

On the log-Sobolev constant of log-concave measures

Pierre Bizeul

June 23, 2023

Abstract

It is well known that a log-Sobolev inequality implies sub-gaussian decay of the tails. In the spirit of the KLS conjecture, we investigate whether this implication can be reversed under a log-concavity assumption. In the general setting, we improve on a result of Bobkov, establishing the best dimension dependent bound on the log-Sobolev constant of subgaussian log-concave measures, and we investigate some special cases.

1 Introduction and results

A Borel probability μ on \mathbb{R}^n is said to satisfy a logarithmic Sobolev inequality with constant $\rho > 0$ if for any locally Lipschitz function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, one has,

$$\text{Ent}_\mu(f^2) \leq 2\rho^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f|^2 d\mu, \quad (1)$$

where for a nonnegative function g , $\text{Ent}_\mu(g) = \mathbb{E}_\mu(g \log g) - \mathbb{E}_\mu(g) \log \mathbb{E}_\mu(g)$ and $|\cdot|$ denotes the euclidean norm. We denote by $\rho_{LS}(\mu)$ the optimal constant ρ such that (1) holds. It is well known that the log-Sobolev inequality (1) implies gaussian concentration. Indeed, the Herbst argument implies a quadratic bound on the logarithmic Laplace transform of Lipschitz functions.

$$\log \int e^{sf} d\mu \leq \frac{\rho^2 s^2 |f|_{\text{Lip}}^2}{2} + s \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f d\mu, \quad (2)$$

where $|f|_{\text{Lip}}$ is the Lipschitz constant of f . Markov's inequality then implies gaussian concentration of f around its mean,

$$\mu(|f - \mathbb{E}_\mu(f)| \geq t) \leq 2e^{-\frac{t^2}{|f|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \rho^2}}. \quad (3)$$

Taking f to be a linear form, we see that μ must have sub-gaussian tails.

In a related direction, we say that μ satisfy a Poincaré inequality with constant $K > 0$ if for any locally Lipschitz function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, one has,

$$\text{Var}_\mu(f) \leq K^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla f|^2 d\mu, \quad (4)$$

where $\text{Var}_\mu(f) = \mathbb{E}_\mu(f^2) - \mathbb{E}_\mu(f)^2$ is the variance of f . We denote by $C_P(\mu)$ the optimal constant K such that (4) holds. It is classical that the log-Sobolev inequality (1) is stronger than (4),

$$C_P(\mu) \leq \rho_{LS}(\mu).$$

Not all measure may satisfy a Poincaré or log-Sobolev inequality. Even under good integrability assumptions, if the support of μ is disconnected, one may build a non-constant function whose gradient vanishes μ almost everywhere, violating (4), hence also (1). A general class of measure which avoids double-bump type distribution is the class of log-concave measures, that is measures that write $d\mu = e^{-V(x)} dx$, for some convex $V : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$. For such measures, the well-known KLS conjecture proposes that it is enough, up to a universal constant, to test linear functions in (4).

Conjecture 1 (KLS). *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any log-concave probability μ on \mathbb{R}^n ,*

$$C_P(\mu)^2 \leq C \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} \text{Var}_\mu(\langle \cdot, \theta \rangle)$$

The KLS conjecture has attracted a lot of attention since its original formulation in [13], culminating in a polylog estimate by Klartag and Lehec [15]. By analogy, it is natural to conjecture that the log-Sobolev constant of log-concave probabilities should be controlled by the Ψ_2 norm of the coordinates.

Conjecture 2. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any centered log-concave probability μ on \mathbb{R}^n ,*

$$\rho_{LS}(\mu) \leq C \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \cdot, \theta \rangle|_{\Psi_2(\mu)}$$

where for a function $g : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, $|g|_{\Psi_2(\mu)} = \inf \{t > 0 / \mathbb{E}_\mu[\exp(g^2/t^2)] \leq 2\}$.

Let us slightly reformulate.

Definition 3. Let μ be a probability, and b_μ its barycenter. We say that μ is α subgaussian if

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle x - b_\mu, \theta \rangle|_{\Psi_2(\mu)} \leq \alpha$$

for some $\alpha > 0$.

We introduce the quantity

$$G_n = \sup_{\mu} \rho_{LS}(\mu) \tag{5}$$

where the supremum runs over all 1 sub-gaussian log-concave measures μ on \mathbb{R}^n . By scaling, Conjecture 2 is equivalent to the boundedness of G_n .

Bobkov proved [4] that if μ is a centered log-concave probability on \mathbb{R}^n , then it satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with constant of order $|X|_{\Psi_2}$ where X is distributed according to μ . We always have

$$|X|_{\Psi_2} \lesssim \sqrt{n} \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |\langle \cdot, \theta \rangle|_{\Psi_2(\mu)}$$

where for two quantities a and b depending on parameters, we write $a \lesssim b$ when there exists a universal constant $c > 0$ such that $a \leq cb$ (see Proposition 19). This inequality is tight in general, since $|X|_{\Psi_2}^2 \geq \log(2)\mathbb{E}|X|^2$ which is obvious from the definition. Hence, Bobkov's result can be reformulated as

$$G_n \lesssim \sqrt{n}.$$

Our first result is the following improvement:

Theorem 4. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 1$*

$$G_n \leq C n^{1/4}.$$

In another direction, a well-known result of Bobkov [5] asserts that for a log-concave vector X ,

$$c_P^2(X) \lesssim \text{Var}(|X|^2). \tag{6}$$

In the case of the Euclidean ball, the inequality is tight, up to constant. In the same spirit, we show that

Theorem 5. *Let X be a log-concave vector, then*

$$\rho_{LS}^2(X) \lesssim ||X|^2 - \mathbb{E}|X|^2|_{\psi_1}$$

Yet again, the bound is tight, up to constants, when X is uniform over the Euclidean ball. As in [5], we use a localization argument to reduce the problem to dimension 1.

Next, we look at two subclasses of sub-gaussian log-concave probabilities. The first one is rotationally invariant log-concave probabilities. For this class we explain that Conjecture 2 holds. Using a result of Bobkov [6], we show that:

Theorem 6. Let μ be a rotationally invariant log-concave probability. There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that,

$$\rho_{LS}(\mu) \leq C \langle \cdot, e_1 \rangle |_{\Psi_2(\mu)}$$

where e_1 is the first element of the canonical basis.

The second one is the class of tilt-stable log-concave probabilities.

Definition 7. We say that a measure μ is β tilt-stable, for some $\beta > 0$, if for all $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$|\text{Cov}(\tau_h \nu)|_{op} \leq \beta^2 I_n.$$

where $\tau_h \mu = \frac{1}{Z_n} \mu e^{h \cdot x}$, and $|\cdot|_{op}$ denotes the operator norm.

Tilt-stability is a stronger requirement than sub-gaussianity.

Lemma 8. Let $\beta > 0$ μ be a β -tilt stable measure, then μ is $C\beta$ subgaussian.

