HAL
open science

An improvement of the mixing rates in a counter-example to the weak invariance principle

Davide Giraudo

To cite this version:

Davide Giraudo. An improvement of the mixing rates in a counter-example to the weak invariance principle. 2015. hal-01114898

HAL Id: hal-01114898
https://hal.science/hal-01114898

Preprint submitted on 10 Feb 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

AN IMPROVEMENT OF THE MIXING RATES IN A COUNTER-EXAMPLE TO THE WEAK INVARIANCE PRINCIPLE

DAVIDE GIRAUDO

Abstract. In [1], the authors gave an example of absolutely regular strictly stationary process which satisfies the central limit theorem but not the weak invariance principle. For each $q < /1/2$, the process can be constructed with mixing rates of order N^{-q} . The goal of this note is to show that actually the same construction can give mixing rates of order N^{-q} for a given $q < 1$.

Résumé. Dans [1], les auteurs ont fourni un exemple de processus strictement stationnaire β-mélangeant vérifiant le théorème limite central mais pas le principe d'invariance faible. Pour tout $q < 1/2$, le processus peut être construit avec des taux de mélange de l'ordre de N^{-q}. L'objectif de cette note est de montrer que la même construction peut fournir des taux de mélange de l'ordre de N^{-q} pour un $q < 1$ donné.

1. Notations and main result

We recall some notations in order to make this note more self-contained. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ be a probability space. If $T\colon \Omega \to \Omega$ is one-to-one, bi-measurable and measure preserving (in sense that $\mu(T^{-1}(A)) = \mu(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$), then the sequence $\left(f \circ T^k\right)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is strictly stationary for any measurable $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. Conversely, each strictly stationary sequence can be represented in this way.

For a zero mean square integrable $f\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, we define $S_n(f) := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f \circ T^j$, $\sigma_n^2(f) := \mathbb{E}(S_n(f)^2)$ and $S_n^*(f,t) := S_{\lfloor nt \rfloor}(f) + (nt - \lfloor nt \rfloor) f \circ T^{\lfloor nt \rfloor}$, where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the greatest integer which is less than or equal to x.

Define the β-mixing coefficients by

$$\beta(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \frac{1}{2} \sup \sum_{i=1}^{I} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \left| \mu(A_i \cap B_j) - \mu(A_i)\mu(B_j) \right|, \tag{1}$$

where the supremum is taken over the finite partitions $\{A_i, 1 \leqslant i \leqslant I\}$ and $\{B_j, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant J\}$ of Ω of elements of $\mathcal{A}$ (respectively of $\mathcal{B}$). They were introduced by Volkonskii and Rozanov [4].

For a strictly stationary sequence $(X_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and $n \geqslant 0$ we define $\beta_X(n) = \beta(n) = \beta(\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^0, \mathcal{F}_n^\infty)$ where $\mathcal{F}_u^v$ is the σ-algebra generated by X_k with $u \leqslant k \leqslant v$ (if $u = -\infty$ or $v = \infty$, the corresponding inequality is strict).

Theorem. *Let $\delta > 0$. There exists a strictly stationary real valued process $Y = (Y_k)_{k\geqslant 0} = \left(f \circ T^k\right)_{k\geqslant 0}$ satisfying the following conditions:*

a) the central limit theorem with normalization $\sqrt{n}$ takes place;
b) the weak invariance principle with normalization $\sqrt{n}$ does not hold;
c) $\sigma_N(f)^2 \asymp N$;
d) for some positive C and each integer N, $\beta_Y(N) \leqslant C \cdot N^{-1+\delta}$;
e) $Y_0 \in \mathbb{L}^p$ for any $p > 0$.

Date: February 10, 2015.
Key words and phrases. Central limit theorem, invariance principle, mixing conditions, strictly stationary process.

We refer the reader to Remark 2 of [1] for a comparison with existing results about the weak invariance principle for strictly stationary mixing sequences.

2. Proof

We recall the construction given in [1]. Let us consider an increasing sequence of positive integers $(n_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ such that

$$n_1 \geqslant 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} < \infty, \tag{2}$$

and for each integer $k \geqslant 1$, let A_k^-, A_k^+ be disjoint measurable sets such that $\mu(A_k^-) = 1/(2n_k^2) = \mu(A_k^+)$.

