

ALMOST SURE CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREMS
FOR m -DEPENDENT RANDOM FIELDS

Tibor Tórnács (Eger, Hungary)

Dedicated to the memory of Professor Péter Kiss

Abstract. It is proved that the almost sure central limit theorem holds true for m -dependent random fields.

AMS Classification Number: 60 F 05, 60 F 15

1. Introduction

Let \mathbf{N} be the set of the positive integers and \mathbf{N}^d the positive integer d -dimensional lattice points, where d is a fixed positive integer. Denote \mathbf{R} the set of real numbers and \mathcal{B} the σ -algebra of Borel sets of \mathbf{R} . Let $\zeta_{\mathbf{n}}$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d$, be a multiindex sequence of random variables on the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{A}, P) . Almost sure limit theorems in multiindex case state that

$$\frac{1}{D_{\mathbf{n}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \delta_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)} \Rightarrow \mu, \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for almost every } \omega \in \Omega.$$

Here δ_x is the unit mass at point x , that is $\delta_x: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, $\delta_x(B) = 1$ if $x \in B$ and $\delta_x(B) = 0$ if $x \notin B$, moreover $\Rightarrow \mu$ denotes weak convergence to the probability measure μ . Theorems of this type are not direct consequences of the corresponding theorems for ordinary sequences.

In this paper $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d)$, $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_d), \dots \in \mathbf{N}^d$. Relations \leq , $\not\leq$, \min , \rightarrow etc. are defined coordinatewise, i.e. $\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty$ means that $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Let $|\mathbf{n}| = \prod_{i=1}^d n_i$ and $|\log \mathbf{n}| = \prod_{i=1}^d \log_+ n_i$, where $\log_+ x = \log x$ if $x \geq e$ and $\log_+ x = 1$ if $x < e$.

In the multiindex version of the classical almost sure limit theorem $\zeta_{\mathbf{n}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{n}|}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} X_{\mathbf{k}}$, where $X_{\mathbf{k}}$, $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{N}^d$, are independent identically distributed random variables with expectation $EX_{\mathbf{k}} = 0$ and variance $D^2 X_{\mathbf{k}} = 1$, moreover $d_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|}$, $D_{\mathbf{n}} = |\log \mathbf{n}|$, finally μ is the standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. (See [2] in multiindex case, while [1] and [3] for single index case.)

We shall prove a similar proposition, but in so-called m -dependent case. For this purpose we need the next known theorems and lemmas.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that for any pair $\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{N}^d$, $\mathbf{h} \leq \mathbf{l}$ there exists a random variable $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}$ with the following properties. $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}} = 0$ if $\mathbf{h} = \mathbf{l}$. If $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{N}^d$, then for $\mathbf{h} = \min\{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}\}$ we suppose that the following pairs of random variables are independent: $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}$; $\zeta_{\mathbf{l}}$ and $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}}$; $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}}$ and $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}$. Assume that there exist $c > 0$ and $\mathbf{n}_0 \in \mathbf{N}^d$ such that $E(\zeta_{\mathbf{l}} - \zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}})^2 \leq c|\mathbf{h}|/|\mathbf{l}|$ for all $\mathbf{n}_0 \leq \mathbf{h} \leq \mathbf{l}$, $\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{N}^d$.*

Let $0 \leq d_k^{(i)} \leq c \log \frac{k+1}{k}$, assume that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} d_k^{(i)} = \infty$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Let $d_{\mathbf{k}} = \prod_{i=1}^d d_{k_i}^{(i)}$ and $D_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}}$. Then for any probability distribution μ the following two statements are equivalent

$$\frac{1}{D_{\mathbf{n}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \delta_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)} \Rightarrow \mu, \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for almost every } \omega \in \Omega;$$

$$\frac{1}{D_{\mathbf{n}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \mu_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}} \Rightarrow \mu, \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\mu_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}}$ denotes the distribution of the $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}$.

Proof. Choose in [2], Theorem 2.1 and Remark 2.2, $B = \mathbf{R}$, $\varrho(x, y) = |x - y|$, $c_n^{(i)} = n$ and $\beta = 1$.

