



Limiting Behavior of Maxima in Stationary Gaussian Sequences

Author(s): Yash Mittal

Source: *The Annals of Probability*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Apr., 1974), pp. 231-242

Published by: Institute of Mathematical Statistics

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2959221>

Accessed: 04-02-2019 17:13 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Institute of Mathematical Statistics is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Annals of Probability*

LIMITING BEHAVIOR OF MAXIMA IN STATIONARY GAUSSIAN SEQUENCES¹

BY YASH MITTAL

Northwestern University, Evanston

Let $\{X_n, n \geq 1\}$ be a real-valued, stationary Gaussian sequence with mean zero and variance one. Let $M_n = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} X_i$, $r_n = E(X_{n+1}X_1)$; $c_n = (2 \ln n)^{1/2}$ and $b_n = c_n - \frac{1}{2}[\ln(4\pi \ln n)]/c_n$. Define $U_n = 2c_n(M_n - c_n)/\ln \ln n$ and $V_n = c_n(M_n - b_n)$. If $r_n = O(1/\ln n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ then

- (i) $p(\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n = -1) = p(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n = 1) = 1$, and
- (ii) $E\{\exp(tV_n)\} \rightarrow E\{\exp(tX)\}$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all t sufficiently small where X is a random variable with distribution function $e^{-e^{-x}}$; $-\infty < x < \infty$.

1. Statement of results. Let $\{X_n, n > 1\}$ be a real-valued, stationary Gaussian sequence with $EX_n = 0$ and $EX_n^2 = 1$. Let $\{r_n, n \geq 0\}$, $r_n = E(X_{n+1}X_1)$ be the covariance sequence and $M_n = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} X_i$. The convergence of M_n , suitably normalized, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ has been of considerable interest. Berman ([1], Theorem 3.1) showed that $r_n \ln n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is sufficient for $(M_n - b_n)c_n$ to converge in distribution to X where X has distribution function $e^{-e^{-x}}$, $-\infty < x < \infty$; and b_n and c_n are constants defined as follows.

$$(1.1) \quad c_n = (2 \ln n)^{1/2}, \quad b_n = c_n - [\ln(4\pi \ln n)]/2c_n.$$

Convergence of M_n/c_n and $M_n - c_n$, called "relative stability" and "stability" of M_n respectively, has been studied by Gnedenko [3], Berman [1] and Pickands [5]. Pickands shows that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $r_n \rightarrow 0$ is sufficient for $M_n/c_n \rightarrow 1$ a.s. and $r_n \ln n \rightarrow 0$ is sufficient for $M_n - c_n \rightarrow 0$ a.s.

Pickands ([7] Theorem 1.1) also considered the problem of the rate at which $M_n - c_n$ converges to zero. In this direction we prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 1. *If*

$$(1.2) \quad r_n = O(1/\ln n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

then

$$(1.3) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2(M_n - c_n)c_n/\ln \ln n = -1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

and

$$(1.4) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2(M_n - c_n)/\ln \ln n = +1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Received June 26, 1972; revised September 24, 1973.

¹ This work has been partially supported by Air Force Grant AF-AFOSR-69-1781.

AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 60G10, 60G15, 60G17, 60F15, 60F20; Secondary 62F30, 62E20.

Key words and phrases. Maxima, stationary Gaussian sequence, law of iterated logarithms, moment generating functions.

Pickands uses the condition $r_n n^\gamma \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for some $0 < \gamma < 1$ instead of (1.2).

An example is given in ([5] page 193) which shows that r_n can be chosen to tend to zero so slowly that on some subsequence $\{n_k\}$, $M_{n_k} - \alpha_{n_k}$ converges in distribution to a normal variable, the α_n being constants with $c_n - \alpha_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently it is deduced that $r_n \rightarrow 0$ is not sufficient for Theorem 1. Theorem 2 exhibits a specific rate at which r_n may tend to zero that is sufficient to violate (1.3) and thus illustrates the sharpness of condition (1.2).

THEOREM 2. *If*

(1.5) r_n is non-increasing and

(1.6) $r_n \ln n / \ln \ln n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

then

(1.7) $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (M_n - c_n) c_n / \ln \ln n = -\infty$ a.s.

The convergence of moments of suitably normalized maxima was considered by Pickands ([6] Theorem 2.1) for independent variables. Theorem 3 shows the convergence of moment generating functions for maxima of dependent variables.

THEOREM 3. *Let X be a random variable with distribution function $e^{-e^{-x}}$, $-\infty < x < \infty$. For all stationary Gaussian sequences $\{X_n, n \geq 1\}$ satisfying*

(1.8) $r_n \ln n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$

(1.9) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\exp(tY_n)) = E(\exp(tX))$

for all t sufficiently small where $Y_n = c_n(M_n - b_n)$.

