

**ON THE CHARACTERISTIC FUNCTION OF A SUM OF  
 M-DEPENDENT RANDOM VARIABLES**

**WANSOO T. RHEE**

Faculty of Management Sciences  
 The Ohio State University  
 Columbus, Ohio 43210

(Received October 8, 1985)

ABSTRACT. Let  $S = f_1 + f_2 + \dots + f_n$  be a sum of 1-dependent random variables of zero mean. Let  $\sigma^2 = E S^2$ ,  $L = \sigma^{-3} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} E |f_i|^3$ . There is a universal constant  $a$  such that for  $a|t|L < 1$ , we have

$$|E \exp(itS\sigma^{-1})| \leq (1+a|t|) \sup\{(a|t|L)^{-1/4} \ln L, \exp(-t^2/80)\}.$$

This bound is a very useful tool in proving Berry-Esseen theorems.

KEY WORDS AND PHRASES. Characteristic Function, m-dependent random variable, Berry-Esseen bound.

1980 AMS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION CODE. P60F05.

1. INTRODUCTION.

Consider a sequence of independent random variables  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n$  of zero means having third moments. Let  $S = f_1 + \dots + f_n$  and  $\sigma^2 = ES^2$ .

If  $t \leq \sigma E(f_i^2)/E|f_i|^3$  for each  $i \leq n$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} |E[\exp(itS\sigma^{-1})]| &\leq \prod_{i \leq n} |E[\exp(itf_i\sigma^{-1})]| \leq \prod_{i \leq n} \exp(-t^2/3 E f_i^2 \sigma^{-2}) \\ &\leq \exp(-t^2/3). \end{aligned}$$

This trivial estimate plays a fundamental role in the proof of Berry-Esseen rates of convergence in the central limit theorem. The purpose of this work is to find an estimate of  $|E[\exp(itS\sigma^{-1})]|$  for the sequence of m-dependent random variables.

We say that a sequence  $(f_i)_{i=1}^n$  of random variables is m-dependent if for each  $1 \leq p \leq n-m-1$ , the sequences  $(f_i)_{i \leq p}$  and  $(f_i)_{i > p+m}$  are independent of each other.

In a recent very interesting paper by V. V. Shergin[1], the author gives the best rate of convergence in the central limit theorem for m-dependent random

variables. We will estimate the bound of  $|E[\exp(itS\sigma^{-1})]|$  by Shergin's methods. This result extracts the most important ideas of Shergin's work. Also we want to point out that this estimate turns out to be an essential tool in the proof of Berry-Esseen type bounds in other limit theorems for m-dependent random variables. In a subsequent work, we shall establish such a convergence rate for U-statistics[2] and an Edgeworth expansion for a sum of m-dependent random variables[3].

2. CONSTRUCTION.

We follow the lines of Shergin's ingenious construction to decompose S in an amenable way. We do not however assume the reader to be familiar with Shergin's paper. The exposition is self contained, and some long details of his proof are eliminated by our approach.

We assume now on  $m=1$ . We denote  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k$  universal constants. No attempt is made at finding optimal values for these universal constants, since the numerical values involved here are too large to be of any interest.

Set  $U = \sum_{i \leq n} E|f_i|^3$ ,  $L = U\sigma^{-3}$  and  $R = -\ln L$ . In the sequel, we assume  $R \geq 10$ . It follows that for  $i \leq n$ , we have

$$E f_i^2 \leq (E|f_i|^3)^{2/3} \leq \sigma^2 L^{2/3} \leq \sigma^2/50R. \tag{2.1}$$

By induction we define indices  $s(i)$  as follows. Set  $s(1) = 1$ , and

$$s(i+1) = 1 + \min\{s : s > s(i), E(f_{s(i)} + \dots + f_s)^2 \geq \sigma^2/R\}.$$

The construction stops at an index  $h$  such that either  $s(h) = n$  or

$$E(f_{s(h)} + \dots + f_s)^2 < \sigma^2/R \text{ for } s(h) < s \leq n.$$

LEMMA 1. ([1]) We have  $10R/11 \leq h \leq 2R$  and  $s(i+1) - s(i) \geq 15R$  for  $1 \leq i \leq h-1$ .

