

# Asymptotic and non-asymptotic estimates for multivariate Laplace integrals

Maria Rosaria Formica <sup>1</sup>, Eugeny Ostrovsky <sup>2</sup>, Leonid Sirota <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Università degli Studi di Napoli Parthenope, via Generale Parisi 13,  
Palazzo Pacanowsky, 80132, Napoli, Italy.  
e-mail: mara.formica@uniparthenope.it

<sup>2</sup> Bar-Ilan University, Department of Mathematic and Statistics, 59200  
Ramat Gan, Israel.  
e-mail: eugostrovsky@list.ru  
e-mail: sirota3@bezeqint.net

## Abstract

We derive bilateral asymptotic as well as non-asymptotic estimates for the multivariate Laplace integrals.

Possible applications: Tauberian theorems for random vectors.

*Key words and phrases:* Laplace or exponential integrals, Fenchel-Morau theorem, random variable and random vector (r.v.), exponential and ordinary tail of distribution, measure and measurable space, Lebesgue measure, regional and ordinary Young-Fenchel transform, saddle-point method, Cramer's condition, moment generating functions (MGF), regular and slowly varying functions.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 44A10, 60B05, 26A12,

## 1 Definitions. Notations. Previous results. Statement of problem.

Let  $R^d$ ,  $d = 1, 2, \dots$  be the ordinary  $d$ - dimensional numerical (Euclidean) space

$$R^d = \{x, x = \bar{x} = \{x(1), x(2), \dots, x(d)\} \}, \quad x(j) \in R, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, d,$$

and let  $(X, B, \mu)$  be a non-trivial measurable space equipped with sigma-finite Borelian measure  $\mu$ , where  $X$  is a measurable subset of  $R^d$  having strictly positive measure  $\mu(X) \in (0, \infty]$ .

Introduce the following subset of the whole space  $R^d$

$$R^d(Z) \stackrel{def}{=} \{x = \bar{x} : \min_i x(i) \geq Z\}, \quad Z = \text{const} \geq 1.$$

*We will impose in the sequel the following condition on the set  $X$ .*

**Condition 1.1.**

$$\exists Z_0 = \text{const} \geq 1 : \forall Z \geq Z_0 \Rightarrow X \cap R^d(Z) \neq \emptyset, \quad (1.1)$$

say for all the values  $Z \geq 1$  sufficiently large.

Denote

$$\lambda = \vec{\lambda} \in R^d, \quad (x, \lambda) = x \cdot \lambda = \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda(i)x(i), \quad |x| = \sqrt{(x, x)},$$

so that  $\dim(x) = \dim(\lambda) = d$ .

Define also

$$R_+^d = \{x, x = \vec{x} = \{x(1), x(2), \dots, x(d)\}, x(j) \geq 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, d\}$$

$$\Lambda(\lambda) = \Lambda = \min_i \lambda(i), \quad \lambda \in R_+^d;$$

correspondingly

$$\underline{x} = \Lambda(x) = \min_i x(i), \quad x \in X.$$

Let also  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$ ,  $x \in X$ , be a measurable numerical valued continuous function  $\zeta : X \rightarrow R$ .

We assume, furthermore, that  $\mu(X) = \infty$ , as long as the opposite (probabilistic) case is trivial for us.

**Definition 1.1.** The following integral

$$I(\lambda) = I[\zeta](\lambda) := \int_X e^{(\lambda, x) - \zeta(x)} \mu(dx) \quad (1.2)$$

is named Laplace or exponential integral.

**In this article we provide asymptotical as well as non-asymptotical upper and lower estimates of the Laplace integral  $I[\zeta](\lambda) = I(\lambda)$ , for all sufficiently large values of the real vector parameter  $\lambda = \vec{\lambda} \in R_+^d$ ,  $d = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , say  $\Lambda(\lambda) \geq 1$  and when  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ ; we obtain direct estimations assuming, of course, its convergence for all the sufficiently large values of the parameter  $|\lambda| := \sqrt{(\lambda, \lambda)}$ .**

**Furthermore we also obtain an inverse evaluation, i.e. we deduce the bilateral bounds for the source function  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$ ,  $\underline{x} \geq 1$ ,  $\Lambda(x) \rightarrow \infty$ , through its integral transform  $I[\zeta](\lambda)$ , with an inverse approach.**

The case of other ‘‘octants’’, for instance,  $\lambda \in R_-^d \stackrel{def}{=} \{\vec{\lambda}\}$ ,  $\lambda(j) < 0$  and  $\Lambda_- = \max_i \lambda(i) \rightarrow -\infty$ , may be investigated quite analogously.

The one-dimensional case  $d = 1$  was considered in [6, 21, 22]; a preliminary result may be found in [23].

We will generalize the main results obtained in the articles [21, 22, 23], where are described also some applications of these estimates, in particular, in the probability theory. The estimates given below may be considered in turn as a generalization of the classical saddle-point method ([11]).

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 and in section 3 we deduce respectively an upper and a lower direct estimate for the Laplace integral  $I(\lambda)$ ; section 4 and section 5 contain an investigation of the inverse problem and, respectively, an upper and a lower estimate for the

source function through the exponential integral. In section 6 we consider the multidimensional Tauberian theorems for exponential integrals; in section 7 some important examples are described. The last section contains the concluding remarks.

Denote, as usually,

$$\vec{0} = \{0, 0, \dots, 0\}, \quad \vec{1} = \{1, 1, \dots, 1\}; \quad \dim \vec{0} = \dim \vec{1} = d;$$

$$\vec{a} \geq \vec{b} \Leftrightarrow a(i) \geq b(i), \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, d;$$

$$R_+^d(1) \stackrel{def}{=} \{x = \vec{x} \geq \vec{1}\}.$$

Let us mention briefly a possible application. Recall that the so-called (multivariate) moment generating function (MGF) for the random vector (r.v.)  $\vec{\xi}$  is defined by the equality

$$\exp(\phi_\xi(\lambda)) \stackrel{def}{=} \mathbf{E} \exp(\vec{\xi} \cdot \vec{\lambda}) =$$

$$\mathbf{E} \exp \left[ \sum_{i=1}^d \xi(i) \lambda(i) \right] = \int_{\Omega} \exp(\vec{\xi}(\omega) \cdot \vec{\lambda}) \mathbf{P}(d\omega) = \quad (1.3)$$

$$\int_{R^d} e^{(\lambda, x)} f_\xi(x) dx = \int_{R^d} e^{(\lambda, x) - \ln(1/f_\xi(x))} dx, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $f_\xi(x)$  denotes the density of the r.v.  $\xi$ , if there exists.

So, the MGF function  $\exp(\phi_\xi(\lambda))$  is, on the other terms, the multivariate Laplace integral. It will be presumed that the r.v.  $\xi$  satisfies the so-called Cramer's condition:

$$\exists \delta = \text{const} > 0 : \forall \lambda, |\lambda| < \delta \Rightarrow \phi_\xi(\lambda) < \infty \quad (1.5)$$

and that the density function there exists.