We postpone its proof to Section 2 (see Lemma 18). As a consequence, Conjecture 2 implies the weaker

Conjecture 9. Let μ be a β tilt-stable log-concave probability, then

$$\rho_{LS}(\mu) \lesssim \beta.$$

We introduce the quantities

$$\tilde{G}_n = \sup_{\mu} \rho_{LS}(\mu)$$

and

$$\tilde{K}_n = \sup_{\mu} \left| |X| - \mathbb{E}|X| \right|_{\Psi_2}$$

where both suprema run over all log-concave probabilities μ of \mathbb{R}^n that are 1 tilt-stables. By scaling, Conjecture 9 then reads

$$\tilde{G}_n \lesssim 1.$$

Furthermore, since the norm is 1-Lipschitz, Proposition 15 below shows that

$$\tilde{K}_n \lesssim \tilde{G}_n. \tag{7}$$

We show the following reverse inequality:

Theorem 10.

$$\tilde{G}_n \lesssim n^{1/6} \tilde{K}_n^{1/3}$$

Remark : Plugging (7) into Theorem 14 only yields $\tilde{G}_n \lesssim n^{1/4}$, which is a corollary of Theorem 4. Any improvement over the inequality $\tilde{K}_n \lesssim n^{1/4}$ provides an improvement for \tilde{G}_n .

Let us say a word about the proof strategy.

Definition 11. Let $\beta > 0$. We say that a measure μ is β strongly tilt-stable if

$$\sup_{t>0} \sup_{h \in \mathbb{R}^n} \left| \text{Cov} \left(\frac{1}{Z_{t,h}} \mu e^{-t|x|^2 + h \cdot x} \right) \right|_{op} \leq \beta^2$$

By definition, strong tilt-stability implies tilt-stability. In Section 4, we show that

Lemma 12. If μ is β strongly tilt-stable and log-concave, then

$$\rho_{LS}(\mu) \lesssim \beta$$

Finally, we show that log-concave tilt-stable measures are strongly log-concave, but with an extra factor $n^{1/6} \tilde{K}_n^{1/3}$.

Lemma 13. Let μ be a log-concave measure on \mathbb{R}^n that is 1 tilt-stable, then μ is $n^{1/6} \tilde{K}_n^{1/3}$ strongly tilt-stable.

Combining Lemmas 12 and 13 proves Theorem 10.

Organization of the Chapter

In Section 2, we recall some background facts and prove Theorem 4. In Section 4, we investigate an approach to Conjecture 2 via stochastic localization. The only result from this section that we shall use later on is Corollary 35, which was first established in [9]. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 5. Finally, in Section 5, we establish Theorem 6 and 10.

2 Background and Proof of Theorem 4

We start by recalling useful facts about sub-gaussian and sub-exponential random variables, for which a good reference is [22] and log-concave vectors.

2.1 Sub-gaussian random variables

Definition 14. Let X be a real random variable. Then the following properties are equivalent:

1. There exists $K_1 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| > t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2/K_1^2) \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

2. There exists $K_2 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(X^2/K_2^2) \leq 2.$$

3. There exists $K_3 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(s(X - \mathbb{E}X)) \leq \exp(s^2 K_3^2) \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}$$

Furthermore, the optimal constants in the three inequalities are all equivalent up to some universal constants. If X satisfies any of the above properties, we say that X is subgaussian, and we define :

$$|X|_{\Psi_2} = \inf \{t > 0 / \mathbb{E} [\exp(X^2/t^2)] \leq 2\}$$

Finally, for a measure μ on \mathbb{R}^n , and a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we define $|f|_{\Psi_2(\mu)} = |f(X)|_{\Psi_2}$ where X is distributed according to μ , $X \sim \mu$. In that terminology, the Herbst's argument (3) may be reformulated as :

Proposition 15. *Let μ be a probability satisfying a log-Sobolev inequality. Then for any centered Lipschitz function f ,*

$$|f|_{\Psi_2(\mu)} \lesssim \rho_{LS}(\mu) |f|_{\text{Lip}}$$

It is seen, by an application of Jensen's inequality, that the Ψ_2 norm of a variable controls its L^2 norm, as mentioned in the introduction.

Lemma 16. *Let X be a sub-gaussian random variable, then*

$$\text{Var}(X) \leq \mathbb{E}X^2 \leq \log(2)|X|_{\Psi_2}^2$$

As a consequence, using the triangle inequality, one can show that centering only improves the Ψ_2 behavior.

Lemma 17. *Let X be a real random variable, then*

$$|X - \mathbb{E}X|_{\Psi_2} \lesssim |X|_{\Psi_2}.$$

We are now in position to prove that tilt-stability implies subgaussianity.

Lemma 18. *Let X be a 1-tilt stable random vector, then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\theta \in S^{n-1}$*

$$\log \mathbb{E} e^{t(X - \mathbb{E}X) \cdot \theta} \leq t^2/2$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that X is centered. Write μ for the law of X . Denote by \mathcal{L}_ν the log-Laplace transform of ν , that is for any $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathcal{L}_\nu(h) = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{h \cdot x} d\nu.$$

It is classical, and easily seen by direct differentiation, that the derivatives of the log-Laplace involves the moments of the measure:

$$\nabla \mathcal{L}_\nu(h) = \text{bar}(\tau_h \nu) \tag{8}$$

$$\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}_\nu(h) = \text{Cov}(\tau_h \nu). \tag{9}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}_\nu(0) = 0$ and $\nabla \mathcal{L}_\nu(h) = \text{bar}(\nu) = 0$, integrating (9) finishes the proof. \square

Notice that this implies Lemma 8. Finally, we establish the following deviation bound for the norm of a vector with sub-gaussian marginals.

Proposition 19. *Let X be a random vector in \mathbb{R}^n , define $\sigma_{SG}(X) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{n-1}} |X \cdot \theta|_{\Psi_2}$. Then, there exists a universal constant $c_0 > 0$ such that for all $t \geq 2c_0 \sqrt{n} \sigma_{SG}(X)$*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2c_0 \sigma_{SG}^2(X)}\right).$$

Proof. We use a simple net argument, and we work with sub-optimal constants to lighten the proof. Let \mathcal{N} be a $\frac{1}{2}$ -net of the sphere. That is a collection of points on the sphere such that any point on the sphere is at distance at most $\frac{1}{2}$ of \mathcal{N} . It is classical that we might choose \mathcal{N} such that

$$|\mathcal{N}| \leq e^{2n}$$

where in that context $|\cdot|$ stands for the cardinal of the set. Now, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have that

$$|x| \leq 2 \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{N}} x \cdot \theta. \tag{10}$$

Now, we use a simple union bound to establish the property. Let $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists \theta \in \mathcal{N} / x \cdot \theta \geq t) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{N}| \exp(-t^2 / c_0 \sigma_{SG}^2(X)) \\ &\leq \exp(2n - t^2 / c_0 \sigma_{SG}^2(X)) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2c_0 \sigma_{SG}^2(X)}\right) \quad \text{for } t \geq 2c_0 \sqrt{n} \sigma_{SG}(X). \end{aligned}$$

where we chose $c_0 \geq 1$. \square

2.2 Sub-exponential random variables

Definition 20. Let X be a real random variable. We say that if X is sub-exponential if there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \exp(|X|/K) \leq 2.$$

In that case, we denote by $|X|_{\psi_1}$ the lowest such K .