The following two lemmas are used as tools in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 3 and may be of independent interest.

LEMMA 1. (1.2) *Implies that*

(1.10) $\exp(tA^2)P(M_n \leq b_n - A/c_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $A \rightarrow \infty$

uniformly in n for all t sufficiently small.

LEMMA 2. *Under condition (1.2)*

(1.11) $p(M_n \geq c_n + ((1 - \varepsilon) \ln \ln n) / 2c_n \text{ i.o.}) = 1$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

Lemma 2 is a special case of Theorem B of Pathak and Qualls [4]. The result (1.11) was obtained independently of Pathak and Qualls at about the same time and uses methods similar to those of Lemma 1.

As corollaries of Theorem 3 we obtain the following numerical estimates. For any random variable X let $\sigma^2(X) = EX^2 - (EX)^2$. Then

COROLLARY 1. $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\ln n) \sigma^2(M_n) = (\pi^2 - 6) / 12$.

COROLLARY 2. $E(M_n^k)/b_n^k = 1 + O(1/\ln n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Section 2 contains proofs of Theorems 1, 2 and 3 and Lemma 1. For proof of Lemma 2 we refer to [4]. Section 3 has comment on nonstationary sequences.

2. Proofs. PROOF OF LEMMA 1. Define $\delta_x = \sup_{i \geq x} r_i$. Condition (1.2) together with the stationarity of the sequence implies that $0 < \delta_1 < 1$. If we let $L(n) = [n^\gamma]$ ($[\cdot]$ denoting integral part), $0 < \gamma < 1$, then (1.2) implies that $\delta_{L(n)} \ln n$ is bounded as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In the following we set

$$\varphi(u) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} \exp(-u^2/2); \quad \Phi(u) = \int_{-\infty}^u \varphi(x) dx, \quad -\infty < u < \infty.$$

In order to find an upper bound for $p(M_n \leq b_n - A/c_n)$ we select some variables out of $X_1 \dots X_n$ as follows. Group the variables $X_1 \dots X_n$ consecutively into $[n/L(n)]$ blocks of $L(n)$ variables each. Excluding the variables in every other block, we will be left with $mL(n)$ variables where $m = [(n/L(n)) + 1]/2$. Thus we have selected $X_{2iL(n)+j}$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$; $j = 1, 2, \dots, L(n)$. Rename these as $U_1, \dots, U_{mL(n)}$. Clearly,

$$P(M_n \leq b_n - A/c_n) \leq P(\max_{1 \leq i \leq mL(n)} U_i \leq b_n - A/c_n).$$

Next consider the variables

$$Z_{ij} = (1 - \delta_1)^{1/2} Y_{ij} + (\delta_1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{1/2} W_i + \delta_{L(n)}^{1/2} V$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, L(n)$, where the Y_{ij} 's, W_i 's and V are mutually independent Gaussian variables with zero mean and unit variance. We see that the covariance matrix of $U_1 \dots U_{mL(n)}$ is bounded above by that of $Z_{11}, Z_{12}, \dots, Z_{1L(n)}, Z_{21}, \dots, Z_{m, L(n)}$. By Slepian's Lemma ([8] Lemma 1, page 468)

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1) \quad & p(\max_{1 \leq i \leq mL(n)} U_i \leq b_n - A/c_n) \\ & \leq p[(1 - \delta_1)^{1/2} Y_{ij} + (\delta_1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{1/2} W_i + \delta_{L(n)}^{1/2} V \leq b_n - A/c_n \quad \forall i, j] \\ & = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p[(1 - \delta_1)^{1/2} Y_{ij} + (\delta_1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{1/2} W_i \leq b_n - A/c_n \\ & \quad - \delta_{L(n)}^{1/2} u \quad \forall i, j] \varphi(u) du. \end{aligned}$$

If we split the integration in (2.1) into ranges $(-\infty, A_n]$ and $[A_n, \infty)$ where $A_n = A/(2c_n \delta_{L(n)}^{1/2})$, then the right-hand side of (2.1) may be seen to be at most

$$(2.2) \quad \Phi(-A_n) + p\{(1 - \delta_1)^{1/2} Y_{ij} + (\delta_1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{1/2} W_i \leq b_n - A/2c_n \quad \forall i, j\}.$$

First, for all $A \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(tA^2)\Phi(-A_n) &= \exp(tA^2)(1 - \Phi(A_n)) \\ &\leq \exp(tA^2)A_n^{-1}\varphi(A_n) \\ &= (A_n 2\pi)^{-1} \exp\{tA^2 - A^2/8c_n^2 \delta_{L(n)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

The last expression tends to zero as $A \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in n for sufficiently small values of t since $c_n^2 \delta_{L(n)}$ is bounded as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Result (1.10) will therefore follow if we show that $\exp(tA^2) \times \{\text{second term in 2.2}\}$ tends to zero as $A \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in n .

