have noted in Section 1.5, this proposition says that the approximated intersection measure  $\ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}}$  is a “good” approximation of the intersection measure  $\ell_t^{\text{IS}}$ .

This proposition has the same role as [KM13, Proposition 2.3]. The factor  $e^{pt}$  comes from the fact that we use 1-order resolvent while they use 0-order resolvent. We will prove this proposition in Section 5, which is the main part of this paper.

## 5 Proof of Proposition 4.3

### 5.1 Outline of the proof

Our proof of Proposition 4.3 is motivated by the same heuristics as Section 3.2 of [KM13] and based on the proof of [KM13, Proposition 2.3] with some modifications. Here is a list of differences:

1. We do not use 0-order resolvents (Green functions), but use 1-order resolvents for deriving the desired estimates. By this modification, we do not need to take care of the divergence of 0-order Green functions on the diagonal set.
2. We change the definition of  $G_t$ . Compare our (5.6) with (3.27) in page 288 of [KM13].
3. We change the way of taking partition of  $\sigma_i$  in order to apply Lemma 2.16. Compare our (5.11) with page 290 of [KM13].
4. We do not take the summation over  $W_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$  with  $\#W_i = \#F_i$ , but over  $F'_i \subset F_i$  with  $\#F'_i = \#S^*$ . Compare our (5.12) with page 290 of [KM13].
5. When we take the summation over  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i}$ , we do not decompose as  $E_i = (E_i \setminus F_i) \cup F_i$ , but decompose as  $E_i = (E_i \setminus J_i) \cup J_i$ . Compare our (5.13) with the last equality of page 290 of [KM13].

The changes in 2–5 are related to the comments before Corollary 2.17. Due to some (relatively minor) possible problems pointed out below, it seems such modifications are needed. We will note these differences more concretely in Remarks 5.6, 5.8 and 5.11.

### 5.2 Preliminary computations

Before proving Proposition 4.3, we give the following lemma and proposition. In the following, we abbreviate the measure  $m(dx)$  just as  $dx$ . Recall the definition of  $H_t^{(i)}$  in (3.1):

$$H_t^{(i)}(y_1, \dots, y_k) := \int_{[0, t]^k} \int_E 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(y_{j-1}, y_j) dy_{k+1} dr_1 \cdots dr_k,$$

where  $r_{k+1} = t - \sum_{j=1}^k r_j$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** For  $m \leq k$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle^m \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^{k-m}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\
&= \int_{E^k} \prod_{l=1}^k f(y_l) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} [\text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i) \otimes (k-m)}] H_t^{(i)}(y_1, \dots, y_k) \right] dy_1 \cdots dy_k \\
&= \int_{E^k} \prod_{l=1}^k f(y_l) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} \int_{[0, t]_{<}^k} \left[ \int_{E^{k-m+1}} \prod_{j=m+1}^k p_{\varepsilon}^{(i)}(z_j, y_j) \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} p_{s_j - s_{j-1}}^{(i)}(w_{j-1}, w_j) \right. \right. \\
&\qquad \qquad \qquad \left. \left. dz_{m+1} \cdots dz_{k+1} \right] ds_1 \cdots ds_k \right] dy_1 \cdots dy_k,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $[0, t]_{<}^k$  is defined in (3.3) and we set  $\sigma(0) = 0$ ,  $\sigma(k+1) = k+1$  and

$$w_j = w_j^{(i)} = \begin{cases} y_{\sigma^{-1}(j)} & \text{when } \sigma^{-1}(j) \leq m, \\ z_{\sigma^{-1}(j)} & \text{when } \sigma^{-1}(j) \geq m+1. \end{cases}$$

The above lemma immediately implies the following moment formula: which is almost the same as [KM13, Lemma 3.1]

**Proposition 5.2** (Moment formula). For  $k \geq 1$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle]^k; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{k}{m} \int_{E^k} \prod_{l=1}^k f(y_l) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} [\text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i) \otimes (k-m)}] H_t^{(i)}(y_1, \dots, y_k) \right] dy_1 \cdots dy_k.
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* For  $\eta > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [\langle f, \ell_{\eta, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^m \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^{k-m}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ \langle f, \ell_{\eta, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^m \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^{k-m} \prod_{i=1}^p 1_E(X_t^{(i)}) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^m \int_E f(y_j) \left( \prod_{i=1}^p \int_0^t p_{\eta}^{(i)}(X_s^{(i)}, y_j) ds \right) dy_j \cdot \prod_{j=m+1}^k \int_E f(y_j) \left( \prod_{i=1}^p \int_0^t p_{\varepsilon}^{(i)}(X_s^{(i)}, y_j) ds \right) dy_j \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p 1_E(X_t^{(i)}) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ \int_{E^k} \prod_{l=1}^k f(y_l) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left( \prod_{j=1}^m \int_0^t p_{\eta}^{(i)}(X_s^{(i)}, y_j) ds \cdot \prod_{j=m+1}^k \int_0^t p_{\varepsilon}^{(i)}(X_s^{(i)}, y_j) ds \cdot 1_E(X_t^{(i)}) \right) dy_1 \cdots dy_k \right] \\
&= \int_{E^k} \prod_{l=1}^k f(y_l) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ \int_{[0, t]^k} \prod_{j=1}^m p_{\eta}^{(i)}(X_{s_j}^{(i)}, y_j) \prod_{j=m+1}^k p_{\varepsilon}^{(i)}(X_{s_j}^{(i)}, y_j) \cdot 1_E(X_t^{(i)}) ds_1 \cdots ds_k \right] dy_1 \cdots dy_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we calculate the expectation of the above equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ \int_{[0, t]^k} \prod_{j=1}^m p_{\eta}^{(i)}(X_{s_j}^{(i)}, y_j) \prod_{j=m+1}^k p_{\varepsilon}^{(i)}(X_{s_j}^{(i)}, y_j) \cdot 1_E(X_t^{(i)}) ds_1 \cdots ds_k \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} \int_{0 \leq s_{\sigma(1)} < \dots < s_{\sigma(k)} \leq t} \prod_{j=1}^m p_{\eta}^{(i)}(X_{s_j}^{(i)}, y_j) \prod_{j=m+1}^k p_{\varepsilon}^{(i)}(X_{s_j}^{(i)}, y_j) \cdot 1_E(X_t^{(i)}) ds_1 \cdots ds_k \right] \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} \int_{[0, t]_{<}^k} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^m p_{\eta}^{(i)}(X_{s_{\sigma(j)}}^{(i)}, y_j) \prod_{j=m+1}^k p_{\varepsilon}^{(i)}(X_{s_{\sigma(j)}}^{(i)}, y_j) \cdot 1_E(X_t^{(i)}) \right] ds_1 \cdots ds_k
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} \int_{[0,t]^k} \left[ \int_{E^{k+1}} \prod_{j=1}^m p_{\eta}^{(i)}(x_{\sigma(j)}, y_j) \prod_{j=m+1}^k p_{\varepsilon}^{(i)}(x_{\sigma(j)}, y_j) \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} p_{s_j - s_{j-1}}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) dx_1 \cdots dx_{k+1} \right] ds_1 \cdots ds_k \\
&= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} [T_{\eta}^{(i)\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i)\otimes(k-m)}] H_t^{(i)}(y_1, \dots, y_k),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the fourth line, we set  $s_0 = 0$  and  $s_{k+1} = t$ .

We have  $H_t^{(i)} \in L^p(E^k)$  and  $\lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} [T_{\eta}^{(i)\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i)\otimes(k-m)}] H_t^{(i)} = [\text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i)\otimes(k-m)}] H_t^{(i)}$  in  $L^p(E^k)$ .

Since Proposition 1.5 says that  $\langle f, \ell_{\eta,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle$  converges to  $\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle$  in any moments with respect to the measure  $\mathbb{P}_{x_0}(\cdot; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)})$ , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{x_0} [\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle^m \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^{k-m}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\
&= \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [\langle f, \ell_{\eta,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^m \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle^{k-m}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\
&= \lim_{\eta \downarrow 0} \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} [T_{\eta}^{(i)\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i)\otimes(k-m)}] H_t^{(i)} \right] dm^{\otimes k} \\
&= \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} [\text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i)\otimes(k-m)}] H_t^{(i)} \right] dm^{\otimes k}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

### 5.3 Outline of the proof

In the following, we abbreviate the measure  $m(dx)$  just as  $dx$ . Also, the constants may change from line to line.

We now begin the proof of Proposition 4.3. It is sufficient to show the following inequality, replacing  $|\cdots|$  with  $(\cdots)$  in (4.12): for all  $t > 0$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x_0} [\langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}} - \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}}, f \rangle^k; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \leq e^{pt} (k!)^p C(\varepsilon)^k. \quad (5.1)$$

Indeed, if  $k$  is even, clearly (4.12) and (5.1) are same. When  $k = 2l + 1$ , we have by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{x_0} [|\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle|^{2l+1}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [(\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle)^{2l}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}]^{1/2} \\
&\quad \cdot \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [(\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon,t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle)^{2l+2}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}]^{1/2} \\
&\leq e^{pt} \{(2l)!^{1/2} (2l+2)!^{1/2}\}^p C(\varepsilon)^{2l+1} \\
&\leq e^{pt} 2^p \{(2l+1)!\}^p C(\varepsilon)^{2l+1} \\
&\leq e^{pt} \{(2l+1)!\}^p (2^p)^{2l+1} C(\varepsilon)^{2l+1},
\end{aligned}$$

and hence (4.12) follows.

Recall the definition of  $H_t^{(i)}$  in (3.1):

$$H_t^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \int_{[0,t]^k} \int_E 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) dx_{k+1} dr_1 \cdots dr_k,$$

where  $r_{k+1} = t - \sum_{j=1}^k r_j$ .

Fix  $\delta > 0$ . For each  $D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ , set  $D_i^c := \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus D_i$ . Also for each  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)} =$



$(n_j^{(i)})_{j \in D_i^c} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^{D_i^c}$ , define

$$\begin{aligned}
& H_t^{(i)}(D_i; x_1, \dots, x_k) \\
& := \int_{[0,t]^k} \int_E 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \prod_{j \in D_i} 1_{\{r_j \leq \delta\}} \prod_{j \in D_i^c} 1_{\{r_j > \delta\}} \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) dx_{k+1} dr_1 \cdots dr_k, \\
& H_t^{(i)}(D_i; \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; x_1, \dots, x_k) \\
& := \int_{[0,t]^k} \int_E 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \prod_{j \in D_i} 1_{\{r_j \leq \delta\}} \prod_{j \in D_i^c} 1_{\{r_j > \delta\}} \\
& \quad \prod_{j \in D_i} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \exp \left\{ -r_j \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\} \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}) \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_j) p_{r_{k+1}}^{(i)}(x_k, x_{k+1}) dx_{k+1} dr_1 \cdots dr_k.
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that our  $H_t^{(i)}(D_i; \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; x_1, \dots, x_k)$  is obtained by multiplying  $p_{r_j}^{(i)}$ 's and  $\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}$ 's by  $H_r(\mathcal{N}^{(i)}; D_i)$  defined in (3.18) of [KM13], and by integrating  $\int_{[0,t]^k} \int_E 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} dx_{k+1} dr_1 \cdots dr_k$ .

