

SDS 384 11: Theoretical Statistics

Lecture 1: Introduction

Purnamrita Sarkar Department of Statistics and Data Science The University of Texas at Austin

www.cs.cmu.edu/~psarkar/teaching

Manegerial Stuff

- Instructor- Purnamrita Sarkar
- Course material and homeworks will be posted under www.cs.cmu.edu/~psarkar/teaching/sds384.html
- Office hours: Tuesdays 11-12pm. GDC 7.504
- TA: TBD
- Homeworks are due Biweekly after class on thursdays
- Grading 5 homeworks (75%), Final Exam (25%)
- Books
 - Asymptotic Statistics, Aad van der Vaart. Cambridge. 1998.
 - Convergence of Stochastic Processes, David Pollard. Springer. 1984.
 Available on-line at http://www.stat.yale.edu/pollard/1984book/

Why do theory?

- Say you have estimated $\hat{\theta}_n$ from data X_1, \dots, X_n . How do we know we have a "good" estimation method?
 - Does $\hat{\theta}_n \to \theta$? This brings us to **Stochastic Convergence**.
- How do I know if one estimation method is better than another?
 - Does the estimate from one converge faster than the other?
 - Does one algorithm work under broader parameter regimes, or weaker assumptions?
 - What is the optimal rate for a given estimation problem?

This class

Your instructor "hopes to cover":

- Consistency of parameter estimates
 - Stochastic Convergence
 - Concentration inequalities
 - Asymptotic normality of estimators
- Empirical processes, VC classes, covering numbers
- Asymptotic testing
- Examples of network clustering with a bit of random matrix theory
- Bootstrap, Nonparametric regression and density estimation

Stochastic Convergence

Assume that $X_n, n \ge 1$ and X are elements of a separable metric space (S, d).

Definition (Weak Convergence)

A sequence of random variable s converge in "law" or in "distribution" to a random variable X, i.e. $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$ if $P(X_n \le x) \to P(X \le x) \ \forall x$ at which $P(X \le x)$ is continuous.

Definition (Convergence in Probability)

A sequence of random variables converge in "probability" to a random variable X, i.e. $X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X$ if $\forall \epsilon > 0$, $P(d(X_n, X) \ge \epsilon) \to 0$.

Stochastic Convergence

Assume that $X_n, n \ge 1$ and X are elements of a separable metric space (S, d).

Definition (Almost Sure Convergence)

A sequence of random variables converge almost surely to a random variable X, i.e. $X_n \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} X$ if $P\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} d(X_n,X)=0\right)=1$.

• If you think about a (scalar) random variable as a function that maps events to a real number, almost sure convergence means $P(\omega \in \Omega : \lim_{n \to \infty} X_n(\omega) = X(\omega)) = 1$

Definition (Convergence in quadratic mean)

A sequence of random variables converge in quadratic mean to a random variable X, i.e. $X_n \stackrel{q.m}{\to} X$ if $E\left[d(X_n,X)^2\right] \to 0$.

Stochastic Convergence

Theorem

$$X_n \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} X$$
, $X_n \stackrel{q.m.}{\to} X \Rightarrow X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X \Rightarrow X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$
 $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} c \Rightarrow X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} c$

Converses: $X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} X \not\Rightarrow X_n \stackrel{P}{\rightarrow} X$

- Convergence in law needs no knowledge of the joint distribution of X_n and the limiting random variable X.
- Convergence in probability does.

Example

Consider $X \sim N(0,1)$, $X_n = -X$. $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$. But how about $X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X$?

Converses: $X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} X \not\Rightarrow X_n \stackrel{P}{\rightarrow} X$

- Convergence in law needs no knowledge of the joint distribution of X_n and the limiting random variable X.
- Convergence in probability does.

Example

Consider $X \sim N(0,1)$, $X_n = -X$. $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$. But how about $X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X$?

• $P(|X_n - X| \ge \epsilon) = P(2|X| \ge \epsilon) \not\to 0 \ \forall \epsilon > 0$. So X_n does not converge in probability to X.

Example

Let
$$Z \sim U(0,1)$$
 and for $n = 2^k + m$ for $k \ge 0, 0 \le m < 2^k$
 $X_n = 1(Z \in [m2^{-k}, (m+1)2^{-k}])$, i.e. $X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1(Z \in [0, 1/2))$, $X_3 = 1(Z \in [1/2, 1)), X_4 = 1(Z \in [0, 1/4)), X_5 = 1(Z \in [1/4, 1/2))$.