Define $V_j = \{(1 - \delta_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} Y_{ij} + (\delta_1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{-\frac{1}{2}} W_{1j}\} (1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{-\frac{1}{2}} j = 1, 2 \dots L(n)$. Because of the independence of Y_{ij} 's and W_{ij} 's, the second term in (2.2) is equal to

$$(2.3) \quad \{p(\max_{1 \leq j \leq L(n)} V_j \leq E_n)\}^m$$

where $E_n = (1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{-\frac{1}{2}}(b_n - A/2c_n)$. We know that $EV_j = 0$; $EV_j^2 = 1$ and $EV_j V_k = (\delta_1 - \delta_{L(n)})/(1 - \delta_{L(n)})$ for $j \neq k$. Consider the joint normal variables $\xi_1 \dots \xi_{L(n)}$ with zero mean, unit variance and equal correlation δ_1 . By Slepian's Lemma ([8] Lemma 1) (2.3) is at most

$$(2.4) \quad \{p(\max_{1 \leq i \leq L(n)} \xi_i \leq E_n)\}^m.$$

Define

$$(2.5) \quad Q(A, n) = \exp(tA^2) \{p(\max_{1 \leq i \leq L(n)} \xi_i \leq E_n)\}^m.$$

We now show that given $\eta > 0$, there exist ν_0 and A_0 (both depending on η alone) such that for all $n \geq \nu_0$ and $A \geq A_0$

$$Q(A, n) < \eta.$$

The result will follow by observing that $Q(A, n) \rightarrow 0$ as $A \rightarrow \infty$ for every fixed n . We use two distinct comparisons to bound (2.4). The first comparison is used to bound $Q(A, n)$ for $0 \leq A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$, the second for $A > 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$ (cf. (2.19)).

We first state a result of Berman [1] that is used repeatedly.

LEMMA (Berman (1964)). Let $\{\chi_n, n \geq 1\}$ and $\{\zeta_n, n > 1\}$ be stationary Gaussian sequences satisfying $E\chi_n = E\zeta_n = 0$; $E\chi_n^2 = E\zeta_n^2 = 1$; $E\chi_{n+1}\chi_1 = \rho_n$ and $E\zeta_{n+1}\zeta_1 = 0$. For every real number a and every positive integer n ,

$$(2.6) \quad |p\{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \chi_i \leq a\} - p\{\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \zeta_i \leq a\}| \\ \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} |\rho_j| (n-j)(2\pi)^{-1} (1 - \rho_j^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\{-a^2/1 + |\rho_j|\}.$$

Using this result, (2.4) is at most

$$(2.7) \quad \{\Phi^{L(n)}(E_n) + \sum_{j=1}^{L(n)-1} (\delta_1(L(n) - j)/(1 - \delta_1)^{\frac{1}{2}} 2\pi) \exp(-E_n^2/(1 + \delta_1))\}^m$$

The sum in (2.7) is bounded above by

$$(2.8) \quad (1 - \delta_1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} L^2(n) \exp(-E_n^2/(1 + \delta_1)).$$

Let $0 \leq A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$ for $\rho, 0 < \rho < 1$ to be chosen later. Then $E_n < \rho b_n$ and (2.8) is less than

$$h(n) = (1 - \delta_1^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} L^2(n) \exp(-\rho^2 b_n^2/(1 + \delta_1)).$$

Using the definitions of b_n and $L(n)$, we see that $h(n) = O((\ln n)^{\rho^2/(1+\delta_1)} n^{-2(-\gamma+\rho^2/(1+\delta_1))})$. Thus for $0 \leq A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$, (2.7) is bounded above by

$$(2.9) \quad \{\Phi^{L(n)}(E_n) + h(n)\}^m = \Phi^{mL(n)}(E_n) \{1 + h(n)\Phi^{-L(n)}(E_n)\}^m.$$

