

HIGHER ORDER ASYMPTOTICS FOR LARGE DEVIATIONS

KASUN FERNANDO AND PRATIMA HEBBAR

ABSTRACT. For sequences of non-lattice *weakly dependent* random variables, we obtain asymptotic expansions for Large Deviation Principles. These expansions, commonly referred to as strong large deviation results, are in the spirit of Edgeworth Expansions for the Central Limit Theorem. We show that Diophantine iid sequences, finite state Markov chains, strongly ergodic Markov chains and observations from smooth expanding maps satisfy the strong large deviation results. In addition, we obtain equivalent expansions in the case of stochastic processes, and verify their existence for additive functionals of processes generated from SDE's satisfying the Hörmander condition.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of real valued random variables, $S_N = X_1 + \cdots + X_N$, and let the asymptotic mean of $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, \bar{X} , be given by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(S_n)}{n} = \bar{X}.$$

We call $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ centered if $\bar{X} = 0$.

If $\{X_n\}$ are centered iid random variables, then $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(S_N \geq aN) = 0$ for all $a > 0$, due to the Law of Large Numbers. Large Deviation Principles (LDPs) give better descriptions of these types of non-typical events by specifying the exponential rate at which their probabilities decay.

The following classical result, due to Cramér, is one of the fundamental results in the theory of Large Deviations (see [16, Chapter 1]).

Theorem 1.1 (Cramér). *Let X be a real valued random variable. Let X_n be a sequence of iid copies of X . Then,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}(S_N \geq aN) = -I(a), \text{ if } a > \bar{X},$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}(S_N \leq aN) = -I(a), \text{ if } a < \bar{X},$$

where $I(z) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} [\theta z - \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})]$ (the Legendre transform of the logarithmic moment generating function of X).

Cramér's LDP has an extension to the non-iid case. We refer the reader to [15, Chapter V.6] for a proof of the following result.

Theorem 1.2 (Local Gärtner–Ellis). *Let X_n be a sequence of random variables (not necessarily iid). Suppose there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for $\theta \in (0, \delta)$,*

$$(1.1) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta S_N}) = \Omega(\theta)$$

where Ω is strictly convex continuously differentiable function with $\Omega'(0) = 0$. Then, for all $a \in \left(0, \frac{\Omega(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$, there exists $\theta_a \in (0, \delta)$ such that

$$(1.2) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}(S_N \geq aN) = -I(a)$$

where $I(a) = \sup_{\theta \in (0, \delta)} [a\theta - \Omega(\theta)] = a\theta_a - \Omega(\theta_a)$.

Remark 1.1.

1. If the limit (1.1) exists for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, then $B := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Omega(\delta)}{\delta} \in (0, \infty]$ exists and (1.2) holds for all $a \in (0, B)$. This is a consequence of the fact that the function $f(x)$ defined as $f(x) = \frac{\Omega(x)}{x}$ is strictly increasing on $(0, \delta)$. (1.1) implies that the function f is differentiable on $(0, \delta)$ and

$$f'(x) = \frac{x\Omega'(x) - \Omega(x)}{x^2}.$$

Now, $\Omega'(x) > \frac{\Omega(x)}{x}$ for all $x \in (0, \infty)$ since $\Omega(x)$ is strictly convex. Thus, $f'(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (0, \delta)$.

2. The function I appearing in the theorem is called the rate function because it gives the exponential rate of decay of tail probabilities.

Note that these results focus on the asymptotics of $\frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}(S_N \geq aN)$ and are referred to as weak large deviation results (for example, in [7]) because they give only the exponential rate of decay of these tail probabilities but not the exact asymptotics, and in particular, not the pre-exponential factor. There have been attempts to improve these results by obtaining asymptotic expansions of $\mathbb{P}(S_N \geq aN)$.

Definition 1.1 (Strong Asymptotic Expansions for LDP). *Suppose S_N satisfies an LDP with rate function I . Then, S_N admits strong asymptotic expansion of order r for large deviations in the range $(0, L)$ if there are functions $D_k : (0, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $0 \leq k < \frac{r}{2}$ such that for each $a \in (0, L)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_N - \bar{X}N \geq aN)e^{I(a)N} = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{D_k(a)}{N^{k+1/2}} + C_{r,a} \cdot o\left(\frac{1}{N^{\frac{r+1}{2}}}\right).$$

Remark 1.2. *We note that order r strong asymptotic expansion for large deviations, if it exists, is unique. Suppose D_k and \tilde{D}_k , $1 \leq k \leq r/2$ are functions on $(0, L)$ corresponding to*

two expansions. Fix $a \in (0, L)$. Then,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{D_k(a)}{N^{k+1/2}} = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{\tilde{D}_k(a)}{N^{k+1/2}} + o\left(\frac{1}{N^{\frac{r+1}{2}}}\right)$$

Multiplying by \sqrt{N} taking the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ we have $D_1(a) = \tilde{D}_1(a)$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{D_k(a)}{N^{k+1/2}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{\tilde{D}_k(a)}{N^{k+1/2}} + o\left(\frac{1}{N^{\frac{r+1}{2}}}\right)$$

Then, multiplying by $N^{3/2}$ and taking $N \rightarrow \infty$, $D_2(z) = \tilde{D}_2(z)$. Continuing this $\lfloor r/2 \rfloor$ times for all $a \in (0, L)$ we can conclude $D_k(a) = \tilde{D}_k(a)$ for $a \in (0, L)$, $1 \leq k \leq r/2$.

These expansions are in the spirit of the higher order expansions obtained first in [6] for iid sequences of random variables with absolutely continuous components and then extended in [1] to those satisfying Cramér's condition: $\limsup_{|t| \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbb{E}(e^{itX})| < 1$. In fact, in the iid case the expansions that are derived here reduce to the ones obtained in [1, 6].

In [7], authors refer to these expansions as strong large deviation results. [7, 17] establish the order 1 expansions under certain assumptions on the behaviour of the moment generating functions. They strengthen the results of [1] but only in the order 1 case. Here, we establish the so-called strong large deviation results of all orders not just for sequences of random variables but also for continuous time stochastic processes. In particular, we recover the results in [1] in the non-lattice setting. For applications of these results to statistics, see examples listed in [1, 7, 17] and references therein.

We also introduce the following *weak* form of the expansion for LDPs (not to be confused with weak large deviation results).

Definition 1.2 (Weak Asymptotic Expansions for LDP). *Suppose S_N satisfies an LDP with rate function I . Let $(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space of functions defined on \mathbb{R} . Then S_N admits weak asymptotic expansion of order r for large deviations in the range $(0, L)$ for $f \in \mathcal{F}$ if there are functions $D_k^f : (0, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (depending on f) for $0 \leq k < \frac{r}{2}$ such that for each $a \in (0, L)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}(f(S_N - (\bar{X} + a)N))e^{I(a)N} = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{D_k^f(a)}{N^{k+1/2}} + C_{r,a} \|f\| \cdot o\left(\frac{1}{N^{\frac{r+1}{2}}}\right).$$

Remark 1.3. *From the same argument in Remark 1.2, for a given f , weak expansion for large deviation is unique.*

These are in the spirit of weak Edgeworth expansions in [4, 12]. However, we believe that this is the first time such expansions have been considered in the context of large deviations. It is also worth noting that in the absence of strong asymptotic expansions, weak expansions

can be used to describe the asymptotics of large deviations. For some examples where the weak expansions exist but the strong ones do not, refer to Section 4.2 and Section 4.4.

The main goal of this paper is to establish natural conditions (in the context of dynamical systems & Markov processes) that guarantee the existence of asymptotic expansions for LDP's. We will refer to sequences of random variables that satisfy these conditions as *weakly dependent* random variables. The weak dependence criterion, stated in Section 2, is an extension of the Nagaev–Guivarc'h criterion which is often used to establish the CLT for Markov processes and dynamical systems (see [5, 13] for details).

The idea behind the Nagaev–Guivarc'h approach is to first code the characteristic function of S_N using iterations of an operator – a Markov operator (for Markov processes) or a transfer operator (for dynamical systems) – and then use the spectral properties of this operator to obtain results about S_N .

This approach is widely applicable because the assumptions on the operator that characterize weak dependence are easily verifiable. In fact, in Section 4, we check these conditions for broad classes of random variables. We recover the results in [1] for non-lattice random variables, in Section 4.1. Also, we provide an affirmative answer to a question raised in [1] about the existence of strong asymptotic expansions for LDP's for iid sequences that are neither 0–Diophantine nor lattice-valued. This is done in Section 4.2 by verifying the assumptions for compactly supported l –Diophantine iid sequences. In Section 4.4, we show that for finite state Markov chains, weak expansions of all orders exist even when strong expansions of sufficiently high order (depending on the number of states) fail to exist. We discuss Markov chains with C^1 –densities in Section 4.3.

Our key example in continuous time, additive functionals of stochastic processes generated from SDE's satisfying Hörmander condition on a d –dimensional compact manifold, is presented in Section 4.6. We show that the additive functionals we define, admit all order strong asymptotic expansions for LDP, in the range $(0, \infty)$. For related large deviation problems for coupled SDE's, we refer the reader to [19, 20].

We present the main results of the paper in Section 2 and their proofs in Section 3. One novelty here is the result on the existence of weak asymptotic expansions for LDP. Our result on strong expansions generalizes results in [1] in the non-lattice non-iid setting. The key ideas behind the proofs are the Cramér's transform which *exponentially tilts* the distribution function of S_N and the weak Edgeworth expansions for weakly dependent random variables found in [12]. The proofs of the main results involve adaptations of proofs of [12, Theorems 2.1, 2.2 and 2.5] to our setting. To obtain analogous results in continuous time, we require stronger assumptions on the stochastic flow $\{X_t\}$.

The coefficients of these asymptotic expansions are related to the asymptotic moments of the exponentially tilted S_N , and hence to exponential moments of S_N . This relationship is explicit because the coefficients are written as integrals of polynomials with coefficients depending on the exponential moments of S_N . The derivation of polynomials follows a standard argument due to Cramér, and in the non-iid setting these polynomials are described

in [12, Section 4] in detail. In fact, a precise description of the coefficients in both weak and strong asymptotic expansions along with an inductive algorithm to compute them are provided there.

Since the proofs deal with obtaining asymptotic expansions, we always assume that N is large enough without explicitly mentioning that we do so. Also, we make no attempt to find optimal constants in error terms. However, we keep track of how the errors depend on the function in the weak expansion. The letter C is often used to denote constants and may refer to different constants, even in the same sentence. The subscripts present in these constants, like r and a in $C_{r,a}$, describe how the constants depend on parameters.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Suppose that there exist a Banach space \mathbb{B} , a family of bounded linear operators $\mathcal{L}_z : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, and vectors $v \in \mathbb{B}, \ell \in \mathbb{B}'$ (the space of bounded linear functionals on \mathbb{B}) such that

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbb{E}(e^{zS_N}) = \ell(\mathcal{L}_z^N v), \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

with the following conditions, [B] and [C], satisfied:

Condition [B]: There exists $\delta > 0$ such that

- (B1) $z \mapsto \mathcal{L}_z$ is continuous on the strip $|\operatorname{Re}(z)| < \delta$ and holomorphic on the disc $|z| < \delta$.
- (B2) For each $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$, the operator \mathcal{L}_θ has an isolated and simple eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta) > 0$ and the rest of its spectrum is contained inside the disk of radius smaller than $\lambda(\theta)$ (spectral gap). In addition, $\lambda(0) = 1$.
- (B3) For each $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$, for all real numbers $s \neq 0$, the spectrum of the operator $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}$, denoted by $\operatorname{sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is})$, satisfies: $\operatorname{sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}) \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| < \lambda(\theta)\}$.
- (B4) For each $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$, there exist positive numbers r_1, r_2, K , and N_0 such that

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^N\| \leq \frac{\lambda(\theta)^N}{N^{r_2}}$$

for all $N > N_0$, for all $K \leq |s| \leq N^{r_1}$.

Remark 2.1. Suppose (B4) holds. Let $N_1 > N_0$ be such that $N_1^{(r_1-\epsilon)/r_1} > N_0$. Then, writing $N_2 = N - \lceil N^{(r_1-\epsilon)/r_1} \rceil \lceil N_1^{\epsilon/r_1} \rceil$, for all $N \gg N_1$, we have that $N_2 > N_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^N\|}{\lambda(\theta)^N} &\leq \frac{\|(\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^{\lceil N^{(r_1-\epsilon)/r_1} \rceil})^{\lceil N_1^{\epsilon/r_1} \rceil}\| \|\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^{N_2}\|}{\lambda(\theta)^{\lceil N^{(r_1-\epsilon)/r_1} \rceil \lceil N_1^{\epsilon/r_1} \rceil} \lambda(\theta)^{N_2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\|(\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^{\lceil N^{(r_1-\epsilon)/r_1} \rceil})^{\lceil N_1^{\epsilon/r_1} \rceil}\|}{\lambda(\theta)^{\lceil N^{(r_1-\epsilon)/r_1} \rceil \lceil N_1^{\epsilon/r_1} \rceil}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lceil N^{(r_1-\epsilon)/r_1} \rceil r_2 \lceil N_1^{\epsilon/r_1} \rceil}, \quad K \leq |s| \leq N^{r_1-\epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^N\| \leq \frac{\lambda(\theta)^N}{N^{r_2 C_{N_1}}},$$

where $C_{N_1} = \frac{r_1 - \epsilon}{r_1} N_1^{\epsilon/r_1}$. Note that by fixing N_1 large enough, we can make $r_2 C_{N_1}$ as large as we want. Hence, given (B4), by reducing r_1 by an arbitrarily small quantity and choosing N_0 sufficiently large, we may assume r_2 is sufficiently large.

As a consequence of (B2), the operator \mathcal{L}_θ , $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$, takes the form

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{L}_\theta = \lambda(\theta)\Pi_\theta + \Lambda_\theta,$$

where Π_θ is the eigenprojection corresponding to the top eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta)$ and $\Pi_\theta\Lambda_\theta = \Lambda_\theta\Pi_\theta = 0$. Due to (B1), we can use perturbation theory of bounded linear operators (see [18, Chapter 7]) to conclude that $\theta \mapsto \lambda(\theta)$, $\theta \mapsto \Pi_\theta$ and $\theta \mapsto \Lambda_\theta$ are analytic.

Condition [C]: For all $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$, $(\log \lambda)''(\theta) > 0$ and $\ell(\Pi_\theta v) > 0$.

Remark 2.2.

1. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is centred to simplify the notation. One can easily reformulate the results for non-centered $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ using the corresponding results for $\{X_n - \bar{X}\}_{n \geq 1}$.
2. Fix $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$. Due to (2.1) and (2.2) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{\theta S_N}) = \ell(\mathcal{L}_\theta^N v) = \lambda(\theta)^N \ell(\Pi_\theta v) + \ell(\Lambda_\theta^N v) = \lambda(\theta)^N \left[\ell(\Pi_\theta v) + \lambda(\theta)^{-N} \ell(\Lambda_\theta^N v) \right].$$

Due to (B2) and (2.2), the spectral radius of Λ_θ is less than $\lambda(\theta)$. So, $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(\theta)^{-N} \ell(\Lambda_\theta^N v) = 0$. From the condition [C], $\ell(\Pi_\theta v) > 0$. Thus, for large enough N ,

$$0 < c_1 < \left[\ell(\Pi_\theta v) + \lambda(\theta)^{-N} \ell(\Lambda_\theta^N v) \right] < c_2$$

for some c_1, c_2 . Therefore

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta S_N}) = \log \lambda(\theta).$$

Also, note that $\log \lambda(\theta)$ is analytic and strictly convex because $\lambda(\theta) > 0$, $\lambda(\cdot)$ is analytic and $(\log \lambda)''(\theta) > 0$. Also, $(\log \lambda)'(0) = \frac{\lambda'(0)}{\lambda(0)} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(S_N)}{N} = 0$ (see [12, Section 4]). Now, applying Theorem 1.2, we conclude that S_N satisfies the LDP in (1.2) with $I(z) = \sup_{\theta \in (0, \delta)} [z\theta - \log \lambda(\theta)]$.

3. From the above calculations it is clear that $\log \lambda(\theta) > \log(\lambda(0)) = 0$ for $\theta \in (0, \delta)$, and hence, $\lambda(\theta) > 1$ for $\theta \in (0, \delta)$.

In order to state our main results, we introduce the function space \mathfrak{F}_k^m given by

$$\mathfrak{F}_k^m = \{f \in C^m(\mathbb{R}) \mid C_k^m(f) < \infty\},$$

where $C_k^m(f) = \max_{0 \leq j \leq m} \|f^{(j)}\|_{L^1} + \max_{0 \leq j \leq k} \|x^j f\|_{L^1}$. We call a function f (left) exponential of order α , if $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} |e^{-\alpha x} f(x)| = 0$. Define the function space $\mathfrak{F}_{k,\alpha}^m$ by

$$\mathfrak{F}_{k,\alpha}^m = \{f \in \mathfrak{F}_k^m \mid f^{(m)} \text{ is exponential of order } \alpha\}.$$

It is clear that $\mathfrak{F}_{k,\alpha}^m \subset \mathfrak{F}_{k,\beta}^m$ if $\alpha > \beta$. Finally, define, $\mathfrak{F}_{k,\infty}^m = \bigcap_{\alpha > 0} \mathfrak{F}_{k,\alpha}^m$.

The following two theorems give higher order asymptotics for the LDP in Theorem 1.2 in the weak and the strong sense, respectively.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that conditions [B] and [C] hold. Then, for all $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$, there exist $\theta_a \in (0, \delta)$ and polynomials $P_k^a(x)$ of degree at most $2k$, such that for $q > \frac{r+1}{2r_1} + 1$ and $\alpha > \theta_a$, for all $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1,\alpha}^q$*

$$\mathbb{E}(f(S_N - aN))e^{I(a)N} = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{N^{k+1/2}} \int P_k^a(x) f_{\theta_a}(x) dx + C_{r+1}^q(f_{\theta_a}) \cdot o_{r,a} \left(\frac{1}{N^{\frac{r+1}{2}}} \right) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $f_{\theta}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-\theta x} f(x)$ and $I(a) = \sup_{\theta \in (0, \delta)} [a\theta - \log \lambda(\theta)] = a\theta_a - \log \lambda(\theta_a)$.

Remark 2.3. *We note that for a given a , the polynomials P_k^a 's are unique. To see this, fix a . From Remark 1.3, $D_k^f(a) = \int P_k^a(x) f_{\theta_a}(x) dx$ are unique for all k . Assume there exist two polynomials, P_k^a and \tilde{P}_k^a with $\int P_k^a(x) f_{\theta_a}(x) dx = \int \tilde{P}_k^a(x) f_{\theta_a}(x) dx$. Since $C_c^\infty([0, 1]) \subset \mathfrak{F}_{r+1,\alpha}^q$ and $\{f_{\theta_a} \mid f \in C_c^\infty([0, 1])\}$ is dense in $L^1[0, 1]$, we have for all $f \in L^1[0, 1]$, $\int P_k^a(x) f(x) dx = \int \tilde{P}_k^a(x) f(x) dx$ we have that $P_k^a(x) = \tilde{P}_k^a(x)$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. So, $P_k^a = \tilde{P}_k^a$.*

Theorem 2.2. *Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \geq 2$. Suppose that conditions [B] and [C] hold with $r_1 > r/2$. Then, for all $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_N \geq aN)e^{I(a)N} = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{D_k(a)}{N^{k+1/2}} + o_{r,a} \left(\frac{1}{N^{\frac{r+1}{2}}} \right) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $D_k(a) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty e^{-\theta_a x} P_k^a(x) dx$.

