

MODULE 7**LIMITING DISTRIBUTIONS****LECTURE 39****Topics****7.1 CONVERGENCE IN DISTRIBUTION AND PROBABILITY****Theorem 1.4**

Let $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables with $E(X_n) = \mu_n \in (-\infty, \infty)$, and $\text{Var}(X_n) = \sigma_n^2 \in (0, \infty)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. Suppose that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n = \mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n^2 = 0$. Then $X_n \xrightarrow{p} \mu$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Using the Markov inequality we have

$$0 \leq P(\{|X_n - \mu| \geq \varepsilon\}) \leq \frac{E(|X_n - \mu|^2)}{\varepsilon^2} = \frac{E((X_n - \mu)^2)}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} E((X_n - \mu)^2) &= E((X_n - \mu_n + \mu_n - \mu)^2) \\ &= E((X_n - \mu_n)^2) + (\mu_n - \mu)^2 \\ &= \sigma_n^2 + (\mu_n - \mu)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq P(\{|X_n - \mu| \geq \varepsilon\}) &\leq \frac{\sigma_n^2 + (\mu_n - \mu)^2}{\varepsilon^2} \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\{|X_n - \mu| \geq \varepsilon\}) = 0, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

$$\Rightarrow X_n \xrightarrow{p} \mu, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad (\text{using Theorem 1.3}). \blacksquare$$

Example 1.7

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be a sequence of i.i.d. $U(0, \theta)$ random variables, where $\theta > 0$. Let $X_{n:n} = \max\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$. For any real constant s , show that $X_{n:n}^s \xrightarrow{p} \theta^s$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Solution. It is easy to verify that a p.d.f. of $X_{n:n}$ is

$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{nx^{n-1}}{\theta^n}, & \text{if } 0 < x < \theta. \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} E(X_{n:n}^s) &= \frac{n}{n+s} \theta^s, \quad n > -s \\ &\rightarrow \theta^s, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(X_{n:n}^s) &= E(X_{n:n}^{2s}) - (E(X_{n:n}^s))^2 \\ &= \frac{n}{n+2s} \theta^{2s} - \left(\frac{n}{n+s} \theta^s \right)^2, \quad n > \max(-s, -2s) \\ &\rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now, using Theorem 1.4, it follows that $X_{n:n}^s \xrightarrow{p} \theta^s$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. ■

Example 1.8

Let $X_n \sim \text{Bin}(n, \theta)$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$. If $Y_n = \frac{X_n}{n}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, show that $Y_n \xrightarrow{p} \theta$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Solution. We have

$$E(Y_n) = E\left(\frac{X_n}{n}\right) = \theta, n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

and

$$\text{Var}(Y_n) = \text{Var}\left(\frac{X_n}{n}\right) = \frac{\text{Var}(X_n)}{n^2} = \frac{\theta(1-\theta)}{n} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Using Theorem 1.4 it follows that $Y_n \xrightarrow{p} \theta$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. ■

Remark 1.2

Theorem 1.3 provides an interpretation of the concept of convergence in probability. Theorem 1.3 suggests that if $X_n \xrightarrow{p} c$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then X_n is stochastically (in probability) very close to c for large values of n . Such an interpretation does not hold for the concept of convergence in distribution. Specifically, if $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, (where X is some non-degenerate random variable) then it cannot be inferred that X_n is getting close to X , for large values of n , in any sense. All we know in that case is that, for large values of n , the distribution of X_n is getting close to that of X . ■

The following example demonstrates that convergence in probability may not imply convergence of moments.

Example 1.9

Let $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables with

$$1 - P(\{X_n = 0\}) = P(\{X_n = n\}) = \frac{1}{n}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

Then the d.f. of X_n is

$$F_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x < 0 \\ 1 - \frac{1}{n}, & \text{if } 0 \leq x < n, n = 1, 2, \dots \\ 1, & \text{if } x \geq n \end{cases}$$

$$\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x < 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } x \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

Thus $X_n \xrightarrow{p} 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, for $r \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$

$$E(X_n^r) = E(|X_n|^r) = n^{r-1} \nrightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad \blacksquare$$

The following example illustrates that convergence in distribution to a non-degenerate random variable also does not imply convergence of moments.