Recall that $-\ln \Phi(x) \sim \varphi(x)/x$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Since $A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$, $b_n - A/2c_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$(2.10) \quad \Phi^{L(n)}(E_n) \geq \Phi^{L(n)}(\rho b_n) = \exp\{L(n) \ln \Phi(\rho b_n)\} \\ \geq \exp\{-c' L(n) \varphi(\rho b_n)/\rho b_n\}$$

for some $c' > 1$ and n large. By definition of b_n and $L(n)$, $-c'L(n)\varphi(\rho b_n)/\rho b_n = o(n^{\gamma-\rho^2})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If we select $\rho^2 > \gamma$, the right hand side of (2.10) tends to 1. Thus for sufficiently large n (independent of A), the expression in the brackets of (2.9) is less than or equal to $\{1 + 2h(n)\}^m$. We may choose ρ and γ , $\rho^2 > \gamma$ such that $\{1 + 2h(n)\}^m \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. (For example select $\gamma \leq (1 - \delta_1)/4$ and $\rho^2 = 1 - (1 - \delta_1)/4 - (1 - \delta_1)^2/8$. Then $\rho^2 > \gamma$ and $2(\rho^2/(1 + \delta_1) - \gamma) > 1 - \gamma$ so $\{1 + 2h(n)\}^m \rightarrow e^0 = 1$ since $m = O(n^{1-\gamma})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.) We can find ν_1 such that for all $n \geq \nu_1$ and $0 \leq A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$, (2.9) is no bigger than $2\Phi^{mL(n)}(E_n)$. Define

$$(2.11) \quad f(A, n) = 2 \exp(tA^2)\Phi^{mL(n)}(E_n)$$

so that $Q(A, n) \leq f(A, n)$ for all $n \geq \nu_1$ and $0 \leq A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$. To find the uniform rate at which $f(A, n) \rightarrow 0$ as $A \rightarrow \infty$, we consider

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{d}{dA} f(A, n) = 2 \exp(tA^2)\Phi^{mL(n)-1}(E_n) \\ \times \left\{ 2tA\Phi(E_n) - \frac{mL(n)}{2c_n(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}} \varphi(E_n) \right\}.$$

The last factor in (2.12) is bounded by

$$(2.13) \quad 2tA - \frac{mL(n)}{2n} \exp \left\{ \frac{Ab_n(1 - A/4b_n c_n)}{2c_n(1 - \delta_{L(n)})} - \frac{b_n^2 \delta_{L(n)}}{(1 - \delta_{L(n)})} \right\} \\ \leq 2tA - \frac{mL(n)}{2n} \exp \{ Ab_n(1 + \rho)/4c_n - b_n^2 \delta_{L(n)} \}$$

for all $0 \leq A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$. The derivative of the right-hand side of (2.13) with respect to A is

$$2t - \frac{mL(n)}{2n} \cdot \frac{(1 + \rho)b_n}{4c_n} \exp \{ b_n(1 + \rho)A/4c_n - b_n^2 \delta_{L(n)} \}.$$

For all $A \geq 0$ and t sufficiently small, this is negative since $b_n^2 \delta_{L(n)}$ is bounded as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus the right-hand side of (2.13) is at most $-mL(n)/2n$. Substituting in (2.12) we get

$$\frac{d}{dA} f(A, n) < -2 \exp(tA^2)\Phi^{mL(n)-1}(E_n) \cdot \frac{mL(n)}{2n} \\ \leq -\frac{mL(n)}{n} f(A, n) < f(A, n)$$

for large n since $mL(n)/n \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore for all $n \geq \nu_2$ (independent of A) and $0 \leq A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$,

$$\frac{d}{dA} f(A, n)/f(A, n) < -1.$$

Integrating both sides w.r.t. A we get

$$f(A', n) \leq f(0, n)e^{-A'}$$

for all $n \geq \nu_2$ and $0 \leq A' \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$. But

$$f(0, n) = 2\Phi^{m_{L(n)}}(b_n(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{-\frac{1}{2}}) < 2$$

so for all $n \geq \max(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ and $0 \leq A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n$,

$$(2.14) \quad Q(A, n) \leq f(A, n) \leq 2e^{-A}.$$

Going back to (2.4), we see that another upper bound for (2.4) is

$$\{p(\xi_1 \leq E_n)\}^m = \Phi^m(E_n).$$

Define

$$(2.15) \quad g(A, n) = \exp(tA^2)\Phi^m(E_n).$$

We will show that the derivative w.r.t. A of $g(A, n)$ is negative for all $A > 4b_n c_n$ and that the maximum of $g(A, n)$ for $2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n \leq A \leq 4b_n c_n$ tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. First

$$(2.16) \quad \frac{d}{dA} g(A, n) = \exp(tA^2)\Phi^{m-1}(E_n) \\ \times \{2tA\Phi(E_n) - m\varphi(E_n)/2c_n(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}\}.$$

Now for all $A > 4b_n c_n$ (hence $(A/2c_n) - b_n > 0$),

$$\begin{aligned} A\Phi(E_n) &= A\{1 - \Phi(-E_n)\} \\ &\leq A(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi(E_n)/((A/2c_n) - b_n) \\ &= (1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi(E_n)/(\frac{1}{2}c_n^{-1} - b_n A^{-1}) \\ &< 4c_n(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi(E_n). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting in (2.16) we get for all $A > 4b_n c_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dA} g(A, n) &< (1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}c_n\varphi_n(E_n) \exp(tA^2)\Phi^{m-1}(E_n) \\ &\times \{8t - m/2c_n^2(1 - \delta_{L(n)})\}, \end{aligned}$$

and this is negative for small t .