PROOF. From the 1-dependence of the  $f_i$  it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 = & \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} E(f_{s(i)} + \dots + f_{s(i+1)-1})^2 + E(f_{s(h)} + \dots + f_n)^2 \\ & + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} E\{f_{s(i+1)-1} f_{s(i+1)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Schwartz's inequality and (2.1) that

$$\sigma^2 \geq (h-1)\sigma^2/R - 2(h-1)\sup E|f_i|^2 \geq 24\sigma^2(h-1)/25R$$

so that  $h \leq 25R/24 + 1 \leq 2R$ . Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 = & \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} E(f_{s(i)} + \dots + f_{s(i+1)-2})^2 + E(f_{s(h)} + \dots + f_n)^2 \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} E f_{s(i+1)-1}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} E(f_{s(i+1)-2} f_{s(i+1)-1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} E(f_{s(i+1)-1} f_{s(i+1)}). \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\sigma^2 \leq h\sigma^2/R + 5h \sup E f_i^2 \leq 11h\sigma^2/10R$$

and hence  $h \geq 10R/11$ . On the other hand, for  $i \leq h-1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2/R &\leq E(f_{s(i)} + \dots + f_{s(i+1)-1})^2 = \sum_{j=s(i)}^{s(i+1)-1} E f_j^2 + \sum_{j=s(i)}^{s(i+1)-2} 2E(f_j f_{j+1}) \\ &\leq 3(s(i+1) - s(i)) \text{Max } E f_i^2 \leq 3(s(i+1) - s(i))\sigma^2/50R \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma.

Q.E.D.

For  $i \leq h-1$ , let  $\tau_i = \sum_{j=s(i)}^{s(i+1)-1} E|f_j|^3$ . We have  $\sum_{i=1}^{h-1} \tau_i \leq U$ . Hence if  $p$  is the number

of indices  $i \leq h-1$  such that  $\tau_i \geq 10U(h-1)^{-1}$ , we have  $p \leq (h-1)/10$ . It follows that

there are at least  $9(h-1)/10$  indices  $i$  for which  $\tau_i \leq 10U(h-1)^{-1}$ .

Let  $H = [9(h-1)/20 - 1]$ . If  $R \geq 10$ , we have  $H \geq R/10$ . This follows from the fact that  $h \geq 10R/11$  and straightforward computations. We can moreover select indices  $i_1, \dots, i_H$

such that for  $1 \leq l \leq h$ ,

$$\tau_{i_l} \leq 10U(h-1)^{-1} \leq 20U/R; \quad i_{l+1} - i_l \geq 2, \quad 2 \leq i_l \leq h-2. \tag{2.2}$$

For  $1 \leq l \leq H$ , we set  $s(i_l) = a_l, s(i_l+1) = a'_l$ . We have  $a_l - a'_l \geq 15R \geq 15H$ .

Let

$$\bar{f}_l = (a'_l - a_l)^{-1} \sum_{a_l \leq j < a'_l} E|f_j|.$$

Since there are at least  $15H/2 \geq 7H$  indices  $a_l \leq j < a'_l$  for which  $E|f_j| \leq 2\bar{f}_l$ , one can pick indices  $p(l, -H), \dots, p(l, 0), \dots, p(l, H)$  of  $[a_l, a'_l[$  with this property such that no two of them are consecutive.

LEMMA 2. For each  $-H \leq i \leq H$ , we have  $E|f_{p(l,i)}| \leq 40L$ .

PROOF. By Holder's inequality, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a_l \leq j < a'_l} E|f_j| &\leq \sum_{a_l \leq j < a'_l} (E|f_j|^3)^{1/3} \leq (a'_l - a_l)^{2/3} \tau_{i_l}^{1/3}, \\ \sum_{a_l \leq j < a'_l} E|f_j|^3 &\leq \sum_{a_l \leq j < a'_l} (E|f_j|^3)^{2/3} \leq (a'_l - a_l)^{1/3} \tau_{i_l}^{2/3}. \end{aligned}$$

As already shown,  $E(\sum_{a_l \leq j < a'_l} f_j)^2 \leq 5 \sum_{a_l \leq j < a'_l} E f_j^2$ , so we get by combining the above

inequalities, and since  $\sigma^2 \leq R E(\sum_{a_l \leq j < a'_l} f_j)^2, \sigma^2 \bar{f}_l \leq 2R \tau_{i_l} \leq 40U$ . Q.E.D.