Let the random variables e_k be defined by

$$e_k(\omega) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \omega \in A_k^+, \\ -1 & \text{if } \omega \in A_k^-, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

We can choose the dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mu, T)$ and the sets A_k^+, A_k^- in such a way that the family $(e_k \circ T^i)_{k\geqslant 1, i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is independent. We define $A_k := A_k^+ \cup A_k^-$ and

$$h_k := \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} U^{-i} e_k - U^{-n_k} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} U^{-i} e_k, \quad h := \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} h_k. \tag{4}$$

Let $i(N)$ denote the unique integer such that $n_{i(N)} \leqslant N < n_{i(N)+1}$.

We shall show the following intermediate result.

Proposition 1. *Assume the sequence $(n_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ satisfies (2) and the following condition:*

$$\text{there exists } \eta > 0 \text{ such that for each } k, \quad n_{k+1} \geqslant n_k^{1+\eta}. \tag{5}$$

Then:

- *a') $n^{-1/2} S_n(h) \to 0$ in probability;*
- *b') the process $(N^{-1/2} S_N^*(h, \cdot))_{N\geqslant 1}$ is not tight in $C[0,1]$;*
- *c') $\sigma_N(h)^2 \lesssim N$;*
- *d') for some positive C, $N \cdot \beta_Y(N) \leqslant C n_{i(N)+1}/n_{i(N)}$;*
- *e') $h \in \mathbb{L}^p$ for any $p > 0$.*

Adding a mean-zero nondegenerate independent sequence $(m \circ T^i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ with moments of any order greater than 2, the variance of the Nth partial sum of $((m+h) \circ T^i)_{i\geqslant 1}$ is bounded above and below by a quantity proportional to N. Defining $f := m + h$, we have the following corollary:

Corollary 2. *Assume the sequence $(n_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ satisfies (5). Then $(f \circ T^i)_{i\geqslant 0}$ satisfies a), b), c), d') and e).*

For $k \geqslant 1$ and $N \geqslant n_k$, the N partial sum of h_k admits the expression

$$\begin{aligned} S_N(h_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} j U^{j+N-2n_k} e_k + \sum_{j=1}^{n_k-1} (n_k - j) U^{j+N-n_k} e_k \\ - \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} j U^{j-2n_k} e_k - \sum_{j=1}^{n_k-1} (n_k - j) U^{j-n_k} e_k. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Let us prove Proposition 1. Item a') follows from the fact that h is a coboundary (see the explanation before Section 2.2 of [1]).

For b'), we recall the following lemma (Lemma 10, [1]).

Lemma 3. *There exists N_0 such that*

$$\mu\left\{\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}|S_N(h_k)|\geqslant n_k\right\}>1/4 \tag{7}$$

whenever $n_k\geqslant N_0$.

The following proposition improves Lemma 11 of [1] since the condition on the sequence $(n_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ (namely, (5)) is weaker than both conditions (11) and (12) of [1].

Proposition 4. *Assume that the sequence $(n_k)_{k\geqslant 1}$ satisfies* (5)*. Then we have for k large enough*

$$\mu\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}|S_N(h)|\geqslant 1/2\right\}\geqslant 1/8. \tag{8}$$

Proof. Let us fix an integer k. Let us define the events

$$A:=\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}|S_N(h)|\geqslant\frac{1}{2}\right\}, \tag{9}$$

$$B:=\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}\left|S_N\left(\sum_{j\geqslant k}h_j\right)\right|\geqslant 1\right\}\text{ and} \tag{10}$$

$$C:=\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}\left|S_N\left(\sum_{j\leqslant k-1}h_j\right)\right|\leqslant\frac{1}{2}\right\}. \tag{11}$$

Since the family $\left\{e_k\circ T^i, k\geqslant 1, i\in\mathbb{Z}\right\}$ is independent, the events B and C are independent. Notice that $B\cap C\subset A$ hence

$$\mu(A)=\mu\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}|S_N(h)|\geqslant\frac{1}{2}\right\}\geqslant\mu(B)\mu(C).$$

