

A LAPLACE DUALITY FOR INTEGRATION

JEAN B. LASSERRE

ABSTRACT. We consider the integral $v(y) = \int_{K_y} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ on a domain $K_y = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : g(\mathbf{x}) \leq y\}$, where g is nonnegative and K_y is compact for all $y \in [0, +\infty)$. Under some assumptions, we show that for every $y \in (0, \infty)$ there exists a distinguished scalar $\lambda_y \in (0, +\infty)$ such that

$$v(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda_y g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}$$

which is the counterpart analogue for integration of Lagrangian duality for optimization. A crucial ingredient is the Laplace transform, the analogue for integration of Legendre-Fenchel transform in optimization. In particular, if both f and g are positively homogeneous then λ_y is a simple explicitly rational function of y . In addition if g is quadratic form then computing $v(y)$ reduces to computing the integral of f with respect to a specific Gaussian measure for which exact and approximate numerical methods (e.g. cubatures) are available.

Keywords: Integration, Laplace transform, optimization, positively homogeneous functions,

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous, nonnegative and such that

$$(1.1) \quad K_y := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : g(\mathbf{x}) \leq y\}, \quad y \in [0, +\infty).$$

is compact for all $y \in [0, +\infty)$, and let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous. Consider the function

$$(1.2) \quad y \mapsto v(y) := \int_{K_y} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \quad y \in [0, +\infty),$$

which is well-defined for every $y \in [0, +\infty)$. This problem appears in several areas of science and engineering. For instance, if f the density of a Gaussian measure μ then $v(y) = \mu(K_y)$ provides the probability that a Gaussian random vector (with distribution μ) lies in K_y , a basic problem encountered in probability, analysis of dynamical systems, and space engineering (e.g., for collision probability of satellites [10]).

Contribution. (i) Assuming that the Laplace transform of v exists (see e.g. [4, §6.26.1] and satisfies the *Final Value Theorem* (see e.g. [4, Theorem 3.8.2]), our first contribution is to show that for every $y \in (0, +\infty)$ there exists $\lambda_y \in (0, +\infty)$ such that:

$$(1.3) \quad v(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda_y g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}.$$

That is, integrating f on K_y reduces to integrating f on the whole space \mathbb{R}^d but now against the measure with density $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \exp(-\lambda_y g(\mathbf{x}))$ with respect to Lebesgue

measure. Such integrals can be approximated, e.g. by cubatures [2, 3] whereas integration on the domain K_y can be quite complicated. In particular, if g is a quadratic polynomial then (1.3) is a Gaussian integral for which even more specific numerical approximations (e.g. cubatures) are available [9].

(ii) Next, if g (resp. f) is positively homogeneous of degree d_g (resp. d_f), then y and λ_y are related by

$$(1.4) \quad y \cdot \lambda_y = (\Gamma(1 + (d + d_f)/d_g))^{d_g/(d+d_f)},$$

for every $y \in (0, +\infty)$. In particular, let f be a polynomial ($\mathbf{x} \mapsto \sum_{\alpha} f_{\alpha} \mathbf{x}^{\alpha}$) of degree d_f , and write $f = \sum_{k=0}^{d_f} f_k$ where for each k , f_k homogeneous of degree k . Then for every $y \in (0, +\infty)$,

$$v(y) = \sum_{k=0}^{d_f} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_k(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda_{y,k} g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x},$$

where for every $k = 0, 1, \dots, d_f$,

$$\lambda_{y,k} = \frac{1}{y} (\Gamma(1 + (d + k)/d_g))^{d_g/(d+k)}, \quad y \in (0, +\infty).$$