Recall that the well-known Young-Fenchel or Legendre transform for the function  $\zeta : X \rightarrow R$  is defined as follows

$$\zeta^*(\lambda) \stackrel{def}{=} \sup_{x \in X} (\lambda \cdot x - \zeta(x)), \quad \lambda \in R^d.$$

If some function  $\phi = \phi(\lambda)$  is defined and is finite in a set  $V$ , i.e.  $\text{dom}[\phi] = V$ , convex or not, one can define formally

$$\phi(\lambda) = +\infty, \quad \lambda \notin V,$$

hence

$$\phi^*(x) \stackrel{def}{=} \sup_{\vec{\lambda} \in V} (\vec{\lambda} \cdot \vec{x} - \phi(\vec{\lambda})), \quad x \in R_+^d.$$

This notion plays an important role in the probability theory. Namely, let  $\xi = \vec{\xi}$  be a random vector for which

$$\mathbf{E} \exp(\lambda \cdot \xi) \leq \exp(\phi(\lambda)), \quad \lambda \in R_+^d. \quad (1.6)$$

Then

$$T_\xi(x) \leq \exp(-\phi^*(x)), \quad x \in R_+^d, \quad (1.7)$$

where  $T_\xi = T_\xi(x)$  denotes the tail function for the r.v.  $\xi$  :

$$T_\xi(x) \stackrel{def}{=} \mathbf{P}(\bar{\xi} \geq \bar{x}), \quad x \in R_+^d, \quad (1.8)$$

the so-called generalized Chernoff's inequality, see e.g. [7, 8, 22].

Moreover, this assertion may be reversed under some natural conditions (smoothness, convexity etc.) in the following sense. Suppose  $d = 1$  (one-dimensional case) and that the last estimate (1.7) holds true. Then, under appropriate conditions (see [22]),

$$\mathbf{E} \exp(\lambda \cdot \xi) \leq \exp(\phi(C_1 \cdot \lambda)), \quad \lambda \in R_+^1 \quad (1.9)$$

for some finite constant  $C_1$ .

## 2 Main result. A direct approach. Upper estimate.

Let us introduce some preliminary notations and conditions. Put

$$K(\epsilon) = K[X, \mu, \zeta](\epsilon) := \int_X e^{-\epsilon \zeta(x)} \mu(dx), \quad (2.1)$$

here and in the sequel  $\epsilon = \text{const} \in (0, 1)$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Assume  $X = R_+^d$ . Let  $\mu$  be the classical Lebesgue measure and let  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$ ,  $x \in R_+^d$ , be a non-negative strictly convex continuous differentiable function. The function  $K(\epsilon)$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , defined by (2.1), satisfies the following estimate*

$$K(\epsilon) \leq C[\zeta, d] \exp(-C_0 \epsilon) \epsilon^{-d}, \quad C_0 = \text{const} \in R. \quad (2.2)$$

**Proof.** There exist positive constants  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_d$  and a number  $C_0 \in R$  such that

$$\zeta(\bar{x}) \geq C_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d C(i) x(i).$$

Indeed, one can apply the well-known Fenchel-Morau theorem

$$\zeta(x) = \sup_{y \in R_+^d} ( (x, y) - \zeta^*(y) ),$$

so that, for an arbitrary  $y_0 \in R_+^d$ ,

$$\zeta(x) \geq (x, y_0) - \zeta^*(y_0).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} K(\epsilon) &\leq \int_{R_+^d} \exp[-\epsilon( C_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d C(i) x(i) ) ] \prod_{i=1}^d dx(i) \\ &= \left[ \prod_{i=1}^d C(i) \right]^{-1} e^{-C_0 \epsilon} \epsilon^{-d}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Furthermore, define

$$Z(\epsilon) = Z[X, \mu, \zeta](\epsilon) := \int_X \exp(\zeta(x(1-\epsilon)) - \zeta(x)) \mu(dx).$$

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $D \subset X$  be a non-empty subset of the whole set  $X$ . We introduce the so-called *regional* Young-Fenchel transform for the function  $\zeta(\cdot)$

$$\zeta^*[D](\lambda) \stackrel{def}{=} \sup_{x \in D} (\lambda \cdot x - \zeta(x)), \quad \lambda \in R^d,$$

so that

$$\zeta^*[X](\lambda) = \zeta^*(\lambda).$$

We represent now *three* methods for an *upper* estimate of  $I(\lambda)$  for sufficiently large values of the real parameter  $|\lambda|$ .

**A.** First of all note that if the measure  $\mu$  is bounded:  $\mu(X) = M \in (0, \infty)$ ; then the integral  $I(\lambda)$  satisfies a very simple estimate

$$I(\lambda) \leq M \cdot \sup_{x \in X} \exp(\lambda x - \zeta(x)) = M \cdot \exp(\zeta^*(\lambda)). \quad (2.3)$$

Let now  $\mu(X) = \infty$  and let  $\epsilon = \text{const} \in (0, 1)$ .

**B.** It will be presumed the finiteness of the integral  $K(\epsilon) = K[X, \mu, \zeta](\epsilon)$  at least for some positive value  $\epsilon_0 \in (0, 1)$ , i.e.

$$K(\epsilon) < \infty \quad \forall \epsilon \geq \epsilon_0.$$

It is proved in particular in [22] that

$$I(\lambda) \leq K(\epsilon) \cdot \exp \left\{ (1-\epsilon) \zeta^* \left( \frac{\lambda}{1-\epsilon} \right) \right\} \leq K(\epsilon) \cdot \exp \left\{ \zeta^* \left( \frac{\lambda}{1-\epsilon} \right) \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

Note that in [22] was considered the one-dimensional case  $d = 1$ ; but the general one may be investigated quite analogously. In detail, let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  be some number for which  $K(\epsilon) \in (0, \infty)$ . Consider the following probability measure, more precisely, the family of probability measures

$$\nu_\epsilon(A) = \frac{1}{K(\epsilon)} \int_A e^{-\epsilon \zeta(x)} \mu(dx),$$

or symbolically

$$\nu_\epsilon(dx) = \frac{1}{K(\epsilon)} e^{-\epsilon \zeta(x)} \mu(dx),$$

so that

$$\nu_\epsilon(X) = \int_X \nu_\epsilon(dx) = 1.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I(\lambda)}{K(\epsilon)} &= \int_X e^{(\lambda, x) - (1-\epsilon)\zeta(x)} \nu_\epsilon(dx) \leq \\ &\exp \left\{ \sup_{x \in X} [(\lambda, x) - (1-\epsilon)\zeta(x)] \right\} = \exp \{ (1-\epsilon) \zeta^*(\lambda/(1-\epsilon)) \}. \end{aligned}$$

So, the relation (2.4) is proved.