Moreover, we can evaluate the first term of the asymptotic expansion for the LDP's under significantly weaker conditions. Namely, under assumptions similar to those in Theorem E of [15], we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *Suppose that (B1), (B2), (B3) and [C] hold. Then, for every $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$, there exists a constant $C(a)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_N \geq aN)e^{I(a)N} = \frac{C(a) \sqrt{I''(a)}}{\theta_a \sqrt{2\pi N}} \left(1 + o(1)\right) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Remark 2.4. Analogous results hold for $a \in \left(\frac{\log(\lambda(-\delta))}{-\delta}, 0\right)$. In fact, one can deduce the corresponding results for $a < 0$ by considering $\{-X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and functions that are right exponential of order α . However, for simplicity we focus only on $a > 0$.

Next, we consider the continuous time asymptotic expansions for LDP's. Let $\{S_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ be a stochastic process with asymptotic mean 0, i.e., $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}(S_t) = 0$. We make the following assumptions on the process S_t .

Suppose that there exists a Banach space \mathbb{B} , a family of bounded linear operators $\mathcal{L}(z, t) : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, and vectors $v \in \mathbb{B}, \ell \in \mathbb{B}'$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{zS_t}) = \ell(\mathcal{L}(z, t)v), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}, \quad t > 0,$$

and for a fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}$, the family of operators $\mathcal{L}(z, \cdot)$ forms a C^0 -semigroup on the Banach space \mathbb{B} . That is

$$\mathcal{L}(z, t_1 + t_2) = \mathcal{L}(z, t_1) \circ \mathcal{L}(z, t_2), \quad \text{for each } t_1, t_2 \geq 0, \quad \mathcal{L}(z, 0) = \text{Id}.$$

Condition (D1) The family of operators $\mathcal{L}(z, 1 + \eta)$ satisfies the condition [B], uniformly in $\eta \in [0, 1]$. That is,

- (1) There exists $\delta > 0$ for which conditions (B1) – (B3) hold for all $\eta \in [0, 1]$.
- (2) For each $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$, there exist positive numbers r_1, r_2, K and N_0 such that

$$(2.3) \quad \|\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t)\| \leq \frac{\lambda(\theta)^t}{t^{r_2}}$$

for all $t > N_0$, for all $K < |s| < t^{r_1}$.

Condition (D2) Suppose $z \in \mathbb{C}$ is such that for all $\eta \in [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{L}(z, 1 + \eta)$ has an isolated simple eigenvalue $\lambda(z, 1 + \eta)$. Then the projection to the top eigenspace, $\Pi(z, 1 + \eta)$, satisfies $\Pi(z, 1 + \eta) = \Pi(z, 1)$ for all $\eta \in [0, 1]$.

From now on, we denote $\Pi(\theta, 1)$ by Π_θ . Using the above condition, along with the semigroup property, we conclude that the top eigenvalue of the operator $\mathcal{L}(z, t)$ (whenever it exists) is equal to $\lambda(z, 1)^t$. Due to (B2) and (D1) the operators $\mathcal{L}(\theta, 1 + \eta)$ with $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$ and $\eta \in [0, 1]$, take the form

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{L}(\theta, 1 + \eta) = \lambda(\theta)^{1+\eta} \Pi(\theta, 1 + \eta) + \Lambda(\theta, 1 + \eta),$$

where $\Pi(\theta, 1 + \eta)$ is the eigenprojection corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta)^{1+\eta}$ of the operator $\mathcal{L}(\theta, 1 + \eta)$ and $\Pi(\theta, 1 + \eta)\Lambda(\theta, 1 + \eta) = \Lambda(\theta, 1 + \eta)\Pi(\theta, 1 + \eta) = 0$. Due to (D1) we can use the perturbation theory of linear operators (see [18, Chapter 7]) to conclude that $\lambda(\cdot)$, $\Pi(\cdot, 1 + \eta)$ and $\Lambda(\cdot, 1 + \eta)$ are analytic.

As a consequence of (2.4) and condition (D2), the family of operators $\Lambda(\theta, t)$ defined as $\mathcal{L}(\theta, t) - \lambda(\theta)^t \Pi_\theta$ also forms a semigroup, and the spectral radius of the operator $\Lambda(\theta, 1)$ is less than $\lambda(\theta)$ for all $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$.

Condition (D3) For all $\eta \in [0, 1]$, $\mathcal{L}(z, 1 + \eta)$ satisfies the condition [C] .

The following proposition, which will be proved in Section 3, is the key idea in adapting the proofs of discrete time results to continuous time.

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose that the conditions (D1) and (D2) hold. Then, for a fixed $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$, there exists $\tilde{\delta} > 0$ such that, for each $s \in (-\tilde{\delta}, \tilde{\delta})$,*

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t) = \lambda(\theta + is)^t \Pi_{\theta+is} + \Lambda(\theta + is, t),$$

where $\Pi_{\theta+is} \equiv \Pi(\theta + is, t)$ is the eigenprojection corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta + is)^t$ of the operator $\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t)$ and for all $t \geq 1$, $\Pi(\theta + is, t)\Lambda(\theta + is, t) = \Lambda(\theta + is, t)\Pi(\theta + is, t) = 0$. In addition, the family of operators $\{\Lambda(\theta + is, t)\}_{t \geq 1}$ forms a semigroup, and the spectral radius of the operator $\Lambda(\theta + is, 1)$ is less than $|\lambda(\theta + is)|$.

The following theorems are the continuous time analogues of Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that conditions (D1), (D2) and (D3) hold. Then, for all $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$, there exist $\theta_a \in (0, \delta)$ and polynomials $P_k^a(x)$ of degree at most $2k$, such that for $q > \frac{r+1}{2r_1} + 1$ and $\alpha > \theta_a$, for all $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1, \alpha}^q$*

$$\mathbb{E}(f(S_t - at))e^{I(a)t} = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{t^{k+1/2}} \int P_k^a(x) f_{\theta_a}(x) dx + C_{r+1}^q(f_{\theta_a}) \cdot o_{r,a} \left(\frac{1}{t^{\frac{r+1}{2}}} \right) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $f_{\theta}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-\theta x} f(x)$ and $I(a) = \sup_{\theta \in (0, \delta)} [a\theta - \log \lambda(\theta)] = a\theta_a - \log \lambda(\theta_a)$.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \geq 2$. Suppose that conditions (D1), (D2) and (D3) hold with $r_1 > r/2$. Then, for all $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_t \geq at)e^{I(a)t} = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{D_k(a)}{t^{k+1/2}} + o_{r,a} \left(\frac{1}{t^{\frac{r+1}{2}}} \right), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

where $D_k(a) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty e^{-\theta_a x} P_k^a(x) dx$.

Theorem 2.7. *Suppose that (D1)–(1), (D2) and (D3) hold. Then, for every $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$, there exists a constant $C(a)$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(S_t \geq at)e^{I(a)t} = \frac{C(a) \sqrt{I''(a)}}{\theta_a \sqrt{2\pi t}} \left(1 + o(1)\right) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Remark 2.5. *Due to Proposition 2.4, the proofs of continuous time results are exact analogues of the proofs of discrete time results. For brevity, we present complete proofs of the discrete time results, and comment on the changes required for continuous time.*

3. PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Recall from Remark 2.2 that the LDP given by (1.2) holds under the conditions [B] and [C]. That is, given $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$, there exists $\theta_a \in (0, \delta)$ such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}(S_N \geq aN) = -I(a)$$

where $I(a) = \sup_{\theta \in (0, \delta)} [a\theta - \log \lambda(\theta)] = a\theta_a - \log \lambda(\theta_a)$. So we fix $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$, and take θ_a to denote value of $\theta \in (0, \delta)$ for which $I(a)$ is achieved. Since, θ_a is the unique maximizer of analytic function $f(\theta) = a\theta - \log \lambda(\theta)$ on $(0, \delta)$, $f'(\theta_a) = 0$. That is,

$$(3.1) \quad a = \frac{\lambda'(\theta_a)}{\lambda(\theta_a)}$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(f(S_n - an))e^{a\theta_a n} &= \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta_a S_n} e^{-(S_n - an)\theta_a} f(S_n - an)) \\ &= \int \widehat{f}_{\theta_a}(s) e^{-iasn} \ell(\mathcal{L}_{\theta_a + is}^n v) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $f_{\theta_a}(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-\theta_a x} f(x)$. Define, $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s = \frac{e^{-ias}}{\lambda(\theta_a)} \mathcal{L}_{\theta_a + is}$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}(f(S_n - an))e^{a\theta_a n} = \lambda(\theta_a)^n \int \widehat{f}_{\theta_a}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v) ds.$$

From this, we have

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbb{E}(f(S_n - an))e^{I(a)n} = \mathbb{E}(f(S_n - an))e^{[a\theta_a - \log \lambda(\theta_a)]n} = \int \widehat{f}_{\theta_a}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v) ds.$$

The following lemma (whose proof we postpone till the end of the proof of the theorem) allows us to obtain the asymptotics of (3.2).

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose conditions [B] and [C] hold. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for all $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$, there are polynomials $P_k^\alpha(x)$ of degree at most $2k$, such that for $g \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1}^q$, $q > \frac{r+1}{2r_1} + 1$,*

$$\int \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^N v) ds = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{N^{k+1/2}} \int P_k^\alpha(x) g(x) dx + C_{r+1}^q(g) \cdot o_{r,a} \left(\frac{1}{N^{\frac{r+1}{2}}} \right).$$

We refer to this expansion as the weak expansion of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s$ for $g \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1}^q$.

Since $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1, \alpha}^q$ with $\alpha > \theta_a$, we have that $f_{\theta_a} \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1}^q$. We show this when $r = 0$ and $q = 1$. The argument for general q and r is similar. Suppose, $f(x), f'(x), xf(x) \in L^1$, $f'(x)$ is continuous and exponential order $\alpha > \theta_a$. It is clear that $(e^{-\theta_a x} f(x))' = -\theta_a e^{-\theta_a x} f(x) + e^{-\theta_a x} f'(x)$ is continuous. We need to show that $e^{-\theta_a x} f(x)$, $(e^{-\theta_a x} f(x))'$ and $x e^{-\theta_a x} f(x)$ are

absolutely integrable. Since f' is exponential of order α , given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $M > 0$ such that for all $x \leq -M$, $-\epsilon e^{\alpha x} \leq f'(x) \leq \epsilon e^{\alpha x}$, and therefore,

$$-\int_{-\infty}^x \epsilon e^{\alpha y} dy \leq \int_{-\infty}^x f'(y) dy \leq \int_{-\infty}^x \epsilon e^{\alpha y} dy.$$

In addition, our assumptions imply that $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = 0$. Thus, $-\frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} e^{\alpha x} \leq f(x) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} e^{\alpha x}$ which shows that f is also exponential of order α .

Now, it remains to show, $e^{-\theta_a x} f(x), e^{-\theta_a x} f'(x), x e^{-\theta_a x} f(x) \in L^1$. This is true because there is $M > 0$ such that for $x < -M$, $|e^{-\theta_a x} f'(x)| < e^{(\alpha - \theta_a)x}$, $|e^{-\theta_a x} f(x)| < e^{(\alpha - \theta_a)x}$ and $|x e^{-\theta_a x} f(x)| < -x e^{(\alpha - \theta_a)x}$.

Finally, to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1 we apply Lemma 3.1 to f_{θ_a} . \square

Proof of Lemma 3.1. For a fixed $\theta_a \in (-\delta, \delta)$, from (2.2) and perturbation theory of bounded linear operators (see [18, Chapter 7]), there exists $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta)$ such that for all $|s| \leq \delta_1$, $\mathcal{L}_{\theta_a + is}$ can be expressed as

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\theta_a + is} = \lambda(\theta_a + is) \Pi_{\theta_a + is} + \Lambda_{\theta_a + is},$$

where $\Pi_{\theta_a + is}$ is the eigenprojection to the top eigenspace of $\mathcal{L}_{\theta_a + is}$, the spectral radius of $\Lambda_{\theta_a + is}$ is less than $|\lambda(\theta_a + is)|$, and $\Lambda_{\theta_a + is} \Pi_{\theta_a + is} = \Pi_{\theta_a + is} \Lambda_{\theta_a + is} = 0$. In addition, the spectral data are analytic with respect to the perturbation parameter because the perturbations are analytic. That is, $z \mapsto \lambda(z)$, $z \mapsto \Pi_z$ and $z \mapsto \Lambda_z$ are analytic in a neighbourhood of $z_0 = \theta_a + i0$ (see [18, Chapter 7]).

Iterating (3.3), we obtain

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\theta_a + is}^n = \lambda(\theta_a + is)^n \Pi_{\theta_a + is} + \Lambda_{\theta_a + is}^n.$$

Define $\bar{\Pi}_s = \Pi_{\theta_a + is}$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_s = \frac{e^{-ias}}{\lambda(\theta_a)} \Lambda_{\theta_a + is}$. Then, for all $|s| < \delta_1$,

$$(3.5) \quad \bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n = \bar{\mu}(s)^n \bar{\Pi}_s + \bar{\Lambda}_s^n,$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s = \frac{e^{-ias}}{\lambda(\theta_a)} \mathcal{L}_{\theta_a + is}$ and $\bar{\mu}(s) = \frac{e^{-ias} \lambda(\theta_a + is)}{\lambda(\theta_a)}$.

From (3.1) and the condition [C],

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{\mu}(0) &= 1, \quad \bar{\mu}'(0) = \left. \frac{d}{ds} \bar{\mu}(s) \right|_{s=0} = -ia + i \frac{\lambda'(\theta_a)}{\lambda(\theta_a)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \bar{\mu}''(0) &= a^2 - \frac{\lambda''(\theta_a)}{\lambda(\theta_a)} = -(\log \lambda)''(\theta_a) =: -\sigma_a^2 \end{aligned}$$

for some $\sigma_a > 0$. Thus, there exists $\bar{\delta}$ such that

$$(3.7) \quad |\bar{\mu}(s)| \leq e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2 / 4}, \quad |s| < \bar{\delta}.$$

First, we estimate the contribution to $\int \hat{g}(s) \ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^N v) ds$ from the region away from $s = 0$. Fix $\bar{\delta} > 0$ as in (3.7). Due to (B3), the spectral radius of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s$ is strictly less than 1. Since

$s \mapsto \bar{\mathcal{L}}_s$ is continuous, there exists $c_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n\| \leq c_0^n$ for all $\delta \leq |s| \leq K$ (K as in (B4)). Thus,

$$\left| \int_{\delta < |s| < K} \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v) ds \right| \leq C \|g\|_1 c_0^n.$$

Due to Remark 2.1, without loss of generality we assume that $r_2 > r_1 + (r+1)/2$. From (B4),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{K < |s| < n^{r_1}} \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v) ds \right| &\leq \frac{C \|g\|_1}{\lambda(\theta_a)^n} \int_{K < |s| < n^{r_1}} \|\mathcal{L}_{\theta_a + is}^n\| ds \leq \frac{C \|g\|_1}{n^{r_2 - r_1}} \\ &= \|g\|_1 \cdot o(n^{-(r+1)/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $g \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1}^q$, we have that $s^q \widehat{g}(s) = (-i)^q \widehat{g^{(q)}}(s)$ and $\widehat{g^{(q)}}$ is bounded. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.8) \quad \left| \int_{|s| > n^{r_1}} \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v) ds \right| &\leq C \int_{|s| > n^{r_1}} |\widehat{g}(s)| ds \leq C \int_{|s| > n^{r_1}} \left| \frac{\widehat{g^{(q)}}(s)}{s^q} \right| ds \\ &\leq C \frac{\|\widehat{g^{(q)}}\|_\infty}{n^{r_1(q-1)}} \\ &= C_{r+1}^q(g) \cdot o(n^{-(r+1)/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the integral $\int_{|s| > n^{r_1}} \left| \frac{1}{s^q} \right| ds$ is finite since $q > \frac{r+1}{2r_1} + 1 > 1$. Combining these estimates, we obtain

$$(3.9) \quad \left| \int_{|s| > \bar{\delta}} \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v) ds \right| = C_{r+1}^q(g) \cdot o(n^{-(r+1)/2}).$$

From (3.7), we know that for all $|s| < \bar{\delta}\sqrt{n}$, $|\ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v)| \leq Ce^{-\frac{1}{4}\sigma_a^2 s^2}$. Thus, for $\sqrt{D \log n} \leq |s| \leq \bar{\delta}\sqrt{n}$, $|\ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v)| \leq Cn^{-\sigma_a^2 D}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\sqrt{\frac{D \log n}{n}} \leq |s| \leq \bar{\delta}} \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v) ds \right| &= \left| \int_{\sqrt{D \log n} \leq |u| \leq \bar{\delta}\sqrt{n}} \widehat{g}\left(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}}^n v) \frac{du}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{n^{\sigma_a^2 D}} \left| \int_{\sqrt{D \log n} \leq |u| \leq \bar{\delta}\sqrt{n}} \widehat{g}\left(\frac{u}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \frac{du}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \\ &= C \frac{1}{n^{\sigma_a^2 D}} \left| \int_{\sqrt{\frac{D \log n}{n}} \leq |s| \leq \bar{\delta}} \widehat{g}(s) ds \right| \\ &\leq \frac{2C\bar{\delta} \|g\|_1}{n^{\sigma_a^2 D}}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $D > \frac{r+1}{2\sigma_a^2}$, we have

$$(3.10) \quad \left| \int_{\sqrt{\frac{D \log n}{n}} \leq |s| \leq \delta} \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v) ds \right| = C_{r+1}^q(g) \cdot o(n^{-(r+1)/2}).$$

Using (B3) and compactness, there exist $C > 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ (which do not depend on n and s) such that $\|\overline{\Lambda}_s^n\| \leq C\epsilon^n$ for all $|s| \leq \delta_1$. By (3.5),

$$(3.11) \quad \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v) = \overline{\mu}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^n \ell(\overline{\Pi}_{s/\sqrt{n}} v) + \ell(\overline{\Lambda}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v).$$

Let us focus on the first term of (3.11). Put $Z(s) = \ell(\overline{\Pi}_s v)$. Note that $Z(s)$ is analytic on $|s| < \delta_1$ because $s \mapsto \overline{\Pi}_s$ is analytic.

