

Bounds for r th order joint cumulant under r th order strong mixing

B.L.S. Prakasa Rao

Indian Statistical Institute, 7, S.J.S. Sansanwal Marg, New Delhi 110016, India

Received November 1997

Abstract

A new concept of r th order strong mixing for sub σ -algebras of a probability space is introduced and a bound for the r th order joint cumulant is obtained under a two-part dependence assumption, which includes the case of r th order strong mixing, generalizing the work of Bradley [(1996) *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 30, 287–293] and Rio [(1993) *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* 29, 587–597].

MSC: primary 60E15

Keywords: Bounds for joint cumulant; r th order strong mixing; Two-part dependence assumption

1. Introduction

Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) be a probability space and \mathcal{F}_i , $1 \leq i \leq r$ be sub σ -algebras on Ω contained in \mathcal{F} for some positive integer $r \geq 2$. Define

$$\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_r) = \sup_{(A_1, \dots, A_r) \in \mathcal{F}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{F}_r} |\text{cum}(I_{A_1}, \dots, I_{A_r})|,$$

where, for any random vector (X_1, \dots, X_r) with X_j \mathcal{F}_j -measurable for $1 \leq j \leq r$,

$$\text{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_r) = \sum (-1)^{p-1} (p-1)! \left(E \prod_{j \in v_1} X_j \right) \dots \left(E \prod_{j \in v_p} X_j \right)$$

and (v_1, \dots, v_p) denotes a partition of the set $\{1, \dots, r\}$ for $p = 1, \dots, r$ (cf. Block and Fang, 1988). Here I_A denotes the indicator function of the set A . The coefficient $\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_r)$ measures the association or dependence between the σ -algebras \mathcal{F}_i , $1 \leq i \leq r$. For the special case $r = 2$, the coefficient reduces to the usual strong-mixing coefficient between two sub σ -algebras.

Let $\{X_n, -\infty < n < \infty\}$ be a stochastic process defined on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) and \mathcal{F}_J denote the σ -algebra generated by the random variables $\{X_k, k \in J\}$ for any subset J in the set $-\infty < n < \infty$. Consider

any family of sets $\{J_{in}, 1 \leq i \leq r, n \geq 1\}$ having the property that $\bigcap_{i=1}^r J_{in} \rightarrow \phi$, the empty set as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The process $\{X_n, -\infty < n < \infty\}$ is said to be *r-strong mixing* if

$$\alpha(\mathcal{F}_{J_{1n}}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{J_{rn}}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for every such collection of sets $\{J_{in}, 1 \leq i \leq r\}$.

If $r=2$, the definition reduces to the classical case of strong-mixing for a sequence of random variables. It is easy to see that if a process is *r-strong mixing*, then it is strong-mixing in the usual sense. Furthermore, every *m-dependent* process is *r-strong mixing*. However, there are processes which are strong-mixing but possibly not *r-strong mixing*. This can be checked from the observation that one can construct random variables X_1, X_2, X_3 such that they are pairwise independent but not mutually independent.

We now obtain a bound on the $\text{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_r)$ for any random vector (X_1, \dots, X_r) with X_j \mathcal{F}_j -measurable for $1 \leq j \leq r$ based on the *r-strong-mixing* coefficient introduced above.

For any nonnegative random variable W defined on the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , define

$$Q_W(z) = \inf\{t \geq 0: P(W > t) \leq z\}, \quad 0 < z < 1.$$

Theorem 1.1. Suppose (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) is a probability space and $\mathcal{F}_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$ are sub σ -algebras of \mathcal{F} . Further suppose that there exists positive real numbers $p_i, 1 \leq i \leq r, \alpha$, and λ such that $\sum_{i=1}^r \frac{1}{p_i} = 1, 0 \leq \lambda, \alpha \leq 1$ and

$$|\text{cum}(I_{A_1}, \dots, I_{A_r})| \leq \alpha + \lambda \prod_{i=1}^r [P(A_i)]^{1/p_i}$$

for all $A_i \in \mathcal{F}_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$. If X_i is \mathcal{F}_i -measurable for $1 \leq i \leq r$, then

$$|\text{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_r)| \leq C_1 \int_0^\alpha \prod_{i=1}^r Q_{|X_i|}(z) dz + C_2 \prod_{i=1}^r \|X_i\|_{p_i}$$

where C_1 is a constant depending only on r and C_2 depends on $r, \lambda, p_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$. Here $\|X_i\|_{p_i}$ denotes $[E(|X_i|^{p_i})]^{1/p_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Since

$$\text{cum}(X_1 + Y_1, X_2, \dots, X_r) = \text{cum}(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_r) + \text{cum}(Y_1, X_2, \dots, X_r),$$

