

On a Theorem Concerning the Sum of Positive Independent Random Variables.

By Kyonori Kanisawa.

§ 1. Let $\{X_k | k=1, 2, \dots\}$ be a sequence of positive independent random variables. We call the sum $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$ to be relatively stable, if there exist $\{B_n > 0 | n=1, 2, \dots\}$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(1) \quad P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{B_n} - 1\right| > \varepsilon\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

We call further the random variables X_n to be relatively stable, if for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(2) \quad P\left(\frac{X_n}{B_n} > \varepsilon\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

uniformly in regard to $1 \leq k \leq n$.

A. Khintchine firstly showed a necessary and sufficient condition for the relative stability of S_n , when the chance variables X_n have a same distribution function. Next A. Bobroff generalized this problem and gived a criterion when $\{X_n | n=1, 2, \dots\}$ have not necessary a same distribution function.

1) A. Khintchine

Giorn. dell' Ist. It. d. Attuari 7 (1936)

pp. 365 - 377.

(2) A. Bobroff, On the relative stability of the sums of positive random variables (Russian). Scientific reports of Moscow national university. Math. 1939, pp. 191 - 202.

In this paper, applying the method of mean concentration function³⁾, we shall give a simple proof of another criterion of this problem.

§ 2. Denote by $\{F_n(x) | n=1, 2, \dots\}$ the distribution functions of $\{X_n | n=1, 2, \dots\}$, then we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1 The necessary and sufficient condition that the sums $S_n (n=1, 2, \dots)$ should be relatively stable and the chance variables $X_n (n=1, 2, \dots)$ should be relatively small is that there exists a sequence of positive numbers $\{C_n > 0 | n=1, 2, \dots\}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \{1 - F_k(C_n)\} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} \frac{x C_n}{C_n^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty.$$

Proof. Our condition is sufficient. Put

$$B_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{C_n} x dF_k(x),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{B_n}{C_n} &= \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{C_n} \frac{x}{C_n} dF_k(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{C_n} \frac{x C_n}{C_n^2} dF_k(x) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{C_n} \frac{x C_n}{C_n^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty \end{aligned}$$

Hence for any $\varepsilon > 0$, if n is sufficient large, we have $C_n \leq B_n \varepsilon$.

- 3) K. Kunisawa, Mean concentration function and the law of large numbers, Proc. Imp. Acad. Tokyo, 20 (1944), pp. 627-630.

Whence

$$P(X_k \geq \varepsilon B_n) \leq P(X_k \geq C_n) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n (1 - F_k(C_n)) \rightarrow 0.$$

This inequality shows that the chance variables X_k are relatively small. Now put

$$f_k(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{itx} dF_k(x), \quad k=1, 2, \dots$$

then for $|t| \leq T$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \left(f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) - 1 \right) - it \right| &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \left(f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) - 1 - it \int_0^{C_n} \frac{x}{B_n} dF_k(x) \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\int_0^{\infty} \left(e^{\frac{itx}{B_n}} - 1 \right) dF_k(x) - it \int_0^{C_n} \frac{x}{B_n} dF_k(x) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \left| \int_0^{C_n} \left(e^{\frac{itx}{B_n}} - 1 - \frac{itx}{B_n} \right) dF_k(x) \right| + \sum_{k=1}^n \left| \int_{C_n}^{\infty} \left(e^{\frac{itx}{B_n}} - 1 \right) dF_k(x) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2B_n} T^2 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^n (1 - F_k(C_n)) = o(T^2) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

As (3) implies $f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1$ uniformly for any finite interval $|t| \leq T$ and $k=1, 2, \dots, n$, we have for the interval $|t| \leq T$

$$\begin{aligned} \log \prod_{k=1}^n f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \log f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) \\ &= - \sum_{k=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) \right)^2 + \dots \right\} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \left(f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) - 1 \right) + o(T) + o(T^2) + o(1) \\ &= it + o(T) + o(T^2) + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can conclude

$$\prod_{k=1}^n f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{it}$$

uniformly for $|t| \leq T$. This fact shows the relative stability of S_m .

Our condition is necessary. We assume that

$$\prod_{k=1}^n f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) \longrightarrow e^{it}$$

(166)

uniformly for $|t| \leq T$ and $k=1, 2, \dots, n$. Hence we see

$$(5) \quad \prod_{k=1}^n |f_k(\frac{t}{B_n})|^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1$$

uniformly for $|t| \leq T$ and

$$(6) \quad |f_k(\frac{t}{B_n})|^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 1$$

uniformly for $|t| \leq T$ and $k=1, 2, \dots, n$. From (5) we have for sufficiently large n

$$\prod_{k=1}^n |f_k(\frac{t}{B_n})|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

for $|t| \leq T$. Hence by the method of the mean concentration function.³⁾

$$\eta \int_0^T e^{-\eta t} (1 - \prod_{k=1}^n |f_k(\frac{t}{B_n})|^2) dt \geq \frac{1}{2} \eta \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^T e^{-\eta t} (1 - |f_k(\frac{t}{B_n})|^2) dt$$

Applying the inequality $(1 - |f_k(\frac{t}{B_n})|^2) \leq 4^i (1 - |f_k(t)|^2)$ (i is a positive integer), we have an absolute constant K such that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^T e^{-\eta t} (1 - |f_k(\frac{t}{B_n})|^2) dt &\geq K \sum_{k=1}^n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{x^2}{\eta^2 B_n^2 + x^2} d\tilde{F}_k(x) \\ &= K \sum_{k=1}^n \eta \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\eta t} (1 - |f_k(\frac{t}{B_n})|^2) dt \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{F}_k(x)$ is the symmetrized distribution of $F_k(x)$. From (5) we have

$$(7) \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n \{1 - \tilde{F}_k(\eta B_n)\} \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} \frac{x^2}{\eta^2 B_n^2 + x^2} d\tilde{F}_k(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