Example

Let
$$Z \sim U(0,1)$$
 and for $n = 2^k + m$ for $k \ge 0, 0 \le m < 2^k$
 $X_n = 1(Z \in [m2^{-k}, (m+1)2^{-k}])$, i.e. $X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1(Z \in [0, 1/2))$, $X_3 = 1(Z \in [1/2, 1)), X_4 = 1(Z \in [0, 1/4)), X_5 = 1(Z \in [1/4, 1/2))$.

• For any $Z \in (0,1)$, the sequence $\{X_n(Z)\}$ does not converge. So $X_n \overset{a,s}{\to} 0$.

Example

Let
$$Z \sim U(0,1)$$
 and for $n = 2^k + m$ for $k \ge 0, 0 \le m < 2^k$
 $X_n = 1(Z \in [m2^{-k}, (m+1)2^{-k}])$, i.e. $X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1(Z \in [0, 1/2))$, $X_3 = 1(Z \in [1/2, 1)), X_4 = 1(Z \in [0, 1/4)), X_5 = 1(Z \in [1/4, 1/2))$.

- For any $Z \in (0,1)$, the sequence $\{X_n(Z)\}$ does not converge. So $X_n \overset{a,s.}{\to} 0$.
- X_n are a sequence of bernoulli's with probabilities $p_n = 1/2^k$ where $k = \lfloor \log n \rfloor$.

Example

Let
$$Z \sim U(0,1)$$
 and for $n = 2^k + m$ for $k \ge 0, 0 \le m < 2^k$
 $X_n = 1(Z \in [m2^{-k}, (m+1)2^{-k}])$, i.e. $X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1(Z \in [0, 1/2))$, $X_3 = 1(Z \in [1/2, 1)), X_4 = 1(Z \in [0, 1/4)), X_5 = 1(Z \in [1/4, 1/2))$.

- For any $Z \in (0,1)$, the sequence $\{X_n(Z)\}$ does not converge. So $X_n \overset{a.s.}{\rightarrow} 0$.
- X_n are a sequence of bernoulli's with probabilities $p_n = 1/2^k$ where $k = \lfloor \log n \rfloor$.
- So $X_n \stackrel{P}{\rightarrow} 0$ and $X_n \stackrel{qm}{\rightarrow} 0$

Example

Example

•
$$P(\lim_{n\to\infty} X_n = X) = P(Z > 0) = 1$$
. So $X_n \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} X$.

Example

- $P(\lim_{n\to\infty} X_n = X) = P(Z > 0) = 1$. So $X_n \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} X$.
- $E|X_n|^2 = 2^{2n}/n \to \infty$. So $X_n \not\to 0$

Example

- $P(\lim_{n\to\infty} X_n = X) = P(Z > 0) = 1$. So $X_n \stackrel{a.s.}{\to} X$.
- $E|X_n|^2 = 2^{2n}/n \to \infty$. So $X_n \not\to 0$
- $P(|X_n| \ge \epsilon) = P(X_n = 2^n) = P(Z \in [0, 1/n)) = 1/n \to 0$

Continuous Mapping Theorem

Theorem

Let g be continuous on a set C where $P(X \in C) = 1$. Then,

$$X_{n} \xrightarrow{d} X \Rightarrow g(X_{n}) \xrightarrow{d} g(X)$$

$$X_{n} \xrightarrow{P} X \Rightarrow g(X_{n}) \xrightarrow{P} g(X)$$

$$X_{n} \xrightarrow{a.s.} X \Rightarrow g(X_{n}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} g(X)$$

Let $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$ where $X \sim N(0,1)$. Then $X_n^2 \stackrel{d}{\to} ?$

Let $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$ where $X \sim N(0,1)$. Then $X_n^2 \stackrel{d}{\to} ?$

• Use $g(x) = x^2$.

Let $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$ where $X \sim N(0,1)$. Then $X_n^2 \stackrel{d}{\to} ?$

- Use $g(x) = x^2$.
- Use $\chi^2 \sim \chi_1^2$.

