

A REMARK ON THE LOG-SOBOLEV INEQUALITY FOR THE GIBBS MEASURE OF THE FOCUSING SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION

GUOPENG LI, JIAWEI LI, LEONARDO TOLOMEO

ABSTRACT. We consider the question of showing a log-Sobolev inequality for the Gibbs measure of the focusing Schrödinger equation built by Lebowitz-Rose-Speer (1988), formally given by

$$d\rho \propto \exp\left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^p dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 dx\right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T})}^2 \leq K} du d\bar{u}.$$

When $2 \leq p \leq 4$, we show that these measures indeed satisfy a log-Sobolev inequality. When $p > 4$, we show a lower bound for the Hessian of the potential, which implies that the known techniques to show these inequalities cannot apply to the measure ρ .

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we consider the focusing Gibbs measures for the nonlinear Schrödinger equations (NLS), initiated in the seminal paper by Lebowitz, Rose, and Speer [24]. A Gibbs measure ρ is a probability measure on functions / distributions whose density can be *formally* given by

$$d\rho = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-H(u)} du, \quad (1.1)$$

where $H(u)$ is a Hamiltonian functional and Z is a normalisation constant, called partition function. In particular, we investigate in the logarithmic Sobolev inequalities (see (1.7)) for the focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS) on the circle $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})$:

$$iu_t + \Delta u + |u|^{p-2}u = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

for which the Hamiltonian $H(u)$ is given by

$$H(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^p dx. \quad (1.3)$$

The study of the equation (1.2) from the viewpoint of the (non-)equilibrium statistical mechanics has received wide attention; see for example [24, 12, 13, 14, 32, 33, 23, 15, 17, 19, 16]. See also [8] for a survey on the subject, more from the dynamical point of view.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 28C20, 35Q55, 60H30.

Key words and phrases. Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities, nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Gibbs measure.

The main difficulty in constructing the focusing Gibbs measures comes from the high degree $p > 2$ of the negative term in the Hamiltonian (1.3). This makes the problem extremely different from the defocusing case, which would correspond to the well studied Φ^p model of quantum field theory. In [24], Lebowitz, Rose, and Speer suggested to consider the Gibbs measure with an extra L^2 -cutoff

$$d\rho = \frac{1}{Z_K} e^{-H(u)} \mathbb{1}_{\{M(u) \leq K\}} du, \quad (1.4)$$

where $M(u)$ denotes the mass functional

$$M(u) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 dx. \quad (1.5)$$

This choice is suitable for the study of the statistical mechanics of NLS, since the mass $M(u)$ is conserved by the flow of NLS, and represents the “generalised number of particles”. In a series of papers [24, 12, 29, 31], the authors showed the following.

Proposition 1.1. *Consider the Gaussian measure*

$$d\mu \propto \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |\nabla u|^2 dx \right) du d\bar{u}. \quad (1.6)$$

Then the measure ρ in (1.4) is well-defined in the following cases:

- (1) $p < 6$, $K \geq 0$,
- (2) $p = 6$, and $K \leq \|Q\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2$, where Q is the ground state of the following elliptic equation on \mathbb{R}

$$\Delta Q + Q^5 + 2Q = 0.$$

Moreover, we have that in all the cases above, the Radon-Nikodym derivative $f = \frac{d\rho}{d\mu}$ satisfies

- (1) *If $p < 6$, $K \geq 0$, $f \in L^q(\mu)$ for every $q < \infty$,*
- (2) *If $p = 6$, and $K \leq \|Q\|_{L^2}^2$, then $f \in L^q(\mu)$ for every*

$$q \leq \left(\frac{\|Q\|_{L^2}^2}{K} \right)^2,$$

- (3) *If $p = 6$, then for every $\alpha < 1$, $f \in L(\log L)^\alpha$, [22, Proposition 6].*

Here, we focus our attention on the logarithmic Sobolev inequality (LSI) for the Gibbs measures with mass-cutoff. Namely, we ask whether the measure ρ in (1.4) satisfies an inequality of the form

$$\int |F(u)|^2 \log \left(\frac{|F(u)|^2}{\int |F(u)|^2 d\rho(u)} \right) d\rho(u) \leq C \int \|\nabla F(u)\|_{L^2}^2 d\rho(u), \quad (1.7)$$

for every suitable smooth functional $F : L^2(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and some constant $C > 0$.

When such an inequality (1.7) holds, we define

$$\text{LS}(\rho) := \inf \left\{ C > 0 : (1.7) \text{ holds for all admissible } F \right\}, \quad (1.8)$$

that is, $\text{LS}(\rho)$ is the best (smallest) constant for which (1.7) is valid. If there is no finite constant C for which (1.7) holds, we set

$$\text{LS}(\rho) := \infty. \quad (1.9)$$

Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities (1.7) are important functional inequalities firstly established by Gross in [20] for Gaussian measures, where its equivalence to hypercontractivity was also shown. LSI is a powerful tool in showing the uniqueness of invariant measure and exponential rate of convergence of the Markov semigroup towards the invariant measure in models from statistical mechanics and quantum field theory. See [5, 21] for comprehensive reviews.

In [4], Bakry and Émery provide a nice sufficient condition for LSI under log-concave measures. For a Gibbs measure ρ as in (1.1), Bakry-Émery criterion (see Proposition 2.1) implies LSI holds when the Hamiltonian H is strictly convex. For applications of Bakry-Émery criterion, see [18, 25, 21].