it is sufficient to prove the theorem for nonnegative random variables $X_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$. Furthermore, $Q_{X^+}(z) \leq Q_{|X|}(z)$. Hence it is sufficient to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. Suppose the conditions in the previous theorem hold and $X_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$ are nonnegative random variables such that X_i is \mathcal{F}_i -measurable for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then

$$|\text{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_r)| \leq C_1 \int_0^\alpha \prod_{i=1}^r Q_{X_i}(z) dz + C_2 \prod_{i=1}^r \|X_i\|_{p_i}$$

where C_1 is a constant depending only on r and C_2 depends on r, λ , and $p_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$.

Proof. Following Theorem 1 of Block and Fang (1988), it follows that

$$\text{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_r) = \int_0^\infty \dots \int_0^\infty \text{cum}(I_{A_1}(x_1), \dots, I_{A_r}(x_r)) dx_1 \dots dx_r$$

where $A_i = [X_i > x_i]$, $1 \leq i \leq k$. Hence

$$|\text{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_r)| \leq \int_0^\infty \dots \int_0^\infty |\text{cum}(I_{A_1}(x_1), \dots, I_{A_r}(x_r))| dx_1 \dots dx_r.$$

It is easy to check that, for any $x_i > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq r$,

$$|\text{cum}(I_{A_1}(x_1), \dots, I_{A_r}(x_r))| \leq \min \left\{ \beta_r P(X_i > x_i), 1 \leq i \leq r; \alpha + \lambda \prod_{i=1}^r [P(X_i > x_i)]^{1/p_i} \right\}$$

where

$$\beta_r = 1 + 2! + \dots + (r - 2)! \quad \text{if } r \text{ is even,}$$

and

$$\beta_r = 1 + 2! + \dots + (r - 1)! \quad \text{if } r \text{ is odd.}$$

Therefore

$$|\text{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_r)| \leq \int_0^\infty \dots \int_0^\infty \min\{\beta_r P(X_i > x_i), 1 \leq i \leq r; \alpha\} dx_1 \dots dx_r + \int_0^\infty \dots \int_0^\infty \min \left\{ \beta_r P(X_i > x_i), 1 \leq i \leq r; \lambda \prod_{i=1}^r [P(X_i > x_i)]^{1/p_i} \right\} dx_1 \dots dx_r.$$

We will now get upper bounds on the two integrals given above following the techniques of Rio (1993) and Bradley (1996). Let

$$S = \{(x_1, \dots, x_r, z) \in R_+^{r+1} : z < \min\{\beta_r P(X_i > x_i), 1 \leq i \leq r; \alpha\}\}.$$

Then

$$S = \{(x_1, \dots, x_r, z) \in R_+^{r+1} : z < \alpha, x_i < Q_{X_i}(z/\beta_r), 1 \leq i \leq r\}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \dots \int_0^\infty \min\{\beta_r P(X_i > x_i), 1 \leq i \leq r; \alpha\} dx_1 \dots dx_r &= \int \dots \int_{(x_1, \dots, x_r, z) \in S} 1 dx_1 \dots dx_r dz \\ &= \int_{z=0}^\alpha \int_{x_1=0}^{Q_{X_1}(z/\beta_r)} \dots \int_{x_r=0}^{Q_{X_r}(z/\beta_r)} dx_1 \dots dx_r \\ &= \int_{z=0}^\alpha \prod_{i=1}^r Q_{X_i} \left(\frac{z}{\beta_r} \right) dz. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Let

$$H(x_1, \dots, x_r) = \min \left\{ \beta_r P(X_i > x_i), 1 \leq i \leq r; \lambda \prod_{i=1}^r [P(X_i > x_i)]^{1/p_i} \right\}.$$

We now obtain a bound on $H(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ following the techniques of Bradley (1996). If $\lambda = 0$, then Theorem 1.2 clearly is a consequence of Eq. (1.1). Suppose $0 < \lambda \leq 1$. Define $a_{k,n} = Q_{X_k}(2^{-n})$, $n \geq 1$ and $J_{k,n} = [a_{k,n}, a_{k,n+1}]$, $n \geq 0$. If $a_{k,n} = a_{k,n+1}$, then define $J_{k,n} = \phi$. Let $J_{k,\infty} = [a_k, \infty)$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_{k,n} = a_k < \infty$. It is easy to see that

$$2^{-n-1} < P(X_k > x_k) \leq 2^{-n}, \quad n \geq 0, \quad x_k \in J_{k,n},$$

and

$$P(X_k > x_k) = 0, \quad x_k \in J_{k,\infty}.$$

Define

$$G_{i_1, \dots, i_r} = \int \dots \int_{(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in J_{1, i_1} \times \dots \times J_{r, i_r}} H(x_1, \dots, x_r) dx_1 \dots dx_r.$$

It can be checked that

$$G_{i_1, \dots, i_r} = 0$$

if $i_k = \infty$ for some $1 \leq k \leq r$.