Now we are in a position to compute $P_k^a(x)$. To this end we make use of ideas in [12]. From (3.6), function $\log \overline{\mu}$ can be written as

$$\log \overline{\mu}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) = -\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2n} + \psi\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right),$$

where ψ denotes the error term, $\psi(0) = \psi'(0) = \psi''(0) = 0$ and $\psi(s)$ is analytic. That is

$$\overline{\mu}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^n = e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \exp\left(n\psi\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right).$$

Denote by $s^2\psi_r(s)$ the order $(r+2)$ Taylor approximation of ψ . Then, ψ_r is the unique polynomial such that $\psi(s) = s^2\psi_r(s) + o(|s|^{r+2})$. Also, $\psi_r(0) = 0$ and ψ_r is a polynomial of degree r . In fact, we can write $\psi(s) = s^2\psi_r(s) + s^{r+2}\tilde{\psi}_r(s)$ where $\tilde{\psi}_r$ is analytic and $\tilde{\psi}_r(0) = 0$. Thus,

$$\exp\left(n\psi\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right) = \exp\left(s^2\psi_r\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + \frac{1}{n^{r/2}}s^{r+2}\tilde{\psi}_r\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right).$$

Denote by $Z_r(s)$ the order r Taylor expansion of $Z(s) - Z(0)$. Then, $Z_r(0) = 0$ and $Z(s) = Z(0) + Z_r(s) + s^r\tilde{Z}_r(s)$ with analytic $\tilde{Z}_r(s)$ such that $\tilde{Z}_r(0) = 0$. Now, substituting the Taylor expansions for $\log \overline{\mu}(s)$ and $Z(s)$, and taking \overline{Z}_r to be the remainder of $\log Z(s)$ when approximated by powers of Z_r upto order r :

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \overline{\mu}^n\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) Z\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &= e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \overline{\mu}^n\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \exp \log Z\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &= Z(0) \exp\left(s^2\psi_r\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + \frac{1}{n^{r/2}}s^{r+2}\tilde{\psi}_r\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k Z(0)^k} \left[Z_r\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right]^k + \frac{1}{n^{r/2} Z(0)} s^r \overline{Z}_r\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= Z(0) \left[1 + \sum_{m=1}^r \frac{1}{m!} \left[s^2 \psi_r \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right) + \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k Z(0)^k} \left(Z_r \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right)^k \right]^m \right] \\
&\quad + Z(0) \left[\frac{1}{n^{r/2}} s^{r+2} \tilde{\psi}_r \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right) + \frac{1}{n^{r/2} Z(0)} s^r \bar{Z}_r \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right) + s^{r+1} \mathcal{O} \left(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Take $\varphi(s) = n s^2 Z(0) \tilde{\psi}_r(s) + \bar{Z}_r(s)$. It is clear that $\varphi(s)$ is analytic and $\varphi(0) = 0$. Now, collecting terms in the RHS according to ascending powers of $n^{-1/2}$ we obtain,

$$(3.12) \quad e^{\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \bar{\mu}^n \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right) Z \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^r \frac{A_k(s)}{n^{k/2}} + \frac{s^r}{n^{r/2}} \varphi \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right) + s^{r+1} \mathcal{O} \left(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}} \right).$$

Notice that, $A_k(s)$ (as a function) and k (as an integer) have the same parity. To see this, note that for each $k \geq 0$, A_k 's are formed by collecting terms with the common factor of $n^{-k/2}$. Observe that ψ_r and Z_r are a polynomial in $\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}$ with no constant term, and therefore when we take powers of $s^2 \psi_r \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$ and $Z_r \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$, the resulting A_k will contain terms of the form $c_m s^{2m+k}$.

Note that $A_0 \equiv Z(0)$. The highest power of s in A_k , $k \geq 1$ is a result from the term $C s^2 \frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}$ in $s^2 \psi_r \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$ being raised to its k^{th} power, i.e., $m = k$ above. Thus, A_k are polynomials of degree $3k$. The lowest power of s in A_k corresponds to $m = 0$ and is equal to k . Next, define $\beta_{n,r}$ by

$$(3.13) \quad \beta_{n,r}(s) = \sum_{k=0}^r \frac{A_k(s)}{n^{k/2}}.$$

We write the Taylor approximation of \hat{g} :

$$\hat{g}(s) = \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{\hat{g}^{(j)}(0)}{j!} s^j + \frac{s^{r+1}}{(r+1)!} \hat{g}^{(r+1)}(\epsilon(s)),$$

where $0 \leq |\epsilon(s)| \leq |s|$ and

$$|\hat{g}^{(r+1)}(\epsilon(s))| = \left| \int x^{r+1} e^{-i\epsilon(s)x} g(x) dx \right| \leq \int |x^{r+1} g(x)| dx \leq C_{r+1}^0(g).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} \hat{g} \left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v) ds \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{\hat{g}^{(j)}(0)}{j! n^{j/2}} \int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} s^j \ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v) ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n^{(r+1)/2}} \frac{1}{(r+1)!} \int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n) s^{r+1} \widehat{g}^{(r+1)}\left(\epsilon\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right) ds,$$

where

$$\left| \int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n) s^{r+1} \widehat{g}^{(r+1)}\left(\epsilon\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right) ds \right| \leq C_{r+1}^0(g) \int |s|^{r+1} e^{-cs^2} ds$$

for large n . Hence,

$$(3.14) \quad \int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} \widehat{g}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n) ds \\ = \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{\widehat{g}^{(j)}(0)}{j! n^{j/2}} \int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} s^j \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n) ds + C_{r+1}^0(g) \cdot \mathcal{O}(n^{-(r+1)/2}).$$

From (3.12),

$$(3.15) \quad e^{\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n) = \exp\left(n\psi\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right) Z\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + e^{\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \ell(\overline{\Lambda}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n) \\ = \sum_{k=0}^r \frac{A_k(s)}{n^{k/2}} + \frac{s^r}{n^{r/2}} \varphi\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + C_{r,a} \cdot \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log^{(r+1)/2}(n)}{n^{(r+1)/2}}\right)$$

for $|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}$. Substituting this in (3.14),

$$(3.16) \quad \int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} \widehat{g}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n) ds \\ = \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{\widehat{g}^{(j)}(0)}{j! n^{j/2}} \int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} s^j e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} \sum_{k=0}^r \frac{A_k(s)}{n^{k/2}} ds + C_{r+1}^0(g) \cdot \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log^{(r+1)/2}(n)}{n^{(r+1)/2}}\right) \\ = \sum_{k=0}^r \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{\widehat{g}^{(j)}(0)}{j! n^{(k+j)/2}} \int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} s^j A_k(s) e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} ds + C_{r+1}^0(g) \cdot o(n^{-r/2}).$$

Since A_k and k have the same parity, if $k+j$ is odd then

$$\int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} s^j A_k(s) e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} ds = 0.$$

So only the positive integer powers of n^{-1} will remain in the expansion. Also, there is C that depends only on r and a such that

$$\int_{|s| \geq \sqrt{D \log n}} s^j A_k(s) e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} ds \leq C \int_{|s| \geq \sqrt{D \log n}} s^{4r} e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} ds \leq \frac{C_{r,a}}{n^{\sigma_a^2 D/4}}.$$

Choosing D such that $2\sigma_a^2 D > (r+1)/2$,

$$\int s^j A_k(s) e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} ds = \int_{|s| \leq \sqrt{D \log n}} s^j A_k(s) e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} ds + C_{r,a} \cdot o(n^{-r/2}).$$

Therefore, fixing D large, we can assume the integrals to be over the whole real line.

Now, define $b_{kj} = \int s^j A_k(s) e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} ds$ and substitute $\widehat{g}^{(j)}(0) = \int (-is)^j g(s) ds$ in (3.16) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{|s| < \sqrt{D \log n}} \widehat{g}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v) ds \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^r \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{b_{kj}}{j! n^{(k+j)/2}} \int (-is)^j g(s) ds + C_{r+1}^0(g) \cdot o(n^{-r/2}) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^r \frac{1}{n^m} \int g(s) \sum_{k+j=2m} \frac{b_{kj}}{j!} (-is)^j ds + C_{r+1}^0(g) \cdot o(n^{-r/2}) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{n^m} \int g(s) P_m^a(s) ds + C_{r+1}^0(g) \cdot o(n^{-r/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.17) \quad P_m^a(s) = \sum_{k+j=2m} \frac{b_{kj}}{j!} (-is)^j.$$

Combining, the above with (3.8) and (3.10) we obtain the required result. \square

Take F_N to be the distribution function of S_N . Let \widetilde{S}_N be a function defined on some finite measure space such that it induces the finite measure $\frac{e^{\theta_a x}}{\lambda(\theta_a)^N} dF_N(x)$ on \mathbb{R} . Note that \widetilde{S}_N is not a random variable since the measure it induces on \mathbb{R} is not a probability measure. Take $G_N(x)$ to be the distribution function of $\frac{\widetilde{S}_N - aN}{\sqrt{N}}$. That is,

$$(3.18) \quad G_N(x) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\widetilde{S}_N - aN}{\sqrt{N}} \leq x\right).$$

Then $\widehat{G}_N(s\sqrt{N}) = \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^N v)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ because

$$\int e^{i\frac{x-aN}{\sqrt{N}}s} \frac{e^{\theta_a x}}{\lambda(\theta_a)^N} dF_N(x) = \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{N}}^N v).$$

Also, recall that for $|s| < \delta_1 \sqrt{N}$ where δ_1 is as in proof of Lemma 3.1,

$$\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{N}}^N v) = \overline{\mu}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^N \ell(\overline{\Pi}_{s/\sqrt{N}} v) + \ell(\overline{\Lambda}_{s/\sqrt{N}}^N v).$$

From (3.12) and the estimate, $\|\bar{\Lambda}_s^N\| \leq C\epsilon^N$ for $|s| < \delta_1$, we conclude that RHS converges to $Z(0)e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $\frac{\tilde{S}_{N-aN}}{\sqrt{N}}$ converges weakly to $Z(0)\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_a^2)$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int (x - aN) \frac{e^{\theta_a x}}{\lambda(\theta_a)^N} dF_N(x) \\ &= \left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \int e^{i(x-aN)s} \frac{e^{\theta_a x}}{\lambda(\theta_a)^N} dF_N(x) \\ &= \left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \left(\bar{\mu}(s)^N \ell(\bar{\Pi}_s v) + \ell(\bar{\Lambda}_s^N v) \right) \\ &= N\bar{\mu}(0)^{N-1} \bar{\mu}'(0) \ell(\bar{\Pi}_0 v) + \bar{\mu}(0)^N \left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \ell(\bar{\Pi}_s v) + \left. \frac{d}{ds} \right|_{s=0} \ell(\bar{\Lambda}_s^N v). \end{aligned}$$

From (3.6), we have $\bar{\mu}'(0) = 0$, $\bar{\mu}(0) = 1$, and therefore

$$\frac{1}{N} \int (x - aN) \frac{e^{\theta_a x}}{\lambda(\theta_a)^N} dF_N(x) = \frac{1}{N} \ell(\bar{\Pi}'_0 v) + \ell((\bar{\Lambda}_0^{N-1} \bar{\Lambda}'_0) v).$$

Since $\|\bar{\Lambda}_0^N\| \leq C\epsilon^N$, the norm of the second term on the right hand side decays exponentially in N , and since $\ell(\bar{\Pi}'_0 v) < \infty$, the first term also goes to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, \tilde{S}_N has asymptotic mean a .

We say that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s$ admits a strong asymptotic expansion order r if, for large enough N , \tilde{S}_N admits the Edgeworth expansion of order r , i.e., there exist polynomials Q_k (whose parity as a function is the opposite of the parity of k) such that

$$(3.19) \quad G_N(x) - Z(0)\mathfrak{N}(x) = Z(0) \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{Q_k(x)}{N^{k/2}} \mathbf{n}(x) + o(N^{-r/2})$$

uniformly for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbf{n}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_a^2}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_a^2}}$ and $\mathfrak{N}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \mathbf{n}(y) dy$. Note that these expansions, if they exist, are unique (the argument in Remark 1.2 applies).

The proof of the existence of the strong expansions is based on two intermediate lemmas (Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3 below). The first lemma establishes that whenever the order r strong asymptotic expansion for $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s$ exists, lower order weak expansions (as in Lemma 3.1) exist for $g \in \mathfrak{F}_r^1$. It is the Proposition A.1 in [12] adapted to our setting. The second lemma shows that whenever $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s$ has weak expansions for $g \in \mathfrak{F}_r^1$ the corresponding S_N has strong expansions (of the corresponding order) for large deviations. Finally, to prove Theorem 2.2, we have to show that the conditions [B] and [C] imply the existence of strong expansions for $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s$.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s$ admits the order r strong asymptotic expansion. Then there are polynomials P_k such that*

$$\int \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n) ds = \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor (r-1)/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{n^{m+\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P_m(s) g(s) ds + C_r^1(g) \cdot o(n^{-r/2}).$$

for $g \in \mathfrak{F}_r^1$.

Proof. Suppose $g \in \mathfrak{F}_r^1$. Define, $\mathcal{E}_{r,n}(x) = Z(0)\mathfrak{N}(x) + Z(0) \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{Q_k(x)}{n^{k/2}} \mathbf{n}(x)$. Observe that $G_n(x) - \mathcal{E}_{r,n}(x) = o(n^{-r/2})$ uniformly in x and

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathcal{E}_{r,n}(x) &= Z(0)\mathbf{n}(x) dx + Z(0) \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} [Q'_k(x) \mathbf{n}(x) + Q_k(x) \mathbf{n}'(x)] dx \\ &= Z(0) \sum_{p=0}^r \frac{R_p(x)}{n^{p/2}} \mathbf{n}(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where R_k are polynomials given by $R_k = Q'_k + Q_k Q$ and Q is such that $\mathbf{n}'(x) = Q(x)\mathbf{n}(x)$, i.e.,

$$(3.20) \quad \mathbf{n}(x)R_k(x) = \frac{d}{dx} [\mathbf{n}(x)Q_k(x)].$$

Note that R_k and Q_k are of opposite parity, because $Q(x)$ is of degree 1.

Next, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n) ds &= \int \widehat{g}(s) \widehat{G}_n(s\sqrt{n}) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int \widehat{g}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \widehat{G}_n(s) ds \\ &= \int g(x\sqrt{n}) dG_n(x) \quad (\text{by Plancherel}) \\ &= \int g(x\sqrt{n}) d\mathcal{E}_{r,n}(x) + \int g(x\sqrt{n}) d(G_n - \mathcal{E}_{r,n})(x). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we integrate by parts and use that $g(\pm\infty) = 0$ (because $g \in \mathfrak{F}_r^1$) and the fact that $\mathcal{E}_{r,n}(\pm\infty)$, $G_n(\pm\infty)$ are finite to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n) ds &= \int g(x\sqrt{n}) d\mathcal{E}_{r,n}(x) + (G_n - \mathcal{E}_{r,n})(x)g(x\sqrt{n}) \Big|_{-\infty}^{\infty} \\ &\quad - \int (G_n - \mathcal{E}_{r,n})(x) \sqrt{n} g'(x\sqrt{n}) dx \\ &= \int \sum_{k=0}^r \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} R_k(x) \mathbf{n}(x) g(x\sqrt{n}) dx + o(n^{-r/2}) \int \sqrt{n} g'(x\sqrt{n}) dx \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.21) \quad = \sum_{k=0}^r \frac{1}{n^{k/2}} \int R_k(x) \mathbf{n}(x) g(x\sqrt{n}) dx + \|g'\|_1 \cdot o(n^{-r/2}).$$

From the Plancherel formula,

$$\int \sqrt{n} g(x\sqrt{n}) R_k(x) \mathbf{n}(x) dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \widehat{g}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) A_k(s) e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} ds,$$

where $\widehat{R_k \mathbf{n}}(s) = A_k(s) e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}}$ and A_k are given by the following relation,

$$(3.22) \quad A_k(s) e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} = R_k\left(-i \frac{d}{ds}\right) \left[e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \right]$$

This follows from the basic Fourier identity $x^j \widehat{f}(s) = (-i)^j \frac{d^j}{ds^j} \widehat{f}(s)$, and we refer the reader to [10, Chapter III, IV] for a detailed discussion. We also note that, by the uniqueness of expansions, these A_k agree with the ones in (3.15). Also, by construction, R_k and A_k have the same parity. This means A_k has the same parity as k .

Next, replace $\int R_k(x) \mathbf{n}(x) g(x\sqrt{n}) dx$ by $\frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{n}} \int \widehat{g}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) A_k(s) e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} ds$ in (3.21) to obtain

$$\int \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n) ds = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=0}^r \frac{1}{n^{(k+1)/2}} \int \widehat{g}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) A_k(s) e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} ds + \|g'\|_1 \cdot o(n^{-r/2}).$$

Then, substituting \widehat{g} with its order $r-1$ Taylor expansion,

$$\int \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n) ds = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=0}^r \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \frac{\widehat{g}^{(j)}(0)}{j! n^{(j+k+1)/2}} \int s^j e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} A_k(s) ds + C_r^1(g) \cdot o(n^{-r/2}).$$

Put

$$b_{jk} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int s^j e^{-\sigma_a^2 s^2/2} A_k(s) ds \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{g}^{(j)}(0) = \int (-is)^j g(s) ds$$

to obtain

$$\int \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n) ds = \sum_{k=0}^r \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \frac{b_{jk}}{j! n^{(j+k)/2}} \int (-is)^j g(s) ds + C_r^1(g) \cdot o(n^{-r/2}).$$

Since k and A_k are of the same parity, $b_{jk} = 0$ when $j+k$ is odd. So we collect terms such that $j+k = 2m$ where $m = 0, \dots, r-1$ and write

$$P_m(s) = \sum_{j+k=2m} \frac{b_{jk}}{j!} (-is)^j.$$

Then, rearranging, simplifying and absorbing higher order terms into the error, we obtain

$$\int \widehat{g}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n) ds = \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor (r-1)/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{n^{m+\frac{1}{2}}} \int P_m(s) g(s) ds + C_r^1(g) \cdot o(n^{-r/2}).$$

This is the order $r - 1$ weak expansion for $g \in \mathfrak{F}_r^1$. □

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose $\{f_k\}$ is a sequence in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1}^1 satisfying the following:*

- (a) *There exists $C > 0$ such that $C_{r+1}^1(f_k) \leq C$ for all k ,*
- (b) *f_k are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$,*
- (c) *$f_k \rightarrow f$ pointwise,*
- (d) *For all m ,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int P_m(s) f_k(s) ds = \int P_m(s) f(s) ds,$$

- (e) *There exists N_0 such that for all $N > N_0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}(f_k(S_N - aN))e^{I(a)N} = \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{N^{m+\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} P_m(s) f_k(s) ds + C_r^1(f_k) \cdot o(N^{-(r+1)/2}).$$

Then, for $N > N_0$,

$$\mathbb{E}(f(S_N - aN))e^{I(a)N} = \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{N^{m+\frac{1}{2}}} \int P_m(s) f(s) ds + C \cdot o(N^{-(r+1)/2}).$$

Proof. From (e) and (a) for $N > N_0$,

$$(3.23) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}(f_k(S_n - an))e^{I(a)n} - \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{n^{m+\frac{1}{2}}} \int P_m(s) f_k(s) ds \right| \leq C_{r+1}^1(f_k) \cdot o(n^{-r/2}) \\ \leq C \cdot o(n^{-r/2}).$$

Now, (b) and (c) give us that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(f_k(S_n - an)) = \mathbb{E}(f(S_n - an)).$$

This along with assumption (d) allow us to take the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ in the RHS of (3.23) and to conclude that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}(f(S_n - an))e^{I(a)n} - \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{n^{m+\frac{1}{2}}} \int P_m(s) f(s) ds \right| \leq C \cdot o(N^{-r/2}).$$

This implies the result. □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$. From (3.18), note that

$$G_n(\infty) = \int \frac{e^{\theta_a x}}{\lambda(\theta_a)^n} dF_n(x) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(e^{\theta_a S_n})}{\lambda(\theta_a)^n} = Z(0) + \frac{\ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a}^n v)}{\lambda(\theta_a)^n}$$

and

$$\widehat{G}_n(s) = \frac{e^{-\frac{is\alpha n}{\sqrt{n}}} \ell(\mathcal{L}_{\theta_a + is/\sqrt{n}}^n v)}{\lambda(\theta_a)^n} = \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v).$$

We proceed as in Lemma 3.1 (see (3.3)–(3.13)) and obtain the polynomials A_k and $\beta_{r,n}$. Also, define polynomials R_k and Q_k using the relations (3.22) and (3.20) respectively. Then,

$$\mathcal{E}_{r+1,n}(x) = Z(0)\mathfrak{N}(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{r+1} \frac{Q_k(x)}{n^{k/2}} \mathbf{n}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(s) = e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \frac{\beta_{r+1,n}(s)}{Z(0)}.$$

Then, $Z(0)\overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(s)$ is the Fourier transform of $\mathcal{E}_{r+1,n}(x)$. This follows from its definition and for a proof see [10, Chapter III, IV].