In the context of Gibbs measures for NLS, [9] was the first paper proving an LSI. They applied the Bakry-Émery criterion to the Gibbs measures for focusing NLS when $2 \leq p \leq 4$. We however point out that in [9], the authors seem to overlook the complications deriving from the presence of the cutoff function,¹ so for completeness of exposition, we revisit this result and establish the following LSI.

Our first main result is the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $2 \leq p \leq 4$ and $K > 0$, and let ρ be the focusing Gibbs measure with L^2 -cutoff at level K given in (1.4), associated with the nonlinear Schrödinger equation (1.2) on \mathbb{T} . Then ρ satisfies a logarithmic Sobolev inequality of the form (1.7). In particular,*

$$\text{LS}(\rho) < \infty,$$

in the sense of definition (1.8).

When $p > 4$, the situation is more complex. In general, establishing LSI beyond the strict convexity assumption on H is challenging, especially on infinite-dimensional spaces. In recent years, there have been several breakthroughs by Bauerschmidt, Bodineau, and collaborators, see [1, 2, 3], that culminated with the proof of uniqueness for the φ_2^4 measure in high temperature in [7]. These results have been obtained via the use of a “multiscale Bakry-Émery formula”, [2, Theorem 2.5], that we now describe in the particular case of the measure ρ . Define the family of Gaussian measures $\bar{\mu}_t$ formally given by

$$d\bar{\mu}_t(u) \propto \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \left\langle u, \frac{\langle \nabla \rangle^2}{1 - e^{-t\langle \nabla \rangle^2}} u \right\rangle \right) du d\bar{u}.$$

¹We remark that if the cutoff function in (1.4) is instead on a non-convex subset of the ball, then the log-Sobolev inequality (1.7) might fail (counterexamples can be constructed easily when the set is disconnected and F is constant on the connected components), but the argument in [9] cannot distinguish the two situations.

Note that if u is a random variable with $\text{Law}(u) = \mu$ in (1.6), then

$$\text{Law}(\sqrt{1 - e^{-t\langle \nabla \rangle^2}} u) = \bar{\mu}_t. \quad (1.10)$$

We then set

$$V_t(\varphi) = \log \left(\mathbb{E}_{\bar{\mu}_t} \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p dx \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right] \right)$$

for every $\varphi \in H^1$. Theorem 2.5 in [2] states that under some suitable ergodicity assumption, if for every $t \geq 0$ there exists a differentiable map $t \mapsto \lambda_t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-2\lambda_t} dt < \infty$$

and the Hessian of $V_t(\varphi)$ denoted by

$$\mathcal{H}(V_t)(\varphi)[e^{-\frac{t\langle \nabla \rangle^2}{2}} w, e^{-\frac{t\langle \nabla \rangle^2}{2}} w] \leq \frac{1}{2} \|w\|_{H^1}^2 - \dot{\lambda}_t \|w\|_{L^2}^2 \quad (1.11)$$

for all $w \in H^1$, then LSI holds.

Instead of working with (1.11), we consider the functional

$$V(\varphi) = \log \left(\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p dx \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right] \right), \quad (1.12)$$

where μ is as in (1.6). Note that, abusing of notation, we have $V = V_\infty$.

By taking t large in (1.11), by boundedness of the operator $\sqrt{1 - e^{-t\langle \nabla \rangle^2}}$ and its inverse, due to the integrability condition for λ_t , in order to apply this criterion we essentially require that, for $w \in H^1$,

$$\sup_{\varphi \in H^1} \mathcal{H}(V)(\varphi)[w, w] < \infty. \quad (1.13)$$

We define the probability measure

$$d\rho_\varphi(u) = \frac{1}{Z_\varphi} \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p dx \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} d\mu(u), \quad (1.14)$$

where Z_φ is an appropriate normalisation constant.

The second main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $4 < p < 6$ and let V be defined by (1.12), with ρ_φ the probability measures given in (1.14). Then the following hold:*

(i) *For every $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$ and every $w \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$,*

$$\mathcal{H}V(\varphi)[w, w] \geq (p-1) \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_\varphi} [|u(x)|^{p-2}] |w(x)|^2 dx. \quad (1.15)$$

(ii) *We have*

$$\sup_{\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{T})} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_\varphi} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |u(x)|^{p-2} dx \right] = \infty. \quad (1.16)$$

In particular, for every $w \in H^1(\mathbb{T}) \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\sup_{\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{T})} \mathcal{H}V(\varphi)[w, w] = \infty. \quad (1.17)$$

Theorem 1.3 tells us, when $4 < p < 6$, the Hessian $\mathcal{H}V(\varphi)$ cannot be uniformly bounded from above on $H^1(\mathbb{T})$ in any fixed direction $w \neq 0$, and thus the multiscale Bakry-Émery criterion from [2] cannot be used to establish an LSI for the associated Gibbs measure.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout the paper we work with complex-valued functions $u : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and view $L^2(\mathbb{T}; \mathbb{C}) = L^2(\mathbb{T})$ as a real Hilbert space with scalar product

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \operatorname{Re} \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx.$$

In particular, $\|u\|_{L^2}^2 = \langle u, u \rangle$ and all gradients and Hessians are taken with respect to this real structure. Whenever we write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2}$ below, it is this (real) scalar product.