We furthermore fix  $R \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  and set  $\mathcal{R} := \{1, \dots, R\}$  and  $\mathcal{R}^c := \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \setminus \mathcal{R}$ . By the eigenfunction expansion (2.1) in Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{j \in D_i^c} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) &= \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \sum_{n_j^{(i)}=1}^{\infty} \exp \left\{ -r_j \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\} \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}) \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_j) \\
&= \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \left( \sum_{n_j^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}} + \sum_{n_j^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^c} \right) \exp \left\{ -r_j \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\} \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}) \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_j) \\
&= \sum_{E_i \subset D_i^c} \sum_{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{D_i^c \setminus E_i} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}} \sum_{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i}} \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \exp \left\{ -r_j \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\} \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}) \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_j).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we can see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& H_t^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\
&= \sum_{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}} H_t^{(i)}(D_i; x_1, \dots, x_k) \tag{5.2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}} \sum_{E_i \subset D_i^c} \sum_{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{D_i^c \setminus E_i} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}} \sum_{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i}} H_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; x_1, \dots, x_k). \tag{5.3}
\end{aligned}$$

Fix small  $\eta, \gamma > 0$  such that  $1 - 2p(\eta + \gamma) > 0$ . We can easily see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\} \\ i=1, \dots, p}} &= \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i \leq \eta k \text{ for all } i}} + \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i > \eta k \text{ for some } i}} \\
\sum_{\substack{E_i \subset D_i^c, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} &= \sum_{\substack{E_i \subset D_i^c, \\ \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) \leq \gamma k \text{ for all } i}} + \sum_{\substack{E_i \subset D_i^c, \\ \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) > \gamma k \text{ for some } i}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we split the left hand side of (5.1) in the manner of the above two equalities, by using Proposition 5.2 and (5.2)–(5.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [(\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle)^k; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\
&= (\mathbf{I})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon) + (\mathbf{II})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon) \\
&= (\mathbf{Ia})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R) + (\mathbf{Ib})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R) + (\mathbf{II})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbf{I})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon) \\
& := \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i \leq \eta k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{k}{m} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i \in \mathfrak{S}_k, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left\{ [\text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i) \otimes (k-m)}] H_t^{(i)}(D_i; \cdot) \right\} dm^{\otimes k}, \\
& (\mathbf{Ia})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R) \\
& := \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i \leq \eta k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{E_i \subset D_i^c, \\ \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) \leq \gamma k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{k}{m} \\
& \quad \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i \in \mathfrak{S}_k, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left\{ \left[ \text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma_i} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i) \otimes (k-m)} \right] H_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \cdot) \right\} dm^{\otimes k}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{II})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon) & := \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ (\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle)^k; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)} \right] - (\mathbf{I})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon), \\
(\mathbf{Ib})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R) & := (\mathbf{I})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon) - (\mathbf{Ia})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R).
\end{aligned}$$

We use the same symbol  $(\mathbf{I})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R)$  and so on, as in Section 3.3 of [KM13].

We divide the proof of Proposition 4.3 into three parts:

**Lemma 5.3.** *For sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$ , There exists  $C(\delta) > 0$ , independent of  $t, k$  and  $\varepsilon$ , such that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} C(\delta) = 0$  and*

$$(\mathbf{II})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon) \leq (k!)^p e^{tp} C(\delta)^k.$$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Fix small  $\delta > 0$  as in Lemma 5.3. Then, for sufficiently large  $R \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , there exists  $C_{\delta}(R) > 0$ , independent of  $t, k$  and  $\varepsilon$ , such that  $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} C_{\delta}(R) = 0$  and*

$$(\mathbf{Ib})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R) \leq (k!)^p e^{tp} C_{\delta}(R)^k.$$

**Lemma 5.5.** *Fix small  $\delta > 0$  and large  $R \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  as in Lemma 5.4. Then, for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $C_{\delta, R}(\varepsilon) > 0$ , independent of  $t$  and  $k$ , such that  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} C_{\delta, R}(\varepsilon) = 0$  and*

$$(\mathbf{Ia})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R) \leq (k!)^p e^{tp} C_{\delta, R}(\varepsilon)^k.$$

Once Lemma 5.3–5.5 are proved, we can obtain (5.1) as follows. For each positive integer  $n$ , choose  $\delta_n, R_n$  and  $\varepsilon_n$  such that  $C(\delta_n) + C_{\delta}(R_n) + C_{\delta_n, R_n}(\varepsilon) \leq n^{-1}$  for all  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_n$ . We may assume that the sequence  $\{\varepsilon_n\}$  is decreasing and converges to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Set  $C'(\varepsilon) := 3\{C(\delta_n) + C_{\delta}(R_n) + C_{\delta_n, R_n}(\varepsilon)\}$  for  $\varepsilon_{n+1} < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_n$ . For  $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_1$ , we also set  $C'(\varepsilon) := 2\|f\|_{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^p [\sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_1^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx]$  because of the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{x_0} \left[ (\langle f, \ell_t^{\text{IS}} \rangle - \langle f, \ell_{\varepsilon, t}^{\text{IS}} \rangle)^k; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)} \right] \\
& = \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{k}{m} \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} [\text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma} T_{\varepsilon}^{(i) \otimes (k-m)}] H_t^{(i)} \right] dm^{\otimes k} \\
& \leq (k!)^p e^{pt} \left\{ 2\|f\|_{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^p \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_1^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right] \right\}^k,
\end{aligned}$$

which is obtained by the same computation as (3.2). Then we obtain  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} C'(\varepsilon) = 0$  and (5.1) with the constant  $C'(\varepsilon)$ .

First, we prove Lemma 5.3 and 5.4.

*Proof of Lemma 5.3.* Write

$$C = \sum_{i=1}^p \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_1^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right] + 1, \quad C(\delta) = \sum_{i=1}^p \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_{1,\delta}^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right]$$

and choose small  $\delta$  such that  $C(\delta) < 1$ . For small  $\delta > 0$ , by applying the inequalities

$$\prod_{j \in D_i} 1_{\{r_j \leq \delta\}} \prod_{j \in D_i^c} 1_{\{r_j > \delta\}} \leq \prod_{j \in D_i} 1_{\{r_j \leq \delta\}} \leq 1$$

to  $H_t^{(i)}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_t^{(i)}(D_i; \cdot)\|_{L^p(E^k)} &\leq e^t \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_1^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right]^{\#D_i^c/p} \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_{1,\delta}^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right]^{\#D_i/p} \\ &\leq e^t C^{k/p} (1 \wedge C(\delta))^{\#D_i/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have for small  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{II})_{t,k}(\eta, \delta, \varepsilon) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i > \eta k \text{ for some } i}} \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{k}{m} \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} [\text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_\sigma T_\varepsilon^{(i)\otimes(k-m)}] H_t^{(i)}(D_i; \cdot) \right] dm^{\otimes k} \\ &\leq \|f\|_\infty^k 2^k (k!)^p \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i > \eta k \text{ for some } i}} \prod_{i=1}^p \|H_t^{(i)}(D_i; \cdot)\|_{L^p(E^k)} \\ &\leq \|f\|_\infty^k 2^k (k!)^p e^{pt} \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i > \eta k \text{ for some } i}} C^k C(\delta)^{\eta k} \\ &\leq \|f\|_\infty^k 2^k (k!)^p e^{pt} 2^{kp} C^k C(\delta)^{\eta k} \\ &= (k!)^p e^{pt} C(\delta)^k, \end{aligned}$$

where in the third line, we use the equality  $\sum_{m=0}^k \binom{k}{m} = 2^k$  and the same estimate as we compute (3.2). In the last line, we take another constant  $C(\delta) = C(p, p^{(i)}, f, \eta, \delta)$  satisfying the same properties.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 5.4.* By (2.2) in Lemma 2.1, there exist  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  and  $R_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , such that  $\|\psi_n^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 \leq C_1 n$  and  $C_2 n^{1/\rho^{(i)}} \leq \lambda_n^{(i)}$  for all  $n > R_0$ . Then for  $R \geq R_0$ , we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^R \|\psi_n^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 \leq \sum_{n=1}^{R_0} \|\psi_n^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 + C_1 R$$

and have

$$\sum_{n=R+1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_n^{(i)})^{-1} \exp \{-\delta(1 + \lambda_n^{(i)})\} \|\psi_n^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 \leq C_1 \sum_{n=R+1}^{\infty} (1 + C_2 n^{1/\rho^{(i)}})^{-1} \exp \{-\delta(1 + C_2 n^{1/\rho^{(i)}})\} n.$$

Hence, by setting

$$C(R) = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{n=1}^R \|\psi_n^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 + 1, \quad C_\delta(R) = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{n=R+1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_n^{(i)})^{-1} \exp \{-\delta(1 + \lambda_n^{(i)})\} \|\psi_n^{(i)}\|_\infty^2,$$

we have

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} C_\delta(R) = 0, \quad \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} C_\delta(R)^\gamma C(R)^p = 0. \quad (5.5)$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & H_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ & \leq \int_{[0, t]^k} 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \\ & \quad \prod_{j \in D_i} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}, x_j) \cdot \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus E_i} 1_{r_j > \delta} \exp\left\{-r_j \lambda_{n_j}^{(i)}\right\} \|\psi_{n_j}^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 \cdot \prod_{j \in E_i} \|\psi_{n_j}^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 dr_1 \cdots dr_k, \end{aligned}$$

by writing  $E' := \text{supp}[f]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \cdot)\|_{L^p(E'^k)} \\ & \leq e^t \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_1^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right]^{\#D_i/p} \\ & \quad \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus E_i} m(E')^{1/p} (1 + \lambda_{n_j}^{(i)})^{-1} \exp\left\{-\delta(1 + \lambda_{n_j}^{(i)})\right\} \|\psi_{n_j}^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 \cdot \prod_{j \in E_i} m(E')^{1/p} \|\psi_{n_j}^{(i)}\|_\infty^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{D_i^c \setminus E_i} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}} \sum_{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i}} \|H_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \cdot)\|_{L^p(E'^k)} \\ & \leq e^t \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_1^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right]^{\#D_i/p} m(E')^{\#D_i^c/p} \\ & \quad \left( \sum_{n=R+1}^{\infty} (1 + \lambda_n^{(i)})^{-1} \exp\left\{-\delta(1 + \lambda_n^{(i)})\right\} \|\psi_n^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 \right)^{\#D_i^c \setminus E_i} \cdot \left( \sum_{n=1}^R \|\psi_n^{(i)}\|_\infty^2 \right)^{\#E_i} \\ & \leq e^t C^k C_\delta(R)^{\#D_i^c \setminus E_i} C(R)^k. \end{aligned}$$

We may assume that  $C_\delta(R) < 1$ . Then  $(\mathbf{Ib})_{t,k}(\eta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon, R) \leq e^{pt} (k!)^p C^k C_\delta(R)^{\gamma k} C(R)^{pk}$ . By setting  $C'_\delta(R) = C C_\delta(R)^\gamma C(R)^p$ , we have  $\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} C'_\delta(R) = 0$  by (5.5), and therefore we have the desired result.  $\square$

## 5.4 Proof of Lemma 5.5 (computation of (Ia), part 1)

From this subsection to the end of Section 5, we prove Lemma 5.5.

In this subsection, we rewrite each term of **(Ia)** into the products of “good” and “not good” factors. Here, the notation “good” means that the factor does not depend on  $t$  and is able to estimate with respect to  $\varepsilon$ , uniformly in  $t$ .

Let  $D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$  and  $E_i \subset D_i^c := \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus D_i$  satisfying

$$\#D_i \leq \eta k \text{ and } \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) \leq \gamma k \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, p.$$

Write  $E_i - 1 := \{j - 1 : j \in E_i\} \cap \{1, \dots, k\}$  and  $F_i := E_i \cap (E_i - 1)$ . Note that obviously  $k \notin F_i$ . Then we can decompose as

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \psi_{n_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}) \psi_{n_j}^{(i)}(x_j) &= \prod_{j \in D_i^c - 1} \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)}(x_j) \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \psi_{n_j}^{(i)}(x_j) \\ &= \prod_{j \in (D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i} \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)}(x_j) \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus F_i} \psi_{n_j}^{(i)}(x_j) \prod_{j \in F_i} \left[ \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_j}^{(i)} \right](x_j) \end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\prod_{j \in D_i} p_{r_j}(x_{j-1}, x_j) \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \exp\left\{-r_j \lambda_{n_j}^{(i)}\right\} \psi_{n_j}^{(i)}(x_{j-1}) \psi_{n_j}^{(i)}(x_j) \cdot p_{r_{k+1}}^{(i)}(x_k, x_{k+1})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \prod_{j \in F_i} \left[ \psi_{n_j}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_j) \\
&\quad \prod_{j \in D_i} p_{r_j}(x_{j-1}, x_j) \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \exp \left\{ -r_j \lambda_{n_j}^{(i)} \right\} \prod_{j \in (D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i} \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)}(x_j) \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus F_i} \psi_{n_j}^{(i)}(x_j) \cdot p_{r_{k+1}}^{(i)}(x_k, x_{k+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since  $k \notin F_i$ , we can decompose

$$H_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; x_1, \dots, x_k) = \prod_{j \in F_i} \left[ \psi_{n_j}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_j) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{x_j\}_{j \notin F_i}), \quad (5.6)$$

where we define a function on  $E^{\#F_i^c}$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
&G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{x_j\}_{j \notin F_i}) \\
&:= \int_{[0, t]^k} \int_E 1_{\{\sum_{j=1}^k r_j \leq t\}} \prod_{j \in D_i} p_{r_j}(x_{j-1}, x_j) \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \exp \left\{ -r_j \lambda_{n_j}^{(i)} \right\} \\
&\quad \prod_{j \in (D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i} \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)}(x_j) \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus F_i} \psi_{n_j}^{(i)}(x_j) \cdot p_{r_{k+1}}^{(i)}(x_k, x_{k+1}) dx_{k+1} dr_1 \cdots dr_k.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence for some operators  $U_1^{(i)}, \dots, U_k^{(i)}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&U_1^{(i)} \otimes \cdots \otimes U_k^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{j \in F_i} \left[ \psi_{n_j}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_j) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{x_j\}_{j \notin F_i}) \right] \\
&= \prod_{j \in F_i} U_j^{(i)} \left[ \psi_{n_j}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_j) \cdot \bigotimes_{j \notin F_i} U_j^{(i)} G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{x_j\}_{j \notin F_i})
\end{aligned}$$

and have

$$\begin{aligned}
&U_1^{(i)} \otimes_{\sigma_i} \cdots \otimes U_k^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{j \in F_i} \left[ \psi_{n_j}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{j+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_j) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{x_j\}_{j \notin F_i}) \right] \\
&= \prod_{l \in S(\sigma)} U_l^{(i)} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_l) \\
&\quad \bigotimes_{l \notin S(\sigma)} U_l^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S(\sigma)} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{x_l\}_{l \notin \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where we write  $S(\sigma) := \bigcap_{i=1}^p \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)$ .