Set

$$Z_{\ell,0} = f_p(\ell,0), \quad Z_{2q} = f_p(\ell,-q) + f_p(\ell,q), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq q \leq H,$$

$$Z_{2q+1} = \sum_{p(\ell,-q-1) < i < p(\ell,-q)} f_i + \sum_{p(\ell,q) < i < p(\ell,q+1)} f_i, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq q \leq H.$$

For  $1 \leq s \leq H$ , let  $b_s = (e_1, \dots, e_s)$  be a collection of integers  $0 \leq e_s \leq 2H+1$ . We set

$$W(b_s) = \sigma^{-1} \left( S - \sum_{\ell=1}^s \sum_{j \leq e_s} Z_{\ell,j} \right).$$

For  $s < H$ ,  $\ell \leq H_1$ ,  $b_s = (e_1, \dots, e_s)$ , we set  $W(b_s, \ell) = W((e_1, \dots, e_s), \ell)$ . Let

$$\phi_s(t) = \max |E[\exp(itW(b_s))]|$$

and if  $s < H$ , let

$$\lambda_s(t) = \max |E[\exp(itW(b_s)) - \exp(itW(b_s,0))]|.$$

Here the maximum is taken over all possible choices of  $b_s$ .

3. ESTIMATES.

LEMMA 3. There is a universal constant  $a_1$  such that for  $a_1|t|L < 1$  and  $1 \leq s < H$  we have

$$\lambda_s(t) \leq (a_1|t|L)^{H+1} + a_1|t|L\phi_{s+1}(t).$$

PROOF. Let us fix  $b_s$ , and for  $0 \leq k \leq 2H+1$ , let  $\gamma_k = \exp(itZ_{s,k}\sigma^{-1}) - 1$ . one sees by induction that

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(itW(b_s)) - \exp(itW(b_s,0)) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{2H+1} \exp(itW(b_s, \ell)) \prod_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \gamma_k \\ &+ \exp(itW(b_s, 2H+1)) \prod_{k=0}^{2H+1} \gamma_k. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

By a well known estimate and lemma 2, we have

$$E|\gamma_{2r}| \leq |t|\sigma^{-1}E|Z_r| \leq 80|t|L \quad \text{for } 0 \leq 2r \leq H-1.$$

So, since  $|\gamma_k| \leq 2$ , if we set  $\bar{\ell} = [\ell/2]$ , we have

$$E \left| \prod_{k=0}^{\ell-1} \gamma_k \right| \leq 2^\ell E \prod_{i \leq \bar{\ell}} |\gamma_{2i}| \leq (160|t|L)^{\bar{\ell}+1}.$$

Thus the lemma follows (with  $a_1 = 320$ ) by taking expectation in (3.1), and since

$$\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (160|t|L)^{\bar{\ell}+1} \leq 2 \quad \text{for } a_1|t|L < 1.$$

LEMMA 4.  $\phi_H(t) \leq (\exp(-t^2/4R) + a_4|t|L)^H.$

PROOF. We fix  $b_H = (e_1, \dots, e_H)$ . For  $1 \leq \ell \leq H$ , we set

$$r'_\ell = p(\ell,-q)-1, \quad r''_\ell = p(\ell,q)+1 \quad \text{if } e_\ell \text{ is of the form } 2q$$

and

$$r_\ell = p(\ell, -q-1), r'_\ell = p(\ell, q-1) \text{ if } e_\ell \text{ is of the form } 2q+1.$$

Let  $r'_0 = 1$  and  $r_{H+1} = n$ . For  $0 \leq \ell \leq H$ , let

$$T_\ell = \sum_{r'_\ell \leq i \leq r_{\ell+1}} f_i.$$

We have  $W(b_H) = \sigma^{-1}(T_0 + \dots + T_H)$ , and the  $T_\ell$  are independent. Moreover it follows from (2.2) that each  $T_\ell$  is the sum of the  $f_i$  over an interval which contains an interval of the type  $[s(j_\ell), s(j_\ell+1)[$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_\ell^2 &= E|T_\ell|^2 \geq E\left(\sum_{s(j_\ell) \leq i < s(j_\ell+1)} f_i\right)^2 - 2E(f_{s(j_\ell)} f_{s(j_\ell-1)}) - 2E(f_{s(j_\ell+1)} f_{s(j_\ell+2)}) \\ &\geq \sigma^2/2R. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\omega_\ell = \sum_{r'_\ell \leq i \leq r_{\ell+1}} E(f_i)^3$ . It follows from the theorem of R. V. Erickson [4] that for

$$\text{each } z, |E(\exp izT_\ell \sigma_\ell^{-1}) - \exp(-z^2/2)| \leq a_3 |z| \omega_\ell \sigma_\ell^{-3}.$$

