

## INFINITE COIN-TOSS AND THE LAWS OF LARGE NUMBERS

The traditional interpretation of the *probability* of an event  $E$  is its *asymptotic frequency*: the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  of the fraction of  $n$  repeated, similar, and independent trials in which  $E$  occurs. Similarly the “expectation” of a random variable  $X$  is taken to be its *asymptotic average*, the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  of the average of  $n$  repeated, similar, and independent replications of  $X$ . As statisticians trying to make inference about the underlying probability distribution  $f(x|\theta)$  governing observed random variables  $X_i$ , this suggests that we should be interested in the probability distribution for large  $n$  of quantities like the average of the RV’s,  $\bar{X}_n \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ .

Three of the most celebrated theorems of probability theory concern this sum. For independent random variables  $X_i$ , all with the same probability distribution satisfying  $E|X_i|^3 < \infty$ , set  $\mu = EX_i$ ,  $\sigma^2 = E|X_i - \mu|^2$ , and  $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ . The three main results are:

**Laws of Large Numbers:**

$$\frac{S_n - n\mu}{\sigma n} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (i.p. \text{ and } a.s.)$$

**Central Limit Theorem:**

$$\frac{S_n - n\mu}{\sigma\sqrt{n}} \implies N(0, 1) \quad (i.d.)$$

**Law of the Iterated Logarithm:**

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pm \frac{S_n - n\mu}{\sigma\sqrt{2n \log \log n}} = 1.0 \quad (a.s.)$$

Together these three give a clear picture of how quickly and in what sense  $\frac{1}{n}S_n$  tends to  $\mu$ . We begin with the Law of Large Numbers (LLN), in its “weak” form (asserting convergence *i.p.*) and in its “strong” form (convergence *a.s.*). There are several versions of both theorems. The simplest requires the  $X_i$  to be IID and  $L_2$ ; stronger results allow us to weaken (but not eliminate) the independence requirement, permit non-identical distributions, and consider what happens if the RV’s are only  $L_1$  (or worse!) instead of  $L_2$ .

The text covers these things well; to complement it I am going to: (1) Prove the simplest version, and with it the Borel-Cantelli theorems; and (2) Show what happens with Cauchy random variables, which don’t satisfy the requirements (the LLN fails).

- I. Weak version, non-iid,  $L_2$ :  $\mu_i = \mathbf{E}X_i$ ,  $\sigma_{ij} = \mathbf{E}[X_i - \mu_i][X_j - \mu_j]$
- A.  $Y_n = (S_n - \Sigma\mu_i)/n$  satisfies  $\mathbf{E}Y_n = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{E}Y_n^2 = \frac{1}{n^2}\Sigma_{i \leq n}\sigma_{ii} + \frac{2}{n^2}\Sigma_{i < j \leq n}\sigma_{ij}$ ;
1. If  $\sigma_{ii} \leq M$  and  $\sigma_{ij} \leq 0$  or  $|\sigma_{ij}| < Mr^{|i-j|}$ ,  $r < 1$ , Chebychev  $\implies Y_n \rightarrow 0$ , *i.p.*
  2. (pairwise) IID  $L_2$  is OK
- II. Strong version, non-iid,  $L_2$ :  $\mathbf{E}X_i = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{E}X_i^2 \leq M$ ,  $\mathbf{E}X_i X_j \leq 0$ .
- A.  $\mathbf{P}[|S_n| > n\epsilon] < \frac{Mn}{n^2\epsilon^2} = \frac{M}{n\epsilon^2}$
1.  $\mathbf{P}[|S_{n^2}| > n^2\epsilon] < \frac{M}{n^2\epsilon^2}$ ,  $\Sigma_n \mathbf{P}[|S_{n^2}| > n^2\epsilon] < \frac{M\pi^2}{6\epsilon^2}$
  2. Borel-Cantelli:  $\mathbf{P}[|S_{n^2}| > n^2\epsilon \text{ i.o.}] = 0$ ,  $\therefore \frac{1}{n^2}S_{n^2} \rightarrow 0$  *a.s.*
  3.  $D_n = \max_{n^2 < k < (n+1)^2} |S_k - S_{n^2}|$ ,  $\mathbf{E}D_n^2 \leq 2n\mathbf{E}|S_{(n+1)^2} - S_{n^2}|^2 \leq 4n^2M$
  4. Chebychev:  $\mathbf{P}[D_n > n^2\epsilon] < \frac{4n^2M}{n^4\epsilon^2}$ ,  $\therefore D_n \rightarrow 0$  *a.s.*
- B.  $|S_k/k| \leq \frac{|S_{n^2}| + D_n}{n^2} \rightarrow 0$  *a.s.*, QED
1. Bernoulli RV's, normal number theorem, Monte Carlo integration.
- III. Weak version, pairwise-iid,  $L_1$
- A. Equivalent sequences:  $\sum_n \mathbf{P}[X_n \neq Y_n] < \infty$
1.  $\sum_n [X_n - Y_n] < \infty$  *a.s.*
  2.  $\sum_{i=1}^n [X_i]$ ,  $a_n \sum_{i=1}^n [X_i]$  converge iff  $\sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i]$ ,  $a_n \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i]$  both converge
  3.  $Y_n = X_n 1_{[|X_n| \leq n]}$
- IV. Counterexamples: Cauchy,
- A.  $X_i \sim \frac{dx}{\pi[1+x^2]} \implies \mathbf{P}[|S_n|/n \leq \epsilon] \equiv \frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1}(\epsilon) \not\rightarrow 1$ , WLLN fails.
  - B.  $\mathbf{P}[X_i = \pm n] = \frac{c}{n^2}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ ;  $X_i \notin L_1$ , and  $S_n/n \not\rightarrow 0$  *i.p.* or *a.s.*
  - C.  $\mathbf{P}[X_i = \pm n] = \frac{c}{n^2 \log n}$ ,  $n > 1$ ;  $X_i \notin L_1$ , but  $S_n/n \rightarrow 0$  *i.p.* and not *a.s.*
  - D. Medians: for ANY RV's  $X_n \rightarrow X_\infty$  *i.p.*, then  $m_n \rightarrow m_\infty$  if  $m_\infty$  is unique.