Just like the ψ_2 norm, the ψ_1 norm controls the L^2 norm.

Lemma 21. *Let X be a sub-exponential random variable, then*

$$\text{Var}(X) \leq \mathbb{E} X^2 \leq 2|X|_{\Psi_1}^2$$

Proof. The lemma follows from the real inequality $1 + x^2 \leq e^{2|x|}$. \square

And we deduce the centering lemma

Lemma 22. *Let X be a real random variable, then*

$$|X - \mathbb{E}X|_{\Psi_1} \lesssim |X|_{\Psi_1}.$$

2.3 Log-concave vectors

For a probability μ , we introduce its concentration function α_μ defined for $r \geq 0$ by

$$\alpha_\mu(r) = \sup_{A, \mu(A) = \frac{1}{2}} \mu(A_r^c)$$

where A_r is the r -extension of A :

$$A_r = \{x, d(x, A) \leq r\}$$

where d denotes the Euclidean distance. It is classical that if μ satisfies a log-Sobolev inequality with constant ρ then

$$\alpha_\mu(r) \leq \exp(-r^2/\rho^2)$$

which is a reformulation of (3).

The following result, which reduces the study of log-Sobolev inequalities for log-concave vectors to the a priori weaker gaussian concentration has been established by E.Milman in a series of papers([19],[20],[21])

Theorem 23. *Let μ be a log-concave measure, and $K > 0$ such that*

$$\alpha_\mu(r) \leq \exp(-r^2/K^2)$$

then,

$$\rho_{LS}(\mu) \lesssim K.$$

The following is the celebrated Bakry-Emery criterion [1], which provides a quantitative bound on the log-Sobolev constant of strongly log-concave measures:

Theorem 24. *Let $\mu = e^{-V(x)}$ be a log concave probability and assume that $\nabla^2 V \geq tI_d$ for some $t > 0$, then*

$$\rho_{LS}^2(\mu) \leq \frac{1}{t}.$$

Finally, we shall need the following results about one-dimensional log-concave vectors

Lemma 25. *Let X be a log-concave real random variable with unit variance $\text{Var}(X) = 1$. Then there exists universal constants c_0, c_1, c_2 such that*

1.

$$\text{Var}(X^2)^{1/2} \geq c_0.$$

2.

$$\text{Var}((X - \mathbb{E}X)^2)^{1/2} \leq c_1.$$

3.

$$|X - \mathbb{E}X|_{\psi_1} \leq c_2.$$

Proof. The existence of c_1 is just the fact that the thin-shell conjecture holds true in dimension one. The existence of c_2 is a reformulation of Borell's lemma.

Finally, there are various ways of proving the existence of c_0 . We replicate the proof given in [5]. We use the following extension of Borell's inequality proved by Bourgain [7]: If Q is a polynomial of degree k and $p > 0$, there exists a universal constant $C(k, p)$ such that for all log concave random vector Z in any dimension,

$$|Q(Z)|_p = (\mathbb{E}|Q(Z)|^p)^{1/p} \leq C(k, p)|Q(Z)|_0 = C(k, p)e^{\mathbb{E} \log|Q(Z)|}.$$

In our case, we write :

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(X^2)^{1/2} &= |X^2 - \mathbb{E}X^2|_2 = |(X + (\mathbb{E}X^2)^{1/2})(X - (\mathbb{E}X^2)^{1/2})|_2 \\
&\geq |(X + (\mathbb{E}X^2)^{1/2})(X - (\mathbb{E}X^2)^{1/2})|_0 \\
&= |(X + (\mathbb{E}X^2)^{1/2})|_0 |(X - (\mathbb{E}X^2)^{1/2})|_0 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{C(1,2)^2} |(X + (\mathbb{E}X^2)^{1/2})|_2 |(X - (\mathbb{E}X^2)^{1/2})|_2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{C(1,2)^2} \text{Var}(X) \\
&= \frac{1}{C(1,2)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

2.4 A short proof of Theorem 4

Here we give a very short proof of Theorem 4, the main ingredient is the following estimate on the concentration function of log-concave probabilities, proved in [3].

Theorem 26. *Let μ be a log-concave probability with covariance matrix A , then there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$, such that*

$$\alpha_\mu(r) \leq \exp\left(-c_1 \min\left(\frac{r}{|A|_{op}^{1/2}}, \frac{r^2}{|A|_{op} \Psi_n^2 \log(n)}\right)\right)$$

We are now in position to prove Theorem 4.

Proof. Let μ be a 1 sub-gaussian log-concave probability and let X be distributed according to μ . We assume, without loss of generality that μ is centered. Let A be the covariance of μ . By Lemma 16,

$$A = \text{Cov}(\mu) \leq I_n$$

By Theorem 23, it is enough to estimate α_μ . Let S be any set of half measure, $\mu(S) = 1/2$. By Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq 2\sqrt{n}) \leq \mathbb{P}(|X| \geq 2\text{Tr}(A)^{1/2}) \leq \frac{1}{4},$$

so that S intersects the ball of radius $2\sqrt{n}$. Hence for any $r \geq 4\sqrt{n}$, $S_r^c \subset B(0, r/2)^c$. Using Proposition 19, we get that

$$\alpha_\mu(r) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{c}\right) \quad \text{for } r \geq R_0 = c\sqrt{n}(X). \quad (11)$$

for some absolute constant $c > 0$. For the small values of r , remark that, for $r \leq R_0$, we have that $r \leq \frac{r^2}{R_0}$. Plugging this into Theorem 26 yields for all $r \leq R_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_\mu(r) &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{c'r^2}{\max\left(\sqrt{n}|A|_{op}^{1/2}, |A|_{op} \Psi_n^2 \log(n)\right)}\right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{c''r^2}{\sqrt{n}|A|_{op}^{1/2}}\right)
\end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where we used the fact that $\Psi_n^2 \log(n) = O(\sqrt{n})$ which has been known since the breakthrough of Chen [8]. Combining (11) and (12) finally yields

$$\alpha_\mu(r) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-c'''r^2}{\max\left(1, \sqrt{n}|A|_{op}^{1/2}\right)}\right) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-c'''r^2}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

which concludes the proof. □

3 Proof of Theorem 5

In this section, we prove Theorem 5. The proof consists in a reduction to dimension one via a localization argument, together with a solution for the one-dimensional case.