We use $C > 0$ to denote various constants, which may vary line by line. We also use $A \lesssim B$ to denote an estimate of the form $A \leq CB$ for some constant $C > 0$. We denote by dx the Lebesgue measure on the torus, normalised so that $\int_{\mathbb{T}} dx = 1$.

Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by P_N the projector onto the frequencies $\{|n| \leq N\}$ defined by

$$\widehat{P_N f}(n) = \mathbb{1}_{\{|n| \leq N\}} \widehat{f}(n).$$

We remark that due to the boundedness of the Hilbert transform on the torus, we have that

$$\|P_N f - f\|_{L^p} \rightarrow 0 \tag{2.1}$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, for every $f \in L^p$, $1 < p < \infty$.

Finally, we set $x_+ = \max\{x, 0\}$.

To show Theorem 1.2, we will use the following celebrated criterion.

Proposition 2.1 (Bakry-Émery [4]). *Consider a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^n (or a linear sub-space) of the form*

$$d\nu(x) \propto e^{-H(x)} dx,$$

and assume that there is $\lambda > 0$ such that as quadratic forms:

$$\mathcal{H}(H(x)) \geq \lambda \cdot \operatorname{id}. \tag{2.2}$$

Then, we have

$$\operatorname{LS}(\nu) \leq \frac{2}{\lambda} < \infty.$$

2.1. Gaussian measure and Gibbs measure. The Gaussian measure μ we introduced formally in (1.6) can be defined rigorously as the law of

$$u(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{g_n}{\langle n \rangle} e^{inx}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a family of mutually independent complex-valued centred Gaussian random variables. By standard bounds on Gaussian random variables, we have the following.

Lemma 2.2. *Let u be a function-valued random variable with $\text{Law}(u) = \mu$ in (1.6). Then for every $q < \infty$, and every $x \in \mathbb{T}$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}|u(x)|^q = \mathbb{E}\|u\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T})}^q < \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

Moreover, using (2.3), we can deduce the following fact.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $K > 0$, and consider the set*

$$S_K = \{u \in L^2 : \|u\|_{L^2}^2 = K\}.$$

Then

$$\mu(S_K) = 0.$$

Proof. The proof is completely analogous to [30, Lemma 2.7]. \square

2.2. Boué-Dupuis variational formula. In order to state the Boué-Dupuis variational formula, as in [6, 31, 26, 27, 28], we first need to introduce some notations. Let W_t be a cylindrical Brownian motion in $L^2(\mathbb{T})$ given by

$$W_t = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} B_n(t) e^{inx},$$

where $\{B_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a family of mutually independent complex-valued² Brownian motions on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We then define a centered Gaussian process Y_t by

$$Y_t = \langle \nabla \rangle^{-1} W_t. \quad (2.5)$$

Note that we have $\mathbb{P} \circ (Y(1))^{-1} = \mu$. By setting $Y^N = P_N Y$, we have $\mathbb{P} \circ (Y^N(1))^{-1} = (P_N)_* \mu$, i.e. the push-forward of μ under P_N .

Next, let \mathbb{H}_a denote the space of drifts, which are progressively measurable processes belonging to $\dot{H}^1([0, 1]; H^1(\mathbb{T}))$, and which are 0 in 0. We now state the variational formula [10, 34]; in particular, see Theorem 7 in [34].

Lemma 2.4 (Boué-Dupuis variational formula). *Let Y be as in (2.5) and fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $V : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable, and satisfies $\mathbb{E}[|V(P_N Y_1)|^p] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[e^{p'V(P_N Y_1)}] < \infty$, for some $1 < p < \infty$, with*

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1.$$

²By convention, we normalize B_n so that $\text{Var}(B_n(t)) = t$.

Then, we have

$$\log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{V(P_N Y_1)} \right] = \sup_{\Theta \in \mathbb{H}_a} \mathbb{E} \left[V(P_N Y_1 + P_N \Theta(1)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}(t)\|_{H_x^1}^2 dt \right], \quad (2.6)$$

where the expectation $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}$ is with respect to the underlying probability measure \mathbb{P} .

The following consequence of this formula will play a fundamental role.

Lemma 2.5. *Let Y, N, V be as in Lemma 2.4. Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, and suppose that $\Theta_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{H}_a$ is an ε^2 -optimiser for the expression in (2.6), in the sense that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[V(P_N Y_1 + P_N \Theta_\varepsilon(1)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{H_x^1}^2 dt \right] \\ & \geq -\varepsilon^2 + \sup_{\Theta \in \mathbb{H}_a} \mathbb{E} \left[V(P_N Y_1 + P_N \Theta(1)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}(t)\|_{H_x^1}^2 dt \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $F : C^\infty(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be measurable and bounded. Then, we have that

$$\left| \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(P_N Y_1) \exp(V(P_N Y_1))]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(V(P_N Y_1))]} - \mathbb{E}[F(P_N(Y_1 + \Theta_\varepsilon(1)))] \right| \leq (1 + \frac{e}{2})\varepsilon \|F\|_{L^\infty} \quad (2.7)$$

Proof. Since the map

$$F \mapsto \frac{\mathbb{E}[F(P_N Y_1) \exp(V(P_N Y_1))]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(V(P_N Y_1))]}$$

defines a probability measure, it is enough to show (2.7) when $F = \mathbb{1}_E$ is an indicator function. Moreover, by swapping E with E^c , it is enough to show that