In particular, by applying  $U_1^{(i)} \otimes \cdots \otimes U_k^{(i)} = \text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes T_\varepsilon^{(i) \otimes (k-m)}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&U_1^{(i)} \otimes_{\sigma_i} \cdots \otimes U_k^{(i)} \left[ H_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; x_1, \dots, x_k) \right] \\
&= \prod_{l \in S(\sigma)_{\leq m}} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_l) \cdot \prod_{l \in S(\sigma)_{> m}} T_\varepsilon^{(i)} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_l) \\
&\quad \bigotimes_{l \notin S(\sigma)} U_l^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S(\sigma)} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (x_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{x_l\}_{l \notin \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $S(\sigma)_{\leq m} := S(\sigma) \cap \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $S(\sigma)_{> m} := S(\sigma) \cap \{m+1, \dots, k\}$ . We set

$$a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) := \left\langle f, \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] \right\rangle,$$

$$a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) := \left\langle f, \prod_{i=1}^p T_\varepsilon^{(i)} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} & \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \end{array} \right] \right\rangle$$

and set

$$G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}) := \int_{E^{S(\sigma)^c}} \prod_{l \notin S(\sigma)} f(y_l) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \bigotimes_{l \notin S(\sigma)} U_l^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S(\sigma)} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} & \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \end{array} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] dy, \quad (5.7)$$

where  $U_l^{(i)} = \text{id}$  for  $l \leq m$  and  $U_l^{(i)} = T_\varepsilon^{(i)}$  for  $l \geq m+1$ . In the definition of  $G_t$ , we shorten the symbol  $\{dy_i\}_{j \in S(\sigma)^c}$  as  $dy$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left\{ \left[ \text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma_i} T_\varepsilon^{(i) \otimes (k-m)} \right] H_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \cdot) \right\} dm^{\otimes k} \\ &= \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{\leq m}} a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{> m}} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \cdot G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}). \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

*Remark 5.6.* There is a difference between our  $G_t$  and the  $G_t$  defined in (3.27) of [KM13]. Our  $G_t$  is obtained by replacing  $\sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)$  by  $S(\sigma)$  in the definition of their  $G_t$ , yet we have the same type of decomposition (5.8) as in the last three lines of the equation (3.26) in [KM13].

## 5.5 Proof of Lemma 5.5 (computation of (Ia), part 2)

Following the last subsection, we also deform (Ia) in this subsection. We regard  $G_t$  as a function of  $m_i$ ,  $\sigma_i$  and  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)}$ , and decompose (Ia) into twelve sums. In the end of this subsection, we rearrange the order of twelve sums appropriately, and in the following subsection, we will estimate (Ia) according to the rearranged order.

Fix  $D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $E_i \subset D_i^c$  and  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^{D_i^c}$  with  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{D_i^c \setminus E_i} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i} \in (\mathcal{R})^{E_i}$ . Decompose as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p \in \mathfrak{S}_k} \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{k}{m} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p \in \mathfrak{S}_k} \sum_{m=0}^k \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_1 \leq m, \\ 0 \leq m_3 \leq k-m}} \sum_{\substack{A \subset \{1, \dots, m\}, \\ \#A = m_1}} \sum_{\substack{B \subset \{m+1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#B = m_3}} (-1)^m \binom{k}{m} 1_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} A=S(\sigma)_{\leq m}, \\ B=S(\sigma)_{> m} \end{array} \right\}} \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^k \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_1 \leq m, \\ 0 \leq m_3 \leq k-m}} \sum_{\substack{A \subset \{1, \dots, m\}, \\ \#A = m_1}} \sum_{\substack{B \subset \{m+1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#B = m_3}} (-1)^m \binom{k}{m} \sum_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_p \in \mathfrak{S}_k} 1_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} A=S(\sigma)_{\leq m}, \\ B=S(\sigma)_{> m} \end{array} \right\}}. \end{aligned}$$

We will see that:

**Lemma 5.7.** *Fix two nonnegative integers  $m_1 \leq m$  and  $m_3 \leq k - m$ . Then*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k^p} 1_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} A=S(\sigma)_{\leq m}, \\ B=S(\sigma)_{> m} \end{array} \right\}} \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{\leq m}} a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{> m}} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \cdot G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}) \quad (5.9)$$

depends only on  $m_1$  and  $m_3$ , and does not depend on the choice of  $A, B \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$  with  $\#A = m_1$  and  $\#B = m_3$ .

Namely, for all  $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_k$  with  $\tau(\{1, \dots, m\}) = \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\tau(\{m+1, \dots, k\}) = \{m+$

$1, \dots, k\}$ , the summation

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k^p} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} A = \tau^{-1}(S(\sigma)_{\leq m}), \\ B = \tau^{-1}(S(\sigma)_{> m}) \end{array} \right\}} \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{\leq m}} a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{> m}} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \cdot G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N})$$

is equal to (5.9).

*Proof.* First, note that  $\tau S(\sigma) := \bigcap_{i=1}^p \tau \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) = S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})$ , where  $\sigma \circ \tau^{-1} := (\sigma_1 \circ \tau^{-1}, \dots, \sigma_p \circ \tau^{-1}) \in \mathfrak{S}_k^p$ . Then we have  $\tau(S(\sigma)_{\leq m}) = (\tau S(\sigma))_{\leq m} = S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})_{\leq m}$  and similarly, we also have  $\tau(S(\sigma)_{> m}) = S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})_{> m}$ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j \in S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})_{\leq m}} a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma \circ \tau^{-1}(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma \circ \tau^{-1}(j)+1}) &= \prod_{j \in S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})_{\leq m}} \left\langle f, \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(j)+1}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(j)}}^{(i)} \right] \right\rangle \\ &= \prod_{\tau^{-1}(j) \in S(\sigma)_{\leq m}} \left\langle f, \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(j)+1}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(j)}}^{(i)} \right] \right\rangle \\ &= \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{\leq m}} a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\prod_{j \in S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})_{> m}} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma \circ \tau^{-1}(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma \circ \tau^{-1}(j)+1}) = \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{> m}} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}).$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &G_t(m, D, E, \sigma \circ \tau^{-1}, \mathcal{N}) \\ &= \int_{E^{S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})^c}} \prod_{l \notin S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})} f(y_l) \\ &\quad \prod_{i=1}^p \bigotimes_{l \notin S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})} T_l^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{l \in \tau \circ \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S(\sigma \circ \tau^{-1})} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \tau \circ \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] dy \\ &= \int_{E^{\tau(S(\sigma)^c)}} \prod_{l \notin \tau(S(\sigma))} f(y_l) \\ &\quad \prod_{i=1}^p \bigotimes_{l \notin \tau(S(\sigma))} T_l^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{l \in \tau(\sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S(\sigma))} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \tau \circ \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] dy \\ &= \int_{E^{\tau(S(\sigma)^c)}} \prod_{j \notin S(\sigma)} f(y_{\tau(j)}) \\ &\quad \prod_{i=1}^p \bigotimes_{j \notin S(\sigma)} T_{\tau(j)}^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{j \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S(\sigma)} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(j)}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(j)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (y_{\tau(j)}) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_{\tau(j)}\}_{j \notin \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] dy \\ &= G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}), \end{aligned}$$

where the symbol  $dy$  is defined as the same as in (5.7). Hence the desired equality holds.  $\square$

By Lemma 5.7, we may rewrite (5.9) by choosing  $A = S_{\leq m}^*$  and  $B = S_{> m}^*$ , where we define  $S_{\leq m}^* := \{1, \dots, m_1\}$  and  $S_{> m}^* := \{m+1, \dots, m+m_3\}$ . Note that  $\#S(\sigma)_{\leq m} = \#S_{\leq m}^* = m_1$ .



Combining (5.8) with Lemma 5.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{m=0}^k (-1)^m \binom{k}{m} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i \in \mathfrak{S}_k; \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \int_{E^k} f^{\otimes k} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left\{ \left[ \text{id}^{\otimes m} \otimes_{\sigma_i} T_\varepsilon^{(i) \otimes (k-m)} \right] H_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \cdot) \right\} dm^{\otimes k} \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^k \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_1 \leq m, \\ 0 \leq m_3 \leq k-m}} \sum_{\substack{A \subset \{1, \dots, m\}, \\ \#A = m_1}} \sum_{\substack{B \subset \{m+1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#B = m_3}} (-1)^{m-m_1} \binom{k}{m} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k^p} 1_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} A = S(\sigma)_{\leq m}, \\ B = S(\sigma)_{> m} \end{array} \right\}} \\
&\quad \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{\leq m}} \left( -a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \right) \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{> m}} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \cdot G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}) \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^k \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_1 \leq m, \\ 0 \leq m_3 \leq k-m}} \binom{m}{m_1} \binom{k-m}{m_3} (-1)^{m-m_1} \binom{k}{m} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k^p} 1_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S_{\leq m}^* = S(\sigma)_{\leq m}, \\ S_{> m}^* = S(\sigma)_{> m} \end{array} \right\}} \\
&\quad \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{\leq m}} \left( -a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \right) \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{> m}} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \cdot G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_i \leq k, \\ m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 = k}} (-1)^{m_2} \frac{k!}{m_1! m_2! m_3! m_4!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k^p} 1_{\left\{ \begin{array}{l} S_{\leq m}^* = S(\sigma)_{\leq m}, \\ S_{> m}^* = S(\sigma)_{> m} \end{array} \right\}} \\
&\quad \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{\leq m}} \left( -a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \right) \prod_{j \in S(\sigma)_{> m}} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \cdot G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}). \tag{5.10}
\end{aligned}$$

From now on, we fix  $m_1, m_2, m_3$  and  $m_4$  with  $m_1 + m_2 = m$  and  $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 = k$ . For each subset  $F'_i \subset F_i$  with  $\#F'_i = \#S^* = m_1 + m_3$ , we split  $\sigma_i \in \mathfrak{S}_k$  as  $\sigma_i = (\sigma_i|_{S^*}, \sigma_i|_{S^{*c}})$  and regard them as a tuple of bijections

$$\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i), \quad \sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i'^c). \tag{5.11}$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k^p} 1_{\{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k^p | S(\sigma) = S^*\}} = \sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^*; \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i'^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}}. \tag{5.12}$$

Set  $F'_i + 1 := \{j+1 : j \in F'_i\} \cap \{1, \dots, k\}$  and  $J_i := F'_i \cap (F'_i + 1) (\subset F_i \subset E_i)$ . We decompose as

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}}. \tag{5.13}$$

*Remark 5.8.* Note that there are differences here from the proof of [KM13, Proposition 2.3]. Firstly, we decompose  $\sigma_i$  according to  $S^*$ , so we define a new symbol  $F'_i$ . Secondly, we decompose  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)}$  according to another new symbol  $J_i$ , in order to make sure that  $G_t$  is independent of the values of  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}$  (see Proposition 5.9).

We conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbf{Ia})_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i \leq \eta k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{E_i \subset D_i^c, \\ \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) \leq \gamma k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \tag{5.10}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i \leq \eta k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{E_i \subset D_i^c, \\ \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) \leq \gamma k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_i \leq k, \\ m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 = k}} \sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^* \text{ for all } i}} (-1)^{m_2} \frac{k!}{m_1! m_2! m_3! m_4!} \\
&\quad \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \\
&\quad \prod_{j \in S_{\leq m}^*} \left( -a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \right) \prod_{j \in S_{> m}^*} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \cdot G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Now, define

$$M_{m_1, m_3} := \left\{ (A, r); \begin{array}{l} A \text{ and } r \text{ are } \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\text{-valued measures on } (\mathcal{R}^p)^2 \text{ with} \\ \text{the total mass } m_1 + m_3 \text{ and } m_1, \text{ respectively, and} \\ r(l) \leq A(l) \text{ for all } l \in (\mathcal{R}^p)^2. \end{array} \right\},$$

$$\Psi(A, r) := \left\{ (\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i}, \sigma_i|_{S^*})_{1 \leq i \leq p} \in \bigotimes_{i=1}^p (\mathcal{R}^{J_i} \times \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i)); \right.$$

$$\left. A = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1})}, r = \sum_{j \in S_{\leq m}^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1})} \right\}.$$

For a given  $(\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i}, \sigma_i|_{S^*})_{1 \leq i \leq p} \in \bigotimes_{i=1}^p (\mathcal{R}^{J_i} \times \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i))$ , there is only one  $(A, r) \in M_{m_1, m_3}$  such that  $(\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i}, \sigma_i|_{S^*})_{1 \leq i \leq p} \in \Psi(A, r)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{j \in S_{\leq m}^*} \left( -a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \right) \prod_{j \in S_{> m}^*} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \\
&= \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} \left[ (-a(l))^{\#\{j \in S_{\leq m}^*; (\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) = l\}} a_\varepsilon(l)^{\#\{j \in S_{> m}^*; (\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) = l\}} \right] \\
&= \sum_{(A, r) \in M_{m_1, m_3}} \mathbf{1}_{\{(\mathcal{N}, \sigma) \in \Psi(A, r)\}} \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [(-a(l))^{r(l)} a_\varepsilon(l)^{A(l) - r(l)}].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we furthermore can rewrite the last two lines of (5.14) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \\
&\quad \prod_{j \in S_{\leq m}^*} \left( -a(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \right) \prod_{j \in S_{> m}^*} a_\varepsilon(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1}) \cdot G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \\
&\quad \sum_{(A, r) \in M_{m_1, m_3}} \mathbf{1}_{\{(\mathcal{N}, \sigma) \in \Psi(A, r)\}} \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [(-a(l))^{r(l)} a_\varepsilon(l)^{A(l) - r(l)}] \cdot G_t(m, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

For two measures  $A$  and  $r$ , we write  $r \leq A$  if  $r(l) \leq A(l)$  for all  $l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p$ . Then we have  $\sum_{(A, r) \in M_{m_1, m_3}} = \sum_{A \in M_{k-m_2-m_4}} \sum_{r \in M_{m_1}; r \leq A}$ , where we set

$$M_{m_1} := \left\{ \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\text{-valued measures on } (\mathcal{R}^p)^2 \text{ with total mass } m_1 \right\}.$$

Summarizing our argument up to here, we have the following decomposition of **(Ia)** in (5.4):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{(Ia)}_{t,k}(\delta, \varepsilon, R) \\
& = (5.14) \\
& = \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i \leq \eta k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{E_i \subset D_i^c, \\ \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) \leq \gamma k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{0 \leq m_2 + m_4 \leq k} \sum_{m_1=0}^{k-m_2-m_4} \sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^* \text{ for all } i}} \\
& \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i'^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{A \in M_{k-m_2-m_4}} \sum_{\substack{r \in M_{m_1}; \\ r \leq A}} \\
& \quad (-1)^{m_2} \frac{k!}{m_1! m_2! (k - m_1 - m_2 - m_4)! m_4!} \mathbf{1}_{\{(\mathcal{N}, \sigma) \in \Psi(A, r)\}} \\
& \quad \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [(-a(l))^{r(l)} a_\varepsilon(l)^{A(l)-r(l)}] \cdot G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

We rearrange the order of twelve summations in (5.16) as follows:

$$\sum_4 \sum_3 \sum_2 \sum_1, \tag{5.17}$$

where each sum  $\sum_1, \dots, \sum_4$  means that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_1 &= \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \\
\sum_2 &= \sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^* \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i'^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \\
\sum_3 &= \sum_{m_1=0}^{k-m_2-m_4} \sum_{\substack{r \in M_{m_1}; \\ r \leq A}} \\
\sum_{4-1} &= \sum_{0 \leq m_2 + m_4 \leq k} \sum_{A \in M_{k-m_2-m_4}} \\
\sum_{4-2} &= \sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i \leq \eta k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{E_i \subset D_i^c, \\ \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) \leq \gamma k \text{ for all } i}}
\end{aligned}$$

and  $\sum_4 = \sum_{4-2} \sum_{4-1}$ . We will keep the order of the summations as above. In the following subsections, we estimate these sums one by one.

## 5.6 Proof of Lemma 5.5 (estimate of the summations $\sum_1$ - $\sum_4$ )

We first consider the summation  $\sum_1$ . Fix  $D_i, E_i, m_1, m_2, m_4, A, r$  and  $F'_i$ . We also fix  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{E_i \setminus J_i}$  and  $\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i'^c)$ . Recall the definitions  $S^* := \{1, \dots, m_1\} \cup \{m_1 + m_2 + 1, \dots, m_1 + m_2 + m_3\}$ ,  $S(\sigma) := \bigcap_{i=1}^p \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) (= \sigma_i^{-1}(F'_i) = S^*, \text{ for all } i \text{ and } \sigma_i|_{S^*})$  and  $J_i := F'_i \cap (F'_i + 1) (\subset F_i \subset E_i)$ .

We also recall the definition of  $G_t$  in (5.7); for  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}$  and  $\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i)$ ,

$$G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N})$$

$$= \int_{E^{S^*c}} \prod_{l \notin S^*} f(y_l) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \bigotimes_{l \notin S^*} U_l^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S^*} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] dy,$$

where  $U_l^{(i)} = \text{id}$  for  $l \leq m$  and  $U_l^{(i)} = T_\varepsilon^{(i)}$  for  $l \geq m+1$ .

The following Proposition 5.9 says that  $G_t$  is independent of the choice of  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}$  and  $\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F_i')$ , under the condition  $(\mathcal{N}^{(i)}, \sigma_i|_{S^*}) \in \Psi(A, r)$ :

**Proposition 5.9.** *Let  $\sigma|_{S^*}, \sigma'|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F_i')$  and  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)}, \mathcal{N}'^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}$ . If*

$$\sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1})} = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}'_{\sigma'(j)}, \mathcal{N}'_{\sigma'(j)+1})},$$

then  $G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}) = G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \sigma', \mathcal{N}')$ .

Hence, for each  $(\{\sigma_i|_{S^*}\}, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}\}) \in \Psi(A, r)$ , we may define

$$G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \{\sigma_i|_{S^*c}\}, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A) := G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}).$$

*Proof.* When  $l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S^*$ , we have  $\sigma_i(l) \in F_i \setminus \sigma_i(S^*) = F_i \setminus F_i' \subset E_i \setminus J_i$  and  $\sigma_i(l) + 1 \in (F_i + 1) \setminus (F_i' + 1) \subset E_i \setminus J_i$ . Recall that  $G_t$  is defined via  $G_t^{(i)}$ . By the assumption, for each  $i$ , we have

$$\prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S^*} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right] (x_l) = \prod_{l \in \sigma_i'^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S^*} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i'(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i'(l)+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right] (x_l).$$

Since  $\sigma_i^{-1}(D_i^c) \supset \sigma_i^{-1}(E_i) \supset \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \supset \bigcap_i \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) = S^*$ , we may decompose

$$\prod_{j \in \sigma_i^{-1}(D_i^c)} \exp \left\{ -r_{\sigma_i(j)} \lambda_{n_{\sigma_i(j)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\} = \prod_{j \in \sigma_i^{-1}(D_i^c) \setminus S^*} \exp \left\{ -r_{\sigma_i(j)} \lambda_{n_{\sigma_i(j)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\} \prod_{j \in S^*} \exp \left\{ -r_{\sigma_i(j)} \lambda_{n_{\sigma_i(j)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\}.$$

Fix  $\{r_{\sigma_i(j)}\}_{j \in (S^*)^c}$  and write  $r' := \sum_{j \in (S^*)^c} r_{\sigma_i(j)}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{(\delta, t]^{S^*}} 1_{\{\sum_{j \in S^*} r_{\sigma_i(j)} \leq t - r'\}} \prod_{j \in S^*} \exp \left\{ -r_{\sigma_i(j)} \lambda_{n_{\sigma_i(j)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\} dr \\ &= \int_{(\delta, t]^{S^*}} 1_{\{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{j \in S^*; n_{\sigma_i(j)}^{(i)} = l} r_{\sigma_i(j)} \leq t - r'\}} \prod_{l \in \mathcal{R}} \exp \left\{ - \left( \sum_{j \in S^*; n_{\sigma_i(j)}^{(i)} = l} r_{\sigma_i(j)} \right) \lambda_l^{(i)} \right\} dr \end{aligned}$$

depends only on  $A$ . Here we abbreviate the symbol  $\{dr_j\}_{j \in S^*}$  as  $dr$ .

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{j \in D_i} p_{r_j}^{(i)}(x_{\sigma_i^{-1}(j-1)}, x_{\sigma_i^{-1}(j)}) \prod_{j \in D_i^c} \exp \left\{ -r_j \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\} \\ & \quad \prod_{j \in (D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i} \psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_{\sigma_i^{-1}(j)}) \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus F_i} \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_{\sigma_i^{-1}(j)}) \cdot p_{r_{k+1}}^{(i)}(x_{\sigma_i^{-1}(k)}, x_{k+1}) \\ &= \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(D_i)} p_{r_{\sigma_i(l)}}(x_{\sigma_i^{-1}(\sigma_i(l)-1)}, x_l) \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(D_i^c)} \exp \left\{ -r_{\sigma_i(l)} \lambda_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right\} \\ & \quad \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}((D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_l) \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(D_i^c \setminus F_i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)}(x_l) \cdot p_{r_{k+1}}^{(i)}(x_{\sigma_i^{-1}(k)}, x_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to prove that, the factor

$$\prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(D_i)} p_{r_{\sigma_i(l)}}(x_{\sigma_i^{-1}(\sigma_i(l)-1)}, x_l) \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(D_i^c) \setminus S^*} \exp \left\{ -r_{\sigma_i(l)} \lambda_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}} \right\} \\ \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}((D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}^{(i)}}(x_l) \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(D_i^c \setminus F_i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}(x_l) \cdot p_{r_{k+1}}^{(i)}(x_{\sigma_i^{-1}(k)}, x_{k+1})$$

depends only on  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{D_i^c \setminus J_i}$ ,  $\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}}$ , and is independent of  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}^{(i)'|_{J_i}}$ ,  $\sigma_i|_{S^*}$  and  $\sigma_i'|_{S^*}$ .

We can see that  $E_i^c - 1 \subset F_i^c$ . We can also see that  $l \in \sigma_i^{-1}((D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i)$  implies  $\sigma_i(l) + 1 \in D_i^c \setminus J_i$ . Furthermore,  $l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(D_i^c \setminus F_i)$  implies  $\sigma_i(l) \in D_i^c \setminus J_i$ . Therefore we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

The following proposition says that the summation of  $G_t$  with respect to  $\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}}$  is independent of the value of  $m_1$ :

**Proposition 5.10.** *For all  $0 \leq m_1, m'_1 \leq k - m_2 - m_4$ , it holds that*

$$\sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i'^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}}\}, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A) \\ = \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i'^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} G_t(m'_1 + m_2, D, E, \{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}}\}, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A).$$

Hence we can define

$$\tilde{G}_t(m_2, m_4, D, E, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A) := \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}} \in \text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i'^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}}\}, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A). \quad (5.18)$$

*Remark 5.11.* In page 292 of [KM13], they do not make the explicit definition of  $\tilde{G}_t$ . In our Proposition 5.10, we define a new  $\tilde{G}_t$  explicitly, with the use of  $J_i$  and the summation over  $\text{Bij}(S^{*c}, F_i'^c)$  in order our  $\tilde{G}_t$  to work similarly to their  $\tilde{G}_t$  in the proof below.