By taking  $z = t \sigma_\ell \sigma^{-1}$  and using  $\sigma_\ell^2 \geq \sigma^2/2R$ , one gets

$$|E(\exp itT_\ell \sigma^{-1})| \leq \exp(-t^2/4R) + 2a_3 \sigma^{-3} R \omega_\ell.$$

Thus, we get

$$|E(\exp itW(b_H))| \leq \prod_{\ell=q}^H (\exp(-t^2/4R) + 2a_3 \sigma^{-3} R \omega_\ell).$$

The concavity of the function  $\ln(1+x)$ , and the fact that  $\sum_{\ell=0}^H \sigma^{-3} R \omega_\ell \leq RL \leq 10HL$  prove

the result.

Q.E.D.

4. RESULTS.

PROPOSITION 5. If  $a_5 |t|L \leq 1$  (and  $L \leq e^{-10}$ ), we have

$$|E(\exp itS \sigma^{-1})| \leq (1+a_5 |t|)(\exp(-t^2/4R) + a_5 |t|L)^H. \tag{4.1}$$

PROOF. Since  $\phi_s \leq \phi_{s+1} + \lambda_{s+1}$ , it follows easily from lemma 3 and by induction that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^q \lambda_\ell(t) \leq q(1+a_1 |t|L)^q ((a_1 |t|L)^{H+1} + a_1 |t| \phi_{s+1}(t)).$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} |E(\exp itS \sigma^{-1})| &\leq \phi_H + \sum_{s=1}^H \lambda_s \\ &\leq \phi_H(t)(1 + Ha_1 |t|L(1+a_1 |t|L)^H) + H(1+a_1 |t|L)^H (a_1 |t|L)^H (a_1 |t|L)^{H+1}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $a_1|t|L \leq e^{1/2} - 1$ , we have, since  $H \leq R = \ln L^{-1}$ ,

$$H(1+a_1|t|L)^H \leq 2(\ln L^{-1})L^{-1/2} \leq a_0L^{-1}.$$

So proposition 5 follows from lemma 4 with  $a_5 = \sup(10a_1, 2a_3, a_0)$ .

It is well worthwhile to reformulate the above result to show more precisely the behaviour of the bound.

THEOREM 6. There exists universal constants  $a_7$  and  $a_8$  such that for  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $|t|$ ,  $a_7 \leq |t|$  and  $a_8|t|L \leq 1$ , and

$$|E(\exp itS\sigma^{-1})| \leq (1+a_5|t|)\sup(\exp(-t^2/80), (a_8|t|L)^{\ln L}). \tag{4.2}$$

PROOF. Let  $a_8 = 3a_5$ . By taking  $a_7$  large enough, the existence of one  $|t|$  satisfying the hypothesis implies  $L \geq e^{10}$ , so we can assume that (4.1) holds. We can also assume that  $a_7 \geq 80a_5$ . If  $|t| \leq 2\sqrt{R}$ , we have  $\exp(-t^2/4R) \geq 1/e$ . Thus, since  $H \geq R/10$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\exp(-t^2/4R) + a_5|t|L)^H &\leq \exp(-t^2/40)(1+ea|t|L)^H \\ &\leq \exp(-t^2/40 + ea_5|t|LH). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $LH \leq LR \leq 1/e$  and  $|t| \geq 80a_5$ , we have  $-t^2/40 + ea_5|t|LH \leq -t^2/80$ , which proves (4.2) in that case. If  $t \geq 2\sqrt{R}$ , then  $\exp(-t^2/8R) \geq \sqrt{e}(\exp(-t^2/4R))$ , and it is easy to check that

$$\exp(-t^2/4R) + a_5|t|L \leq \text{Max}\{\exp(-t^2/8R), 3a_5|t|L\}$$

and theorem 6 follows. Q.E.D.

REMARK. (1) In case of a  $m$ -dependent ( $m > 1$ ) sequence of random variables, an estimate of  $|E(\exp itS\sigma^{-1})|$  can be obtained by considering  $S$  as the sum of 1-dependent blocks of  $f_i$ .