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_E(P_N Y_1) \exp(V(P_N Y_1))]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(V(P_N Y_1))]} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_E(P_N(Y_1 + \Theta_\varepsilon(1)))] \geq -(1 + \frac{e}{2})\varepsilon. \quad (2.8)$$

For this, we apply (2.6) with V replaced by $\varepsilon \mathbb{1}_E + V$, for $0 \leq \varepsilon$. By the elementary inequalities

$$e^\varepsilon \leq 1 + \varepsilon + \frac{e}{2}\varepsilon^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \log(1 + x) \leq x$$

for $0 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, $x \geq 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\varepsilon + \frac{e}{2}\varepsilon^2) \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_E(P_N Y_1) e^{V(P_N Y_1)}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{V(P_N Y_1)}]} \\
& \geq \log \frac{\mathbb{E}[e^{(\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_E + V)(P_N Y_1)}]}{\mathbb{E}[e^{V(P_N Y_1)}]} \\
& = \sup_{\Theta \in \mathbb{H}_a} \mathbb{E} \left[(\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_E + V)(P_N Y_1 + P_N \Theta(1)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}(t)\|_{H_x^1}^2 dt \right] \\
& \quad - \sup_{\Theta \in \mathbb{H}_a} \mathbb{E} \left[V(P_N Y_1 + P_N \Theta(1)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}(t)\|_{H_x^1}^2 dt \right] \\
& \geq \mathbb{E} \left[(\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_E + V)(P_N Y_1 + P_N \Theta_\varepsilon(1)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{H_x^1}^2 dt \right] \\
& \quad - \varepsilon^2 - \mathbb{E} \left[V(P_N Y_1 + P_N \Theta_\varepsilon(1)) - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_\varepsilon(t)\|_{H_x^1}^2 dt \right] \\
& = -\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{1}_E(P_N(Y_1 + \Theta_\varepsilon(1))) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

from which we deduce

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}[F(P_N Y_1) \exp(V(P_N Y_1))]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(V(P_N Y_1))]} - \mathbb{E}[F(P_N(Y_1 + \Theta_\varepsilon(1)))] \geq -\left(1 + \frac{e}{2}\right)\varepsilon,$$

and hence (2.8). □

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Throughout this section, we consider the measure

$$d\rho_\Lambda(u) = \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda} \exp(-\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 dx) d\rho(u), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\Lambda > 0$ is an appropriate normalisation constant. Since ρ is supported on the set $\{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K\}$, we have that

$$\exp(-\Lambda K) \text{LS}(\rho) \leq \text{LS}(\rho_\Lambda) \leq \exp(\Lambda K) \text{LS}(\rho). \tag{3.2}$$

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $p < 6$, and let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $R > 0$ and $\Lambda > 0$. Consider the measures*

$$\begin{aligned}
& d\rho_{\Lambda, N, R} \\
& = \frac{1}{Z_{\Lambda, N, R}} \exp \left(-\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N u|^p dx - R(\|P_N u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^8 \right) d\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{\Lambda, N, R} = \rho_\Lambda,$$

where ρ_Λ is given as in (3.1) and the limits are taken in total variation.

Proof. It is enough to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left(-\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N u|^p dx - R(\|P_N u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^8 \right) \\ &= \exp \left(-\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^p dx \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \end{aligned}$$

in $L^1(\mu)$. We first check pointwise convergence and then verify a uniform integrability bound.

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left(-\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N u|^p dx - R(\|P_N u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^8 \right) \\ &= \exp \left(-\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^p dx \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \end{aligned}$$

pointwise, so it is enough to show that for any $q > 1$,

$$\sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \int \exp \left(\frac{q}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N u|^p dx - qR(\|P_N u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^8 \right) d\mu(u) < \infty. \quad (3.3)$$

By dominated convergence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \limsup_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\exp \left(\frac{q}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N u|^p dx - qR(\|P_N u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^8 \right) \right] \\ &= \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\exp \left(\frac{q}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N u|^p dx \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right], \end{aligned}$$

which is finite by [31, Proposition 3.1]. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By (3.2), it suffices to show that for Λ big enough, $\text{LS}(\rho_\Lambda) < \infty$. Moreover, it is enough to show the inequality (1.7) for bounded cylindrical functions F , in the sense that there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $F(u) = F(P_{N_0}(u))$. Finally, in view of Lemma 3.1, the result follows once we show that

$$\text{LS}((P_N)_* \rho_{\Lambda, N, R}) \lesssim 1$$

uniformly in N and R . We have that, on the image of P_N (which is finite dimensional, and can be identified with \mathbb{C}^{2N+1}), the measure $(P_N)_* \rho_{\Lambda, N, R}$ is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & d(P_N)_* \rho_{\Lambda, N, R}(u) \\ & \propto \exp \left(-\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 dx + \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^p dx - R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^8 - \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{H^1}^2 \right) du d\bar{u}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can apply Proposition 2.1 to

$$H(u) = \Lambda \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^p dx + R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^8 + \frac{1}{2} \|u\|_{H^1}^2.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}H(u) &= 2\Lambda \cdot \text{id} - (p-1)|u|^{p-2} + 16R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^7 \cdot \text{id} \\ &\quad + 224R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^6 u \otimes u + (1 - \Delta), \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

which implies that

$$\mathcal{H}H(u) \geq 2\Lambda \cdot \text{id} - (p-1)|u|^{p-2} + 16R(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^7 \cdot \text{id} + (1-\Delta)$$

as operators.

