

# UPPER AND LOWER BOUNDS ON TVD AND KLD BETWEEN CENTERED ELLIPTICAL DISTRIBUTIONS IN HIGH-DIMENSIONAL SETTING

PAVEL IEVLEV, TIMOFEI SHASHKOV

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we derive some upper and lower bounds and inequalities for the total variation distance (TVD) and the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD), also known as the relative entropy, between two probability measures  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  defined by

$$D_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)} |\mu(B) - \nu(B)| \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\text{KL}}(\mu \parallel \nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \ln \left( \frac{d\mu(x)}{d\nu(x)} \right) \mu(dx)$$

correspondingly when the dimension  $n$  is high. We begin with some elementary bounds for centered elliptical distributions admitting densities and showcase how these bounds may be used by estimating the TVD and KLD between multivariate Student and multivariate normal distribution in the high-dimensional setting. Next, we show how the same approach simplifies when we apply it to multivariate Gamma distributions with independent components (in the latter case, we only study the TVD, because KLD may be calculated explicitly, see [1]). Our approach is motivated by the recent contribution by Barabesi and Pratelli [2].

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Measuring the dissimilarity between two probability measures using total variation distance (TVD) or Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD) is prominent across statistics and machine learning. In a typical application, the two measures are either (a) empirical and fitted, (b) corresponding to two different models of the same dataset or (c) corresponding to one model fitted to two different datasets. In case (a), these measures are used to estimate how well the model fits the data. For example, in hypothesis testing TVD provides so-called minimax lower bounds on both Type I errors (false positives) and Type II errors (false negatives) over all possible decision rules, see [3, Theorem 2.2]. In case (b), the two measures assess whether a model may be switched to a more preferable one within prescribed error bounds. A common example is to switch true but intractable distribution  $\mu$  to a simple approximation  $\nu$ , such as the Laplace approximation, see [4, 5, 6, 7], or variational inference, see [8]. In case (c), measures  $D_{\text{TV}}$  and  $D_{\text{KL}}$  are used to guarantee some robustness under changes of the underlying data, such as restriction to a subset, and/or mitigate overfitting. Since the advent of generative neural networks, the case (c) has gained a lot of attention. Two notable examples for point (c) are (i) assessing the vulnerability to data poisoning by estimating how much the fitted distribution is affected by injecting new points into the dataset [9] and (ii) providing quantitative privacy guarantee when the dataset used for training contains sensitive information, such as a language model trained on private emails. In both examples, the framework is quite similar: given a randomized algorithm assigning to a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  some distribution  $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ , check how  $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$  differs from  $\mu_{\mathcal{D}'}$  if  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}'$  are close. In the differential privacy setting, the aim is to ensure that an observer cannot infer whether a particular individual's data was part of the training set by sampling from  $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$  by adding as little noise to the model as possible (utility-privacy trade-off), see, [10, 11]. In this context, TVD measures the maximum distance between the output distributions when a single data point is removed.

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60E15, 62H05.

*Key words and phrases.* total variation distance; Kullback-Leibler divergence; multivariate Student distribution; high-dimensional statistics; Gamma distribution;

Supported by SNSF Grant 200021–196888.

The choice between  $D_{\text{KL}}$  and  $D_{\text{TV}}$  in specific applications is mainly guided by (a) the necessity for a more sensitive metric ( $D_{\text{KL}}$  is weaker than  $D_{\text{TV}}$  due to Pinsker's inequality  $D_{\text{TV}}(\mu, \nu)^2 \leq D_{\text{KL}}(\mu \parallel \nu)/2$ ), see [12, 13, 14], (b) the fact  $D_{\text{KL}}$  is frequently easier to compute (for many common distribution families, closed form expressions are available, see [15]), and (c) the fact that  $D_{\text{TV}}$  is usually easier to interpret. The sensitivity (a) is particularly important in the context of data poisoning and differential privacy [12, 13] whereas for more generic learning algorithms performance (b) is of more importance. For a general overview of probability metrics and how to choose between them, see [16].

The aforementioned applications underscore the necessity of total variation and KL divergence bounds *in high-dimensional settings* where explicit formulas are seldom available and Monte Carlo simulations may be prohibitively costly. This area of research has attracted a lot of attention recently, see [17, 2].

In this paper, we derive some elementary bounds on the TVD and KLD between centered elliptical distributions (Propositions 1 and 2) and then show how they may be applied when one distribution is the multivariate Student  $t$ -distribution and the other is multivariate normal (Theorems 1 and 2) or when both distributions are multivariate Gamma with independent components (Theorem 3). The bounds of Theorems 1 and 2 are given in terms of standard special functions, such as the incomplete regularized Gamma and Beta functions and the Lambert  $W$ -function. Since the bounds work for sufficiently large  $n$ , we show how to choose the threshold (see Lemma 4 and condition (10)). In Section 4, we use CLT with Berry-Esseen bounds with respect to  $n$  for the analysis of TVD between two Gamma laws in a similar way to [2].

In principle, the same approach is applicable to any two elliptical distributions for which the sets  $A_{\pm}$  from Proposition 1 may be described in a convenient form. Moreover, the same approach may be used to construct bounds on other divergences.

**Brief organization of the paper.** Section 2 is dedicated to some elementary bounds on the TVD and KLD between two elliptical distributions, which we later showcase in Section 3 by estimating the TVD and KLD between multivariate Student and multivariate normal distribution and in Section 4 by estimating the TVD between two multivariate Gamma distributions with independent components. Throughout the paper, longer proofs are relegated to the Appendix.

**Notation.** Throughout the paper, we use the following special functions:

- $W_0$  and  $W_{-1}$ : branches of the Lambert- $W$  function, see [18];
- $\gamma(x; a) = \int_0^x t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt$  and  $\Gamma(x; a) = \int_x^{\infty} t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt$ : lower and upper incomplete Gamma function, see, e.g., [19, Chapter 6.5];
- $P(z; a) = \gamma(x; a)/\Gamma(a)$ : lower regularized incomplete Gamma function;
- $B(x; a, b) = \int_0^x t^{a-1} (1-t)^{b-1} dt$ : incomplete Beta function;
- $I(x; a, b) = B(x; a, b)/B(a, b)$ : regularized incomplete Beta function;
- ${}_2F_1$  and  ${}_2F_2$ : hypergeometric functions.
- $\text{erf}(x) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-t^2} dt$  and  $\text{erfi}(x) = -i \text{erf}(ix)$ : error function and the imaginary error function.
- $\text{Ei}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{e^t}{t} dt$ : exponential integral.

References concerning these special functions may be found in [20].

## 2. ELEMENTARY BOUNDS ON TVD AND KLD BETWEEN TWO ELLIPTICAL DISTRIBUTIONS

Let  $\mathcal{E}(g, \Sigma)$  be a centered elliptical distribution admitting a pdf given by

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \Sigma}} g(x^\top \Sigma^{-1} x).$$

Here  $g$  is a so-called density generator. For a comprehensive treatment of elliptical distributions, see [21, 22].

First, we want to show that calculation of the distances between two elliptical distributions  $\mathcal{E}(g_1, \Sigma_1)$  and  $\mathcal{E}(g_2, \Sigma_2)$  may be reduced to the case when  $\Sigma_1 = I$  and  $\Sigma_2$  diagonal. Instead of proving it for TV and DKL separately, we prove it for all  $f$ -divergences (see [23]) in Lemma 1. Note that a version of this lemma in a general context is available in [24].

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $D$  be the eigenvalue matrix of  $\Sigma_2^{-1}\Sigma_1$ . Then*

$$D_f(\mathcal{E}(g_1, \Sigma_1) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_2, \Sigma_2)) = D_f(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)),$$

where  $D_f$  is the  $f$ -divergence associated to a convex function  $f: [0, \infty) \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$  such that  $f(x) < \infty$  for all  $x > 0$  and  $f(1) = 0$  by

$$D_f(\mu \parallel \nu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} f\left(\frac{d\mu(x)}{d\nu(x)}\right) d\nu(x).$$

Applying this lemma with  $f(t) = t \ln t$  and  $f(t) = |t - 1|/2$  yields the same claim for  $D_{\text{KL}}$  and  $D_{\text{TV}}$ .