(2) The constant  $1/4$  in the exponent of (4.2) plays no particular role. It is clear from the method that it can be replaced by any number; but the values of  $a_5$  and  $a_8$  depend on this exponent. However for the applications we have in mind, any positive number will be sufficient.

To support our claim that theorem 6 is useful tool, we deduce Shergin's theorem in a simpler way. Let  $\phi$  be the distribution function with the normal law.

SHERGIN'S THEOREM.

$$\sup_t |P(S < t) - \phi(t)| \leq aL.$$

PROOF. It is possible either to use the construction of sections 2 and 3 or to do again a similar but much simpler construction. In order not to repeat arguments

already used, we choose the first approach. Let  $q = [H/2]$  and  $p = p(q, 0)$ . Let  $S_1 = \sum_{0 \leq i < p} f_i$  and  $S_2 = \sum_{p < i \leq n} f_i$ . For  $s(i_l) \leq s \leq p$  (resp.  $p < s \leq s(i_{l+1})$ ), it is easily seen that  $E(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq s} f_i)^2 \geq \sigma^2/10$  (resp.  $E(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} f_i)^2 \geq \sigma^2/16$ ). The method of lemma 3 and the result of theorem 6 gives for  $4a_8 |t|L \leq 1$ :

$$|E(\exp itS\sigma^{-1}) - E(\exp it(S_1 + S_2)\sigma^{-1})| \leq (a_1 |t|L)^{H+1} + a_1 |t|L(1+4a_5 |t|) \text{Max}\{\exp(-t^2/320), (4a_8 |t|L)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \ln L/64\}.$$

Moreover, if  $\sigma_1^2 = E S_1^2$  and  $\sigma_2^2 = E S_2^2$ , we get for  $\epsilon = 1, 2$ , from Erickson's theorem:

$$|E(\exp itS_\epsilon \sigma^{-1}) - \exp(-t^2 \sigma_\epsilon^2 / 2\sigma^2)| \leq 16a_3 |t|L.$$

So it follows, using again theorem 6, that

$$|E(\exp it(S_1 + S_2)\sigma^{-1}) - \exp(-t^2(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2) / 2\sigma^2)| \leq 36a_3 |t|L(1+4a_5 |t|) \text{Max}\{\exp(-t^2/320), (4a_8 |t|L)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \ln L/64\}.$$

Now, if we set  $T^{-1} = 4e^8 a_8 L$ , a straightforward computation gives

$$J(T) = \int_{-T}^T t^{-1} |E(\exp itS) - \exp(-t^2(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2) / 2\sigma^2)| \leq a_{10} L.$$

The familiar Esseen inequality gives

$$\sup_x (P(S\sigma^{-1} < x) - \phi'(x)) \leq a(J(T) + T^{-1}) \leq a_{11} L$$

where  $\phi'(x)$  is the normal distribution function with variance

$$k^2 = \sigma^{-2}(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2) = \sigma^{-2} E(S - f_p)^2. \text{ We have}$$

$$\sup_x (\phi'(x) - \phi(x)) \leq 1 - k^2 \leq \sigma^2 (E(f_p^2) + 2E(f_{p-1} f_p) + 2E(f_p f_{p+1})).$$

We can also assume that at the time we picked the indices  $p(q, j)$  we have made the extra effort to choose  $p = p(q, 0)$  such that for  $\epsilon = 1, 0, 1$ , we have

$$E(f_{p+\epsilon}^2) \leq 10(a'_q - a_q) \sum_{a'_l \leq j \leq a'_l} E|f_j|^2. \text{ It then follows by an estimate similar to lemma 2}$$

that the right hand side of the parenthesis is also bounded by  $a_{12} L$ , and concludes the proof.

REFERENCES

1. SHERGIN, V.V. On the convergence rate in the central limit theorem for m-dependent random variables, Theor. Prob. appl. XXIV (1979), 782-796.

2. RHEE, W. On Asymptotic normality for  $m$ -dependent U-Statistics, to appear.
3. RHEE, W. An Edgeworth expansion for a sum of  $m$ -dependent random variables, to appear in International Journal of Math. and Mathematical Sci.
4. ERICKSON, R.V.  $L_1$  bounds for asymptotic normality of  $m$ -dependent sums using Stein's technique, Ann. Prob. 2, 3 (1974), 522-529.
5. FELLER, W. An Introduction to Probability theory and its applications, John Wiley & Sons, 1970.