Next, if we set

$$\mathcal{G}(n) = \max\{g(A, n) \leftarrow 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n \leq A \leq 4b_n c_n\},$$

then

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}(n) &\leq \exp(t(4b_n c_n)^2)\Phi^m((b_n - (1 - \rho)b_n)/(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &\leq \exp\{64t(\ln n)^2\}\Phi^m(\rho b_n/(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

By Cramér ([2], page 374), there exists a c'' , $0 < c'' < 1$ such that for all n large, the right-hand side of (2.17) is bounded by

$$\exp\{64t(\ln n)^2 - c''m\varphi(\rho'b_n)/\rho'b_n\} \quad \text{where } \rho' = \rho(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By definition of b_n , this expression is no bigger than

$$(2.18) \quad \exp\{64t(\ln n)^2 - (\text{const.})(m/b_n)n^{-\rho'^2}\}.$$

We select ρ and γ , such that (2.18) tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. (If $\gamma \leq (1 - \delta_1)/4$ and $\rho^2 = 1 - (1 - \delta_1)/4 - (1 - \delta_1)^2/8$ we have

$$1 - \gamma - \rho^2/1 - \delta_{L(n)} > 1 - (1 - \delta_1)/4 - (1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{-1}(1 - (1 - \delta_1)/4) \\ + (1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{-1}(1 - \delta_1)^2/8$$

which is positive for n large since $\delta_{L(n)} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then (2.18) tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$.)

Now by definitions of Q , f and g (cf. (2.5), (2.11), (2.15)) we have

$$(2.19) \quad Q(A, n) \leq 2e^{-A} \quad \forall n \geq \max(\nu_1, \nu_2) \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq A \leq 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n \\ \leq \mathcal{G}(n) \quad \forall A > 2(1 - \rho)b_n c_n.$$

Hence given $\eta > 0$, choose A_0 so large that $2e^{-A} < \eta$ for all $A \geq A_0$ and choose $\nu_0 > \max(\nu_1, \nu_2)$ so large that $\mathcal{G}(n) < \eta \quad \forall n \geq \nu_0$. Then (2.19) gives

$$Q(A, n) < \eta$$

for all $n \geq \nu_0$ (independent of A) and $A \geq A_0$ (independent of n).

The observation that $Q(A, n) \rightarrow 0$ as $A \rightarrow \infty$ for every fixed n is clear since

$$Q(A, n) \leq \exp(tA^2)\Phi^m(E_{n,A}) = \exp(tA^2)\{1 - \Phi(-E_{n,A})\}^m$$

where $E_{n,A} = E_n = (b_n - A/2c_n)(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{-1/2}$. Let A be so large that $(A/2c_n) - b_n > 1$; then the above expression is at most

$$\exp(tA^2)\varphi^m(-E_{n,A})(1 - \delta_{L(n)})^{m/2} < \exp\left\{tA^2 - \frac{m}{2}(A/2c_n - b_n)^2\right\}$$

and it tends to zero as $A \rightarrow \infty$ for t sufficiently small. Thus there exists a_n such that for all $A \geq a_n$, $Q(A, n) \leq \eta$. Let $a^* = \max_{0 \leq i \leq \nu_0} a_i$; then

$$Q(A, n) \leq \eta \quad \forall A \geq a^* \quad \text{and for all } n.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 1.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. We will prove that (1.2) implies

$$(2.20) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2c_n(M_n - c_n)/\ln \ln n = +1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

and

$$(2.21) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2c_n(M_n - c_n)/\ln \ln n = -1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

We first consider the lim sup. According to Lemma 2, for $\varepsilon > 0$

$$P(2c_n(M_n - c_n)/\ln \ln n > 1 - \varepsilon \text{ i.o.}) = 1.$$

In other words

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2c_n(M_n - c_n)/\ln \ln n \geq 1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

With no conditions on the covariance sequence, Theorem 2.1 of [7] shows that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2c_n(M_n - c_n)/\ln \ln n \leq 1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Hence (2.20) is proved.