*Proof.* Define  $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_k$  by

$$\tau(j) = \begin{cases} j + m_2 & \text{when } 1 \leq j \leq m_1, \\ j - m_1 & \text{when } m_1 + 1 \leq j \leq m_1 + m_2, \\ j & \text{when } m_1 + m_2 + 1 \leq j \leq k. \end{cases}$$

Then we can see that  $\tau(S^*) = \{1, \dots, m_2\} \cup \{k - m_4 + 1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $\tau((S^{*c})_{\leq m_1 + m_2}) = \{1, \dots, m_2\}$  and  $\tau((S^{*c})_{> m_1 + m_2}) = \{k - m_4 + 1, \dots, k\}$ . Since

$$\bigotimes_{l \notin S^*} U_l^{(i)} = \bigotimes_{\substack{l \notin S^*; \\ l \leq m}} \text{id} \otimes \bigotimes_{\substack{l \notin S^*; \\ l > m}} T_\varepsilon^{(i)}$$

in the definition of  $G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N})$ , we have by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.7,

$$G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N}) \\ = \int_{E^{\tau(S^{*c})}} \prod_{l \notin \tau(S^*)} f(y_l) \\ \prod_{i=1}^p \bigotimes_{l \notin \tau(S^*)} U_l^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{l \in \tau(\sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S^*)} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)}^{(i)}} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)+1}^{(i)}} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] dy$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{E^{m_2+m_4}} \prod_{\substack{l \leq m_2, \\ k-m_4 < l}} f(y_l) \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \bigotimes_{l \leq m_2} \text{id} \otimes \bigotimes_{l > k-m_4} T_\varepsilon^{(i)} \right] \\
&\quad \left[ \prod_{l \in \tau(\sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S(\sigma))} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \tau \circ \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] dy \\
&= \int_{E^{m_2+m_4}} \prod_{\substack{l \leq m_2, \\ k-m_4 < l}} f(y_l) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \bigotimes_{l \leq m_2} \text{id} \otimes \bigotimes_{l > k-m_4} T_\varepsilon^{(i)} \right] \\
&\quad \left[ \prod_{\substack{l \in \tau \circ \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i), \\ l \leq m_2, k-m_4 < l}} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)}}^{(i)} \quad \psi_{n_{\sigma_i \circ \tau^{-1}(l)+1}}^{(i)} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \tau \circ \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the last integral does not depend on  $m_1$ , the conclusion follows by taking summation with respect to  $\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}}$ .  $\square$

Now, consider the summation  $\sum_1$  which appears in (5.17). Recall

$$\Psi(A, r) := \left\{ (\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i}, \sigma_i|_{S^*})_{1 \leq i \leq p} \in \bigotimes_{i=1}^p (\mathcal{R}^{J_i} \times \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i)); \right. \\
\left. A = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1})}, r = \sum_{j \in S_{\leq m}^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1})} \right\}$$

and let  $A_i$  be the  $i$ -th marginal of  $A$ , which is a measure on  $\mathcal{R}^2$ . We define

$$\Phi(A) := \left\{ \left\{ \mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i} \right\} \in \bigotimes_{i=1}^p \mathcal{R}^{J_i} \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists } \sigma_i^0 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i), \text{ such that} \\ A_i = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma_i^0(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma_i^0(j)+1})} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq p. \end{array} \right. \right\}, \quad (5.19)$$

$$\Psi(A, r, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i}\}) := \left\{ \left\{ \sigma_i|_{S^*} \right\} \in \bigotimes_{i=1}^p \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i) \left| A = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1})} \text{ and } r = \sum_{j \in S_{\leq m}^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma(j)+1})} \right. \right\}. \quad (5.20)$$

By Lemma 2.16, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\#\Psi(A, r) &= \sum_{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \Phi(A)} \#\Psi(A, r, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i}\}) \\
&= \#\Phi(A) m_1! (k - m_1 - m_2 - m_4)! \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{l^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} A_i(l^{(i)})!}{\prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} A(l)!} \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} \binom{A(l)}{r(l)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with Proposition 5.9, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{J_i}; \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^*} \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i); \\ \text{for all } i}} 1_{\{(\mathcal{N}, \sigma) \in \Psi(A, r)\}} \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [(-a(l))^{r(l)} a_\varepsilon(l)^{A(l)-r(l)}] \cdot G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \sigma, \mathcal{N})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \#\Psi(A, r) \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [(-a(l))^{r(l)} a_\varepsilon(l)^{A(l)-r(l)}] \cdot G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \{\sigma_i|_{S^*c}\}, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A) \\
&= \#\Phi(A) m_1! (k - m_1 - m_2 - m_4)! \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{l^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} A_i(l^{(i)})!}{\prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} A(l)!} \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} \binom{A(l)}{r(l)} [(-a(l))^{r(l)} a_\varepsilon(l)^{A(l)-r(l)}] \\
&\quad G_t(m_1 + m_2, D, E, \{\sigma_i|_{S^*c}\}, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A). \tag{5.21}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, consider the summations  $\sum_2$  which appear in (5.16). By using  $\tilde{G}_t$  defined in Proposition 5.10, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^* \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^*c} \in \text{Bij}(S^*c, F_i'^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \tag{5.21} \\
&= m_1! (k - m_1 - m_2 - m_4)! \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{l^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} A_i(l^{(i)})!}{\prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} A(l)!} \cdot \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} \binom{A(l)}{r(l)} [(-a(l))^{r(l)} a_\varepsilon(l)^{A(l)-r(l)}] \\
&\quad \sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^* \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \#\Phi(A) \cdot \tilde{G}_t(m_2, m_4, D, E, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A). \tag{5.22}
\end{aligned}$$

By definition,  $\#\Phi(A)$  depends only on  $m_2 + m_4$  and is independent of  $m_1$ . By Proposition 5.10, the last line of (5.22) depends only on  $A, m_2, m_4$  and is independent of  $m_1$  and  $r$ .

Note that  $\sum_{m_1=0}^{k-m_2-m_4} \sum_{r \in M_{m_1}; r \leq A} = \sum_{r \leq A}$ .

Now, consider the summation  $\sum_4$  which appears in (5.17). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{m_1=0}^{k-m_2-m_4} \sum_{\substack{r \in M_{m_1}; \\ r \leq A}} (-1)^{m_2} \frac{k!}{m_1! m_2! (k - m_1 - m_2 - m_4)! m_4!} \tag{5.22} \\
&= (-1)^{m_2} \frac{k!}{m_2! m_4!} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{l^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} A_i(l^{(i)})!}{\prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} A(l)!} \sum_{r \leq A} \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} \binom{A(l)}{r(l)} [(-a(l))^{r(l)} a_\varepsilon(l)^{A(l)-r(l)}] \\
&\quad \sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^* \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \#\Phi(A) \cdot \tilde{G}_t(m_2, m_4, D, E, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A) \\
&= (-1)^{m_2} \frac{k!}{m_2! m_4!} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{l^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} A_i(l^{(i)})!}{\prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} A(l)!} \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [a_\varepsilon(l) - a(l)]^{A(l)} \\
&\quad \sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^* \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \#\Phi(A) \cdot \tilde{G}_t(m_2, m_4, D, E, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A). \tag{5.23}
\end{aligned}$$



where we used the equality  $\sum_{m_1=0}^{k-m_2-m_4} \sum_{r \in M_{m_1}; r \leq A} = \sum_{r \leq A}$  and the multinomial formula

$$\sum_{r \leq A} \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} \binom{A(l)}{r(l)} [(-a(l))^{r(l)} a_\varepsilon(l)^{A(l)-r(l)}] = \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [a_\varepsilon(l) - a(l)]^{A(l)}.$$

Before considering the summation  $\sum_4$  which appears in (5.17), we give some estimates in order to find an upper bound of the last two lines of (5.23).

**Lemma 5.12.** *There exists a constant  $C = C(p, p^{(i)}, f, \delta) > 0$  such that the following inequality holds for all  $D, E, m_2, m_4, A$  and  $t$ :*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^* \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \\ & \quad \# \Phi(A) \cdot \tilde{G}_t(m_2, m_4, D, E, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A) \\ = & \sum_{\substack{F'_i \subset F_i, \\ \#F'_i = \#S^* \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\sigma_i|_{S^*c} \in \text{Bij}(S^*c, F_i^c), \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \\ & \quad \# \Phi(A) \cdot G_t(m_2, m_4, D, E, \{\sigma_i|_{S^*c}\}, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A) \\ \leq & C^k (k!)^p e^{pt} k^p \left( \prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{l^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} A_i(l^{(i)})! \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The first equality is obtained by the definition of  $\tilde{G}_t$  in Proposition 5.10. So we will prove the inequality in the third line.

First, we estimate  $\Phi(A)$ . Recall

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(A) & := \left\{ \left\{ \mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i} \right\} \in \otimes \mathcal{R}^{J_i} \left| \begin{array}{l} \text{There exists } \sigma_i^0 \in \text{Bij}(S^*, F'_i), \text{ such that} \\ A_i = \sum_{j \in S^*} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_{\sigma_i^0(j)}, \mathcal{N}_{\sigma_i^0(j)+1}^{(i)})}, \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq p. \end{array} \right. \right\} \\ & = \left\{ \left\{ \mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{J_i} \right\} \in \otimes \mathcal{R}^{J_i} \left| A_i = \sum_{j \in F'_i} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_j^{(i)}, \mathcal{N}_{j+1}^{(i)})}, \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq p \right. \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and then, by Lemma 2.15,

$$\# \Phi(A) \leq \prod_{i=1}^p \# \left\{ \left\{ \mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{F'_i} \right\} \in \mathcal{R}^{F'_i} \left| A_i = \sum_{j \in F'_i} \delta_{(\mathcal{N}_j^{(i)}, \mathcal{N}_{j+1}^{(i)})} \right. \right\} \leq \prod_{i=1}^p \left( k \cdot \frac{\prod_{l_1^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}} \bar{A}_i(l_1^{(i)})!}{\prod_{l^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} A_i(l^{(i)})!} \right),$$

where the second inequality follows since  $A \in M_{k-m_2-m_4}$  and  $\sum_{l_1^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}} \bar{A}_i(l_1^{(i)}) = k - m_2 - m_4$ .

Next we estimate  $G_t$ . Write  $E' := \text{supp}[f]$ . For each  $i$ , we have

$$\left\| \prod_{j \in F_i \setminus F'_i} \left[ \psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right] (y_l) \right\|_{L^p(E' F_i \setminus F'_i)} \leq \left( \prod_{j \in F_i \setminus F'_i} \|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty \|\psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty \right) \cdot m(E')^{\#(F_i \setminus F'_i)/p}$$

and have

$$\left\| G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{x_l\}_{l \notin F_i}) \right\|_{L^p(E' F_i^c)}$$

$$\leq e^t \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_1^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right]^{\#D_i/p} \cdot \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus J_i} \exp \left\{ -\delta(1 + \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \right\} \\ \left( \prod_{j \in (D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i} \|\psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus F_i} \|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty \right) \cdot m(E')^{\#(D_i^c \setminus F_i)/p}.$$

Since

$$\left( \prod_{j \in F_i \setminus F_i'} \|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty \|\psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty \right) \left( \prod_{j \in (D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i} \|\psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus F_i} \|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty \right) \\ \leq \left( \prod_{j \in F_i \setminus F_i'} (\|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1) (\|\psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1) \right) \left( \prod_{j \in (D_i^c - 1) \setminus F_i} (\|\psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1) \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus F_i} (\|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1) \right) \\ = \left( \prod_{j \in F_i'} (\|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1)^{-1} (\|\psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1)^{-1} \right) \left( \prod_{j \in (D_i^c - 1)} (\|\psi_{n_{j+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1) \prod_{j \in D_i^c} (\|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1) \right) \\ \leq \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus J_i} (\|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1)^2,$$

we have

$$G_t(m_2, m_4, D, E, \{\sigma_i|_{S^{*c}}\}, \{\mathcal{N}^{(i)}|_{E_i \setminus J_i}\}, A) \\ = \int_{E^{S^{*c}}} \prod_{l \notin S^*} f(y_l) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^p \bigotimes_{l \notin S^*} T_l^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S^*} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] dy \\ \leq \|f\|_\infty^{m_2+m_4} \prod_{i=1}^p \left\| \bigotimes_{l \notin S^*} T_l^{(i)} \left[ \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S^*} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right] \right\|_{L^p(E'^{S^{*c}})} \\ \leq \|f\|_\infty^{m_2+m_4} \prod_{i=1}^p \left\| \prod_{l \in \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i) \setminus S^*} \left[ \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \psi_{n_{\sigma_i(l)+1}^{(i)}}^{(i)} \right] (y_l) \cdot G_t^{(i)}(D_i, \mathcal{N}^{(i)}; \{y_l\}_{l \notin \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)}) \right\|_{L^p(E'^{S^{*c}})} \\ \leq \|f\|_\infty^{m_2+m_4} \prod_{i=1}^p \left\{ e^t \left[ \sup_{y \in E} \int_E R_1^{(i)}(x, y)^p dx \right]^{\#D_i/p} \cdot \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus J_i} \exp \left\{ -\delta(1 + \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \right\} \right. \\ \left. \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus J_i} (\|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1)^2 m(E')^{\#(D_i^c \setminus F_i')/p} \right\} \\ \leq C(p, p^{(i)}, f)^k e^{pt} \prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus J_i} \exp \left\{ -\delta(1 + \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \right\} (\|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1)^2.$$