Example 1.10

Let $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables with p.m.f.s

$$f_n(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n}, & \text{if } x \in \left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\right\} \\ \frac{1}{n}, & \text{if } x = n, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and let X be a random variable with p.m.f.

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } x \in \left\{0, \frac{1}{2}\right\}. \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then the distribution function of X is

$$F(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x < 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } 0 \leq x < \frac{1}{2}, \\ 1, & \text{if } x \geq \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

and the distribution function of X_n is

$$F_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x < 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n}, & \text{if } 0 \leq x < \frac{1}{2} \\ 1 - \frac{1}{n}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq x < n \\ 1, & \text{if } x \geq n \end{cases}, n = 1, 2, \dots$$

$$\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x < 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } 0 \leq x < \frac{1}{2}. \\ 1, & \text{if } x \geq \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

It follows that $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover $E(X) = \frac{1}{4}$ and

$$E(X_n) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n} \right] + 1 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{5}{4} \neq E(X). \blacksquare$$

We know that, for a real constant c , $X_n \xrightarrow{p} c$, as $n \rightarrow \infty \Leftrightarrow X_n - c \xrightarrow{p} 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The following example illustrates that $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ may not imply that $X_n - X \xrightarrow{p} 0$,

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ or, equivalently, $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, does not imply that $X_n - X$ will converge in distribution to a random variable degenerate at 0 (also see Remark 1.2).

Example 1.11

Let $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and X be as defined in Example 1.10. Further suppose that, for each $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, X_n and X are independent. Then $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. However, for $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} P(\{|X_n - X| \geq \varepsilon\}) &= \frac{1}{2} \left[P(\{|X_n| \geq \varepsilon\}) + P\left(\left|X_n - \frac{1}{2}\right| \geq \varepsilon\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n}\right) + \frac{1}{n} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n}\right) + \frac{1}{n} \right] \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

implying that $X_n - X$ does not converge in distribution to a random variable degenerate at 0. ■

Definition 1.2

A sequence $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ of random variables is said to be *bounded in probability* if there exists a positive real constant M (not depending on n) such that

$$P\left(\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \{|X_n| \leq M\}\right) = 1. \quad \blacksquare$$

The following theorem relates convergence in distribution of a sequence $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ of random variables to the convergence of corresponding sequence of moment generating functions (m.g.f.s). We shall not provide the proof of the theorem as it is slightly involved.

Theorem 1.5

Let $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables and let X be another random variable. Suppose that there exists an $h > 0$ such that the m.g.f.s $M(\cdot), M_1(\cdot), M_2(\cdot), \dots$ of X, X_1, X_2, \dots , respectively, are finite on $(-h, h)$.

- (i) If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n(t) = M(t)$, $\forall t \in (-h, h)$, then $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) If X_1, X_2, \dots are bounded in probability and $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n(t) = M(t)$, $\forall t \in (-h, h)$. ■

The following example demonstrates that the conclusion of Theorem 1.5 (ii) may not hold if X_1, X_2, \dots are not bounded in probability.

Example 1.12

Let $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ and X be as defined in Example 1.10. Then the m.g.f. of X is

$$M(t) = \frac{1 + e^{\frac{t}{2}}}{2}, t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and the m.g.f. of X_n is

$$M_n(t) = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n}\right)\left(1 + e^{\frac{t}{2}}\right) + \frac{e^{nt}}{n}$$

$$\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \begin{cases} \frac{1 + e^{\frac{t}{2}}}{2}, & \text{if } t \leq 0 \\ \infty, & \text{if } t > 0 \end{cases}$$

$$\neq M(t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

However, $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. ■