To prove (2.21), we first show that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} 2c_n(M_n - c_n)/\ln \ln n \geq -1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 of [7], it is sufficient to show that the inequalities

$$(2.22) \quad M_{n(\varepsilon, m)} \leq a(n(\varepsilon, m), \varepsilon) \quad m = 1, 2, \dots$$

hold only finitely often with probability one $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, where $n(\varepsilon, m) = [e^{\varepsilon m}]$ and

$$a(n, \varepsilon) = c_n - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon \right) \ln \ln n / c_n = b_n - \varepsilon \ln \ln n / c_n.$$

We look at

$$(2.23) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P\{M_{n(\varepsilon, m)} \leq a(n(\varepsilon, m), \varepsilon)\} \\ \leq m_0 + \sum_{m_0}^{\infty} P\{M_{n(\varepsilon, m)} \leq a(n(\varepsilon, m), \varepsilon)\}.$$

By Lemma 1, if (1.2) holds then for some $t > 0$ we can choose m_0 so large that the right-hand side of (2.23) is at most

$$m_0 + \sum_{m_0}^{\infty} \exp \{-t\varepsilon^2(\ln \ln n(\varepsilon m))^2\} \leq m_0 + \sum_{m_0}^{\infty} \exp \{-t\varepsilon^2(\ln \varepsilon m)^2\}.$$

The above sum is finite for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and (2.22) follows by the Borel–Cantelli Lemma. To complete the proof of Theorem 1 we need to show that for all $\varepsilon > 0$

$$P(M_n \leq c_n - (1 - \varepsilon)\ln \ln n / (2c_n) \text{ i.o.}) = 1,$$

or

$$P(M_n \leq b_n + \varepsilon \ln \ln n / (2c_n) \text{ finitely often}) = 0.$$

The last probability is

$$P(\bigcup_n \bigcap_{k=n}^{\infty} \{M_k > b_k + \varepsilon \ln \ln k / c_k\}) \\ \leq \sum_n P(\bigcap_{k=n}^{\infty} \{M_k > b_k + \varepsilon \ln \ln k / c_k\}) \\ = \sum_n \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P(\bigcap_{k=n}^N \{M_k > b_k + \varepsilon \ln \ln k / c_k\}) \\ = \sum_n \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} P(M_n > b_n + \varepsilon \ln \ln N / c_N).$$

By (2.6)

$$P(M_N > b_N + \varepsilon \ln \ln N / c_N) \\ \leq P(M_N^* > b_N + \varepsilon \ln \ln N / c_N) \\ + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{|r_j|(N-j)}{2\pi(1-r_j^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp - \frac{(b_N + \varepsilon \ln \ln N / c_N)^2}{1 + |r_j|}$$

where M_N^* is maximum of N independent standard normal variables. The first term in the right-hand side above tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by Theorem 3.1 of [1] and the second term tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by arguments similar to those in Lemma 3.1 of [1]. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. We assume that

$$(2.24) \quad r_n \text{ is non-increasing ;}$$

$$(2.25) \quad r_n \ln n / \ln \ln n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and we will show that

$$(2.26) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} (M_n - c_n)c_n / \ln \ln n = -\infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Define $A_n(K) = \{(M_n - c_n)c_n < -K \ln \ln n\}$. To show that $P(A_n(K) \text{ i.o.}) = 1$ it will be sufficient to show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(A_n^c(K)) = 0 \forall K$.

Let $\{Z_n, n > 1\}$ be a sequence of independent, Gaussian variables with zero mean and unit variance. Let $M_n^* = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Z_i$ and let U be a standard normal variable independent of $\{Z_n, n \geq 1\}$. The covariance matrix of $\{(1 - r_n)^{1/2}Z_i + r_n^{1/2}U, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ is dominated above by the covariance matrix of $x_1 \cdots x_n$, for all n since $\{r_n\}$ is non-increasing. Hence by Slepian's Lemma ([8] Lemma 1), we have for all K and n ,

$$\begin{aligned} P(A_n^c(K)) &\leq P(c_n((1 - r_n)^{1/2}M_n^* + r_n^{1/2}U - c_n) \geq -K \ln \ln n) \\ &= P((1 - r_n)^{1/2}c_n(M_n^* - c_n) \geq c_n^2 r_n(1 + (1 - r_n)^{1/2})^{-1} \\ &\quad - K \ln \ln n - c_n r_n^{1/2}U) \\ &\leq P((1 - r_n)^{1/2}c_n(M_n^* - c_n) \geq c_n^2 r_n/4 - K \ln \ln n) \\ &\quad + (1 - \Phi(c_n r_n^{1/2}/4)). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the second term in the right-hand side above tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Condition (2.25) implies that the first term tends to zero by a classical result that

$$(2.27) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (M_n^* - c_n)c_n / \ln \ln n = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

((2.27) is also special case of Theorem 1). Theorem 2 is proved.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. We will show that if (1.8) holds then for t sufficiently small,

$$(2.28) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp(tY_n) = \exp(tX)$$

where $Y_n = c_n(M_n - b_n)$. The random variable X is defined in the statement of Theorem 3.

