From Super Poincaré to Weighted Log-Sobolev and Entropy-Cost Inequalities [*]

Feng-Yu Wang

School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

Present: Department of Mathematics, University of Swansea, Singleton Park, SA2 8PP, UK

November 19, 2018

Abstract

We derive weighted log-Sobolev inequalities from a class of super Poincaré inequalities. As an application, the Talagrand inequality with larger distances are obtained. In particular, on a complete connected Riemannian manifold, we prove that the $\log^\delta$-Sobolev inequality with $\delta \in (1,2)$ implies the $L^{2/(2-\delta)}$-transportation cost inequality

$$W^\rho_{2/(2-\delta)}(f\mu, \mu)^{2/(2-\delta)} \leq C\mu(f \log f), \quad \mu(f) = 1, f \geq 0$$

for some constant $C > 0$, and they are equivalent if the curvature of the corresponding generator is bounded below. Weighted log-Sobolev and entropy-cost inequalities are also derived for a large class of probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

1 Introduction

Let (E, ρ) be a Polish space and μ a probability measure on E. For $p \geq 1$ we define the L^p-Wasserstein distance (or the L^p-transportation cost) by

$$W^\rho_p(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \left\{ \inf_{\pi \in \mathscr{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{E \times E} \rho(x, y)^p \pi(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}y) \right\}^{1/p}$$

---

for probability measures μ_1, μ_2 on E, where $\mathscr{C}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is the class of probability measures on $E \times E$ with marginal distributions μ_1 and μ_2.

According to [4, Corollary 4],

$$W_p^\rho(f\mu, \mu)^{2p} \leq C\mu(f \log f), \quad f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1$$

holds for some $C > 0$ provided $\mu(e^{\lambda\rho(o,\cdot)^{2p}}) < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$, where $o \in E$ is a fixed point. See also [8] for $p = 1$. Furthermore, it is easy to derive from [14, Theorem 1.15] that for any $q \in [1, 2p)$, there exists $C > 0$ such that

(1.1)
$$W_q^\rho(f\mu, \mu)^{2p} \leq C\mu(f \log f), \quad f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1$$

if and only if $\mu(e^{\lambda\rho(o,\cdot)^{2p}}) < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$. In general, however, this concentration of μ does not imply (1.1) for $q = 2p$. Indeed, there exist a plentiful examples where $\mu(e^{\lambda\rho(o,\cdot)^2}) < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$ but there is no any constant $C > 0$ such that the Talagrand inequality

(1.2)
$$W_2^\rho(f\mu, \mu)^2 \leq C\mu(f \log f), \quad f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1$$

holds, see e.g. [1] for examples with $\mu(e^{\lambda\rho(o,\cdot)^2}) < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$ but the Poincaré inequality does not hold, which is weaker than (1.2) (see [17, Section 7] or [2, Section 4.1]).

Therefore, to derive (1.1) with $q = 2p$, one needs something stronger than the corresponding concentration of μ. In fact, it is now well known in the literature that, the Talagrand inequality follows from the log-Sobolev inequality for a class of local Dirichlet forms, see [21, 17, 2, 25, 20] and references within.

In this paper, we aim to derive (1.1) with $q = 2p$, i.e.

(1.3)
$$W_{2p}^\rho(f\mu, \mu)^{2p} \leq C\mu(f \log f), \quad f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1,$$

by using functional inequalities stronger than the log-Sobolev one.

To this end, in Section 2 we study the weighted log-Sobolev inequality

$$\mu(f^2 \log f^2) \leq C\mu(\alpha \circ \rho(o, \cdot)\Gamma(f, f)), \quad \mu(f^2) = 1$$

for a positive function $\alpha(r) \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$ and a nice square field Γ. Combining this with known results on log-Sobolev and the Talagrand inequality, we derive (1.2) with the original distance ρ replaced by a larger one, which is induced by the weighted square field $\alpha \circ \rho(o, \cdot)\Gamma$. In particular, we have the following result on a Riemannian manifold.

Let M be a connected complete Riemannian manifold, and $\mu(dx) = e^{V(x)}dx$ a probability measure on M for some $V \in C(M)$. We shall use the following super Poincaré inequality (see [23])

(1.4) $$\mu(f^2) \le r\mu(|\nabla f|^2) + \beta(r)\mu(|f|)^2, \quad r > 0$$

to establish the corresponding weighted log-Sobolev inequality

(1.5) $$\mu(f^2 \log f^2) \le C\mu(\alpha \circ \rho(o,\cdot)|\nabla f|^2), \quad \mu(f^2) = 1.$$

By [25, Theorem 1.1], (1.5) implies

(1.6) $$W_2^{\rho_\alpha}(f\mu,\mu)^2 \le C\mu(f \log f), \quad f \ge 0, \mu(f^2) = 1,$$

where ρ_α is the Riemannian distance induced by the metric

(1.7) $$\langle X, Y \rangle' := \frac{1}{\alpha \circ \rho(o,x)}\langle X, Y \rangle, \quad X, Y \in T_x M, \ x \in M.$$

The main result of the paper is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that (1.4) holds for some positive decreasing $\beta \in C((0,\infty))$ such that*

$$\eta(s) := \big(\log(2s)\big)\big(1 \wedge \beta^{-1}(s/2)\big), \quad s \ge 1$$

is bounded, where $\beta^{-1}(s) := \inf\{t \ge 0: \ \beta(t) \le s\}$. Then (1.5) holds for some $C > 0$ and

$$\alpha(s) := \sup_{t \ge \mu(\rho(o,\cdot) \ge s-2)^{-1}} \eta(t), \quad s \ge 0.$$

Consequently, (1.6) holds.

The following consequences show that the above result is sharp in specific situations.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $\delta \in (1,2)$.*
(a) (1.4) with $\beta(r) = \exp[c(1 + r^{-1/\delta})]$ implies (1.5) with

$$\alpha(s) := (1 + \rho(o,\cdot))^{-2(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)}$$

and (1.6) with $\rho_\alpha(x,y)$ replaced by

$$\rho(x,y)(1 + \rho(o,x) \vee \rho(o,y))^{(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)}.$$

Consequently, it implies

(1.8) $$W_{2/(2-\delta)}^{\rho}(f\mu,\mu)^{2/(2-\delta)} \le C\mu(f \log f), \quad \mu(f) = 1, f \ge 0$$

for some constant $C > 0$.
(b) If $V \in C^2(M)$ with $\mathrm{Ric} - \mathrm{Hess}_V$ bounded below, then the following are equivalent to each other:

3

(1) (1.4) with $\beta(r) = \exp[c(1 + r^{-1/\delta})]$ for some constant $c > 0$;

(2) (1.5) with $\alpha(s) := (1 + \rho(o, \cdot))^{-2(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)}$ for some $C > 0$;

(3) (1.6) for some $C > 0$ and $\rho_\alpha(x, y)$ replaced by $\rho(x, y)(1 + \rho(o, x) \vee \rho(o, y))^{(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)}$;

(4) (1.8) for some $C > 0$;

(5) $\mu(\exp[\lambda\rho(o, \cdot)^{2/(2-\delta)}]) < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$.