As a slight consequence:

$$I(\lambda) \leq \inf_{\epsilon \in (0,1)} \left[ K(\epsilon) \cdot \exp \left\{ (1-\epsilon) \zeta^* \left( \frac{\lambda}{1-\epsilon} \right) \right\} \right]; \quad (2.5)$$

$$I(\lambda) \leq \inf_{\epsilon \in (0,1)} \left[ K(\epsilon) \cdot \exp \left\{ \zeta^* \left( \frac{\lambda}{1-\epsilon} \right) \right\} \right]. \quad (2.6)$$

**C.** An opposite method, which was introduced in a particular case in [21], [22]. Define the following integral

$$Z(\epsilon) = Z[\zeta, \mu, X](\epsilon) := \int_X e^{\zeta((1-\epsilon)x - \zeta(x))} \mu(dx),$$

if, of course, it is finite at least for some value  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ .

Let again  $\epsilon = \text{const} \in (0, 1)$ . Applying the well-known Young inequality

$$(\lambda, x) \leq \zeta((1-\epsilon)x) + \zeta^*(\lambda/(1-\epsilon)),$$

we have

$$I(\lambda) \leq e^{\zeta^*(\lambda/(1-\epsilon))} \int_X e^{\zeta((1-\epsilon)x - \zeta(x))} \mu(dx) = Z(\epsilon) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda/(1-\epsilon))}.$$

Of course

$$I(\lambda) \leq \inf_{\epsilon \in (0,1)} \left[ Z(\epsilon) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda/(1-\epsilon))} \right]. \quad (2.7)$$

**D.** Denote

$$R(\epsilon) = R[X, \mu, \zeta](\epsilon) := \min(K(\epsilon), Z(\epsilon)), \quad \epsilon \in (0, 1).$$

We conclude

$$I(\lambda) \leq R[X, \mu, \zeta](\epsilon) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda/(1-\epsilon))}. \quad (2.8)$$

Furthermore, we will use the following elementary inequality

$$1 + \epsilon < \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} \leq 1 + 2\epsilon, \quad 0 < \epsilon \leq 1/2.$$

Let us introduce a new function  $\phi(\lambda) := \zeta^*(\lambda)$ ,

$$\pi_\kappa(\lambda) \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{\kappa}{(\lambda \cdot \zeta^{*\prime}(\lambda))} = \frac{\kappa}{(\lambda \cdot \phi'(\lambda))}, \quad \kappa = \text{const} \in (0, \infty), \quad (2.9)$$

$$\pi(\lambda) = \pi_1(\lambda) \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{1}{(\lambda \cdot \zeta^{*\prime}(\lambda))} = \frac{1}{(\lambda \cdot \phi'(\lambda))}, \quad (2.10)$$

alike ones in the monograph [25], chapter 3; and suppose that

$$\lim_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \pi(\lambda) = 0; \quad (2.11)$$

so that the value  $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda(\kappa)$  may be chosen such that

$$\forall \lambda : \min_i \lambda(i) \geq \Lambda(\kappa) \Rightarrow \pi_\kappa(\lambda) \leq 1/2.$$

Let us impose the following condition on the function  $\phi(\cdot)$ :

$$\sup_{\min_i \lambda(i) \geq \Lambda(\kappa)} \left[ \phi \left( \lambda + \frac{2\lambda}{(\lambda, \phi'(\lambda))} \right) - \phi(\lambda) \right] = C(\phi, \kappa) = C(\phi) < \infty. \quad (2.12)$$

Define also

$$r(\lambda) = r[\zeta, \kappa](\lambda) \stackrel{def}{=} R[X, \mu, \zeta](\pi_\kappa(\lambda)).$$

Choosing  $\epsilon = \pi(\lambda)$  in the domain  $\min_i \lambda(i) \geq \Lambda(1)$ , we have the following

**Theorem 2.1.** *If the function  $\phi(\cdot) = \zeta^*(\cdot)$  satisfies the condition (2.12), then*

$$I(\lambda) \leq e^{C(\phi)} r(\lambda) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda)}. \quad (2.13)$$

**Example 2.1.** Assume in addition  $R(\epsilon) \leq C_1 \epsilon^{-\beta}$ ,  $\beta = \text{const} \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ ; then

$$I(\lambda) \leq C_1 e^{C(\phi)} \epsilon^{-\beta} e^{2\epsilon/\pi(\lambda)} e^{\phi(\lambda)}, \quad \lambda(i) \geq \Lambda,$$

and, after the minimization over  $\epsilon$ ,

$$I(\lambda) \leq C_1 e^{C(\phi)} 2^\beta \beta^{-\beta} e^\beta \pi_1^{-\beta}(\lambda) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda)}.$$

**E.** Let us consider an arbitrary simple partition  $X = X_0 \cup X_1$ ,  $X_0 \cap X_1 = \emptyset$  of the whole set  $X$  onto two disjoint measurable subsets. We deduce splitting integral  $I(\lambda)$  into two ones

$$I(\lambda) = \int_{X_0} \exp(\lambda x - \zeta(x)) \mu(dx) + \int_{X_1} \exp(\lambda x - \zeta(x)) \mu(dx) = I_0 + I_1,$$

and applying the foregoing estimates:

$$I_0 \leq \mu(X_0) \exp \left[ \sup_{x \in X_0} (\lambda x - \zeta(x)) \right] = \mu(X_0) \exp [ \zeta^*[X_0](\lambda) ],$$

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq R[X_1, \mu, \zeta](\epsilon) \exp \left[ \sup_{x \in X_1} (\lambda x / (1 - \epsilon) - \zeta(x)) \right] \\ &= R[X_1, \mu, \zeta](\epsilon) \exp [ \zeta^*[X_1](\lambda / (1 - \epsilon)) ]. \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$W[X, \mu, \zeta, \epsilon](\lambda) =: \mu(X_0) \exp [ \zeta^*[X_0](\lambda) ] + R[X_1, \mu, \zeta](\epsilon) \exp [ \zeta^*[X_1](\lambda / (1 - \epsilon)) ],$$

$$W_0[X, \mu, \zeta](\lambda) = \inf_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)} W[X, \mu, \zeta, \epsilon](\lambda). \quad (2.14)$$

We obtained actually the following compound estimate.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Suppose*

$$\exists c \in (0, \infty) : \forall \lambda, |\lambda| \geq c \Rightarrow W_0[X, \mu, \zeta](\lambda) < \infty. \quad (2.15)$$

*Then,  $\forall \lambda : |\lambda| \geq c$  and  $\forall \epsilon \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$I(\lambda) \leq W[X, \mu, \zeta, \epsilon](\lambda). \quad (2.16)$$

As a slight consequence:

$$I(\lambda) \leq W_0[X, \mu, \zeta](\lambda), \quad |\lambda| \geq c. \quad (2.17)$$

**Remark 2.1.** Introduce the following condition on the function  $\zeta(\cdot)$ :

$$\exists C_1 \in [1, \infty) : W_0[X, \mu, \zeta](\lambda) \leq \exp\{ \zeta^*(C_1 \lambda) \}, \quad |\lambda| \geq c. \quad (2.18)$$

