

LIDIA INGLOT (Wrocław)

POINT PROCESSES OF MINIMAL ORDER STATISTICS

1. Introduction. Let

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{X} = \{X_n: n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$$

be a stationary sequence of random variables with distributions $F(x) = P(X_n < x)$, where \mathbf{Z} is the set of integer numbers. We denote by $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^k(\mathcal{X})$ the σ -field generated by the sequence $\{X_n: n \leq k\}$, where $k \in \mathbf{Z}$.

Suppose that $\{u_n = u_n(\tau)\}$ is a sequence of real numbers satisfying the following condition:

$$(2) \quad F(u_n) = \tau/n + o(1/n) \quad \text{for every } \tau > 0.$$

The main assumption in this paper is that the sequence (1) satisfies Berman's condition of order 1.

Definition 1. The stationary sequence $\mathcal{X} = \{X_n: n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ satisfies *Berman's condition of order 1* if for

$$(3) \quad \varphi(x) = \mathbb{E}|P(X_1 < x | \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^0(\mathcal{X})) - F(x)|$$

we have

$$(4) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n\varphi(u_n) = 0,$$

where u_n is defined to satisfy (2).

Definition 1 is a special case of the definition of [1], p. 503 (see also [2], p. 62).

Remark that every independent sequence $\{X_n: n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ of random variables with identical distributions trivially satisfies Berman's condition.

The next useful tool in our consideration is the following

LEMMA 1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{X} = \{X_n: n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ is a stationary sequence of random variables with distributions $F(x)$. Then*

$$\left| P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^r \{X_{r_j} \geq x\}\right) - (1 - F(x))^n \right| \leq n\varphi(x),$$

where φ is a function defined to satisfy (3) and $r_j < r_{j+1}$.

Proof. Let $\{\hat{X}_n: n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ be a stationary sequence associated with $\{X_n: n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$, e.g., a sequence of independent random variables with identical distributions $F(x) = P(X_n < x) = P(\hat{X}_n < x)$. For fixed n and x , define the events A_{r_j} and B_{r_j} , where $j \in \mathbf{Z}$, as follows:

$$A_{r_j} = \{X_{r_j} \geq x\} \quad \text{and} \quad B_{r_j} = \{\hat{X}_{r_j} \geq x\}.$$

The difference $P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_{r_j}\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_{r_j}\right)$ can be expressed as the sum of differences of probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_{r_j}\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_{r_j}\right) &= [P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_{r_j}\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} A_{r_j} \cap B_{r_n}\right)] + \\ &\quad + [P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n-1} A_{r_j} \cap B_{r_n}\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{n-2} A_{r_j} \cap \bigcap_{j=n-1}^n B_{r_j}\right)] + \dots + \\ &\quad + [P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^k A_{r_j} \cap \bigcap_{j=k+1}^n B_{r_j}\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_{r_j} \cap \bigcap_{j=k}^n B_{r_j}\right)] + \dots + \\ &\quad + [P\left(A_{r_1} \cap \bigcap_{j=2}^n B_{r_j}\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_{r_j}\right)]. \end{aligned}$$

Remark that $\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_{r_j}$ is in $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{r_{k-1}}(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{r_{k-1}}(\mathcal{X})$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &|P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^k A_{r_j} \cap \bigcap_{j=k+1}^n B_{r_j}\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_{r_j} \cap \bigcap_{j=k}^n B_{r_j}\right)| \\ &= \left| \int_{\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_{r_j}} [P\left(A_{r_k} \cap \bigcap_{j=k+1}^n B_{r_j} \mid \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{r_{k-1}}(\mathcal{X})\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{j=k}^n B_{r_j} \mid \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{r_{k-1}}(\mathcal{X})\right)] dP \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{\bigcap_{j=1}^{k-1} A_{r_j}} (P(B_{r_1})^{n-k} [P(A_{r_k} \mid \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{r_{k-1}}(\mathcal{X})) - P(B_{r_k})]) dP \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} |P(A_{r_k} \mid \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{r_{k-1}}(\mathcal{X})) - P(B_{r_k})|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{X_n: n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ is stationary, so is the sequence of random variables $\{|P(A_{r_k} \mid \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{r_{k-1}}(\mathcal{X})) - P(B_{r_k})|, k \in \mathbf{Z}\}$; hence

$$\mathbb{E} |P(A_{r_k} \mid \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{r_{k-1}}(\mathcal{X})) - P(B_{r_k})| = \mathbb{E} |P(A_1 \mid \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^0(\mathcal{X})) - P(B_1)|.$$

Thus

$$|P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_{r_j}\right) - P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n B_{r_j}\right)| \leq n\varphi(x).$$

The proof of Lemma 1 is an obvious modification of the proof of Theorem 2.1 from [1].