In order to give a lower bound for $\mu(B)$, we define $E_k:=\bigcup_{N=2n_k}^{n_k^2}\bigcup_{j\geqslant k+1}\{S_N(h_j)\neq 0\}$; then

$$\mu(B)\geqslant\mu(B\cap E_k^c) \tag{12}$$

$$=\mu\left(\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}|S_N(h_k)|\geqslant 1\right\}\cap E_k^c\right) \tag{13}$$

$$\geqslant\mu\left(\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}|S_N(h_k)|\geqslant 1\right\}\right)-\mu(E_k). \tag{14}$$

Let us give an estimate of the probability of E_k. As noted in [1] (proof of Lemma 11 therein), the inclusion

$$\bigcup_{N=2n_k}^{n_k^2}\{S_N(h_j)\neq 0\}\subset\bigcup_{i=-2n_j+1}^{n_k^2}T^{-i}A_j \tag{15}$$

takes place for $j>k$, hence

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{N=2n_k}^{n_k^2}\{S_N(h_j)\neq 0\}\right)\leqslant\frac{n_k^2+2n_j}{n_j^2}, \tag{16}$$

and it follows that

$$\mu(E_k)\leqslant\sum_{j=k+1}^{+\infty}\frac{2n_k}{n_j}. \tag{17}$$

By (5), we have $n_k \leqslant n_j^{1/(1+\eta)}$ for $j > k$, hence by (17),

$$\mu(E_k) \leqslant 2 \sum_{j=k+1}^{+\infty} n_j^{-\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}}. \tag{18}$$

As condition (5) implies that $n_k \geqslant 2^k$ for k large enough, we conclude that the following inequality holds for k large enough:

$$\mu(E_k) \leqslant 2 \sum_{j=k+1}^{+\infty} 2^{-j\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}} \tag{19}$$

Thus, by Lemma 3 and (19), we have for k large enough

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}|S_N(h)| \geqslant \frac{1}{2}\right\} \\ &\quad\geqslant \left(\frac{1}{4} - 2\sum_{j=k+1}^{+\infty} 2^{-j\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}}\right)\left(1 - \mu\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}\left|S_N\left(\sum_{j\leqslant k-1} h_j\right)\right| > \frac{1}{2}\right\}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Defining $c_k := \mu\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}\left|S_N\left(\sum_{j\leqslant k-1} h_j\right)\right| > \frac{1}{2}\right\}$, it is enough to prove that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} c_k = 0. \tag{21}$$

Using (6) (accounting $N \geqslant 2n_k \geqslant n_j$ for $j < k$), we get the inequalities

$$c_k \leqslant \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mu\left\{\frac{1}{n_k}\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2}|S_N(h_j)| > \frac{1}{2(k-1)}\right\} \tag{22}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leqslant \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mu\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{8k}\right\} + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mu\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j-1} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{8k}\right\} \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mu\left\{\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2} U^N\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{8k}\right\} + \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mu\left\{\max_{2n_k\leqslant N\leqslant n_k^2} U^N\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j-1} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{8k}\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

$$\leqslant n_k^2\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mu\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{8k}\right\} + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mu\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j-1} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{8k}\right\}\right). \tag{24}$$

Notice that for each $j \leqslant k-1$,

$$\mu\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j-1} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{8k}\right\} \leqslant \mu\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{16k}\right\} + \mu\left\{|n_j U^{n_j} e_j| > \frac{n_k}{16k}\right\}. \tag{25}$$

Condition (5) implies the inequality $16k \cdot n_{k-1} < n_k$ for k large enough, hence keeping in mind that $U^{n_j} e_j$ is bounded by 1, inequality (25) becomes for such k's,

$$\mu\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j-1} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{8k}\right\} \leqslant \mu\left\{\left|\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} iU^i e_j\right| > \frac{n_k}{16k}\right\}. \tag{26}$$

