

# Chapter 1: *tails of the normal distribution*

Pietro Maria Sparago and Shakeel Gavioli-Akilagun

Last updated: May 29 2024

## 1 Introduction

## 2 Tails of the normal distribution

**Theorem 2.1.** *Let  $X \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Define  $\bar{\Phi}(x) := P(X > x), x \geq 0$ . Then*

$$\frac{1}{2}e^{-x\sqrt{2/\pi}-x^2/2} \leq \bar{\Phi}(x) \leq \min\left(\frac{1}{2}e^{-x^2/2}, \frac{1}{x}\phi(x)\right), x \geq 0 \quad (1)$$

*Proof.* We have, by continuity and Corollary 2.1:

$$2\bar{\Phi}(x) = \lim_{y \downarrow 0} \frac{\bar{\Phi}(x+y)}{\bar{\Phi}(y)} \begin{cases} \leq \lim_{y \downarrow 0} e^{-xy-x^2/2} = e^{-x^2/2} \\ \geq \lim_{y \downarrow 0} e^{-\rho(y)x-x^2/2} = e^{-x\sqrt{2/\pi}-x^2/2} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

We conclude for the upper bound with Lemma 2.1. □

**Remark 2.1.** *Note that Proposition 2.1 yields a stronger version of the infimum Chernoff bound which is found with*

$$\bar{\Phi}(x) \leq \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} e^{-\lambda x} e^{\lambda^2/2} = e^{-x^2/2}, x \geq 0$$

where the second equality follows from the quadratic minimization condition  $\frac{d}{d\lambda}(-\lambda x + \lambda^2/2) = 0$  which yields  $\lambda = x$ .

### 2.1 Lemmas for the proof of Theorem 2.1 - mostly from Pollard (2002); Appendix D

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $\phi(x) := (2\pi)^{-1/2}e^{-x^2/2}$ . Then:

$$\left(\frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{x^3}\right)\phi(x) < \bar{\Phi}(x) < \frac{1}{x}\phi(x), \quad x > 0 \quad (3)$$

*Proof.* We have  $\bar{\Phi}(x) = \int_x^\infty \phi(t)dt$ . Note that for all  $t > 0$  the functions  $1 - 3/t^4 < 1$  and  $1 + 1/t^2 > 1$  so  $(1 - 3/t^4)\phi(t) < \phi(t) < (1 + 1/t^2)\phi(t)$ . We thus integrate from  $x > 0$  to infinity and obtain the claimed bounds.  $\square$

It follows immediately that for the function  $\rho(x) := \phi(x)/\bar{\Phi}(x)$ ,  $x > 0$  we have the bounds

$$x < \rho(x) < \frac{x^3}{x^2 - 1}, \quad x > 1$$

**Theorem 2.2.**  $\rho$  is increasing,  $\rho(-\infty) = 0$  and  $\rho(0) = \sqrt{2/\pi}$ . The function  $\rho(x) - x$  decreases to zero as  $x$  tends to infinity. The function  $\ln \rho(x)$  is concave and  $\ln \rho(x + \delta) < \ln \rho(x) + (\rho(x) - x)\delta$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\delta > 0$ .

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} &= \frac{\bar{\Phi}(x)}{\phi(x)} = \int_x^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{\phi(x)} dt \\ &\stackrel{z=t-x}{=} \int_0^\infty \frac{\phi(z+x)}{\phi(x)} dz \\ &= \int_0^\infty e^{-zx} e^{-z^2/2} dz \end{aligned}$$

That is, the Laplace transform of the finite measure  $\mu(dz) := e^{-z^2/2}dz$ ,  $z > 0$ . From this it follows that  $\rho(0) = \sqrt{2/\pi}$  and that  $\rho(-\infty) = 0$ , since by monotone convergence  $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} = \infty$ . For  $x \geq 0$  we have  $ze^{-zx} \leq z$ ,  $z > 0$  and  $z \in L^1(d\mu)$ . So by differentiation-under-integral lemma we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x) \left( \frac{d}{dx} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \right) &= \rho(x) \left( - \int_0^\infty ze^{-zx} \mu(dz) \right) < 0 \\ \rho(x) \left( \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \right) &= \rho(x) \int_0^\infty z^2 e^{-zx} \mu(dz) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

The function  $1/\rho$  is decreasing because  $\frac{d}{dx} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} < 0$ , so that  $\rho$  is increasing. Now, we have:

$$\ln \rho(x) = \ln(\phi(x)) - \ln(\bar{\Phi}(x)) = -\ln(\sqrt{2\pi}) - \frac{x^2}{2} - \ln(\bar{\Phi}(x))$$

Therefore

$$\frac{d}{dx} \ln \rho(x) = -x - \frac{1}{\bar{\Phi}(x)} \frac{d}{dx} \bar{\Phi}(x) = \frac{\phi(x)}{\bar{\Phi}(x)} - x = \rho(x) - x$$

But we also have  $\frac{d}{dx}(-\ln \rho(x)) = \frac{d}{dx} \ln(1/\rho(x))$  so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dx}(\rho(x) - x) &= -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} \ln \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \\ &= -\frac{d}{dx} \left( \rho(x) \left( \frac{d}{dx} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \right) \right) \\ &= -\left( \rho(x) \left( \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \right) + \left( \left( \frac{d}{dx} \rho(x) \right) \left( \frac{d}{dx} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \right) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dx} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} = -\frac{d}{dx} \rho(x) \frac{1}{\rho(x)^2} \implies \frac{d}{dx} \rho(x) = -\rho(x)^2 \left( \frac{d}{dx} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \right)$$

