

Lecture 16

Lecture date: Oct 20

Scribe: Yun Long

In this class, we finished the proof of the following theorem.

Theorem 1 Let $q \in (2, 3]$, X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables satisfying $\mathbf{E}[X_i] = 0$, $\mathbf{E}[X_i^2] = 1$, and $\mathbf{E}[|X_i|^q] \leq \beta$ for some constant $\beta > 0$. Let Q be a multi-linear polynomial of degree d that can be expressed as $Q(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} c_S \prod_{i \in S} x_i$. And the Fourier coefficients satisfies $\sum_{S \neq \emptyset} c_S^2 = 1$. Let $\Delta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a non-decreasing function with $\Delta(0) = 0$, $\Delta(1) = 1$ and $\sup_x |\Delta^{(3)}(x)| = A < \infty$. Define $\Delta_r(x) = \Delta(\frac{x}{r})$. Then

$$|\mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(X_1, \dots, X_n)] - \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(G_1, \dots, G_n)]| \leq O_q(Ar^{-q}\beta^{d/q} \sum_i (\sum_{S:i \in S} c_S^2)^{q/2}) \quad (1)$$

Where G_1, \dots, G_n are independent and with standard normal distributions.

Proof: Split the left hand side of equation (1), we get,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(X_1, \dots, X_n)] - \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(G_1, \dots, G_n)]| \\ & \leq |\mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(X_1, \dots, X_n)] - \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(G_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)]| \\ & \quad + |\mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(G_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)] - \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(G_1, G_2, X_3, \dots, X_n)]| \\ & \quad + \dots \\ & \quad + |\mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}, X_n)] - \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(G_1, \dots, G_n)]| \end{aligned}$$

We will prove the following claim:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}, X_i, Z_{i+1}, \dots, Z_n)] - \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}, G_i, Z_{i+1}, \dots, Z_n)]| \\ & \leq O_q(Ar^{-q}\eta^{-d} (\sum_{S:i \in S} c_S^2)^{q/2}) \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

Where $Z_j = X_j$, if $j > i$, $Z_j = G_j$, if $j < i$, and $\eta = \frac{\beta^{-1/q}}{2\sqrt{q-1}}$.

If this claim is proved, then summing (2) over all i lead to our desired upper bound (1).

Proof of the claim: Since Q is a multi-linear polynomial, we could write it as

$$Q(Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}, W, Z_{i+1}, \dots, Z_n) = R(Z) + S(Z) \cdot W$$

Here $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}, Z_{i+1}, \dots, Z_n)$. Polynomial R and S satisfies:

$$R(Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}, Z_{i+1}, \dots, Z_n) = \sum_{S: i \notin S} c_S \prod_{j \in S} Z_j$$

$$S(Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}, Z_{i+1}, \dots, Z_n) = \sum_{S: i \in S} c_S \prod_{j \in S \setminus \{i\}} Z_j$$

Starting from the left hand side of (2). By the lemma we proved in last lecture:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r(R(Z) + S(Z)X_i)] - \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r(R(Z) + S(Z)G_i)] \\ & \leq O_q(Ar^{-q})[\mathbf{E}(|S(Z)X_i|^q) + \mathbf{E}(|S(Z)G_i|^q)] \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7 of Lecture 13, all X_j and G_j are $(2, q, \eta)$ hyper-contractive with such defined η . By the claim we proved in last lecture,

$$O_q(Ar^{-q})[\mathbf{E}(|S(Z)X_i|^q) + \mathbf{E}(|S(Z)G_i|^q)] \leq O_q(Ar^{-q}\eta^{-d})[\|S(Z)X_i\|_2^q + \|S(Z)G_i\|_2^q]$$

Because $\|S(Z)X_i\|_2^2 = \|S(Z)G_i\|_2^2 = \sum_{S: i \in S} c_S^2$, we thus proved

$$\mathbf{E}[\Delta_r(R(Z) + S(Z)X_i)] - \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r(R(Z) + S(Z)G_i)] \leq O_q(Ar^{-q}\eta^{-d}) \sum_{S: i \in S} c_S^2$$

which is the claim we wanted. \square

Remark: If in addition, $I_i(Q) \leq \delta$ for all i . Since $\sum_{S: i \in S} c_S^2 = I_i(Q)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(X_1, \dots, X_n)] - \mathbf{E}[\Delta_r Q(G_1, \dots, G_n)]| & \leq O_q(Ar^{-q}\eta^{-d}(\sum_i I_i(Q))^{q/2}) \\ & \leq O_q(Ar^{-q}\eta^{-d})\delta^{q/2-1} \sum_i I_i \\ & \leq O_q(Ar^{-q}\eta^{-d})\delta^{q/2-1}d \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality uses the fact that $\sum_{S \neq \emptyset} c_S^2 = 1$, so,

$$\sum_i I_i = \sum_S c_S^2 |S| \leq d \sum_{S \neq \emptyset} c_S^2 = d$$