This condition is satisfied if, for example, the function  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$ ,  $x \in X$  is regular varying:

$$\zeta(\lambda) = |\lambda|^m L(|\lambda|), \quad |\lambda| \geq 1, \quad (2.19)$$

where  $m = \text{const} > 0$ ,  $|\cdot|$  is the ordinary Euclidean norm (or an arbitrary other non-degenerate vector one) and  $L = L(r)$ ,  $r \geq 1$ , is some positive continuous slowly varying function as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , and we suppose

$$\forall A \in B \Rightarrow \mu(A) = \int_A |x|^\alpha M(|x|) dx, \quad \alpha = \text{const} > -d,$$

where, as before,  $M = M(r)$ ,  $r \geq 1$ , is some positive continuous slowly varying function as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . Briefly:  $\mu(dx) = |x|^\alpha M(|x|) dx$ . We have  $K(\epsilon) \leq \overline{K}(\epsilon)$ ,  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ ;

$$\overline{K}(\epsilon) := \int_{R^d} \exp(-\epsilon |x|^m L(|x|)) |x|^\alpha M(|x|) dx.$$

One can apply the spherical coordinates:

$$\overline{K}(\epsilon) = \frac{\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2 + 1)} K_0(\epsilon),$$

where

$$K_0(\epsilon) = \int_0^\infty \exp(-\epsilon r^m L(r)) r^{\alpha+d-1} M(r) dr.$$

We obtain, after the substitution  $r^m \epsilon = y$ ,  $dr = m^{-1} y^{1/m-1} \epsilon^{-1/m} dy$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_m(\epsilon) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} m \epsilon^{(\alpha+d)/m} K_0(\epsilon) \\ &= \int_0^\infty y^{(\alpha+d)/m-1} \exp(-y L(y^{1/m} \epsilon^{-1/m})) M(y^{1/m} \epsilon^{-1/m}) dy \end{aligned}$$

and, as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0+$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_m(\epsilon) &\sim M(\epsilon^{-1/m}) \int_0^\infty e^{-y L(\epsilon^{-1/m})} y^{(\alpha+d)/m-1} dy \\ &= M(\epsilon^{-1/m}) \Gamma((\alpha+d)/m) L^{-(\alpha+d)/m}(\epsilon^{-1/m}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Gamma$  is the classical Gamma function.

To summarize: as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0+$

$$m \overline{K}(\epsilon) \sim \frac{\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2 + 1)} \epsilon^{-(\alpha+d)/m} \Gamma((\alpha+d)/m) \frac{M(\epsilon^{-1/m})}{L^{(\alpha+d)/m}(\epsilon^{-1/m})}. \quad (2.20)$$

Thus, in this case, the values  $K = K(\epsilon)$  and  $R = R(\epsilon)$ ,  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ , are finite with concrete estimate following from (2.20):

$$m Z(\epsilon) \leq C[\zeta, m, d] \frac{\pi^{d/2}}{\Gamma(d/2 + 1)} \epsilon^{-(\alpha+d)/m} \Gamma((\alpha+d)/m) \frac{M(\epsilon^{-1/m})}{L^{(\alpha+d)/m}(\epsilon^{-1/m})}. \quad (2.21)$$

If the condition of Remark 2.1 is satisfied, then

$$I(\lambda) \leq \exp(\zeta^*(C_2 \lambda)), \quad L(\lambda) \geq 1. \quad (2.22)$$

**Theorem 2.2.** Let  $X = R_+^d$  and  $\mu$  be the ordinary Lebesgue measure. Suppose that the random vector  $\vec{\xi}$ , with non-negative entries  $\{\xi(i)\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , satisfies the Cramer's condition:

$$\exists \lambda_0 = \vec{\lambda}_0 = \{\lambda_0(i)\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, \quad \lambda_0(i) > 0 : \mathbf{E} \exp(\lambda_0 \cdot \xi) < \infty.$$

Then

$$\exists \epsilon_0 > 0 : \forall \epsilon > \epsilon_0 \Rightarrow K(\epsilon) = K[X, \mu, \zeta](\epsilon) < \infty.$$

**Proof.** Denote for brevity  $G(x) = G[\xi](x)$ , so that

$$T_\xi(\vec{x}) = e^{-G(\vec{x})}, \quad x \geq 0.$$

It is sufficient to consider only the two-dimensional case: assume

$$B = B(\lambda, \mu) := \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{\lambda x + \mu y - G(x, y)} dx dy < \infty$$

for some positive values  $\lambda, \mu$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \sum_{n=0}^\infty \sum_{m=0}^\infty \int_n^{n+1} \int_m^{m+1} e^{\lambda x + \mu y - G(x, y)} dx dy \geq \\ &\sum_{n=0}^\infty \sum_{m=0}^\infty \int_n^{n+1} \int_m^{m+1} e^{\lambda n + \mu m - G(n+1, m+1)} dx dy = \sum_{n=0}^\infty \sum_{m=0}^\infty e^{\lambda n + \mu m - G(n+1, m+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty \sum_{m=0}^\infty e^{\lambda n + \mu m - G(n+1, m+1)} < B(\lambda, \mu) < \infty,$$

so

$$e^{\lambda n + \mu m - G(n+1, m+1)} \leq B(\lambda, \mu) < \infty, \quad G(n+1, m+1) \leq B e^{-\lambda n - \mu m},$$

and finally

$$(\lambda \mu)^{-1} K(\epsilon) < \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty e^{-\epsilon G(x, y)} dx dy \leq \sum_{n=0}^\infty \sum_{m=0}^\infty \exp\{-\epsilon[\lambda(n-1) + \mu(m-1)]\} < \infty,$$

if

$$\epsilon > \epsilon_0 := \max(\lambda^{-1}, \mu^{-1}),$$

□

### 3 Main result. A direct approach. Lower estimate.

We introduce additional notations.

$$S(\lambda, x) = (\lambda, x) - \zeta(x), \quad x_0 = x_0(\lambda) \in \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in X} S(\lambda, x),$$

where, by definition,

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{x \in X} S(\lambda, x) = \{x \in X : S(\lambda, x) = \zeta^*(\lambda)\}.$$

Obviously, the value  $x_0 = x_0(\lambda)$  may be non-unique.  
 Furthermore, we introduce the variables

$$X_0 = X_0(\epsilon) = X_0(\epsilon, \lambda) := \{x \in X : S(\lambda, x) \geq \zeta^*(\lambda(1 - \epsilon))\}, \quad \epsilon = \text{const} \in (0, 1),$$

$$U(\epsilon) = U[\zeta](\epsilon, \lambda) := \int_{X_0(\epsilon)} \mu(dx) = \mu(X_0(\epsilon, \lambda)).$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  be such that  $U(\epsilon) > 0$ . Then, for sufficiently large values  $\min_i \lambda(i) \geq \Lambda = \text{const} \geq 1$ , we have*

$$I(\lambda) \geq U[\zeta](\epsilon, \lambda) \exp(\zeta^*(\lambda(1 - \epsilon))), \quad \epsilon \in (0, 1), \quad \min_i \lambda(i) \geq \Lambda.$$