3.1 The one dimensional case

Our aim is to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 27. *Let X be a log-concave random variable on the real line, then*

$$\rho_{LS}^2(X) \lesssim |X^2 - \mathbb{E}X^2|_{\psi_1}.$$

The first step is to show that the right-hand-side is minimized, up to constants, when X is centered:

Lemma 28. *Let Y be a centered log-concave random variable on the real line, then*

$$|Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1} \lesssim \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}} |(Y+a)^2 - \mathbb{E}(Y+a)^2|_{\psi_1}$$

Proof. Let Y be as in the definition. By homogeneity we may assume that $\mathbb{E}Y^2 = 1$, that is, Y is isotropic. We temporarily adopt the notation

$$K = |Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1}.$$

Let c_0, c_1, c_2 be the three constants from Lemma 25. Recall that the standard deviation is a lower bound for the ψ_1 norm (Lemma 21).

We distinguish two cases:

- If $K \leq 8c_1c_2$

Then for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the log-concave vector $Y+a$ has unit variance, thus

$$\text{Var}((Y+a)^2)^{1/2} \geq c_0.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |(Y+a)^2 - \mathbb{E}(Y+a)^2|_{\psi_1} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \text{Var}((Y+a)^2)^{1/2} \\ &\geq \frac{c_0}{2} \\ &\geq \frac{c_0}{16c_1c_2} K \end{aligned}$$

- If $K \geq 8c_1c_2$

Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$, expanding the squares, we find that

$$|(Y+a)^2 - \mathbb{E}(Y+a)^2|_{\psi_1} = |Y^2 + 2aY - 1|_{\psi_1}.$$

We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(Y^2 + 2aY - 1) &= \text{Var}(Y^2 + 2aY) \\ &\geq \left(\text{Var}(2aY)^{1/2} - \text{Var}(Y^2)^{1/2} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Now, since Y is an isotropic log-concave random variable,

$$c_0 \leq \text{Var}(Y^2)^{1/2} \leq c_1.$$

Thus, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
|Y^2 + 2aY - 1|_{\psi_1} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \text{Var}(Y^2 + 2aY - 1)^{1/2} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\text{Var}(2aY)^{1/2} - \text{Var}(Y^2)^{1/2} \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} (2a - c_1).
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We again make a case disjunction.

– If $a \geq \frac{K}{4c_2} + \frac{c_1}{2}$, we get from (13) that

$$|Y^2 + 2aY - 1|_{\psi_1} \geq \frac{K}{4c_2}$$

– If $a \leq \frac{K}{4c_2} + \frac{c_1}{2}$ we simply use the triangle inequality :

$$\begin{aligned}
|Y^2 + 2aY - 1|_{\psi_1} &\geq |Y^2 - 1| - |2aY|_{\psi_1} \\
&\geq K - 2a|Y|_{\psi_1} \\
&\geq K - 2ac_2 \\
&\geq K/2 - c_1c_2 \\
&\geq K/4
\end{aligned}$$

In the end, we get that

$$|(Y + a)^2 - \mathbb{E}(Y + a)^2|_{\psi_1} \geq \frac{K}{C}$$

with $C = \max(4, 4c_2, \frac{c_0}{16c_1c_2})$, which is the desired result. □

Now we lower bound the quantity $|Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1}$ when Y is one dimensional and centered.

Lemma 29. *Let Y be a centered log-concave random variable on the real line, then*

$$|Y^2|_{\psi_1} \lesssim |Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1}.$$

Proof. By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
|Y^2|_{\psi_1} &\lesssim |Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1} + |\mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1} \\
&\lesssim |Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1} + \mathbb{E}Y^2 \\
&\lesssim |Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1} + \text{Var}(Y)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, applying Lemma 25 one more time,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(Y) &\lesssim \text{Var}(Y^2)^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim |Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1}
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. □

Now we are in position to prove Lemma 27. Let X be a log-concave real random variable, and let $Y = X - \mathbb{E}X$. Recall Bobkov's result :

$$\rho_{LS}(X) = \rho_{LS}(Y) \lesssim |Y^2|_{\psi_1}.$$

Combining Lemmas 29 and 28, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{LS}(X) &\lesssim |Y^2|_{\psi_1} \\
&\lesssim |Y^2 - \mathbb{E}Y^2|_{\psi_1} \\
&\lesssim |X^2 - \mathbb{E}X^2|_{\psi_1},
\end{aligned}$$

which is Lemma 27.

3.2 A localization argument

We use the following geometric version of the localization lemma:

Lemma 30. *Let μ be a log-concave probability, and S be any measurable set. Then there exists a disintegration*

$$\mu = \mathbb{E}_{\mu_\infty(\omega)}$$

where almost surely

- μ_∞ is one dimensional and log-concave
- $\mu_\infty(S) = \mu(S)$

In the sequel we drop the dependence in ω .

Now, for a measure μ , we define the quantity

$$\frac{1}{k_\mu} = \inf_S \frac{\mu^+(S)}{\mu(S)(1-\mu(S))\sqrt{\log \frac{1}{\mu(S)}}} = \inf_S \frac{\mu^+(S)}{\mathcal{E}_\mu(S)}$$

Ledoux ([17]) showed that for all log-concave measure μ ,

$$k_\mu \simeq \rho_{LS}(\mu).$$

Now, we fix a set S and a disintegration $\mu = \mathbb{E}\mu_\infty$ given by the localization lemma. We may write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^+(S) &= \mathbb{E}\mu_\infty^+(S) \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{k_{\mu_\infty}}\mathcal{E}_{\mu_\infty}(S)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{k_\mu}\right)\mathcal{E}_\mu(S) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we need to estimate $\frac{1}{k_{\mu_\infty}}$. Now, let $a \geq 0$ and denote by $K_a = \||X|^2 - a\|_{\psi_1}$ where $X \sim \mu$. Write X_∞ for the vector having density μ_∞ . We have that

$$2 \geq \mathbb{E}e^{(|X|^2 - a)/K_a} = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}e^{(|X_\infty|^2 - a)/K_a}\right]$$

Thus by Markov's inequality, with probability greater than 1/2,

$$\mathbb{E}e^{(|X_\infty|^2 - a)/K_a} \leq 4.$$

We work on that event that we denote by \mathcal{U} . Now since X_∞ is one-dimensional, we may write $X_\infty = b_\infty + \xi_\infty\theta_\infty$ where ξ_∞ is log concave, $|\theta| = 1$ and $b_\infty \perp \theta_\infty$. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}e^{(|X_\infty|^2 - a)/K_a} = \mathbb{E}e^{(|b_\infty|^2 + \xi_\infty^2 - a)/K_a} \leq 4$$

That is, we have shown that

$$|\xi_\infty^2 - (a - |b|^2)|_{\psi_1} \leq 2K_a$$

In particular, although that is not necessary,

$$|\xi_\infty^2 - \mathbb{E}\xi_\infty^2|_{\psi_1} \lesssim K_a \tag{14}$$

since the mean minimizes the ψ_1 norm up to a universal constant. Now, using Lemma 27, we may rewrite (14) as

$$\frac{1}{k_{\mu_\infty}} \gtrsim \frac{1}{K_a} \tag{15}$$

Finally putting all together we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^+(S) &\geq E\left(\frac{1}{k_{\mu_\infty}}\right)\mathcal{E}_\mu(S) \\ &\geq E\left(\frac{1}{k_{\mu_\infty}}1_U\right)\mathcal{E}_\mu(S) \\ &\gtrsim \frac{1}{K_a}\mathcal{E}_\mu(S)\end{aligned}$$

S being arbitrary, we get

$$k_\mu \lesssim K_a = \|X\|^2 - a|_{\Psi_1}.$$

Taking $a = \mathbb{E}X^2$ concludes the proof.

