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Abstract—Yet another simple proof of the entropy power inequality is given, which avoids both the integration over a path of Gaussian perturbation and the use of Young’s inequality with sharp constant or Rényi entropies. The proof is based on a simple change of variables, is formally identical in one and several dimensions, and easily settles the equality case.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The entropy power inequality (EPI) was stated by Shannon [1] in the form

$$e^{2h(X+Y)} \geq e^{2h(X)} + e^{2h(Y)}$$

(1)

for any independent $n$-dimensional random vectors $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with densities and finite second moments, with equality if and only if $X$ and $Y$ are Gaussian with proportional covariances. Shannon gave an incomplete proof; the first complete proof was given by Stam [2] using properties of Fisher’s information. A detailed version of Stam’s proof was given by Blachman [3]. A very different proof was provided by Lieb [4] using Young’s convolutional inequality with sharp constant. Dembo et al. [5] provided a clear exposition of both Stam’s and Lieb’s proofs. Carlen and Soffer gave an interesting variation of Stam’s proof for one-dimensional variables [6]. Szarek and Voiculescu [7] gave a proof related to Lieb’s but based on a variant of the Brunn-Minkowski inequality. Guo et al. [8], Verdú and Guo [9] gave another proof based on the I-MMSE relation. A similar proof based on a relation between divergence and causal MMSE was given by Binia [10]. Yet another proof based on properties of mutual information was proposed in [11] and [12]. A more involved proof based on a stronger form of the EPI that uses spherically symmetric rearrangements, also related to Young’s inequality with sharp constant, was recently given by Wang and Madiman [13].

As first noted by Lieb [4], the above Shannon’s formulation (1) of the EPI is equivalent to

$$h(\sqrt{\lambda}X + \sqrt{1-\lambda}Y) \geq h(X) + h(Y)$$

(2)

for any $0 < \lambda < 1$. All available proofs of the EPI used this form.1 Proofs of the equivalence can be found in numerous papers, e.g., [5, Ths. 4, 6, and 7], [9, Lemma 1], [12, Prop. 2], and [14, Th. 2.5].

There are a few technical difficulties for proving (2) which are not always explicitly stated in previous proofs. First of all, one should check that for any random vector $X$ with finite second moments, the differential entropy $h(X)$ is always well-defined—even though it could be equal to $-\infty$. This is a consequence of [12, Proposition 1]; see also Appendix A for a precise statement and proof. Now if both independent random vectors $X$ and $Y$ have densities and finite second moments, so has $\sqrt{\lambda}X + \sqrt{1-\lambda}Y$ and both sides of (2) are well-defined. Moreover, if either $h(X)$ or $h(Y)$ equals $-\infty$ then (2) is obviously satisfied. Therefore, one can always assume that $X$ and $Y$ have finite differential entropies.2

Another technical difficulty is the requirement for smooth densities. More precisely, as noted in [13, Remark 10] some previous proofs use implicitly that for any $X$ with arbitrary density and finite second moments and any Gaussian $Z$ independent of $X$,

$$\lim_{t \to 0} h(X + \sqrt{t}Z) = h(X).$$

(3)

This was proved explicitly in [12, Lemma 3] and [13, Th. 6.2] using the lower-semicontinuity of divergence; the same result can also be found in previous works that were not directly related to the EPI [16, eq. (51)], [17, Proof of Lemma 1], [18, Proof of Th. 1].

As a consequence, it is sufficient to prove the EPI for random vectors of the form $X + \sqrt{t}Z$ ($t > 0$). Indeed, letting $Z'$ be an independent copy of $Z$ such that $(Z, Z')$ is independent of $(X, Y)$, the EPI written for $X + \sqrt{t}Z$ and $Y + \sqrt{t}Z'$ reads

$$h(\sqrt{\lambda}X + \sqrt{1-\lambda}Y + \sqrt{t}Z') \geq h(X + \sqrt{t}Z) + h(Y + \sqrt{t}Z')$$

where $Z'' = \sqrt{\lambda}Z + \sqrt{1-\lambda}Z'$ is again identically distributed as $Z$ and $Z'$. Letting $t \to 0$ we obtain the general EPI (2).4 Now, for any random vector $X$ and any $t > 0$, $X + \sqrt{t}Z$ has a continuous and positive density. This can be seen using the properties of the characteristic function, similarly as in [12, Lemma 1]; see Appendix B for a precise statement and proof. Therefore, as already noticed in [13, Sec. XI], one can always assume that $X$ and $Y$ have continuous, positive densities.