Of course,

$$I(\lambda) \geq \sup_{\epsilon \in (0, 1)} [ U[\zeta](\epsilon, \lambda) \exp(\zeta^*(\lambda(1 - \epsilon))) ], \quad \min_i \lambda(i) \geq \Lambda.$$

**Proof.**

$$\begin{aligned} I(\lambda) &= \int_X \exp[ \lambda x - \zeta(x) ] \mu(dx) \geq \int_{X_0} \exp[ \lambda x - \zeta(x) ] \mu(dx) \\ &\geq \int_{X_0} \exp[ \zeta^*(\lambda(1 - \epsilon)) ] \mu(dx) = U[\zeta](\epsilon, \lambda) \exp[ \zeta^*(\lambda(1 - \epsilon)) ]. \end{aligned}$$

□

As a slight consequence we get:

**Corollary 3.1.**

$$I(\lambda) \geq U[\zeta](\epsilon, \lambda) \exp\left( \zeta^*(\lambda) - \epsilon(\lambda, \zeta^{*\prime}(\lambda)) \right),$$

and, if we choose  $\epsilon = \pi_\kappa(\lambda)$ ,

$$I(\lambda) \geq U[\zeta](\pi_\kappa(\lambda), \lambda) \exp(\zeta^*(\lambda) - \kappa). \quad (3.1)$$

Let us define the following function

$$V(\lambda) = V[\zeta](\lambda) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\kappa > 0} \{ U[\zeta](\pi_\kappa(\lambda), \lambda) e^{-\kappa} \}, \quad (3.2)$$

so, by (3.1), we have

$$I(\lambda) \geq V[\zeta](\lambda) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda)}, \quad \min_i \lambda(i) \geq \Lambda. \quad (3.3)$$

For instance, it is reasonable to suppose in addition, see e.g. Example 3.1 below, that

$$U[\zeta](\pi_\kappa(\lambda), \lambda) \geq \gamma \Lambda^\alpha \kappa^\beta, \quad \alpha, \beta, \gamma = \text{const} \in (0, \infty);$$

then

$$I(\lambda) \geq \gamma (\beta/e)^\beta \Lambda^\alpha e^{\zeta^*(\lambda)}, \quad \Lambda = \min_i \lambda(i) \geq e.$$

Let us consider the following important example.

**Example 3.1.** Suppose that  $X = R_+^d$ ,  $d\mu = dx$  and that the function  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$ ,  $x \in X = R_+^d$  is non-negative, strictly convex, twice continuous and differentiable as well as its conjugate  $\zeta^*(\lambda)$  and such that its second (matrix) derivative

$$\zeta''(x) = \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 \zeta(x)}{\partial x(i) \partial x(j)} \right\}, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, d$$

is a strictly positive definite matrix for all sufficiently large values  $\min_i x(i)$ .

Denote also

$$\zeta'(x) = \text{grad}\zeta(x) = \left\{ \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial x(i)} \right\},$$

$$x_0 = \bar{x}_0[\zeta](\lambda) = x_0[\zeta](\lambda) = \text{argmax}_{x \in R_+^d} S(\lambda, x) = \text{argmax}_{x \in R_+^d} [(\lambda, x) - \zeta(x)],$$

$$\Delta = \Delta(\lambda, x) = S(\lambda, x) - S(\lambda(1 - \epsilon), x_0(\lambda)),$$

so that

$$\text{grad}\zeta(x_0) = \lambda, \quad \lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} x_0[\zeta](\lambda) = \infty$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} X_0(\epsilon, \lambda) &= \{x \in R_+^d : S(\lambda, x) \geq \zeta^*(\lambda(1 - \epsilon))\} \\ &= \{x \in R_+^d : S(\lambda, x) \geq S(\lambda(1 - \epsilon), x_0(\lambda))\}. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce after simple calculations, using Taylor's formula, that the set  $X_0(\epsilon, \lambda)$  is asymptical equivalent, as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0+$ , to the following one (multidimensional ellipsoid)

$$\tilde{X}_0 = \left\{ x : (\zeta''(x_0)(x - x_0), (x - x_0)) \leq \epsilon (\lambda, x_0) \right\},$$

in the sense that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0+} \frac{\mu(\tilde{X}_0)}{\mu(X_0)} = 1.$$

The case when the value  $\epsilon = \epsilon(\lambda)$  is dependent on  $\lambda$ , but such that

$$\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon(\lambda) = 0,$$

can not be excluded.

It is no hard to calculate the "volume" of ellipsoid  $\tilde{X}_0$ :

$$\mu(\tilde{X}_0) = \frac{\pi^{d/2} [2\epsilon \cdot (\lambda, x_0)]^d}{\Gamma(d/2 + 1)} \cdot \left\{ \det \zeta''(x_0) \right\}^{-1/2}.$$

Following

$$\mu(X_0) \geq C_0(d) [ \epsilon \cdot (\lambda, x_0[\zeta](\lambda)) ]^d \cdot \left\{ \det \zeta''(x_0) \right\}^{-1/2}.$$

If, for instance,  $d = 1$ ,  $m = \text{const} > 1$ ,

$$\zeta(x) = \zeta_m(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} x^m / m,$$

then

$$x_0 = \lambda^{1/(m-1)}, \quad \lambda, x \geq 1; \quad \mu(X_0) \geq C_m \epsilon^{1/2} \lambda^{1/(m-1)},$$

and we find, after some calculations,

$$\begin{aligned} I_m(\lambda) &\stackrel{def}{=} \int_0^\infty \exp(\lambda x - x^m/m) dx \\ &\geq \left(\frac{2.5}{m-1}\right)^{1/2} \lambda^{(2-m)/(2m-2)} \exp\left(\lambda^{m'}/m'\right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $m' = m/(m-1)$ ,  $\lambda \geq \lambda_0(m)$  and

$$\lambda_0(m) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } 1 < m \leq 2 \\ 2 \left(\frac{m-2}{2m-2}\right)^{(m-1)/m} & \text{if } m > 2 \end{cases}$$

The last estimate is in full accordance, up to a multiplicative constant, with the exact asymptotic estimates for  $I_m(\lambda)$ , as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , which may be found, e.g., in the well-known book [11], sections 1, 2:

$$I_m(\lambda) \sim \sqrt{2\pi/(m-1)} \lambda^{(2-m)/(2m-2)} \exp\left(\lambda^{m'}/m'\right). \quad (3.4)$$

The upper estimate corresponding to the lower one obtained above, for the integral  $I_m(\lambda)$ , has the form

$$I_m(\lambda) \leq m^{2/m-1} e^{1/m} \Gamma(1/m) \lambda^{1/(m-1)} \exp\left(\lambda^{m'}/m'\right), \quad \lambda \geq \lambda_0(m).$$

## 4 Inverse approach. Upper estimation.

Let now the representation (1.2) be given on the form of an *inequality*

$$\int_X e^{(\lambda, x) - \zeta(x)} \mu(dx) \geq J(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in R_+^d \quad (4.1)$$

for a certain non-negative continuous function  $J = J(\lambda)$ . Here we derive the upper bound for the source function  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$  for all the sufficiently large values  $\Lambda(x) = \min_i x(i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$ , of course, under appropriate conditions.