We also have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathcal{R}^c)^{D_i^c \setminus E_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^{E_i \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus J_i} \exp \left\{ -\delta(1 + \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \right\} (\|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1)^2 \\ \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathcal{N}^{(i)} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{>0})^{D_i^c \setminus J_i}, \\ i=1, \dots, p}} \prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{j \in D_i^c \setminus J_i} \exp \left\{ -\delta(1 + \lambda_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}) \right\} (\|\psi_{n_j^{(i)}}^{(i)}\|_\infty + 1)^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp\left\{-\delta(1 + \lambda_n^{(i)})\right\} \left(\|\psi_n^{(i)}\|_{\infty} + 1\right)^2 \right]^{\#(D_i^c \setminus J_i)} \\
&\leq C(p, p^{(i)}, \delta)^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Inequalities  $\binom{\#F_i}{\#S^*} \leq \sum_{n=0}^{\#F_i} \binom{\#F_i}{\#S^*} = 2^{\#F_i} \leq 2^k$  and  $(k - m_2 - m_4)!(m_2 + m_4)! \leq k!$  yield the desired result.  $\square$

Now we will consider the summations  $\sum_4$  which appear in (5.17). Since  $\#D_i \leq \eta k$  and  $\#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) \leq \gamma k$ , we have  $\#D_i^c \geq (1 - \eta)k$  and  $\#(D_i^c \setminus (E_i - 1)) \leq \gamma k$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\#(E_i \cap (E_i - 1)) &= \#D_i^c - \#(D_i^c \setminus (E_i \cap (E_i - 1))) \\
&\geq \#D_i^c - \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) - \#(D_i^c \setminus (E_i - 1)) \\
&\geq (1 - 2(\eta + \gamma))k.
\end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
m_2 + m_4 &= \#(S^*)^c = \#\left(\bigcap_i \sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)\right)^c \\
&\leq \sum_i \#\sigma_i^{-1}(F_i)^c = \sum_i \#(F_i)^c = \sum_i \#(E_i \cap (E_i - 1))^c \\
&\leq 2p(\eta + \gamma)k
\end{aligned}$$

and hence  $k - m_2 - m_4 \geq (1 - 2p(\eta + \gamma))k$ .

For  $l = (l_i^{(1)}, l_i^{(2)})_{1 \leq i \leq p} \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p$ , we have  $\psi_{l_i^{(1)}}^{(i)}, \psi_{l_i^{(2)}}^{(i)} \in L^{2p}(E)$  and the similar estimate as (4.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
|a(l) - a_{\varepsilon}(l)| &= \left| \left\langle f, \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \psi_{l_i^{(1)}}^{(i)} \psi_{l_i^{(2)}}^{(i)} \right] \right\rangle - \left\langle f, \prod_{i=1}^p T_{\varepsilon}^{(i)} \left[ \psi_{l_i^{(1)}}^{(i)} \psi_{l_i^{(2)}}^{(i)} \right] \right\rangle \right| \\
&\leq \|f\|_{\infty} \left\| \prod_{i=1}^p \left[ \psi_{l_i^{(1)}}^{(i)} \psi_{l_i^{(2)}}^{(i)} \right] - \prod_{i=1}^p T_{\varepsilon}^{(i)} \left[ \psi_{l_i^{(1)}}^{(i)} \psi_{l_i^{(2)}}^{(i)} \right] \right\|_1 \\
&\leq \|f\|_{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^p \left( \left\| \left[ \psi_{l_i^{(1)}}^{(i)} \psi_{l_i^{(2)}}^{(i)} \right] - T_{\varepsilon}^{(i)} \left[ \psi_{l_i^{(1)}}^{(i)} \psi_{l_i^{(2)}}^{(i)} \right] \right\|_p \cdot \prod_{j \neq i} \left\| \psi_{l_j^{(1)}}^{(i)} \right\|_{2p}^2 \left\| \psi_{l_j^{(2)}}^{(i)} \right\|_{2p}^2 \right) \\
&\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Write  $C_R(\varepsilon) = \sum_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [a_{\varepsilon}(l) - a(l)]$  and choose small  $\varepsilon_R > 0$  such that  $C_R(\varepsilon) < 1/2$ , for all  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_R$ . Then

$$C_R(\varepsilon)^{(2^{-1})(1-2p(\eta+\gamma))k} k^p \leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \left[ (1/2)^{(2^{-1})(1-2p(\eta+\gamma))k} k^p \right] < \infty.$$

Consider the summation  $\sum_{4-1}$  which appears in (5.17). By Lemma 5.12, we have

$$\sum_{0 \leq m_2 + m_4 \leq k} \sum_{A \in M_{k-m_2-m_4}} \quad (5.23)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{0 \leq m_2 + m_4 \leq k} \sum_{A \in \mathcal{M}_{k-m_2-m_4}} \frac{k!}{m_2! m_4!} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{l^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} A_i(l^{(i)})!}{\prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} A(l)!} \cdot \prod_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [a_\varepsilon(l) - a(l)]^{A(l)} \\
&\quad \cdot C(p, p^{(i)}, f, \delta)^k (k!)^p e^{pt} k^p \left( \prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{l^{(i)} \in \mathcal{R}^2} A_i(l^{(i)})! \right)^{-1} \\
&\leq (k!)^p k^p C(p, p^{(i)}, f, \delta)^k e^{pt} \sum_{0 \leq m_2 + m_4 \leq k} \frac{k!}{m_2! m_4! (k - m_2 - m_4)!} \cdot \left( \sum_{l \in (\mathcal{R}^2)^p} [a_\varepsilon(l) - a(l)] \right)^{k - m_2 - m_4} \\
&\leq (k!)^p k^p C(p, p^{(i)}, f, \delta)^k e^{pt} \sum_{0 \leq m_2 + m_4 \leq k} \frac{k!}{m_2! m_4! (k - m_2 - m_4)!} \cdot C_R(\varepsilon)^{(1-2p(\eta+\gamma))k} \\
&\leq (k!)^p k^p C(p, p^{(i)}, f, \delta)^k e^{pt} C_R(\varepsilon)^{(1-2p(\eta+\gamma))k} \\
&\leq (k!)^p C(p, p^{(i)}, f, \delta)^k e^{pt} C_R(\varepsilon)^{(1/2)(1-2p(\eta+\gamma))k} \quad \text{for small } \varepsilon < \varepsilon_R. \tag{5.24}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, consider the summation  $\sum_{4-2}$  which appears in (5.17). Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{D_i \subset \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ \#D_i \leq \eta k \text{ for all } i}} \sum_{\substack{E_i \subset D_i^c, \\ \#(D_i^c \setminus E_i) \leq \gamma k \text{ for all } i}} \tag{5.24} \\
&\leq 2^{kp} \cdot 2^{k\eta} \cdot (k!)^p C(p, p^{(i)}, f, \delta)^k e^{pt} C_R(\varepsilon)^{(1/2)(1-2p(\eta+\gamma))k} \quad \text{for small } \varepsilon < \varepsilon_R.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we complete the proof of Lemma 5.5.  $\square$

## 6 Proof of Theorem 1.8

### 6.1 Applying Varadhan's integral lemma

First, recall that  $t^{-1}\ell_t^{(i)} \in \mathcal{M}_1(E)$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , with probability  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function  $J^{(i)}$ , and that  $t^{-1}\ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E)$  satisfies the LDP as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , with probability  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_t$ , scale  $t$  and the good rate function  $J_\varepsilon^{(i)}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_\varepsilon^{(i)}(\nu) &:= \inf \{ J^{(i)}(\mu); \mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(E), p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\mu] = \nu \} \\
&= \inf \{ \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) - \lambda_1^{(i)}; \psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2 = 1, p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2] = \nu \}
\end{aligned}$$

for  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E)$ .

Fix  $f \in C_b(E)$ ,  $\theta > 0$  and define  $\Phi : \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\Phi(\nu) := \theta \langle f, \nu \rangle$  for  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E)$ . Then  $\Phi$  is continuous with respect to the weak topology, hence we obtain

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [e^{\gamma t \Phi(t^{-1}\ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)})}] \leq \gamma \theta \|f\|_\infty < \infty$$

for any  $\gamma > 1$ .

Now, applying Varadhan's integral lemma (Lemma 2.6) with  $t^{-1}\ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)}$  and we obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [e^{\theta \langle f, \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} \rangle}] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [e^{t \Phi(t^{-1}\ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)})}] = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E)} \{ \Phi(\nu) - J_\varepsilon^{(i)}(\nu) \}.$$

By Lemma 6.1 stated below, we can rewrite the equality as

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [e^{\theta \langle f, \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} \rangle}] = \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2 = 1} \left\{ \theta \int_E p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2] f dm - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}. \tag{6.1}$$

**Lemma 6.1.** For each  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and  $\theta > 0$ ,

$$\sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E)} \{\Phi(\nu) - J_\varepsilon^{(i)}(\nu)\} = \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \int_E p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2] f dm - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* First, fix  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}(E)$  and suppose  $J_\varepsilon^{(i)}(\nu) < \infty$ . For each  $n$ , choose  $\psi_n \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  with  $\|\psi_n\|_2 = 1$ ,  $p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_n^2] = \frac{d\nu}{dm}$  and  $\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_n, \psi_n) - \lambda_1^{(i)} \leq J_\varepsilon^{(i)}(\nu) + n^{-1}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\nu) - J_\varepsilon^{(i)}(\nu) &\leq \theta \langle f, p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi_n^2] \rangle - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi_n, \psi_n) + \lambda_1^{(i)} + n^{-1} \\ &\leq \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \int_E p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2] f dm - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\} + n^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

and the upper bound follows.

Conversely, fix  $\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$  with  $\|\psi\|_2 = 1$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta \int_E (p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[f]) \psi^2 dm - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + \lambda_1^{(i)} &\leq \Phi(p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]) - J_\varepsilon^{(i)}(p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]) \\ &\leq \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_{\leq 1}} \{\Phi(\nu) - J_\varepsilon^{(i)}(\nu)\} \end{aligned}$$

and the lower bound follows.  $\square$

Next, we will extend [CR05, Theorem 7] under our setting. Throughout this section, with some abuse of notations, we denote

$$\frac{1}{t} \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} = L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} := \frac{1}{t} \frac{d\ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)}}{dm}, \quad \frac{1}{t^p} \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}} = L_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}} := \frac{1}{t^p} \frac{d\ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}}{dm}.$$

**Proposition 6.2.** Let  $h \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$  be nonnegative and compactly supported. Write  $m_h(dx) := h(x)m(dx)$ . Suppose  $E' := \text{supp}[m_h]$  is compact and each  $p_t^{(i)}(\cdot, \cdot)$  is uniformly continuous in  $E \times E$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp \left\{ \theta \|\ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(m_h)} \right\} \\ = \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_{L^2(m)}=1} \left\{ \theta \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]\|_{L^p(m_h)} - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E \prod_{i=1}^p \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\} \\ = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_{L^2(m)}=1} \left\{ \theta \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]\|_{L^p(m_h)} - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

*Proof of Proposition 6.2.* Our proof is based on the proof of [CR05, Theorem 7].

First we prove the lower bound of (6.2). Take  $q > 0$  such that  $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$ . For any function  $f \in C_b(E)$  with  $\|f\|_{L^q(m_h)} = 1$ , we have  $(\int_E \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h)^{1/p} \geq \int_E f \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} dm_h = \int_E f \cdot \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} \cdot h dm$  and by the equality (6.1),

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\} \geq \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \int_E p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2] f dm_h - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}.$$

Since  $p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2] \in L^p(E; m) \subset L^p(E; m_h)$ , by letting  $f \rightarrow \frac{p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]^{p-1}}{\|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]\|_{L^p(m_h)}^{p-1}}$  and then

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\} \geq \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]^p dm_h \right)^{1/p} - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}.$$

We next prove the upper bound of (6.2). Let  $E' := \text{supp}[h]$ . Fix  $\delta > 0$  and take  $q > 0$  with  $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$ . For each  $f \in C_K(E') \subset L^q(E'; m_h)$  with  $\|f\|_{L^q(m_h)} = 1$ , set  $U_f := \{g \in L^p(E'; m_h) : \|g\|_{L^p(m_h)} - \int_E f g dm_h < \delta\}$ . We note that  $K_\varepsilon^{(i)}$  is  $L^p(E'; m_h)$ -bounded and  $C_K(E')$  is dense in  $L^q(E'; m_h)$ . By the Hahn-Banach theorem, the family of such  $U_f$ 's is an open cover of  $K_\varepsilon^{(i)}$ .