One is thus led to prove the following version of the EPI.

---

1A nice discussion of general necessary and sufficient conditions for the EPI (1) can be found in [15, Secs. V and VI].
2Throughout this paper we assume that Gaussian random vectors are non-degenerate (have non-singular covariance matrices).
3A similar observation was done in [6] in a different context of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck semigroup (instead of the heat semigroup).

Theorem (EPI): Let $X, Y$ be independent random vectors with continuous, positive densities and finite differential entropies and second moments. For any $0 < \lambda < 1$,

$$h(\sqrt{X} + \sqrt{1 - \lambda} Y) \geq \lambda h(X) + (1 - \lambda) h(Y)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

with equality if and only if $X, Y$ are Gaussian with identical covariances.

Previous proofs of (2) can be classified into two categories:

- proofs in [2], [3], [6], and [8]–[12] rely on the integration over a path of a continuous Gaussian perturbation of some data processing inequality using either Fisher’s information, the minimum mean-squared error (MMSE) or mutual information. As explained in [11, eq. (10)], [12] and [19, eq. (25)], it is interesting to note that in this context, Fisher’s information and MMSE are complementary quantities;
- proofs in [4], [7], [13], and [20] are related to Young’s inequality with sharp constant or to an equivalent argumentation using spherically symmetric rearrangements, and/or the consideration of convergence of Rényi entropies.

It should also be noted that not all of the available proofs of (2) settle the equality case—that equality in (2) holds only for Gaussian random vectors with identical covariances. Only proofs from the first category using Fisher’s information were shown to capture the equality case. This was made explicit by Sturm [2], Carlen and Soffer [6] and for more general fractional EPI’s by Madiman and Barron [19].

In this paper, a simple proof of the Theorem is given that avoids both the integration over a path of a continuous Gaussian perturbation and the use of Young’s inequality, spherically symmetric rearrangements, or Rényi entropies. It is based on a “Gaussian to not Gaussian” lemma proposed in [21] and is formally identical in one dimension ($n = 1$) and in several dimensions ($n > 1$). It also easily settles the equality case.

II. FROM GAUSSIAN TO NOT GAUSSIAN

The following “Gaussian to not Gaussian” lemma [21] will be used here only in the case where $X^*$ is a $n$-variate Gaussian vector, e.g., $X^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$, but holds more generally as $X^*$ need not be Gaussian.

**Lemma 1:** Let $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ and $X^* = (X_1^*, \ldots, X_n^*)$ be any two $n$-dimensional random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with continuous, positive densities. There exists a diffeomorphism $\Phi$ whose Jacobian matrix is triangular with positive diagonal elements such that $X$ has the same distribution as $\Phi(X^*)$.

For completeness we present two proofs in the Appendix. The first proof in Appendix C follows Knothe [22]. The second proof in Appendix D is based on the (multivariate) inverse sampling method.

The essential content of this lemma is well known in the theory of convex bodies [23, p. 126], [24, Th. 3.4], [25, Th. 1.3.1] where $\Phi$ is known as the Knöthe map between two convex bodies. The difference with Knöthe’s map is that in Lemma 1, the determinant of the Jacobian matrix need not be constant. The Knöthe map is also closely related to the so-called Knöthe-Rosenblatt coupling in optimal transport theory [26], [27], and there is a large literature of optimal transportation arguments for geometric-functional inequalities such as the Brunn-Minkowski, isoperimetric, sharp Young, sharp Sobolev and Prékopa-Leindler inequalities. The Knöthe map was used in the original paper by Knöthe [22] to generalize the Brunn-Minkowski inequality, by Gromov in [23, Appendix I] to obtain isoperimetric inequalities on manifolds and by Barthe [28] to prove the sharp Young’s inequality. In a similar vein, other transport maps such as the Brenier map were used in [29] for sharp Sobolev and Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequalities and in [30] for a generalized Prékopa-Leindler inequality on manifolds with lower Ricci curvature bounds. Since the present paper was submitted, the Brenier map has also been applied to the stability of the EPI for log-concave densities [31]. All the above-mentioned geometric-functional inequalities are known to be closely related to the EPI (see e.g., [5]), and it is perhaps not too surprising to expect a direct proof of the EPI using an optimal transportation argument—namely, Knöthe—map—which is what this paper is about.