Let us impose the following condition on our datum. Namely, assume that for some finite constant  $C_{12}$

$$e^{C(\zeta^*)} r(\lambda) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda)} \leq e^{\zeta^*(C_{12}[\zeta](\lambda))}, \quad \lambda \geq \Lambda = \text{const} \geq 1, \quad (4.2)$$

Suppose also that the function  $\zeta(\cdot)$  is non-negative, continuous and convex. We have, by virtue of Theorem 2.1,

$$e^{\zeta^*(C_{12}[\zeta](\lambda))} \geq J(\lambda), \quad \lambda \geq \Lambda,$$

$$\ln J(\lambda) \leq \zeta^*(C_{12}\lambda), \quad C_{12} = C_{12}[\zeta] \in (0, \infty),$$

therefore

$$[\ln J(\cdot)]^*(x) \geq \zeta^{**}(x/C_{12}).$$

Under the above conditions and by virtue of Fenchel-Moreau Theorem, we have

**Theorem 4.1.** *If the function  $\zeta(\cdot)$  satisfies the condition (4.1), where  $J = J(\lambda)$  is a non-negative function, then*

$$\zeta(x) \leq [\ln J(\cdot)]^*(C_{12}x), \quad \Lambda(x) = \min_i x(i) \geq 1. \quad (4.3)$$

## 5 Inverse approach. Lower estimation.

Let now the representation (1.2) be given on the form of an *inequality*

$$\int_X e^{(\lambda, x) - \zeta(x)} \mu(dx) \leq K(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in R_+^d \quad (5.1)$$

for a certain non-negative continuous function  $K = K(\lambda)$ . Here we derive the lower bound for the source function  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$ .

Let us impose the following condition on our datum. Namely, assume that there exists  $C_{13} = C_{13}[\zeta] = \text{const} \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$e^{C(\zeta^*)} V[\zeta](\lambda) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda)} \geq e^{\zeta^*(C_{13}\lambda)}, \quad \lambda \geq \Lambda = \text{const} \geq 1. \quad (5.2)$$

Suppose, as above, that the function  $\zeta(\cdot)$  is non-negative, continuous and convex. We have, by virtue of Theorem 3.1 and its consequences,

$$e^{\zeta^*(C_{13}\lambda)} \leq K(\lambda), \quad \lambda \geq \Lambda,$$

$$\ln K(\lambda) \geq \zeta^*(C_{13}\lambda),$$

therefore, under the above conditions and by virtue of Fenchel-Moreau Theorem, we have

**Theorem 5.1.** *If the function  $\zeta(\cdot)$  satisfies the condition (5.1), where  $K = K(\lambda)$  is a non-negative continuous function, then*

$$\zeta(x) \geq [\ln K(\cdot)]^*(C_{13}x), \quad \Lambda(x) \geq 1. \quad (5.3)$$

## 6 Multivariate Tauberian theorems.

**Preface.** Tauberian theorems are named the relations between asymptotical or not-asymptotical behavior of some function (sequence) and correspondent behavior of its certain integral transform, for example, Laplace, Fourier or power series transform, see [32, 19]. They play a very important role, for example, in the probability theory (see [3]), to establish the connection between the behavior of tail of distribution for a random variable and the asymptotic one of its Moment Generation Function (MGF).

There are many results in this direction for one-dimensional case, as well as asymptotical ones, see e.g. in [1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 20, 24, 29, 33].

In this section we investigate multivariate Tauberian theorems describing relations between the function  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$ ,  $x \in X$  and its Laplace integral transform  $I[\zeta](\lambda)$ ,  $\lambda \in R^d$ , when  $\Lambda(x) \rightarrow \infty$  or correspondingly  $\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ .

DIRECT APPROACH.

**Theorem 6.1. (Upper limit).** *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 2.1 for the function  $\phi(\lambda) = \zeta^*(\lambda)$ , if in addition suppose that*

$$\lim_{\min_i \lambda(i) \rightarrow \infty} \phi(\lambda) = \infty \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$\lim_{\min_i \lambda(i) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\ln r(\lambda)|}{\phi(\lambda)} = 0, \quad (6.2)$$

then

$$\overline{\lim}_{\min_i \lambda(i) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln I(\lambda)}{\phi(\lambda)} \leq 1. \quad (6.3)$$

**Proof.** Choosing  $\epsilon = \epsilon(\lambda) = \pi(\lambda) = \pi_1(\lambda)$  we have, for sufficiently large values  $\Lambda(\lambda) = \min_i \lambda(i)$ ,

$$\frac{\ln I(\lambda)}{\phi(\lambda)} \leq \frac{|\ln r(\lambda)|}{\phi(\lambda)} + \frac{\phi(\lambda + \lambda\pi(\lambda))}{\phi(\lambda)}.$$

The term on the left hand side tends to zero as  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ , the limit of the quantity on the right hand side is equal to one. In detail,

$$\frac{\phi(\lambda + \lambda\pi(\lambda))}{\phi(\lambda)} \geq \frac{\phi(\lambda)}{\phi(\lambda)} = 1.$$

On the other hand, from the condition (2.12) it follows

$$\phi(\lambda + 2\lambda \pi(\lambda)) \leq C(\phi) + \phi(\lambda),$$

therefore, by virtue of condition (6.1),

$$\frac{\phi(\lambda + \lambda\pi(\lambda))}{\phi(\lambda)} \leq 1 + \frac{C_1(\phi)}{\phi(\lambda)} \rightarrow 1,$$

as  $\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ .

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.2. (Lower limit).** *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 3.1 for the function  $\phi(\lambda) = \zeta^*(\lambda)$ , if in addition suppose that*

$$\lim_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln\{V(\lambda)\}}{\zeta^*(\lambda)} = 0, \quad (6.4)$$

where  $V$  is defined in (3.2), then

$$\underline{\lim}_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln I(\lambda)}{\zeta^*(\lambda)} \geq 1. \quad (6.5)$$

**Proof.** The proof is completely alike to the one based on Theorem 6.1 and may be omitted.  $\square$

As consequence of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 we have

**Theorem 6.3.** *Suppose that all the conditions of Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 are satisfied. Then there exists the following limit and*

$$\lim_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln I(\lambda)}{\zeta^*(\lambda)} = 1. \quad (6.6)$$

INVERSE APPROACH.