By (6) we have also for sufficiently large n

$$F_k(\eta B_n) \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

uniformly in regard to $1 \leq k \leq n$. Hence

$$2(1 - \tilde{F}_k(\eta B_n)) = P(|X_k - Y_k| \geq \eta B_n).$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq P(X_k - Y_k \geq \gamma B_n) \geq P(X_k \geq 2\gamma B_n, Y_k < \gamma B_n) \\ &= \{1 - F_k(2\gamma B_n)\} F_k(\gamma B_n) \end{aligned}$$

where Y_k is a random variable independent of X_k and has the same distribution function $F_k(x)$ as X_k . From (7) we see

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (1 - F_k(\gamma B_n)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

If we select properly a positive sequence tending to zero $\{\eta_n | n=1, 2, \dots\}$ such that

$$(8) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n (1 - F_k(\eta_n B_n)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

we see

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} \frac{x \eta_n B_n}{\eta_n^2 B_n^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

Otherwise, there should exist subsequence $n_1, n_2, n_3, \dots, n_i, \dots \rightarrow \infty$

and a constant M satisfying

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{x \eta_{n_i} B_{n_i}}{\eta_{n_i}^2 B_{n_i}^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) \leq M.$$

Since we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2\eta_{n_i} B_{n_i}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \int_0^{\eta_{n_i} B_{n_i}} x dF_k(x) \\ &\frac{1}{2\eta_{n_i}^2 B_{n_i}^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \int_0^{\eta_{n_i} B_{n_i}} x^2 dF_k(x) \end{aligned} \right\} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \int_0^{\eta_{n_i} B_{n_i}} \frac{x \eta_{n_i} B_{n_i}}{\eta_{n_i}^2 B_{n_i}^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{x \eta_{n_i} B_{n_i}}{\eta_{n_i}^2 B_{n_i}^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) \leq M, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$(9) \quad \frac{1}{B_{n_i}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \int_0^{\eta_{n_i} B_{n_i}} x dF_k(x) \leq 2\eta_{n_i} M,$$

$$(10) \quad \frac{1}{B_{n_i}^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \int_0^{\eta_{n_i} B_{n_i}} x^2 dF_k(x) \leq 2\eta_{n_i}^2 M.$$

(168)

Whence, putting $C_n = \eta_n B_n$, in the analogous way with (4)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \left(f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) - 1 - it \int_0^{C_n} \frac{x}{B_n} dF_k(x) \right) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \left| \int_0^{C_n} e^{\frac{itx}{B_n}} - 1 - \frac{itx}{B_n} dF_k(x) \right| + \sum_{k=1}^n \left| \int_{C_n}^{\infty} \left(e^{\frac{itx}{B_n}} - 1 \right) dF_k(x) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^n t^2 \int_0^{C_n} \frac{x^2}{2B_n^2} dF_k(x) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^n (1 - F_k(C_n)). \end{aligned}$$

From (8), (9) and (10), we have for $|t| \leq T$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \left(f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) - 1 \right) \right| & \leq |t| \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \int_0^{C_{n_i}} \frac{x}{B_{n_i}} dF_k(x) + t^2 \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \int_0^{C_{n_i}} \frac{x^2}{2B_{n_i}^2} dF_k(x) \\ & \quad + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} (1 - F_k(C_{n_i})) \\ & \leq T \cdot 2\eta_{n_i} M + T^2 \cdot \eta_{n_i}^2 M + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

Hence for $|t| \leq T$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \left(f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) - 1 \right) = o(1) + o(T^2) + o(T).$$

Whence

$$\begin{aligned} \log \prod_{k=1}^{n_i} f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \log f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \left(f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_{n_i}}\right) - 1 \right) \\ & \quad + o(T^2) + o(T) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

This fact is contrary to the first assumption:

$$\prod_{k=1}^n f_k\left(\frac{t}{B_n}\right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{it}$$

Remark. Following three conditions are equivalent: for properly chosen $C_n > 0$ ($C_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$).

1° (A. Bobroff)

$$a) \sum_{k=1}^n (1 - F_k(c_n)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

$$b) \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{c_n} \int_0^{c_n} (1 - F_k(x)) dx \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$$

$$2° a) \sum_{k=1}^n (1 - F_k(c_n)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

$$b) \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} \frac{c_n x}{c_n^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$$

$$3° a) \sum_{k=1}^n (1 - F_k(c_n)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0,$$

$$b) \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{c_n} \int_0^{c_n} x dF_k(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$$

In fact, 1° implies 2°.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} \frac{c_n x}{c_n^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} \frac{c_n x}{c_n^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) + \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{c_n} x dF_k(x) \\ &\geq \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{c_n} \frac{x}{c_n} dF_k(x). \end{aligned}$$

By partial integration

$$(1) \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{c_n} (1 - F_k(x)) dx = \sum_{k=1}^n \left\{ (1 - F_k(c_n)) + \frac{1}{c_n} \int_0^{c_n} x dF_k(x) \right\}$$

Hence

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} \frac{c_n x}{c_n^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$$

2° implies 3°. For from the above equation, it is evident.

3° implies 1°. It is evident, for

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{c_n} \frac{x}{c_n} dF_k(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{c_n} \frac{c_n x}{2 c_n^2} dF_k(x) \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{c_n} \frac{c_n x}{c_n^2 + x^2} dF_k(x) \leq \sum_{k=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} \frac{c_n x}{c_n^2 + x^2} dF_k(x). \end{aligned}$$