(iii) Finally, we interpret (1.3) as a *duality* result, namely a duality analogue for integration (hence in the usual $(+, \times)$ -algebra) of *Lagrangian duality* for optimization (hence in the $(\max, +)$ -algebra). Indeed, associated with the optimization problem

$$(1.5) \quad \mathbf{P} : \hat{v}(y) = \inf \{ f(\mathbf{x}) : g(\mathbf{x}) \geq y \}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R},$$

is the Lagrangian $\mathbf{x} \mapsto L(\mathbf{x}, \lambda) := f(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda g(\mathbf{x})$. If f and $-g$ are convex then so is \hat{v} and its Legendre-Fenchel transform \hat{v}^* reads:

$$(1.6) \quad \hat{v}^*(\lambda) = \sup_y \lambda y - \hat{v}(y) = \begin{cases} -\inf_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda g(\mathbf{x}) & \text{if } \lambda \geq 0, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then applying Legendre-Fenchel to \hat{v}^* yields

$$(1.7) \quad \hat{v}(y) = \sup_{\lambda} \lambda y - \hat{v}^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda y + G(\lambda)$$

$$(1.8) \quad \text{with } G(\lambda) := \inf_{\mathbf{x}} L(\mathbf{x}, \lambda), \quad \lambda \geq 0.$$

Under some convexity assumptions on f and g , there exists a maximizer $\mathbf{x}_y \in K_y = \{\mathbf{x} : g(\mathbf{x}) \geq y\}$ and KKT-multiplier $\lambda_y^* \geq 0$ such that

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_y) - \lambda_y^* \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_y) = 0; \quad \lambda_y^* (g(\mathbf{x}_y) - y) = 0,$$

and so

$$(1.9) \quad v(y) = \lambda_y y + \inf_{\mathbf{x}} f(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda_y^* g(\mathbf{x}), \quad y \in (0, +\infty).$$

So the original minimization of f on K_y reduces to the minimization of the Lagrangian $L(\mathbf{x}, \lambda_y^*)$ now over the whole \mathbb{R}^d , for a distinguished value λ_y^* of the KKT-multiplier $\lambda \geq 0$ associated with the constraint $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq y$.

In particular, notice that if g (resp. f) is differentiable and positively homogeneous of degree d_g (resp. d_f) then using Euler's identity $\langle \mathbf{x}_y, \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_y) \rangle = d_f f(y)$ (resp. $\langle \mathbf{x}_y, \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_y) \rangle = d_g g(y)$) one obtains $\lambda_y \cdot y = \hat{v}(y) d_f/d_g$, to compare with (1.4).

- The analogue for integration of the Lagrangian $L(\mathbf{x}, \lambda)$ in (1.8) for optimization, is the “Lagrangian” integrand $\mathbf{x} \mapsto f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda g(\mathbf{x}))$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and
- the analogue of the dual function $G(\lambda)$ in (1.8) is just the integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}$ (where the “ $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ ” has been replaced with “ $\int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ ”).
- Finally, the analogue for integration of the Legendre-Fenchel transform (1.6) in optimization, is the Laplace transform

$$\mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda y) v(y) dy, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \Re(\lambda) > 0,$$

of v in (1.2), and the analogue of (1.7) is via the inverse Laplace transform

$$v(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} \exp(\lambda y) \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) d\lambda, \quad \forall y \in (0, +\infty),$$

(with $c > \Re a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{C}$).

Formal analogies between concepts in optimization and their counterparts in integration is not new and has been observed in a number of domains. For instance, *convolution* of Gaussian distributions in probability is the analogue of *inf-convolution* of quadratic forms in optimization. Similarly, concepts in probability have their counterparts in Dynamic Programming as outlined and described in [1, §9.4]. Finally for convex polytopes $K_y \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, in [6] one has shown *explicit* links between *integration* and *counting* on the one hand, and linear (LP) and integer programming (IP) on the other hand. In particular, classical LP ingredients (basis, reduced gradient, and dual vector) also appear explicitly in Brion & Vergne formula for integration and counting over convex polytopes; see [6].

The present contribution is also in the same spirit as in [6] and [7] but now for integration of a larger class of functions (continuous rather than linear in [6]) on a larger class of domains (K_y instead of convex polytopes in [6], or very specific domains in [7]). Indeed, an integration domain of the form $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : g_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq b_j, j = 1, \dots, m\}$ reduces to $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \max_j \tilde{g}_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1, j = 1, \dots, m\}$ with $\tilde{g}_j(\mathbf{x}) := g_j(\mathbf{x})/b_j$. Then one considers the set $K_y := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \max_j \tilde{g}_j(\mathbf{x}) \leq y\}$. (In particular notice that if the g_j 's are all positively homogeneous of degree d_g , then so is the function $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \max_j g_j(\mathbf{x})$.) Crucial in all the references [7, 6, 5] is to embed a specific integral on K_1 in a larger parametrized family of integrals on K_y , with values $v(y)$, $y \in (0, +\infty)$, and then apply the Laplace transform to v . This is exactly what is done in optimization on K_y where one applies the Legendre-Fenchel transform to the value function $\hat{v}(y)$ in (1.5). When the Laplace transform has a closed form expression then its inverse (e.g. for $y = 1$ to obtain $v(1)$) can sometimes be computed efficiently; see e.g. [7].