From the Berry-Esséen inequality, [2, Lemma 12.2], for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $B > 0$ such that

$$(3.24) \quad \left| G_n(x) - (1 + \lambda(\theta_a)^{-n} Z(0)^{-1} \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a}^n v)) \mathcal{E}_{r+1,n}(x) \right| \\ \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-Bn^{\frac{r+1}{2}}}^{Bn^{\frac{r+1}{2}}} \left| \frac{\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v) - (Z(0) + \lambda(\theta_a)^{-n} \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a}^n v)) \overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(s)}{s} \right| ds + \frac{\varepsilon}{n^{\frac{r+1}{2}}}.$$

Note that $(\ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a + is/\sqrt{n}}^n v) - \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a}^n v) \overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(s))|_{s=0} = 0$ because $\overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(0) = 1$. Also, both $\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v)$ and $\overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(s)$ are uniformly bounded in s and n . Therefore, choosing $\gamma < \delta_1$ (δ_1 as in (3.3)), we have

$$(3.25) \quad \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\gamma\sqrt{n}}^{\gamma\sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v) - \lambda(\theta_a)^{-n} \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a}^n v) \overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(s)}{s} \right| ds \\ = \frac{\lambda(\theta_a)^{-n}}{\pi} \int_{-\gamma\sqrt{n}}^{\gamma\sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{\ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a + is/\sqrt{n}}^n v) - \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a}^n v) \overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(s)}{s} \right| ds \\ \leq C \lambda(\theta_a)^{-n} \sqrt{n} = o(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}}).$$

We claim that

$$(3.26) \quad \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\gamma\sqrt{n}}^{\gamma\sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{\overline{\mu}(s/\sqrt{n})^n Z(s/\sqrt{n}) - \beta_{r+1,n}(s)}{s} \right| ds = o(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}})$$

for sufficiently small γ . From the definition of $\beta_{r+1,n}(s)$,

$$\frac{\overline{\mu}(s/\sqrt{n})^n Z(s/\sqrt{n}) - e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \beta_{r+1,n}(s)}{s} = \frac{e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}}}{n^{(r+1)/2}} \left(s^r \varphi\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + s^{r+1} \mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{r+2}{2}}) \right),$$

where $\varphi(s) = o(1)$ as $s \rightarrow 0$. As a result, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ the integrand of (3.26) can be made smaller than $\frac{\varepsilon}{n^{(r+1)/2}} (s^r + s^{r+1}) e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}}$ by choosing γ small enough. This establishes (3.26).

Combining (3.25) and (3.26), we obtain that for small γ ,

$$(3.27) \quad \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\gamma\sqrt{n}}^{\gamma\sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v) - (Z(0) + \lambda(\theta_a)^{-n} \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a}^n v)) \overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(s)}{s} \right| ds \leq \frac{C\varepsilon}{n^{(r+1)/2}},$$

where $C = \int (s^r + s^{r+1}) e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} ds$.

Take

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma\sqrt{n} < |s| < K\sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v)}{s} \right| ds, \\ J_2 &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{K\sqrt{n} < |s| < Bn^{\frac{r+1}{2}}} \left| \frac{\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v)}{s} \right| ds, \\ J_3 &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma\sqrt{n} < |s| < Bn^{\frac{r+1}{2}}} e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \left| \frac{\beta_{r+1,n}(s)}{s} \right| ds, \end{aligned}$$

where K as in (B4).

Now, we estimate these integrals using (B3) and (B4). Since $\beta_{r+1,n}(s)$ is a polynomial of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{4}} \beta_{r+1,n}(s)$ is bounded uniformly in s and n (say by M). Therefore,

$$J_3 \leq M \int_{|s| > \delta\sqrt{n}} e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{4}} ds \leq M e^{-cn}$$

for some $c > 0$. By (B4), $\|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n\| \leq \frac{1}{n^{r_2}}$ with $r_2 > r + 1$ (WLOG) for $K < |s| < n^{r_1}$. Also, by assumption $r_1 > r/2$. Thus,

$$J_2 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{K < |s| < Bn^{r/2}} \left| \frac{\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v)}{s} \right| ds \leq C n^{r/2 - r_2} = o(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}}).$$

By (B3), the spectral radius of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s$ is strictly less than 1. Since $s \mapsto \overline{\mathcal{L}}_s$ is continuous, there exist $\gamma < 1$ and $C > 0$ such that $\|\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n\| \leq C\gamma^n$ for all $\delta \leq |s| \leq K$ for large n . Then, for sufficiently large n , we have

$$J_1 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\delta < |s| < K} \left| \frac{\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v)}{s} \right| ds \leq C\gamma^n.$$

Combining the asymptotics for J_1, J_2 and J_3 ,

$$(3.28) \quad \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{|s| > \gamma\sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{\ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}}^n v) - (Z(0) + \lambda(\theta_a)^{-n} \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a}^n v)) \overline{\beta}_{r+1,n}(s)}{s} \right| ds = o(n^{-(r+1)/2}).$$

From (3.27) and (3.28), we deduce that RHS of (3.24) is $o(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}})$. Therefore, $G_n(x) = (1 + \lambda(\theta_a)^{-n} Z(0)^{-1} \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a} v)) \mathcal{E}_{r+1,n}(x) + o(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}})$ uniformly in x . Since $\mathcal{E}_{r+1,n}(x)$ is uniformly bounded in x, n and $\lambda(\theta_a) > 1$ we have that $\frac{\ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a} v) \mathcal{E}_{r+1,n}(x)}{\lambda(\theta_a)^n Z(0)}$ decays exponentially fast. Thus,

$G_n(x) = \mathcal{E}_{r+1,n}(x) + o(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}})$. By the derivation of $\mathcal{E}_{r+1,n}(x)$, it is immediate that this expansion takes the form described in (3.19).

From Lemma 3.2, $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s$ has the order r weak expansion on \mathfrak{F}_r^1 . Since $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r,\alpha}^1$ where $\alpha > \theta_a$, we have that $f_{\theta_a} \in \mathfrak{F}_r^1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(f(S_n - an))e^{I(a)n} &= \int \widehat{f}_{\theta_a}(s) \ell(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n v) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{n^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \int e^{-\theta_a z} P_k^a(z) f(z) dz + C_{r+1}^1(g) \cdot o_{r,\theta_a} \left(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

for all $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r,\alpha}^1$, $\alpha > \theta_a$.

In particular, this holds for $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Let $\{f_m\} \subset C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be a sequence such that $1_{[0,\infty)}$ is a point-wise limit of f_m and $(f_m)_{\theta_a}$'s satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 3.3. (We construct such a sequence in Appendix A). Then, by Lemma 3.3,

$$\mathbb{E}(1_{[0,\infty)}(S_n - an))e^{I(a)n} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{n^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \int e^{-\theta_a x} P_k^a(x) 1_{[0,\infty)}(x) dx + o_{r,\theta_a} \left(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}} \right).$$

That is

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq an)e^{I(a)n} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{n^{k+\frac{1}{2}}} \int_0^\infty e^{-\theta_a x} P_k^a(x) dx + o_{r,\theta_a} \left(n^{-\frac{r+1}{2}} \right).$$

□

Remark 3.1. Note that the coefficients of the strong expansion are obtained by replacing f with $1_{[0,\infty)}$ in coefficients of the weak expansions. Since f_k 's are bounded in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1}^1 , we can do this without altering the order of the error. However, for any $q > 1$, $1_{[0,\infty)}$ is not a pointwise limit of a sequence of functions f_k in \mathfrak{F}_r^q with $C_{r+1}^q(f_k)$ bounded. To observe this, assume that $\|f_k\|_1, \|f_k'\|_1, \|f_k''\|_1$ are uniformly bounded and $f_k \rightarrow 1_{[0,\infty)}$ point-wise. Then, for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$,

$$\int \delta' \phi = - \int \delta \phi' = \int 1_{[0,\infty)} \phi'' = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int f_k \phi'' = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} - \int f_k' \phi' = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int f_k'' \phi$$

This implies that $\frac{|\phi'(0)|}{\|\phi\|_\infty} \leq \sup_k \|f_k''\|_1$ for all $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Clearly, this is a contradiction. Therefore, Theorem 2.1 does not automatically give us strong expansions. Indeed, in Section 4 we exhibit an example (see example 4.2.2) where weak expansions exist when strong expansions fail to exist.

The proof of Theorem 2.3 is similar to that of Theorem 2.2. We include it for completeness.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let $a \in \left(0, \frac{\log \lambda(\delta)}{\delta}\right)$. Since (B1) and (B2) hold, as before we have (3.12) where φ is analytic, $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $r = 1$. As in the previous proof, Berry-Esséen inequality, [2, Lemma 12.2], given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $B > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |G_n(x) - (1 + \lambda(\theta_a)^{-n} Z(0)^{-1} \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a} v)) \mathcal{E}_{1,n}(x)| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-B\sqrt{n}}^{B\sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{\ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}} v) - (Z(0) + \lambda(\theta_a)^{-n} \ell(\Lambda_{\theta_a} v)) \bar{\beta}_{1,n}(s)}{s} \right| ds + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi(t) = o(1)$ as $t \rightarrow 0$ we have,

$$\frac{\bar{\mu}(s/\sqrt{n})^n Z(s/\sqrt{n}) - e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \beta_{1,n}(s)}{s} = \frac{e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\varphi\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + s \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}) \right).$$

Also, we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma\sqrt{n} < |s| < B\sqrt{n}} e^{-\frac{\sigma_a^2 s^2}{2}} \left| \frac{\beta_{r+1,n}(s)}{s} \right| ds = \mathcal{O}(e^{-cn})$$

as before. Because of (B3) there is $\gamma < 1$ such that,

$$\int_{\delta\sqrt{n} < |s| < B\sqrt{n}} \left| \frac{\ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{s/\sqrt{n}} v)}{s} \right| ds = \int_{\delta < |s| < B} \left| \frac{\ell(\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s v)}{s} \right| dt \leq C \sup_{\gamma \leq |s| \leq B} \|\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n\| \leq C\gamma^n.$$

Combining these estimates we conclude that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n$ admits the strong expansion of order 1. Therefore, $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s^n$ admits the weak expansion order 0 for $f \in \mathfrak{F}_1^1$. As before, approximating $1_{[0,\infty)}$ by a sequence in C_c^∞ , we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq an) e^{I(a)n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty e^{-\theta_a x} P_0^a(x) dx + o_{r,\theta_a} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right).$$

From (3.17), $P_0^a(x) = Z(0) \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\sigma_a^2}} = \ell(\Pi_{\theta_a} v) \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\sigma_a^2}}$ and take $C(a) := \ell(\Pi_{\theta_a} v)$. Then,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty e^{-\theta_a z} P_0^a(z) dz = \frac{\ell(\Pi_{\theta_a} v)}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_a^2} \int_0^\infty e^{-\theta_a z} dz = \frac{C(a)}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_a^2} \frac{1}{\theta_a}.$$

From the duality of the Legendre transform, $\sigma_a^2 = (\log \lambda)''(\theta_a) = \frac{1}{I''(a)}$. Hence, we have the required form of the first order expansion. \square

Remark 3.2. (B1) through (B4) with $r_1 > r/2$ imply that $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_s$ satisfies the conditions (A1) through (A4) in [12] with $r_1 > r/2$. We observed above that this is enough to guarantee the existence of the order $r + 1$ Edgeworth expansion for \tilde{S}_N . However, we cannot directly apply the results in [12] because \tilde{S}_N does not induce a probability measure.

Now, we establish (2.5), and remark on the proofs of continuous time results.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. Let $\theta \in (-\delta, \delta)$ and $\eta \in [0, 1]$ be fixed. Consider the two parameter perturbation of the operator $\mathcal{L}(\theta, 1 + \eta)$ of the form $\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon)$. From condition (D1), for a fixed η , $z \mapsto \mathcal{L}(z, 1 + \eta)$ is holomorphic on the disc $|z| < \delta$ and for each fixed z , the family of operators $\mathcal{L}(z, t)$ forms a C^0 -semigroup. Therefore, this two parameter perturbation is continuous. Hence, by perturbation theory, for each $\eta \in [0, 1]$, there exists $\delta_\eta > 0$ such that, on the set $\{(s, \varepsilon) : |s| < \delta_\eta, \varepsilon < \delta_\eta\}$,

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon) = \lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon)\Pi(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon) + \Lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon),$$

where $\Pi(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon)$ is the eigenprojection of the operator $\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon)$ corresponding to the top eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon)$, and

$$\Pi(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon)\Lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon) = \Lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon)\Pi(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon) = 0.$$

In addition, the spectral radius of $\Lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon)$ is less than $|\lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta + \varepsilon)|$.

Since the interval $[0, 1]$ is compact, we can choose $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_k$ such that the set $\{\eta : |\eta - \eta_i| < \delta_{\eta_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ contains the interval $[0, 1]$. Put $\tilde{\delta} = \min_{i=1,2,\dots,k} \delta_{\eta_i}$. Thus, for all $\eta \in [0, 1]$ and s such that $|s| < \tilde{\delta}$,

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, 1 + \eta) = \lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta)\Pi(\theta + is, 1 + \eta) + \Lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta),$$

and the spectral radius of $\Lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta)$ is less than $|\lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta)|$.

Put $\Pi_{\theta+is} = \Pi(\theta + is, 1)$. From (D2) we know that $\Pi(\theta + is, 1 + \eta) = \Pi_{\theta+is}$ for all $\eta \in [0, 1]$ and $|s| < \tilde{\delta}$. This along with the semigroup property imply that $\lambda(\theta + is, 1 + \eta) = \lambda(\theta + is)^{1+\eta}$ for all $\eta \in [0, 1]$, $|s| < \tilde{\delta}$.

For $t > 1$, define the new semigroup $\Lambda(\theta + is, t) = \mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t) - \lambda(\theta + is)^t \Pi_{\theta+is}$. Then, using the fact that $\frac{t}{[t]} \in [1, 2]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t) &= \mathcal{L}\left(\theta + is, \frac{t}{[t]}\right)^{[t]} = \left(\lambda(\theta + is)^{\frac{t}{[t]}} \Pi_{\theta+is} + \Lambda\left(\theta + is, \frac{t}{[t]}\right)\right)^{[t]} \\ &= \lambda(\theta + is)^t \Pi_{\theta+is} + \Lambda(\theta + is, t). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the spectral radius of the operator $\Lambda(\theta + is, 1)$ is less than $|\lambda(\theta + is)|$. □

Remark 3.3. Fix large t . Under (D1) and (D2) we have (2.5):

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t) = \lambda(\theta + is)^t \Pi_{\theta+is} + \Lambda(\theta + is, t)$$

which is the continuous time analogue of (3.4). This, along with assumption (D3), allow us to obtain proofs of Theorems 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 by replacing n by t , $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_s^n$ by $\overline{\mathcal{L}}(s, t) = \frac{e^{-ias}}{\lambda(\theta)^t} \mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t)$ and the projection operators in the proofs of the corresponding discrete time results.

4. EXAMPLES

4.1. iid random variables with Cramér's condition. Let X be a non-lattice centred random variable whose logarithmic moment generating function $h(\theta) = \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})$ is finite on a neighborhood of 0. Let X_n be a sequence of iid copies of X . Then, from [16, Chapter 1], we have the LDP:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}(S_N \geq Na) = -I(a), \text{ if } a > 0$$

where the rate function I is given by

$$I(z) = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} [\gamma z - \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\gamma X})].$$

Denote by $\text{supp } X$ the support of the random variable X . Then, for each $a \in (0, \sup(\text{supp } X))$, there exists a unique θ_a such that $I(a) = \theta_a a - \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta_a X})$.

We further assume that X satisfies the Cramér's condition. That is,

$$(4.1) \quad \limsup_{|t| \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbb{E}(e^{itX})| < 1.$$

This is equivalent to X being 0–Diophantine, a notion we define later in (4.4). These conditions are enough to guarantee the existence of weak and strong expansions for large deviations. In this regard, we state and prove the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let X be a non-lattice centred random variable whose logarithmic moment generating function is finite on a neighborhood of 0, and satisfying the Cramér's condition. Let X_n be a sequence of iid copies of X . Then, for all r ,*

- (a) S_N admits the weak asymptotic expansion of order r for large deviations for $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1}^2$ in the range $(0, \sup(\text{supp } X))$.
- (b) S_N admits the strong asymptotic expansion of order r for large deviations in the range $(0, \sup(\text{supp } X))$.

Proof. Take $\mathbb{B} = \mathbb{R}$, $\ell = \text{Id}$ and $v = 1$. Define $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}$ acting on \mathbb{B} by $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}u = \mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)X}) \cdot u$. Then, by the independence of X_n , $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n 1 = \mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)X})^n = \mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)S_n})$. Since the moment generating function is finite on J , $(\theta+is) \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}$ is analytic on the strip $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Re}(z) \in J\}$. So we have (2.1) and (B1). (B2) is immediate because \mathbb{B} is one-dimensional, $\lambda(\theta) = \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X}) > 0$ for $\theta \in J$ and $\lambda(0) = 1$.

Take F to be the distribution function of X . For $\theta \in J$, we define $Y_{X,\theta}$ to be a random variable with distribution function G^θ given by

$$(4.2) \quad G^\theta(y) = \frac{e^{y\theta} F(y)}{\mu(\theta)} \text{ where } \mu(\theta) = \int e^{y\theta} dF(y).$$

Since X is non-lattice, and $Y_{X,\theta}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to X , we have $Y_{X,\theta}$ is also non-lattice. Therefore, for each $s \neq 0$,

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{|\mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)X})|}{\mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})} = |\mathbb{E}(e^{isY_{X,\theta}})| < 1.$$

This is equivalent to (B3).

Because $Y_{X,\theta}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to X , $Y_{X,\theta}$ also satisfies the Cramér's condition (see [1, Lemma 4]). Therefore, (4.3) holds uniformly in $|s| \geq 1$. That is, there exist $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that $|\mathbb{E}(e^{isY_{X,\theta}})| \leq \epsilon < 1$ for $|s| \geq 1$. Therefore, $|\mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)X})^n| \leq \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})^n \epsilon^n$, for $|s| \geq 1$. This gives (B4) for arbitrary r_1 .

To see that [C] holds, observe that

$$(\log \lambda(\theta))'' = \frac{\mathbb{E}(X^2 e^{\theta X}) \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X}) - \mathbb{E}(X e^{\theta X})^2}{\mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})^2}.$$

From the Hölder's inequality, $\mathbb{E}(X e^{\theta X})^2 \leq \mathbb{E}(X^2 e^{\theta X}) \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})$, and the equality does not occur because X is not constant. Hence, $(\log \lambda(\theta))'' > 0$. \square

This provides an alternative proof for existence of strong asymptotic expansions for large deviations in [1, Theorem 2 (Case 1)] for iid sequences satisfying Cramér's condition. We also recover, [1, Theorem 1 (Case 1, 3)] which gives us the first term of the expansions for non-lattice iid sequences.

