

ON INFINITELY DIVISIBLE LAWS AND A RENEWAL THEOREM  
FOR NON-NEGATIVE RANDOM VARIABLES

by

Walter L. Smith

University of North Carolina

Institute of Statistics Mimeo Series No. 511

February 1967

This research was supported by the Department of the  
Navy, Office of Naval Research. Grant NONR-855(09).

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, N. C.

1 Introduction. Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be an infinite sequence of independent, non-negative, random variables. Write  $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$  and let  $N(x)$  be the maximum suffix  $k$  such that  $S_k \leq x$ . The simplest Elementary Renewal Theorem states that, when the  $\{X_n\}$  are identically distributed,  $E\{N(x)/x\} \rightarrow 1/E X_n$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $\Psi(x)$  be an unbounded, non-decreasing function of regular variation (Feller, 1966, p. 269). A more general theorem of Smith (1964, 1966) allows the  $\{X_n\}$  to be non-identically distributed and shows that if  $S_n/n$  tends in probability to a finite limit  $\mu$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (that is, the Weak Law of large numbers holds) then  $E\Psi(N(x)) \sim \Psi(x/\mu)$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . This result has been carried further by Williamson (1966) who showed that if there exists a proper distribution function  $K(x)$  such that  $P\{S_n/n \leq x\} \rightarrow K(x)$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , at every continuity point of  $K(x)$ , then  $E N(x) \sim x \int_0^\infty u^{-1} dK(u)$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . However, Williamson found it necessary to assume that certain extra conditions were satisfied, and his theorem is not as strong as the one of Smith for the case when  $K(x)$  is degenerate (and a weak law of large numbers holds). In the present paper we shall prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1 Let  $\{X_n\}$  be an infinite sequence of mutually independent, non-negative, random variables. Let  $\lambda(n)$  be an unbounded, strictly increasing, and continuous function of regular variation with exponent  $1/\beta$ ,  $\beta > 0$ . Let  $\Lambda(x)$  be the function inverse to  $\lambda(n)$ . Suppose there is a proper distribution function  $K(x)$  such that, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(1.1) \quad P \left\{ \frac{X_1 + X_2 + \dots + X_n}{\lambda(n)} \leq x \right\} \longrightarrow K(x)$$

at every continuity point of  $K(x)$ . Then, if  $R(x)$  is any regularly varying function of index  $\alpha > 0$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\underline{e R(N(x)) \sim I(\alpha\beta) R(\Lambda(x)) ,}$$

where

$$\underline{I(\alpha\beta) = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{u^{\alpha\beta}} dK(u) .}$$

The integral  $I(\alpha\beta)$  may be divergent, in which case it is to be understood that

$$\underline{e R(N(x)) / R(\Lambda(x)) \rightarrow +\infty \text{ as } x \rightarrow +\infty .}$$

Note that the inverse of a regularly varying function is a regularly varying function and that, consequently,  $\Lambda(x)$  is regularly varying with index  $\beta$ . We also remark that it will be seen later that  $I(\alpha\beta)$  is necessarily finite when a condition " $\Phi(0+) > 0$ ", to be explained later, is satisfied.

The special case of Theorem 1 when the  $\{X_n\}$  are identically distributed, non-negative random variables is not uninteresting. Feller (1966 p. 424 Theorem 2) provides an appropriate convergence theorem. Unfortunately, as he gives it, it does not give results when his exponent has the value unity. From the material he provides, however, one can prove quite easily the following.

Theorem A. Let  $\{X_n\}$  be an infinite sequence of mutually independent, identically distributed, non-negative random variables with distribution function  $F(x)$ . Let  $\Lambda(x)$  be a continuous and non-decreasing regularly varying function with exponent  $\beta$ ,  $0 < \beta \leq 1$ , and suppose that, as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{1}{x} \int_0^x \{1 - F(u)\} du \sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-\beta) \Lambda(x)} .$$


---

Let  $\lambda(n)$  be the regularly varying function which is inverse to  $\Lambda(x)$ . Then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$P\left\{ \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{\lambda(n)} \leq x \right\} \longrightarrow G(x)$$


---

at all points of continuity, where  $G(x)$  is the stable distribution function with Laplace-Stieltjes transform  $G^*(s) = e^{-s^\beta}$ .