We remark that (1.4) with $\beta(r) = \exp[c(1 + r^{-1/\delta})]$ for some $c > 0$ is equivalent to the following $\log^\delta$-Sobolev inequality mentioned in the abstract (see [23, 24, 13, 26] for more general results on (1.4) and the F-Sobolev inequality)

$$\mu(f^2 \log^\delta(1 + f^2)) \leq C_1 \mu(|\nabla f|^2) + C_2, \quad \mu(f^2) = 1.$$

Since due to [24, Corollary 5.3] if (1.4) holds with $\beta(r) = \exp[c(1 + r^{-1/\delta})]$ for some $\delta > 2$ then M has to be compact, as a complement to Corollary 1.2 we consider the critical case $\delta = 2$ in the next Corollary.

Corollary 1.3. (1.4) with $\beta(r) = \exp[c(1 + r^{-1/2})]$ for some $c > 0$ implies (1.5) with $\alpha(s) := e^{-c_1 s}$ for some $c_1 > 0$ and (1.6) with $\rho_\alpha(x, y)$ replaced by

$$\rho(x, y) e^{c_2[\rho(o,x) \vee \rho(o,y)]} \geq e^{c_3 \rho(x,y)} - 1$$

for some $c_2, c_3 > 0$. If $\mathrm{Ric} - \mathrm{Hess}_V$ is bounded below, they are all equivalent to the concentration $\mu(\exp[e^{\lambda\rho(o,\cdot)}]) < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$.

Example 1.1. Let Ric be bounded below. Let $V \in C(M)$ be such that $V + a\rho(o, \cdot)^\theta$ is bounded for some $a > 0$ and $\theta \geq 2$. By [23, Corollaries 2.5 and 3.3], (1.4) holds for $\delta = 2(\theta - 1)/\theta$. Then Corollary 1.2 implies

$$W_\theta^\rho(f\mu, \mu)^\theta \leq C\mu(f \log f), \quad f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1$$

for some constant $C > 0$.

In this inequality θ could not be replaced by any larger number, since $W_\theta^\rho \geq W_1^\rho$ and by Proposition 3.1 below for any $p \geq 1$ the inequality

$$W_1^\rho(f\mu, \mu)^p \leq C\mu(f \log f), \quad f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1$$

implies $\mu(e^{\lambda\rho(o,\cdot)^p}) < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$, which fails when $p > \theta$ for μ specified above.

Example 1.2. In the situation of Example 1.1 but let $V + \exp[\sigma\rho(o, \cdot)]$ be bounded for some $\sigma > 0$. Then by [23, Corollaries 2.5 and 3.3], (1.4) holds with $\beta(r) = \exp[c(1+r^{-1/2})]$ for some $c > 0$. Hence, by Corollary 1.3,

$$(1.9) \qquad \inf_{\pi \in \mathscr{C}(\mu, f\mu)} \int_{M \times M} \rho(x,y)^2 e^{c_1\rho(x,y)} \pi(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}y) \le C\mu(f \log f), \quad f \ge 0, \mu(f) = 1$$

holds for some $c_1, C > 0$.

On the other hand, it is easy to see from Jensen's inequality that the left hand side is larger than

$$(\exp[c_2 W_1^\rho(\mu, f\mu)] - 1)^2$$

for some $c_2 > 0$. So, by Proposition 3.1 below (1.9) implies $\mu(\exp[\exp(\lambda\rho(o, \cdot))]) < \infty$ holds for any $\lambda > 0$, which is the exact concentration property of the given measure μ.

In the next section we study the super Poincaré and the weighted log-Sobolev inequality in an abstract framework, and complete proofs of the above results are presented in Section 3. Finally, weighted log-Sobolev and transportation cost inequalities are also studied for probability measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$ by using concentrations.

2 From super Poincaré to weighted log-Sobolev inequalities

We shall work with a diffusion framework as in [1]. Let $(E, \mathscr{F}, \mu)$ be a separable complete probability space, and let $(\mathscr{E}, \mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E}))$ be a conservative symmetric local Dirichlet form on $L^2(\mu)$ with domain $\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E})$ in the following sense. Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a dense subspace of $\mathscr{D}(\mathscr{E})$ under the $\mathscr{E}_1^{1/2}$-norm ($\mathscr{E}_1(f, f) = \|f\|_2^2 + \mathscr{E}(f, f)$) which is composed of bounded functions, stable under products and composition with Lipschitz functions on $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\Gamma : \mathscr{A} \times \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{M}_b$ be a bilinear mapping, where $\mathscr{M}_b$ is the set of all bounded measurable functions on E, such that

(1) $\Gamma(f, f) \ge 0$ and $\mathscr{E}(f, g) = \mu(\Gamma(f, g))$ for $f, g \in \mathscr{A}$;
(2) $\Gamma(\phi \circ f, g) = \phi'(f)\Gamma(f, g)$ for $f, g \in \mathscr{A}$ and $\phi \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R})$;
(3) $\Gamma(fg, h) = g\Gamma(f, h) + f\Gamma(g, h)$ for $f, g, h \in \mathscr{A}$ with $fg \in \mathscr{A}$.

It is easy to see that the positivity and the bilinear property imply $\Gamma(f, g)^2 \le \Gamma(f, f)\Gamma(g, g)$ for all $f, g \in \mathscr{A}$. For simplicity we set below $\Gamma(f, f) = \Gamma(f)$ and $\mathscr{E}(f, f) = \mathscr{E}(f)$.

We shall denote by $\mathscr{A}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ the set of functions f such that for any integer n, the truncated function $f_n = \min(n, \max(f, -n))$ is in $\mathscr{A}$. For such functions, the bilinear map Γ automatically extends and shares the same properties than for functions in $\mathscr{A}$.

Next, let $\varrho \in \mathscr{A}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ be positive such that $\Gamma(\varrho, \varrho) \le 1$. We shall start from the super Poincaré inequality

$$(2.1) \qquad\qquad \mu(f^2) \le r\mathscr{E}(f,f) + \beta(r)\mu(|f|)^2, \quad r > 0.$$

To derive the desired weighted log-Sobolev inequality

$$(2.2) \qquad\qquad \mu(f^2 \log f^2) \le C\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho), \quad \mu(f^2) = 1,$$

we shall also need the following Poincaré inequality

$$(2.3) \qquad\qquad \mu(f^2) \le C_0\mathscr{E}(f,f) + \mu(f)^2$$

for some $C_0 > 0$. Here and in what follows, the reference function f is taken from $\mathscr{A}$.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume (2.3) holds for some $C_0 > 0$. Then (2.1) implies (2.2) for some constant $C > 0$ and α given in Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. (a) Let $\Phi(s) = \mu(\varrho \ge s)$ which decreases to zero as $s \to \infty$. We may take $r_0 > 0$ such that

$$(2.4) \qquad\qquad r_0(1 + \sup_{s \ge 1} \eta(s)) \le \frac{1}{32}$$

and

$$(2.5) \qquad\qquad \beta^{-1}(e^{r_0^{-1}}/4) \le 1.$$

For a fixed number $r \in (0, r_0]$ we define

$$h_n = \big((\varrho - \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}) - n)_+ \wedge 1\big)\big((n+2+\Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}) - \varrho)_+ \wedge 1\big),$$
$$\delta_n = \Big(\log \frac{2}{\Phi(n+\Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}))}\Big)\beta^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{2\Phi(n+\Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}))}\Big),$$
$$B_n = \{n \le \varrho - \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}) \le n+2\}, \quad n \ge 0.$$

Then

$$(2.6) \qquad\qquad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} h_n^2 \ge \frac{1}{2}1_{\{\rho \ge 1 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}})\}}.$$