2. The main theorem. Let N be the set of natural numbers. For each $n \in N$ we define the discrete parameter process $\eta_n(t)$ for $t = j/n$ and $j \in Z$ as $\eta_n(j/n) = X_j$. Thus for a given n the process η_n is obtained from $\{X_n: n \in Z\}$ by time scale changes.

Definition 2. The point process $N_n, n \in N$, defined as

$$(5) \quad N_n(B) = \sum_{j/n \in B} \mathbf{1}_{\{\eta_n(j/n) < u_n\}}$$

for every Borel subset B of the real line, where $\mathbf{1}_A(\cdot)$ is the indicator function of the set A , will be called a *point process of minimal order statistics*.

The point processes M_n may be properly regarded as random elements either in the space of integer-valued increasing step functions on the real line or in the space \mathcal{N} of integer-valued Borel measures on the real line. In either case the space is metric under the "vague topology" (e.g., generated in \mathcal{N} by the functions $\mu \rightarrow \int f d\mu$ for continuous f with bounded support, cf. [3]) and we may consider convergence in distribution of such random elements ($M_n \xrightarrow{d} M$ will be used to indicate this convergence).

The following result is a special case of a theorem of Kallenberg [3].

THEOREM 1. *Let $M_n, n \in N$, be point processes on the real line and let M be a point process without multiple events and such that $M(\{a\}) = 0$ (a. s.) for every fixed real a . Assume that*

(i) $P(M_n(B) = 0) \rightarrow P(M(B) = 0)$ for all sets B of the form $\bigcup_{i=1}^r (a_i, b_i]$, $a_1 < b_1 < \dots < a_r < b_r$;

(ii) $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} EM_n(a, b] \leq EM(a, b]$ for all finite $a < b$.

Then $M_n \xrightarrow{d} M$.

Now we use this theorem to obtain the main result of this paper. The idea of proof of the following theorem is taken from [4].

THEOREM 2. *Let $\{X_n: n \in Z\}$ be a stationary sequence of random variables which satisfies Berman's conditions (3) and (4). Suppose that $\{u_n: n \in N\}$ satisfies condition (2). If N_n is the point process defined in (5), then*

$$N_n \xrightarrow{d} N,$$

where N is a Poisson process with parameter τ .

LEMMA 2. *Let $\{X_n: n \in Z\}$ satisfy the assumption of Theorem 2 and let $\{u_n: n \in N\}$ satisfy condition (2). Then for every $a > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\min_{1 \leq j \leq [an]} X_j < u_n) = 1 - e^{-a\tau}.$$

Proof. Let

$$Z_n = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} X_i \quad \text{and} \quad A_{in} = \{X_i \geq u_n\}.$$

Remark that if $\alpha = 1$, then

$$(6) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(Z_n < u_n) = 1 - e^{-\tau},$$

which follows easily from the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} |P(Z_n < u_n) - (1 - e^{-\tau})| &\leq \left| \prod_{i=1}^n P(A_{in}) - e^{-\tau} \right| + \left| P\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_{in}\right) - \prod_{i=1}^n P(A_{in}) \right| \\ &= |(1 - F(u_n))^n - e^{-\tau}| + \left| P\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_{in}\right) - (1 - F(u_n))^n \right| \\ &= |(1 - \tau/n + o(1/n))^n - e^{-\tau}| + n\varphi(u_n). \end{aligned}$$

Now assume that $\alpha > 0$. From (6) we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(Z_{[an]} < u_{[an]}(\alpha\tau)) = 1 - e^{-\alpha\tau}.$$

Hence it is necessary only to show that

$$(7) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [P(Z_{[an]} < u_{[an]}(\alpha\tau)) - P(Z_{[an]} < u_n(\tau))] = 0.$$

But the proof of (7) is an obvious modification of the proof of Theorem 2.1 from [4]. Clearly, (7) proves Lemma 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. To prove the theorem it is enough to show that the sequence $\{N_n: n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1. The assumption (ii) of this theorem holds trivially:

$$\mathbb{E}N_n(a, b] = ([bn] - [an])F(u_n) \leq n(b-a)(\tau/n + o(1/n)) = \mathbb{E}N(a, b].$$

To check (i) suppose that $B = (a, b]$ for some $a < b$. Then

$$P(N_n(a, b] = 0) = P(Z_{[bn]-[an]} \geq u_n).$$

Let $h > 0$ and let n be sufficiently large. Then

$$[(b-a)n] \leq [bn] - [an] \leq [(b-a)n] + 1 \leq [(b-a+h)n]$$

and, consequently,

$$P(Z_{[(b-a+h)n]} \geq u_n) \leq P(Z_{[bn]-[an]} \geq u_n) \leq P(Z_{[(b-a)n]} \geq u_n).$$