Let  $X_i$  be *iid* standard Cauchy RV's, with

$$\mathbb{P}[X_1 \leq t] = \int_{-\infty}^t \frac{dx}{\pi[1+x^2]} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan(t)$$

and characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E} e^{i\omega X_1} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\omega x} \frac{dx}{\pi[1+x^2]} = e^{-|\omega|},$$

so  $S_n/n$  has characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E} e^{i\omega S_n/n} = \mathbb{E} e^{i\frac{\omega}{n}[X_1+\dots+X_n]} = \left(\mathbb{E} e^{i\frac{\omega}{n}X_1}\right)^n = (e^{-|\frac{\omega}{n}|})^n = e^{-|\omega|}$$

and  $S_n/n$  also has the standard Cauchy distribution with  $\mathbb{P}[S_n/n \leq t] = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan(t)$ ; in particular,  $S_n/n$  does not converge almost surely, or even in probability.

### A LAW OF LARGE NUMBERS FOR CORRELATED SEQUENCES

In many applications we would like a Law of Large Numbers for sequences of random variables that are *not* independent; for example, in Markov Chain Monte Carlo integration, we have a stationary Markov chain  $\{X_t\}$  (this means that the distribution of  $X_t$  is the same for all  $t$  and that the conditional distribution of  $X_u$  for  $u > t$ , given  $\{X_s | s \leq t\}$ , depends only on  $X_t$ ) and want to estimate the population mean  $\mathbb{E}[\phi(X_t)]$  for some function  $\phi(\cdot)$  by the sample mean

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi(X_t)] \approx \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \phi(X_t).$$

Even though they are identically distributed, the random variables  $Y_t \equiv \phi(X_t)$  won't be independent if the  $X_t$  aren't independent, so the LLN we already have doesn't quite apply.

A sequence of random variables  $Y_t$  is called *stationary* if each  $Y_t$  has the same probability distribution and, moreover, each finite set  $(Y_{t_1+h}, Y_{t_2+h}, \dots, Y_{t_k+h})$  has a joint distribution that doesn't depend on  $h$ . The sequence is called " $L_2$ " if each  $Y_t$  has a finite variance  $\sigma^2$  (and hence also a well-defined mean  $\mu$ ); by stationarity it also follows that the *covariance*

$$\gamma_{st} = \mathbb{E}[(Y_s - \mu)(Y_t - \mu)]$$

is finite and depends only on the absolute difference  $|t - s|$ .