Next, we shall use the following formula for the total variation distance in terms of the pdfs: if  $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_1, I)$  has pdf  $f_1$  and  $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)$  has pdf  $f_2$ , then

$$(1) \quad D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) = \mathbb{P}\{f_1(\mathbf{X}) \geq f_2(\mathbf{X})\} - \mathbb{P}\{f_1(\mathbf{Y}) \geq f_2(\mathbf{Y})\}.$$

Hereafter we assume that  $d_i = D_{ii}, i = 1, \dots, d$  and there exists positive  $d_-, d_+$  such that  $d_- \leq d_i \leq d_+$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ .

The following two lemmas contain elementary bounds on TVD and DKL between elliptical distributions.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_1, I)$ ,  $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)$ .*

(a) *If  $D = I$ , then*

$$D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) = \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{r^2 \in A\} (g_1(r^2) - g_2(r^2)) r^{n-1} dr$$

with  $A = \{t \in [0, \infty) : g_1(t) \geq g_2(t)\}$ .

(b) *If  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are decreasing on  $[0, \infty)$ , then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \left[ g_1(r^2) \mathbb{1}\{r^2 \in A_-\} - g_2(r^2) \mathbb{1}\{d_- r^2 \in A_+\} \right] r^{n-1} dr \\ & \leq D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \\ & \leq \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \left[ g_1(r^2) \mathbb{1}\{r^2 \in A_+\} - g_2(r^2) \mathbb{1}\{d_+ r^2 \in A_-\} \right] r^{n-1} dr \end{aligned}$$

with

$$(2) \quad A_\pm = \left\{ t \in [0, \infty) : \prod_{i=1}^n d_i^{1/2} g_1(t) \geq g_2\left(\frac{t}{d_\mp}\right) \right\}.$$

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_1, I)$  and  $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)$ .*

(a) *If  $D = I$ , then*

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) = \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \ln\left(\frac{g_1(r^2)}{g_2(r^2)}\right) g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr.$$

(b) *If  $g_2$  is decreasing on  $[0, \infty)$ , then:*

$$\frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty g_1(r^2) \ln\left(\frac{g_1(r^2)}{g_2(r^2/d_+)}\right) r^{n-1} dr + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \\ &\leq \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty g_1(r^2) \ln\left(\frac{g_1(r^2)}{g_2(r^2/d_-)}\right) r^{n-1} dr + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i, \end{aligned}$$

### 3. MULTIVARIATE STUDENT T-DISTRIBUTION AGAINST MULTIVARIATE NORMAL DISTRIBUTION

The pdfs of the centered multivariate  $t$ -distribution with  $\Sigma = I$  and of the multivariate normal distribution with  $\Sigma = D = \text{diag}(d_i)$  are given by

$$(3) \quad f_1(x) = \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2)\nu^{n/2}\pi^{n/2}} \left[1 + \frac{1}{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2\right]^{-(\nu+n)/2} \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2} \prod_{i=1}^n d_i^{1/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i^2}{d_i}\right).$$

In this section, we apply Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 to obtain lower and upper bounds on the total variation distance and KL divergence between these two distributions.

#### 3.1. Total variation distance

To apply Proposition 1, we need first to find a convenient description of the sets

$$A_\pm = \left\{ t \in [0, \infty) : \left(\prod_{i=1}^n d_i\right)^{1/2} \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2)\nu^{n/2}\pi^{n/2}} \left[1 + \frac{t}{\nu}\right]^{-(\nu+n)/2} \geq \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{n/2}} e^{-\frac{t}{2d_\mp}} \right\}.$$

Rewriting  $A_\pm$  as follows

$$A_\pm = \left\{ x : \left(1 + \frac{t}{\nu}\right)^{(\nu+n)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{2d_\mp}\right) \leq \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2) \cdot (2\pi)^{n/2}}{\Gamma(\nu/2)\nu^{n/2}\pi^{n/2}} \prod_{i=1}^n d_i^{1/2} \right\}$$

and denoting

$$(4) \quad c = \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2) \cdot (2\pi)^{n/2}}{\Gamma(\nu/2)\nu^{n/2}\pi^{n/2}} \prod_{i=1}^n d_i^{1/2} = \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2)} \left(\frac{2}{\nu}\right)^{n/2} \prod_{i=1}^n d_i^{1/2},$$

we find that both sets  $A_+$  and  $A_-$  are sublevel sets of a function  $\varphi_{\alpha,\gamma}(x) = (1+x)^\alpha e^{-\gamma x}$ :

$$(5) \quad A_\pm = \left\{ t : \varphi_{\alpha,\gamma_\pm}\left(\frac{t}{\nu}\right) \leq c \right\}, \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha = \frac{\nu+n}{2}, \quad \gamma_\pm = \frac{\nu}{2d_\mp}.$$

In the following lemma we simplify the description of  $A_\pm$  further.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\varphi_{\alpha,\gamma}(x) = (1+x)^\alpha e^{-\gamma x}$  and  $\alpha, \gamma, c > 0$ . Then there exist two numbers  $a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) < b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$  such that the sublevel set*

$$D_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) := \{x \geq 0 : \varphi_{\alpha,\gamma}(x) \leq c\}$$

*admits the following representation:*

$$(6) \quad D_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) = \{x \geq 0 : x \leq a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) \text{ or } x \geq b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)\}.$$

Moreover,

- If either of the following cases occurs,
  - (a)  $\gamma > \alpha$ ,
  - (b)  $\gamma \leq \alpha$  and  $0 < c < 1$ ,
 then  $a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) < 0$ , and therefore  $D_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) = [b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c), \infty)$ .
- If either of the following cases occurs,
  - (c)  $\gamma > \alpha$  and  $c \geq 1$ ,
  - (d)  $\gamma \leq \alpha$  and  $c \geq e^\gamma(\alpha/\gamma e)^\alpha$ ,
 then  $b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) \leq 0$ , and therefore  $D_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) = [0, \infty)$ .
- If  $\gamma \leq \alpha$  and  $1 \leq c < e^\gamma(\alpha/\gamma e)^\alpha$ , then  $a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) > 0$  and therefore  $D_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) = [0, a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)] \cup [b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c), \infty)$ .

**Remark 1.** The aforementioned numbers  $a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$  and  $b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$  can be calculated explicitly using branches  $W_{-1}$  and  $W_0$  of the Lambert function:

$$(7) \quad a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) = -1 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} W_0 \left( -\frac{\gamma c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha}}{\alpha} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) = -1 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} W_{-1} \left( -\frac{\gamma c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha}}{\alpha} \right).$$

Consider the following function:

$$(8) \quad c_{\text{lower}}(n) = \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2)} \left( \frac{2}{\nu} \right)^{n/2} d_-^{n/2}.$$

Clearly,  $c \geq c_{\text{lower}}(n)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The following three lemmas study the behaviour of the function  $c_{\text{lower}}(n)$ .

**Lemma 3.** If  $c_{\text{lower}}(1) \geq 1$ , then  $c_{\text{lower}}$  is strictly increasing as a function on  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 4.** Let  $n_0 = 2k$ , where  $k$  satisfies

$$(9) \quad \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2l}{\nu} \right) \geq -\ln d_-.$$

Then  $c_{\text{lower}}(n_0) \geq 1$ .

*Proof of Lemma 4.* Let  $n_0 = 2k$ . By (8),

$$c_{\text{lower}}(n_0) = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2} + k)}{\Gamma(\frac{\nu}{2})} \left( \frac{2}{\nu} \right)^k d_-^k = \frac{2^k}{\nu^k} \prod_{l=0}^{k-1} \left( \frac{\nu}{2} + l \right) d_-^k = \prod_{l=0}^{k-1} \left( 1 + \frac{2l}{\nu} \right) d_-^k.$$

Hence, if  $k$  satisfies (9), we have

$$\ln c_{\text{lower}}(n_0) = k \ln d_- + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2l}{\nu} \right) \geq 0 \iff c_{\text{lower}}(n_0) \geq 1.$$

□

**Remark 2.** Note that since the sequence  $k^{-1} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \ln(1 + 2l/\nu) \sim \ln k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , such  $n_0$  always exists.