For $w \in H^1$, since $p-2 \leq 2$, by Sobolev embeddings and Young's inequality, we have that (for some constant $C > 0$ that can change from line to line)

$$\begin{aligned} (p-1) \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^{p-2} |w|^2 dx &\leq \int_{\mathbb{T}} C(1 + |u|^2) |w|^2 dx \\ &\leq C(1 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2) \|w\|_{L^\infty}^2 \\ &\leq C(1 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2) \|w\|_{H^{\frac{3}{4}}}^2 \\ &\leq C(1 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2) \|w\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w\|_{H^1}^{\frac{3}{2}} \\ &\leq C(1 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2)^4 \|w\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|w\|_{H^1}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$(p-1)|u|^{p-2} \leq C(1 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2)^4 \cdot \text{id} + (1-\Delta)$$

as operators. Moreover, there exists a constant $\Lambda_* = \Lambda_*(K)$ such that

$$(\|u\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^7 - C(1 + \|u\|_{L^2}^2)^4 \geq -\Lambda_*.$$

Therefore, for $R > \frac{1}{16}$, we get that as operators

$$\mathcal{H}H(u) \geq (2\Lambda - \Lambda_*) \cdot \text{id} \geq \text{id}$$

as long as $\Lambda \geq \frac{\Lambda_*+1}{2}$, which shows that

$$\text{LS}((P_N)_* \rho_{\Lambda, N, R}) \leq 2.$$

□

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is heavily reliant on the description of the measure ρ_φ provided by Lemma 2.5. To see this, we first show the following lower bound on the quantity $\mathcal{H}V(\varphi)$, which is (1.15) in Theorem 1.3.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $V(\varphi)$ be given as in (1.12). Then for all $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$, we have that*

$$\mathcal{H}(V)(\varphi)[w, w] \geq (p-1) \int_{\mathbb{T}} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_\varphi}[|u|^{p-2}] |w|^2 dx. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. By Cameron-Martin's theorem (see e.g. [11, Corollary 2.4.3]), we may write that

$$V(\varphi) = \log \left(\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^p + \langle u, (1-\Delta)\varphi \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \|\varphi\|_{H^1}^2 \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right] \right).$$

In particular, we have that V is smooth as a function of φ , and by computation similar to (3.4) and the argument in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\mathcal{H}V(\varphi) = \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{H}V_R(\varphi),$$

where

$$V_R(\varphi) = \log \left(\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p dx - R(\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^\sigma \right) \right] \right),$$

and $\sigma > \frac{p}{2} + 1$. For an appropriately integrable functional $F(\varphi)$, by the chain rule we have that

$$\nabla \log (\mathbb{E}_\mu [\exp(F(\varphi))]) = \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\nabla F \exp(F(\varphi))]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\exp(F(\varphi))]}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H} \log (\mathbb{E}_\mu [\exp(F(\varphi))]) [w, w] \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\mathcal{H}F[w, w] \exp(F(\varphi))]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\exp(F(\varphi))]} + \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu [|\nabla F \cdot w|^2 \exp(F(\varphi))]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\exp(F(\varphi))]} \\ & \quad - \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\nabla F \cdot w \exp(F(\varphi))]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\exp(F(\varphi))]} \right|^2 \\ & \geq \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\mathcal{H}F[w, w] \exp(F(\varphi))]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\exp(F(\varphi))]}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used Jensen's inequality for probability measure

$$\frac{d\nu}{d\mu} = \frac{\exp(F(\varphi))}{\mathbb{E}_\mu [\exp(F(\varphi))]}$$

in the last step. Applying to V_R , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}(V_R)(\varphi)[w, w] \\ & \geq (p-1) \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^{p-2} |w|^2 \right) \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p - R(\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^\sigma \right) \right]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p - R(\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^\sigma \right) \right]} \\ & \quad - \frac{\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\left(R\mathcal{H}(\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^\sigma [w, w] \right) \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p - R(\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^\sigma \right) \right]}{\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p - R(\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 - K)_+^\sigma \right) \right]}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking limits as $R \rightarrow \infty$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}(V)(\varphi)[w, w] \\ & \geq (p-1) \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^{p-2} |w|^2 \right) \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u + \varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right]}, \end{aligned}$$

which is (4.1). \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let $2 \leq p < 6$. For every $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$, we have that $V(\varphi) < \infty$. Moreover, for $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ dyadic, $L > 0$, define $\rho_{N,L,\varphi}$ to be the probability measure*

$$d\rho_{N,L,\varphi} = \frac{1}{Z_{N,L,\varphi}} \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N(u + \varphi)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} - L \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 > K} \right) d\mu, \quad (4.2)$$

where $Z_{N,L,\varphi}$ is an appropriate normalisation constant. Then for every $q < \infty$, we have that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{N,L,\varphi}} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^q dx \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\infty,L,\varphi}} \left[\mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^q dx \right], \quad (4.3)$$

and

$$V(\varphi) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty, L \rightarrow \infty} \log Z_{N,L,\varphi}. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. By (2.1), we have that for every $1 < p < \infty$,

$$P_N(u + \varphi) \rightarrow u + \varphi$$

in $L^p(\mathbb{T})$. Therefore, from Lemma 2.3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N(u + \varphi)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} - L \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 > K} \right) \\ & \rightarrow \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|u+\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} - L \mathbb{1}_{\|u+\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 > K} \right) \end{aligned}$$