**Theorem.** If a stationary  $L_2$  sequence has a summable covariance, *i.e.*, satisfies  $\sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} |\gamma_{st}| \leq c < \infty$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_t] = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t.$$

*Proof.* Let  $S_T$  be the sum of the first  $T$   $Y_t$ 's and set (as usual)  $\bar{Y}_T \equiv S_T/T$ . The variance of  $S_T$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(S_T - T\mu)^2] &= \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[(X_s - \mu)(X_t - \mu)] \\ &\leq \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} |\gamma_{st}| \\ &\leq Tc, \end{aligned}$$

so  $\bar{Y}_T$  had variance  $V[\bar{Y}_T] \leq c/T$  and by Chebychev's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} P[|\bar{Y}_T - \mu| > \epsilon] &\leq \frac{E[(\bar{Y}_T - \mu)^2]}{\epsilon^2} \\ &= \frac{E[(S_T - T\mu)^2]}{T^2\epsilon^2} \\ &\leq \frac{Tc}{T^2\epsilon^2} \\ &= \frac{c}{T\epsilon^2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

A strong LLN follows with a bit more work, just as for *iid* random variables.

### Examples

1. **IID:** If  $X_t$  are independent and identically distributed, and if  $Y_t = \phi(X_t)$  has finite variance  $\sigma^2$ , then  $Y_t$  has a well-defined finite mean  $\mu$  and  $\bar{Y}_T \rightarrow \mu$ .

Here  $\gamma_{st} = \begin{cases} \sigma^2 & \text{if } s = t \\ 0 & \text{if } s \neq t \end{cases}$ , so  $c = \sigma^2 < \infty$ .

2. **AR<sub>1</sub>:** If  $Z_t$  are *iid*  $N(0, 1)$  for  $-\infty < t < \infty$ ,  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\sigma > 0$ ,  $-1 < \rho < 1$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &\equiv \mu + \sigma \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \rho^s Z_{t-s} \\ &= \rho X_{t-1} + \alpha + \sigma Z_t, \end{aligned} \tag{*}$$

where  $\alpha = (1 - \rho)\mu$ , then the  $X_t$  are identically distributed (all with the  $N(\mu, \frac{\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2})$  distribution) but not independent (since  $\gamma_{st} = \frac{\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2} \rho^{|s-t|} \neq 0$ ); this is called an “autoregressive process” (because of equation (\*), expressing  $X_t$  as a regression of previous  $X_s$ 's) of order one (because only one earlier  $X_s$  appears in (\*)), and is about the simplest non-*iid* sequence occurring in applications. Since the covariance is summable,

$$\sum_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} |\gamma_{st}| = \frac{\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2} \frac{1+|\rho|}{1-|\rho|} = \frac{\sigma^2}{(1-|\rho|)^2} < \infty,$$

we again have  $\bar{X}_T \rightarrow \mu$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

2. **Geometric Ergodicity:** If for some  $0 < \rho < 1$  and  $c > 0$  we have  $\gamma_{st} \leq c\rho^{|s-t|}$  for a Markov chain  $Y_t$  the chain is called *Geometrically Ergodic* (because  $c\rho^t$  is a geometric sequence), and the same argument as for AR<sub>1</sub> shows that  $\bar{Y}_t$  converges; Meyn & Tweedie (1993), Tierney (1994), and others have given conditions for MCMC chains to be Geometric Ergodic, and hence for the almost-sure convergence of sample averages to population means.
3. **General Ergodicity:** Consider the three sequences of random variables on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with  $\Omega = (0, 1]$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{B}(\Omega)$ , each with  $X_0(\omega) = \omega$ :
  1.  $X_{n+1} \equiv 2X_n \pmod{1}$ ;
  2.  $X_{n+1} \equiv X_n + \alpha \pmod{1}$  (Does it matter if  $\alpha$  is rational?);
  3.  $X_{n+1} \equiv 4X_n(1 - X_n)$ .