By Lemma 2, the outside terms have the limits $e^{-\tau(b-a+h)}$ and $e^{-\tau(b-a)}$, respectively, and since h is arbitrary, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(N_n(a, b] = 0) = e^{-\tau(b-a)}.$$

Now let $B = \bigcup_{i=1}^r (a_i, b_i]$, $a_1 < b_1 < \dots < a_r < b_r$, and put

$$E_j = ([a_j n] + 1, [a_j n] + 2, \dots, [b_j n]),$$

$$Z(E_j) = \min \{X_i : i \in E_j\},$$

$$C_{jn} = \{Z(E_j) \geq u_n\}, \quad A_{in} = \{X_i \geq u_n\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} P(N_n(B) = 0) &= P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^r C_{jn}\right) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^r P(N_n(a_j, b_j) = 0) + \left[P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^r C_{jn}\right) - \prod_{j=1}^r P(C_{jn}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^r C_{jn}\right) - \prod_{j=1}^r P(C_{jn}) \right] = 0.$$

Using Lemma 1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^r C_{jn}\right) - \prod_{j=1}^r P(C_{jn}) \right| &= \left| P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^r \bigcap_{i \in E_j} A_{in}\right) - \prod_{j=1}^r P\left(\bigcap_{i \in E_j} A_{in}\right) \right| \\ &\leq \left| P\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^r \bigcap_{i \in E_j} A_{in}\right) - \prod_{j=1}^r \prod_{i \in E_j} P(A_{in}) \right| + \\ &\quad + \left| \prod_{j=1}^r \prod_{i \in E_j} P(A_{in}) - \prod_{j=1}^r P\left(\bigcap_{i \in E_j} A_{in}\right) \right| \\ &\leq \varphi(u_n) \left(\sum_{j=1}^r ([b_j n] - [a_j n]) \right) + \prod_{j=1}^r (\varphi(u_n) ([b_j n] - [a_j n])) \\ &\leq (\varphi(u_n) n) \left(r \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} (b_j - a_j) + r/n \right) + (\varphi(u_n) n)^r \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq r} (b_j - a_j) + 1/n \right)^r. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if B is a finite sum on the segment $(a_i, b_i]$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(N_n(B) = 0) = \prod_{j=1}^r \exp\{-\tau(b_j - a_j)\} = \exp\{-\tau m(B)\},$$

where m is the Lebesgue measure. Therefore, using Theorem 1 we obtain Theorem 2.

3. Application. Suppose that the sequence $\{X_n : n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ satisfies the assumption of Theorem 2 and that $\{N_n : n \in \mathbf{N}\}$ is defined as above. From Theorem 2 we obtain the following fact:

For every Borel set B whose boundary has Lebesgue measure zero ($m(\partial B) = 0$) we have

$$(8) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(N_n(B) = r) = e^{-\tau m(B)} \frac{(\tau m(B))^r}{r!}.$$

Moreover, the joint distribution of any finite number of $N_n(B_1), \dots, N_n(B_k)$ corresponding to disjoint B_i (with $m(\partial B_i) = 0$ for each i) converges to the product of the corresponding Poisson probabilities.

Let Z_n^k be the $(n - k + 1)$ -st order statistic for $\{X_n: n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$. Remark that $\{N_n(0, 1] < k\} = \{Z_n^k \geq u_n\}$. Hence and from (8) we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(Z_n^k < u_n) = 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} e^{-\tau} \frac{\tau^i}{i!}.$$

References

- [1] S. M. Berman, *Limit theorems for the maximum term in stationary sequence*, Ann. Math. Statist. 35 (1964), p. 502-516.
- [2] W. Dziubdziela, *Rozkłady graniczne ekstremalnych statystyk pozycyjnych*, Matematyka Stosowana 9 (1977), p. 45-71.
- [3] O. Kallenberg, *Characterization and convergence of random measures and point processes*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete 27 (1973), p. 9-21.
- [4] M. R. Leadbetter, *Weak convergence of high level exceedances by a stationary sequence*, ibidem 34 (1976), p. 11-15.

Received on 4. 6. 1979

LIDIA INGLOT (Wrocław)

PROCESY PUNKTOWE MINIMALNYCH STATYSTYK POZYCYJNYCH

STRESZCZENIE

Praca poświęcona jest teorii rozkładów granicznych ekstremalnych statystyk pozycyjnych w stacjonarnym (w węższym sensie) ciągu zmiennych losowych spełniających warunek Bermana. Zdefiniowany został proces minimalnych statystyk pozycyjnych i pokazano jego zbieżność do procesu Poissona. W dowodzie twierdzenia i lematu wykorzystano metody podane przez Leadbettera w [4].