4 An approach via stochastic localization

In this section we describe a general strategy to estimate the log-Sobolev constant of a log-concave probability using stochastic localization. We briefly recall the definition and basic properties of the process in the Lee-Vampla formulation [18], we refer to [10],[18],[8] and [15] for a more detailed exposition.

Let μ be log-concave probability on \mathbb{R}^n with density f . For $t \geq 0$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we introduce the probability

$$\mu_{t,h} = \frac{1}{Z_{t,h}}\mu e^{-t|x|^2+h\cdot x} \quad (16)$$

which density will be denoted by $f_{t,h}$ and where $Z_{t,h}$ is a normalizing constant. We further denote by

$$a_{t,h} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} x d\mu_{t,h}$$

and

$$A_{t,h} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x - a_t)(x - a_t)^T d\mu_{t,h}$$

the barycenter and covariance matrix of the measure $\mu_{t,h}$. Consider the stochastic differential equation:

$$h_0 = 0 \quad dh_t = a_{t,h_t}dt + dB_t \quad (17)$$

where $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a standard Brownian motion. The stochastic localization of μ is the measure-valued process $(\mu_{t,h_t})_{t \geq 0}$, which by a slight abuse of notations, we hereby denote by $(\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$. Accordingly, we drop the dependence in h_t to denote by f_t, a_t and A_t the density, barycenter, and covariance matrix of the process. The following lemma is classical, and is an alternate definition of the process.

Lemma 31. *For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$,*

$$df_t(x) = (x - a_t)f_t(x) \cdot dB_t$$

As an immediate consequence, we obtain

Lemma 32. *For any measurable function φ , the process $(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d\mu_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a martingale.*

To avoid unnecessary constants, we introduce for a measure ν with barycenter b ,

$$\tilde{\sigma}(\nu) = \inf\{K > 0, \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \nu} e^{(X-b)\cdot u} \leq e^{\frac{u^2 K^2}{2}}\}.$$

By Definition 14, we have that $\tilde{\sigma} \simeq \sigma_{SG}$. We define $\tilde{\sigma}_t = \tilde{\sigma}(\mu_t)$. The following couple of lemmas show that in order to bound the log-Sobolev constant of μ , it is enough to bound $\tilde{\sigma}_t$. Let g be a locally-Lipschitz function, and $M_t = \int g^2 d\mu_t$.

Lemma 33. For all $T > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}_\mu(g^2) &= \mathbb{E} \text{Ent}_{\mu_T}(g^2) + \text{Ent}(M_T) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \text{Ent}_{\mu_T}(g^2) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \frac{d[M]_t}{2M_t} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{T} \mathbb{E}_\mu(|\nabla g|^2) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \frac{d[M]_t}{2M_t} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first line follows from the martingale property (Lemma 32), while the second one is derived from straightforward Itô calculus. Finally for the last inequality we used the fact that $\mu_t = \mu_{t,h_t}$ satisfies the Bakry-Emery condition (Theorem 24), which can be seen from the definition (16). \square

Lemma 34.

$$\frac{d[M]_t}{2M_t} \leq \tilde{\sigma}_t^2 \text{Ent}_{\mu_t}(g^2).$$

Proof. Let $t \geq 0$, we first compute

$$dM_t = d \int g^2 d\mu_t = \left(\int g^2(x - a_t) \mu_t \right) \cdot dB_t.$$

Let $\lambda > 0$ a parameter to be determined later. From the previous computation,

$$\begin{aligned} d[M]_t &= \left| \int g^2(x - a_t) \mu_t \right|^2 \\ &= \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \left(\int g^2(x - a_t) \cdot \theta \mu_t \right)^2 \\ &= \lambda M_t^2 \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \left(\int \frac{g^2}{M_t} \frac{(x - a_t) \cdot \theta}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \mu_t \right) \\ &\leq \lambda M_t^2 \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}} \left(\text{Ent}_{\mu_t} \left(\frac{g^2}{M_t} \right) + \log \mathbb{E}_{\mu_t} e^{\frac{(x - a_t) \cdot \theta}{\sqrt{\lambda}}} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \lambda M_t^2 \left(\frac{1}{M_t} \text{Ent}_{\mu_t}(g^2) + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_t^2}{2\lambda} \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2 \left(\lambda \text{Ent}_{\mu_t}^2(g^2) + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_t^4 M_t^2}{4\lambda} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality, we used that $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$ for reals a, b . Finally, we get that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\frac{d[M]_t}{2M_t} \leq \frac{\lambda \text{Ent}_{\mu_t}^2(g^2)}{M_t} + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_t^4 M_t}{4\lambda}.$$

Choosing the optimal $\lambda = \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_t^2 M_t}{2 \text{Ent}_{\mu_t}(g^2)}$ concludes the proof. \square

At this point, it is unclear whether a high-probability bound on $\tilde{\sigma}_t$ is enough to establish a log-Sobolev inequality for μ . We explain the difference with what happens in the context of the KLS conjecture, where one seeks to bound the variance of an arbitrary function φ . Denoting by $N_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \varphi d\mu_t$ the analogs of Lemmas 33 and 34 are the followings

$$\text{For all } T \geq 0 \quad \text{Var}_\mu(\varphi) \leq \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E}_\mu(|\nabla \varphi|^2) + \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T_0} d[N]_t \quad (18)$$

and the control on $d[N]_t$:

$$d[N]_t \leq |A_t|_{op} \text{Var}_{\mu_t}(\varphi) \quad (19)$$

which is obtained by Cauchy-Schwarz (see for instance [9]). Now, suppose that μ is isotropic, for normalization sake, one typically proves a bound of the form :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T_0} |A_t|_{op} \geq 2\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{c}{T_0}\right) \quad (20)$$

for some $T_0 \geq 0$. Now, by a theorem of E.Milman, we might assume that φ is 1-Lipschitz. Furthermore, we might also assume that μ has a bounded support, of polynomial diameter D (actually one can assume that $D \lesssim \sqrt{n}$). In that case, one has the trivial almost sure upper-bound

$$\text{For all } t \geq 0, \quad \text{Var}_{\mu_t}(f) \leq D^2 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (21)$$

Using this, one can bound the second term of the right hand side of (18) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \int_0^{T_0} d[N]_t &\leq 2 \int_0^{T_0} \mathbb{E} \text{Var}_{\mu_t} \varphi \, dt + D^2 \exp\left(-\frac{c}{T_0}\right) \\ &\leq 2T_0 \text{Var}_{\mu}(\varphi) + D^2 \exp\left(-\frac{c}{T_0}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, since D is polynomial, if $T_0 \leq \frac{c_1}{\log(n)}$, $D^2 \exp\left(-\frac{c}{T_0}\right) = o(1)$. Plugging this into (18) yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{\mu}(\varphi) &\leq \frac{2}{T_0} \mathbb{E}_{\mu} (|\nabla \varphi|^2) + o(1) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{T_0} + o(1) \\ &\lesssim \frac{2}{T_0}. \end{aligned}$$

This finally implies that $C_P(\mu)^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{T_0}$.

