

Markov-bridge representation of ergodic large-deviation principles

D.R. Michiel Renger*

July 2, 2024

Abstract

We revisit classic ergodic large-deviation principles: for the occupation measure (Donsker-Varadhan), and for the empirical flux. We show that these problems can be embedded into a more general, discrete-time framework. A conditioning and mixing argument then yields alternative expressions for these well-known rate functionals, formulated in terms of Markov bridges.

1 Introduction

Ergodic large-deviation principles

Consider a stochastic process $(A(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on \mathbb{R}^d and its ergodic average $\bar{A}_T := T^{-1} \int_0^T A(t) dt$. Under sufficient ergodicity assumptions this average converges as $T \rightarrow \infty$ to a deterministic ergodic limit. We revisit the classic problem of deriving the corresponding large-deviation principle [DZ09], formally the exponential rate of decay:

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{A}_T \approx a) \sim e^{-TI(a)}, \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1)$$

Here $I(a)$ is called the “rate functional” and is minimised by the ergodic limit.

Our work is motivated by the following classic results:

- (A) $A(t) := \mathbb{1}_{X(t)}$ for an irreducible continuous-time Markov chain on a finite space \mathcal{X} with generator matrix Q . In this case $\bar{A}_T = T^{-1} \int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{X(t)} dt \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ is simply the occupation measure, signifying the proportion of time that the chain $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ spends in each state $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The classic result due to Donsker, Varadhan and Gärtner shows that the large-deviation principle (1) holds with rate functional [DV75a, DV75b, DV76, DV83, Gär77]:

$$I_{\text{DVG}}(\rho) := \sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}, \min_x (u_x) > 0} - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{(Qu)_x}{u_x} \rho_x, \quad (2)$$

*TU München, Boltzmannstraße 3, 85747 Garching, Germany. Email: d.r.m.renger@tum.de

and I_{DVG} is minimised by the invariant measure $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ of the chain $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$.

(B) In the same model as in (A), the cumulative empirical flux

$$W_{xy}(t) := \sum_{s \in [0, t]: X(s^-) \neq X(s)} \mathbf{1}_{(X(s^-), X(s))}(x, y) \quad (3)$$

counts the number of jumps x to y in time interval $[0, t]$. If $A(t) := (\mathbf{1}_{X(t)}, \dot{W}(t))$ ¹, then the large-deviation principle (1) holds with rate functional [BFG15a, BFG15b, BCFG18]:

$$I_{\text{BFG}}(\rho, j) := \begin{cases} \sum \sum_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} s(j_{xy} | \rho_x Q_{xy}), & \text{div } j = 0, j \ll \rho \otimes Q, \\ \infty, & \text{else,} \end{cases}, \quad (4)$$

$$s(a | b) := \begin{cases} a \log \frac{a}{b} - a + b, & a, b > 0, \\ b, & a = 0, b \geq 0, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

and \mathcal{I}_{BFG} is minimised by $\rho_x = \pi_x$, $j_{xy} = (\rho \otimes Q)_{xy} := \pi_x Q_{xy}$.

(C) From the contraction principle one immediately recovers two separate large-deviation principles (1) for the occupation measure (as above) and the average empirical flux $T^{-1} \int_0^T \dot{W}(t) dt = T^{-1} W(T)$ respectively:

$$I_{\text{DVG}}(\rho) = \inf_{j \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}}} I_{\text{BFG}}(\rho, j), \quad I_{\text{flux}}(j) := \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})} I_{\text{BFG}}(\rho, j).$$

Comparing these results shows that – as common in large-deviation theory – rate functionals are often only implicitly defined, but they may become explicit after including more variables in the description.

In the current paper we derive a similar large-deviation principle as above with an explicit rate functional, obtained by including *different* variables. Inspired by [BCFG18], the main argument stems from rewriting $T = nT_0$ for a *fixed* $T_0 > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so that the ergodic average becomes²,

$$\bar{A}^n := \bar{A}_{nT_0} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{1}{T_0} \int_{(m-1)T_0}^{mT_0} A(t) dt, \quad (6)$$

and then considering the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In all examples above, the variables $T_0^{-1} \int_{(m-1)T_0}^{mT_0} A(t) dt$ in (6) become independent after conditioning on the values $(X((m-1)T_0), X(mT_0))$ of another

¹Strictly speaking the time derivative $\dot{W}(dt)$ exists as a singular measure in time, but since $A(t)$ appears as integrands only, we allow this minor abuse of notation in the introduction.