Under the condition (1.8) we know that Y_n converge in distribution to X ([1], Theorem 3.1). (2.28) follows if for small t

$$(2.29) \quad \int_{|x| \geq A} \exp(tx) dF_n(x) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } A \rightarrow \infty,$$

uniformly in n where $F_n(x) = P(c_n(M_n - b_n) \leq x)$, $x \in (-\infty, \infty)$.

First we prove that the integral for $x > A$ in (2.29) tends to zero without restricting the covariance sequence at all. For any $t < 1$, write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_A^\infty \exp(tx) dF_n(x) &= -\int_A^\infty \exp(tx) d(1 - F_n(x)) \\ (2.30) \quad &= \exp(tA)P(M_n > b_n + A/c_n) \\ &\quad + t \int_A^\infty \exp(tx)P(M_n > b_n + x/c_n) dx. \end{aligned}$$

The first term in (2.30) tends to zero as $A \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in n since for

all $A \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \exp(tA)P(M_n > b_n + A/c_n) &= \exp(tA)P(\text{at least one of } x_1 \cdots x_n > b_n + x/c_n) \\
 &\leq \exp(tA) \cdot n \cdot (1 - \Phi(b_n + A/c_n)) \\
 &\leq \exp(tA) \cdot n \cdot \varphi(b_n + A/c_n)/(b_n + A/c_n) \\
 &= c_n(b_n + A/c_n)^{-1} \exp((t - b_n/c_n)A - A^2/2c_n^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

(Recall that $b_n/c_n \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.)

For the second term in (2.30), set $t' = (1 + t)/2$. Then $t < t' < 1$ and by the preceding discussion for a given $\delta > 0$, there exists $A_0(t')$ such that for all $x \geq A_0(t')$

$$\exp(t'x)P(M_n > b_n + x/c_n) < \delta$$

or

$$\exp(tx)P(M_n > b_n + x/c_n) < \delta \exp(-(t' - t)x).$$

Thus

$$\int_A^\infty \exp(tx)P(M_n > b_n + x/c_n) dx < \delta(t' - t)^{-1} \exp(-(t' - t)A)$$

for all $A \geq A_0(t')$. The right-hand side above tends to zero as $A \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in n and one part of (2.29) is proved.

Now we consider

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{-\infty}^A \exp(tx) dF_n(x) &= \exp(-tA)P(M_n \leq b_n - A/c_n) \\
 &\quad - t \int_A^\infty \exp(-tx)P(M_n \leq b_n - x/c_n) dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

We will be done if we show that for all $t > 0$ the following expression tends to zero as $A \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in n

$$(2.31) \quad \exp(tA)P(M_n \leq b_n - A/c_n) + t \int_A^\infty \exp(tx) \cdot P(M_n \leq b_n - x/c_n) dx.$$

For any $t_0 > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \exp(tx)P(M_n \leq b_n - A/c_n) &= \exp(-t_0x(x - t/t_0)) \\
 &\quad \times \exp(t_0x^2)P(M_n \leq b_n - x/c_n).
 \end{aligned}$$

Suppose (1.8) holds so that Lemma 1 is valid for all $t \leq t_0$. Then there exists $A_0 > t/t_0 + 1$ such that for all $x \geq A_0$ and for all n , $\exp(t_0x^2)P(M_n \leq b_n - x/c_n) < 1$ so

$$\exp(tx)P(M_n \leq b_n - x/c_n) \leq \exp(t_0x).$$

The expression in (2.31) is at most $\exp(-t_0A) + (t/t_0) \exp(-t_0A)$ for all $A \geq A_0$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1. By Theorem 3, $EY_n = c_n(EM_n - b_n) \rightarrow EX$ and $EY_n^2 = c_n^2E(M_n - b_n)^2 \rightarrow EX^2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma^2(Y_n) &= EY_n^2 - (EY_n)^2 \\
 &= c_n^2\{EM_n^2 - 2b_nEM_n + b_n^2 - (EM_n)^2 + 2b_nEM_n - b_n^2\} \\
 &= c_n^2\sigma^2(M_n).
 \end{aligned}$$

But $\sigma^2(M_n) \rightarrow \sigma^2(X)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the result follows since $\sigma^2(X) = (\pi^2/6) - 1$ by Cramér ([2], page 376).