Theorem 4.2. *Let X be a non-lattice centred random variable whose logarithmic moment generating function is finite on a neighborhood of 0. Let X_n be a sequence of iid copies of X . Then, S_N admits the order 0 strong expansion for large deviations in the range $(0, \sup(\text{supp } X))$.*

Proof. To see this we only have to observe that (B1), (B2), (B3) and [C] hold as long as X is non-lattice (we used Cramér's condition only when we established (B4) in the previous proof). So the result follows from Theorem 2.3. Also, we note that $\ell(\Pi_\theta v) = 1$ for all θ . Thus, we recover the said results in [1]. \square

4.2. Compactly supported l -Diophantine iid random variables. A random variable X is called l -Diophantine if there exist positive constants s_0 and C such that

$$(4.4) \quad |\mathbb{E}(e^{isX})| < 1 - \frac{C}{|s|^l}, \quad |s| > s_0.$$

Equivalently, a random variable X with distribution function F is l -Diophantine if and only if there exists $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $|x| > C_1$,

$$(4.5) \quad \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \{ax + y\}^2 dF(a) \geq \frac{C_2}{|x|^l}$$

where $\{x\} := \text{dist}(x, \mathbb{Z})$ (see [4]).

Now, we describe two interesting classes of l -Diophantine random variables. In Case I, we discuss a iid sequence of compactly supported and l -Diophantine with ($l \neq 0$) random variables, while in Case II, we assume in addition, that those random variables take finitely many values.

4.2.1. *Case I.* Let X be compactly supported and l -Diophantine with ($l \neq 0$). Then, assuming $\text{supp } X \subseteq [c, d]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \{ax + y\}^2 dG^\theta(a) &= \frac{1}{\int_c^d e^{\theta a} dF(a)} \int_c^d \{ax + y\}^2 e^{\theta a} dF(a) \\ &\geq \frac{e^{\theta c}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\theta a} dF(a)} \int_c^d \{ax + y\}^2 dF(a). \end{aligned}$$

where G^θ as in (4.2). Thus, from (4.5), for all $|x| > C_1$,

$$\inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \{ax + y\}^2 dG^\theta(a) \geq \frac{e^{\theta c}}{\int_c^d e^{\theta a} dF(a)} \frac{C_2}{|x|^l}.$$

So the random variable $Y_{X,\theta}$ with distribution function G^θ is also l -Diophantine.

Theorem 4.3. *Let X be compactly supported and l -Diophantine with ($l \neq 0$). Then,*

- (a) *For all r , S_N admits the weak asymptotic expansion of order r for large deviations in the range $(0, \text{sup}(\text{supp } X))$ for $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1,\alpha}^q$ where $q > \lfloor (r+1)l/2 \rfloor$ and for suitable α depending on a .*
- (b) *For all $r < \lfloor 2l^{-1} \rfloor$, S_N admits the strong asymptotic expansion for large deviations of order r in the range $(0, \text{sup}(\text{supp } X))$.*

Proof. Taking $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}$ as in Section 4.1, we can establish the condition [C], (B1), (B2) and (B3) as in the 0-Diophantine case. (B4) follows from the l -Diophantineness of $Y_{X,\theta}$. In fact,

$$\frac{|\mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)X})|}{\mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})} = |\mathbb{E}(e^{isY_{X,\theta}})| < 1 - \frac{K_\theta}{|s|^l}, \quad |s| > 1,$$

and hence, it follows that whenever $1 < |s| < n^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{l}}$,

$$|\mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)S_n})| = \mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)X})^n \leq \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})^n e^{-C_\theta n^\epsilon/2}$$

where $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ can be made arbitrarily small. So $r_1 = (1 - \epsilon)l^{-1} < l^{-1}$. \square

4.2.2. *Case II.* Let X be a centred random variable taking values a_1, \dots, a_d , ($d \geq 3$) with probabilities p_1, \dots, p_d respectively. Then, the logarithmic moment generating function $h(\theta) = \log \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})$ of X is finite for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Take X_n to be a sequence of iid copies of X .

Take $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d)$, $b_j = a_j - a_1$, for $j = 2 \dots d$ and $d(s) = \max_{j \in \{2, \dots, d\}} \text{dist}(b_j s, 2\pi\mathbb{Z})$. Then, \mathbf{a} is called β -Diophantine if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for $|s| > 1$,

$$d(s) \geq \frac{C}{|s|^\beta}.$$

We restrict the rest of our discussion to X with support $\{a_1, \dots, a_d\}$ such that $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d)$ is β -Diophantine. In fact, almost all \mathbf{a} are β -Diophantine provided $\beta > (d-1)^{-1}$ (see [21]). Since \mathbf{a} is β -Diophantine, the characteristic function of X satisfies,

$$|\mathbb{E}(e^{isX})| < 1 - \frac{c}{|s|^{2\beta}}, \quad |s| > 1$$

for some c . This follows from the following Lemma whose proof can be found in [8]).

Lemma 4.4. *Let X be discrete taking values a_1, \dots, a_d with probabilities p_1, \dots, p_d respectively, and $d(s)$ as defined above. Then there exists a positive constant c such that*

$$|\mathbb{E}(e^{isX})| \leq 1 - cd(s)^2.$$

Now, we prove the existence of asymptotic expansions for large deviations in this setting.

Theorem 4.5. *Let X be a random variable supported on $\{a_1, \dots, a_d\}$ where $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d)$ is β -Diophantine. Take X_n to be a sequence of iid copies of X . For all r , S_N admits the weak expansion of order r in the range $(0, \sup(\text{supp}X))$ for $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1, \alpha}^q$ where $q > \lfloor (r+1)\beta \rfloor$ and for suitable α depending on a .*

Proof. We define $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}$ as in Section 4.1. Then, the conditions (B1), (B2), (B3) and [C] are immediate from Section 4.1.

Due to Lemma 4.4, as a random variable, X is 2β -Diophantine. Since X is compactly supported, $Y_{X, \theta}$ is 2β -Diophantine for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ as in Section 4.2.1. That is for all θ there exists c_θ such that

$$\frac{|\mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)X})|}{\mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})} = |\mathbb{E}(e^{isY_{X, \theta}})| < 1 - \frac{c_\theta}{|s|^{2\beta}}, \quad |s| > 1.$$

Therefore, when $1 < |s| < n^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2\beta}}$, $|\mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)S_n})| = \mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)X})^n \leq \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta X})^n e^{-C_\theta n^\epsilon / 2}$ where $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ can be made arbitrarily small. So (B4) holds with $r_1 < \frac{1-\epsilon}{2\beta} < \frac{1}{2\beta}$. \square

However, one can show that strong expansions of order $2d-3$ or higher do not exist. To see this, let \tilde{S}_n be sum of n iid copies of $Y_{X, \theta}$ (defined in Section 4.1). Note that \tilde{S}_n takes $\mathcal{O}(n^{d-1})$ different values. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_n > an)$ has jumps of $\mathcal{O}(n^{-(d-1)})$. As a result, as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_n > (a+\epsilon)n)$ and $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{S}_n > (a-\epsilon)n)$ may differ only by at most $\mathcal{O}(n^{-(d-1)})$. This forces the order of the strong asymptotic expansion to satisfy $\frac{r+1}{2} < d-1$, which gives us $r < 2d-3$ as required. Thus, this is an example where weak expansions exist even when strong expansions fail to exist.

4.3. Time homogeneous Markov chains with smooth density. Take x_n to be a time homogeneous Markov process on a compact connected manifold M with C^1 transition density $p(x, y)$ which is bounded away from 0 (non-degenerate), and $X_n = h(x_{n-1}, x_n)$ for C^1 function $h : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We assume that $h(x, y)$ can not be written in the form

$$(4.6) \quad h(x, y) = H(y) - H(x) + c(x, y)$$

where $H \in L^\infty(M)$ and $c(x, y)$ is piece-wise constant. The following lemma characterizes such h (see [12]).

Lemma 4.6. (4.6) holds iff there exists $o \in M$ such that the function $x \mapsto h(o, x) + h(x, o)$ is piece-wise constant.

Note that the CLT holds for X_n and the limiting normal distribution is degenerate if and only if (4.6) holds with constant $c(x, y)$ (see [14]). Therefore, in our setting, the CLT is non-degenerate.

We need the following lemma to obtain the condition [B].

Lemma 4.7. Let $K(x, y)$ be a positive C^k function on $M \times M$. Let P be an operator on $L^\infty(M)$ given by

$$Pu(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} K(x, y)u(y) dy.$$

Then, P has a simple leading eigenvalue $\lambda > 0$ and the corresponding eigenfunction g is positive and C^k .

Proof. From the Weierstrass theorem, $K(x, y)$ is a uniform limit of functions formed by finite sums of functions of the form $J(x)L(y)$. Therefore, P can be approximated by finite rank operators. So P is compact on $L^\infty(M)$. Since P is an operator which leaves the cone of positive functions invariant, by a direct application of Birkhoff Theory (see [3]), P has a leading eigenvalue λ which is positive and simple along with a unique positive eigenfunction g , $\|g\|_\infty$.

Because P is compact, there is $r \in (0, \lambda)$ such that $\text{sp}_{L^\infty}(P) \cap \{|z| > r\} = \{\lambda\}$. Next, we consider P acting on $C^1(M)$. Observe that,

$$\frac{d}{dx}(Pu)(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{\partial K}{\partial x}(x, y)u(y) dy.$$

So, $\|Pu(x)\|_{C^1} \leq C\|u\|_\infty$ for some C . Since $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq \|\cdot\|_{C^1}$ unit ball with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{C^1}$ is relatively compact with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Therefore, the essential spectral radius is 0 by [13, Lemma 2.2].

Note that the constant function $\mathbf{1} \in C^1(M)$. By positivity of P ,

$$1 \geq \|g\|_\infty \implies \mathbf{1} \geq g \implies P^n \mathbf{1} \geq P^n g \implies P^n \mathbf{1} \geq \lambda^n g.$$

Therefore,

$$\|P^n\| = \|P^n \mathbf{1}\|_{C^1} \geq \|P^n \mathbf{1}\|_\infty \geq \lambda^n \|g\|_\infty = \lambda^n$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm of P acting on $C^1(M)$. Therefore, the spectral radius of P acting on $C^1(M)$ is at least λ .

Since $C^1(M) \subset L^\infty(M)$, $\text{sp}_{C^1}(P) \subseteq \text{sp}_{L^\infty}(P)$. Therefore, $\text{sp}_{C^1}(P) \cap \{|z| > r\} \subseteq \{\lambda\}$. This establishes that $g \in C^1$. We can repeat the argument and show $g \in C^k$. \square

The next theorem establishes the existence of strong and weak expansions for large deviations in this setting.

Theorem 4.8. *Take x_n to be a time homogeneous Markov process on a compact connected manifold M with C^1 non-degenerate transition density $p(x, y)$. Let $X_n = h(x_{n-1}, x_n)$ for C^1 function $h : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which does not satisfy (4.6). Take $B = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_n}{n}$ with $B_n = \sup_{x_0, \dots, x_n} \sum_{j=1}^n h(x_{j-1}, x_j)$ with the supremum is taken over all possible realizations of the Markov chain x_n . Then, for all r ,*

- (a) S_N admits the weak asymptotic expansion of order r for large deviations in the range $(0, B)$, for $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1, \alpha}^q$ with $q \geq 1$ and suitable α depending on a .
- (b) S_N admits the strong asymptotic expansion of order r for large deviations in the range $(0, B)$.

Proof. Take $\mathbb{B} = L^\infty(M)$ and consider the family of integral operators,

$$(\mathcal{L}_z u)(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} p(x, y) e^{zh(x, y)} u(y) dy, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Let μ be the initial distribution of the Markov chain. Then, using the Markov property, we have $\mathbb{E}_\mu[e^{zS_n}] = \mu(\mathcal{L}_z^n 1)$. Now, we check the condition [B].

It is straightforward that $z \mapsto \mathcal{L}_z$ is entire and therefore (B1) holds. Note that, for all θ , \mathcal{L}_θ is of the form P in Lemma 4.7. Therefore, (B2) holds for all θ . Take $\lambda(\theta)$ be the top eigenvalue and g_θ to be the corresponding eigenfunction. Then, g_θ is C^1 .

To show (B3) and (B4), we define a new operator Q_θ as follows.

$$(Q_\theta u)(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda(\theta)} \int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{\theta h(x, y)} p(x, y) u(y) \frac{g_\theta(y)}{g_\theta(x)} d(y).$$

It is easy to see that

$$p_\theta(x, y) = \frac{e^{\theta h(x, y)} p(x, y)}{g_\theta(x) \lambda(\theta)} \quad \text{and} \quad dm_\theta(y) = g_\theta(y) dy$$

define a new Markov chain x_n^θ with the associated Markov operator Q_θ . That is, Q_θ is a positive operator and $Q_\theta 1 = \frac{1}{\lambda(\theta)} \int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{\theta h(x, y)} p(x, y) \frac{g_\theta(y)}{g_\theta(x)} dy = 1$ (because g_θ is the eigenfunction corresponding to eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta)$ of \mathcal{L}_θ).

Now, we can repeat the arguments in [12] to establish properties of the perturbed operator given by

$$(Q_{\theta+is})u(x) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} e^{ish(x, y)} p_\theta(x, y) dm_\theta(y)$$

Since (4.6) does not hold we conclude that $\text{sp}(Q_{\theta+is}) \subset \{|z| < 1\}$ (see [12, Section 3.6.3]).

Take G_θ to be the operator on $L^\infty(M)$ that corresponds to multiplication by g_θ . Then, $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is} = \lambda(\theta)G_\theta \circ Q_{\theta+is} \circ G_\theta^{-1}$. Therefore, $\text{sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is})$ is the $\text{sp}(Q_{\theta+is})$ scaled by $\lambda(\theta)$. This implies $\text{sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}) \subset \{|z| < \lambda(\theta)\}$ as required.

Also, because g_θ is C^1 we can integrate by parts, as in [12, Section 3.6.3], to conclude that there is ϵ_θ and r_θ such that $\|Q_{\theta+is}^2\| \leq (1 - \epsilon_\theta)$ for all $|t| \geq r_\theta$. Therefore,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n\| = \lambda(\theta)^n \|G_\theta Q_{\theta+is}^n G_\theta^{-1}\| \leq \lambda(\theta)^n \|G_\theta\| \|Q_{\theta+is}^n\| \|G_\theta^{-1}\| \leq C\lambda(\theta)^n (1 - \epsilon_\theta)^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}.$$

Now, we establish [C]. Since (4.6) does not hold, the asymptotic variance σ_θ^2 of $X_n^\theta = h(x_{n-1}^\theta, x_n^\theta)$ is positive. Taking $\gamma(\theta + is)$ to be the top eigenvalue of $Q_{\theta+is}$, $\lambda(\theta + is) = \lambda(\theta)\gamma(\theta + is)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (\log \lambda(\theta))'' &= -\frac{d^2}{ds^2} \log \lambda(\theta + is) \Big|_{s=0} = -\frac{d^2}{ds^2} \log \gamma(\theta + is) \Big|_{s=0} \\ &= -\frac{\gamma''(\theta)}{\gamma(\theta)} + \left(\frac{\gamma'(\theta)}{\gamma(\theta)}\right)^2 = -\gamma''(\theta) + \gamma'(\theta)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Put $S_N^\theta = X_1^\theta + \dots + X_N^\theta$. Since, $\mathbb{E}(e^{isS_N^\theta}) = \int Q_{\theta+is}^N 1 d\mu$, from (3.6), we have that $\gamma'(\theta)^2 - \gamma''(\theta) = \sigma_\theta^2$. Thus, $(\log \lambda(\theta))'' = \sigma_\theta^2 > 0$.

Note that, $\mathcal{L}_\theta = \lambda(\theta)\Pi_\theta + \Lambda_\theta$ where Π_θ is the projection onto the top eigenspace. From [15, Chapter III], $\Pi_\theta = g_\theta \otimes \varphi_\theta$ where φ_θ is the top eigenfunction of Q_θ^* , the adjoint of Q_θ . Because Q_θ^* itself is a positive compact operator acting on $(L^\infty)^*$ (the space of finitely additive finite signed measures), φ_θ is a finite positive measure. Hence, $\mu(\Pi_\theta 1) = \varphi_\theta(1)\mu(g_\theta) > 0$ for all θ .

The rate function $I(a)$ is finite for $a \in (0, B)$ where $B = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \lambda(\theta)}{\theta}$. We observe that $B < \infty$ because h is bounded i.e. $\frac{S_n}{n} \leq \|h\|_\infty$. In fact,

$$B = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_n}{n} \text{ with } B_n = \sup_{x_0, \dots, x_n} \sum_{j=1}^n h(x_{j-1}, x_j)$$

where the supremum is taken over all possible realizations of the Markov chain x_n .

To see this, note that B_n is subadditive. So $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_n}{n}$ exists and is equal to $\inf_n \frac{B_n}{n}$. Given, $a > B$ there exists N_0 such that for all $n > N_0$, $\frac{S_n}{n} \leq \frac{B_n}{n} < a$. Thus, $\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq an) = 0$ for all $n > N_0$ and hence, $I(a) = \infty$. Next, given $a < B$, for all n , $B_n > an$. Fix n . Then, there exists a realization x_1, \dots, x_n such that $an < \sum h(x_{j-1}, x_j) \leq B$. Since h is uniformly continuous on $M \times M$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that by choosing y_j from a ball of radius δ centred at x_j i.e. $y_j \in \mathbb{B}(x_j, \delta)$, we have $an < \sum h(y_{j-1}, y_j) \leq B$. We estimate the probability of choosing such a realization y_1, \dots, y_n and obtain a lower bound for $\mathbb{P}(S_n \geq an)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S_n \geq an) &\geq \int_{\mathbb{B}(x_n, \delta)} \dots \int_{\mathbb{B}(x_1, \delta)} \int_{\mathbb{B}(x_0, \delta)} p(y_{n-1}, y_n) \dots p(y_0, y_1) d\mu(y_0) dy_1 \dots dy_n \\ &\geq \mu(\mathbb{B}(x_0, \delta)) \left(\min_{x, y \in \mathcal{M}} p(x, y) \right)^n \text{vol}(\mathbb{B}_\delta)^n \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $I(a) < \infty$ as required. \square

4.4. Finite State Markov chains. Consider the time homogeneous Markov chain x_n with state space $S = \{1, \dots, d\}$ whose transition probability matrix $P = (p_{jk})_{d \times d}$ is positive. Suppose $\mathbf{h} = (h_{jk})_{d \times d} \in M(d, \mathbb{R})$ is such that there are no constants c, r and a d -vector H such that

$$(4.7) \quad rh_{jk} = c + H(k) - H(j) \pmod{2\pi}$$

for all j, k . Define $X_n = h_{x_n x_{n+1}}$.

Next, define $b_{l,j,k} = h_{lj} + h_{jk}$, $l, j, k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ with $k \neq 2$ and

$$d(s) = \max_{l,j,k} \text{dist}((b_{l,j,k} - b_{l,1,k})s, 2\pi\mathbb{Z}).$$

We further assume that \mathbf{h} is β -Diophantine, that is, there exists $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $|s| > 1$,

$$(4.8) \quad d(s) \geq \frac{K}{|s|^\beta}.$$

If $\beta > \frac{1}{d^3 - d^2 - 1}$ then almost all \mathbf{h} are β -Diophantine (see [21]). These assumptions yield the following result.

Theorem 4.9. *Take x_n to be a time homogeneous Markov chain on $\{1, \dots, d\}$ with a positive transition probability matrix $P = (p_{jk})_{d \times d}$. Let $X_n = h_{x_n x_{n+1}}$ for h which does not satisfy (4.7) and $\mathbf{h} = (h_{jk})_{d \times d}$ β -Diophantine. Take $B = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_n}{n}$, $B_n = \sup_{x_0, \dots, x_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{h}_{x_{j-1} x_j}$ where the supremum is taken over all possible realizations of the Markov chain x_n . Then, for all r , S_N admits the weak expansion of order r in the range $(0, B)$ for $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1, \alpha}^d$ where $q > \lfloor (r+1)\beta \rfloor$ and for suitable α depending on a .*

Proof. We use ideas in the previous section and [12] to establish conditions [B] and [C].