Let $j_{k,n}$ be the length of the interval $J_{k,n}$. Following the estimates derived in Bradley (1996), it can be shown that

$$H(x_1, \dots, x_r) \leq \min\{\beta_r 2^{-i_1}, \dots, \beta_r 2^{-i_r}, \lambda 2^{-\sum_{k=1}^r i_k/p_k}\}$$

and hence

$$G_{i_1, \dots, i_r} \leq \left\{ \prod_{k=1}^r j_{k, i_k} \right\} \min\{\beta_r 2^{-i_1}, \dots, \beta_r 2^{-i_r}, \lambda 2^{-\sum_{k=1}^r i_k/p_k}\}.$$

For nonnegative integers i_2, \dots, i_r , we can obtain the following estimates:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i_1=0}^{\infty} G_{i_1, i_1+i_2, \dots, i_1+i_r} &\leq \lambda \sum_{i_1=0}^{\infty} \left[j_{1, i_1} 2^{-(i_1/p_1)} \left\{ \prod_{k=2}^r j_{k, i_1+i_k} 2^{-(i_1+i_k)/p_k} \right\} \right] \\ &\leq \lambda \left[\sum_{i_1=0}^{\infty} j_{1, i_1}^{p_1} 2^{-i_1} \right]^{1/p_1} \prod_{k=2}^r \left[\sum_{i_1=0}^{\infty} j_{1, i_1+i_k}^{p_k} 2^{-(i_1+i_k)} \right]^{1/p_k} \\ &\leq 2\lambda \prod_{k=1}^r \|X_k\|_{p_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\sum_{i_1=0}^{\infty} G_{i_1+i_2, i_1, \dots, i_1+i_r} \leq 2\lambda \prod_{k=1}^r \|X_k\|_{p_k}.$$

Another bound for

$$\sum_{i_1=0}^{\infty} G_{i_1, i_1+i_2, \dots, i_1+i_r}$$

is

$$\beta_r \cdot 2 \cdot 2^{-\sum_{k=2}^r i_k(1-\frac{1}{p_k})} \prod_{k=1}^r \|X_k\|_{p_k}.$$

by Holder’s inequality. Similarly, another bound for

$$\sum_{i_1=0}^{\infty} G_{i_1+i_2, i_1, \dots, i_1+i_r}$$

is

$$\beta_r^r . 2.2^{-\sum_{k=2}^r i_k(1-\frac{1}{p_k})} \prod_{k=1}^r \|X_k\|_{p_k}.$$

The above bounds involve sums of G_{i_1, \dots, i_r} with i_1 varying over 0 to ∞ . Similar bounds hold for other indices i_j , $1 \leq j \leq r$. Note that

$$\int_0^{\infty} \dots \int_0^{\infty} H(x_1, \dots, x_r) dx_1 \dots dx_r = \sum_{i_1=0}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{i_r=0}^{\infty} G_{i_1, \dots, i_r}.$$

By the arguments similar to those given in Bradley (1996) and using the bounds given above, it follows that there exists a constant C_2 depending on $\lambda, r, p_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$ such that

$$\int_0^{\infty} \dots \int_0^{\infty} H(x_1, \dots, x_r) dx_1 \dots dx_r \leq C_2 \prod_{k=1}^r \|X_k\|_{p_k}.$$

Combining this bound with the earlier bound obtained in Eq. (1.1), we have

$$|\text{cum}(X_1, \dots, X_r)| \leq C_1 \int_0^{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^r Q_{X_i}(z) dz + C_2 \prod_{k=1}^r \|X_k\|_{p_k}.$$

Remarks. More explicit bounds involving $\lambda, r, p_i, 1 \leq i \leq r$ for C_1 and C_2 can be obtained as in the case when $r = 2$ (cf. Bradley, 1996). It is however clear from the proof of the result that C_2 can be chosen to be zero in case $\lambda = 0$.

References

Block, H.W., Fang, Z., 1988. A multivariate extension of Hoeffding’s lemma. *Ann. Probab.* 16, 1803–1820.
 Bradley, R.C., 1996. A covariance inequality under a two-part dependence assumption. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 30, 287–293.
 Rio, E., 1993. Covariance inequalities for strongly mixing processes. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Probab. Statist.* 29, 587–597.