Let $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$ where $X \sim N(0,1)$. Then $X_n^2 \stackrel{d}{\to} ?$

- Use $g(x) = x^2$.
- Use $\chi^2 \sim \chi_1^2$.
- So $X_n^2 \xrightarrow{d} \chi_1^2$

Let $X_1, ..., X_n$ be i.i.d. with mean μ and variance σ^2 . We have $\bar{X}_n - \mu \stackrel{d}{\to} 0$. Consider $g(x) = 1_{x>0}$. Then $g((\bar{X}_n - \mu)^2) \stackrel{d}{\to} ?$

Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be i.i.d. with mean μ and variance σ^2 . We have $\bar{X}_n - \mu \stackrel{d}{\to} 0$. Consider $g(x) = 1_{x>0}$. Then $g((\bar{X}_n - \mu)^2) \stackrel{d}{\to} ?$

ullet Using Continuous Mapping Theorem, $(\bar{X}_n-\mu)^2\stackrel{d}{
ightarrow} 0$

Let $X_1, ..., X_n$ be i.i.d. with mean μ and variance σ^2 . We have $\bar{X}_n - \mu \stackrel{d}{\to} 0$. Consider $g(x) = 1_{x>0}$. Then $g((\bar{X}_n - \mu)^2) \stackrel{d}{\to} ?$

- Using Continuous Mapping Theorem, $(\bar{X}_n \mu)^2 \stackrel{d}{\to} 0$
- Can we use Continuous Mapping Theorem to claim that $g(\bar{X}_n \mu)^2 \stackrel{d}{\to} 0$?

Let $X_1, ..., X_n$ be i.i.d. with mean μ and variance σ^2 . We have $\bar{X}_n - \mu \stackrel{d}{\to} 0$. Consider $g(x) = 1_{x>0}$. Then $g((\bar{X}_n - \mu)^2) \stackrel{d}{\to} ?$

- Using Continuous Mapping Theorem, $(\bar{X}_n \mu)^2 \stackrel{d}{\to} 0$
- Can we use Continuous Mapping Theorem to claim that $g(\bar{X}_n \mu)^2 \stackrel{d}{\to} 0$?
- NO. Because, 0 is a random variable whose mass is at 0, where g is discontinuous.

• If $X_n \stackrel{qm}{\to} X$, then is it true that for continuous f (discontinuous only at a measure zero set), $f(X_n) \stackrel{qm}{\to} f(X)$?

- If $X_n \stackrel{qm}{\to} X$, then is it true that for continuous f (discontinuous only at a measure zero set), $f(X_n) \stackrel{qm}{\to} f(X)$?
- Consider an *L* Lipschitz function f(X). $|f(x) f(y)| \le L|x y|$.

- If $X_n \stackrel{qm}{\to} X$, then is it true that for continuous f (discontinuous only at a measure zero set), $f(X_n) \stackrel{qm}{\to} f(X)$?
- Consider an *L* Lipschitz function f(X). $|f(x) f(y)| \le L|x y|$.
- $E[|f(X_n) f(X)|^2] \le L^2 E[|X_n X|^2] \to 0$. So for Lipschitz functions quadratic mean convergence goes through.

- If $X_n \stackrel{qm}{\to} X$, then is it true that for continuous f (discontinuous only at a measure zero set), $f(X_n) \stackrel{qm}{\to} f(X)$?
- Consider an *L* Lipschitz function f(X). $|f(x) f(y)| \le L|x y|$.
- $E[|f(X_n) f(X)|^2] \le L^2 E[|X_n X|^2] \to 0$. So for Lipschitz functions quadratic mean convergence goes through.
- Can you come up with a non-Lipschitz function and a sequence $\{X_n\}$ where $f(X_n) \not\stackrel{qm}{\rightarrow} 0$?

Portmanteau Theorem

Theorem

The following are equivalent.

- $X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} X$
- $E[f(X_n)] \rightarrow E[f(X)]$ for all bounded and continuous f.
- $E[f(X_n)] \rightarrow E[f(X)]$ for all bounded and Lipschitz f.
- $E[e^{it^TX_n}] \to E[e^{it^TX_n}], \ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}^k$. (Levy's continuity theorem)
- $t^T X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} t^T X \ \forall t \in \mathbb{R}^k$. (Cramer-Wold device)
- $\liminf_{n} E[f(X_n)] \ge E[f(X)]$ for all non-negative continuous f
- $\limsup_{n} P(X_n \in F) \le P(X \in F)$ for all closed F
- $\liminf_{n} P(X_n \in F) \ge P(X \in F)$ for all open F
- $P(X_n \in B) \rightarrow P(X \in B)$ for all continuity sets B $(P(X \in \partial B) = 0)$

Consider
$$f(x) = x$$
 and

$$X_n = \begin{cases} n & \text{w.p. } 1/n \\ 0 & \text{w.p. } 1 - 1/n \end{cases}$$

Consider f(x) = x and

$$X_n = \begin{cases} n & \text{w.p. } 1/n \\ 0 & \text{w.p. } 1 - 1/n \end{cases}$$

• $X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} 0$, but $E[X_n] \rightarrow ?$

Consider f(x) = x and

$$X_n = \begin{cases} n & \text{w.p. } 1/n \\ 0 & \text{w.p. } 1 - 1/n \end{cases}$$

- $X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} 0$, but $E[X_n] \rightarrow ?$
- $E[X_n] = 1$. What went wrong?