2. MAIN RESULT

2.1. Notation and definitions. Let $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}] = \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ be the ring of polynomials in the real variables x_1, \dots, x_d , of degree at most n . Denote by $\mathbb{R}_+ \subset \mathbb{R}$ the positive half-line. A function f is positively homogeneous of degree d_f if $f(\lambda \mathbf{x}) = \lambda^{d_f} f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and all $\lambda > 0$. When f is continuously differentiable, Euler's identity states that $\langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x} \rangle = d_f f(\mathbf{x})$, $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Laplace transform. For a function $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, its Laplace transform $\mathcal{L}_h : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, is defined by:

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{L}_h(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty h(y) \exp(-\lambda y) dy, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C},$$

provided that the integral is well-defined. For instance a sufficient condition is that h is of *exponential order* $\exp(at)$ ($a > 0$) as $t \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. there exists $T, M > 0$ such that for all $t > T$, $|h(t)| \leq M \exp(at)$; see e.g. [4, §3.3]. If h is continuous or piecewise continuous in every finite interval $(0, T)$, then \mathcal{L}_h exists for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Re s > a$. When it is the case then we can recover h via the inverse Laplace transform:

$$h(y) = \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} \exp(\lambda y) \mathcal{L}_h(\lambda) d\lambda, \quad y \in (0, +\infty),$$

where $c > a$. We also have the well-known *Initial Value Theorem* ([4, Theorem 3.8.1])

$$(2.2) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \mathcal{L}_h(\lambda) = \lim_{y \rightarrow 0} h(y),$$

and *Final Value Theorem*

$$(2.3) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda \mathcal{L}_h(\lambda) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} h(y).$$

The latter holds under additional assumptions; see [4, Theorem 3.8.2, pp. 110–112].

2.2. Main result.

Assumption 2.1. (i) *The function $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, nonnegative and the set K_y in (1.1) is compact for every $y \in [0, \infty)$.*

(ii) *The function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and nonnegative.*

Let $v : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be as in (1.2). Observe that if one knows how to evaluate $v(y)$ for continuous nonnegative functions, then we may also evaluate $v(y)$ for continuous functions bounded from below. Indeed if f is bounded below, say $f \geq \tau$ for some $\tau > -\infty$, then

$$v(y) = \int_{K_y} f d\mathbf{x} = \tau \int_{K_y} 1 d\mathbf{x} + \int_{K_y} (f - \tau) d\mathbf{x}$$

i.e. v is a weighted sum of two integrals of nonnegative functions (1 and $f - \tau$). Therefore it suffices to restrict to the family of nonnegative functions f .

Theorem 2.2. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold.*

(i) *With v as in (1.2), assume that v is of exponential order $\exp(at)$ for some $a > 0$. Then for every real $\lambda > 0$,*

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x},$$

(ii) *In addition, assume that the set $K_0 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : g(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$ has Lebesgue measure zero, and that the Final Value Theorem (2.3) holds. Then for every $y \in (0, +\infty)$, there exists $\lambda_y \in (0, +\infty)$ such that*

$$(2.5) \quad v(y) = \lambda_y \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda_y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda_y g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Similarly, for every $\lambda \in (0, +\infty)$ there exists $y_\lambda \in (0, +\infty)$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad v(y_\lambda) = \lambda \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Proof. (i) By [4, Theorem 3.31], \mathcal{L}_v exists for all λ provided that $\Re(\lambda) > a$. Next, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) &= \int_0^\infty v(y) \exp(-\lambda y) dy = \int_0^\infty \left(\int_{K_y} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right) \exp(-\lambda y) dy \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \left(\int_{g(\mathbf{x})}^\infty \exp(-\lambda y) dy \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}, \quad \forall \lambda > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (2.4). (The third equality is obtained by a standard Fubini-Tonelli interchange.)