By (2.1) and noting that

6

$$\mu(|f|h_n)^2 \le \mu(f^2h_n^2)\mu(\varrho > n + \Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}})) \le \mu(f^2h_n^2)\Phi(n + \Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}})),$$

we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\mu(f^2h_n^2) \le \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left\{r_n\mu\big(\Gamma(fh_n, fh_n)\big) + \beta(r_n)\mu(|f|h_n)^2\right\}$$

$$\le \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left\{\frac{2r_n}{\delta_n}\mu(\Gamma(f, f)\delta_n 1_{B_n}) + 2r_n\mu(f^2 1_{B_n}) + \beta(r_n)\Phi(n + \Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}}))\mu(f^2h_n^2)\right\}$$

for $r_n > 0$. Since by (2.5) and the definition of α

$$\alpha(s) \ge \delta_n \text{ for } s \ge n + 2 + \Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}}),$$

letting $r_n = \delta_n r$ we obtain

(2.7)
$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\mu(f^2h_n^2) \le \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left\{2r\mu(\Gamma(f, f)\alpha \circ \varrho 1_{B_n}) + 2r\delta_n\mu(f^2 1_{B_n})\right.$$
$$\left. + \beta(r\delta_n)\Phi(n + \Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}}))\mu(f^2h_n^2)\right\}.$$

Noting that

$$A := r\log\frac{2}{\Phi(n + \Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}}))} \ge r\log\frac{2}{\Phi(\Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}}))} = 1,$$

we have

$$\beta(\delta_n r) = \beta\left(A\beta^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2\Phi(n + \Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}}))}\right)\right) \le \frac{1}{2\Phi(n + \Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}}))}.$$

Thus, by (2.7) and (2.4) and the fact that $\delta_n \le \sup\eta$, we arrive at

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\mu(f^2h_n^2) \le \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\left\{2r\mu(\Gamma(f, f)\alpha \circ \varrho 1_{B_n}) + \frac{1}{8}\mu(f^2) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\mu(f^2h_n^2)\right.$$

It follows from this and (2.6) that

(2.8)
$$\mu(f^2 1_{\{\varrho \ge 1 + \Phi^{-1}(2\mathrm{e}^{-r^{-1}})\}}) \le 8r\mu(\Gamma(f, f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + \frac{1}{2}\mu(f^2).$$

(b) On the other hand, since α is decreasing

$$\mu(f^2 1_{\{\varrho \le 1 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}})\}}) \le \mu(f^2\{(2 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}) - \varrho)_+^2 \wedge 1\})$$
$$\le 2s\mu(\Gamma(f,f)1_{\{\varrho \le 2 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}})\}}) + 2s\mu(f^2) + \beta(s)\mu(|f|)^2$$
$$\le \frac{2s}{\alpha(2 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}))}\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + 2s\mu(f^2) + \beta(s)\mu(|f|)^2, \quad s > 0.$$

Taking

$$s = r\alpha(2 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}})) \le \frac{1}{32}$$

due to (2.4), we obtain

$$\mu(f^2 1_{\{\varrho \le 1 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}})\}}) \le 2r\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + \frac{1}{16}\mu(f^2) + \beta\big(r\alpha(2 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}))\big)\mu(|f|)^2.$$

Since by (2.5) and the definition of α

$$r\alpha\big(2 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}})\big) \ge \Big(r\log\frac{2}{\Phi(\Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}))}\Big)\beta^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{2\Phi(\Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}}))}\Big)$$
$$= \beta^{-1}\Big(\frac{e^{r^{-1}}}{4}\Big),$$

we obtain

$$\mu(f^2 1_{\{\varrho \le 1 + \Phi^{-1}(2e^{-r^{-1}})\}}) \le 2r\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + \frac{1}{16}\mu(f^2) + \frac{e^{r^{-1}}}{4}\mu(|f|)^2.$$

Combining this with (2.8) we conclude that

$$\mu(f^2) \le 40r\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + e^{r^{-1}}\mu(|f|)^2, \quad r \in (0, r_0].$$

Therefore, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

(2.9) $$\mu(f^2) \le r\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + e^{c(1+r^{-1})}\mu(|f|)^2, \quad r > 0.$$

According to e.g. [24, Corollary 1.3], this is equivalent to the defective weighted log-Sobolev inequality

(2.10) $$\mu(f^2 \log f^2) \le C_1\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + C_2, \quad \mu(f^2) = 1.$$

(c) Finally, for any f with $\mu(f) = 0$, it follows from (2.3) that

$$\mu(f^2) \leq \mu(f^2\{(1 + R - \varrho)_+^2 \wedge 1\}) + \|f\|_\infty^2 \mu(\varrho \geq R)$$
$$\leq 2C_0\mu(\Gamma(f,f)1_{\{\varrho \leq 1+R\}}) + (2C_0 + 1)\|f\|_\infty^2 \mu(\varrho \geq R) + \mu(f\{(\varrho - R)_+ \wedge 1\})^2$$
$$\leq \frac{2C_0}{\alpha(1+R)}\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + 2(C_0 + 1)\|f\|_\infty^2 \mu(\varrho \geq R), \quad R > 0.$$

Since $\mu(\varrho \geq R) \to 0$ as $R \to \infty$, the weighted weak Poincaré inequality

$$\mu(f^2) \leq \tilde{\beta}(r)\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + r\|f\|_\infty^2, \quad r > 0, \mu(f) = 0$$

holds for some positive function $\tilde{\beta}$ on $(0, \infty)$. By [19, Propsosition 1.3], this and (2.9) implies the weighted Poincaré inequality

$$\mu(f^2) \leq C'\mu(\Gamma(f,f)\alpha \circ \varrho) + \mu(f)^2$$

for some constant $C' > 0$. Combining this with (2.10) we obtain the desired weighted log-Sobolev inequality (2.2). $\qquad\square$

3   Proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Corollaries

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Since α is bounded, the completeness of the original metric implies that of the weighted one given by (1.7). So, (1.6) follows from (1.5) due to [25, Theorem 1.1] with $p \to 2$. Thus, by Theorem 2.1 with $E = M$ and $\Gamma(f,f) = |\nabla f|^2$, it suffices to prove that (1.4) implies the Poincaré inequality (2.3) for some $C_0 > 0$. Due to [23] the super Poincaré inequality (1.4) implies that the spectrum of L is discrete. Moreover, since M is connected, the corresponding Dirichlet form is irreducible so that 0 is a simple eigenvalue. Therefore, L possesses a spectral gap, which is equivalent to the desired Poincaré inequality. $\qquad\square$

To complete the proof of Corollary 1.2, in the spirit of [16, 3] we introduce below a deviation inequality induced by the L^1-transportation cost inequality.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\tilde{\rho} : M \times M \to [0, \infty)$ be measurable. For any $r > 0$ and measurable set $A \subset M$ with $\mu(A) > 0$, let*

$$A_r = \{x \in M : \tilde{\rho}(x, y) \geq r \text{ for some } y \in A\}, \quad r > 0.$$

If

(3.1) $$W_1^{\tilde{\rho}}(f\mu, \mu) \leq \Phi \circ \mu(f \log f), \quad f \geq 0, \mu(f) = 1$$

holds for some positive increasing $\Phi \in C([0, \infty))$, then

9

$$(3.2) \qquad \mu(A_r) \le \exp\big[-\Phi^{-1}(r - \Phi \circ \log \mu(A)^{-1})\big], \quad r > \Phi \circ \log \mu(A)^{-1},$$

where $\Phi^{-1}(r) := \inf\{s \ge 0 : \Phi(s) \ge r\}$, $r \ge 0$.