Therefore

$$\frac{d}{dx}(\rho(x) - x) = -\left( \rho(x) \left( \frac{d^2}{dx^2} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \right) - \rho(x)^2 \left( \frac{d}{dx} \frac{1}{\rho(x)} \right)^2 \right)$$

The term in the parenthesis in the variance of the measure  $\nu_x(dz) := \rho(x)e^{-zx}\mu(dz)$ , which is strictly positive. In fact for any  $x \geq 0$ ,  $\nu_x(dz)$  is a probability measure:

$$\int_0^\infty \nu_x(dz) = \rho(x) \int_0^\infty e^{-zx-z^2/2} dz = \rho(x) \int_x^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{\phi(x)} dt = 1$$

Thus,  $\rho(x) - x$  is decreasing because its first derivative is strictly negative. Now since

$$\frac{d^2}{dx^2} \ln \rho(x) = \frac{d}{dx}(\rho(x) - x) < 0$$

then the function  $\ln \rho(x)$  is thus concave. To see that  $\rho(x) - x$  vanishes as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$0 < \rho(x) - x < \frac{x}{x^2 - 1} \xrightarrow{x \rightarrow \infty} 0$$

It remains to show the last claim. For  $\delta > 0$  and some  $x^* \in (x, x + \delta)$ , since  $\rho(x) - x$  is decreasing:

$$\ln \frac{\rho(x + \delta)}{\rho(x)} = \delta \frac{\ln \rho(x + \delta) - \ln \rho(x)}{\delta} \stackrel{\text{MVT}}{=} \delta(\rho(x^*) - x^*) < \delta(\rho(x) - x)$$

and we conclude. □

**Corollary 2.1.** *For  $x \geq 0$  and  $\delta > 0$ :*

$$e^{-\rho(x)\delta - \delta^2/2} \leq \frac{\bar{\Phi}(x + \delta)}{\bar{\Phi}(x)} \leq e^{-x\delta - \delta^2/2}$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\Phi}(x + \delta) &= \int_x^\infty \phi(z + \delta) dz \\
&= \frac{e^{-\delta^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-z^2/2 - z\delta} dz \\
&\stackrel{e^{-z\delta} \leq e^{-x\delta}, \forall z \geq x}{\leq} \frac{e^{-\delta^2/2 - x\delta}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_x^\infty e^{-z^2/2} dz \\
&= e^{-\delta^2/2 - x\delta} \bar{\Phi}(x)
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.2 we have  $\ln \frac{\rho(x+\delta)}{\rho(x)} < (\rho(x) - x)\delta$ . We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\bar{\Phi}(x + \delta)}{\bar{\Phi}(x)} &= \frac{\bar{\Phi}(x + \delta)}{\phi(x + \delta)} \frac{\phi(x)}{\bar{\Phi}(x)} \frac{\phi(x + \delta)}{\phi(x)} \\
&= \frac{\rho(x + \delta)}{\rho(x)} \frac{\phi(x + \delta)}{\phi(x)} \\
&= e^{-\ln \frac{\rho(x+\delta)}{\rho(x)}} e^{-\delta^2/2 - x\delta} \\
&\geq e^{-\rho(x)\delta - \delta^2/2}
\end{aligned}$$

and we conclude. □

### 3 Laws of Iterated Logarithm

#### 3.1 Motivation

Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be a sequence of independently and identically distributed random variables with mean zero and variance one, and let  $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$  for  $n \geq 1$  and  $S_0 = 0$  be the associated partial sum process. The strong law of large numbers states that scaled by  $n^{-1}$  the partial sum process converges almost surely to the mean of the  $X$ 's, in this case zero:

$$n^{-1}S_n \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4)$$

Whereas the central limit theorem states that scaled by  $n^{-1/2}$  the partial sum process converges in distribution to a standard Gaussian:

$$n^{-1/2}S_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5)$$

It is often of interest to quantify the fluctuations of  $S_n$ . The law of iterated logarithm provides such a result, and states that almost surely the fluctuations will be no larger than  $\sqrt{2n \log \log(n)}$ . Comparing to the scaling factors in (4) and (5) the law of iterated logarithm can be understood as

operating *between* the central limit theorem and the law of large numbers.

### 3.2 A law of iterated logarithm for the Wiener process

We present a law of iterated logarithm for the Wiener process. In section 3.3 this result will be used as a building block for proving laws of iterated logarithms for more general random walks.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a Wiener process, then  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost surely*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_n}{\sqrt{2n \log \log(n)}} = 1 \quad (6)$$

We present the proof of Theorem 3.1 which can be found in section 8.5 of Durrett (2019). The proof relies on the reflection principle for Wiener processes, which is stated below.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be a Wiener process, putting  $T_a = \inf \{t > 0 \mid B_t = a\}$  with  $a > 0$  it holds that  $\mathbb{P}(T_a < t) = 2\mathbb{P}(B_t \geq a)$ .*

*Proof.* this is the proof. □

### 3.3 Laws of iterated logarithm for discrete random walks

Another approach to proving the theorem is given in Chapter 11 of Pollard (2002)

### 3.4 Distributional convergence

### 3.5 Non-asymptotic laws of iterated logarithm

## References

Durrett, R. (2019), *Probability: theory and examples*, Vol. 49, Cambridge university press.

Pollard, D. (2002), *A user's guide to measure theoretic probability*, number 8, Cambridge University Press.