In our case, although it is enough to prove gaussian concentration for 1-Lipschitz function by Theorem 23, no such reduction is available at the level of the log-Sobolev inequality, so that it is unclear whether a high-probability bound for $\tilde{\sigma}_t$ of the type (20) would be enough to conclude that $\rho_{LS}(\mu)^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{T_0}$. However, it is clear that an almost sure bound on $\tilde{\sigma}_t$ is enough. As a consequence, we retrieve the following corollary, which already appears in [9].

Corollary 35. *Let μ be a M strongly log-concave log-concave probability on \mathbb{R}^n*

$$\rho_{LS}(\mu) \leq 2M$$

Proof. Recall that by definition,

$$M^2 = \sup_{t>0, h \in \mathbb{R}^n} |\text{Cov}\left(\frac{1}{Z_{h,t}} \mu e^{-t|x|^2+h \cdot x}\right)|_{op}.$$

Set $t > 0$ and $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The fact that

$$\sup_{h \in \mathbb{R}^n} |\text{Cov}\left(\frac{1}{Z_{h,t}} \mu e^{-t|x|^2+h \cdot x}\right)|_{op} \leq M^2$$

shows that the measure μ_{t,h_0} is M tilt-stable. From Lemma 18, this implies that $\tilde{\sigma}(\mu_{t,h_0}) \leq M$. By letting t and h_0 take arbitrary values, we see that

$$\tilde{\sigma}_t \leq M \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Plugging this into Lemma 34 then in Lemma 33 yields, for an arbitrary function g , and $T > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ent}_{\mu}(g^2) &\leq \frac{2}{T} \mathbb{E}_{\mu} (|\nabla g|^2) + M^2 \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \text{Ent}_{\mu_t} \, dt \\ &\leq \frac{2}{T} \mathbb{E}_{\mu} (|\nabla g|^2) + M^2 T \text{Ent}_{\mu}(g^2) \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $T = \frac{1}{2M^2}$ yields the result. □

5 Some subclasses of subgaussian log-concave probabilities

5.1 Rotationally invariant measures

We say that a measure μ is rotationally invariant if for any orthogonal transformation $R \in O(n)$ and any measurable set A , $\mu(RA) = \mu(A)$. When μ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure then $d\mu = \lambda(|x|)dx$ for some positive integrable function λ . Now, it is easy to check that μ is log-concave if and only if λ is log-concave and nonincreasing.

In order for μ to satisfy a log-Sobolev inequality, its marginals must be sub-gaussian. This is not always the case, as one might consider a density proportional to $e^{-|x|}$ (remark that this is not the exponential product measure, since the norm is the ℓ_2 one. However the decay of the tails is still only exponential.)

By scaling, we assume that μ is *isotropic*, that is for any $\theta \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (x \cdot \theta)^2 d\mu = 1$. Equivalently,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |x|^2 d\mu = n.$$

Bobkov [6] established the following estimate for the concentration function.

Proposition 36. *The concentration function of μ satisfy :*

$$\alpha_\mu(r) \leq e^{-cr^2} \quad \text{for } r \leq \sqrt{n}$$

for some universal constant $c > 0$.

As a consequence, we get that

$$\alpha_\mu(r) \leq e^{-\frac{c_1 r^2}{\sigma_{SG}(\mu)^2}} \quad \text{for } r \leq 2\sigma_{SG}(\mu)\sqrt{n}. \quad (22)$$

where we used the fact that $\sigma_{SG}(\mu) \gtrsim 1$ since μ is isotropic. Using Proposition 19, we conclude that

$$\alpha_\mu(r) \leq e^{-\frac{c_2 r^2}{\sigma_{SG}(\mu)^2}} \quad \text{for } r \geq 0$$

for some universal constant $c_2 > 0$. By Theorem 23, this implies Theorem 6.

5.2 Tilt-stable measures

Let ν be a centered probability on \mathbb{R}^n . For any $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the tilted measure $\tau_h \nu = \nu_{0,h} = \frac{1}{Z_h} \nu e^{h \cdot x}$. Recall that that ν is said to be β tilt-stable is for any $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\text{Cov}(\tau_h \nu) \preceq \beta^2 I_n.$$

Or, equivalently,

$$\nabla^2 \mathcal{L}_\nu(h) \leq \beta^2 I_n$$

uniformly in h , where \mathcal{L}_ν is the log-Laplace transform of ν , that is for any $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\mathcal{L}_\nu(h) = \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{h \cdot x} d\nu.$$

Tilted measures and the log-Laplace transform are known to play a central role in convex geometry ([14], [16], [11]). In the context of the discrete hypercube, tilt-stable measures appear notably in the work of Eldan and Shamir [12], where they are shown to exhibit non-trivial concentration and Eldan and Chen [9].

Examples of tilt-stable measures include strongly log-concave measures, by the Brascamp-Lieb inequality which is a weaker form of Theorem 24, as well as product of tilt-stable measures. Indeed, if $\nu = \nu_1 \otimes \nu_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \nu_k$ is a product measure, notice that for any $h = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$,

$$\tau_h \nu = \tau_{h_1} \nu_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \tau_{h_k} \nu_k$$

so that if and each component is β_k tilt-stable, ν is itself tilt-stable with constant $\beta = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \beta_i$. The uniform measure on the discrete or continuous hypercube is then easily seen to be tilt-stable for instance.

An interesting question is to give sufficient conditions for a log-concave probability μ to be tilt-stable. A natural question in that direction is whether all sub-gaussian log-concave probabilities are in fact tilt-stables.

In the following, given a tilt-stable log-concave probability μ we use a perturbation argument to show that it is strongly tilt-stable by estimating

$$\sup_{t>0, h \in \mathbb{R}^n} |\text{Cov}(\mu_{t,h})|_{op}.$$

The idea is that the tilt-stability of μ allows us to get rid of the tilts in the above supremum. This is justified by the next lemma.

Lemma 37. *Let μ be a sub-gaussian probability, $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t > 0$. Then there exists $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$\mu_{t,h} = \frac{1}{Z} (\tau_{h_0} \mu) e^{-t|x - \text{bar}(\tau_{h_0} \mu)|^2}$$

where Z is a normalizing constant. In other words, all the measures $\mu_{t,h}$ may be obtained as **centered** gaussian perturbations of tilts of μ .