Given the representation (1.2), in which the function  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$  is *convex and continuous*, we have

**Theorem 6.4. (Lower estimate)** *Suppose that there exists a continuous non-negative function  $Q = Q(\lambda)$ ,  $\lambda \in R^d$ , for which*

$$\lim_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln V(\lambda)}{Q(\lambda)} = 0,$$

$$\overline{\lim}_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln I(\lambda)}{Q(\lambda)} \leq 1,$$

and

$$\lim_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} Q(\lambda) = \infty.$$

Then

$$\underline{\lim}_{\Lambda(x) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\zeta(x)}{Q^*(x)} \geq 1.$$

**Proof.** Let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  be an arbitrary “small” number. There exists a value  $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0(\delta) > 1$  such that, for all the values  $\lambda$ ,

$$\Lambda(\lambda) \geq \Lambda_0 \Rightarrow \ln I(\lambda) \leq (1 + \delta) Q(\lambda),$$

$$I(\lambda) \leq \exp((1 + \delta) Q(\lambda)).$$

We apply the estimation of Corollary 3.1, so that

$$V[\zeta](\lambda) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda)} \leq \exp((1 + \delta) Q(\lambda)),$$

and

$$\frac{\zeta^*(\lambda)}{Q(\lambda)} \leq \frac{\ln V(\lambda)}{Q(\lambda)} + (1 + \delta) \leq (1 + 2\delta), \quad \Lambda(\lambda) \geq 2\Lambda_0.$$

Therefore

$$\zeta^*(\lambda) \leq (1 + 2\delta)Q(\lambda),$$

and

$$\zeta^{**}(x) \geq \frac{1}{1 + 2\delta} Q^*\left(\frac{x}{1 + 2\delta}\right).$$

Applying the Fenchel-Morau Theorem, we conclude the proof. □

Given again the representation (1.2), in which the function  $\zeta = \zeta(\lambda)$  is *convex and continuous*, we have

**Theorem 6.5. (Upper estimate)** *Suppose that there exists a continuous non-negative function  $Q = Q(\lambda)$ ,  $\lambda \in R^d$ , for which*

$$\lim_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln r(\lambda)}{Q(\lambda)} = 0,$$

$$\overline{\lim}_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln I(\lambda)}{Q(\lambda)} \geq 1,$$

and

$$\lim_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} Q(\lambda) = \infty.$$

Then

$$\overline{\lim}_{\Lambda(x) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\zeta(x)}{Q^*(x)} \leq 1.$$

**Proof.** The proof is quite alike as the one in Theorem 6.4. Let  $\delta \in (0, 1)$  be an arbitrary “small” number. There exists a value  $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0(\delta) > 1$  such that, for all the values  $\lambda$ ,

$$\Lambda(\lambda) \geq \Lambda_0 \Rightarrow \ln I(\lambda) \geq (1 - \delta) Q(\lambda),$$

$$I(\lambda) \geq \exp((1 - \delta) Q(\lambda)).$$

We apply the estimation of Corollary 3.1, so that

$$e^{C(\phi)} r[\zeta](\lambda) e^{\zeta^*(\lambda)} \geq \exp((1 - \delta) Q(\lambda)),$$

and

$$\frac{\zeta^*(\lambda)}{Q(\lambda)} \geq \frac{C(\phi) + \ln r(\lambda)}{Q(\lambda)} + (1 - \delta) \geq (1 - 2\delta), \quad \Lambda(\lambda) \geq 2\Lambda_0.$$

Therefore

$$\zeta^{**}(x) \leq \frac{1}{1 - 2\delta} Q^*\left(\frac{x}{1 - 2\delta}\right).$$

Applying the Fenchel-Morau Theorem, we conclude the proof.  $\square$

To summarize.

**Theorem 6.6. (Hybrid estimate).** *Suppose that all the conditions of Theorems 6.4 and 6.4 are satisfied. Then the following limit there exists and*

$$\lim_{\Lambda(x) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\zeta(x)}{Q^*(x)} = 1.$$

## 7 An important example.

In this section we consider  $X = R^d$  as well as  $\lambda \in R^d$ .

**Definition 7.1.** Recall that the function  $g = g(x) : R^d \rightarrow R$  is said to be *radial*, or equally *spherical invariant*, iff it depends only on the Euclidean norm  $|x|$  of the vector  $x = \vec{x}$ , namely there exists  $g_0 : R \rightarrow R$  such that

$$g(x) = g_0(|x|).$$

**Lemma 7.1.** *Suppose that the function  $g : R^d \rightarrow R$  is radial and such that its Young-Fenchel transformation  $g^*(y)$  there exists. Then it is again a radial function, namely there is a function  $g_0 : R \rightarrow R$  for which*

$$g^*(y) = g_0^*(|y|) = \sup_{z \in R} (|y| z - g_0(z)). \quad (7.1)$$

*As a consequence, it is an even function.*

*Moreover, the optimal value in the definition of the Young-Fenchel transformation, i.e. the variable*

$$x(y) = x[g](y) := \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in R^d} ((x, y) - g(x)),$$

*so that  $g^*(y) = (y, x[g](y) - g(x[g](y)))$ , is also a radial function if, of course, there exists and is uniquely determined.*

**Proof.** Let  $U : R^d \rightarrow R^d$  be an arbitrary linear *unitary* operator and let  $U^*$  be its conjugate (linear) operator, also unitary. Recall that a function  $f : R^d \rightarrow R$  is radial iff for an arbitrary linear unitary operator  $U$ , it is  $f(Ux) = f(x)$ ,  $x \in R^d$ .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} g^*(Uy) &= \sup_{x \in R^d} ((x, Uy) - g(x)) = \sup_{x \in R^d} ((U^*x, y) - g(x)) \\ &= \sup_{x \in R^d} ((U^*x, y) - g(U^*x)) = \sup_{z \in R^d} ((z, y) - g(z)) = g^*(y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the function  $g^*(y)$  is radial.

The second proposition has an alike proof.  $\square$

**Remark 7.1.** The radiality of the Fourier transform of a radial function is well-known, see e.g. [31], chapters 2,3.

Let us consider the following family of Young-Fenchel functions

$$\zeta_{\kappa, L}(\lambda) \stackrel{def}{=} \kappa^{-1} |\lambda|^\kappa L^{1/\theta} (|\lambda|^\kappa), \quad |\lambda| \geq e,$$

$$\zeta_{\kappa, L}(\lambda) = C \lambda^2, \quad |\lambda| < e.$$

where  $\kappa = \text{const} > 1$ ,  $\theta = \kappa/(\kappa - 1)$ ,  $L(r)$ ,  $r \geq e$  is a slowly varying at infinity, twice continuous and differentiable function, such that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(r)}{L(r/L(r))} = 1.$$

The Young-Fenchel transformation for these functions is calculated in particular in the monograph [30], chapter 1, sections 1,3,4: as  $x \rightarrow \infty$

$$\zeta_{\kappa, L}^*(x) \sim \theta^{-1} |x|^\theta L^{1/\theta}(x).$$

One can apply our theory of Tauberian theorems.