Combining (24) with (26), we obtain

$$c_k \leqslant 2n_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mu \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} iU^i e_j \right| > \frac{n_k}{16k} \right\} \tag{27}$$

$$\leqslant 2n_k^2 \frac{(16k)^p}{n_k^p} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} iU^i e_j \right|^p, \tag{28}$$

where $p > 2 + 1/\eta$. By Rosenthal's inequality (see [3], Theorem 1), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} iU^i e_j \right|^p \leqslant C_p \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} i^p \mathbb{E} |e_j| + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} \mathbb{E}[i^2 e_j^2] \right)^{p/2} \right) \tag{29}$$

$$\leqslant C_p (n_j^{p+1-2} + n_j^{3p/2}/n_j^p) \tag{30}$$

$$\leqslant 2C_p n_j^{p-1} \tag{31}$$

as $p > 2$. Therefore, for some constant K depending only on p,

$$c_k \leqslant K \cdot n_k^{2-p} k^p \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j^{p-1} \leqslant K \cdot k^{p+1} \frac{n_{k-1}^{p-1}}{n_k^{p-2}}, \tag{32}$$

and by (5),

$$c_k \leqslant K \cdot k^{p+1} n_{k-1}^{p-1-(p-2)(1+\eta)}. \tag{33}$$

Since $p - 1 - (p-2)(1+\eta) = 1 - (p-2)\eta < 0$ and $n_{k-1} \geqslant 2^{k-1}$ for each $k \geqslant 2$, we get

$$c_k \leqslant K \cdot k^{p+1} 2^{(1-(p-2)\eta)(k-1)}. \tag{34}$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 4 hence that of b'). □

For c'), we follow the computation in the proof of Proposition 13 of [1], using the fact that $\sup_k \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} n_j/n_k$ is finite.

We now provide a bound for the mixing rates. Corollary 6 of [1] states the following.

Proposition 5. *For each integer k, we have*

$$\beta(N) \leqslant \sum_{j : 2n_j \geqslant N} \frac{4}{n_j}. \tag{35}$$

Then d') follows from the bounds

$$\beta(2N) \leqslant \frac{4}{n_{i(N)}} + \sum_{k \geqslant i(N)} \frac{4}{n_{k+1}} = \frac{4}{n_{i(N)}} \left(1 + \sum_{j \geqslant 1} \frac{n_j}{n_{j+1}} \right). \tag{36}$$

In Proposition 14 of [1], it was proved that for each $q \geqslant 2$, there exists a constant C_q such that for each $k \geqslant 1$, $\|h_k\|_q \leqslant C_q n_k^{-1/q}$. Condition (5) implies that $n_k \geqslant 2^k$ for k large enough, hence e') is satisfied.

This concludes the proof of Proposition 1 and that of Corollary 2.

In order to prove the main result, we shall make some particular choices of sequence $(n_k)_{k \geqslant 1}$ which satisfy conditions (2) and (5).

We define for a positive δ

$$n_k := \lfloor 2^{(1+\eta)^k + 1} \rfloor. \tag{37}$$

The sequence $(n_k)_{k \geqslant 1}$ satisfies (5) and by Proposition 11 of [2], we have $\beta(N) \leqslant CN^{-1/(1+\eta)}$ for some universal constant C.

References

[1] D. Giraudo and D. Volný, *A strictly stationary β-mixing process satisfying the central limit theorem but not the weak invariance principle*, Stochastic Process. Appl (2014), vol. 124, no. 11, 3769–3781, MR 3249354

[2] D. Giraudo and D. Volný, *A counter example to central limit theorem in Hilbert spaces under a strong mixing condition*, Electronic Communications in Probability (2014), vol. 19. MR 3254741

[3] H. P. Rosenthal, *On the subspaces of L^p $(p > 2)$ spanned by sequences of independent random variables*, Israel J. Math. **8** (1970), 273–303. MR 0271721 (42 #6602)

[4] V. A. Volkonskiĭ and Yu. A. Rozanov, *Some limit theorems for random functions. I*, Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen **4** (1959), 186–207. MR 0105741 (21 #4477)

Université de Rouen, LMRS, Avenue de l'Université, BP 12 76801 Saint-Étienne-du-Rouvray cedex, France.

E-mail address: `davide.giraudo1@univ-rouen.frr`