Consider f(x) = x and

$$X_n = \begin{cases} n & \text{w.p. } 1/n \\ 0 & \text{w.p. } 1 - 1/n \end{cases}$$

- $X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} 0$, but $E[X_n] \rightarrow ?$
- $E[X_n] = 1$. What went wrong?
- f(x) = x is not bounded.

Putting everything together

Theorem

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X \text{ and } d(X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{P}{\to} 0 \Rightarrow Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$$
 (1)

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X \text{ and } Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} c \Rightarrow (X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{d}{\to} (X, c)$$
 (2)

$$X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X \text{ and } Y_n \stackrel{P}{\to} Y \Rightarrow (X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{P}{\to} (X, Y)$$
 (3)

Theorem

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X \text{ and } d(X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{P}{\to} 0 \Rightarrow Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$$
 (1)

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X \text{ and } Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} c \Rightarrow (X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{d}{\to} (X, c)$$
 (2)

$$X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X \text{ and } Y_n \stackrel{P}{\to} Y \Rightarrow (X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{P}{\to} (X, Y)$$
 (3)

 Eq 3 does not hold if we replace convergence in probability by convergence in distribution.

Theorem

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X \text{ and } d(X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{P}{\to} 0 \Rightarrow Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$$
 (1)

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X \text{ and } Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} c \Rightarrow (X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{d}{\to} (X, c)$$
 (2)

$$X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X \text{ and } Y_n \stackrel{P}{\to} Y \Rightarrow (X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{P}{\to} (X, Y)$$
 (3)

- Eq 3 does not hold if we replace convergence in probability by convergence in distribution.
- Example: $X_n \sim N(0,1), Y_n = -X_n$. $X \perp Y$ and X, Y are independent standard normal random variables.

Theorem

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X \text{ and } d(X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{P}{\to} 0 \Rightarrow Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$$
 (1)

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X \text{ and } Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} c \Rightarrow (X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{d}{\to} (X, c)$$
 (2)

$$X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} X \text{ and } Y_n \stackrel{P}{\to} Y \Rightarrow (X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{P}{\to} (X, Y)$$
 (3)

- Eq 3 does not hold if we replace convergence in probability by convergence in distribution.
- Example: $X_n \sim N(0,1), Y_n = -X_n$. $X \perp Y$ and X, Y are independent standard normal random variables.
- Then $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$ and $Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} Y$. But $(X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{d}{\to} (X, -X)$, not $(X_n, Y_n) \stackrel{d}{\to} (X, Y)$.

Theorem (Slutsky's theorem)

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} X$$
 and $Y_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} c$ imply that

$$X_n + Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X + c$$

$$X_n Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} cX$$

$$X_n / Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X / c$$

Theorem (Slutsky's theorem)

$$X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} X$$
 and $Y_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} c$ imply that

$$X_n + Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X + c$$

$$X_n Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} cX$$

$$X_n / Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X / c$$

• Does $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$ and $Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} Y$ imply $X_n + Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X + Y$?

Theorem (Slutsky's theorem)

 $X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} X$ and $Y_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} c$ imply that

$$X_n + Y_n \xrightarrow{d} X + c$$

$$X_n Y_n \xrightarrow{d} cX$$

$$X_n / Y_n \xrightarrow{d} X / c$$

- Does $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$ and $Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} Y$ imply $X_n + Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X + Y$?
- Take $Y_n = -X_n$, and X, Y as independent standard normal random variables. $X_n \stackrel{d}{\to} X$ and $Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} Y$ but $X_n + Y_n \stackrel{d}{\to} 0$.

• First note that
$$S_n = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_i X_i^2 - \bar{X}_n^2 = \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{\sum_i X_i^2}{n} - \bar{X}_n^2$$

- First note that $S_n = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_i X_i^2 \bar{X}_n^2 = \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{\sum_i X_i^2}{n} \bar{X}_n^2$
- Law of large numbers give $\frac{\sum_{i} X_{i}^{2}}{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} E[X^{2}]$ and $X_{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} \mu$.