PROOF OF COROLLARY 2. That

$$b_n^{-k} E(M_n^k) = 1 + O(1/\ln n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for all $k \geq 1$ will be proved by induction. By Theorem 3 we have, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$EM_n = b_n + (E(X)/c_n) + o(1/c_n)$$

and

$$E(M_n^2) = b_n^2 + (2b_n E(X)/c_n) + o(1) + EX^2/(2 \ln n).$$

Hence the result is true for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$. Let it be true for all $k \leq l$. Consider

$$E(M_n - b_n)^{l+1} = E(M_n^{l+1}) + \sum_{j=1}^{l+1} \binom{l+1}{j} (-b_n)^j E(M_n^{l+1-j}).$$

By Theorem 3, the left-hand side above is equal to

$$(E(X^{l+1})/c_n^{l+1}) + o(1/c_n^{l+1}) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$E(M_n^{l+1}) = -\sum_{j=1}^{l+1} \binom{l+1}{j} (-b_n)^j E(M_n^{l+1-j}) + (E(X^{l+1})/c_n^{l+1}) + o(1/c_n^{l+1})$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} (E(M_n^{l+1})/b_n^{l+1}) &= -\sum_{j=1}^{l+1} \binom{l+1}{j} (-1)^j (E(M_n^{l+1-j})/b_n^{l+1-j}) \\ &\quad + (E(X^{l+1})/(c_n b_n)^{l+1}) + o(1/c_n^{l+1}). \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis the right-hand side above is equal to

$$-(1 + O(1/\ln n)) \sum_{j=1}^{l+1} \binom{l+1}{j} (-1)^j + O(1/(\ln n)^{l+1}).$$

But $-\sum_{j=1}^{l+1} (-1)^j = 1$ and the result follows.

We also note that Corollary 2 implies that

$$E|M_n|^k/b_n^k = 1 + O(1/\ln n) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} E|M_n|^k &\leq E(M_n^k) + 2k \int_0^\infty x^{k-1} P(M_n \leq -x) dx \\ &\leq E(M_n^k) + 2k \int_0^\infty x^{k-1} \Phi(-x) dx \\ &= E(M_n^k) + \text{constant}. \end{aligned}$$

3. Discussion. REMARK 1. The existence of covariance sequences satisfying (1.2) or (1.6) can be seen by observing that $1/\ln |x|$ and $\ln \ln |x|/\ln |x|$ are non-negative, even and convex on $[K, \infty)$, for some constant K . To satisfy Pólya's criterion we only need to choose the constant K properly and extend the functions on $[0, K)$ by a suitable straight line. Such functions are then covariance functions of real valued, stationary, Gaussian processes $\{X_i(s), s \geq 0\}$. Restricting these processes to the integers will provide examples of Gaussian sequences satisfying required conditions.

REMARK 2. The assumption of stationarity is not crucial in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 3. For a nonstationary sequence $\{X_n, n \geq 1\}$, let $EX_n = 0$; $EX_n^2 = 1$ and $r_{m,n} = E(X_m X_n)$. The assumption (1.8) e.g. can be replaced by

- (a) $\sup_{m \neq n} r_{m,n} \neq 1$, and
- (b) $r_{m,n} \ln |m - n| \rightarrow 0$ as $|m - n| \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in m and n .

Acknowledgment. I am very pleased to express my gratitude to my advisor Professor Donald Ylvisaker. The inspiration for this work has been his able guidance, encouragement and patience.

REFERENCES

- [1] BERMAN, S. M. (1964). Limit theorems for the maximum term in stationary sequences. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **35** 502–516.
- [2] CRAMÉR, H. (1946). *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*. Princeton Univ. Press.
- [3] GNEDENKO, B. V. (1943). Sur la distribution limite du terme maximum d'une série aléatoire. *Ann. of Math.* **44** 423–453.
- [4] PATHAK, P. K. and QUALLS, C. (0000). A law of iterated logarithm for stationary Gaussian processes. To appear.
- [5] PICKANDS, J. III (1967). Maxima of stationary Gaussian processes. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* **7** 190–223.
- [6] PICKANDS, J. III (1968). Moment convergence of sample extremes. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **39** 881–889.
- [7] PICKANDS, J. III (1969). An iterated logarithm law for the maximum in a stationary Gaussian sequence. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* **12** 344–353.
- [8] SLEPIAN, D. (1962). The one-sided barrier problem for Gaussian noise. *Bell System. Tech. J.* **41** 463–501.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS
THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540