μ -a.s. as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and also from Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N(u + \varphi)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} - L \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 > K} \right) \\ & \rightarrow \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p dx \right) \mathbb{1}_{\|u+\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \end{aligned}$$

μ -a.s. as $N, L \rightarrow \infty$. Recalling that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[|u|^q] \lesssim_q 1$$

for every $q < \infty$, for both (4.3) and (4.4), it is enough to show that for any $q > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{N,L \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu} \left[\exp \left(\frac{q}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N(u + \varphi)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} - qL \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 > K} \right) \right] \\ & \leq \sup_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_{\mu} \left[\exp \left(\frac{q}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N(u + \varphi)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right) \right] < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi \in H^1$, because of the Sobolev embedding $H^1 \subset L^p$, it is enough to show that for every $\beta > 0$, $\tilde{K} > 0$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu} \left[\exp \left(\beta \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \tilde{K}} \right) \right] < \infty.$$

This however follows from [31, Proposition 3.1]. \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let $4 < p < 6$. Let $M \geq 1$ be a dyadic number, and suppose that $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$ satisfies*

$$\|\varphi\|_{H^1} \lesssim M, \quad \|\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K/2, \quad \|\varphi\|_{L^{p-2}}^{p-2} \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-2},$$

and

$$\|\varphi\|_{L^p}^p \sim M^{\frac{p}{2}-1}. \quad (4.5)$$

Let $0 < \varepsilon_0 \ll 1$, $N \geq N_0(\varphi)$ be big enough, and let Θ_1 be a 1-optimiser for the expression

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \widetilde{Z_{N,M,\varphi}} \\ &= \sup_{\Theta \in \mathbb{H}_a} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta(1)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta(1)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta(1)\|_{L^2}^2 > K} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}(t)\|_{H_x^1}^2 dt \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where Y_1 is defined as in (2.5). Then

$$\log \widetilde{Z_{N,M,\varphi}} \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)|^{p-2} dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right] \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-2}. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. First of all, by choosing $\Theta \equiv 0$, we have from (4.5) that

$$\log \widetilde{Z_{N,M,\varphi}} \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-1},$$

which is (4.7). Now suppose by contradiction that for some constant $\delta_0 \ll 1$ small enough (to be determined later),

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)|^{p-2} dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right] \leq \delta_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-2}. \quad (4.9)$$

By Gagliardo-Nirenberg, we have that

$$\|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{L^p}^p \lesssim \|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{L^2}^{\frac{p}{2}+1} \|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{H^1}^{\frac{p}{2}-1}.$$

Define the set

$$E_{<} := \{\|P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K\},$$

and let $E_{>}$ be its complementary. On $E_{<}$, for some constant $C = C(p, K)$, by Young's inequality we have that

$$\|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{L^p}^p \leq C(1 + \|P_N Y_1\|_{L^2})^{\frac{2p+4}{6-p}} + \frac{1}{8} \|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{H^1}^2,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{E_<} \\ & \leq C(1 + \|P_N Y_1\|_{L^p}^p + \|\varphi\|_{L^p}^p + \|P_N Y_1\|_{L^2}^{\frac{2p+4}{6-p}}) \mathbb{1}_{E_<} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{8} \|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{H^1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{E_<} \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

and proceeding similarly with $p-2$ instead of p , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{L^{p-2}}^{p-2} & \leq \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{2p-8}{8-p}} (1 + \|P_N Y_1\|_{L^2})^{\frac{2p}{8-p}} \\ & \quad + CM^{-2} \|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{H^1}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Since $\|\varphi\|_{L^{p-2}}^{p-2} \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-2}$, when $N \geq N_0(\varphi)$ is big enough, on the set

$$G_< := \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)|^{p-2} dx \leq \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-2} \right\} \cap E_< ,$$

we must have that $\|\Theta_1(1)\|_{L^{p-2}}^{p-2} \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-2}$ as well, and so for M big enough, we have from (4.11) that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{H^1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{G_<} \right] \geq CM^2 \mathbb{P}(G_<) - C\varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{2p-8}{8-p}} \quad (4.12)$$

provided that $4 < p < 6$. Moreover, by Gagliardo-Nirenberg, we have that

$$\|u\|_{L^p}^p \lesssim \|u\|_{H^1}^{\frac{4}{p}} \|u\|_{L^{p-2}}^{\frac{p^2-4}{p}} \leq \frac{1}{4} \|u\|_{H^1}^2 + C \|u\|_{L^{p-2}}^{p+2}. \quad (4.13)$$