²The restriction to discrete values of $T = nT_0$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ does not influence the large deviations, as a straightforward Markov inequality shows that \bar{A}_{nT_0} and $\bar{A}_{(n+\alpha)T_0}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ are exponentially equivalent as soon as $\int_0^{\alpha T_0} A(t) dt$ has finite mean.

but related Markov process $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ on a finite set \mathcal{X} . Thus we might as well consider the coupled, *discrete-time* process

$$X_m := X(mT_0), \quad A_m := \frac{1}{T_0} \int_{(m-1)T_0}^{mT_0} A(t) dt. \quad (7)$$

Result in discrete time

From here we focus on a *general* homogeneous and irreducible discrete-time Markov chain $(X_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ on a finite set \mathcal{X} and another discrete-time process $(A_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ on \mathbb{R}^d . Define:

$$\begin{aligned} q^{xy}(da) &:= \mathbb{P}(A_1 \in da \mid X_0 = x, X_1 = y), & (8) \\ \phi^{xy}(\lambda) &:= \log \int e^{\lambda \cdot a} q^{xy}(da), & \phi^{xy*}(a) &:= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d} [\lambda \cdot a - \phi^{xy}(\lambda)], \\ \phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy}(s) &:= \log \int e^{s|a|} q^{xy}(da), & \phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy*}(r) &:= \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} [rs - \phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy}(s)]. \end{aligned}$$

The conditional independence mentioned above can be exploited by studying the two variables:

$$K^n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{(X_{m-1}, X_m)} A_m, \quad \Theta^n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{(X_{m-1}, X_m)}$$

in $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}}$ and in the probability measures $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}}$ respectively. Of course $\sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} K^{n,xy} = \bar{A}^n := n^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^n A_m$, and so (K^n, Θ^n) indeed contains more information than \bar{A}^n .

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that:*

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1 \in da_1, \dots, A_n \in da_n \mid X_0 = x_0, \dots, X_n = x_n) = \prod_{m=1}^n q_{x_{m-1}, x_m}(da_m), \quad (9)$$

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy*}(r)}{r} = \infty \text{ for all } x, y \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (10)$$

Then the sequence (K^n, Θ^n) satisfies the large-deviation principle with good rate functional:

$$I(k, \theta) := \begin{cases} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} \theta_{xy} \phi^{xy*} \left(\frac{k^{xy}}{\theta_{xy}} \right) + \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} s(\theta_{xy} \mid (e^1 \# \theta)_x P_{xy}), & k \ll \theta \text{ \& } e^1 \# \theta = e^2 \# \theta, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where P_{xy} is the transition probability of $(X_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, marginals are denoted by $(e^1 \# \theta)_x := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \theta_{xy}$, $(e^2 \# \theta)_y := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \theta_{xy}$ and $k \ll \theta$ means that $k^{xy} = 0$ whenever $\theta_{xy} = 0$.

A few comments on the assumptions are in place. First, $(X_m)_m$ needs to be a homogeneous Markov process, and but $(A_m)_m$ only needs to a hidden Markov process. Indeed, the independence assumption (9) implies that $(X_m, A_m)_m$ must be a homogeneous Markov process. The other way around, the independence assumption (9) is easily checked by showing that $(X_m, A_m)_m$ is a homogeneous Markov process where the transition rates do not depend on A_m . Second, the superlinear growth assumption (10) is really needed to ensure goodness of the mappings $a \mapsto \theta_{xy} \phi^{xy*}(\theta_{xy}^{-1}a)$ as $\theta_{xy} \rightarrow 0$.

Note that since we work in finite dimensions the topology is not an issue. The proof will be fairly straight forward: the first sum in the rate functional (11) arises from a reweighted Cramér's Theorem, and the second one is the known large-deviation rate for the pair-empirical measure Θ^n . Nevertheless the result is interesting and relevant, as one obtains alternative, previously unknown expressions for the two classic cases in one go.