Consider the family of operators $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is} : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$,

$$(4.9) \quad (\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is} f)_j = \sum_{k=1}^d e^{(\theta+is)h_{jk}} p_{jk} f_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, d$$

Take $v = \mathbf{1}$ and $\ell = \boldsymbol{\mu}_0$, the initial distribution. Then, from the Markov property we obtain $\mathbb{E}(e^{isS_N}) = \sum_{j=1}^d (\boldsymbol{\mu}_0)_j (\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n \mathbf{1})_j = \boldsymbol{\mu}_0(\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n \mathbf{1})$. Obviously, $z \mapsto \mathcal{L}_z$ is entire. So, (2.1) and (B1) holds.

Note that for all θ , the matrix $P^\theta = (e^{\theta h_{jk}} p_{jk})$ is a positive matrix and hence, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem, P^θ has a positive leading eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta)$ that is simple, and the corresponding eigenvector $\mathbf{g}^\theta = (g_j^\theta)$ is positive. In addition, P (corresponding to $\theta = 0$) is stochastic. So its top eigenvalue $\lambda(0) = 1$. Since we deal with finite-dimensional spaces, the remaining part of (B2) follows immediately.

Next, define a new Markov chain x_n^θ corresponding to the stochastic matrix

$$\overline{P}^\theta = \left(\frac{e^{\theta h_{jk}} p_{jk} g_k^\theta}{\lambda(\theta) g_j^\theta} \right).$$

Then, the corresponding operator is,

$$(Q_{it}f)_j = \sum_{k=1}^d e^{i\theta h_{jk}} \frac{e^{\theta h_{jk}} p_{jk} g_k^\theta}{\lambda(\theta) g_j^\theta} f_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, d.$$

Also, (B3) follows because (4.7) does not hold. For a proof of this fact refer to [12, Section 3.6.2], where (B3) is proven for $\theta = 0$. However, the same proof applies to our situation because it relies only on the properties of \mathbf{h} , not on the underlying Markov process.

From the Diophantine condition (4.8), there exists $c > 0$, $\|\mathcal{L}_{is}^2\| \leq 1 - cd(s)^2$. For a proof of this, refer to [12, Section 3.6.2]. So $\|\mathcal{L}_{is}^n\| \leq (1 - cd(s)^2)^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \leq e^{-Cs^{-2\beta}n/2}$ for $|s| > 1$. Thus, $\|\mathcal{L}_{is}^n\| \leq e^{-Cn^\epsilon/2}$ when $1 < |s| < n^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2\beta}}$. Similarly, $\|Q_{is}^n\| \leq e^{-Cn^\epsilon/2}$ for $1 < |s| < n^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2\beta}}$. Hence, the argument for $\theta = 0$ (original chain) works for all θ .

Note that, $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is} = \lambda(\theta)G_\theta \circ Q_{is} \circ G_\theta^{-1}$ where G_θ corresponds to multiplication by $G_\theta = (g_j^\theta \delta_{jk})$. Therefore, $\|\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n\| \leq C\lambda(\theta)^s e^{-Cn^\epsilon/2}$ for $1 < |s| < n^{\frac{1-\epsilon}{2\beta}}$ which gives us (B4) with $r_1 = \frac{1-\epsilon}{2\beta}$ where $\epsilon > 0$ can be made arbitrarily small.

The same argument in Theorem 4.8 adapted to chains give us condition [C] and that the range of large deviations is $(0, B)$ where

$$B = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_n}{n} \text{ with } B_n = \sup_{x_0, \dots, x_n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{h}_{x_{j-1}x_j}$$

where the supremum is taken over all possible realizations of the Markov chain x_n . □

However, as in the case of discrete iid random variables, strong expansions of order $2d^2 - 3$ or higher do not exist because the number of distinct values X_n takes is at most d^2 .

Note that in the proof of the previous theorem, the Diophantine nature of \mathbf{h} was not used in proving (B1), (B2), (B3) and [C]. Therefore, we also have the following first order asymptotics for large deviations for a general finite state Markov chain.

Theorem 4.10. *Take x_n to be a time homogeneous Markov chain on $\{1, \dots, d\}$ with a positive transition probability matrix $P = (p_{jk})_{d \times d}$. Let $X_n = h_{x_n x_{n+1}}$ for h which does not satisfy (4.7). Then, S_N admits the order 0 strong expansion for large deviations in the range $(0, B)$.*

4.5. Smooth Expanding Maps. Uniformly expanding maps are the most basic type of uniformly hyperbolic systems, and as a result they have been studied extensively. Most of their statistical properties are well-known. See, for example, [13] and references therein.

Here we establish an exact Large Deviation Principle for C^1 -observables in the setting of C^2 -expanding maps of the torus.

Suppose f is smooth and uniformly expanding on \mathbb{T} , i.e., $f \in C^r(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T})$, $r \geq 2$ and there is λ_* such that $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{T}} |f'(x)| \geq \lambda_* > 1$. Let μ be any Borel probability measure on \mathbb{T} . Let $g \in C^{r-1}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ be such that there is constant c and $\phi \in C^0(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$(4.10) \quad g = c + \phi - \phi \circ f.$$

That is, g is not a continuous co-boundary. Take $X_n = g \circ f^n$. If we choose an initial point x according to a probability density $\rho(x)$ then $\{X_n\}$ becomes a sequence of random variables. The following theorem establishes a strong large deviation result for X_n .

Theorem 4.11. *Suppose $f \in C^r(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{T})$, $r \geq 2$ and uniformly expanding on \mathbb{T} . Let $g \in C^{r-1}(\mathbb{T}, \mathbb{R})$ be such that (4.10) does not hold. Take $X_n = g \circ f^n$ with initial distribution μ . Define $\mathcal{M}_f^1(\mathbb{T}) = \{\nu \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{T}) \mid f_*\nu = \nu\}$, $B = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}_f^1(\mathbb{T})} \int g d\nu$, and*

$$(4.11) \quad I(a) = - \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(a)} \left[h_{KS}(\nu) - \int (\log f') d\nu \right]$$

where $\mathcal{M}(a) = \{\nu \in \mathcal{M}^1(\mathbb{T}) \mid f_*\nu = \nu, \int g d\nu = a\}$ and h_{KS} is the Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy. Then, for all $a \in (0, B)$ there exists a constant $K = K(a)$ such that

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbb{P}(S_N \geq aN) e^{I(a)N} = \frac{K}{\sqrt{2\pi N}} (1 + o(1)) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Take \mathcal{L} to be the transfer operator associated with f ,

$$\mathcal{L}(h)(x) = \sum_{f(y)=x} \frac{h(y)}{f'(y)}.$$

For $z \in \mathbb{C}$, define $\mathcal{L}_z : C^1 \rightarrow C^1$ by $\mathcal{L}_z(\cdot) = \mathcal{L}(e^{zg} \cdot)$. That is,

$$\mathcal{L}_z(h)(x) = \sum_{f(y)=x} e^{zg(y)} \frac{h(y)}{f'(y)}.$$

Then, it follows from properties of the transfer operator that

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{zS_n}) = \int (\mathcal{L}_z^n \rho)(x) dx.$$

Also, $z \mapsto \mathcal{L}_z$ is analytic due to the power series expansion, $\mathcal{L}_z(\cdot) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{k!} \mathcal{L}(g^k \cdot)$. Note here that, $\mathcal{L}(g^k \cdot) : C^1 \rightarrow C^1$ because $\|g\|_{\infty} < \infty$ and $\|g'\|_{\infty} < \infty$.

From [9, Lemma A.1], we have that for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, \mathcal{L}_{θ} is of Perron-Forbenius type for all θ and the projection operator to the top-eigenspace Π_{θ} takes the form $h_{\theta} \otimes m_{\theta}$ where $h_{\theta} \in C^1$ is positive and m_{θ} is a positive measure. That is for all θ , $\mathcal{L}_{\theta} = \lambda(\theta)h_{\theta} \otimes m_{\theta} + \Lambda_{\theta}$ with $\|\Lambda_{\theta}\| < Cr_{\theta}^n$ where $0 < r_{\theta} < \lambda(\theta)$.

We need to verify that $(\log \lambda)''(\theta) > 0$ and $\text{sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}) \subset \{|z| < \lambda(\theta)\}$ for $s \neq 0$.

To see the former we note that

$$(\log \lambda)''(\theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} m_\theta \left(\left[\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} g \circ f^k \right]^2 h_\theta \right) \geq 0,$$

and if equality holds then g is a continuous coboundary (see [9, A.12b and Lemma A.16]). Therefore, in our setting, $(\log \lambda)''(\theta) > 0$ for all θ .

For the latter, we first show that $\text{sp}(\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}) \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| \leq \lambda(\theta)\}$, essential spectral radius of $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}$ is at most $\lambda_*^{-1}\lambda(\theta)$, and there are no eigenvalues on $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| = \lambda(\theta)\}$. Observe that

$$(4.13) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n u(x) = \sum_{f^n(y)=x} \frac{e^{(\theta+is)g_n(y)}}{(f^n)'(y)} u(y)$$

where $g_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} g \circ f^k$. From this it follows that

$$(4.14) \quad \frac{d}{dx} \mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n u = \mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n \left(\frac{u'}{(f^n)'} + (\theta + is) \frac{g_n'}{(f^n)'} u - \frac{(f^n)''}{[(f^n)']^2} u \right).$$

We note that from [9, Remark A.3] the spectral radii of $\mathcal{L}_\theta : C^1 \rightarrow C^1$ and $\mathcal{L}_\theta : C^0 \rightarrow C^0$ coincide. Now, from (4.15),

$$(4.15) \quad \|\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n u\|_\infty \leq \|\mathcal{L}_\theta^n\|_{C^0} \|u\|_\infty \leq C\lambda(\theta)^n \|u\|_\infty,$$

and from (4.14),

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dx} \mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n u \right\|_\infty = \|\mathcal{L}_\theta^n\|_{C^0} \left(\lambda_*^{-n} \|u'\|_\infty + \left[\sqrt{\theta^2 + s^2} \lambda_*^{-n} \|g_n'\|_\infty + \lambda_*^{-2n} \|(f^n)''\|_\infty \right] \|u\|_\infty \right).$$

Thus, we obtain,

$$\|\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}^n u\|_{C^1} \leq C\lambda(\theta)^n \left(\lambda_*^{-n} \|u\|_{C^1} + \bar{C} \|u\|_\infty \right)$$

where \bar{C} depends only on s and θ . Since the unit ball in C^1 is relatively compact in C^0 , we can use [13, Lemma 2.2] to conclude that the essential spectral radius of $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}$ is at most $\lambda_*^{-1}\lambda(\theta)$ and the spectral radius of $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}$ is at most $\lambda(\theta)$.

Next, we normalize the family of operators $\mathcal{Q}_{\theta+is}$,

$$\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta+is} v(x) = \sum_{f(y)=x} \frac{e^{(\theta+is)g(y)} h_\theta(y)}{f'(y) h_\theta \circ f(y)} v(y)$$

Then, $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta+is} = H_\theta^{-1} \circ \mathcal{L}_\theta \circ H_\theta$ where H_θ is multiplication by the function h_θ . Note that H_θ is invertible because $h_\theta > 0$. Now, $\mathcal{Q}_{\theta+is}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta+is}$ have the same spectrum. However, the eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue 1 of $\bar{\mathcal{Q}}_\theta$ changes to the constant function $\mathbf{1}$.

Assume $e^{i\theta}$ is an eigenvalue of $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta+is}$ for $s \neq 0$. Then, there exists $u \in C^1$ with $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta+is}u(x) = e^{i\theta}u(x)$. Observe that,

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta}|u|(x) = \sum_{f(y)=x} \frac{e^{\theta g(y)}|u(y)|h(y)}{f'(y)h \circ f(y)} \geq \left| \sum_{f(y)=x} \frac{e^{(\theta+is)g(y)}u(y)h(y)}{f'(y)h \circ f(y)} \right| = |\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta+is}u(x)| = |u(x)|$$

Also note that, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta}$ is a positive operator. Hence, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta}^n|u|(x) \geq |u(x)|$ for all n . However,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta}^n|u|)(x) = \int |u(y)| \cdot \mathbf{1} dm_{\theta}(y)$$

because $\mathbf{1}$ is the eigenfunction corresponding to the top eigenvalue. So for all x ,

$$\int |u(y)| dm_{\theta}(y) \geq |u(x)|$$

This implies that $|u(x)|$ is constant. WLOG $|u(x)| \equiv 1$. So we can write $u(x) = e^{i\gamma(x)}$ for $\gamma \in C^1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta+is}u(x) &= \sum_{f(y)=x} \frac{e^{\theta g(y)}h(y)}{f'(y)h \circ f(y)} e^{i(sg(y)+\gamma(y))} = e^{i(\theta+\gamma(x))} \\ \implies \sum_{f(y)=x} \frac{e^{\theta g(y)}h(y)}{f'(y)h \circ f(y)} e^{i(sg(y)+\gamma(y)-\gamma(f(y))-\theta)} &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

for all x . Since,

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta}\mathbf{1} = \sum_{f(y)=x} \frac{e^{\theta g(y)}h(y)}{f'(y)h \circ f(y)} = \mathbf{1}$$

and $e^{i(sg(y)+\gamma(y)-\gamma(f(y))-\theta)}$ are unit vectors, it follows that

$$sg(y) + \gamma(y) - \gamma(f(y)) - \theta = 0 \pmod{2\pi}$$

for all y . Because LHS is continuous,

$$sg(y) + \gamma(y) - \gamma(f(y)) - \theta = c$$

Because g is not a continuous coboundary we have a contradiction. Therefore, $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\theta+is}$ does not have an eigenvalue on the unit circle when $s \neq 0$. So $\mathcal{L}_{\theta+is}$ does not have eigenvalues on $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| = \lambda(\theta)\}$ when $s \neq 0$.

Now, due to Theorem 2.3 the strong large deviation result (4.12) holds with

$$I(a) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} [a\theta - \log \lambda(\theta)] = a\theta_a - \log \lambda(\theta_a),$$

and

$$K = K(a) = \frac{\sqrt{I''(a)}}{\theta_a} m_{\theta_a}(\mathbb{T}) \int h_{\theta_a}(x) \rho(x) dx.$$

The entropy formulation of $I(a)$, (4.11), can be found in [9, Lemma 6.6]. \square

4.6. SDE's satisfying Hörmander Hypoellipticity condition. Let M be a compact d -dimensional smooth manifold and $\{V_0, \dots, V_k\}$ be a collection of smooth vector fields of M such that $D = \{V_1, \dots, V_k\}$ satisfies the Hörmander Hypoellipticity condition, i.e., the Lie algebra generated by D evaluated at x spans the tangent space $T_x M$ at each $x \in M$.

Let W_t be the k -dimensional Wiener process with components W_t^i for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let X_t be the process on M , and Y_t be the process on \mathbb{R} satisfying the coupled SDEs,

$$(4.16) \quad dX_t = \sum_{i=1}^k V_i(X_t) \circ dW_t^i + V_0(X_t) dt, \quad X_0 = x,$$

$$(4.17) \quad dY_t = \sigma(X_t) \circ d\widetilde{W}_t + b(X_t) dt, \quad Y_0 = y,$$

where the real valued function $b : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the real valued function $\sigma : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are smooth and \widetilde{W}_t is a 1-dimensional Wiener process independent of the k -dimensional Wiener process W_t . We also assume that σ is non-degenerate, i.e, $\sigma^2(x) > 0$ for each $x \in M$. The right hand sides of (4.16) and (4.17) are interpreted in the Stratonovich sense. Note that the distribution of X_t for each $t > 0$ is absolutely continuous by Hörmander's theorem. Let $\rho(t, x)$ be the density of the process X_t on M and let $\bar{\rho}(x)$ be its invariant density on M . We assume that

$$\int_M b(x) d\bar{\rho}(x) = 0.$$

The above condition guarantees that the asymptotic mean of the random process Y_t is zero, since

$$\bar{Y} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}(Y_t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E} \left(\int_0^t b(X_s) ds \right) = \int_M b(x) d\bar{\rho}(x)$$

Theorem 4.12. *If the above assumptions hold, then for all $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$,*

- (a) Y_t admits the weak expansion of order r in the range $(0, \infty)$ for $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1, \alpha}^q$ with $q \geq 1$ and suitable α depending on a and
- (b) Y_t admits the strong expansion of order r in the range $(0, \infty)$.

Proof. The infinitesimal generator of the joint Markov process (X_t, Y_t) is a partial differential operator \mathcal{M} acting on functions u defined on $M \times \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$(4.18) \quad \mathcal{M}u = \frac{1}{2} \nabla_x [(V(x)V^T(x)) \nabla_x u] + \frac{1}{2} (\sigma^2(x)) \Delta_y u + V_0(x) \nabla_x u + b(x) \nabla_y u,$$

where $V(x)$ is the $d \times k$ matrix formed by the vectors $\{V_1, \dots, V_k\}$ as columns.

We also observe that, from the Kolmogorov Forward Equation, the transition density for the Markov process $(X_t, Y_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is given by $p(t, (x_0, y_0), (x, y))$, and it satisfies the partial differential equation

$$(4.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t p &= \mathcal{M}_{(x,y)}^* p, \\ p(0, (x_0, y_0), (x, y)) &= \delta_{(x_0, y_0)}(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathbb{B} be the Banach space of complex valued continuous functions defined on M equipped with the supremum norm. Define, for each $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $t \geq 0$, the bounded linear operator $\mathcal{L}(z, t) : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ given by

$$\mathcal{L}(z, t)f(x) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(f(X_t)e^{z(Y_t-y)}),$$

where the right hand side clearly does not depend on y .

The family of operators $\{\mathcal{L}(z, t)\}_{\{t \geq 0\}}$ forms a semigroup since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(z, t) \circ \mathcal{L}(z, s)f(x) &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}((\mathcal{L}(z, s)f)(X_t)e^{z(Y_t-y)}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(\mathbb{E}_{(X_t, Y_t)}(f(X_s)e^{z(Y_s-Y_t)})e^{z(Y_t-y)}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(\mathbb{E}_{(X_t, Y_t)}(f(X_s)e^{z(Y_s-y)})) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(f(X_{s+t})e^{z(Y_{s+t}-y)}) \\ &= \mathcal{L}(z, t+s)f(x). \end{aligned}$$

Now we will verify conditions (D1), (D2) and (D3) from Section 2 for the family of operators $\mathcal{L}(z, t)$. To verify condition (D1), we will show that (B1) – (B3) hold uniformly on $t \in [1, 2]$ and show that (2.3) holds.

• **Condition (B1)** We first observe that the map $z \mapsto \mathcal{L}(z, t)$ is infinitely differentiable in z for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Indeed, for each $f \in \mathbb{B}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $D_z^\alpha(\mathcal{L}(z, t)f)(x_0) = \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(Y_t^\alpha f(X_t)e^{zY_t})$. We know that Y_t is a stochastic process on \mathbb{R} with bounded diffusion and drift coefficients, which implies that Y_t has all exponential moments. Hence, $D_z^\alpha \mathcal{L}(z, t)$ is a well defined bounded linear operator on \mathbb{B} for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Note that $\mathcal{L}(0, t)$ is a compact operator on \mathbb{B} since, if we define

$$q_{0,t}(x_0, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} p(t, (x_0, 0), (x, y))dy,$$

then, for any $f \in \mathbb{B}$, $\mathcal{L}(0, t)f(x_0) = \int_M f(x)q_{0,t}(x_0, x)dx$, where $q_{0,t}$ is positive and continuous in $(x_0, x) \in M \times M$. We note that 1 is the top eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}(0, t)$ with constant functions forming the eigenspace. All the other eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}(0, t)$ have absolute values less than 1, by the Perron–Frobenius theorem.