(ii) In view of the assumptions on f and g , the function v is continuous and non decreasing, and the Initial Value Theorem (2.2) holds. Hence $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) = v(0) = 0$. Next, as the Final value Theorem holds we also have $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \lambda \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} v(y) =: v(\infty)$ with possibly $v(\infty) = +\infty$. Moreover, the function

$$\lambda \mapsto \lambda \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}, \quad \lambda \in (0, +\infty),$$

is continuous and therefore,

$$\lambda \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda)(0, +\infty) = (0, +\infty) = v((0, \infty)),$$

which yields the desired result (2.5) and (2.6). \square

Hence Theorem 2.2 states that for every $y \in (0, +\infty)$, integrating f on K_y w.r.t. Lebesgue measure is the same as integrating f on the whole space \mathbb{R}^d but now against the measure with density $\exp(-\lambda_y g(\mathbf{x}))$ w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, for some distinguished real scalar $\lambda_y \in (0, +\infty)$.

For a fixed λ , evaluating the integral $\int f \exp(-\lambda g) d\mathbf{x}$ is challenging but numerical approximations are available, e.g. via cubature formula for the weight function $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \exp(-\lambda_y g(\mathbf{x}))$; see e.g. [2, 3]. A prototypal and important case is when g is a (nonnegative) quadratic polynomial. Then the measure $\exp(-\lambda_y g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}$ is (up to scaling) a Gaussian measure for which numerical integration techniques are well documented; see e.g. [9].

Equation (2.5) is also the analogue for integration of the Lagrangian relaxation (1.9) in optimization, where under some convexity assumptions, the minimization of f on $K_y = \{\mathbf{x} : g(\mathbf{x}) \geq y\}$ is replaced with the minimization of the Lagrangian $\mathbf{x} \mapsto L(\mathbf{x}, \lambda_y^*) = \lambda_y^* g - f$ on the whole \mathbb{R}^d for some distinguished multiplier $\lambda_y^* \geq 0$. Indeed with y fixed, the KKT-optimality conditions at a local minimizer $\mathbf{x}^* \in K_y$ of \mathbf{P} state that there exists $\lambda_y^* \geq 0$ such that \mathbf{x}_y^* is a critical point of the Lagrangian $L(\mathbf{x}, \lambda_y^*)$; in addition, if f and $-g$ are convex then \mathbf{x}_y^* is a global minimizer of $L(\mathbf{x}, \lambda_y^*)$.

Next, with λ fixed and \mathcal{L}_v the Laplace transform of v ,

$$(2.7) \quad \lambda \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) = \int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda y) v(y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x},$$

is the counterpart for integration of the Legendre-Fenchel transform

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{v}^*(\lambda) &= \sup_y \lambda y - \hat{v}(y) = - \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) - \lambda g(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \lambda g(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}), \quad \lambda \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

for \hat{v} in (1.5).

In (2.7) “ $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}$ ” (infinitesimal sum) is the analogue of “ $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ ” in (2.8). So it is fair to consider the density $\mathbf{x} \mapsto f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda g(\mathbf{x}))$ w.r.t. Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d as the counterpart of the Lagrangian $\mathbf{x} \mapsto L(\mathbf{x}, \lambda)$ in optimization. Moreover, we call the distinguished scalar λ_y in Theorem 2.2 a “Laplace dual variable”, the exact analogue for integration of the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker Lagrange multiplier λ_y^* in (1.9) for optimization, associated with the constraint $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq y$.

These correspondences provide with an additional instance of formal analogies between duality in optimization and in integration via Fenchel and Laplace transforms respectively, in the spirit of those investigated in [6] for LP and Integer Programming on the one hand and linear integration and counting on the other hand.

However, so far Theorem 2.2 is only a qualitative result as it does not provide a clue on what is the scalar λ_y associated with $y \in (0, +\infty)$. We next address this issue under additional assumptions on f and g .