Application to the classic cases in continuous time

Applying the discrete-time result to the classic cases discussed above yields the following alternative formulations for (2) and (4), in terms of inf-convolutions.

Corollary 1.2 ((A) Occupation measure LDP). *Fix a $T_0 > 0$ and let $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be an irreducible continuous-time Markov chain on a finite state space \mathcal{X} with transition probability $p_{T_0}(x, y)$. Then the large-deviation rate functional (2) corresponding to the occupation measure $T^{-1} \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{X(t)} dt$ has the alternative formulation:*

$$I_{\text{DVG}}(\rho) = \inf_{\substack{\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) \\ e^1 \# \theta = e^2 \# \theta}} \inf_{\substack{k \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} \\ \sum_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} k^{xy} = \rho}} I(k, \theta),$$

where I is given by (11), ϕ^{xy*} by (8), and

$$q^{xy}(d\rho) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{T_0} \int_0^{T_0} \mathbf{1}_{X(t)} dt \in d\rho \mid X(0) = x, X(T_0) = y\right). \quad (12)$$

Corollary 1.3 ((B) Average flux LDP). *Fix a $T_0 > 0$, let $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ be a continuous-time Markov chain on a finite state space \mathcal{X} with positive jump rates $Q_{xy} > 0$ between all states, and let $W_{xy}(t)$ be the cumulative flux (3). Then the large-deviation rate functional (4) corresponding to the pair $(T^{-1} \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{X(t)} dt, T^{-1}W(T))$ has the alternative formulation:*

$$I_{\text{BFG}}(\rho, j) = \inf_{\substack{\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) \\ e^1 \# \theta = e^2 \# \theta}} \inf_{\substack{k \in (\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \times \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}})^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} \\ \sum_{x, y \in \mathcal{X}} k^{xy} = (\rho, j)}} I(k, \theta),$$

where I is given by (11), ϕ^{xy*} by (8), and

$$q^{xy}(d\rho, dj) = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{T_0} \int_0^{T_0} \mathbf{1}_{X(t)} dt \in d\rho, \frac{1}{T_0} W(T_0) \in dj \mid X(0) = x, X(T_0) = y\right). \quad (13)$$

Generalisations

To keep the notation simple we work with homogeneous Markov chains $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$. However, the discrete-time chain (7) remains homogeneous if the continuous-time chain $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ has T_0 -periodic jump rates $Q(t)$, and Corollaries 1.2 and 1.3 remain true as long as those jump rates are bounded (from above, and below away from zero). In fact, the continuous-time large-deviation principle (4) was already extended to periodic rates in [BCFG18].

The discrete-time Theorem 1.1 can be generalised to infinite dimensions using the Dawson-Gärtner Theorem [DZ09, Th. 4.6.1]. More precisely, \mathbb{R}^d can be replaced by a dual Banach space \mathcal{A} that has a predual, and \mathcal{X} can be generalised to a measurable space, so that Θ^n becomes a probability measure in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ and K^n becomes a Banach-valued vector measures in $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}; \mathcal{A})$, see [Din00]. The exponential tightness argument of Lemma 2.1 is still applicable; thus a priori one obtains exponential tightness in the *vague* topology of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}; \mathcal{A}) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$. This is a real issue, because both Cramér's Theorem as well as the pair-empirical measure large deviations are known to fail in infinite-dimensional measure spaces when equipped with the narrow topology.

2 Proof of the result in discrete time

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The claim will follow immediately from a mixing argument [Big04, Th. 5] after checking the following properties.

1. The random variable Θ^n takes values in the compact set $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$ and is thus exponentially tight. In Lemma 2.1 we show the uniform exponential tightness of K^n , conditioned on $\Theta^n = \theta^n$ for arbitrary converging sequences $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) \ni \theta^n \rightarrow \theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$ from the set

$$\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) := \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) \cap (n^{-1}\mathbb{N})^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}}. \quad (14)$$

Together, this implies that (K^n, Θ^n) is exponentially tight [Big04, Prop. 6].