Since  $K_\varepsilon^{(i)}$  is compact in  $L^p(E'; m_h)$ , there are finitely many  $f_1, \dots, f_N \in C_K(E')$  such that, for every  $i$ ,  $\|g\|_{L^p(m_h)} \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \int_E f_i g dm_h + \delta$  for all  $g \in K_\varepsilon^{(i)}$ . In particular,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \exp \left\{ \theta t \left( \int_E L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\} \right] \leq e^{\delta t} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp \left\{ \theta t \langle f_i \cdot h, L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} \rangle \right\}$$

and by the equality (6.1),

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \exp \left\{ \theta t \left( \int_E L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\} \right] \\ & \leq \delta + \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \int_E f_i p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2] dm_h - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\} \\ & \leq \delta + \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]^p dm_h \right)^{1/p} - \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ , we thus obtain (6.2).

We next prove the lower bound of (6.3). Fix  $\delta > 0$  and let  $d$  be a metric of  $E$ . We define the sets  $A_\varepsilon^{(i)} \subset C(E') \subset L^p(E'; m_h)$  by

$$A_\varepsilon^{(i)} := \left\{ \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t p_\varepsilon^{(i)}(\cdot, X_s^{(i)}(\omega)) ds : t \in (0, \infty), \omega \in \{t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}\} \right\}. \quad (6.4)$$

We can see that  $A_\varepsilon^{(i)}$  is uniformly bounded and equi-continuous. By the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem, each  $A_\varepsilon^{(i)}$  is a relatively compact set of  $C(E')$ , and hence, a relatively compact set of  $L^p(E'; m_h)$ . Write  $K_\varepsilon^{(i)}$  as the  $L^p(E'; m_h)$ -closure of  $A_\varepsilon^{(i)}$ .

Consider the continuous, non-negative function

$$(L^p(E'; m_h))^p \ni (f_1, \dots, f_p) \mapsto \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left( \int_{E'} |f_i|^p dm_h \right)^{1/p} - \left( \int_{E'} \prod_{i=1}^p |f_i| dm_h \right)^{1/p} \in [0, \infty). \quad (6.5)$$

Since this function is equal to 0 on the diagonal set  $\{f_1 = \dots = f_p\} \subset (L^p(E'; m_h))^p$ , for each  $g \in L^p(E'; m_h)$  there exists a constant  $b = b(g, \delta) > 0$  such that  $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left( \int_E |f_i|^p dm \right)^{1/p} - \left( \int_E \prod_{i=1}^p |f_i| dm \right)^{1/p} < \delta$  if  $f_i \in B_b(g)$  for all  $i$ , where  $B_b(g)$  is the open ball in  $L^p(E'; m_h)$  of radius  $b$  centered at  $g$ . Since  $K_\varepsilon^{(i)}$  is compact in  $L^p(E'; m_h)$ , take finite  $g_1, \dots, g_N \in L^p(E'; m_h)$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_N > 0$  such that  $K_\varepsilon^{(i)} \subset \bigcup_{l=1}^N B_{b_l}(g_l)$  for all  $i$ .

Now,  $t^{-1} \rho_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} = L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)}$  belongs to some  $B_{b_l}(g_l)$  and hence

$$\sum_{l=1}^N \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \exp \left\{ \frac{\theta}{p} t \left( \int_{E'} L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\}; L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} \in B_{b_l}(g_l) \right] \geq \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp \left\{ \frac{\theta}{p} t \left( \int_{E'} L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\}.$$

For each  $l$ , the continuity of the function (6.5) implies that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp \left\{ \theta t \left( \int_{E'} \prod_{i=1}^p L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq e^{-\delta t} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \exp \left\{ \frac{\theta}{p} t \sum_{i=1}^p \left( \int_{E'} L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\}; L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} \in B_{b_l}(g_l) \text{ for all } i \right] \\
&= e^{-\delta t} \prod_{i=1}^p \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \exp \left\{ \frac{\theta}{p} t \left( \int_{E'} L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\}; L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} \in B_{b_l}(g_l) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities with (6.2), we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp \left\{ \theta t \left( \int_E \prod_{i=1}^p L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\} \\
&\geq -\delta + \sum_{i=1}^p \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{x_0} \exp \left\{ \frac{\theta}{p} t \left( \int_E L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\} \\
&= -\delta + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_{L^2(m)}=1} \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E |p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]|^p dm_h \right)^{1/p} - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove the upper bound of (6.3). Since

$$\left\{ \int_E \prod_{i=1}^p L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} dm_h \right\}^{1/p} \leq \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^p \left( \int_E L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\}^{1/p} \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{1}{p} \left( \int_E L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p},$$

we have from the upper bound of 1st equality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \exp \left\{ \theta t \left( \int_E \prod_{i=1}^p L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^p \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \left[ \exp \left\{ \frac{\theta}{p} t \left( \int_E L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} \right\} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]^p dm_h \right)^{1/p} - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

## 6.2 Exponential approximation

Recall that  $t^p \int_E \prod_{i=1}^p L_{t,\varepsilon}^{(i)} dm_h = \langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle$  and  $\lambda_1^{(i)} := \inf \{ \mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) : \psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \int_E \psi^2 dm = 1 \}$ .

Next, we prove a similar result with [CR05, Theorem 6]. As we have already noted in the end of Section 1.5, Chen and Rosen consider the stable processes on  $\mathbb{R}^N$ , so the Fourier transformation method is valid. Instead, we use Proposition 4.3.

**Lemma 6.3.** *For any  $\theta > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_{x_0} [\exp \{ \theta | \langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle |^{1/p} \}] \leq 1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_1^{(i)}}{p}.$$

*Proof.* Define  $q$  by  $1/p + 1/q = 1$ . By Hölder's inequality and Proposition 4.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{x_0} [ | \langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle |^{k/p}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)} ] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [ | \langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle |^k; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)} ]^{1/p} \mathbb{P}_{x_0}(t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)})^{1/q} \\
&\leq k! e^t C(\varepsilon)^{k/p} \mathbb{P}_{x_0}(t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)})^{1/q}
\end{aligned}$$



and hence, for small  $\varepsilon > 0$  (which depends on  $\theta$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [\exp\{\theta|\langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle|^{1/p}\}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\theta^k}{k!} \mathbb{E}_{x_0} [|\langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle|^{k/p}; t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)}] \\ &\leq e^t \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \theta^k C(\varepsilon)^{k/p} \mathbb{P}_{x_0}(t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)})^{1/q} \\ &= e^t \{1 - \theta C(\varepsilon)^{1/p}\}^{-1} \mathbb{P}_{x_0}(t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)})^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

By normalization, we rewrite the above inequality as

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t [\exp\{\theta|\langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle|^{1/p}\}] \leq e^t \{1 - \theta C(\varepsilon)^{1/p}\}^{-1} \mathbb{P}_{x_0}(t < \zeta^{(1)} \wedge \dots \wedge \zeta^{(p)})^{-1/p}.$$

By [FOT11, Corollary 6.4.2], we have the equality  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1} \log \mathbb{P}_{x_0}(t < \zeta^{(i)}) = -\lambda_1^{(i)}$ . Since  $\zeta^{(1)}, \dots, \zeta^{(p)}$  are independent, we reach the conclusion.  $\square$

Fix a nonnegative and compactly supported function  $h \in \mathcal{B}_b(E)$ . For  $\theta \geq 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} N^{(i)}(\theta, \varepsilon, h) &:= \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]^p dm_h \right)^{1/p} - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}, \\ N^{(i)}(\theta, 0, h) &:= \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \left( \int_E \psi^{2p} dm_h \right)^{1/p} - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The next Lemma is used in the proof of the lower bound of Proposition 1.8 below.

**Lemma 6.4.** *For fixed  $\theta \geq 0$ , it holds that*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} N^{(i)}(\theta, \varepsilon, h) \leq N^{(i)}(\theta, 0, h), \quad (6.6)$$

$$\limsup_{\theta' \rightarrow \theta} N^{(i)}(\theta', 0, h) \leq N^{(i)}(\theta, 0, h). \quad (6.7)$$

*Proof.* For convenience, we fix  $i$  and omit the index  $(i)$  only in this proof.

Fix  $\theta > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Take  $L^2(E; m)$ -normalized  $\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)} \in \mathcal{F}$  such that

$$N(\theta, \varepsilon, h) - \delta < \theta \left( \int_E p_\varepsilon[\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)^2}]^p dm_h \right)^{1/p} - p\mathcal{E}(\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) + p\lambda_1.$$

We have  $0 = N(0, \varepsilon, h) \leq N(\theta, \varepsilon, h)$ , and by (2.3), we also have

$$\left( \int_E p_\varepsilon[\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)^2}]^p dm_h \right)^{1/p} \leq \|\psi^{(\varepsilon, \delta)}\|_{L^{2p}(m)} \leq C_\delta + \delta \mathcal{E}(\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)})$$

and hence  $(p - \theta\delta)\mathcal{E}(\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}, \psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}) < \theta C_\delta + p\lambda_1 + \delta$ . By choosing a small  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\{\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}\}$  is bounded in  $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E}_1)$ . By (2.5), we can take a subsequence such that  $\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)}$  converges to some  $\psi^{(\delta)}$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , in  $L^2(E; m)$  and in  $L^{2p}(E; m)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & N(\theta, \varepsilon, h) - N(\theta, 0, h) \\ &\leq \theta \|p_\varepsilon[\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)^2}]\|_{L^p(m_h)} - \theta \|\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)^2}\|_{L^p(m_h)} + \delta \\ &\leq \theta \|p_\varepsilon[\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)^2} - \psi^{(\delta)^2}]\|_{L^p(m_h)} + \theta \|p_\varepsilon[\psi^{(\delta)^2}]\|_{L^p(m_h)} - \theta \|\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)^2}\|_{L^p(m_h)} + \delta \\ &\leq \theta \|h\|_\infty \|\psi^{(\delta, \varepsilon)^2} - \psi^{(\delta)^2}\|_{L^p(m)} + \theta \|p_\varepsilon[\psi^{(\delta)^2}]\|_{L^p(m_h)} - \theta \|\psi^{(\delta)^2}\|_{L^p(m_h)} + \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} N(\theta, \varepsilon, h) \leq N(\theta, 0, h)$ .

To prove the second inequality, fix  $\theta' \geq 0$ . For each  $\delta > 0$ , take  $\psi^{(\delta, \theta')} \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $\|\psi^{(\delta, \theta')}\|_2 = 1$  and  $N(\theta', 0, h) < \theta' \|\psi^{(\delta, \theta')}\|_{L^{2p}(m_h)}^2 - p\mathcal{E}(\psi^{(\delta, \theta')}, \psi^{(\delta, \theta')}) + p\lambda_1 + \delta$ . By the same

manner as the proof of the first inequality, we can find that  $(p - \theta'\delta)\mathcal{E}(\psi^{(\delta,\theta')}, \psi^{(\delta,\theta')}) < \theta'C_\delta + p\lambda_1 + \delta$ . We have

$$N(\theta', 0, h) - N(\theta, 0, h) \leq (\theta' - \theta)\|\psi^{(\delta,\theta')}\|_{L^{2p}(m_h)}^2 + \delta \leq (\theta' - \theta)(C_\delta + \delta\mathcal{E}(\psi^{(\delta,\theta')}, \psi^{(\delta,\theta')})) + \delta.$$

Hence  $\limsup_{\theta' \rightarrow \theta} N(\theta', 0, h) \leq N(\theta, 0, h)$ .  $\square$

Finally we prove Proposition 1.8. Our proof is based on the proof of [CR05, Theorem 1].