Let $\Phi'$ be the Jacobian (i.e., the determinant of the Jacobian matrix) of $\Phi$. Since $\Phi' > 0$, the usual change of variable formula reads

$$\int f(x) \, dx = \int f(\Phi(x^*)) \Phi'(x^*) \, dx^*. \hspace{1cm} (4)$$

A simple application of this formula gives the following well-known lemma which was used in [21].

**Lemma 2:** For any diffeomorphism $\Phi$ with positive Jacobian $\Phi' > 0$, if $h(\Phi(X^*))$ is finite,

$$h(\Phi(X^*)) = h(X^*) + \mathbb{E}\{\log \Phi'(X^*)\}. \hspace{1cm} (5)$$

The proof is given for completeness.

**Proof:** Let $f(x)$ be the density of $\Phi(X^*)$ so that $g(x^*) = f(\Phi(x^*))/\Phi'(x^*)$ is the density of $X^*$. Then we have

$$\int f(x) \log f(x) \, dx = \int f(\Phi(x^*)) \log f(\Phi(x^*)) \Phi'(x^*) \, dx^* = \int g(x^*) \log g(x^*)/\Phi'(x^*) \, dx^*$$

which yields (5). \hfill \Box

III. PROOF OF THE ENTROPY POWER INEQUALITY

Let $X^*, Y^*$ be any i.i.d. random vectors, e.g., $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$. For any $0 < \lambda < 1$, $\sqrt{X^*} + \sqrt{1 - \lambda} Y^*$ is identically distributed as $X^*$ and $Y^*$ and, therefore,

$$h(\sqrt{\lambda} X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda} Y) = \lambda h(X^*) + (1 - \lambda) h(Y^*). \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

Subtracting both sides from both sides of (2) one is led to prove that

$$h(\sqrt{\lambda} X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda} Y) - h(\sqrt{\lambda} X^* + \sqrt{1 - \lambda} Y^*) \geq \lambda (h(X) - h(X^*)) + (1 - \lambda)(h(Y) - h(Y^*)). \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

Let $\Phi$ be as in Lemma 1, so that $X$ has the same distribution as $\Phi(X^*)$. Similarly let $\Psi$ be such that $Y$ has the same distribution as $\Psi(Y^*)$. Since $\sqrt{T} X + \sqrt{1 - T} Y$ is identically distributed as $\sqrt{T} \Phi(X^*) + \sqrt{1 - T} \Psi(Y^*)$,

$$h(\sqrt{T} X + \sqrt{1 - T} Y) = h(\sqrt{T} X^* + \sqrt{1 - T} Y^*) = h(\sqrt{T} \Phi(X^*) + \sqrt{1 - T} \Psi(Y^*) - h(\sqrt{T} X^* + \sqrt{1 - T} Y^*). \hspace{1cm} (8)$$
On the other hand, by Lemma 2,
\[ \lambda(h(X) - h(X^*)) + (1 - \lambda)(h(Y) - h(Y^*)) \]
\[ = \lambda(h(\Phi(X^*)) - h(X^*)) + (1 - \lambda)(h(\Psi(Y^*)) - h(Y^*)) \]
\[ = \mathbb{E}\{\log \Phi'(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X - \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y)\} \]
\[ + (1 - \lambda)\mathbb{E}\{\log \Psi'(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y)\} \]
\[ \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\{\log \Phi'(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X - \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y)\} \]
\[ + (1 - \lambda)\mathbb{E}\{\log \Psi'(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y)\} \]
(20)