Note that if  $d_- \geq 1$ , then one can check that  $c_{\text{lower}}(1) \geq 1$  and by Lemma 3 we obtain that  $c_{\text{lower}}(n) \geq 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and, in particular,  $n_0 = 2$ . The next lemma discusses the case  $d_- < 1$ .

**Lemma 5.** If  $d_- < 1$ , then the function  $c_{\text{lower}}(x)$  has one minimum  $x_{\min} > \frac{\nu}{d_-} - \nu$  in  $[0, \infty)$  and, moreover,  $c_{\text{lower}}(x)$  strictly decreases as  $x < x_{\min}$  and strictly increases as  $x > x_{\min}$ .

**Corollary 1.**  $n_0 > \nu/d_- - \nu$ , where  $n_0$  is as in Lemma 4.

*Proof of Corollary 1.* Assume the opposite. Since  $n_0 \geq 2$ , using Lemma 5 we conclude that  $x_{\min} \geq \nu/d_- - \nu \geq 2$  and, therefore, by Lemma 4

$$c_{\text{lower}}(1) > c_{\text{lower}}(2) \geq c_{\text{lower}}(n_0) \geq 1.$$

Hence by Lemma 3, we conclude that  $c_{\text{lower}}(1) < c_{\text{lower}}(2)$ , which contradicts the inequality above. □

**Lemma 6.**  $c < e^{\gamma - (\alpha/\gamma - e)^\alpha}$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

**Remark 3.** It turns out that without any additional information on  $d_i$  both cases  $c \geq e^{\gamma + (\alpha/\gamma + e)^\alpha}$  and  $c < e^{\gamma + (\alpha/\gamma + e)^\alpha}$  are possible even for large  $n$ . Indeed, one can check that

$$\frac{c}{e^{\gamma - (\alpha/\gamma - e)^\alpha}} \sim C n^{-1/2} \prod_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{d_i}{d_-} \right)^{1/2}$$

for some positive constant  $C$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, if we take, for example, a sequence  $d_1 = 1, d_2 = \dots = d_n = 2$ , then for large  $n$  we have that  $c > e^{\gamma + (\alpha/\gamma + e)^\alpha}$ . On the other hand, if  $d_1 = \dots = d_n = d_- = d_+$ , then  $c < e^{\gamma + (\alpha/\gamma + e)^\alpha}$  for  $n$  large enough.

Hereafter we assume  $n_0$  to be the minimal possible integer, which satisfies conditions of the Lemma 4. Now we discuss an important corollary from Lemma 2, Lemma 3, Lemma 4, Lemma 5, Lemma 6 and Corollary 1.

**Corollary 2.** *Under conditions above for all  $n \geq n_0$  and  $(d_i, i \geq 1)$  holds*

$$D_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c) = [0, a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)] \cup [b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c), \infty), \quad 0 < a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c) < b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c).$$

If there exists  $n_{\text{upper}} > 0$  such that for  $n \geq n_{\text{upper}}$

$$(10) \quad c < e^{\gamma^+} (\alpha / \gamma_+ e)^\alpha,$$

then for all  $n \geq \max(n_0, n_{\text{upper}})$  holds

$$D_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c) = [0, a_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c)] \cup [b_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c), \infty), \quad 0 < a_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c) < b_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c).$$

If, on the other hand, there exists  $n_{\text{lower}}$  such that for  $n \geq n_{\text{lower}}$

$$(11) \quad c \geq e^{\gamma^+} (\alpha / \gamma_+ e)^\alpha,$$

then for all  $n \geq \max(n_{\text{lower}}, n_0)$

$$D_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c) = [0, \infty).$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2, it is sufficient to check that  $c < e^{\gamma^-} (\alpha / \gamma_- e)^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha > \gamma_\pm$  and  $c > 1$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . By Lemma 6, we have that  $c < e^{\gamma^-} (\alpha / \gamma_- e)^\alpha$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . One can check that  $\alpha > \gamma_\pm \iff n > \nu / d_\mp - \nu$ . By Corollary 1, we obtain that  $n \geq n_0 > \nu / d_- - \nu \geq \nu / d_+ - \nu$ . Hence,  $\alpha > \gamma_\pm$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ .

Finally, if  $c_{\text{lower}}(1) \geq 1$ , then by Lemma 3  $c(n) > 1$  for all  $n$ . If  $c_{\text{lower}}(1) < 1$ , then from Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 it follows that  $c_{\text{lower}}(n) \geq 1$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . Thus, the proof follows.  $\square$

From Corollary 2 it follows that  $A_-$ : by (6),

$$A_- = \{t \in [0, \infty) : t \leq \nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)\} \cup \{t \in [0, \infty) : t \geq \nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)\}.$$

Similarly, for  $A_+$  we have

$$A_+ = \{t \in [0, \infty) : t \leq \nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c)\} \cup \{t \in [0, \infty) : t \geq \nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c)\},$$

if the condition (10) is satisfied and  $A_+ = [0, \infty)$ , if the condition (11) is satisfied. Combining this description with Proposition 1, we obtain bounds for the total variation distance.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}(g_1, I)$  and  $\mathcal{E}(g_2, D)$  be the multivariate centered  $t$ -distribution and the multivariate centered normal distribution defined by their densities (3).*

1. If Equation (11) is satisfied, then for  $n \geq \max(n_0, n_{\text{lower}})$

$$D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \leq P\left(\frac{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}}{2d_+}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - P\left(\frac{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}}{2d_+}; \frac{n}{2}\right)$$

2. If (10) is satisfied, then for  $n \geq \max(n_0, n_{\text{upper}})$  there are the following bounds for  $D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D))$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \\ & \leq P\left(\frac{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}}{2d_+}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - P\left(\frac{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}}{2d_+}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - I\left(\frac{1}{1 + \nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_+}^2}; \frac{\nu}{2}; \frac{n}{2}\right) + I\left(\frac{1}{1 + \nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_+}^2}; \frac{\nu}{2}; \frac{n}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \\ & \geq P\left(\frac{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_+}}{2d_-}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - P\left(\frac{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_+}}{2d_-}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - I\left(\frac{1}{1 + \nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}^2}; \frac{\nu}{2}; \frac{n}{2}\right) + I\left(\frac{1}{1 + \nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}^2}; \frac{\nu}{2}; \frac{n}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 1. These plots illustrate the lower and upper bounds behaviour for three different vectors  $d = (d_i)_{i=1,\dots,800}$ , randomly chosen from  $[0.95, 1.01]^{800}$ .

where  $P$  is the lower regularized incomplete Gamma function and  $I$  is the regularized incomplete Beta function.

**Remark 4.** Since  $x \mapsto I(x; a, b)$  is increasing, the upper bound in point (2) of the last theorem is lower than that of the point (1).

### 3.2. KL divergence

Before stating the next theorem, we introduce auxiliary notation that will be used in its formulation. For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $0 < k < n/2$  define

$$(12) \quad \alpha_{\mp, n-2} = 2^{1-\frac{n}{2}} e^{\frac{\nu}{2d_{\mp}}} \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \left(\frac{d_{\mp}}{\nu}\right)^{1-\frac{n}{2}} \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{n}{2}, \frac{\nu}{2d_{\mp}}\right)$$

and let for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(13) \quad \Delta_{\mp, n} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\pi} \left( \pi \operatorname{erfi} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\nu}{2d_{\mp}}} \right) + \ln \left( \frac{d_{\mp}}{2\nu} \right) - \gamma_{\text{EM}} \right) - \frac{\sqrt{\pi\nu}}{d_{\mp}} {}_2F_2 \left( 1, 1; \frac{3}{2}, 2; \frac{\nu}{2d_{\mp}} \right) & \text{if } n = 1, \\ -e^{-\frac{\nu}{2d_{\mp}}} \operatorname{Ei} \left( -\frac{\nu}{2d_{\mp}} \right) & \text{if } n = 2, \\ \Gamma(n/2) \Delta_{\mp, 2} + \Gamma(n/2) \sum_{l=1}^{n/2-1} \frac{\alpha_{\mp, n-2l}}{\Gamma(n/2-l+1)} & \text{if } n \mid 2, n > 2, \\ \Gamma(n/2) \Delta_{\mp, 2} + \Gamma(n/2) \sum_{l=1}^{n/2-1} \frac{\alpha_{\mp, n-2l}}{\Gamma(n/2-l+1)} & \text{if } n \nmid 2, n > 1. \end{cases}$$

Here  $\gamma_{\text{EM}}$  is the Euler-Mascheroni constant.