**Theorem 7.1.** *Denote*

$$I_{\kappa, L}(\lambda) := \int_X e^{(\lambda, x) - \zeta_{\kappa, L}^*(x)} dx. \quad (7.2)$$

*We have*

$$\lim_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln I_{\kappa, L}(\lambda)}{\zeta_{\kappa, L}(\lambda)} = 1. \quad (7.3)$$

*Furthermore, the inverse conclusion holds true. Namely, if for some Young-Orlicz function  $\zeta = \zeta(x)$*

$$\lim_{\Lambda(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln I[\zeta](\lambda)(|\lambda|)}{\zeta_{\kappa, L}(|\lambda|)} = 1, \quad (7.4)$$

*then*

$$\lim_{\Lambda(x) \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\zeta(|x|)}{\zeta_{\kappa, L}^*(|x|)} = 1. \quad (7.5)$$

A particular case:

$$\zeta(x) = \zeta_{m, r}(x) = m^{-1} |x|^m \ln^r(|x|), \quad |x| \geq e, \quad m = \text{const} > 1, \quad r = \text{const} \in R.$$

We obtain, after some calculations, as  $|y| \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\zeta_{m,r}^*(y) \sim \frac{1}{m'} (m-1)^{r/(m-1)} |y|^{m'} [\ln |y|]^{-r/(m-1)},$$

where  $m' = m/(m-1)$ .

## 8 Concluding remarks.

**A.** It is interesting, by our opinion, to generalize the estimates obtained in the second section to the case of infinite-dimensional linear spaces, as well as to generalize our estimates for the more general integrals of the form

$$I[\zeta](\lambda) := \int_X \exp \zeta(\lambda, x) \mu(dx).$$

**B.** One can consider also the applications of the obtained results in the Probability theory, namely, in the theory of great deviation, asymptotical or not.

## References

- [1] D.R. Bagdasarov and E.I. Ostrovsky, *Reversion of Chebyshev's Inequality*. Probab. Theory Appl., **40** (4) (1996), 737–742.
- [2] C. Bennet and R. Sharpley, *Interpolation of operators*. Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1988.
- [3] N. H. Bingham, *Tauberian theorems and large deviations*. arXiv:0712.3410v1 [math.PR] 20 Dec 2007.
- [4] M. Broniatowski and A. Fuchs, *Tauberian Theorems, Chernoff Inequality and the Tail Behavior of Finite Convolution of Distribution Function*. Adv. Math., **116** (1) (1995), 12–33.
- [5] V.V. Buldygin and Yu.V. Kozachenko, *Metric Characterization of Random Variables and Random Processes*. Translations of Mathematics Monograph, AMS, v.188 (1998).
- [6] H. Chen, *Evaluation of the Laplace integral*. Internat. J. Math. Ed. Sci. Tech., **35** (5) (2004), 773–777.
- [7] H. Chernoff, *A career in statistics*. In X. Lin, C. Genest, D.L. Banks, G. Molenberghs, D.W. Scott, J-L. Wang, *Past, Present, and Future of Statistical Science*. CRC Press. p. 35. ISBN 9781482204964 (2014).
- [8] H. Chernoff, *A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations*. Ann. Math. Statistics, **23**, (1952), 493–507.
- [9] P.L. Davies, *Tail probabilities for positive random variables with entire characteristic functions of very regular growth*. Z. Angew. Math. Mech., **56**, (1976), 334–336.
- [10] P. Eichelsbacher and L. Knichel, *Fine asymptotics for models with Gamma type moments*. arXiv:1710.06484v1 [math.PR] 17 Oct 2017.
- [11] M.V. Fedoryuk, *The saddle-point method*. Moscow, Nauka, (1977) (In Russian).
- [12] J.L. Geluk, L. de Haan and U. Stadtmüller, *A Tauberian theorem of exponential type*. Canad. J. Math. **38** (3) (1986), 697-718.

- [13] J.L. Geluk, *On the relation between the tail probability and the moments of a random variable.* Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Indag. Math. **46** (4) (1984), 401–405.
- [14] S. Janson, *Further examples with moments of Gamma type.* arXiv:1204.5637v2, 6 Feb 2013.
- [15] S. Janson, *Moments of Gamma type and the Brownian supremum process area.* Probab. Surv., **7** (2010), 1–52.
- [16] Y. Kasahara, *Tauberian theorems of exponential type.* J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **18** (2) (1978), 209–219.
- [17] Y. Kasahara and N. Kosugi, *Remarks on Tauberian theorem of exponential type and Fenchel-Legendre transform.* Osaka J. Math., **39** (3) (2002), 613–619.
- [18] V.N. Kolokoltsov, T.M. Lapinski, *Multivariate Laplace approximation with estimated error and application to limit theorems.* arXiv:1502.03266v5 [math.PR] 17 Jul 2018.
- [19] J. Korevaar, *Tauberian theory: a century of developments.* Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, **329** Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.
- [20] N. Kosugi, *Tauberian theorem of exponential type and its application to multiple convolution.* J. Math. Kyoto Univ., **39** (2) (1999), 331–346.
- [21] Yu.V. Kozachenko and E.I. Ostrovsky, *The Banach Spaces of random Variables of subgaussian Type.* Theory of Probab. and Math. Stat. (in Russian). Kiev, KSU, **32**, (1985). 43–57.
- [22] Yu.V. Kozachenko, E.I. Ostrovsky and L. Sirota, *Relations between exponential tails, moments and moment generating functions for random variables and vectors.* arXiv:1701.01901v1 [math.FA] 8 Jan 2017.
- [23] V.P. Maslov and M.V. Fedoryuk, *Logarithmic Asymptotic behavior of the Laplace integrals.* Mathematical Notes, **30** (5) (1981), 763–768.
- [24] D.M. Mason, *An extended version of the Erdős-Rényi strong law of large numbers.* Ann. Probab., **17** (1) (1989), 252–265.
- [25] E.I. Ostrovsky, *Exponential estimations for Random Fields and its applications,* (in Russian). Moscow - Obninsk, OINPE (1999).
- [26] E. Ostrovsky and L. Sirota, *Vector rearrangement invariant Banach spaces of random variables with exponential decreasing tails of distributions.* arXiv:1510.04182v1 [math.PR] 14 Oct 2015.
- [27] E. Ostrovsky and L. Sirota, *Non-asymptotical sharp exponential estimates for maximum distribution of discontinuous random fields.* arXiv:1510.08945v1 [math.PR] 30 Oct 2015
- [28] E.I. Ostrovsky, *About supports of probability measures in separable Banach spaces.* Soviet Math., Doklady, **255** (6) (1980), 836–838, (in Russian).
- [29] E. Ostrovsky and L. Sirota, *Inversion of Tchebychev-Tchernov inequality.* arXiv:1711.06896v1 [math.PR] 18 Nov 2017.
- [30] E. Seneta, *Regularly Varying Functions.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.
- [31] E. M. Stein and G. Weiss, *Introduction to Fourier analysis on Euclidean spaces.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1971.
- [32] A. Tauber, *Ein Satz aus der Theorie der unendlichen Reihen.* Monatsh. Math. Phys. **8** (1) (1897), 273–277.
- [33] A.L. Yakimiv, *Probabilistic applications of Tauberian theorems.* Modern probability and statistics, VSP, Leiden, 2005, ISBN: 9067644374.

- [34] A. Zhang and Y. Zhou, *A Non-asymptotic, Sharp, and User-friendly Reverse Chernoff-Cramer Bound*. arXiv:1810.09006v1 [math.PR] 21 Oct 2018.