Thus both sides of (7) have been rewritten in terms of the Gaussian X* and Y*. We now compare (8) and (9). Toward this aim we make the change of variable (X*, Y*) → (X̂, Ŷ) where
\[ \begin{aligned}
X^* &= \sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y \\
Y^* &= \sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y.
\end{aligned} \]
(10)

Again, X̂, Ŷ are i.i.d. Gaussian and
\[ \begin{aligned}
X^* &= \sqrt{1 - \lambda}X - \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y \\
Y^* &= -\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y.
\end{aligned} \]
(11)

To simplify the notation define
\[ \Theta_j(X) = \sqrt{1 - \lambda}\Phi(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X - \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y) + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}\Psi(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y). \]
(12)

Then (8) becomes
\[ h(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y) - h(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X^* + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y^*) \]
\[ = h(\Theta_j(X)) - h(\breve{X}). \]
(13)

Here Lemma 2 cannot be applied directly because Θ_j(X̂) is not a deterministic function of X̂. But since conditioning reduces entropy,
\[ h(\Theta_j(X)) \geq h(\Theta_j(X)|\breve{Y}) \]
(14)

Now for fixed Ŷ, since Φ and Ψ have triangular Jacobian matrices with positive diagonal elements, the Jacobian matrix of Θ_j is also triangular with positive diagonal elements. Thus, by Lemma 2,
\[ h(\Theta_j(X)|\breve{Y} = \breve{Y}) - h(\breve{X}) = \mathbb{E}\{\log \Theta'_j(\breve{X})\} \]
(15)

where Θ_j is the Jacobian of the transformation Θ_j. Since X̂ and Ŷ are independent, averaging over Ŷ yields
\[ h(\Theta_j(X)|\breve{Y} = \breve{Y}) - h(\breve{X}) = \mathbb{E}\{\log \Theta'_j(\breve{X})\}. \]
(16)

Therefore, by (13)-(14)
\[ h(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y) - h(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X^* + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y^*) \]
\[ \geq \mathbb{E}\{\log \Theta'_j(\breve{X})\}. \]
(17)

On the other hand, (9) becomes
\[ \lambda(h(X) - h(X^*)) + (1 - \lambda)(h(Y) - h(Y^*)) \]
\[ = \lambda(h(\Phi(X^*)) - h(X^*)) + (1 - \lambda)(h(\Psi(Y^*)) - h(Y^*)) \]
\[ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\{\log \Phi'(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X - \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y)\} \]
\[ + (1 - \lambda)\mathbb{E}\{\log \Psi'(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y)\} \]
(18)

where in (20) we have used Jensen’s inequality λ log a +
(1 - λ) log b ≤ log(λa + (1 - λ)b) on each component, in (21) the fact that the Jacobian matrix of Θ_j is triangular with positive diagonal elements, and (22) is (17). This proves (2).

IV. THE CASE OF EQUALITY

Equality in (2) holds if and only if both (14) and (20) are equalities. Equality in (20) holds if and only if for all
\[ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \]
\[ \frac{\partial \Phi_i}{\partial x_j}(X^*) = \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial y_j}(Y^*) \]
(23)

Since X* and Y* are independent Gaussian random vectors this implies that \[ \frac{\partial \Phi_i}{\partial x_j} \] and \[ \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial y_j} \] are constant and equal. Thus in particular \[ \Theta_j \] is constant. Now equality in (14) holds if and only if Θ_j(̂X) is independent of Ŷ, thus Θ_j(̂X) = Θ(̂X) does not depend on the particular value of Ŷ. Thus for all \[ i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \]
\[ 0 = \frac{\partial (\Theta_j(\breve{X}))}{\partial y_j} \]
\[ = -\sqrt{1 - \lambda}\Phi(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X - \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y) \]
\[ + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}\Psi(\sqrt{1 - \lambda}X + \sqrt{1 - \lambda}Y) \]
(24)

hence \[ \frac{\partial \Phi_i}{\partial x_j} \] and \[ \frac{\partial \Psi_i}{\partial y_j} \] are constant and equal for any \[ i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \] Therefore, Φ and Ψ are linear transformations, equal up to an additive constant. It follows that Φ(X*) and Φ(Y*) (hence X and Y) are Gaussian with identical covariances. This ends the proof of the Theorem. □

Extensions of similar ideas when X*, Y* need not be Gaussian can be found in [32].