**Theorem 2.** Under assumptions given in this section,

1. If  $\nu > 2$ , then

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_2, D))$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i + \frac{\nu}{\nu-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2d_i} - \frac{1}{2}(n+\nu) \left( \psi_0 \left( \frac{n+\nu}{2} \right) - \psi_0 \left( \frac{\nu}{2} \right) \right) + \ln \left( \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2) \pi^{n/2} \nu^{n/2}} \right).$$

2. If  $\nu \leq 2$ , then  $D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) = \infty$ .

3. For all  $\nu > 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \left( 0, \frac{\nu+n}{2\Gamma(n/2)} \Delta_{-, n} - \ln \left( \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2) \pi^{n/2} \nu^{n/2}} \right) - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i \right) \\ & \leq D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_2, D) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_1, I)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{\nu + n}{2\Gamma(n/2)} \Delta_{+,n} - \ln \left( \frac{\Gamma((\nu + n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2) \pi^{n/2} \nu^{n/2}} \right) - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i,$$

where  $\Delta_{\mp,n}$  is given in (13).

#### 4. DISTANCES BETWEEN TWO GAMMA DISTRIBUTIONS

In this section we derive bounds on the total variation distance between two multivariate Gamma distributions with independent components defined by their pdfs

$$f_1(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i^{\alpha_i} x_i^{\alpha_i-1} e^{-\lambda_i x_i}}{\Gamma(\alpha_i)} \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mu_i^{\beta_i} x_i^{\beta_i-1} e^{-\mu_i x_i}}{\Gamma(\beta_i)},$$

$\alpha_i, \beta_i, \lambda_i, \mu_i > 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Before we formulate our next result, recall the Berry Esseen inequality.

Let  $Z_i, i = 1, 2, \dots$  be a sequence of independent random variables such that

$$(14) \quad \mathbb{E}\{Z_i\} = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}\{Z_i^2\} = \sigma_i^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\{|Z_i|^3\} = \rho_i < \infty, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots$$

Then according to Berry-Esseen theorem there exists an absolute constant  $C_0$  such that

$$(15) \quad \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq C_0 \kappa_n$$

where  $F_n$  and  $\Phi$  are distribution functions of  $S_n = (Z_1 + \dots + Z_n) / \left( \sqrt{\sigma_1^2 + \dots + \sigma_n^2} \right)$  and  $Z \sim N(0, 1)$  respectively, and  $\kappa_n = (\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i) / (\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2)^{3/2}$ .

Denote distributions of  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  with pdfs  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  respectively by  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}}$  and  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Y}}$ . Moreover, in this section we assume  $\psi_0$  and  $\psi_1$  to be polygamma functions of order 0 and 1.

#### Theorem 3.

$$D_{\text{TV}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Y}}) = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{c - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\{Z_i\}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}\{Z_i\}}} \leq Z \leq \frac{c - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{Z}_i\}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}\{\tilde{Z}_i\}}} \right\} + \varepsilon,$$

where

$$Z_i = (\alpha_i - \beta_i) \ln X_i + (\mu_i - \lambda_i) X_i, \quad X_i \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_i, \lambda_i),$$

$$\tilde{Z}_i = (\alpha_i - \beta_i) \ln Y_i + (\mu_i - \lambda_i) Y_i, \quad Y_i \sim \text{Gamma}(\beta_i, \mu_i), \quad Z \sim N(0, 1),$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{Z_i\} = (\alpha_i - \beta_i) \left( \psi_0(\alpha_i) - \ln \lambda_i \right) + \alpha_i \left( \frac{\mu_i}{\lambda_i} - 1 \right),$$

$$\text{Var}\{Z_i\} = (\alpha_i - \beta_i)^2 \psi_1(\alpha_i) - \frac{(\lambda_i - \mu_i)(\alpha_i(\lambda_i + \mu_i) - 2\beta_i \lambda_i)}{\lambda_i^2},$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{\tilde{Z}_i\} = (\alpha_i - \beta_i) \left( \psi_0(\beta_i) - \ln \mu_i \right) + \beta_i \left( 1 - \frac{\lambda_i}{\mu_i} \right),$$

$$\text{Var}\{\tilde{Z}_i\} = (\alpha_i - \beta_i)^2 \psi_1(\beta_i) + \frac{(\lambda_i - \mu_i)(\beta_i(\lambda_i + \mu_i) - 2\alpha_i \mu_i)}{\mu_i^2},$$

$$|\varepsilon| \leq C_0(\kappa_n + \tilde{\kappa}_n), \quad \kappa_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i}{(\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}\{Z_i\})^{3/2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\kappa}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\rho}_i}{(\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}\{\tilde{Z}_i\})^{3/2}}$$

and

$$\rho_i = \mathbb{E}\{|Z_i - \mathbb{E}\{Z_i\}|^3\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\rho}_i = \mathbb{E}\{|\tilde{Z}_i - \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{Z}_i\}|^3\}.$$

*Proof.* As in Section 3, we shall begin by describing the set  $\{x: f_1(x) \geq f_2(x)\}$ :

$$(16) \quad \{x: f_1(x) \geq f_2(x)\} = \left\{ x: \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\alpha_i - \beta_i} e^{(\mu_i - \lambda_i)x_i} \geq \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_i) \mu_i^{\beta_i}}{\Gamma(\beta_i) \lambda_i^{\alpha_i}} \right\}$$



$$(17) \quad = \left\{ \mathbf{x} : \sum_{i=1}^n \left( (\alpha_i - \beta_i) \ln x_i + (\mu_i - \lambda_i) x_i \right) \geq c \right\},$$

where

$$c = \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \left( \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_i) \mu_i^{\beta_i}}{\Gamma(\beta_i) \lambda_i^{\alpha_i}} \right).$$

Hence

$$D_{\text{TV}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Y}}) = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \geq c \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Z}_i \geq c \right\}$$

and therefore

$$D_{\text{TV}}(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{Y}}) = \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{c - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\{Z_i\}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}\{Z_i\}}} \leq Z \leq \frac{c - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\{\tilde{Z}_i\}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}\{\tilde{Z}_i\}}} \right\} + \varepsilon,$$

with  $Z \sim N(0, 1)$  and  $|\varepsilon| \leq C_0(\kappa_n + \tilde{\kappa}_n)$ .