Proof. Developing the right hand-side shows that

$$\frac{1}{Z} (\tau_{h_0} \mu) e^{-t|x - \text{bar}(\tau_{h_0} \mu)|^2} = \mu_{t, h_0 + 2t \text{bar}(\tau_{h_0} \mu)}.$$

Hence, we need to show that for any $t > 0$, the function $F : h_0 \rightarrow h_0 + 2t \text{bar}(\tau_{h_0} \mu)$ is onto. By (9), its jacobian is $J_F(h) = I_n + 2t \text{Cov}(\tau_{h_0} \mu) \geq I_n$. This implies that F is open (sends open sets to open sets) and proper (pre-image of compacts are compacts), hence onto. \square

5.2.1 A perturbation result

According to the previous Lemma, we wish to upper-bound the covariance of measures of the type $\nu_t = \frac{1}{Z_t} \nu e^{-t|x|^2}$ in terms of ν . In our setting, ν will be a centered tilt-stable log-concave measure. In general we can say the following.

Lemma 38. *Let ν be a probability, then*

$$|\text{Cov}(\nu_t)|_{op} \leq \int |x|^2 d\nu_t \leq \int |x|^2 d\nu$$

In particular, if ν is centered,

$$|\text{Cov}(\nu_t)|_{op} \leq \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(\nu)) \tag{23}$$

Proof. It suffices to remarks that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int |x|^2 d\nu_t = - \int |x|^2 d\nu_t + \left(\int |x|^2 d\nu_t \right)^2 \leq 0$$

and $|\text{Cov}(\nu_t)|_{op} \leq \text{Tr}(\text{Cov}(\nu_t)) \leq \int |x|^2 d\nu_t$. \square

Our goal is to improve on (23) when ν is a centered sub-gaussian log-concave probability.

The following lemma is inspired by Barthe and Milman [2].

Lemma 39. *Let ν be a centered sub-gaussian probability on \mathbb{R}^n with sub-gaussian constant $\sigma_{SG}(\nu)$ and $t > 0$. Then the probability*

$$\nu_t = \frac{1}{Z_t} e^{-t|x|^2} \nu$$

is sub-gaussian with constant:

$$\sigma_{SG}^2(\nu_t) \lesssim \sigma_{SG}^2(\nu) (1 + \log K(t))$$

where $K(t) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-2t|x|^2} d\nu}{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-2t|x|^2} d\nu \right)^2}$

Proof. For any $\lambda > 0$, let E_λ be the event $E_\lambda = \{\frac{d\nu_t}{d\nu} \leq \lambda\}$. Let S be a measurable set, we simply write

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_t(S) &= \int_{S \cap E_\lambda} d\nu_t + \int_{S \cap E_\lambda^c} d\nu_t \\ &\leq \int_{S \cap E_\lambda} \frac{d\nu_t}{d\nu} d\nu + \mathbb{P}_{\nu_t}(E_\lambda^c) \\ &\leq \lambda \nu(S) + \mathbb{P}_{\nu_t}(E_\lambda^c).\end{aligned}$$

Next, by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_t}(E_\lambda^c) = \mathbb{P}_{\nu_t}\left(\frac{d\nu_t}{d\nu} > \lambda\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\nu_t} \frac{d\nu_t}{d\nu}}{\lambda} = \frac{K(t)}{\lambda}.$$

Let $\theta \in \mathcal{S}^{n-1}$ and $r > 0$. Setting $S = S_{\theta,r} = \{x, |x \cdot \theta| \leq r\}$, we get :

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_t(\{x, |x \cdot \theta| \leq r\}) &\leq \lambda \nu(\{x, |x \cdot \theta| \leq r\}) + \frac{K(t)}{\lambda} \\ &\leq 2\lambda e^{-\frac{cr^2}{\sigma_{SG}^2(\nu)}} + \frac{e^{\log K(t)}}{\lambda}\end{aligned}$$

where we used the sub-gaussianity of ν , and $c > 0$ is a universal constant. Optimizing in $\lambda > 0$ yields :

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_t(\{x, |x \cdot \theta| \leq r\}) &\leq \max\left(1, 2\sqrt{2} \exp\left(-\frac{cr^2}{2\sigma_{SG}^2(\nu)} + \frac{\log K(t)}{2}\right)\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{c_1 r^2}{\sigma_{SG}^2(\nu)(1 + \log K(t))}\right)\end{aligned}$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is a universal constant. This shows that

$$|\langle \cdot, \theta \rangle|_{\Psi_2(\nu_t)}^2 \lesssim \sigma_{SG}^2(\nu)(1 + \log K(t)).$$

The functional $\langle \cdot, \theta \rangle$ is a priori not centered for ν_t . Using Lemma 17 concludes the proof. \square

Now, we wish to estimate $K(t)$. We are mostly interested in small values of t , since for large t , when ν is log-concave, which is the case of interest for us, we will simply use $\text{Cov}(\nu_t) \leq \frac{1}{t}$. When ν is a standard Gaussian, a quick computation shows that $K(t)$ behaves like $\log K(t) \lesssim nt^2 = \mathbb{E}(|G|^2)t^2$. We recover this estimate with an extra factor, the Ψ_2 norm of $|X| - \mathbb{E}|X|$ (see Lemma 41 below). We start with a preliminary lemma

Lemma 40. *Let X be a random vector with sub-gaussian norm, then there exists a universal constant $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $r > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|X|^2 - r) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{c_1 r^2}{4\mathbb{E}|X|^2 M^2}\right)$$

Proof. To alleviate notations, we denote by $M = \| |X| - \mathbb{E}|X| \|_{\Psi_2(\nu)}$. For any $0 < r < \mathbb{E}|X|^2$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(|X|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|X|^2 - r) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{|X|} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}|X|^2 - r}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|X| \leq (\mathbb{E}|X|^2)^{1/2} - \frac{r}{2(\mathbb{E}|X|^2)^{1/2}}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|X| \leq \mathbb{E}|X| + cM - \frac{r}{2(\mathbb{E}|X|^2)^{1/2}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used the concavity of the square-root function, and in the second one, we used that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|X|^2 &= (\mathbb{E}|X|)^2 + \text{Var}(|X|) \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}|X|)^2 + c^2 M^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}|X| + cM)^2\end{aligned}$$

for a universal constant $c > 0$. Using the gaussian concentration for $|X|$, we get that for any $r \geq 4cM (\mathbb{E}|X|^2)^{1/2}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|X|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|X|^2 - r) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|X| \leq \mathbb{E}|X| - \frac{r}{4(\mathbb{E}|X|^2)^{1/2}}\right) \quad (24)$$

$$\leq \exp\left(-\frac{r^2}{4\mathbb{E}|X|^2 M^2}\right) \quad (25)$$

Combining this with the trivial bound $\mathbb{P}(|X|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|X|^2 - r) \leq 1$ for small r , yields the result. \square