Proof. It suffices to prove for $\mu(A_r) > 0$. In this case, letting $\mu_A = \mu(\cdot \cap A)/\mu(A)$ and $\mu_{A_r} = \mu(\cdot \cap A_r)/\mu(A_r)$, we obtain from (3.1) that

$$r \le W_1^{\tilde\rho}(\mu_A, \mu_{A_r}) \le W_1^{\tilde\rho}(\mu_A, \mu) + W_1^{\tilde\rho}(\mu_{A_r}, \mu) \le \Phi \circ \log \mu(A)^{-1} + \Phi \circ \log \mu(A_r)^{-1}.$$

This completes the proof. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.2. (a) Let $\beta(r) = e^{c(1+r^{-1/\delta})}$ for some $c > 0$ and $\delta > 1$. It is easy to see that

$$1 \wedge \beta^{-1}(s/2) \le c_1 \log^{-\delta}(2s), \quad s \ge 1$$

holds for some constant $c_1 > 0$. Next, by [24, Corollary 5.3], (1.4) with this specific function β implies

$$\mu(\rho(o, \cdot) \ge s - 2) \le c_2 \exp[-c_3 s^{2/(2-\delta)}], \quad s \ge 0$$

for some constants $c_2, c_3 > 0$. Therefore,

$$(3.3) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \alpha(s) \le c_4(1+s)^{-2(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)}, \quad s \ge 0$$

holds for some constant $c_4 > 0$.

On the other hand, for any $x_1, x_2 \in M$ let $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $\rho(o, x_i) = \rho(o, x_1) \vee \rho(o, x_2)$. Define

$$f(x) = \big(\rho(x, x_i) \wedge \frac{\rho(o, x_i)}{2}\big)(1 + \rho(o, x_i))^{(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then

$$\alpha \circ \rho(o, \cdot)|\nabla f|^2 \le c_4(1 + \rho(o, \cdot))^{-2(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)}|\nabla f|^2$$
$$\le c_4 \mathbf{1}_{\{\rho(o,x_i)/2 \le \rho(o,\cdot) \le 3\rho(o,x_i)/2\}}(1 + \rho(o, \cdot))^{-2(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)}(1 + \rho(o, x_i))^{2(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)} \le c_5$$

for some constant $c_5 > 0$. Since by the triangle inequality $\rho(o, x_i) \ge \frac{1}{2}\rho(x_1, x_2)$, this implies that the intrinsic distance ρ_α satisfies

$$\rho_\alpha(x_1, x_2)^2 \ge \frac{|f(x_1) - f(x_2)|^2}{c_5}$$
$$\ge c_6 \rho(x_1, x_2)^2(1 + \rho(o, x_1) \vee \rho(o, x_2))^{2(\delta-1)/(2-\delta)} \ge c_7 \rho(x_1, x_2)^{2/(2-\delta)}$$

10

for some constant $c_6, c_7 > 0$. Hence the proof of (a) is completed by Theorem 1.1.

(b) Now, assume that

$$\mathrm{Ric} - \mathrm{Hess}_V \geq -K$$

for some $K \geq 0$. By (a) and Proposition 3.1, which ensures the implication from (4) to (5), it suffices to deduce (1) from (5). Let

$$h(r) = \mu(e^{r\rho(o,\cdot)^2}), \quad r > 0.$$

By [24, Theorem 5.7], the super Poincaré inequality (1.4) holds with

$$(3.4) \qquad \beta(r) := c_0 \inf_{0 < r_1 < r} r_1 \inf_{s > 0} \frac{1}{s} h(2K + 12s^{-1}) e^{s/r_1 - 1}, \quad r > 0$$

for some constant $c_0 > 0$. Since for any $\lambda > 0$ there exists $c(\lambda) > 0$ such that

$$rt^2 \leq \lambda t^{2/(2-\delta)} + c(\lambda) r^{1/(\delta-1)}, \quad r > 0,$$

it follows from (5) that

$$h(r) \leq c_1 \exp[c_1 r^{1/(\delta-1)}], \quad r > 0$$

for some constants $c_1 > 0$. Therefore,

$$\beta(r) \leq c_2 \inf_{0 < r_1 < r} r_1 \inf_{s > 0} \frac{1}{s} \exp[c_2 s^{-1/(\delta-1)} + s/r_1], \quad r > 0$$

for some $c_2 > 0$. Taking $s = r^{(\delta-1)/\delta}$ and $r_1 = r$, we conclude that

$$\beta(r) \leq e^{c(1+r^{-1/\delta})}, \quad r > 0$$

for some $c > 0$. Thus, (1) holds. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Corollary 1.3. The proof is similar to that of Corollary 1.2 by noting that (1.4) with $\beta(r) = \exp[c(1+r^{-1/2})]$ implies $\mu(\rho(o,\cdot) \geq s) \leq \exp[-ce^{c_1 s}]$ for some $c_1 > 0$, see [24, Corollary 5.3]. $\qquad\square$

4   Weighted log-Sobolev and transportation cost inequalities on $\mathbb{R}^d$

Our main purpose of this section is to establish the weighted log-Sobolev inequality for an arbitrary probability measure using the concentration of this measure. We shall also prove the HWI inequality introduced in [2] for the corresponding weighted Dirichlet form. The main point is to find square fields (resp. cost functions) for a given probability measure to satisfy the log-Sobolev inequality (resp. the Talagrand transportation cost inequality).

So, the line of our study is exactly opposed to existed references in the literature, see e.g. [9, 10, 11] and references within, which provided conditions on the reference measure such that the log-Sobolev (resp. transportation cost) inequality holds for a given square field (resp. the corresponding cost function).

The basic idea of the study comes from Caffarelli [5] which says that for any probability measure $\mu(\mathrm{d}x) := \mathrm{e}^{V(x)}\mathrm{d}x$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a convex function ψ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\nabla\psi$ pushes μ forward to the standard Gaussian measure γ; that is, letting

$$y(x) := \nabla\psi(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

which is one-to-one, one has $\gamma = \mu \circ y^{-1}$. Furthermore, $\nabla\psi$ is uniquely determined and Hess_ψ is non-degenerate with

$$\det(\mathrm{Hess}_\psi) = (2\pi)^{d/2}\mathrm{e}^{V+|\nabla\psi|^2/2}.$$

Let

$$\rho(x_1, x_2) := |y(x_1) - y(x_2)|, \quad x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Let W_2 be the L^2-Wasserstein distance induced by the usual Euclidiean metric. Due to Talagrand [21]

(4.1) $$W_2(\gamma, f^2\gamma)^2 \le 2\gamma(f^2 \log f^2), \quad \gamma(f^2) = 1.$$

Since $\pi \in \mathscr{C}(\mu \circ y^{-1}, (f^2 \circ y^{-1})\mu \circ y^{-1})$ if and only if $\pi \circ (y \otimes y) \in \mathscr{C}(\mu, f^2\mu)$, we obtain from (4.1) and the change of variables theorem that

$$W_2^\rho(\mu, f^2\mu)^2 = W_2(\gamma, (f^2 \circ y^{-1})\gamma)^2 \le 2\gamma(f^2 \circ y^{-1} \log f^2 \circ y^{-1}) = 2\mu(f^2 \log f^2), \quad \mu(f^2) = 1.$$