□

## 5. APPENDIX

### 5.1. Proof of Lemma 1.

Let  $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_1, \Sigma_1)$  and  $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_2, \Sigma_2)$ . Since the matrix  $\Sigma_1^{-1/2} \Sigma_2 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$  is symmetric, there exists an orthogonal matrix  $P$  and a diagonal matrix  $D$  such that

$$\Sigma_1^{-1/2} \Sigma_2 \Sigma_1^{-1/2} = P^\top D P.$$

Changing the variables by  $\mathbf{y} = P \Sigma_1^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D_f(\mathcal{E}(g_1, \Sigma_1) \| \mathcal{E}(g_2, \Sigma_2)) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \Sigma_2}} g_2(\mathbf{x}^\top \Sigma_2^{-1} \mathbf{x}) f \left( \frac{g_1(\mathbf{x}^\top \Sigma_1^{-1} \mathbf{x}) \sqrt{\det \Sigma_2}}{g_2(\mathbf{x}^\top \Sigma_2^{-1} \mathbf{x}) \sqrt{\det \Sigma_1}} \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \sqrt{\det \Sigma_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det \Sigma_2}} g_2(\mathbf{y}^\top D^{-1} \mathbf{y}) f \left( \frac{g_1(\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y}) \sqrt{\det D}}{g_2(\mathbf{y}^\top D^{-1} \mathbf{y})} \right) d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\det D}} g_2(\mathbf{y}^\top D^{-1} \mathbf{y}) f \left( \frac{g_1(\mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{y}) \sqrt{\det D}}{g_2(\mathbf{y}^\top D^{-1} \mathbf{y})} \right) d\mathbf{y} \\ &= D_f(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I) \| \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)). \end{aligned}$$

To conclude the proof, it remains to notice that the eigenvalues and their multiplicities of  $\Sigma_1^{-1/2} \Sigma_2 \Sigma_1^{-1/2}$  and those of  $\Sigma_2 \Sigma_1^{-1}$  are the same.

### 5.2. Proof of Proposition 1

(a) Follows from [21, Theorem 2.9].

(b) Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) &= \mathbb{P}\{f_1(\mathbf{X}) \geq f_2(\mathbf{X})\} - \mathbb{P}\{f_1(\mathbf{Y}) \geq f_2(\mathbf{Y})\} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left( \prod_{i=1}^n d_i \right)^{1/2} g_1(|\mathbf{X}|^2) \geq g_2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_i^2}{d_i} \right) \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left( \prod_{i=1}^n d_i \right)^{1/2} g_1(|\mathbf{Y}|^2) \geq g_2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_i^2}{d_i} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are decreasing, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\{|\mathbf{X}|^2 \in A_-\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left( \prod_{i=1}^n d_i \right)^{1/2} g_1(|\mathbf{X}|^2) \geq g_2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_i^2}{d_i} \right) \right\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{|\mathbf{X}|^2 \in A_+\}.$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ d_+ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_i^2}{d_i} \in A_- \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left( \prod_{i=1}^n d_i \right)^{1/2} g_1(|\mathbf{Y}|^2) \geq g_2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_i^2}{d_i} \right) \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ d_- \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_i^2}{d_i} \in A_+ \right\}.$$

Combining these bounds, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \{ |\mathbf{X}|^2 \in A_- \} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ d_- \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_i^2}{d_i} \in A_+ \right\} \\ & \leq D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \leq \mathbb{P} \{ |\mathbf{X}|^2 \in A_+ \} - \mathbb{P} \left\{ d_+ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_i^2}{d_i} \in A_- \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to note that

$$\mathbb{P} \{ |\mathbf{X}|^2 \in A_{\pm} \} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1} \{ |\mathbf{x}|^2 \in A_{\pm} \} g_1(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^{\infty} \mathbb{1} \{ r^2 \in A_{\pm} \} g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left\{ d_{\mp} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{Y_i^2}{d_i} \in A_{\pm} \right\} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1} \left\{ d_{\mp} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i^2}{d_i} \in A_{\pm} \right\} \prod_{i=1}^n d_i^{-1/2} g_2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i^2}{d_i} \right) d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1} \{ d_{\mp} |\mathbf{y}|^2 \in A_{\pm} \} g_2(|\mathbf{y}|^2) d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^{\infty} \mathbb{1} \{ d_{\mp} r^2 \in A_{\pm} \} g_2(r^2) dr. \end{aligned}$$

### 5.3. Proof of Proposition 2

- (a) Follows from [21, Theorem 2.9].
- (b) By definition, if  $g_2$  is a decreasing function, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I) \| \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g_1(|\mathbf{x}|^2) \ln \left( \frac{g_1(|\mathbf{x}|^2) \prod_{i=1}^n d_i^{1/2}}{g_2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i^2}{d_i} \right)} \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g_1(|\mathbf{x}|^2) \ln \left( \frac{g_1(|\mathbf{x}|^2)}{g_2 \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i^2}{d_i} \right)} \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} g_1(|\mathbf{x}|^2) \ln \left( \frac{g_1(|\mathbf{x}|^2)}{g_2(|\mathbf{x}|^2/d_-)} \right) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i + \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^{\infty} g_1(r^2) \ln \left( \frac{g_1(r^2)}{g_2(r^2/d_-)} \right) r^{n-1} dr. \end{aligned}$$

The lower bound for  $D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I) \| \mathcal{E}(g_2, D))$  may be proved in the same way.

### 5.4. Proof of Theorem 1

To start with, we check auxiliary lemmas mentioned in Section 3.1.

*Proof of Lemma 2.* If  $\alpha > \gamma$ , then the maximum of  $\varphi_{\alpha, \gamma}(x)$ ,  $x \geq 0$  equals

$$\varphi_{\alpha, \gamma}(x_0) = e^{\gamma} \left( \frac{\alpha}{\gamma e} \right)^{\alpha} > 1 \quad \text{and is attained at } x_0 = \frac{\alpha - \gamma}{\gamma}.$$

Otherwise, if  $\gamma \geq \alpha$ , the maximum of  $\varphi_{\alpha, \gamma}(x)$ ,  $x \geq 0$  is  $\varphi_{\alpha, \gamma}(0) = 1$  and the function  $\varphi_{\alpha, \gamma}$  is decreasing. Therefore, if  $\alpha < \gamma$  and  $c \geq 1$  or  $\gamma \leq \alpha$  and  $c \geq e^{\gamma}(\alpha/\gamma e)^{\alpha}$ , we have that

$$D_{\alpha, \gamma}(c) = \{x: \varphi_{\alpha, \gamma}(x) \leq c\} = [0, \infty).$$

In order to find the roots of  $\varphi_{\alpha, \gamma}(x) = c$  in the remaining cases

- (a)  $0 < c < 1$ ,  
 (b)  $\alpha \geq \gamma$  and  $1 < c < e^\gamma(\alpha/\gamma e)^\alpha$ ,

we shall use the Lambert functions  $W_{-1}(x)$  and  $W_0(x)$  defined on  $[-1/e, 0]$  as the two solutions  $y_{-1}$  and  $y_0$  of  $ye^y = x$  satisfying  $y_{-1} \leq y_0$ , see [18]. Let us first rewrite the equation in the form  $ye^y = z$  with some  $y$  and  $z$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1+x)^\alpha e^{-\gamma x} = c &\iff (1+x)^\alpha e^{-\gamma(1+x)} = ce^{-\gamma} \\
 &\iff (1+x)e^{-(\gamma/\alpha)(1+x)} = c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha} \\
 (18) \quad &\iff -\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}(1+x)e^{-(\gamma/\alpha)(1+x)} = -\frac{\gamma c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha}}{\alpha}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The last equation is of the form  $ye^y = z$  with  $y = -(\gamma/\alpha)(1+x)$  and  $z = -\gamma c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha}/\alpha$ . In order to solve it, we need to check whether  $z \in [-1/e, 0]$ , which is the domain of  $W_{-1}$  and  $W_0$ :

$$(19) \quad -\frac{\gamma c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha}}{\alpha} \geq -\frac{1}{e} \iff c^{1/\alpha} \leq \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} e^{\gamma/\alpha-1} \iff c \leq e^\gamma \left(\frac{\alpha}{\gamma e}\right)^\alpha.$$

We have:

- (a) If  $0 < c < 1$ , then  $c^{1/\alpha} < 1$  and  $e^{x-1}/x \geq 1$  for all  $x \geq 0$ , so (19) is satisfied.  
 (b) If  $\alpha \geq \gamma$  and  $1 < c < e^\gamma(\alpha/\gamma e)^\alpha$ , then the condition (19) is also satisfied.