*Proof of Proposition 1.8.* We first prove the upper bound. Fix  $a, b > 0$  with  $a^{-1} + b^{-1} = 1$ . By Hölder's inequality,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta a^{-1} \langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p}\} \leq \left( \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p}\} \right)^{1/a} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta a^{-1} b |\langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle|^{1/p}\} \right)^{1/b}$$

and by Proposition 6.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta a^{-1} \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]\|_{L^p(m_h)} - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\} \\ & \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{at} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p}\} + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{bt} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta a^{-1} b |\langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle|^{1/p}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We can see that  $p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2] \rightarrow \psi^2$  in  $L^p$  for each  $i$  and  $\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}$ . By taking  $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$ , Lemma 6.3 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta a^{-1} \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]\|_{L^p(m_h)} - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\} \\ & \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{at} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p}\} + \frac{1}{bp} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^p \left( 1 + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $a \rightarrow 1$ ,  $b \rightarrow \infty$  and hence

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \|\psi\|_{L^{2p}(m_h)}^2 - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\} \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p}\}.$$

We next prove the lower bound. Fix  $a, b > 0$  with  $a^{-1} + b^{-1} = 1$ . By Hölder's inequality,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p}\} \leq \left( \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta a \langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p}\} \right)^{1/a} \left( \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta b |\langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle|^{1/p}\} \right)^{1/b}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p}\} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{ap} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta a \|p_\varepsilon^{(i)}[\psi^2]\|_{L^p(m_h)} - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\} \\ & \quad + \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{bt} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta b |\langle \ell_{t,\varepsilon}^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle - \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle|^{1/p}\} \end{aligned}$$

Take  $\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$  and  $\limsup_{a \rightarrow 1}$ , successively. Then Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 6.4 imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \tilde{\mathbb{E}}_t \exp\{\theta \langle \ell_t^{\text{IS}}, h \rangle^{1/p}\} \\ & \leq \limsup_{a \rightarrow 1} \frac{1}{ap} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta a^{-1} \|\psi\|_{L^{2p}(m_h)}^2 - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\} + \limsup_{a \rightarrow 1} \frac{1}{bp} \sum_{i=1}^p \left( 1 + \lambda_1^{(i)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{F}^{(i)}, \|\psi\|_2=1} \left\{ \theta \|\psi\|_{L^{2p}(m_h)}^2 - p\mathcal{E}^{(i)}(\psi, \psi) + p\lambda_1^{(i)} \right\}.$$

□

## 7 Examples

In this section, we give sufficient conditions for Assumption **(A)**.

### 7.1 Diffusion processes with (sub-)Gaussian type estimates

Let  $(E, d, m)$  be a locally compact, separable metric measure space with  $\text{diam}(E) = 1$  and  $m(E) < \infty$ . Let  $X$  be a Hunt process on  $E$  with the transition density  $p_t(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Suppose there exist positive constants  $c_1, \dots, c_5, d_f \geq 1$  and  $d_w \geq 2$  such that

$$c_1 t^{-d_f/d_w} \leq p_t(x, x), \quad (7.1)$$

$$p_t(x, y) \leq c_2 t^{-d_f/d_w} \exp \left\{ -c_3 \left( \frac{d(x, y)^{d_w}}{t} \right)^{1/(d_w-1)} \right\} \quad (7.2)$$

and

$$c_4 r^{d_f} \leq m(B(x, r)) \leq c_5 r^{d_f} \quad (7.3)$$

for all  $x, y \in E, r \in (0, 1]$  and  $t \in (0, 1]$ .

**Proposition 7.1.** *Under the above conditions, if an integer  $p$  with  $p \geq 2$  satisfies*

$$d_f - p(d_f - d_w) > 0,$$

*then Assumption **(A)** holds.*

*Proof.* Write  $d_s := 2d_f/d_w$ . We have by (7.1) and (7.2),  $c_1 t^{-d_s/2} \leq p_t(x, x) \leq c_2 t^{-d_s/2}$  for all  $x \in E$  and  $t \in (0, 1]$ , hence (A3) follows because  $m(E) < \infty$ .

Next, we have by (7.2),  $p_t(x, y) \leq c_2 t^{-d_s/2}$  for all  $x, y \in E$  and  $t \in (0, 1]$ . When  $d_s > 2$ , we have  $p < d_s/(d_s - 2)$  and (A4) holds for  $\mu = d_s$ . When  $d_s \leq 2$ , we have  $p < (2 + \varepsilon)/\{(2 + \varepsilon) - 2\} = (2 + \varepsilon)/\varepsilon$  for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $p_t(x, y) \leq c_2 t^{-d_s/2} \leq c_2 t^{-(2+\varepsilon)/2}$  for all  $x, y \in E$  and  $t \in (0, 1]$ . Hence (A4) holds for  $\mu = 2 + \varepsilon$ .

To prove (1.7) in (A5), fix  $x, y \in E$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(x, y) &= \int_0^\infty e^{-t} p_t(x, y) dt \\ &\leq \int_0^1 e^{-t} \left[ c_2 t^{-d_f/d_w} \exp \left\{ -c_3 \left( \frac{d(x, y)^{d_w}}{t} \right)^{1/(d_w-1)} \right\} \right] dt + \int_1^\infty e^{-t} [c_2 t^{-d_s/2}] dt \\ &\leq \int_0^1 e^{-t} \left[ c_2 t^{-d_f/d_w} \exp \left\{ -c_3 \left( \frac{d(x, y)^{d_w}}{t} \right)^{1/(d_w-1)} \right\} \right] dt + c_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $m(B(y; 2^{-n+1})) - m(B(y; 2^{-n})) \leq c_5 2^{-(n-1)d_f} - c_4 2^{-nd_f} \leq C 2^{-nd_f}$  for each  $n$ , we also have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_E \left( \int_0^1 e^{-t} \left[ c_2 t^{-d_f/d_w} \exp \left\{ -c_3 \left( \frac{d(x, y)^{d_w}}{t} \right)^{1/(d_w-1)} \right\} \right] dt \right)^p m(dx) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \int_{2^{-n} < d(x, y) \leq 2^{-n+1}} \left( \int_0^1 e^{-t} \left[ c_2 t^{-d_f/d_w} \exp \left\{ -c_3 \left( \frac{d(x, y)^{d_w}}{t} \right)^{1/(d_w-1)} \right\} \right] dt \right)^p m(dx) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \{m(B(y; 2^{-n+1})) - m(B(y; 2^{-n}))\} \left( \int_0^1 e^{-t} \left[ c_2 t^{-d_f/d_w} \exp \left\{ -c_3 \left( \frac{2^{-nd_w}}{t} \right)^{1/(d_w-1)} \right\} \right] dt \right)^p \\
&\leq C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-nd_f} \left( \int_0^1 t^{-\frac{d_f}{d_w}} \exp \left\{ -c_3 2^{-n\frac{d_w}{d_w-1}} t^{-\frac{1}{d_w-1}} \right\} dt \right)^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, since  $d_f - p(d_f - d_w) > 0$ , standard calculations imply

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-nd_f} \left( \int_0^1 t^{-\frac{d_f}{d_w}} \exp \left\{ -c_3 2^{-n\frac{d_w}{d_w-1}} t^{-\frac{1}{d_w-1}} \right\} dt \right)^p < \infty. \quad (7.4)$$

Consequently, (1.7) in (A5) holds.

To see (1.8), we can similarly find that for  $\delta < 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_E \left( \int_0^{\delta} e^{-t} \left[ c_2 t^{-d_f/d_w} \exp \left\{ -c_3 \left( \frac{d(x, y)^{d_w}}{t} \right)^{1/(d_w-1)} \right\} \right] dt \right)^p m(dx) \\
&\leq C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-nd_f} \left( \int_0^{\delta} t^{-\frac{d_f}{d_w}} \exp \left\{ -c_3 2^{-n\frac{d_w}{d_w-1}} t^{-\frac{1}{d_w-1}} \right\} dt \right)^p.
\end{aligned}$$

By regarding  $\sum_n$  as the integral with respect to the counting measure on  $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , (1.8) follows by (7.4) and the dominated convergence theorem.  $\square$

## 7.2 Jump-type processes

Let  $(E, d, m)$  be a locally compact, separable metric measure space with  $\text{diam}(E) = 1$  and  $m(E) < \infty$ . Let  $X$  be a Hunt process on  $E$  with the transition density  $p_t(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Suppose there exist positive constants  $c_1, \dots, c_4$ ,  $d_f \geq 1$  and  $d_w \geq 2$  such that

$$c_1 t^{-d_f/d_w} \leq p_t(x, x), \quad (7.5)$$

$$p_t(x, y) \leq c_2 \left\{ t^{-d_f/d_w} \wedge \frac{t}{d(x, y)^{d_f+d_w}} \right\} \quad (7.6)$$

and

$$c_3 r^{d_f} \leq m(B(x, r)) \leq c_4 r^{d_f} \quad (7.7)$$

for all  $x, y \in E$ ,  $r \in (0, 1]$  and  $t \in (0, 1]$ .

By similar calculations as in the proof of Proposition 7.1, we can prove the following.

**Proposition 7.2.** *Under the above conditions, if an integer  $p$  with  $p \geq 2$  satisfies*

$$d_f - p(d_f - d_w) > 0,$$

*then Assumption (A) holds.*

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Professor Takashi Kumagai, my master's thesis supervisor, and Professor Ryoki Fukushima, for helpful discussions. We also wish to thank Professor Wolfgang König and Professor Chiranjib Mukherjee for their comments.

## References

- [AGS14] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli and Giuseppe Savaré. Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below. *Duke Math. J.*, 163(7):1405–1490, 2014.
- [Bar98] Martin T. Barlow. Diffusions on fractals. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1995)*, volume 1690 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–121. Springer, Berlin, 1998.
- [BBCK09] Martin T. Barlow, Richard F. Bass, Zhen-Qing Chen and Moritz Kassmann. Non-local Dirichlet forms and symmetric jump processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(4):1963–1999, 2009.
- [BP88] Martin T. Barlow and Edwin A. Perkins. Brownian motion on the Sierpiński gasket. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 79(4):543–623, 1988.
- [Che04] Xia Chen. Exponential asymptotics and law of the iterated logarithm for intersection local times of random walks. *Ann. Probab.*, 32(4):3248–3300, 2004.
- [Che10] Xia Chen. *Random walk intersections*, volume 157 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
- [CK03] Zhen-Qing Chen and Takashi Kumagai. Heat kernel estimates for stable-like processes on  $d$ -sets. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 108(1):27–62, 2003.
- [CKS87] Eric Anders Carlen, Shigeo Kusuoka and Daniel W. Stroock. Upper bounds for symmetric Markov transition functions. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 23(2, suppl.):245–287, 1987.
- [CKS14] Zhen-Qing Chen, Panki Kim and Renming Song. Dirichlet heat kernel estimates for rotationally symmetric Lévy processes. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 109(1):90–120, 2014.
- [CR05] Xia Chen and Jay Rosen. Exponential asymptotics for intersection local times of stable processes and random walks. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 41(5):901–928, 2005.
- [Dav07] Edward Brian Davies. *Linear operators and their spectra*, volume 106 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [dH00] Frank den Hollander. *Large deviations*, volume 14 of *Fields Institute Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
- [dHS85] Laurens de Haan and Ulrich Stadtmüller. Dominated variation and related concepts and Tauberian theorems for Laplace transforms. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 108(2):344–365, 1985.
- [DZ98] Amir Dembo and Ofer Zeitouni. *Large deviations techniques and applications*, volume 38 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
- [EFHN15] Tanja Eisner, Bálint Farkas, Markus Haase and Rainer Nagel. *Operator theoretic aspects of ergodic theory*, volume 272 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2015.

- [FOT11] Masatoshi Fukushima, Yoichi Oshima and Masayoshi Takeda. *Dirichlet forms and symmetric Markov processes*, volume 19 of *de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, extended edition, 2011.
- [FT08] Masatoshi Fukushima and Masayoshi Takeda. *Markov Processes (in Japanese)*. Baifūkan, Tokyo, 2008.
- [GSC11] Pavel Gyrya and Laurent Saloff-Coste. Neumann and Dirichlet heat kernels in inner uniform domains. *Astérisque*, (336):viii+144, 2011.
- [JLZ16] Renjin Jiang, Huaqian Li and Huichun Zhang. Heat kernel bounds on metric measure spaces and some applications. *Potential Anal.*, 44(3):601–627, 2016.
- [Kal83] Olav Kallenberg. *Random measures*. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin; Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London, third edition, 1983.
- [Kal02] Olav Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2002.
- [KM02] Wolfgang König and Peter Mörters. Brownian intersection local times: upper tail asymptotics and thick points. *Ann. Probab.*, 30(4):1605–1656, 2002.
- [KM13] Wolfgang König and Chiranjib Mukherjee. Large deviations for Brownian intersection measures. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 66(2):263–306, 2013.
- [LG92] Jean-François Le Gall. Some properties of planar Brownian motion. In *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XX—1990*, volume 1527 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 111–235. Springer, Berlin, 1992.
- [LY86] Peter Li and Shing-Tung Yau. On the parabolic kernel of the Schrödinger operator. *Acta Math.*, 156(3-4):153–201, 1986.
- [TTT17] Masayoshi Takeda, Yoshihiro Tawara and Kaneharu Tsuchida. Compactness of Markov and Schrödinger semi-groups: a probabilistic approach. *Osaka J. Math.*, 54(3):517–532, 2017.
- [Zha02] Qi S. Zhang. The boundary behavior of heat kernels of Dirichlet Laplacians. *J. Differential Equations*, 182(2):416–430, 2002.