APPENDIX A

The differential entropy h(X) = -f log f of a random vector X with density f is not always well-defined because the negative and positive parts of the integral might be both infinite, as in the example f(x) = 1/(2x log^2 x) for 0 < x < 1/e and e < x < +∞, and 0 otherwise [12].

Proposition 1: Let X be an random vector with density f and finite second moments. Then h(X) = -f log f is well-defined and < +∞.

Proof: Let Z be any Gaussian vector with density g > 0. On one hand, since X has finite second moments, the integral
\( f \) \( f \) \( \log \) \( g \) finite. On the other hand, since \( g \) never vanishes, the probability measure of \( X \) is absolutely continuous with respect to that of \( Z \). Therefore, the divergence \( D(f \| g) \) is equal to the integral \( \int f \log(f/g) \). Since the divergence is non-negative, it follows that \( -\int f \log f = -\int f \log g - D(f \| g) \leq -\int f \log g \) is well-defined and < \( +\infty \) (the positive part of the integral is finite). \( \square \)

**APPENDIX B**

It is stated in [33, Appendix II A] that strong smoothness properties of distributions of \( Y = X + Z \) for independent Gaussian \( Z \) are “very well known in certain mathematical circles” but it seems difficult to find a reference.

The following result is stated for an arbitrary random vector \( X \). It is not required that \( X \) has a density. It could instead follow e.g., a discrete distribution.

**Proposition 2:** Let \( X \) be any random vector and \( Z \) be any independent Gaussian vector with density \( g \). Let \( X \) be independent Gaussian random vectors with density \( g \) and \( \phi \) has the same distribution as \( \Phi(X_1^*) \) where \( \partial\Phi_1 \) is positive.

In the first two dimensions, for each \( x_1^*, x_2^* \) in \( \mathbb{R} \), define \( \Phi_2(x_1^*, x_2^*) \) such that

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{x_1, x_2}(\Phi_1(x_1^*), \cdot) \frac{\partial\Phi_1}{\partial x_1^*}(x_1^*) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{x_1, x_2}(x_1^*, x_2^*, \cdot).
\]

(28)

Again \( \Phi_2 \) is continuously differentiable and increasing in \( x_2^* \); differentiating gives

\[
f_{x_1, x_2}(\Phi_1(x_1^*), \Phi_2(x_1^*, x_2^*)) \frac{\partial\Phi_1}{\partial x_1^*}(x_1^*) \frac{\partial\Phi_2}{\partial x_2^*}(x_2^*) = f_{x_1, x_2}(x_1^*, x_2^*)
\]

(29)

which proves the result in two dimensions. Continuing in this manner we arrive at

\[
f_{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n}(\Phi_1(x_1^*), \Phi_2(x_1^*, x_2^*), \ldots, \Phi_n(x_1^*, x_2^*, \ldots, x_n^*))
\]

\[
\times \frac{\partial\Phi_1}{\partial x_1^*}(x_1^*) \frac{\partial\Phi_2}{\partial x_2^*}(x_2^*) \cdots \frac{\partial\Phi_n}{\partial x_n^*}(x_n^*)
\]

\[
= f_{x_1^*, x_2^*, \ldots, x_n^*}(x_1^*, x_2^*, \ldots, x_n^*)
\]

(30)

which shows that \( X = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n) \) has the same distribution as \( \Phi(X_1^*, X_2^*, \ldots, X_n^*) = (\Phi_1(X_1^*), \Phi_2(X_1^*, X_2^*), \ldots, \Phi_n(X_1^*, X_2^*, \ldots, X_n^*)) \). The Jacobian matrix of \( \Phi \) has the form

\[
\mathbf{J}_\Phi(x_1^*, x_2^*, \ldots, x_n^*) = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{\partial\Phi_1}{\partial x_1^*} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\frac{\partial\Phi_2}{\partial x_1^*} & \frac{\partial\Phi_2}{\partial x_2^*} & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\frac{\partial\Phi_n}{\partial x_1^*} & \frac{\partial\Phi_n}{\partial x_2^*} & \cdots & \frac{\partial\Phi_n}{\partial x_n^*}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(31)

where all diagonal elements are positive since by construction each \( \Phi_k \) is increasing in \( x_k^* \). \( \square \)