Applying  $W_0$  and  $W_{-1}$  to both sides of (18), we obtain two solutions which we denote by  $a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$  and  $b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$ :

$$-\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}(1+a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)) = W_0\left(-\frac{\gamma c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha}}{\alpha}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad -\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}(1+b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)) = W_{-1}\left(-\frac{\gamma c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha}}{\alpha}\right).$$

Solving them for  $a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$  and  $b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$ , we obtain

$$a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) = -1 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} W_0\left(-\frac{\gamma c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha}}{\alpha}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) = -1 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} W_{-1}\left(-\frac{\gamma c^{1/\alpha} e^{-\gamma/\alpha}}{\alpha}\right).$$

Since  $W_{-1}(x) \leq W_0(x)$ , we see that  $a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) \leq b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$ . If  $\gamma > \alpha$ , using that  $W_0(z) \geq -1$  (see [18, p. 331]) we obtain

$$a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) \leq -1 + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} < 0,$$

hence  $b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$  is the only root in  $x \geq 0$ . If, on the other hand,  $\gamma \leq \alpha$  and  $0 < c < 1$ , then by  $W_0(z) \geq \sqrt{1+ez} - 1$  for  $x \in [-1/e, 0]$  (see [25, Theorem 3.2]), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) &\leq -1 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \left( \sqrt{1 - \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} c^{1/\alpha} e^{1-\gamma/\alpha}} - 1 \right) \\
 &< -1 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \left( \sqrt{1 - \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} e^{1-\gamma/\alpha}} - 1 \right) \quad \text{by } 0 < c < 1 \\
 &\leq -1 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \left( 1 - \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} - 1 \right) \quad \text{by } \sqrt{1 - xe^{1-x}} \leq 1 - x, \quad x \in [0, 1] \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in this case  $b_{\alpha,\gamma}(c)$  is again the only root in  $x \geq 0$ .

Finally, if  $\alpha \geq \gamma$  and  $1 < c < e^\gamma(\alpha/\gamma e)^\alpha$ , then since  $W_0(x) \geq -1$ , we have that

$$a_{\alpha,\gamma}(c) \geq -1 + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \geq 0.$$

□

From the presented proof Remark 1 automatically follows.

*Proof of Lemma 3.* The function  $n \mapsto c_{\text{lower}}(n)$  increases on  $\mathbb{N}$  if for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  holds

$$(20) \quad \frac{c_{\text{lower}}(2k+1)}{c_{\text{lower}}(2k)} > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{c_{\text{lower}}(2k)}{c_{\text{lower}}(2k-1)} > 1.$$

Since

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2} + k\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2} + k\right)} = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)} \prod_{l=0}^{k-1} \frac{(\nu+1)/2 + l}{\nu/2 + l} = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)} \prod_{l=0}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu + 2l}\right),$$

we have

$$\frac{c_{\text{lower}}(2k+1)}{c_{\text{lower}}(2k)} = \underbrace{\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{2}{\nu}\right)^{1/2}}_{= c_{\text{lower}}(1) \geq 1} d_-^{1/2} \prod_{l=0}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu + 2l}\right) \geq \prod_{l=0}^{k-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu + 2l}\right) > 1.$$

Moreover

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2} + k\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2} + k - 1\right)} = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2} + 1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \prod_{l=0}^{k-2} \frac{\nu/2 + 1 + l}{(\nu+1)/2 + l} = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2} + 1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \prod_{l=0}^{k-2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu + 2l + 1}\right).$$

Using the logarithmic convexity of the Gamma-function, we have that  $\Gamma(x)\Gamma(x+1) \geq \Gamma(x+1/2)^2$  for all  $x \geq 0$ , and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{c_{\text{lower}}(2k)}{c_{\text{lower}}(2k-1)} &= \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2} + 1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{2}{\nu}\right)^{1/2} d_-^{1/2} \prod_{l=0}^{k-2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu + 2l + 1}\right) \\ &\geq \underbrace{\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)} \left(\frac{2}{\nu}\right)^{1/2}}_{= c_{\text{lower}}(1) \geq 1} d_-^{1/2} \prod_{l=0}^{k-2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu + 2l + 1}\right) \geq \prod_{l=0}^{k-2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\nu + 2l + 1}\right) > 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 5.* The derivative  $c_{\text{lower}}'(x)$  is given by

$$c_{\text{lower}}'(x) = f(x) \left( \ln\left(\frac{2d_-}{\nu}\right) + \psi_0\left(\frac{\nu+x}{2}\right) \right),$$

where

$$f(x) = \frac{2^{-1+x/2} d_-^{x/2} \Gamma((\nu+x)/2)}{\nu^{x/2} \Gamma(\nu/2)} > 0 \quad \text{for all } x > 0$$

and  $\psi_0(x)$  is a digamma function. Since  $\psi_0$  is strictly increasing,  $c_{\text{lower}}$  has at most one minimum point  $x_{\min}$ . Let us check that if  $d_- < 1$ , then  $c_{\text{lower}}$  has minimum  $x_{\min} > 0$ . Indeed, using that

$$\psi_0(x) < \ln x \quad \text{for } x > 0,$$

we obtain

$$c'_{\min}(0) = f(0) \left( \ln\left(\frac{2d_-}{\nu}\right) + \psi_0\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right) \right) < f(0) \ln d_- < 0.$$

Hence, the minimum  $x_{\min}$  exists, and  $c_{\text{lower}}$  increases if  $x > x_{\min}$  and decreases otherwise for  $x > 0$ .

Moreover,

$$0 = c_{\text{lower}}'(x_{\min}) < f(x_{\min}) \left( \ln\left(\frac{2d_-}{\nu}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{\nu + x_{\min}}{2}\right) \right) = f(x_{\min}) \ln\left(\frac{2d_-(\nu + x_{\min})}{2\nu}\right),$$

hence  $x_{\min} > \nu/d_- - \nu$ . Here we used again that  $\psi_0(x) < \ln x$  for  $x > 0$ . □

*Proof of Lemma 6.* Observe first that  $c/(e^{\gamma-}(\alpha/\gamma_-e)^\alpha)$  decreases as on  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . To this end, notice that

$$e^{\gamma-}(\alpha/\gamma_-e)^\alpha = C_1 e^{-n/2} (\nu+n)^{(\nu+n)/2} \nu^{-n/2} d_+^{n/2},$$

where  $C_1 = e^{\nu/2d_+ - \nu/2} d_+^{\nu/2} \nu^{-\nu/2}$ . Therefore, we obtain that

$$\frac{c}{e^{\gamma-}(\alpha/\gamma_-e)^\alpha} = \frac{1}{C_1} \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)(2e)^{n/2}}{\Gamma(\nu/2)(\nu+n)^{(\nu+n)/2}} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{d_i}{d_+}\right)^{1/2} = C_2 f(n) g(n),$$

where  $C_2 = 1/(C_1\Gamma(\nu/2))$  is an independent of  $n$  positive constant,

$$f(n) = \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)(2e)^{n/2}}{(\nu+n)^{(\nu+n)/2}} \quad \text{and} \quad g(n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{d_i}{d_+}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Since  $f, g$  are positive functions and  $g$  is decreasing, it remains to show that  $f$  decreases on  $\mathbb{N}$ . To this end, we calculate its derivative. It turns out that

$$f'(n) = f_0(n) \left( \ln(2) - \ln(\nu+n) + \psi_0 \left( \frac{\nu+n}{2} \right) \right) = f_0(n) \left( -\ln \left( \frac{\nu+n}{2} \right) + \psi_0 \left( \frac{\nu+n}{2} \right) \right) < 0,$$

where

$$f_0(n) = \frac{(2e)^{n/2}\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{2(\nu+n)^{(\nu+n)/2}} > 0.$$