Similarly, since

$$\nabla(f \circ y^{-1}) = (Dy^{-1})(\nabla f) \circ y^{-1} = [(Dy) \circ y^{-1}]^{-1}(\nabla f) \circ y^{-1} = [(\mathrm{Hess}_\psi)^{-1}\nabla f] \circ y^{-1},$$

where $Dy := (\partial_i y_j)_{d \times d}$, by Gross' log-Sobolev inequality for γ (see [12]) we obtain

$$\mu(f^2 \log f^2) \le 2\mu(|(\mathrm{Hess}_\psi)^{-1}\nabla f|^2), \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \mu(f^2) = 1.$$

On the other hand, however, since the transportation $\nabla\psi$ is normally inexplicit, it is hard to estimate the distance ρ and the matrix Hess_ψ. So, to derive transportation and log-Sobolev inequalities with explicit distances and Dirichlet forms, we shall construct, instead of $\nabla\psi$, an explicit map using the concentration of μ, which transports the measure into the standard Gaussian measure with a perturbation. In many cases this perturbation is bounded and hence, does not make much trouble to derive the desired inequalities.

4.1 Main results

In this subsection we provide an explicit positive function α and an explicit distance ρ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that the log-Sobolev inequality

$$(4.2) \qquad \mu(f^2 \log f^2) \leq 2\mu(\alpha |\nabla f|^2), \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \ \mu(f^2) = 1$$

and the transportation-cost inequality

$$(4.3) \qquad W_2^\rho(\mu, f^2 \mu)^2 \leq 2\mu(f^2 \log f^2), \quad \mu(f^2) = 1$$

hold. In a special case, we are also able to present the HWI inequality stronger than (4.2).

Let us first consider a probability measure $\mu(\mathrm{d}x) := \mathrm{e}^{V(x)}\mathrm{d}x$ on $[\delta, \infty)$ for some $\delta \in [-\infty, \infty)$, where $[-\infty, \infty)$ is regarded as $\mathbb{R}$. Let

$$\Phi_\delta(r) := \frac{1}{c_\delta} \int_\delta^r \mathrm{e}^{-s^2/2}\mathrm{d}s, \quad \varphi(r) := \mu([\delta, r)) = \int_\delta^r \mathrm{e}^{V(x)}\mathrm{d}x, \quad r \geq \delta,$$

where $c_\delta := \int_\delta^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-x^2/2}\mathrm{d}x$ is the normalization.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mu(\mathrm{d}x) := 1_{[\delta,\infty)}(x)\mathrm{e}^{V(x)}\mathrm{d}x$ be a probability measure on $[\delta, \infty)$. For the above defined Φ_δ and φ, (4.2) and (4.3) hold with $\mathbb{R}^d$ replaced by $[\delta, \infty)$ for*

$$\alpha := \left(\frac{\Phi_\delta' \circ \Phi_\delta^{-1} \circ \varphi}{\varphi'} \right)^2,$$
$$\rho(x, y) := |\Phi_\delta^{-1} \circ \varphi(x) - \Phi_\delta^{-1} \circ \varphi(y)|, \quad x, y \geq \delta.$$

Furthermore,

$$(4.4) \ \ \mu(f^2 \log f^2) + W_2^\rho(\mu, f^2\mu)^2 \leq 2\sqrt{2\mu(\alpha f'^2)}W_2^\rho(\mu, f^2\mu), \quad f \in C_0^\infty([\delta, \infty)), \mu(f^2) = 1.$$

The inequality (4.4), linking the Wasserstein distance, the relative entropy and the energy, is called the HWI inequality in [2] and [18].

To extend this result to $\mathbb{R}^d$ for $d \geq 2$, we consider the polar coordinate $(r, \theta) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, where $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ is the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the induced metric. Then μ can be represented as

$$\mathrm{d}\mu = c(d)r^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{V(r\theta)}\mathrm{d}r\mathrm{d}\theta =: G(r, \theta)\mathrm{d}r\mathrm{d}\theta,$$

where $\mathrm{d}\theta$ is the normalized volume measure on $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, and $c(d)/d$ equals to the volume of the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $B(0, r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x| < r\}$ and

$$\Phi_0(r) := \int_{B(0,r)} \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-|x|^2/2}\mathrm{d}x}{(2\pi)^{d/2}}, \quad r \ge 0,$$

$$h(\theta) := \int_0^\infty s^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{V(s\theta)}\mathrm{d}s, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1},$$

$$\varphi_\theta(r) := \frac{1}{h(\theta)} \int_0^r s^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{V(s\theta)}\mathrm{d}s, \quad \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, r \ge 0.$$

Since $\mu(\mathbb{R}^d) = 1$, we have $h(\theta) \in (0, \infty)$ for a.e. $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

We shall prove that the map

$$x \mapsto \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_{\frac{x}{|x|}}(|x|)\frac{x}{|x|}$$

transports μ into a Gaussian measure with density $h \circ \theta$. Thus, to derive the desired inequalities for μ, we need a regularity property of this transportation specified in the following result.

Theorem 4.2. *Let* $r(x) := |x|, \theta(x) := \frac{x}{|x|}, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. *If* $C(h) := \sup_{\theta_1,\theta_2\in\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \frac{h(\theta_1)}{h(\theta_2)} < \infty$, *then* (4.3) *holds for*

$$\rho(x_1, x_2) := C(h)^{-1/2}|(\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r)\theta)(x_1) - (\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r)\theta)(x_2)|, \quad x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

If moreover $\varphi_\theta(r)$ *is differentiable in* θ *then* (4.2) *holds for*

$$\alpha := C(h) \inf_{\varepsilon>0} \max \left\{ \frac{(1+\varepsilon)r^2}{(\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2}, \frac{(\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2}{(\varphi_\theta'(r))^2} + \frac{(1+\varepsilon^{-1})|\nabla_\theta\varphi_\theta(r)|^2}{(\varphi_\theta'(r)\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2} \right\}.$$

If, in particular, h *is constant (it is the case if* $V(x)$ *depends only on* $|x|$), *then the following HWI inequality holds:*

(4.5) $\mu(f^2 \log f^2)+W_2^\rho(\mu, f^2\mu)^2 \le 2\sqrt{2\mu(\alpha|\nabla f|^2)}\,W_2^\rho(\mu, f^2\mu), \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \mu(f^2) = 1,$

for

$$\alpha := \max \left\{ \frac{r^2}{(\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi(r))^2}, \frac{(\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi(r))^2}{(\varphi'(r))^2} \right\}$$

and $\varphi = \varphi_\theta$ *is independent of* θ.

Note that if V is locally bounded and $\zeta(r) := \sup_{|x|=r} V(x)$ satisfies $\int_0^\infty r^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{\zeta(r)}\mathrm{d}r < \infty$, then $C(h) < \infty$. Thus, Theorem 4.2 applies to a large number of probability measures. In particular, we have the following concrete result.