In particular, by (4.13) and the definition of $G_<$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{G_<} \right] & \leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left[\|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{H^1}^2 \mathbb{1}_{G_<} \right] \\ & \quad + CM^{\frac{(p+2)(p-4)}{2(p-2)}} \mathbb{P}(G_<). \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Since $2 < p < 6$, note that

$$\frac{(p+2)(p-4)}{2(p-2)} < 2.$$

Note also that by (4.9), we must have that

$$\mathbb{P}(E_< \setminus G_<) \leq \delta := \min \left(\frac{\delta_0}{\varepsilon_0 \mathbb{P}(E_<)}, \mathbb{P}(E_<) \right) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\delta_0}{\varepsilon_0}}, \quad (4.15)$$

and so

$$\mathbb{P}(G_<) + \mathbb{P}(E_>) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Therefore, by (4.6), (4.7), (4.9), (4.10), (4.14), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \log \widetilde{Z_{N,M,\varphi}} \\
& \leq 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N Y_1 + P_N \varphi + P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{L^2}^2 > K} - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 \|\dot{\Theta}_1(t)\|_{H_x^1}^2 dt \right] \\
& \leq C(1 + M^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{P}(E_{<} \setminus G_{<}) + \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{2p-8}{8-p}}) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[-\varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{1}_{E_{>}} - \frac{1}{8} \|P_N \Theta_1(1)\|_{H^1}^2 \right] \\
& \leq 2C\delta M^{\frac{p}{2}-1} - \varepsilon_0 (\mathbb{P}(G_{<}) + \mathbb{P}(E_{>})) M^{\frac{p}{2}-1},
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction with (4.7) when $\delta \ll 1$ is small enough, which in view of (4.15), is the case as soon as δ_0 in (4.9) is small enough. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Suppose that φ_M satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 4.3. Such a family of φ_M can be built (for instance) by choosing φ_1 to be a nonnegative smooth function with compact support with $\|\varphi_1\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K/2$, and

$$\varphi_M(x) = M^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_1(Mx).$$

Recall the probability measures $\rho_{N,L,\varphi}$ introduced in (4.2). With this notation, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& d\rho_{N,\varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1},\varphi} \\
& := \frac{1}{\widetilde{Z_{N,M,\varphi}}} \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |P_N(u + \varphi)|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{1}_{\|P_N(u+\varphi)\|_{L^2}^2 > K} \right) d\mu(P_N u),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

and analogously

$$\begin{aligned}
& d\rho_{\infty,\varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1},\varphi} \\
& = \frac{1}{\widetilde{Z_{M,\varphi}}} \exp \left(\frac{1}{p} \int_{\mathbb{T}} |u + \varphi|^p dx \mathbb{1}_{\|u+\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mathbb{1}_{\|u+\varphi\|_{L^2}^2 > K} \right) d\mu(u).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Note that the definition of $\widetilde{Z_{N,M,\varphi}}$ in (4.16) coincides with the expression (4.6) in view of Lemma 2.4.

Then, by Lemma 2.5, (4.8), and monotone convergence theorem, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho_{N,\varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1},\varphi}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^{p-2} dx \mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right] \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-2} - C \mathbb{E}_{\mu} [\|u\|_{L^{p-2}}^{p-2}] \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-2}.$$

In view of (4.3), we can take limits as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\infty, \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1}, \varphi}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^{p-2} dx \mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right] \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-2} \quad (4.18)$$

as well. Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\varphi}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^{p-2} dx \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\infty, \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1}, \varphi}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^{p-2} dx \mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right] \frac{\widetilde{Z_{M, \varphi}}}{Z_{\varphi}} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\infty, \varepsilon_0 M^{\frac{p}{2}-1}, \varphi}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^{p-2} dx \mathbb{1}_{\|u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq K} \right] \\ &\gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (4.18) in the last step. This shows that

$$\sup_{\varphi \in H^1} \mathbb{E}_{\rho_{\varphi}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} |u|^{p-2} dx \right] \gtrsim M^{\frac{p}{2}-2}.$$

Since M is arbitrary, we obtain (1.16). Together with (1.15), we obtain (1.17). \square

Acknowledgements. G. L. was supported by the NSFC (grant no. 12501181); and he would also like to thank the School of Mathematics at the University of Edinburgh for its hospitality, where part of this manuscript was prepared, and acknowledges support from the European Research Council (grant no. 864138, “SingStochDispDyn”).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Bauerschmidt, T. Bodineau, *A very simple proof of the LSI for high temperature spin systems*, J. Funct. Anal. 276 (2019), no. 8, 2582–2588.
- [2] R. Bauerschmidt, T. Bodineau, *Log-Sobolev inequality for the continuum sine-Gordon model*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 74 (2021), no. 10, 2064–2113.
- [3] R. Bauerschmidt, T. Bodineau, B. Dagallier, *Stochastic dynamics and the Polchinski equation: an introduction*, Probab. Surv. 21 (2024), 200–290.
- [4] D. Bakry, M. Émery, *Diffusions hypercontractives*, Séminaire de probabilités, XIX, 1983/84, 177–206. Lecture Notes in Math., 1123.
- [5] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, M. Ledoux, *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, 348, Springer, Cham, 2014. xx+552 pp.
- [6] N. Barashkov, M. Gubinelli, *A variational method for Φ_3^4* , Duke Math. J. 169 (2020), no. 17, 3339–3415.
- [7] R. Bauerschmidt, B. Dagallier, H. Weber, *Holley–Stroock uniqueness method for the φ_2^4 dynamics*, arXiv:2504.08606.
- [8] Á. Bényi, T. Oh, O. Pocovnicu, *On the probabilistic Cauchy theory for nonlinear dispersive PDEs*, in *Landscapes of time-frequency analysis*, 1–32, Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal., Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham.
- [9] G. Blower, C. Brett, I. Doust, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities and spectral concentration for the cubic Schrödinger equation*, Stochastics 86 (2014), no. 6, 870–881.
- [10] M. Boué, P. Dupuis, *A variational representation for certain functionals of Brownian motion*, Ann. Probab. 26 (1998), no. 4, 1641–1659.
- [11] V. I. Bogachev, *Gaussian measures*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 62, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1998.