For each, find a probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  (equivalently find a distribution for  $X_0$ ) such that the  $X_n$  are all identically distributed; the sequence is called *ergodic* if each  $E \in \mathcal{F}$  left invariant by the transformation  $T$  that takes  $X_n$  to  $X_{n+1}$ ,  $E = T^{-1}(E)$ , is trivial in the sense that  $\mathbb{P}[E] = 0$  or  $\mathbb{P}[E] = 1$ . The *Ergodic Theorem* asserts that  $\bar{X}_n$  converges almost-surely to a  $T$ -invariant limit  $X_\infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ; since only constants are  $T$ -invariant for ergodic sequences, it follows that  $\bar{X}_n \rightarrow \mu = EX_n$ . The conditions here are weaker than those for the usual LLN; in all three cases above, for example, each  $X_n$  is completely determined by  $X_0$  so there is complete dependence!

### Stable Limit Laws

Let  $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$  be the partial sum of *iid* random variables. IF the random variables are all square integrable, THEN the Central Limit Theorem applies and necessarily  $\frac{S_n}{n\sigma^2} - \mu \implies \text{No}(0, 1)$ . But what if each  $X_n$  is *not* square integrable? We have already seen CLT fail for Cauchy variables  $X_j$ . Denote by  $F(x) = \mathbb{P}[X_n \leq x]$  the common CDF of the  $\{X_n\}$ .

#### Theorem (Stable Limit Law).

There exist constants  $A_n > 0$  and  $B_n \in \mathbb{R}$  and a distribution  $\mu$  for which the

$$\frac{S_n}{A_n} - B_n \implies \mu$$

if and only if there are constants  $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ ,  $M^- \geq 0$ , and  $M^+ \geq 0$ , with  $M^- + M^+ > 0$ , such that the following limits hold for every  $\xi > 0$  as  $x \rightarrow +\infty$ :

1.  $\frac{F(-x)}{1 - F(x)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}[X \leq -x]}{\mathbb{P}[X > x]} \rightarrow \frac{M^-}{M^+}$ ;
2.  $M^+ > 0 \implies \frac{1 - F(x\xi)}{1 - F(x)} \rightarrow \xi^{-\alpha}$        $M^- > 0 \implies \frac{F(-x\xi)}{F(-x)} \rightarrow \xi^{-\alpha}$ .

In this case the limit is the **Stable Distribution** with index  $\alpha$ , with characteristic function

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{i\omega Y}] = e^{i\delta\omega - \gamma|\omega|^\alpha [1 - i\beta \tan \frac{\pi\alpha}{2} \text{sgn}(\omega)]},$$

where  $\beta = \frac{M^+}{M^- + M^+}$  and  $\gamma = (M^- + M^+)$ . The sequence  $A_n$  must be essentially  $A_n \propto n^{1/\alpha}$  (more precisely, the sequence  $C_n = n^{-1/\alpha} A_n$  is *slowly changing* in the sense that

$$1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_{cn}}{C_n}$$

for every  $c > 0$ ); thus partial sums converge to stable distributions at rate  $n^{-1/\alpha}$ , more slowly (*much* more slowly, if  $\alpha$  is close to one) than in the  $L^2$  (Gaussian) case of the central limit theorem.

Note that the **Cauchy** distribution is the special case of  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) = (1, 0, 1, 0)$  and the **Normal** distribution is the special case of  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) = (2, 0, \sigma^2/2, \mu)$ . Although each Stable distribution has an absolutely continuous distribution with continuous probability density function  $f(y)$ , these two cases and the “inverse gamma distribution” with  $\alpha = 1/2$  and  $\beta = \pm 1$  are the only ones where the p.d.f. can be given in closed form. Moments are easy enough to compute; for  $\alpha < 2$  the Stable distribution only has finite moments of order  $p < \alpha$  and, in particular, *none* of them has a finite variance. The Cauchy has finite moments of order  $p < 1$  but does not have a well-defined mean.

Condition 2. says that each tail must be fall off like a power (sometimes called *Pareto tails*), and the powers must be identical; Condition 1. gives the tail ratio. In a common special case,  $M^- = 0$ ; for example, random variables  $X_n$  with the Pareto distribution (often used to model income) given by  $P[X_n > t] = (k/t)^\alpha$  for  $t \geq k$  will have a stable limit for their partial sums if  $\alpha < 2$ , and (by CLT) a normal limit if  $\alpha \geq 2$ . You can find out more details reading Chapter 9 of Breiman’s book.