**APPENDIX C**

**FIRST PROOF OF LEMMA 1**

We use the notation \( f \) for densities (p.d.f.’s). In the first dimension, for each \( x_1^* \) in \( \mathbb{R} \), define \( \Phi_1(x_1^*) \) such that

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\Phi_1(x_1^*)} f_{x_1} = \int_{-\infty}^{x_1^*} f_{x_1}. \tag{26}
\]

Since the densities are continuous and positive, \( \Phi_1 \) is continuously differentiable and increasing; differentiating gives

\[
f_{x_1}(\Phi_1(x_1^*)) = \frac{\partial\Phi_1}{\partial x_1^*}(x_1^*) \tag{27}
\]

which proves the result in one dimension: \( X_1 \) has the same distribution as \( \Phi_1(X_1^*) \) where \( \frac{\partial\Phi_1}{\partial x_1^*} \) is positive.

We use the notation \( F \) for distribution functions (c.d.f.’s). We also note \( F_{x_i}|x_i(x_2|x_i) = \mathbb{P}(x_2 \leq x_2 | x_1 = x_i) \) and let \( F_{x_i}|x_i^{-1}(x_1) \) be the corresponding inverse function in the argument \( x_2 \) for a fixed value of \( x_1 \). Such inverse functions are well-defined since it is assumed that \( X \) is a random vector with continuous, positive density.

The inverse transform sampling method is well known for univariate random variables but its multivariate generalization is not.

**Lemma 3 (Multivariate Inverse Transform Sampling Method (see, e.g., [34, Algorithm 2]))**: Let \( U = (U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_n) \) be uniformly distributed on \( [0, 1]^n \). The vector \( \Phi(U) \) with components

\[
\Phi_1(U_1) = F_{x_1}^{-1}(U_1) \\
\Phi_2(U_1, U_2) = F_{x_2|x_1}(U_2|\Phi_1(U_1)) \\
\vdots \\
\Phi_n(U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_n) = F_{x_n|x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}}(U_n|\Phi_1(U_1), \ldots, \Phi_{n-1}(U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_{n-1}))
\]

(32)

has the same distribution as \( X \).
Proof: By inverting $\Phi$, it is easily seen that an equivalent statement is that the random vector $(X_1, X_2, X_3, \ldots, X_n)$ is uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]^n$. Clearly $X_k$ is uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]$, since

$$\mathbb{P}(X_k \leq x) = \mathbb{P}(X \leq F_X^{-1}(x)) = F_X \circ F_X^{-1}(u_1).$$

Similarly for any $k > 0$ and fixed $x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1}, F_{X_k}(x_1, \ldots, x_{k-1})$ is also uniformly distributed in $[0, 1]$. The result follows by the chain rule. □

Proof of Lemma 1: By Lemma 3, $X$ has the same distribution as $\Phi(U)$, where each $\Phi_k(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k)$ is increasing in $u_k$. Similarly $X^*$ has the same distribution as $\Psi(U)$, where both $\Phi$ and $\Psi$ have (lower) triangular Jacobian matrices $J_\Phi, J_\Psi$ with positive diagonal elements. Then $X$ has the same distribution as $\Phi(\Psi^{-1}(X^*))$. By the chain rule for differentiation, the transformation $\Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}$ has Jacobian matrix $J_\Phi \circ \Psi^{-1} \cdot J_\Psi^{-1} = (J_\Phi \circ \Psi^{-1}) \cdot (J_\Psi \circ \Psi^{-1})^{-1}$. This product of (lower) triangular matrices with positive diagonal elements and is again (lower) triangular with positive diagonal elements. □
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