14

Corollary 4.3. *Let V be differentiable such that $\mu(\mathrm{d}x) := \mathrm{e}^{V(x)} \, \mathrm{d}x$ is a probability measure and*

$$(4.6) \qquad -c_1|x|^{\delta-1} \le \langle \nabla V(x), \nabla|x| \rangle \le -c_2|x|^{\delta-1}$$

holds for some constants $\delta, c_1, c_2 > 0$ and large $|x|$. If there exists a constant $c_3 > 0$ such that

$$(4.7) \qquad |\nabla_\theta V| \le c_3,$$

where ∇_θ is the gradient on $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ at point θ, then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$(4.8) \qquad \mu(f^2 \log f^2) \le c\mu((1 + |\cdot|)^{2-\delta}|\nabla f|^2), \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \mu(f^2) = 1.$$

Consequently,

$$(4.9) \qquad W_2^{\tilde{\rho}}(\mu, f^2\mu)^2 \le c'\mu(f^2 \log f^2), \quad \mu(f^2) = 1$$

holds for some constant $c' > 0$ and

$$\tilde{\rho}(x, y) := \frac{|x - y|}{(1 + |x| \vee |y|)^{1-\delta/2}}, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Remark. (a) The inequalities presented in Corollary 4.3 are sharp in the sense that (4.9) (and hence also (4.8)) implies $\mu(\mathrm{e}^{\lambda r^\delta}) < \infty$ for some $\lambda > 0$, which is the exact concentration of μ. This follows from [3, Corollary 3.2] and the fact that $\tilde{\rho}(0, x) \approx |x|^{\delta/2}$ for large $|x|$.

(b) When V is strictly concave, the matrix

$$\Lambda[v_1, v_2] := \int_0^1 s(-\mathrm{Hess}_V)((1 - s)v_1 + sv_2)\mathrm{d}s$$

is strictly positive definite for any $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. It is proved by Kolesnikov (see [15, Corollary 3.1]) that

$$(4.10) \qquad \mu(f^2 \log f^2) \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle \Lambda[T_f, \cdot]^{-1}\nabla f, \nabla f\rangle\mathrm{d}\mu, \quad f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \mu(f^2) = 1,$$

where $x \mapsto T_f(x)$ is the optimal transport of $f^2\mu$ to μ. In particular, for $V(x) := -|x|^\delta + c$ with $\delta > 2$ and a constant c, [15, Example 3.2] implies (4.8) for even smooth function f^2. But Corollary 4.3 works for more general V and all smooth function f.

(c) Recently, Gentil, Guillin and Miclo [9] (see [10, 11] for further study) established a Talagrand type inequality for $V(x) = -|x|^\delta + c$ with $\delta \in [1, 2]$ and a constant c. Precisely, there exist constants $a, D > 0$ such that

$$(4.11) \qquad \inf_{\pi \in \mathscr{C}(\mu, f^2 \mu)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} L_{a,D}(x - y) \pi(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}y) \leq D\mu(f^2 \log f^2), \qquad \mu(f^2) = 1,$$

where

$$L_{a,D}(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{|x|^2}{2}, & \text{if } |x| \leq a, \\ \frac{a^{2-\delta}}{\delta}|x|^\delta + \frac{a^2(\delta-2)}{2\delta}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $L_{a,D}(x - y) \geq \varepsilon \tilde{\rho}(x, y)^2$ for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$, this inequality implies (4.9) for $\delta \in [1, 2]$. But (4.11) is yet unavailable for $\delta \notin [1, 2]$ while (4.9) holds for more general V. In particular, if $\delta > 2$ then (4.9) with $\tilde{\rho}(x, y) \geq c(|x - y| \vee |x - y|^{\delta/2})$ for some $c > 0$, which is new in the literature.

4.2 Proofs

We first briefly prove for the one-dimensional case (i.e. Theorem 4.1), then extend the argument to high dimensions. It turns out, comparing with the one-dimensional case, that the difficulty point of the proof for high dimensions comes from the angle part. So, a restriction concerning the angle part was made in Theorem 4.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $y(x) := \Phi_\delta^{-1} \circ \varphi(x), \; x \geq \delta$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}y} &= \frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}x} \cdot \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}y} = \mathrm{e}^{V(x)} \frac{\mathrm{d}\varphi^{-1} \circ \Phi_\delta(y)}{\mathrm{d}y} \\ &= \frac{\mathrm{e}^{V(x)} \Phi_\delta'(y)}{\varphi' \circ \varphi^{-1} \circ \Phi_\delta(y)} = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{V(x)} \Phi_\delta'(y)}{\varphi'(x)} = \Phi_\delta'(y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, μ is the standard Gaussian measure under the new coordinate $y \in [\delta, \infty)$. In other words, one has

$$\gamma(\mathrm{d}x) := (\mu \circ y^{-1})(\mathrm{d}x) = Z 1_{[\delta,\infty)}(x) \mathrm{e}^{-x^2/2} \mathrm{d}x,$$

where Z is the normalization constant. By the HWI inequality proved in [2, 17, 18] and the Gross log-Sobolev inequality which implies the Talagrand inequality, we have

$$(4.12) \qquad \begin{aligned} &\gamma(g^2 \log g^2) + W_2(\gamma, g^2\gamma)^2 \leq 2\sqrt{2\gamma((g')^2)} \, W_2(\gamma, g^2\gamma), \\ &W_2(\gamma, g^2\gamma)^2 \leq 2\gamma(g^2 \log g^2), \quad \gamma(g^2) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

16

We remark that although the HWI and Gross's log-Sobolev inequalities are stated in the above references for the global Gaussian measure, they are also true on a regular convex domain Ω, since the stronger gradient estimate

$$|\nabla P_t f| \le \mathrm{e}^{-t} P_t |\nabla f|, \quad f \in C_b^1(\Omega)$$

holds for the Neumann heat semigroup on Ω (cf. [22] and references within).

For any $f \in C_0^1([\delta, \infty))$ with $\mu(f^2) = 1$, let $g := f \circ y^{-1}$. We have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}g}{\mathrm{d}x} = (f' \circ y^{-1}) \frac{\mathrm{d}y^{-1}}{\mathrm{d}x} = \frac{f' \circ y^{-1}}{y' \circ y^{-1}} = (f' \circ y^{-1}) \left(\frac{\Phi_\delta' \circ \Phi_\delta^{-1} \circ \varphi}{\varphi'} \right) \circ y^{-1}.$$

Since $\gamma = \mu \circ y^{-1}$, this and (4.12) imply (4.3) and (4.4). Finally, (4.2) is implied by (4.4). $\qquad\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let (r, θ) be the polar coordinate introduced in Section 2, and let ∇_θ denote the gradient operator on $\mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ for the standard metric induced by the Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^d$. By the orthogonal decomposition of the gradient, we have

$$(4.13) \qquad \nabla f = (\partial_r f) \frac{\partial}{\partial r} + r^{-1} \nabla_\theta f, \quad |\nabla f|^2 = (\partial_r f)^2 + r^{-2} |\nabla_\theta f|^2.$$

Let us introduce a new polar coordinate $(\bar{r}, \theta)$, where

$$\bar{r}(r, \theta) := \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r), \quad r \ge 0, \theta \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}.$$