2. The random variable Θ^n satisfies the large-deviation principle in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$ with good rate functional [dH08, Th. IV.3]:

$$\theta \mapsto \begin{cases} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} s(\theta_{xy} \mid (e^1 \# \theta)_x P_{xy}), & e^1 \# \theta = e^2 \# \theta, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3. In Lemma 2.2 we show that for arbitrary converging sequences $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) \ni \theta^n \rightarrow \theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$, the random variables K^n conditioned on $\Theta^n = \theta^n$ satisfies the large-deviation principle with rate functional

$$I_{\text{cond}}(k \mid \theta) := \begin{cases} \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} \theta_{xy} \phi^{xy*} \left(\frac{k_{xy}}{\theta_{xy}} \right), & k \ll \theta, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where we implicitly set $\theta_{xy}\phi^{xy*}(k^{xy}/\theta_{xy}) := 0$ whenever $\theta_{xy} = 0$ and $k^{xy} = 0$. Here it is essential that we chose $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$ so that $\theta_{xy}^n > 0$ for all x, y .

4. Finally, $I_{\text{cond}}(k \mid \theta) = \sum_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\lambda^{xy} \in [k^{xy} \cdot \lambda^{xy} - \theta_{xy}\phi^{xy}(\lambda^{xy})]}$ is clearly jointly lower semicontinuous in k and θ . □

In the following, the key will be to observe that both K^n and Θ^n are invariant under permutations of the indices $m = 1, \dots, n$, so that the independence assumption (9) yields, for box sets $dk = \times_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} dk^{xy}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(K^n \in dk \mid \Theta^n = \theta^n) = \prod_{x,y \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^{n\theta_{xy}^n} \tilde{A}_m^{xy} \in dk^{xy}\right), \quad (16)$$

where the new variables \tilde{A}_m^{xy} are independent identically distributed with probability q^{xy} .

Lemma 2.1. *For each pair $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ the sequence of conditional probabilities $\mathbb{P}(K^{n,xy} \in da \mid \Theta^n = \theta^n)$ is uniformly exponentially tight, i.e. for each $\eta > 0$ there exists an $R_\eta > 0$ such that for all convergent sequences $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) \ni \theta^n \rightarrow \theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(|K^{n,xy}|_1 > R_\eta \mid \Theta^n = \theta) \leq -\eta.$$

As a consequence, K^n is also uniformly exponentially tight.

Proof. By (16), using a standard Chernoff bound and then $\theta_{xy}^n \leq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(|K^{n,xy}|_1 \geq R_\eta \mid \Theta^n = \theta) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} - \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} [sR_\eta - \theta_{xy}^n \phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy}(s)] \\ &\leq -\phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy*}(R_\eta). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The result then follows from Assumption (10). □

Lemma 2.2. *Take an arbitrary sequence $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}) \ni \theta^n \rightarrow \theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})$. Then the sequence of conditional probabilities $\mathbb{P}(K^n \in dk \mid \Theta^n = \theta^n)$ satisfies the large-deviation principle with good rate functional $I_{\text{cond}}(k \mid \theta)$.*

Proof. By the independence (16) we can show the large-deviation principle for each pair x, y separately. We distinguish between three cases.

Let $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ be a pair for which $\theta_{xy} > 0$. By Cramér's Theorem [DZ09, Cor. 6.1.6]³ the sequence $(n\theta_{xy}^n)^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^{n\theta_{xy}^n} \tilde{A}_m^{xy}$ satisfies the large-deviation principle with speed $n\theta_{xy}^n \rightarrow \infty$ and good rate functional $\phi^{xy*}(k^{xy})$. The sequence

³In fact, that particular version of Cramér's Theorem requires an additional condition to derive goodness of the rate functional, but this follows from our Assumption (10) since $\phi^{xy*}(a) \geq \phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy*}(|a|_1)$.

$n^{-1} \sum_{m=1}^{n\theta_{xy}^n} \tilde{A}_m^{xy}$ thus satisfies the large-deviation principle *with speed* n and good rate functional $\theta_{xy} \phi^{xy*} \left(\frac{k^{xy}}{\theta_{xy}} \right)$.