- First note that $S_n = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_i X_i^2 \bar{X}_n^2 = \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{\sum_i X_i^2}{n} \bar{X}_n^2$
- Law of large numbers give $\frac{\sum_{i} X_{i}^{2}}{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} E[X^{2}]$ and $X_{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} \mu$.
- So $(\frac{\sum_{i} X_{i}^{2}}{n}, X_{n}) \stackrel{P}{\to} (E[X^{2}], \mu)$ and now using the continuous mapping theorem, $S_{n}^{2} \stackrel{P}{\to} \sigma^{2}$.

- First note that $S_n = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_i X_i^2 \bar{X}_n^2 = \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{\sum_i X_i^2}{n} \bar{X}_n^2$
- Law of large numbers give $\frac{\sum_{i} X_{i}^{2}}{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} E[X^{2}]$ and $X_{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} \mu$.
- So $(\frac{\sum_{i} X_{i}^{2}}{n}, X_{n}) \stackrel{P}{\to} (E[X^{2}], \mu)$ and now using the continuous mapping theorem, $S_{n}^{2} \stackrel{P}{\to} \sigma^{2}$.
- Finally, $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n \mu) \stackrel{d}{\to} N(0, \sigma^2)$ using CLT.

- First note that $S_n = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_i X_i^2 \bar{X}_n^2 = \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{\sum_i X_i^2}{n} \bar{X}_n^2$
- Law of large numbers give $\frac{\sum_{i} X_{i}^{2}}{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} E[X^{2}]$ and $X_{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} \mu$.
- So $(\frac{\sum_{i} X_{i}^{2}}{n}, X_{n}) \stackrel{P}{\to} (E[X^{2}], \mu)$ and now using the continuous mapping theorem, $S_{n}^{2} \stackrel{P}{\to} \sigma^{2}$.
- Finally, $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n \mu) \stackrel{d}{\to} N(0, \sigma^2)$ using CLT.
- Now using Slutsky's lemma, $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_n \mu)/S_n \stackrel{d}{\to} N(0,1)$ using CLT.

Uniformly tight

Definition

X is defined to be "tight" if $\forall \epsilon > 0 \ \exists M$ for which,

$$P(||X|| > M) < \epsilon$$

 $\{X_n\}$ is defined to uniformly tight if $\forall \epsilon > 0 \ \exists M$ for which,

$$\sup_{n} P(\|X_n\| > M) < \epsilon$$

Prohorov's theorem

Theorem

- $X_n \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} X \Rightarrow \{X_n\}$ is UT.
- $\{X_n\}$ is UT implies that, there exists a subsequence $\{n_j\}$ such that $X_{n_j} \stackrel{d}{\to} X$.

Notation for rates, small oh-pee and big oh-pee

Definition

• The small op:

$$X_n = o_P(1) \Leftrightarrow X_n \stackrel{P}{\to} 0$$

 $X_n = o_P(R_n) \Leftrightarrow X_n = Y_n R_n \text{ and } Y_n = o_P(1)$

 X_n is vanishing in probability

• The big O_P :

$$X_n = O_P(1) \Leftrightarrow \{X_n\} \text{ is UT}$$

 $X_n = O_P(R_n) \Leftrightarrow X_n = Y_n R_n \text{ and } Y_n = O_P(1)$

 X_n lies within a ball of finite radius with high probability

How do they interact

$$o_{P}(1) + O_{P}(1) = O_{P}(1).$$

$$O_{P}(1)o_{P}(1) = o_{P}(1).$$

$$1 + O_{P}(1) = O_{P}(1).$$

$$(1 + o_{P}(1))^{-1} = O_{P}(1).$$

$$o_{P}(O_{P}(1)) = o_{P}(1).$$

$$X_{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} 0, R(h) = o(\|h\|^{p}) \Rightarrow R(X_{n}) = o_{P}(\|X_{n}\|^{p})$$

$$X_{n} \stackrel{P}{\to} 0, R(h) = O(\|h\|^{p}) \Rightarrow R(X_{n}) = O_{P}(\|X_{n}\|^{p})$$

 $o_P(1) + o_P(1) = o_P(1).$

Be careful:

$$e^{o_P(1)} \neq o_P(1)$$
 $O_P(1) + O_P(1)$ Can actually be $o_P(1)$ because of cancellation.