Lemma 41. *Under the same hypothesis as in Lemma 39, we have*

$$\log K(t) \lesssim \left(1 + t^2 \mathbb{E} \left[|X| - \mathbb{E}|X| \right]_{\Psi_2(\nu)}^2 \mathbb{E}|X|^2\right)$$

Proof. By Jensen's inequality, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-2t|x|^2} d\nu \geq e^{-t\mathbb{E}|X|^2}$, so that

$$K(t) \leq e^{2t\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{-2t|x|^2} d\nu. \quad (26)$$

Now, using Lemma 40, for any $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-t|X|^2} \right] &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(|X|^2 \leq r) te^{-tr} dr \\ &\leq t \int_0^{\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \mathbb{P}(|X|^2 \leq r) e^{-tr} dr + e^{-t\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \\ &\leq t \int_0^{\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \mathbb{P}(|X|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}|X|^2 - r) e^{-t(\mathbb{E}|X|^2 - r)} dr + e^{-t\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \\ &\leq te^{-t\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \int_0^{\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \exp\left(-\frac{c_1 r^2}{4\mathbb{E}|X|^2 M^2} + tr\right) dr + e^{-t\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \\ &\leq te^{-t\mathbb{E}|X|^2} e^{\frac{t^2 \mathbb{E}|X|^2}{c_1 M^2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left(-\left(\frac{\sqrt{c_1} r}{2M\sqrt{\mathbb{E}|X|^2}} - \frac{tM\sqrt{\mathbb{E}|X|^2}}{\sqrt{c_1}}\right)^2\right) dr + e^{-t\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \\ &\leq e^{-t\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \left(2t\sqrt{\frac{2M^2\mathbb{E}|X|^2}{c_1}} e^{\frac{M^2 t^2 \mathbb{E}|X|^2}{c_1}} + 1\right) \\ &\leq \tilde{c}_1 e^{-t\mathbb{E}|X|^2} \left(1 + e^{\frac{t^2 \mathbb{E}|X|^2 M^2}{c_1}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used that $z \leq e^{z^2}$ valid for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Combining this with (26) yields

$$K(t) \lesssim 1 + e^{\frac{2t^2 \mathbb{E}|X|^2 M^2}{c_1}},$$

concluding the proof. \square

5.3 Proof of Theorem 10

Let μ be a 1 tilt-stable log-concave probability. Let $t > 0$ and $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$. By Lemma 37, there exists $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\mu_{t,h} = \frac{1}{Z} (\tau_{h_0} \mu) e^{-t|x - \text{bar}(\tau_{h_0} \mu)|^2}.$$

Denote by $A_{t,h} = \text{Cov}(\mu_{t,h})$. Remark that $\tau_{h_0} \mu$ is again a 1 tilt-stable log-concave probability. Then, combining Lemmas 39 and 41, applied to $\tau_{h_0} \mu$ after a centering, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} |A_{t,h}|_{op} &\lesssim \sigma_{SG}^2(\mu_{t,h}) \\ &\lesssim 1 + t^2 \tilde{K}_n^2 \text{Tr}(A_{t,h}) \\ &\lesssim 1 + t^2 \tilde{K}_n^2 n \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since μ is log-concave, μ_t satisfies the Bakry-Emery criterion with constant t , so that

$$\begin{aligned} |A_{t,h}|_{op} &\lesssim \max\left(1 + t^2 \tilde{K}_n^2 n, \frac{1}{t}\right) \\ &\lesssim n^{1/3} \tilde{K}_n^{2/3}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Corollary 35 finishes the proof.

References

- [1] Dominique Bakry and Michel Émery. Diffusions hypercontractives. In *Séminaire de Probabilités XIX 1983/84: Proceedings*, pages 177–206. Springer, 2006.
- [2] Franck Barthe and Emanuel Milman. Transference principles for log-sobolev and spectral-gap with applications to conservative spin systems. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 323(2):575–625, 2013.
- [3] Pierre Bizeul. On measures strongly log-concave on a subspace. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09422*, 2022.
- [4] Sergey G Bobkov. Isoperimetric and analytic inequalities for log-concave probability measures. *The Annals of Probability*, 27(4):1903–1921, 1999.
- [5] Sergey G Bobkov. On isoperimetric constants for log-concave probability distributions. In *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis: Israel Seminar 2004–2005*, pages 81–88. Springer, 2007.
- [6] SG Bobkov. Gaussian concentration for a class of spherically invariant measures. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 167(3):326–339, 2010.
- [7] Jean Bourgain. On the distribution of polynomials on high dimensional convex sets. In *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis: Israel Seminar (GAFA) 1989–90*, pages 127–137. Springer, 2006.
- [8] Yuansi Chen. An almost constant lower bound of the isoperimetric coefficient in the kls conjecture. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 31(1):34–61, 2021.
- [9] Yuansi Chen and Ronen Eldan. Localization schemes: A framework for proving mixing bounds for markov chains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.04163*, 2022.
- [10] Ronen Eldan. Thin shell implies spectral gap up to polylog via a stochastic localization scheme. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 23(2):532–569, 2013.
- [11] Ronen Eldan and Bo’az Klartag. Approximately gaussian marginals and the hyperplane conjecture. *Concentration, functional inequalities and isoperimetry*, 545:55–68, 2011.

- [12] Ronen Eldan and Omer Shamir. Log concavity and concentration of lipschitz functions on the boolean hypercube. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 282(8):109392, 2022.
- [13] Ravi Kannan, László Lovász, and Miklós Simonovits. Isoperimetric problems for convex bodies and a localization lemma. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 13(3):541–559, 1995.
- [14] Bo’az Klartag. On convex perturbations with a bounded isotropic constant. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GFA*, 16(6):1274–1290, 2006.
- [15] Bo’az Klartag and Joseph Lehec. Bourgain’s slicing problem and kls isoperimetry up to polylog. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.15551*, 2022.
- [16] Bo’az Klartag and Emanuel Milman. Centroid bodies and the logarithmic laplace transform—a unified approach. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 262(1):10–34, 2012.
- [17] Michel Ledoux. A simple analytic proof of an inequality by p. buser. *Proceedings of the American mathematical society*, 121(3):951–959, 1994.
- [18] Yin Tat Lee and Santosh Srinivas Vempala. Eldan’s stochastic localization and the kls hyperplane conjecture: an improved lower bound for expansion. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 998–1007. IEEE, 2017.
- [19] Emanuel Milman. On the role of convexity in functional and isoperimetric inequalities. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 99(1):32–66, 2009.
- [20] Emanuel Milman. Isoperimetric and concentration inequalities: equivalence under curvature lower bound. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 154(2):207–239, 2010.
- [21] Emanuel Milman. Properties of isoperimetric, functional and transport-entropy inequalities via concentration. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 152(3):475–507, 2012.
- [22] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.