Corollary 2.3. *Let Assumption 2.1(i) holds. In addition let g (resp. f) be positively homogeneous of degree d_g (resp. d_f). Then with v as in (1.2):*

$$(2.9) \quad \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda^{1+(d+d_f)/d_g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x},$$

for all $\lambda \in (0, +\infty)$, and

$$(2.10) \quad v(y) = \frac{y^{(d+d_f)/d_g} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}}{\Gamma(1 + (d + d_f)/d_g)}$$

for all $y \in [0, +\infty)$. In addition, for every $y \in (0, +\infty)$,

$$(2.11) \quad v(y) = \lambda_y \cdot \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda_y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda_y g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x},$$

with $y \cdot \lambda_y = \Gamma(1 + (d + d_f)/d_g)^{d_g/(d+d_f)}$.

Proof. By (2.4) in Theorem 2.2(i), for every real scalar $\lambda > 0$ (and using that f, g are positively homogeneous),

$$\begin{aligned} L_v(\lambda) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}, \quad \Re(\lambda) > 0 \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^{1+(d+d_f)/d_g}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (2.9). On the other hand, as f and g are positively homogeneous, v is also positively homogeneous of degree $(d + d_f)/d_g$, and v being univariate,

$$\begin{aligned} v(y) &= y^{(d+d_f)/d_g} v(1) \Rightarrow \\ \mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) &= \frac{\Gamma(1 + (d + d_f)/d_g)}{\lambda^{1+(d+d_f)/d_g}} v(1), \quad \Re(\lambda) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce that $v(1)\Gamma(1 + (d + d_f)/d_g) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}$, and from which (2.10) follows. So with $y \in (0, +\infty)$,

$$\lambda_y L_v(\lambda_y) = v(y) \iff \lambda_y \cdot y = \Gamma(1 + (d + d_f)/d_g)^{d_g/(d+d_f)},$$

which yields (2.11). \square

So Corollary 2.3 identifies the Laplace (or “dual”) variable λ_y associated with each $y \in (0, +\infty)$, and such that integrating f on K_y reduced to integrating f on \mathbb{R}^d , but now against the measure with density $\exp(-\lambda_y g(\mathbf{x}))$ w.r.t. Lebesgue measure. Notice that if g is a nonnegative quadratic polynomial then this measure is a Gaussian measure (up to scaling by a constant).

Of course, in view of (2.10), to evaluate $v(y)$ is suffices to evaluate $v(1)$, or equivalently, to compute the single integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}$, which is quite a difficult task in general. However to approximate the integral, one may invoke numerical tools like cubatures for the weight function $\exp(-g(\mathbf{x}))$; see e.g. [2, 3]. An even more specific case is when g is a nonnegative quadratic form in which case one has to integrate f against a Gaussian measure for which several specialized procedures exist; see for instance some specific cubatures rules described in [9]. Notice also that in the particular case where $d + d_f = d_g$ then $\lambda_y \cdot y = 1$ and so $v(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})/y) d\mathbf{x}$ for all $y \in (0, +\infty)$.

Another interesting case is when f is a polynomial. Then write f as $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=0}^{d_f} f_k(\mathbf{x})$, where for each k , f_k is a homogeneous polynomial of degree k . Then in view of Corollary 2.3:

$$v(y) = \sum_{k=0}^{d_f} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_k(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\lambda_{y,k} g(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x}$$

with $\lambda_{y,k} = \Gamma(1 + (d + k)/d_g)^{d_g/(d+k)}/y$, for every $y \in (0, +\infty)$.

The case of the simplex. Let $\mathbf{e} := (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $K_y := \{\mathbf{x} \geq 0 : \mathbf{e}^T \mathbf{x} \leq y\}$ (a dilation of the canonical simplex). As one integrates over a subset of \mathbb{R}_+^d one may and will assume that $f(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Then

$$\mathcal{L}_v(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-\langle \lambda \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{x} \rangle) d\mathbf{x} = \mathcal{L}_f(\lambda \mathbf{e}),$$

where \mathcal{L}_f is the multivariate Laplace transform of f .