- [12] J. Bourgain, *Periodic nonlinear Schrödinger equation and invariant measures*, Comm. Math. Phys. 166 (1994), no. 1, 1–26.
- [13] J. Bourgain, *Invariant measures for the 2D-defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. 176 (1996), no. 2, 421–445.
- [14] J. Bourgain, *Invariant measures for the Gross-Piatevskii equation*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 76 (1997), no. 8, 649–702.
- [15] J. Bourgain and A. Bulut, *Almost sure global well posedness for the radial nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the unit ball I: the 2D case*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré C Anal. Non Linéaire, 31(6):1267–1288, 2014.
- [16] B. Bringmann, *Invariant Gibbs measures for the three-dimensional wave equation with a Hartree nonlinearity II: dynamics*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 26 (2024), no. 6, 1933–2089.
- [17] E. A. Carlen, J. Fröhlich, J. L. Lebowitz, *Exponential relaxation to equilibrium for a one-dimensional focusing non-linear Schrödinger equation with noise*, Comm. Math. Phys. 342 (2016), no. 1, 303–332.
- [18] E. A. Carlen, D. W. Stroock, *An application of the Bakry-Emery criterion to infinite-dimensional diffusions*, in *Séminaire de Probabilités, XX, 1984/85*, 341–348, Lecture Notes in Math., 1204, Springer, Berlin,
- [19] Y. Deng, A. Nahmod, H. Yue, *Invariant Gibbs measures and global strong solutions for nonlinear Schrödinger equations in dimension two*, Ann. of Math. 200 (2024), no. 2, 399–486.
- [20] L. Gross, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, Amer. J. Math. 97 (1975), no. 4, 1061–1083.
- [21] A. Guionnet, B. Zegarliński, *Lectures on logarithmic Sobolev inequalities*, in *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXVI*, 1–134, Lecture Notes in Math., 1801, Springer, Berlin.
- [22] F. Höfer, N. Nikov, *On growth of Sobolev norms for periodic nonlinear Schrödinger and generalised Korteweg-de Vries equations under critical Gibbs dynamics*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 153 (2025), no. 12, 5215–5230.
- [23] J. L. Lebowitz, P. Mounaix, W. M. Wang, *Approach to equilibrium for the stochastic NLS*, Comm. Math. Phys. 321 (2013), no. 1, 69–84.
- [24] J. Lebowitz, H. Rose, E. Speer, *Statistical Mechanics of the Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation*, J. Stat. Phys. 50 (1988), no. 3, 657–687.
- [25] M. Ledoux, *Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities for unbounded spin systems revisited*, in *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXV*, 167–194, Lecture Notes in Math., 1755, Springer, Berlin.
- [26] T. Oh, M. Okamoto, L. Tolomeo, *Focusing Φ_3^4 -model with a Hartree-type nonlinearity*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 304 (2024), no. 1529, vi+143 pp.
- [27] T. Oh, M. Okamoto, L. Tolomeo, *Stochastic quantization of the Φ_3^3 -model*, Mem. Eur. Math. Soc., 16, EMS Press, Berlin, 2025. viii+145 pp.
- [28] T. Oh, K. Seong, L. Tolomeo, *A remark on Gibbs measures with log-correlated Gaussian fields*, Forum Math. Sigma 12 (2024), Paper No. e50, 40 pp.
- [29] T. Oh, P. Sosoe, L. Tolomeo, *Optimal integrability threshold for Gibbs measures associated with focusing NLS on the torus*, Invent. Math. 227 (2022), no. 3, 1323–1429.
- [30] T. Robert, K. Seong, L. Tolomeo, Y. Wang, *Focusing Gibbs measures with harmonic potential*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat. 61 (2025), no. 1, 571–598.
- [31] L. Tolomeo, H. Weber, *Phase transition for invariant measures of the focusing Schrödinger equation*, to appear in Comm. Math. Phys.
- [32] N. Tzvetkov, *Invariant measures for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the disc*, Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ. 3 (2006), no. 2, 111–160.
- [33] N. Tzvetkov, *Invariant measures for the defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 58 (2008), no. 7, 2543–2604.
- [34] A. Üstünel, *Variational calculation of Laplace transforms via entropy on Wiener space and applications*, J. Funct. Anal. 267 (2014), no. 8, 3058–3083.

GUOPENG LI, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BEIJING 100081, CHINA,

Email address: `guopeng.li@bit.edu.cn`

JIAWEI LI, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, AND THE MAXWELL INSTITUTE FOR THE MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, JAMES CLERK MAXWELL BUILDING, THE KING'S BUILDINGS, PETER GUTHRIE TAIT ROAD, EDINBURGH, EH9 3FD, UNITED KINGDOM,

Email address: `jiawei.li@ed.ac.uk`

LEONARDO TOLOMEO, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, AND THE MAXWELL INSTITUTE FOR THE MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, JAMES CLERK MAXWELL BUILDING, THE KING'S BUILDINGS, PETER GUTHRIE TAIT ROAD, EDINBURGH, EH9 3FD, UNITED KINGDOM,

Email address: `l.tolomeo@ed.ac.uk`