Hence,  $f$  is a decreasing function and so does  $c/(e^{\gamma-(\alpha/\gamma_-e)^\alpha})$ . To finish the prove it remains to check the inequality for  $n = 1$ . Since  $d_1 \leq d_+$ , we have that

$$\frac{c}{e^{\gamma-(\alpha/\gamma_-e)^\alpha}} = \frac{1}{C_1} \frac{\Gamma((\nu+1)/2)(2e)^{1/2}}{\Gamma(\nu/2)(\nu+1)^{(\nu+1)/2}} \left(\frac{d_1}{d_+}\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{1}{C_1} \frac{\Gamma((\nu+1)/2)(2e)^{1/2}}{\Gamma(\nu/2)(\nu+1)^{(\nu+1)/2}},$$

where  $C_1 = e^{\nu/2}d_+^{-\nu/2}d_+^{\nu/2}\nu^{-\nu/2}$ . Since  $xe^{1/x} \geq e$  for all  $x > 0$ , we have that  $C_1 \geq \nu^{-\nu/2}$ . Therefore, using that  $\Gamma(x+1/2) \leq x^{1/2}\Gamma(x)$  for all  $x > 0$ , we obtain that

$$\frac{c}{e^{\gamma-(\alpha/\gamma_-e)^\alpha}} \leq \frac{\nu^{\nu/2}\Gamma((\nu+1)/2)(2e)^{1/2}}{\Gamma(\nu/2)(\nu+1)^{(\nu+1)/2}} \leq \frac{e^{1/2}}{(1+1/\nu)^{(\nu+1)/2}} = \left(\frac{e}{(1+1/\nu)^{\nu+1}}\right)^{1/2} < 1,$$

where we used that  $(1+1/x)^{x+1} > e$  for all  $x > 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* If (11) is satisfied,  $D_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c) = [0, \infty)$  and therefore  $A_+ = [0, \infty)$ . This makes the lower bound from Theorem 1 trivial, since

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty y^{n/2-1} e^{-y} dy = 1.$$

Nevertheless, the upper bound remains interesting:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) &\leq \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr - \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{2d_+y \in A_-\} y^{n/2-1} e^{-y} dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{2d_+y \in A_-^c\} y^{n/2-1} e^{-y} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_-^c = [0, \infty) \setminus A_-$ . Since  $A_-^c = (\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c), \nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c))$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) &\leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)/2d_+}^{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)/2d_+} y^{n/2-1} e^{-y} dy \\ &= \frac{\gamma(n/2, \nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)/(2d_+)) - \gamma(n/2, \nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)/(2d_+))}{\Gamma(n/2)} \\ &= P\left(\frac{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)}{2d_+}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - P\left(\frac{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)}{2d_+}; \frac{n}{2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $P(z; a) = \gamma(z; a)/\Gamma(a)$  is the lower regularized incomplete Gamma function. Assume now that the condition (10) holds. Then we have that

$$0 < a_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}(c) < b_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}(c) < \infty.$$

Since  $A_\pm^c = (\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}(c), \nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}(c))$ , by Proposition 1 we have the following bounds on  $d(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D))$ :

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) &\leq \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{r^2 \in A_+\} g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr - \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{2d_+y \in A_-\} y^{n/2-1} e^{-y} dy \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \\ \geq \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{r^2 \in A_-\} g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr - \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{2d_- y \in A_+\} y^{n/2-1} e^{-y} dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f_1$  is a pdf of  $\mathbf{X}$ , we can rewrite the bounds in terms of  $A_\pm^c$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \\ \leq \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{r^2 \in A_+\} g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr - \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{2d_+ y \in A_-\} y^{n/2-1} e^{-y} dy \\ = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{2d_+ y \in A_-^c\} y^{n/2-1} e^{-y} dy - \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}\{r^2 \in A_+^c\} g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr \\ = P\left(\frac{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}}{2d_+}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - P\left(\frac{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}}{2d_+}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c)}^{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_+}(c)} g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{TV}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I), \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \\ \geq P\left(\frac{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_+}}{2d_-}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - P\left(\frac{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_+}}{2d_-}; \frac{n}{2}\right) - \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)}^{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_-}(c)} g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to calculate the integral of  $g_1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}(c)}^{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}(c)} g_1(r^2) r^{n-1} dr \\ = \frac{2\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(n/2)\Gamma(\nu/2)\nu^{n/2}} \int_{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}(c)}^{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}(c)} \left[1 + \frac{r^2}{\nu}\right]^{-(\nu+n)/2} r^{n-1} dr \\ = \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(n/2)\Gamma(\nu/2)} \int_{\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}^2(c)}^{\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}^2(c)} \frac{t^{n/2-1}}{(1+t)^{n/2+\nu/2}} dt \\ = \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(n/2)\Gamma(\nu/2)} \left( B\left(\frac{1}{1+\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}^2}; \frac{\nu}{2}, \frac{n}{2}\right) - B\left(\frac{1}{1+\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}^2}; \frac{\nu}{2}, \frac{n}{2}\right) \right) \\ = I\left(\frac{1}{1+\nu a_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}^2}; \frac{\nu}{2}, \frac{n}{2}\right) - I\left(\frac{1}{1+\nu b_{\alpha, \gamma_\pm}^2}; \frac{\nu}{2}, \frac{n}{2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where we used the following representation of the incomplete Beta function:

$$B(x; a, b) = \int_{\frac{1-x}{x}}^\infty \frac{t^{b-1}}{(1+t)^{a+b}} dt,$$

as well as

$$\frac{\Gamma(a+b)}{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)} B(x; a, b) = \frac{B(x; a, b)}{B(a, b)} = I(x; a, b),$$

where  $I$  is the regularized incomplete Beta function. □

### 5.5. Proof of Theorem 2

Let  $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_1, I)$  and  $\mathbf{Y} \sim \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)$ . By definition of  $D_{\text{KL}}$  we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_1, I) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_2, D)) \\ = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i + \frac{n}{2} \ln(2\pi) + \frac{\nu}{\nu-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2d_i} + \frac{2\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty g_1(r^2) \ln(g_1(r^2)) r^{n-1} dr, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\mathbb{E}\{X_1^2\} = \nu/(\nu-2)$  and  $g_2(t) = 1/(2\pi)^{n/2} e^{-t/2}$ . The last integral on the right evaluates to

$$-\frac{1}{2}(\nu+n) \left( \psi_0 \left( \frac{\nu+n}{2} \right) - \psi_0 \left( \frac{\nu}{2} \right) \right) + \ln \left( \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2) \pi^{n/2} \nu^{n/2}} \right).$$

Next, we estimate  $D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_2, D) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_1, I))$ . By Proposition 2 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_2, D) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_1, I)) \\ \geq \max \left( 0, -\frac{1}{2^{n/2-1} \Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty e^{-r^2/2} \ln(g_1(d_- r^2)) r^{n-1} dr - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{KL}}(\mathcal{E}(g_2, D) \parallel \mathcal{E}(g_1, I)) \\ \leq -\frac{1}{2^{n/2-1} \Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty e^{-r^2/2} \ln(g_1(d_+ r^2)) r^{n-1} dr - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \ln d_i. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to calculate the first term on the right. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2^{n/2-1} \Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty e^{-r^2/2} \ln(g_1(d_\mp r^2)) r^{n-1} dr \\ = -\frac{\nu+n}{2^{n/2} \Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty e^{-r^2/2} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{d_\mp r^2}{\nu} \right) r^{n-1} dr + \ln \left( \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2) \pi^{n/2} \nu^{n/2}} \right) \\ = -\frac{\nu+n}{2\Gamma(n/2)} \int_0^\infty e^{-y} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2d_\mp y}{\nu} \right) y^{n/2-1} dy + \ln \left( \frac{\Gamma((\nu+n)/2)}{\Gamma(\nu/2) \pi^{n/2} \nu^{n/2}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Denote  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\mp, n} = \int_0^\infty e^{-y} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2d_\mp y}{\nu} \right) y^{n/2-1} dy$ . We claim that  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\mp, n} = \Delta_{\mp, n}$ . For  $n=1$  and  $n=2$ , the identities

$$\tilde{\Delta}_{\mp, n} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\pi} \left( \pi \operatorname{erfi} \left( \sqrt{\frac{\nu}{2d_\mp}} \right) + \ln \left( \frac{d_\mp}{2\nu} \right) - \gamma_{\text{EM}} \right) - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\nu}{d_\mp} {}_2F_2 \left( 1, 1; \frac{3}{2}, 2; \frac{\nu}{2d_\mp} \right), & \text{if } n=1, \\ -e^{\nu/2d_\mp} \operatorname{Ei} \left( -\frac{\nu}{2d_\mp} \right), & \text{if } n=2 \end{cases}$$