We note that if $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, then $q_{\theta,t}(x_0, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\theta y} p(t, (x_0, 0), (x, y))dy > 0$ for all $x_0, x \in M$. This kernel is continuous in $(x_0, x) \in M \times M$. That is, $\mathcal{L}(\theta, t)$ is a positive, compact operator for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$.

• **Condition (D2):** We observe that the coefficients of the operator \mathcal{M} are independent of the time variable t , and therefore the Markov process (X_t, Y_t) is time homogeneous. Thus, the top eigenspace of the operators $\mathcal{L}(\theta, t)$ is the same for all $t > 0$. Thus, $\Pi(\theta, t) = \Pi(\theta, 1)$ for all $t > 0$, in particular, condition (D2) holds.

• **Condition (B2)** Using (D2) and the semigroup property, condition (B2) is satisfied since there exists a $\lambda(\theta) > 0$ for all θ , the top eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta)^t$ of the operator $\mathcal{L}(\theta, t)$ exists, and other eigenvalues of $\mathcal{L}(\theta, t)$ have absolute values less than $\lambda(\theta)^t$.

• **Condition (B3)** We need to show that $\text{sp}(\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t)) \subseteq \{|z| < \lambda(\theta)^t\}$. We first note that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t)f(x)| &= |\mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(f(X_t)e^{(\theta+is)(Y_t-y)})| \leq \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(|f(X_t)e^{(\theta+is)(Y_t-y)}|) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(x,y)}(|f(X_1)|e^{\theta(Y_1-y)}) = \mathcal{L}(\theta, t)|f|(x). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\text{sp}(\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, t)) \subseteq \{|z| \leq \lambda(\theta)^t\}$. To prove that there is inclusion with strict inequality, it is enough to show that $\text{sp}(\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, 1)) \subseteq \{|z| < \lambda(\theta)\}$. We suppose, on the contrary, that there exists an eigenfunction $f \in \mathbb{B}$ of the operator $\mathcal{L}(\theta + is, 1)$, with $\|f\| = 1$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta + is)$ such that $|\lambda(\theta + is)| = \lambda(\theta)$. That is, for all $x \in M$,

$$(4.20) \quad \mathbb{E}_{(x,0)}(f(X_1)e^{(\theta+is)Y_1}) = \lambda(\theta + is)f(x).$$

We know $\lambda(\theta)$ is the top eigenvalue of the operator $\mathcal{L}(\theta, 1)$. Thus, there exists an eigenfunction $g \in \mathbb{B}$ of $\mathcal{L}(\theta, 1)$, corresponding to the eigenvalue $\lambda(\theta)$, which implies that for all $x \in M$,

$$(4.21) \quad \mathbb{E}_{(x,0)}(g(X_1)e^{\theta Y_1}) = \lambda(\theta)g(x).$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that, for all $x \in M$, $g(x) > 0$, and that $|f(x)| \leq g(x)$. In addition, we can assume that there exists a point $x_0 \in M$ such that $|f(x_0)| = g(x_0)$. Now,

$$|\mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(f(X_1)e^{(\theta+it)Y_1})| = |\lambda(\theta)f(x_0)| = \lambda(\theta)g(x_0) = \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g(X_1)e^{\theta Y_1}).$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(|f(X_1)e^{(\theta+it)Y_1}|) \geq \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g(X_1)e^{\theta Y_1}).$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(e^{\theta Y_1}(|f(X_1)e^{itY_1}| - g(X_1))) \geq 0,$$

and therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(e^{\theta Y_1}(|f(X_1)| - g(X_1))) = \mathcal{L}(\theta, 1)(|f| - g)(x_0) \geq 0.$$

We have from our assumption that $|f| \leq g$, and we know that $\mathcal{L}(\theta, 1)$ is a positive operator. We conclude that,

$$Q_\theta(|f| - g)(x_0) = \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(e^{\theta Y_1}(|f(X_1)| - g(X_1))) = 0.$$

Now,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(e^{\theta Y_1}(|f(X_1)| - g(X_1))) = \int_M (|f(x)| - g(x))q_{\theta,1}(x_0, x)dx.$$

From the definition of $q_{\theta,1}$, we know that, for a fixed $x_0 \in M$, $q_{\theta,1}(x_0, x) > 0$, $x \in M$. Therefore, for all $x \in M$, $|f(x)| = g(x)$. Thus, there exists a continuous function ϕ defined on M such that $f(x) = e^{i\phi(x)}g(x)$ for all $x \in M$. Substituting this in (4.20), we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,0)}(e^{i\phi(X_1)}g(X_1)e^{(\theta+is)Y_1}) = \lambda(\theta+is)e^{i\phi(x)}g(x) = e^{i\phi(x)}\mathbb{E}_{(x,0)}(g(X_1)e^{\theta Y_1})\frac{\lambda(\theta+is)}{\lambda(\theta)},$$

where the last equality follows from equation (4.21). In addition, since $|\lambda(\theta+is)| = \lambda(\theta)$, there exists a constant c such that $\frac{\lambda(\theta+is)}{\lambda(\theta)} = e^{ic}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(x,0)}(e^{i\phi(x)}e^{\theta Y_1}e^{ic}g(X_1)(e^{isY_1+i\phi(X_1)-i\phi(x)-ic} - 1)) = 0.$$

This implies that $s\tilde{y} + \phi(\tilde{x}) - \phi(x) - ic = 0 \pmod{2\pi}$ whenever $p(1, (x, 0), (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})) > 0$. This is not possible since the Brownian motion \tilde{W} (in the definition of Y_1) is independent of W (in the definition of X_1). Thus, $\text{sp}(\mathcal{L}(\theta+is, 1)) \subseteq \{|z| < \lambda(\theta)\}$ which implies $\text{sp}(\mathcal{L}(\theta+is, t)) \subseteq \{|z| < \lambda(\theta)^t\}$.

• **Condition ((2.3))** Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ be fixed. Let $g_\theta(x)$ be such that $\|g_\theta\| = 1$ and $\mathcal{L}(\theta, 1)g_\theta(x) = \lambda(\theta)g_\theta(x)$ for all $x \in M$. Then we also have $\mathcal{L}(\theta, t)g_\theta(x) = \lambda(\theta)^t g_\theta(x)$ for all $x \in M$, since condition (D2) holds. In addition, since $\mathcal{L}(\theta, 1)$ is a positive operator, the eigenfunction g_θ is positive. We observe that g_θ satisfies the PDE $e^{-\theta y}\mathcal{M}(e^{\theta y}g_\theta(x)) = \mu(\theta)g_\theta(x)$ for all $x \in M$. Since the coefficients of the operator $e^{-\theta y}\mathcal{M}(e^{\theta y}\cdot)$ are differentiable in θ the function g_θ is differentiable in θ .

We first consider a new family of operators $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(z, t) : \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ defined by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(z, t)f(x_0) = \int_M f(x)\tilde{q}_{z,t}(x_0, x) dx,$$

where $\tilde{q}_{z,t}(x_0, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{zy}p_\theta(t, (x_0, 0), (x, y)) dy$ and

$$p_\theta(t, (x_0, 0), (x, y)) := \frac{e^{\theta y}g_\theta(x)p(t, (x_0, 0), (x, y))}{\lambda(\theta)^t g_\theta(x_0)}.$$

Let $\mathbf{1}$ denote the function that takes the value 1 for all $x_0 \in M$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(0, t)\mathbf{1}(x_0) &= \int_M 1 \cdot \tilde{q}_{0,t}(x_0, x) dx \\ &= \int_M \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_\theta(t, (x_0, 0), (x, y)) dy dx \\ &= \int_M \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{\theta y}g_\theta(x)p(t, (x_0, 0), (x, y))}{\lambda(\theta)^t g_\theta(x_0)} dy dx \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda(\theta)^t g_\theta(x_0)} \int_M \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\theta y}g_\theta(x)p(t, (x_0, 0), (x, y)) dy dx \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\lambda(\theta)^t g_\theta(x_0)} \mathcal{L}(\theta, t) g_\theta(x_0) = 1.$$

Therefore $\mathbf{1}$ is an eigenfunction for the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(0, t)$ corresponding to the top eigenvalue 1.

Observe that the operators $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ and \mathcal{L} satisfy, for all $f \in \mathbb{B}$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(z, t)f(x_0) = \frac{1}{\lambda(\theta)^t g_\theta(x_0)} \mathcal{L}(\theta + z, t)(f g_\theta)(x_0).$$

It is easy to see that the new family of operators $\{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(z, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ also forms a C_0 semigroup. Thus, in order to prove (2.3), we need to show that there exist positive numbers r_1, r_2, K and N_0 such that

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(is, t)\| \leq \frac{1}{t^{r_2}}$$

for all $t > N_0$, for all $K < |s| < t^{r_1}$. In fact, it will be enough to show that there exists an $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $t \in [1, 2]$ and for all $|s| > K$,

$$(4.22) \quad \|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(is, t)\| < 1 - \epsilon,$$

since the above relation would imply that, for all $t > 2$,

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(is, t)\| = \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{L}}\left(is, \frac{t}{[t]}\right)^{[t]} \right\| \leq \left\| \tilde{\mathcal{L}}\left(is, \frac{t}{[t]}\right) \right\|^{[t]} \leq (1 - \epsilon)^{[t]}.$$

showing exponential decay.

We observe that for any $f \in \mathbb{B}$, and $x_0 \in M$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(is, t)f(x_0) = \int_M f(x) \tilde{q}_{is,t}(x_0, x) dx$$

where,

$$\tilde{q}_{is,t}(x_0, x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{(\theta+is)y} g_\theta(x) p(t, (x_0, 0), (x, y))}{\lambda(\theta)^t g_\theta(x_0)} dy,$$

and therefore, it is enough to show that there exists an $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $K > 0$ such that for all $|s| > K$, and for all $t \in [1, 2]$,

$$(4.23) \quad |\tilde{q}_{is,t}(x_0, x)| \leq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Let \mathcal{F}_t denote the sigma algebra generated by the process $\{W_u\}_{u \in [0, t]}$. Note that the following equality holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}_{is,t}(x_0, x) &= \frac{g_\theta(x)}{\lambda(\theta)^t g_\theta(x_0)} \mathbb{E}_{(x_0, 0)} \left(e^{(\theta+is)Y_t} \mid X_t = x \right) \\ &= \frac{g_\theta(x)}{\lambda(\theta)^t g_\theta(x_0)} \mathbb{E}_{(x_0, 0)} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(e^{(\theta+is) \left(\int_0^t \sigma(X_u) d\tilde{W}_u + \int_0^t (\sigma'(X_u)\sigma(X_u) + b(X_u)) du \right)} \mid \mathcal{F}_t \right) \mid X_t = x \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now we know that

$$\left\{ e^{\int_0^t (\theta+is)\sigma(X_u) d\tilde{W}_u - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t (\theta+is)^2 \sigma^2(X_u) du} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \right\}$$

forms a martingale for all $t > 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is)Y_t} | \mathcal{F}_t) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(e^{\int_0^t (\theta+is)^2 \sigma^2(X_u) du + (\theta+is) \int_0^t (\sigma'(X_u)\sigma(X_u) + b(X_u)) du} | \mathcal{F}_t) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(e^{\theta^2 \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u) du - s^2 \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u) du + 2is\theta \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u) du + (\theta+is) \int_0^t \sigma'(X_u)\sigma(X_u) + b(X_u) du} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Since $\sigma(x)$, $b(x)$ are smooth on the compact manifold M , and $\sigma(x) > 0$ for all $x \in M$, for a fixed $\theta > 0$, we can choose $K > 0$ such that for all $t \in [1, 2]$, $|s| > K$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta^2 \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u) du - s^2 \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u) du + 2is\theta \int_0^t \sigma^2(X_u) du + (\theta+is) \int_0^t \sigma'(X_u)\sigma(X_u) + b(X_u) du} | \mathcal{F}_t) \right| \\ & < (1 - \epsilon) \frac{\|g_\theta\| \sup\{\lambda(\theta)^t | t \in [1, 2]\}}{\inf\{g_\theta(x) | x \in M\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the quantities $\sup\{\lambda(\theta)^t | t \in [1, 2]\}$ and $\inf\{g_\theta(x) | x \in M\}$ are strictly positive and finite due to condition (B2) and the fact that eigenfunction g_θ is strictly positive on M . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_{(x_0, 0)}(e^{(\theta+is)Y_t} | X_t = x) \right| \\ &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{(x_0, 0)}\left(e^{(\theta+is) \left(\int_0^t \sigma(X_u) d\tilde{W}_u + \int_0^t \sigma'(X_u)\sigma(X_u) + b(X_u) du \right)} \Big| \mathcal{F}_t \right) \Big|_{X_t = x} \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{(x_0, 0)}\left(\left| \mathbb{E}(e^{(\theta+is) \left(\int_0^t \sigma(X_u) d\tilde{W}_u + \int_0^t \sigma'(X_u)\sigma(X_u) + b(X_u) du \right)} | \mathcal{F}_t) \right| \Big| X_t = x \right) \\ &\leq (1 - \epsilon) \frac{\|g_\theta\| \sup\{\lambda(\theta)^t | t \in [1, 2]\}}{\inf\{g_\theta(x) | x \in M\}}, \end{aligned}$$

As a result $|\tilde{q}_{is, t}(x_0, x)| \leq (1 - \epsilon)$. This implies that for all $t \in [1, 2]$, $|s| > K$, $\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(is, t)\| < 1 - \epsilon$, which concludes the proof of condition (D1).

• **Condition (D3):** We first note that the top eigenvalue of operators $\mathcal{L}(z, 1 + \eta)$ is $\lambda(\theta)^{1+\eta}$. Thus, it is enough to show that $\log \lambda(\theta)$ is twice continuously differentiable and the second derivative is positive for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mu(\theta) = \log \lambda(\theta)$.

Let $\theta > 0$ be fixed. We know that the function g_θ is such that

$$(4.24) \quad \mathcal{L}(\theta, t)g_\theta = e^{t\mu(\theta)}g_\theta.$$

Let ψ_θ be a linear functional in \mathbb{B}' satisfying $\langle \psi_\theta, \mathcal{L}(\theta, t)f \rangle = e^{t\mu(\theta)}\langle \psi_\theta, f \rangle$ for all $f \in \mathbb{B}$, and $\langle \psi_\theta, g_\theta \rangle = 1$. That is, ψ_θ is the invariant measure of the operator $\mathcal{L}(\theta, t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Let us

define a new operator $\mathcal{L}'(\theta, t)$ which is the derivative of the operator $\mathcal{L}(\theta, t)$ with respect to θ . Thus,

$$\left(\mathcal{L}'(\theta, t)f\right)(x_0) = \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(f(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t}).$$

We differentiate equation (4.24) on both sides with respect to θ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}'(\theta, t)g_\theta(x_0) + \mathcal{L}(\theta, t)g'_\theta(x_0) &= \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g_\theta(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t}) + \mathcal{L}(\theta, t)g'_\theta(x_0) \\ (4.25) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= t\mu'(\theta)e^{t\mu(\theta)}g_\theta(x_0) + e^{t\mu(\theta)}g'_\theta(x_0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying the linear functional ψ_θ on both sides, we obtain,

$$\langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g_\theta(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t}) \rangle + \langle \psi_\theta, \mathcal{L}(\theta, t)g'_\theta \rangle = t\mu'(\theta)e^{t\mu(\theta)}\langle \psi_\theta, g_\theta \rangle + e^{t\mu(\theta)}\langle \psi_\theta, g'_\theta \rangle,$$

which simplifies to

$$\langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g_\theta(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t}) \rangle + e^{t\mu(\theta)}\langle \psi_\theta, g'_\theta \rangle = t\mu'(\theta)e^{t\mu(\theta)} + e^{t\mu(\theta)}\langle \psi_\theta, g'_\theta \rangle.$$

Thus, we obtain the following formula for $\mu'(\theta)$.

$$(4.26) \qquad \qquad \qquad \mu'(\theta) = \frac{\langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g_\theta(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t}) \rangle}{te^{t\mu(\theta)}}.$$

Differentiating the equation (4.25) again with respect to θ and taking the action of the linear functional ψ_θ on both sides, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g_\theta(X_t)Y_t^2 e^{\theta Y_t}) \rangle + 2\langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g'_\theta(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t}) \rangle + e^{t\mu(\theta)}\langle \psi_\theta, g''_\theta \rangle \\ = t\mu''(\theta)e^{t\mu(\theta)} + t^2(\mu'(\theta))^2e^{t\mu(\theta)} + 2t\mu'(\theta)e^{t\mu(\theta)}\langle \psi_\theta, g'_\theta \rangle + e^{t\mu(\theta)}\langle \psi_\theta, g''_\theta \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, rearranging the terms, we obtain the following formula for $\mu''(\theta)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu''(\theta) &= \frac{\langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g_\theta(X_t)Y_t^2 e^{\theta Y_t}) \rangle - t^2(\mu'(\theta))^2e^{t\mu(\theta)}}{te^{t\mu(\theta)}} \\ &\quad + 2\frac{\langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g'_\theta(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t}) \rangle - t\mu'(\theta)e^{t\mu(\theta)}\langle \psi_\theta, g'_\theta \rangle}{te^{t\mu(\theta)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the formula for $\mu'(\theta)$ in the above expression we obtain

$$(4.27) \quad \mu''(\theta) = \frac{\langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g_\theta(X_t)Y_t^2 e^{\theta Y_t - t\mu(\theta)}) \rangle - (\langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g_\theta(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t - t\mu(\theta)}) \rangle)^2}{t} \\ + 2\frac{\langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g'_\theta(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t - t\mu(\theta)}) \rangle - \langle \psi_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x_0,0)}(g_\theta(X_t)Y_t e^{\theta Y_t - t\mu(\theta)}) \rangle \langle \psi_\theta, g'_\theta \rangle}{t}.$$

Let $\tilde{\mathbb{B}}$ be the Banach space of bounded continuous functions defined on $M \times \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the supremum norm. We define a new family of bounded linear operators $N(\theta, t) : \tilde{\mathbb{B}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{B}}$, $t \geq 0$ by

$$(4.28) \qquad N(\theta, t)f(x_0, y_0) := \mathbb{E}_{(x_0, y_0)}\left(f(X_t, Y_t)e^{\theta(Y_t - y_0) - t\mu(\theta)}\frac{g_\theta(X_t)}{g_\theta(x_0)}\right)$$

for each $f \in \tilde{\mathbb{B}}$. Note that the family $\{N(\theta, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ forms a C^0 semigroup.

We first observe that the operators $\{N(\theta, t)\}_{t \geq 0}$ are positive, and $N(\theta, t)\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the constant function taking the value 1 on $M \times \mathbb{R}$.

The operator $N(\theta, t)$ is also an operator on \mathbb{B} because, for $f \in \mathbb{B}$,

$$N(\theta, t)f(x_0) = \mathbb{E}_{(x_0, y_0)} \left(f(X_t) e^{\theta(Y_t - y_0) - t\mu(\theta)} \frac{g_\theta(X_t)}{g_\theta(x_0)} \right) = \left[\frac{e^{-t\mu(\theta)}}{g_\theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta, t)(g_\theta f) \right](x_0) \in \mathbb{B}.$$

Now, corresponding to this family of operators, we have a new Markov process $(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t)$ on $M \times \mathbb{R}$, such that, $N(\theta, t)f(x_0, y_0) = \mathbb{E}_{(x_0, y_0)}(f(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t))$. In addition, we observe that $\langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, N(\theta, t)f \rangle = \langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, f \rangle$ for all $f \in \mathbb{B}$. That is, $\psi_\theta g_\theta$ is the invariant measure for the process \tilde{X}_t on the manifold M for all $t \geq 0$.