Now let $x, y \in X$ be a pair for which $\theta_{xy} = 0$ but $k^{xy} \neq 0$. For arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$ the Chernoff bound (17), $0 < \theta_{xy}^n \rightarrow \theta_{xy} = 0$ and Assumption (10) together yield:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(|K^{n,xy}|_1 \geq \epsilon) \leq -\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \theta_{xy}^n \phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy*} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\theta_{xy}^n} \right) = -\infty. \quad (18)$$

This shows that $I_{\text{cond}}(k|\theta) = \infty$ whenever $k \ll \theta$ is violated.

Finally, consider a pair for which $0 < \theta_{xy}^n \rightarrow \theta_{xy} = 0$ and $k^{xy} = 0$. Since $K^{n,xy}$ is exponentially tight by Lemma 2.1, the corresponding rate functional for that particular pair x, y must have infimum zero. We conclude that $\theta_{xy} \phi^{xy*}(k^{xy}/\theta_{xy}) = 0$. \square

3 Proof for the classical cases in continuous time

Now $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is a given *continuous-time* Markov chain on finite state space \mathcal{X} , and to keep notation tidy let us restrict to homogeneous chains. In order to prove Corollaries (1.2) and (1.3), the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 need to be checked for the two specific settings; the results then follow immediately from the Contraction Principle [DZ09, Th. 4.2.1].

The second result requires more work than the first one. Unfortunately it is generally difficult to obtain an explicit expression for q^{xy} . However, the following bridge representation will be helpful. As before, the transition probability and generator matrices of the unconditioned chain are denoted by $P(t)$ and Q .

Lemma 3.1. *Conditioned on $X(0) = x, X(T_0) = y$, the process $(X(t))_{t \in [0, T_0]}$ is an inhomogeneous Markov chain with transition probabilities, for $0 < s \leq t < T_0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ab}^{xy}(s, t) &:= \mathbb{P}(X(t) = b \mid X(0) = x, X(s) = a, X(T_0) = y) \\ &= \frac{P_{ab}(t-s)P_{by}(T_0-t)}{P_{ay}(T_0-s)}, \end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding time-dependent generator matrix is given by:

$$Q_{ab}^{xy}(t) = \frac{(P(t-s)Q)_{ab}P_{by}(T_0-t) - \mathbf{1}_{ab}(QP(T_0-t))_{by}}{P_{ay}(T_0-t)}.$$

The Markovianity follows from Doob's h-transform [FPY92]; the transition probability follows trivially from the Markov property of the unconditioned chain, and the generator is derived from the transition probability using the forward and backward Kolmogorov equations. Because of the Markov property of the new, conditioned chain the transition probabilities $P_{ab}^{xy}(s, t)$ do not depend on x , but we shall keep the x in the superindex for consistency of notation.

(A) Occupation measure LDP. In this setting $A(t) := \mathbb{1}_{X(t)}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d := \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$, and the discrete-time process $(X_m, A_m)_m$ is defined by (7). Let q, ϕ, ϕ^* be given by (12) and (8).

Proof of Corollary 1.2. The coupled process $(X(t), T_0^{-1} \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{X(s)} ds)_{t \geq 0}$ is also Markovian, with generator

$$(\tilde{Q}f)(x, \rho) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} Q_{xy} [f(y, \rho) - f(x, \rho)] + \frac{1}{T_0} \mathbb{1}_x \cdot \nabla_\rho f(x, \rho).$$

Therefore $(X_m, A_m)_m$ is Markovian, and since the jump and drift rates in the generator do not depend on ρ , the conditional independence (9) holds.

For the growth condition (10): $\tilde{A}_m^{xy} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ almost surely, implying that $\phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy*}(r) = \infty$ whenever $r \notin [0, 1]$. \square

(B) Average flux LDP. Recall that $W(t)$ is the cumulative empirical flux (3) and $A(t) := (\mathbb{1}_{X(t)}, \dot{W}(t))$, which lies in $\mathbb{R}^d := \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}}$. Define the discrete-time process $(X_m, A_m)_m$ by (7), and q, ϕ, ϕ^* by (13) and (8).

Proof of Corollary 1.3. Similar to the argument above, the coupled process $(X(t), T_0^{-1} \int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{X(s)} ds, T_0^{-1} W(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is Markovian with generator

$$(\tilde{Q}f)(x, \rho, j) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} Q_{xy} [f(y, \rho, j + \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{1}_{xy}) - f(x, \rho, j)] + \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{1}_x \cdot \nabla_\rho f(x, \rho, j),$$

and since the jump and drift rates do not depend on (ρ, j) , the conditional independence (9) holds.