Let $X_{\mathbf{n}}$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d$, be a multiindex sequence of random variables on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P})$. Suppose that $EX_{\mathbf{n}} = 0$ and $D^2 X_{\mathbf{n}} < \infty$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d$. Let $\|\mathbf{n}\| = \max\{n_1, \dots, n_d\}$ and $d(V_1, V_2) = \inf\{\|\mathbf{n} - \mathbf{m}\| : \mathbf{n} \in V_1, \mathbf{m} \in V_2\}$, where $V_1, V_2 \subset \mathbf{N}^d$. Let $\sigma(V)$, where $V \subset \mathbf{N}^d$, be the smallest σ -algebra with respect to which $\{X_{\mathbf{n}}, \mathbf{n} \in V\}$ are measurable.

Definition 1.2. Let $m \in \mathbf{N}$ be fixed. The random field $\{X_{\mathbf{n}}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d\}$ is said to be m -dependent if the σ -algebras $\sigma(V_1)$ and $\sigma(V_2)$ are independent whenever $d(V_1, V_2) > m$, $V_1, V_2 \subset \mathbf{N}^d$.

In the following let $S_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} X_{\mathbf{k}}$, $B_{\mathbf{n}} = D^2 S_{\mathbf{n}}$, $\zeta_{\mathbf{n}} = S_{\mathbf{n}}/\sqrt{B_{\mathbf{n}}}$ and let $\mu_{\zeta_{\mathbf{n}}}$ denote the distribution of the random variable $\zeta_{\mathbf{n}}$.

Lemma 1.3. *Let $\{X_{\mathbf{n}}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d\}$ be an m -dependent random field, $EX_{\mathbf{n}} = 0$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d$. Assume that*

$$(1.1) \quad \text{there exist } M, \delta \in \mathbf{R} \text{ such that } E|X_{\mathbf{n}}|^{2+\delta} \leq M < \infty \text{ for all } \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d,$$

for some $\delta \geq 0$. Then there exists constant $C_{\delta} > 0$ such that

$$E|S_{\mathbf{n}}|^{2+\delta} \leq C_{\delta} |\mathbf{n}|^{\frac{2+\delta}{2}}$$

for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d$.

Proof. See [4], Lemma 5.

Lemma 1.4. Let $\mu, \mu_{\mathbf{n}}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d$, be distributions with $\mu_{\mathbf{n}} \Rightarrow \mu$, as $\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty$. Let $d_{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{N}^d$, be a nonidentically zero sequence of nonnegative real numbers. Assume that for each fixed $\mathbf{n}_0 \in \mathbf{N}^d$,

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in A_{\mathbf{n}_0}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $A_{\mathbf{n}_0} = \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{N}^d : \mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n} \text{ and } \mathbf{k} \not\geq \mathbf{n}_0\}$. Then

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \mu_{\mathbf{k}} \Rightarrow \mu, \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let $f: \mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a bounded and continuous function. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\mathbf{n}_\varepsilon \in \mathbf{N}^d$ such that for $\mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{n}_\varepsilon$

$$\left| \int f d\mu_{\mathbf{n}} - \int f d\mu \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in A_{\mathbf{n}_\varepsilon}} d_{\mathbf{k}} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2K},$$

where $|\int f d\mu_{\mathbf{n}} - \int f d\mu| \leq K < \infty$. Let $\gamma_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \mu_{\mathbf{k}} / \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int f d\gamma_{\mathbf{n}} - \int f d\mu \right| &\leq \frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in A_{\mathbf{n}_\varepsilon}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \left| \int f d\mu_{\mathbf{k}} - \int f d\mu \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}}} \sum_{\mathbf{n}_\varepsilon \leq \mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \left| \int f d\mu_{\mathbf{k}} - \int f d\mu \right| < \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

which implies Lemma 1.4.

It is easy to see that the conditions of Lemma 1.4 are satisfied for $d_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|}$. The next proposition is a central limit theorem for m -dependent random fields.