We have

$$\mathrm{d}\mu := G(r, \theta) \mathrm{d}r \mathrm{d}\theta = \frac{G(r, \theta)}{\partial_r \bar{r}} \mathrm{d}\bar{r} \mathrm{d}\theta = c(d) h(\theta) \Phi_0'(\bar{r}) \mathrm{d}\bar{r} \mathrm{d}\theta = c(d) h(\theta) \mathrm{d}\mu_0,$$

where $\mathrm{d}\mu_0 := \Phi_0'(\bar{r}) \mathrm{d}\bar{r} \mathrm{d}\theta$ is the standard Gaussian measure under the new polar coordinate $(\bar{r}, \theta)$. Thus, letting

$$y(x) := \bar{r}(x) \theta(x) = \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_{\frac{x}{|x|}}(|x|) \theta(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

we have

$$(\mu \circ y^{-1})(\mathrm{d}x) = c(d) h(x/|x|)(\mu_0 \circ y^{-1})(\mathrm{d}x) = c(d) h(x/|x|) \gamma(\mathrm{d}x),$$

where γ is the standard Gaussian measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. By Gross' log-Sobolev inequality one has

$$\gamma(g^2 \log g^2) \le 2\gamma(|\nabla g|^2), \quad g \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \mu_0(g^2) = 1.$$

Thus, by the perturbation of the log-Sobolev inequality (cf. [7]), we have

(4.14) $(\mu \circ y^{-1})(g^2 \log g^2) \leq 2C(h)(\mu \circ y^{-1})(|\nabla g|^2), \quad g \in W^{2,1}(\gamma), (\mu \circ y^{-1})(g^2) = 1.$

Moreover, by [2, Corollary 3.1], (4.14) implies

(4.15) $W_2(\mu \circ y^{-1}, g^2 \mu \circ y^{-1})^2 \leq 2C(h)(\mu \circ y^{-1})(g^2 \log g^2), \quad (\mu \circ y^{-1})(g^2) = 1.$

This implies (4.3) for the desired distance ρ by using the change of variables theorem as explained above.

Similarly, to prove (4.2) we intend apply (4.14) for $g := f \circ y^{-1}$, where $f \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\mu(f^2) = 1$. Since $y^{-1} = (\varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r), \theta)$ under the polar coordinate, by the chain rule we have

$$\nabla_\theta(f \circ y^{-1}) = \nabla_\theta f(\varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r), \theta) = \big((\nabla_\theta f) \circ y^{-1} + (\partial_r f) \circ y^{-1}\big)\nabla_\theta \varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r).$$

But $\varphi_\theta \circ \varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0 = \Phi_0$ implies

$$(\nabla_\theta \varphi_\theta)(\varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r)) + \varphi_\theta' \circ \varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r) \cdot \nabla_\theta(\varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r)) = 0,$$

where $(\nabla_\theta \varphi_\theta)(\varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r)) := \nabla_\theta \varphi_\theta(s)|_{s = \varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r)}$, we arrive at

(4.16)
$$\begin{aligned}
&|\nabla_\theta(f \circ y^{-1})|^2 \\
&\leq (1 + \varepsilon)(\partial_r f)^2 \circ y^{-1}\Big(\frac{|\nabla_\theta \varphi_\theta(r)|(\varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r))}{\varphi_\theta' \circ \varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r)}\Big)^2 + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1})|\nabla_\theta f|^2 \circ y^{-1} \\
&= (1 + \varepsilon)(\partial_r f)^2 \circ y^{-1}\Big(\frac{|\nabla_\theta \varphi_\theta(r)|}{\varphi_\theta'(r)}\Big)^2 \circ y^{-1} + (1 + \varepsilon^{-1})|\nabla_\theta f|^2 \circ y^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

On the other hand,

$$\partial_r(f \circ y^{-1}) = (\partial_r f) \circ y^{-1}\frac{\Phi_0'(r)}{\varphi_\theta' \circ \varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r)}.$$

Since

(4.17) $r = \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r(y^{-1})) = \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r) \circ y^{-1},$

we have

$$\Phi_0'(r) = \big(\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r)\big) \circ y^{-1}, \quad \varphi_\theta' \circ \varphi_\theta^{-1} \circ \Phi_0(r) = \varphi_\theta'(r) \circ y^{-1}.$$

Thus,

$$|\partial_r(f \circ y^{-1})|^2 = \left\{(\partial_r f)\frac{\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r)}{\varphi_\theta'(r)}\right\}^2 \circ y^{-1}.$$

Combining this with (4.13), (4.16) and (4.17), we obtain

$$|\nabla(f \circ y^{-1})|^2 = (\partial_r(f \circ y^{-1}))^2 + r^{-2}|\nabla_\theta(f \circ y^{-1})|^2$$
$$\leq \left\{(\partial_r f)\frac{\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r)}{\varphi_\theta'(r)}\right\}^2 \circ y^{-1}$$
$$+ (\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^{-2} \circ y^{-1}\left\{(1+\varepsilon)(\partial_r f)^2\left(\frac{|\nabla_\theta\varphi_\theta(r)|}{\varphi_\theta'(r)}\right)^2 + (1+\varepsilon^{-1})|\nabla_\theta f|^2\right\} \circ y^{-1}$$
$$= (\partial_r f)^2 \circ y^{-1}\left\{\frac{(\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2}{(\varphi_\theta'(r))^2} + \frac{(1+\varepsilon)|\nabla_\theta\varphi_\theta(r)|^2}{(\varphi_\theta'(r))^2(\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2}\right\} \circ y^{-1}$$
$$+ \quad (r \circ y^{-1})^{-2}|\nabla_\theta f|^2 \circ y^{-1}\left(\frac{(1+\varepsilon^{-1})r^2}{(\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2}\right) \circ y^{-1}$$
$$\leq |\nabla f|^2 \circ y^{-1} \max\left\{\frac{(1+\varepsilon^{-1})r^2}{(\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2}, \frac{(\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2}{(\varphi_\theta'(r))^2} + \frac{(1+\varepsilon)|\nabla_\theta\varphi_\theta(r)|^2}{(\varphi_\theta'(r))^2(\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2}\right\} \circ y^{-1}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Therefore,

$$(4.18) \qquad\qquad |\nabla(f \circ y^{-1})|^2 \leq (\alpha|\nabla f|^2) \circ y^{-1}$$

and hence (4.2) follows from (4.14) by letting $g = f \circ y^{-1}$.

Finally, if h is constant then $\mu \circ y^{-1}$ is the standard Gaussian measure. Hence, by [2, Theorem 4.3] one has

$$W_2(\mu \circ y^{-1}, (f^2 \circ y^{-1})\mu \circ y^{-1})^2 + (\mu \circ y^{-1})(f^2 \circ y^{-1} \log f^2 \circ y^{-1})$$
$$\leq 2\sqrt{2(\mu \circ y^{-1})(|\nabla(f \circ y^{-1})|^2)}\, W_2(\mu \circ y^{-1}, (f^2 \circ y^{-1})\mu \circ y^{-1}).$$

By combining this with (4.18) we prove (4.5). □

Proof of Corollary 4.3. Since there exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\Phi_0'(r) = c_0 r^{d-1}e^{-r^2/2} = \begin{cases}\Theta(r^{d-1}) & \text{as } r \to 0,\\ \Theta(r(1 - \Phi_0(r))) & \text{as } r \to \infty,\end{cases}$$

where $f = \Theta(g)$ means that the two positive functions f and g are asymptotically bounded by each other up to constants, there exists a constant $c \geq 1$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c}\Phi_0'(r) \leq \min\{r, r^{d-1}\}(1 - \Phi_0(r)) \leq c\Phi_0'(r), \quad r \geq 0.$$