To check the growth condition (10) for each pair $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, we use $|T_0^{-1} \int_0^{T_0} \mathbb{1}_{X(t)} dt|_1 = 1$ and replace the conditional process $(|T_0^{-1} W(t)|_1)_{t \in [0, T_0]}$ by a simpler, real-valued process $(U(t))_{t \in [0, T_0]}$ with higher jump rates. To this aim, note that for any pair $a \neq b \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} Q_{ab}^{xy}(t) = \frac{Q_{ab} P_{by}(T_0)}{P_{ay}(T_0)} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow T_0} Q_{ab}^{xy}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{Q_{ab} Q_{by}}{Q_{ay}}, & a, b \neq y, \\ Q_{yb} P_{by}(T_0), & a = y, \\ \infty, & b = y, \end{cases}$$

so that by continuity $\bar{Q}_{ab}^{xy} := \sup_{t \in [0, T_0]} Q_{ab}^{xy}(t) < \infty$ for $b \neq y$ (we assumed that all $Q_{ab} > 0$). The process $(U(t))_{t \in [0, T_0]}$ with $U(0) = 0$ makes independent jumps $+T_0^{-1}$ with Poisson rates \bar{Q}_{ab}^{xy} for $a \neq b, a, b \neq y$, and jumps $+2T_0^{-1}$ with rate \bar{Q}_{yb}^{xy} for $b \neq y$; the factor 2 represents an *instantaneous* jump back to y . Then, setting $\bar{Q}^{xy} := \sum_{\substack{a, b \in \mathcal{X} \\ a \neq b, a, b \neq y}} \bar{Q}_{ab}^{xy} + \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{X} \\ b \neq y}} \bar{Q}_{yb}^{xy}$,

$$\phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy}(s) \leq \log \mathbb{E} e^{s(1+U(T_0))} \leq s + \bar{Q}^{xy} T_0 (e^{2s/T_0} - 1).$$

From this one obtains the claimed superlinear growth:

$$\phi_{|\cdot|}^{xy*}(r) \geq \frac{1}{2} s (r - 1 | 2\bar{Q}^{xy}).$$

\square

References

- [BCFG18] L. Bertini, R. Chetrite, A. Faggionato, and D. Gabrielli. Level 2.5 large deviations for continuous-time Markov chains with time periodic rates. volume 19, pages 3197–3238, 2018.
- [BFG15a] L. Bertini, A. Faggionato, and D. Gabrielli. Flows, currents, and cycles for Markov chains: large deviation asymptotics. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 125(7):2786–2819, 2015.
- [BFG15b] L. Bertini, A. Faggionato, and D. Gabrielli. Large deviations of the empirical flow for continuous time Markov chains. *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, 51(3):867–900, 2015.
- [Big04] J.D. Biggins. Large deviations for mixtures. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 9:60–71, 2004.
- [dH08] F. den Hollander. *Large deviations*, volume 14. American Mathematical Soc., 2008.
- [Din00] N. Dinculeanu. *Vector Integration and Stochastic Integration in Banach Spaces*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, USA, 2000.
- [DV75a] M.D. Donsker and S.R.S. Varadhan. Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, I. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 28(1):1–47, 1975.
- [DV75b] M.D. Donsker and S.R.S. Varadhan. Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, II. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 28(2):279–301, 1975.
- [DV76] M.D. Donsker and S.R.S. Varadhan. Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, III. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 29(4):389–461, 1976.
- [DV83] M.D. Donsker and S.R.S. Varadhan. Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, IV. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 36(2):183–212, 1983.
- [DZ09] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large deviations techniques and applications*, volume 38. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- [FPY92] P. Fitzsimmons, J. Pitman, and M. Yor. Markovian bridges: construction, Palm interpretation, and splicing. In *Seminar on Stochastic Processes, 1992*, pages 101–134. Springer, 1992.
- [Gär77] J. Gärtner. On large deviations from the invariant measure. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 22(1):24–39, 1977.