Theorem 1.5. Let $\{X_{\mathbf{n}}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d\}$ be an m -dependent random field, $EX_{\mathbf{n}} = 0$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d$. Assume that (1.1) holds for some $\delta > 0$ and

$$(1.2) \quad \text{there exist } \sigma > 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{n}_\sigma \in \mathbf{N}^d \text{ such that } \frac{B_{\mathbf{n}}}{|\mathbf{n}|} \geq \sigma \text{ for all } \mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{n}_\sigma.$$

Then

$$\mu_{\zeta_{\mathbf{n}}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. It is a simple corollary of [4], Theorem 1.

2. Results

Theorem 2.1. Let $\{X_{\mathbf{n}}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d\}$ be an m -dependent random field, $EX_{\mathbf{n}} = 0$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d$. Suppose that (1.1) and (1.2) hold for some $\delta \geq 0$. Let $0 \leq d_k^{(i)} \leq c \log \frac{k+1}{k}$, assume that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} d_k^{(i)} = \infty$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. Let $d_{\mathbf{k}} = \prod_{i=1}^d d_{k_i}^{(i)}$ and $D_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}}$. Then for any probability distribution μ the following two statements are equivalent

$$\frac{1}{D_{\mathbf{n}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \delta_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)} \Rightarrow \mu, \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for almost every } \omega \in \Omega;$$

$$\frac{1}{D_{\mathbf{n}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \mu_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}} \Rightarrow \mu, \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{N}^d$, $\mathbf{h} \leq \mathbf{l}$, $\mathbf{m} = (m, \dots, m) \in \mathbf{N}^d$, $V_{\mathbf{l}} = \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{N}^d : \mathbf{t} \leq \mathbf{l}\}$, $V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}} = \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{N}^d : \mathbf{t} \leq \mathbf{l} \text{ and } \mathbf{t} \not\leq \mathbf{h} + \mathbf{m}\}$, $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{B_{\mathbf{l}}}} \sum_{\mathbf{t} \in V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}} X_{\mathbf{t}}$. Let us verify in this

case the assumptions of Theorem 1.1.

(I) $\zeta_{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}} = 0$ because $V_{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}} = \emptyset$.

(II) Let $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{N}^d$ and $\mathbf{h} = \min\{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}\}$. Then

$\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}$ is $\sigma(V_{\mathbf{k}})$ -measurable, $\zeta_{\mathbf{l}}$ is $\sigma(V_{\mathbf{l}})$ -measurable,

$\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}$ is $\sigma(V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}})$ -measurable if $V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}} \neq \emptyset$, otherwise $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}} = 0$,

$\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}}$ is $\sigma(V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}})$ -measurable if $V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}} \neq \emptyset$, otherwise $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}} = 0$,

$d(V_{\mathbf{k}}, V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}) > m$ if $V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}} \neq \emptyset$,

$d(V_{\mathbf{l}}, V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}}) > m$ if $V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}} \neq \emptyset$,

$d(V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}}, V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}) > m$ if $V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}} \neq \emptyset$ and $V_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}} \neq \emptyset$.

Thus the following pairs of random variables are independent: $\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}$; $\zeta_{\mathbf{l}}$ and $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}}$; $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{k}}$ and $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}$.

(III) By Lyapunov's inequality, $(\mathbb{E}|\xi|^s)^{1/s} \leq (\mathbb{E}|\xi|^t)^{1/t}$ if $0 < s \leq t$. (See it for example in [5].) Thus we have

$$\mathbb{E}S_{\mathbf{h}+\mathbf{m}}^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}|S_{\mathbf{h}+\mathbf{m}}|^{2+\delta})^{\frac{2}{2+\delta}}.$$

By Lemma 1.3,

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbb{E}S_{\mathbf{h}+\mathbf{m}}^2 \leq \left(c_1|\mathbf{h}+\mathbf{m}|^{\frac{2+\delta}{2}}\right)^{\frac{2}{2+\delta}} = c_2|\mathbf{h}+\mathbf{m}|.$$

Let $\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathbf{N}^d$ such that $\max\{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}_\sigma\} \leq \mathbf{h} \leq \mathbf{l}$. Then $\mathbf{m} \leq \mathbf{h}$ and (2.1) imply that