Then Theorem 2.2 states that under Assumption 2.1, for every $y \in (0, +\infty)$, there exists $\lambda_y \in (0, +\infty)$ such that $v(y) = \lambda_y \mathcal{L}_f(\lambda_y y)$, i.e., v is directly related to the Laplace transform \mathcal{L}_f of f , evaluated on the diagonal.

Mean Value Theorem. For the optimization problem \mathbf{P} in (1.5), in addition to the optimal value $\hat{v}(y)$, one is also interested in extracting a minimizer $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_y \in K_y$. The counterpart for integration of “extraction” of minimizer in optimization, is provided by the Mean Value Theorem. Indeed if f is continuous and K_y is compact then by the Mean Value Theorem (MVT), for every $y \in (0, +\infty)$, there exists $\mathbf{x}_y^* \in K_y$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad v(y) = \int_{K_y} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = f(\mathbf{x}_y^*) \text{vol}(K_y)$$

to compare with $\hat{v}(y) = f(\hat{\mathbf{x}}_y)$ for some $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_y \in K_y$ for the optimization problem (1.5). Clearly, as for the extraction of the minimizer $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_y$ in optimization, MVT “extracts” a distinguished point $\mathbf{x}_y^* \in K_y$ that “explains” $v(y)$. In the positively homogeneous case one may say more on \mathbf{x}_y^* .

Lemma 2.4. *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be nonnegative homogeneous of degree d_g and with $K_y \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ compact for every $y \in [0, \infty)$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and positively homogeneous of degree d_f . Then in (2.12) one may choose $\mathbf{x}_y^* := y^{1/d_g} \mathbf{x}_1^*$ for any $\mathbf{x}_1^* \in K_1$ (which satisfies (2.12) with $y = 1$).*

Proof. On the one hand, by Corollary 2.3

$$v(y) = \int_{K_y} f(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = \frac{y^{(d+d_f)/d_g} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})) \, d\mathbf{x}}{\Gamma(1 + (d + d_f)/d_g)},$$

while on the other hand, by the MVT, there exists $\mathbf{x}_y^* \in K_y$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} v(y) &= f(\mathbf{x}_y^*) \operatorname{vol}(K_y) = f(\mathbf{x}_y^*) y^{d/d_g} \operatorname{vol}(K_1) \\ &= f(\mathbf{x}_y^*) \frac{y^{d/d_g}}{\Gamma(1 + d/d_g)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})) \, d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\frac{f(\mathbf{x}_y^*) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})) \, d\mathbf{x}}{\Gamma(1 + d/d_g)} = \frac{y^{d_f/d_g} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(\mathbf{x}) \exp(-g(\mathbf{x})) \, d\mathbf{x}}{\Gamma(1 + (d + d_f)/d_g)},$$

that is,

$$f(\mathbf{x}_y^*) = y^{d_f/d_g} \frac{v(1)}{\operatorname{vol}(K_1)} = y^{d_f/d_g} f(\mathbf{x}_1^*) = f(y^{1/d_g} \mathbf{x}_1^*)$$

where we have used (2.12) with $y = 1$, and the fact that f is d_f -positively homogeneous. Hence one may indeed choose $\mathbf{x}_y^* := y^{1/d_g} \mathbf{x}_1^*$ because $g(\mathbf{x}_y^*) = g(y^{1/d_g} \mathbf{x}_1^*) = y g(\mathbf{x}_1^*) \leq y$ (as $g(\mathbf{x}_1^*) \leq 1$), and so $\mathbf{x}_y^* \in K_y$. \square

One has a similar result in homogeneous optimization. Indeed under the same assumptions of Lemma 2.4 (and also assuming continuously differentiability of f and g), consider any point $\mathbf{x}_1^* \in K_1$ of \mathbf{P} with $y = 1$, which satisfies the KKT-optimality conditions

$$\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_1^*) = \lambda_1 \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_1^*); \quad \lambda_1^*(1 - g(\mathbf{x}_1^*)) = 0,$$