Equivalently,

(4.19) $\dfrac{1}{c}\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1}(r) \leq \min\{\Phi_0^{-1}(r),\ \Phi_0^{-1}(r)^{d-1}\}(1-r) \leq c\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1}(r), \quad r \in [0,1).$

Next, it is easy to see from (4.6) that

(4.20) $$\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r) = \begin{cases} \Theta(r^{\delta/2}) & \text{as } r \to \infty, \\ \Theta(r) & \text{as } r \to 0, \end{cases}$$

and

(4.21) $$\frac{1-\varphi_\theta(r)}{\varphi_\theta'(r)} = \frac{\int_r^\infty s^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{V(s\theta)}\mathrm{d}s}{r^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{V(r\theta)}} \leq cr^{1-\delta}$$

for some constant $c > 0$ and all $r \geq 1$. Combining (4.19), (4.20) and (4.21) we obtain

(4.22) $$\max\left\{\frac{r^2}{(\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2},\ \frac{(\Phi_0' \circ \Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2}{(\varphi_\theta'(r))^2}\right\} \leq c(1+r)^{2-\delta}$$

for some constant $c > 0$.
     If (4.7) holds then

$$|\nabla_\theta \varphi_\theta(r)| = |\nabla_\theta(1-\varphi_\theta(r)| \leq c_4 \min\left\{r^d,\ \int_r^\infty s^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{V(s\theta)}\mathrm{d}s\right\},$$

so that due to (4.20) and (4.21)

$$\frac{|\nabla_\theta \varphi_\theta(r)|^2}{(\varphi_\theta'(r))^2(\Phi_0^{-1} \circ \varphi_\theta(r))^2} \leq c_5\left(\frac{\min\{r^d,\ \int_r^\infty s^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{V(s\theta)}\mathrm{d}s\}}{(r\mathbf{1}_{\{r<1\}} + r^{\delta/2}\mathbf{1}_{\{r\geq1\}})r^{d-1}\mathrm{e}^{V(r\theta)}}\right)^2 \leq c_6(1+r)^{2-3\delta}$$

for some constants $c_5, c_6 > 0$. Combining this with (4.22) and Theorem 4.2, we prove (4.8).
     Finally, for any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ let $i \in \{1,2\}$ such that $|x_i| = |x_1| \vee |x_2|$. Similarly to the proof of Corollary 1.2, define

$$f(x) = \frac{|x - x_i| \wedge \frac{|x_i|}{2}}{(1+|x_i|)^{1-\delta/2}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then

$$\Gamma(f,f) := (1+|\cdot|)^{2-\delta}|\nabla f|^2 \leq \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{|x_i|/2 \leq |\cdot| \leq 3|x_i|/2\}}(1+|\cdot|)^{2-\delta}}{(1+|x_i|)^{2-\delta}} \leq C(\delta)$$

20

for some constant $C(\delta) > 0$. Since $|x_i| \geq \frac{1}{2}|x_1 - x_2|$, this implies that the intrinsic distance ρ induced by Γ satisfies

$$\rho(x_1, x_2)^2 \geq \frac{|f(x_1) - f(x_2)|^2}{C(\delta)} \geq C_1(\delta)\tilde{\rho}(x_1, x_2)^2$$

for some constant $C_1(\delta) > 0$, and hence is complete. Thus, by [25, Theorem 1.1] or [26, Theorem 6.3.3], (4.9) follows from (4.8). $\square$

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank the referees for useful comments.

References

[1] D. Bakry, M. Ledoux and F.-Y. Wang, *Perturbations of functional inequalities using growth conditions,* J. Math. Pures Appl. 87(2007), 394-407.

[2] S. G. Bobkov, I. Gentil and M. Ledoux, *Hypercontractivity of Hamilton-Jacobi equations,* J. Math. Pures Appl. 80(2001), 669–696.

[3] S. G. Bobkov, and F. Götze, *Exponential integrability and transportation cost related to logarithmic Sobolev inequalities,* J. Funct. Anal. 163(1999), 1–28.

[4] F. Bolley and C. Villani, *Weighted csiszár-Kullback-Pinsker inequalities and applications to transportation inequalities,* Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6), 14(2005), 331–352.

[5] L. A. Caffarelli, *The regularity of mappings with a convex potential,* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 5(1992), 99–104.

[6] J. D. Deuschel and D. W. Stroock, *Large Deviations*, Pure and Appl. Math. Ser. 137, Academic Press, San Diego, 1989.

[7] J. D. Deuschel and D. W. Stroock, *Hypercontractivity and spectral gap of symmetric diffusions with applications to the stochastic Ising models,* J. Funct. Anal. 92(1990), 30–48.

[8] H. Djellout, A. Guilin and L.-M. Wu, *Transportation cost-information inequalities for random dynamical systems and diffusions,* Ann. Probab. 32(2004), 2702–2732.

[9] I. Gentil, A. Guillin and L. Miclo, *Modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and transportation inequalities,* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 133(2005), 409–436.

[10] I. Gentil, A. Guilin and L. Miclo, *Modified logarithmic Sobolev inequalities in null curvature,* Revista Mat. Ibero. 23(2007).

[11] N. Gozlan, *Characterization of Talagrand's like transportation-cost inequalities on the real line,* J. Funct. Anal. 250(2007), 400–425.

[12] L. Gross, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities,* Amer. J. Math. 97(1976), 1061–1083.

[13] F.-Z. Gong and F.-Y. Wang, *Functional inequalities for uniformly integrable semigroups and application to essential spectrums,* Forum Math. 14(2002), 293–313.

[14] N. Gozlan, *Integral criteria for transportation cost inequalities,* Electron. Comm. Probab. 11(2006), 64–77.

[15] A. V. Kolesnikov, *Convexity inequalities and optimal transport of infinite dimensional measures,* J. Math. Pures Appl. 83(2004), 1373–1404.

[16] K. Marton, *A simple proof of the blowing-up lemma,* IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 32(1986), 445–446.

[17] F. Otto and C. Villani, *Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality,* J. Funct. Anal. 173(2000), 361–400.

[18] F. Otto and C. Villani, *Comment on: "Hypercontractivity of Hamilton-Jacobi equations", by S. Bobkov, I. Gentil and M. Ledoux,* J. Math. Pures Appl. 80(2001), 697–700.

[19] M. Röckner and F.-Y. Wang, *Weak Poincaré inequalities and L^2-convergence rates of Markov semigroups,* J. Funct. Anal. 185(2001), 564–603.

[20] J. Shao, *Hamilton-Jacobi semigroup in infinite dimensional spaces*, Bull. Sci. Math. 130(2006), 720–738.

[21] M. Talagrand, *Transportation cost for Gaussian and other product measures,* Geom. Funct. Anal. 6(1996), 587–600.

[22] F.-Y. Wang, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities on noncompact Riemannian manifolds*, Probab. Theory Related Fields 109 (1997), 417–424.

[23] F.-Y. Wang, *Functional inequalities for empty essential spectrum,* J. Funct. Anal. 170(2000), 219–245.

[24] F.-Y. Wang, *Functional inequalities, semigroup properties and spectrum estimates,* Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quant. Probab. Relat. Topics 3(2000), 263–295.

[25] F.-Y. Wang, *Probability distance inequalities on Riemannian manifolds and path spaces,* J. Funct. Anal. 206(2004), 167–190.

[26] F.-Y. Wang, *Functional Inequalities, Markov Processes, and Spectral Theory*, Science Press, Beijing 2005.