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbb{E}(\zeta_{\mathbf{l}} - \zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}})^2 = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{B_{\mathbf{l}}}}S_{\mathbf{h}+\mathbf{m}}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{B_{\mathbf{l}}}\mathbb{E}S_{\mathbf{h}+\mathbf{m}}^2 \leq \frac{c_2}{B_{\mathbf{l}}}|\mathbf{h}+\mathbf{m}|.$$

Since $\mathbf{l} \geq \mathbf{n}_\sigma$ thus, by assumption (1.2), $\frac{1}{B_{\mathbf{l}}} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma|\mathbf{l}|}$. So (2.2) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}(\zeta_{\mathbf{l}} - \zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}})^2 \leq \frac{c_2}{\sigma} \frac{|\mathbf{h}+\mathbf{m}|}{|\mathbf{l}|} = c_3 \frac{\prod_{i=1}^d (h_i + m)}{|\mathbf{l}|} \leq 2^d c_3 \frac{|\mathbf{h}|}{|\mathbf{l}|} = c_4 \frac{|\mathbf{h}|}{|\mathbf{l}|}.$$

Therefore random variables $\zeta_{\mathbf{l}}$ and $\zeta_{\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{l}}$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.1, which implies Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\{X_{\mathbf{n}}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d\}$ be an m -dependent random field, $\mathbb{E}X_{\mathbf{n}} = 0$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}^d$. Assume that (1.1) and (1.2) hold for some $\delta > 0$. Then*

$$\frac{1}{|\log \mathbf{n}|} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|} \delta_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for almost every } \omega \in \Omega.$$

Proof. Let $d_k^{(i)} = \frac{1}{k}$, $k \in \mathbf{N}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$. The conditions of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied, because $2 \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right)^k$, so $\frac{1}{k} \leq \frac{1}{\log 2} \log \frac{k+1}{k}$, moreover $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k} = \infty$. Then $d_{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|}$ and

$$(2.3) \quad D_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{1}{k_i} = \prod_{i=1}^d \sum_{k_i=1}^{n_i} \frac{1}{k_i} \sim \prod_{i=1}^d \log n_i \sim |\log \mathbf{n}|,$$

where $a_{\mathbf{n}} \sim b_{\mathbf{n}}$ if $a_{\mathbf{n}}/b_{\mathbf{n}} \rightarrow 1$, as $\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty$. By Theorem 1.5, $\mu_{\zeta_{\mathbf{n}}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, as $\mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore Lemma 1.4 implies that

$$\frac{1}{D_{\mathbf{n}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} d_{\mathbf{k}} \mu_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}} = \frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|} \mu_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now using Theorem 2.1, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|}} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{k}|} \delta_{\zeta_{\mathbf{k}}(\omega)} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \text{ as } \mathbf{n} \rightarrow \infty, \text{ for almost every } \omega \in \Omega.$$

This fact and (2.3) imply Theorem 2.2.

References

- [1] BERKES, I., Results and problems related to the pointwise central limit theorem, In: Szyszkowicz, B. (Ed.) *Asymptotic results in probability and statistics*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, (1998), 59–96.
- [2] FAZEKAS, I., RYCHLIK, Z., Almost sure central limit theorems for random fields, *Technical Report No. 2001/12, University of Debrecen, Hungary* (submitted to Math. Nachr.).
- [3] FAZEKAS, I., RYCHLIK, Z., Almost sure functional limit theorems, *Technical Report No. 2001/11, University of Debrecen, Hungary* (submitted to Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie -Skłodowska Lublin - Polonia, Vol.LVI,1, 2002.)
- [4] PRAKASA RAO, B. L. S., A non-uniform estimate of the rate of convergence in the central limit theorem for m -dependent random fields, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete* **58** (1981), 247–256.
- [5] SHIRYAYEV, A. N., *Probability*, Springer-Verlag New York Inc. (1984).

Tibor Tómacs

Department of Mathematics
 Károly Eszterházy College
 H-3301, Eger, P. O. Box 43.
 Hungary
 E-mail: tomacs@ektf.hu