may be checked directly. To prove the case for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we use mathematical induction. Assume that  $n \geq 3$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}_{\mp, k} = \Delta_{\mp, k}$  for all  $k \leq n-1$ . Let us show that it holds for  $k=n$ . Using integration by parts, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty e^{-y} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2d_\mp y}{\nu} \right) y^{n/2-1} dy \\ = -e^{-y} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2d_\mp y}{\nu} \right) y^{n/2-1} \Big|_0^\infty + \left( \frac{n}{2} - 1 \right) \int_0^\infty e^{-y} \ln \left( 1 + \frac{2d_\mp y}{\nu} \right) y^{(n-2)/2-1} dy \\ + \frac{2d_\mp}{\nu} \int_0^\infty e^{-y} \left( 1 + \frac{2d_\mp y}{\nu} \right)^{-1} y^{n/2-1} dy \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& =: \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) \tilde{\Delta}_{\mp, n-2} + \tilde{\alpha}_{\mp, n-2} \\
& = \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) \left(\left(\frac{n}{2} - 2\right) \Delta_{\mp, n-4} + \alpha_{\mp, n-4}\right) + \alpha_{\mp, n-2} \\
& = \left(\prod_{i=1}^k \left(\frac{n}{2} - i\right)\right) \Delta_{\mp, n-2k} + \sum_{l=1}^k \left(\prod_{i=1}^{l-1} \left(\frac{n}{2} - i\right)\right) \alpha_{\mp, n-2l} \\
& = \frac{\Gamma(n/2)}{\Gamma(n/2 - k)} \Delta_{\mp, n-2k} + \Gamma(n/2) \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{\alpha_{\mp, n-2l}}{\Gamma(n/2 - l + 1)},
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $0 < k < n/2$ , where

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{\mp, n-2} = \frac{2d_{\mp}}{\nu} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-y} \left(1 + \frac{2d_{\mp}y}{\nu}\right)^{-1} y^{n/2-1} dy = \alpha_{\mp, n-2}$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . Hence, using mathematical induction one can obtain that for even  $n$

$$(21) \quad \tilde{\Delta}_{\mp, n} = \Gamma(n/2) \Delta_{\mp, 2} + \Gamma(n/2) \sum_{l=1}^{n/2-1} \frac{\alpha_{\mp, n-2l}}{\Gamma(n/2 - l + 1)} = \Delta_{\mp, n}$$

and if  $n$  is odd, then

$$(22) \quad \tilde{\Delta}_{\mp, n} = \frac{\Gamma(n/2)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \Delta_{\mp, 1} + \Gamma(n/2) \sum_{l=1}^{(n-1)/2} \frac{\alpha_{\mp, n-2l}}{\Gamma(n/2 - l + 1)} = \Delta_{\mp, n}.$$

Thus, Theorem 2 follows.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. Penny, “KL-divergences of Normal, Gamma, Dirichlet, and Wishart densities.” Available at: [www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/~wpenny/publications/densities.ps](http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/~wpenny/publications/densities.ps).
- [2] L. Barabesi and L. Pratelli, “An inequality for the total variation distance between high-dimensional centered Gaussian laws,” *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, vol. 211, pp. Paper No. 110148, 5, 2024.
- [3] A. B. Tsybakov, *Introduction to nonparametric estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, New York, 2009.
- [4] G. P. Dehaene, “A deterministic and computable Bernstein-von Mises theorem,” 2019. arXiv:1904.02505.
- [5] M. J. Kasprzak, R. Giordano, and T. Broderick, “How good is your Laplace approximation of the Bayesian posterior? Finite-sample computable error bounds for a variety of useful divergences,” Aug. 2023. arXiv:2209.14992.
- [6] V. Spokoiny, “Dimension free nonasymptotic bounds on the accuracy of high-dimensional Laplace approximation,” *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 1044–1068, 2023.
- [7] V. Spokoiny, “Mixed Laplace approximation for marginal posterior and Bayesian inference in error-in-operator model,” 2023. arXiv:2305.09336.
- [8] D. M. Blei, A. Kucukelbir, and J. D. McAuliffe, “Variational inference: a review for statisticians,” *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, vol. 112, no. 518, pp. 859–877, 2017.
- [9] J. Li, W. Guo, X. Han, J. Cai, and X. Liu, “Federated learning based on defending against data poisoning attacks in iot,” 2022. 2209.06397.
- [10] G. Kaissis, J. Hayes, A. Ziller, and D. Rueckert, “Bounding data reconstruction attacks with the hypothesis testing interpretation of differential privacy,” 2023. arXiv:2307.03928.
- [11] B. Rassouli and D. Gündüz, “Optimal utility-privacy trade-off with total variation distance as a privacy measure,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 15, pp. 594–603, 2020.
- [12] J. Jia, C. Tan, Z. Liu, X. Li, Z. Liu, S. Lv, and C. Dong, “Total variation distance privacy: Accurately measuring inference attacks and improving utility,” *Information Sciences*, vol. 626, pp. 537–558, 2023.
- [13] E. Ghazi and I. Issa, “Total variation meets differential privacy,” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, vol. 5, pp. 207–220, 2024.
- [14] E. Ullah, T. Mai, A. Rao, R. A. Rossi, and R. Arora, “Machine unlearning via algorithmic stability,” in *Proceedings of Thirty Fourth Conference on Learning Theory* (M. Belkin and S. Kpotufe, eds.), vol. 134 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 4126–4142, PMLR, 15–19 Aug 2021.



- [15] F. Nielsen and R. Nock, "Entropies and cross-entropies of exponential families," in *2010 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing*, pp. 3621–3624, 2010.
- [16] A. L. Gibbs and F. E. Su, "On choosing and bounding probability metrics," *International Statistical Review*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 419–435, 2002.
- [17] L. Devroye, A. Mehrabian, and T. Reddad, "The total variation distance between high-dimensional Gaussians with the same mean," 2023. arXiv:1810.08693.
- [18] R. M. Corless, G. H. Gonnet, D. E. G. Hare, D. J. Jeffrey, and D. E. Knuth, "On the Lambert  $W$  function," *Adv. Comput. Math.*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 329–359, 1996.
- [19] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, eds., *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1992. Reprint of the 1972 edition.
- [20] "NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions." <https://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release 1.2.3 of 2024-12-15. F. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schneider, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller, B. V. Saunders, H. S. Cohl, and M. A. McClain, eds.
- [21] K. T. Fang, S. Kotz, and K. W. Ng, *Symmetric multivariate and related distributions*, vol. 36 of *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*. Chapman and Hall, Ltd., London, 1990.
- [22] A. K. Gupta, T. Varga, and T. Bodnar, *Elliptically contoured models in statistics and portfolio theory*. Springer, New York, second ed., 2013.
- [23] I. Sason and S. Verdú, " $f$ -divergence inequalities," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 5973–6006, 2016.
- [24] F. Nielsen, "On information projections between multivariate elliptical and location-scale families," 2021. arXiv:2101.03839.
- [25] B. Roig-Solvas and M. Sznaiar, "Euclidean distance bounds for LMI analytic centers using a novel bound on the Lambert function," 2022. arXiv:2004.01115.

PAVEL IEVLEV, DEPARTMENT OF ACTUARIAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF LAUSANNE, UNIL-DORIGNY, 1015 LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND, ORCID.ORG/0000-0003-3329-5741

*Email address:* [ievlev.pn@gmail.com](mailto:ievlev.pn@gmail.com)

TIMOFEI SHASHKOV, DEPARTMENT OF ACTUARIAL SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF LAUSANNE, UNIL-DORIGNY, 1015 LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND, ORCID.ORG/0009-0004-1567-0530

*Email address:* [timofei98shashkov@gmail.com](mailto:timofei98shashkov@gmail.com)