for some $\lambda_1^* \geq 0$. Define $\mathbf{x}_y^* := y^{1/d_g} \mathbf{x}_1^*$ so that $g(\mathbf{x}_y^*) = y g(\mathbf{x}_1^*) \leq y$, which shows that $\mathbf{x}_y^* \in K_y$. Next, ∇f and ∇g are positively homogeneous of degree $d_f - 1$ and $d_g - 1$ respectively. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_y^*) = \nabla f(y^{1/d_g} \mathbf{x}_1^*) &= y^{(d_f-1)/d_g} \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_1^*) \\ &= y^{(d_f-1)/d_g} \lambda_1^* \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_1^*) \\ &= y^{(d_f-1)/d_g} \lambda_1^* \nabla g(y^{-1/d_g} \mathbf{x}_y^*) \\ &= y^{((d_f-1)-(d_g-1))/d_g} \lambda_1^* \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_y^*) \\ &= \underbrace{y^{(d_f-d_g)/d_g} \lambda_1^*}_{\lambda_y^*} \nabla g(\mathbf{x}_y^*). \end{aligned}$$

Hence with $\lambda_y^* := y^{(d_f-d_g)/d_g} \lambda_1^* \geq 0$, $\mathbf{x}_y^* \in K_y$ satisfies the KKT-optimality conditions of \mathbf{P} with $y \in (0, +\infty)$ because the complementary condition $\lambda_y^*(g(\mathbf{x}_y^*) - y) = 0$

is also satisfied (as $g(\mathbf{x}_1^*) = 1$ implies $g(\mathbf{x}_y^*) = y$). This also shows that the KKT-multiplier λ_y^* is a positively homogeneous function of degree $(d_f - d_g)/d_g$.

3. CONCLUSION

We have provided a Laplace duality framework for integrals on domains $K_y \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ parametrized by $y \in (0, +\infty)$. It mimics Legendre-Fenchel duality in optimization, and we have exhibited existence of a distinguished Laplace dual variable λ_y that permits to replace the initial integral on the compact domain K_y with an associated integral on the whole \mathbb{R}^d , with same value. In the homogeneous case one obtains an explicit expression of λ_y and it would be interesting to identify other cases where such an identification is possible because then, the original integral can be approximated, e.g., by cubatures for the integral on the whole \mathbb{R}^d with the identified specific exponential weight.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Bacelli, G. Cohen, G.J. Olsder, and J.P. Quadrat, *Synchronization and Linearity: An Algebra for Discrete Event Systems*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 1992
- [2] R. Cools, "An encyclopaedia of cubature formulas", *J. Complexity*, vol 19, no. 3, pp. 445–453, 2003
- [3] R. Cools, and A. Haegemans, "Algorithm 824: CUBPACK: A package for automatic cubature; framework description", *Trans. Math. Software*, vol 29, no. 3, pp. 287–296, 2003.
- [4] L. Debnath, *Integral Transforms and Their Applications*, CRC Press Inc., Boca Raton, Florida, 1995.
- [5] J.B. Lasserre, "A quick proof for the volume of n-balls", *Amer. Math. Monthly*, vol 108, pp. 768–769, 2001.
- [6] J.B. Lasserre, *Linear and Integer Programming versus Linear Integration and Counting*, Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering, Springer, New York, 2009.
- [7] J.B. Lasserre, and E.S. Zeron, "Solving a class of multivariable integration problems via Laplace Lechniques", *Appl. Math. (Warsaw)*, vol 28, pp. 391–405, 2001
- [8] J.B. Lasserre, and E.S. Zeron, "A Laplace transform algorithm for the volume of a convex polytope", *JACM*, vol 48, pp. 1126–1140, 2001.
- [9] R. Orive, J.C. Santos-Leon, and M.G. Spalevic, "Cubature formulae for Gaussian weight: Some old and new rules", *Elec. Trans. Num. Anal.*, vol 53, pp. 426–438, 2020
- [10] R. Serra, D. Arzelier, M. Joldes, J.B. Lasserre, A. Rondepierre, and B. Salvy, "Fast and Accurate Computation of Orbital Collision Probability for Short-Term Encounters", *J. Guidance, Control & Dynamics*, vol 39, pp. 1–13, 2016.

LAAS-CNRS AND TOULOUSE SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS (TSE), LAAS, 7 AVENUE DU COLONEL ROCHE, 31077 TOULOUSE CÉDEX 4, FRANCE, TEL: +33561336415

Email address: `lasserre@laas.fr`