Let us define the function $h \in \tilde{\mathbb{B}}$ by $h(x, y) = y$ for all $(x, y) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$. Now, we re-write the formula (4.27) for $\mu''(\theta)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mu''(\theta) &= \frac{1}{t} \left(\langle \psi_\theta(x), N(\theta, t)(h^2)(x, 0)g_\theta(x) \rangle_x - (\langle \psi_\theta(x), N(\theta, t)(h)(x, 0)g_\theta(x) \rangle_x)^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{t} \left[\langle \psi_\theta(x), N(\theta, t) \left(\frac{hg'_\theta}{g_\theta} \right) (x, 0)g_\theta(x) \rangle_x \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \langle \psi_\theta(x), N(\theta, t)(h)(x, 0)g_\theta(x) \rangle_x \langle \psi_\theta(x), g'_\theta(x) \rangle_x \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{t} \left(\langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, N(\theta, t)(h^2) \rangle - (\langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, N(\theta, t)(h) \rangle)^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{t} \left(\langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, N(\theta, t) \left(\frac{hg'_\theta}{g_\theta} \right) \rangle - \langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, N(\theta, t)(h) \rangle \langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, \frac{g'_\theta}{g_\theta} \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu''(\theta) &= \frac{1}{t} \left(\langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x,0)}(\tilde{Y}_t^2) \rangle - (\langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x,0)}(\tilde{Y}_t) \rangle)^2 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{t} \left(\langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x,0)} \left(\frac{\tilde{Y}_t g'_\theta(\tilde{X}_t)}{g_\theta(\tilde{X}_t)} \right) \rangle - \langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x,0)}(\tilde{Y}_t) \rangle \langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, \frac{g'_\theta}{g_\theta} \rangle \right) \end{aligned}$$

Denoting $\langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, \mathbb{E}_{(x,0)}(f(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t)) \rangle$ by $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_\theta g_\theta}(f(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t))$ the above formula can be written as

$$(4.29) \quad \mu''(\theta) = \frac{1}{t} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\psi_\theta g_\theta}(\tilde{Y}_t^2) - (\mathbb{E}_{\psi_\theta g_\theta}(\tilde{Y}_t))^2 \right) + \frac{2}{t} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\psi_\theta g_\theta} \left(\frac{\tilde{Y}_t g'_\theta(\tilde{X}_t)}{g_\theta(\tilde{X}_t)} \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_\theta g_\theta}(\tilde{Y}_t) \langle \psi_\theta g_\theta, \frac{g'_\theta}{g_\theta} \rangle \right).$$

In order to analyze the process $(\tilde{X}_t, \tilde{Y}_t)$, we first study the transition kernel of the associated Markov Operator $N(\theta, t)$. For $f \in \tilde{\mathbb{B}}$,

$$N(\theta, t)f(x_0, y_0) = \int_M \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x, y) k(t, (x_0, y_0), (x, y)) dy dx,$$

where

$$k(t, (x_0, y_0), (x, y)) := e^{-t\mu(\theta)} \frac{e^{\theta y} g_\theta(x)}{e^{\theta y_0} g_\theta(x_0)} p(t, (x_0, y_0), (x, y)).$$

From (4.19), we see that $k(t, (x_0, y_0), (x, y))$ solves the PDE

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t k &= g_\theta(x) e^{\theta y} \mathcal{M}_{(x,y)}^* \left(\frac{k}{g_\theta(x) e^{\theta y}} \right) - \mu(\theta) k =: \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^* k \\ k(0, (x_0, y_0), (x, y)) &= \delta_{(x_0, y_0)}(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

where we have a new differential operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ acting on functions $u : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^* u = g_\theta(x) e^{\theta y} \mathcal{M}_{(x,y)}^* \left(\frac{u}{g_\theta(x) e^{\theta y}} \right) - \mu(\theta) u.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^* k &= \mathcal{M}^* k - \frac{\nabla_x g_\theta}{g_\theta} (V(x) V^T(x)) \nabla_x k - \theta \sigma^2(x) \nabla_y k \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{V_0(x) \nabla_x g_\theta(x)}{g_\theta(x)} + \frac{1}{2} \theta^2 \sigma^2(x) - \frac{\nabla_x ((V(x) V^T(x)) \nabla_x g_\theta(x))}{2g_\theta(x)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{(\nabla_x g_\theta)^2}{g_\theta^2} (V(x) V^T(x)) + b(x) \theta - \mu(\theta) \right] k. \end{aligned}$$

From the choice of g_θ , we know that $e^{-\theta y} \mathcal{M}(e^{\theta y} g_\theta(x)) = \mu(\theta) g_\theta(x)$. That is,

$$\frac{1}{2} \nabla_x [(V(x) V^T(x)) \nabla_x g_\theta] + V_\theta \nabla_x g_\theta + b(x) \theta g_\theta + \frac{1}{2} (\sigma^2(x)) \theta^2 g_\theta = \mu(\theta) g_\theta.$$

Therefore, the above expression simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}^* k &= \mathcal{M}^* k - \frac{\nabla_x g_\theta}{g_\theta} (V(x) V^T(x)) \nabla_x k - \theta \sigma^2(x) \nabla_y k \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{(\nabla_x g_\theta)^2 (V(x) V^T(x))}{g_\theta^2} - \frac{\nabla_x [(V(x) V^T(x)) \nabla_x g_\theta]}{g_\theta} \right) k \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$ simplifies to

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} k = \mathcal{M} k + \frac{\nabla_x g_\theta}{g_\theta} (V(x) V^T(x)) \nabla_x k + \theta \sigma^2(x) \nabla_y k$$

From the above expression of the generator of the new process $(\widetilde{X}_t, \widetilde{Y}_t)$, we conclude that the process $(\widetilde{X}_t, \widetilde{Y}_t)$ differ from the process (X_t, Y_t) only by the additional drift terms in x and y . The asymptotic variance (also referred to as Effective Diffusivity) of the process \widetilde{Y}_t is given by

$$\Xi = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\psi_\theta g_\theta} \left((\widetilde{Y}_t - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_\theta g_\theta} \widetilde{Y}_t)^2 \right)}{t}.$$

Choose a function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}f + b + \sigma^2\theta = 0$ on M , and $f \geq 0$ on M . Then the process $\widetilde{Y}_t + f(\widetilde{X}_t)$ forms a martingale, and therefore,

$$(4.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \widetilde{Y}_t + f(\widetilde{X}_t) - \widetilde{Y}_0 - f(\widetilde{X}_0) &= \int_0^t V(\widetilde{X}_u) \nabla_x f(\widetilde{X}_u) dW_u + \int_0^t \sigma(\widetilde{X}_u) d\widetilde{W}_u \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \widetilde{\mathcal{M}}f(\widetilde{X}_u) + b(\widetilde{X}_u) + \theta\sigma^2(\widetilde{X}_u) du \\ &= \int_0^t V(\widetilde{X}_u) \nabla_x f(\widetilde{X}_u) dW_u + \int_0^t \sigma(\widetilde{X}_u) d\widetilde{W}_u. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} (\widetilde{Y}_t - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} \widetilde{Y}_t)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} \left(\int_0^t V(\widetilde{X}_u) \nabla_x f(\widetilde{X}_u) dW_u + \int_0^t \sigma(\widetilde{X}_u) d\widetilde{W}_u - (f(\widetilde{X}_t) - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}}(f(\widetilde{X}_t))) \right)^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t (V(\widetilde{X}_u) \nabla_x f(\widetilde{X}_u))(V(\widetilde{X}_u) \nabla_x f(\widetilde{X}_u))^* du \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \sigma^2(\widetilde{X}_u) du \right) + \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} (f(\widetilde{X}_t)^2) - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} (f(\widetilde{X}_t))^2 \\ &\quad - 2\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} (f(\widetilde{X}_t)) \left(\int_0^t V(\widetilde{X}_u) \nabla_x f(\widetilde{X}_u) dW_u + \int_0^t \sigma(\widetilde{X}_u) d\widetilde{W}_u \right) \end{aligned}$$

Also, note that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} (f(\widetilde{X}_t)) \left(\int_0^t V(\widetilde{X}_u) \nabla_x f(\widetilde{X}_u) dW_u + \int_0^t \sigma(\widetilde{X}_u) d\widetilde{W}_u \right)}{t} = 0.$$

Therefore, using the fact that $\psi_{\theta g_\theta}$ is the invariant measure of the process \widetilde{X}_t on M , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi &= \frac{1}{2} \int_M ((V(x) \nabla_x f(x))(V(x) \nabla_x f(x))^* + \sigma^2(x)) \psi_{\theta g_\theta} dx \\ &\quad + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} (f(\widetilde{X}_t)^2) - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} (f(\widetilde{X}_t))^2}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sigma > 0$ for all $x \in M$, we have $\Xi > 0$. Thus we have shown that the first term in (4.29) is positive. Now it remains to show that the limit of the second term in (4.29) is zero as t approaches infinity. That is,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} \left(\frac{\widetilde{Y}_t g'_\theta(\widetilde{X}_t)}{g_\theta(\widetilde{X}_t)} \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_\theta}} (\widetilde{Y}_t) \langle \psi_{\theta g_\theta}, \frac{g'_\theta}{g_\theta} \rangle}{t} = 0.$$

First, we observe that

$$(4.31) \quad \begin{aligned} & \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_{\theta}}}(\tilde{Y}_t) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_{\theta}}} \left(\tilde{Y}_0 + f(\tilde{X}_0) - f(\tilde{X}_t) + \int_0^t V(\tilde{X}_u) \nabla_x f(\tilde{X}_u) dW_u + \int_0^t \sigma(\tilde{X}_u) d\tilde{W}_u \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we only need to show that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_{\theta}}} \left(\frac{\tilde{Y}_t g'_{\theta}(\tilde{X}_t)}{g_{\theta}(\tilde{X}_t)} \right) = 0.$$

Since $0 < \Xi < \infty$, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$(4.32) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_{\theta}}} \frac{|\tilde{Y}_t^2|}{t} \leq K$$

Using Cauchy- Schwartz inequality, and the above bound on $\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_{\theta}}}(\tilde{Y}_t^2)$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_{\theta}}} \left(\frac{\tilde{Y}_t g'_{\theta}(\tilde{X}_t)}{g_{\theta}(\tilde{X}_t)} \right) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_{\theta}}}(\tilde{Y}_t^2)^{1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_{\theta}}} \left(\frac{(g'_{\theta}(\tilde{X}_t))^2}{g_{\theta}^2(\tilde{X}_t)} \right)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{K} \sqrt{t} \sup_{x \in M} \left| \frac{(g'_{\theta}(x))^2}{g_{\theta}^2(x)} \right|$$

Therefore, we have,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}_{\psi_{\theta g_{\theta}}} \left(\frac{\tilde{Y}_t g'_{\theta}(\tilde{X}_t)}{g_{\theta}(\tilde{X}_t)} \right) \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sqrt{K} \sqrt{t} \sup_{x \in M} \left| \frac{(g'_{\theta}(x))^2}{g_{\theta}^2(x)} \right| = 0.$$

Thus, we have shown, that $\mu''(\theta) > 0$. Thus, condition (D3) is satisfied.

We have shown that the conditions (D1), (D2) and (D3) hold with r_1 arbitrarily large. As a result, for all r , Y_t admits the weak expansion of order r in the range $(0, \infty)$ for $f \in \mathfrak{F}_{r+1, \alpha}^q$ with $q \geq 1$ and suitable α depending on a . Also, for all r , Y_t admits the strong expansion of order r in the range $(0, \infty)$. \square


APPENDIX A. CONSTRUCTION OF $\{f_k\}$.

For each k , let $f_k(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(kx) + \frac{1}{2}$ for $x \in [-1, k]$. Extend f_k to $[-2, k+1]$ in such a way that $f_k(-2) = f_k(k+1) = 0$, f_k is continuously differentiable and satisfying the following conditions.

- (1) f_k is increasing on $[-2, k]$ with derivative on $[-2, -1]$ is bounded above by 1.
- (2) f_k is decreasing on $[k+1/2, k+1]$ with derivative bounded below by -5 .
- (3) $|f'_k| \leq 5$ on $[k, k+1]$.
- (4) $0 \leq f_k \leq 1$ on $[-2, k+1]$ and $f_k = 0$ elsewhere.

Then, f_k is supported on $[-2, k + 1]$. Here our choice of bounds 1 and -5 in some sense arbitrary. As long as they are large enough and independent of k , we obtain an appropriate sequence of functions.

As an example, when $k = 5$, the graph of f_5 looks like:



Since $0 \leq f_k \leq 1$, for all $\gamma > 0$,

$$\int |(f_k)_\gamma(x)| dx = \int |e^{-\gamma x} f_k(x)| dx \leq \int_{-2}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma x} dx = C_{\gamma,1} < \infty.$$

Since $|f'_k| \leq 5$ on $[k, k + 1]$, $0 \leq f_k \leq 1$ and f_k is increasing on $[-2, k]$

$$\begin{aligned} \int |((f_k)_\gamma)'(x)| dx &= \int_{-2}^{k+1} |\gamma e^{-\gamma x} f_k(x) + e^{-\gamma x} f'_k(x)| dx \\ &\leq \int_{-2}^{k+1} (\gamma e^{-\gamma x} f_k(x) + e^{-\gamma x} |f'_k(x)|) dx \\ &\leq \int_{-2}^k \gamma e^{-\gamma x} dx + \int_{-1}^k f'_k(x) dx + \int_k^{k+1} (\gamma e^{-\gamma x} + 5e^{-\gamma x}) dx \\ &\leq 1 + \int_{-2}^{k+1} (5 + \gamma) e^{-\gamma x} dx = C_{\gamma,2} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Also, note that $|x^l f_k(x)| \leq x^l e^{-\gamma x}$ for all $x \in [-2, k + 1]$. Hence,

$$\int |x^l f_k(x)| dx \leq \int_{-2}^{\infty} x^l e^{-\gamma x} dx = J_{\gamma,l} < \infty.$$

Put $J_r(\gamma) = \max_{1 \leq l \leq r} J_{\gamma,l}$ and $C_\gamma(r) = \max\{J_r(\gamma), C_{\gamma,1}, C_{\gamma,2}\}$. Then, $C_\gamma(r)$ is finite and depends only on γ and r .

Now, we have the following:

- (1) $C_{r+1}^1((f_k)_\gamma) \leq C_\gamma(r)$ for all k .
- (2) Since $\frac{1}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(kx) + \frac{1}{2}$ converges pointwise to $1_{[0,\infty)}(x)$, $f_k \rightarrow 1_{[0,\infty)}$ pointwise.

(3) Since for all m , $e^{-\gamma z} P_m^a(z) f_k(z) \rightarrow e^{-\gamma z} P_m^a(z) 1_{[0, \infty)}(z)$ pointwise as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$|e^{-\gamma z} P_m^a(z) f_k(z)| \leq e^{-\gamma z} |P_m^a(z)| 1_{[-2, \infty)}$$

for all k , and $e^{-\gamma z} |P_m^a(z)| 1_{[-2, \infty)}$ is integrable, applying the LDCT,

$$\int P_p(z) (f_k)_\gamma(z) dz = \int_{-2}^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} P_p(z) f_k(z) dz \rightarrow \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\gamma z} P_p(z) dz.$$

Acknowledgement. The authors would like to thank Dmitry Dolgopyat and Leonid Korolov for useful discussions and suggestions during the project and carefully reading the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bahadur, R. R., Ranga Rao R.; *On Deviations of the Sample Mean*. Ann. Math. Statist. **31** (1960), no. 4, 1015-1027.
- [2] Bhattacharya, R. N., Ranga Rao R.; *Normal Approximation and Asymptotic Expansions*, first edition, John Wiley and Sons, 1976, xiv+274 pp.
- [3] Birkhoff, G. *Extensions of Jentzsch's theorem*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **85** (1957), no. 1, 219–227.
- [4] Breuillard, E.; *Distributions diophantiennes et théorèmes limite local sur \mathbb{R}^d* . Probab. Theory Related Fields **132** (2005), no. 1, 39–73.
- [5] Bougerol, P., Lacroix, J.; *Products of random matrices with applications to Schrödinger operators*, Progress in Probability and Statistics, first edition, Birkhäuser Basel, Boston, 1985, xi+284 pp.
- [6] Cramér H.; *Sur un nouveau théorème-limite de la théorie des probabilités*. Actualités scientifiques et industrielles, no. 736, Hermann & Cie, Paris, 1938, 2-23.
- [7] Chaganty, N. R., Sethuraman, J., *Strong Large Deviation and Local Limit Theorems*, Ann. Probab. **21** (1993), no. 3, 1671–1690.
- [8] Dolgopyat, D., Fernando, K.; *An error term in the Central Limit Theorem for sums of discrete random variables*. preprint.
- [9] De Simoi, J., Liverani, C.; *Limit theorems for fast-slow partially hyperbolic systems*, Invent. math. (2018), no. 213, 811–1016.
- [10] Esséen, C.-G.; *Fourier analysis of distribution functions. A mathematical study of the Laplace-Gaussian law*, Acta Math. **77** (1945) 1–125.
- [11] Feller, W.; *An introduction to probability theory and its applications Vol. II.*, second edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York–London–Sydney, 1971, xxiv+669.
- [12] Fernando, K., Liverani, C.; *Edgeworth expansions for weakly dependent random variables*. arXiv:1803.07667 [math.PR].
- [13] Gouezel, S.; *Limit theorems in dynamical systems using the spectral method. Hyperbolic dynamics, fluctuations and large deviations*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., **89** (2015) 161–193, AMS, Providence, RI.
- [14] Guivarc'h, Y., Hardy J.; *Théorèmes limites pour une classe de chaînes de Markov et applications aux difféomorphismes d'Anosov*, Annales de l'I.H.P. Probabilités et statistiques, **24** (1) (1988), 73–98.
- [15] Hennion, H.; Hervé, L.; *Limit Theorems for Markov Chains and Stochastic Properties of Dynamical Systems by Quasi-Compactness*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, first edition, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2001, viii+125.
- [16] den Hollander, F.; *Large Deviations*, Fields Institute Monographs 14, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000, x+142 pp.

- [17] Joutard, C.; *Strong large deviations for arbitrary sequences of random variables*, Ann. Inst. Stat. Math. **65** (2013), no. 1, 49-67.
- [18] Kato, T.; *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Classics in Mathematics, reprint of the 1980 edition, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995, xxii+619.
- [19] Liptser, R.; *Large deviations for two scaled diffusions*. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **106**, (1996), 71–104
- [20] Veretennikov, A. Yu.; *Lower bound for large deviations for an averaged SDE with a small diffusion*. Russian J. Math. Phys. **5** (1997), no. 1, 99–104.
- [21] Sprindzuk V. G.; *Metric theory of Diophantine approximations*, Scripta Series in Math. V. H. Winston & Sons, Washington, D.C. 1979, xiii+156 pp.

PRATIMA HEBBAR DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, 4176 CAMPUS DRIVE, COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-4015, UNITED STATES.

E-mail address: phebbar@math.umd.edu

KASUN FERNANDO, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, 4176 CAMPUS DRIVE, COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-4015, UNITED STATES.

E-mail address: abkf@math.umd.edu