Incidentally, when  $0 < \beta < 1$  (i.e.  $\beta \neq 1$ ), the condition (1.2) is equivalent to the simpler

$$\{1 - F(x)\} \sim \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\beta) \Lambda(x)} .$$

From Theorem A and Theorem 1 we then have the following renewal theorem for non-negative and identically distributed random variables: -

Theorem 2. Under the conditions of Theorem A, for any regularly varying function  $R(x)$ , with exponent  $\alpha > 0$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$E \{R(x)\} \sim \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(\alpha\beta+1)} R(\Lambda(x)) .$$


---

Notice that Theorem 2 does not provide information if  $\beta = 0$ . However, the special case  $\{\beta = 0; \alpha = 1\}$  has been discussed, to some extent, in an

elementary fashion already (Smith, 1961). All we need to deduce Theorem 2 from the earlier ones is the evaluation of  $I(\alpha\beta)$  for the stable law  $G(x)$ .

We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{u^{\alpha\beta}} dG(u) &= \int_0^{\infty} \left\{ \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\lambda u} \frac{\lambda^{\alpha\beta-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha\beta)} d\lambda \right\} dG(u) \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\lambda^\beta} \frac{\lambda^{\alpha\beta-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha\beta)} d\lambda \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+1)}{\Gamma(\alpha\beta+1)}, \text{ as claimed.} \end{aligned}$$

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1.

We begin by mentioning certain results from "standard" probability theory which we shall use. Let  $\{F_n(x)\}$  be the respective distribution functions of the variables  $\{X_n\}$ . Then, denoting Laplace-Stieltjes transforms thus:  $F_n^*(s)$ , for  $s$  real and positive, we see that (1.1) implies

$$(2.1) \quad \prod_{j=1}^n F_j^* \left( \frac{s}{\lambda(n)} \right) \rightarrow K^*(s), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Let us write, for  $x > 0$ ,

$$\Phi_n(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^{x\lambda(n)} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du.$$

Then, plainly,  $\Phi_n(x)$  is a non-decreasing function of  $x$  and it is not a difficult piece of analysis to deduce from (2.1) that

$$\Phi_n^*(s) \rightarrow \frac{1}{s} \log \frac{1}{K^*(s)}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Therefore by the continuity theorem for Laplace-Stieltjes transforms (Feller, 1966, p. 410), there is a non-decreasing function  $\Phi(x)$  (possibly with a jump at  $x = 0$ , which must be taken into account when calculating transforms) and, at continuity points,  $\Phi_n(x) \rightarrow \Phi(x)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore,

$$\Phi^*(s) = \frac{1}{s} \log \frac{1}{K^*(s)}.$$

We can quickly determine whether  $\Phi(x)$  has a jump at  $x = 0$ , since we must evidently have

$$\Phi(0+) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{s} \log \frac{1}{K^*(s)}.$$

Incidentally, it is not hard to show that, when  $\Phi(0+) > 0$ ,  $I(\alpha\beta)$  is finite for all  $\alpha > 0$ . If we define, for  $x > 0$ , non-increasing functions

$$M_n(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n \{1 - F_j(x \lambda(n))\},$$

then  $\Phi_n(x) = \int_0^x M_n(u) du$  and so there must be a non-increasing function  $M(x)$  such that  $M_n(x) \rightarrow M(x)$ , at all continuity points, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Furthermore, for any  $a > b > 0$ ,

$$\Phi(a) - \Phi(b) = \int_b^a M(u) du,$$

as so

$$\Phi(x) = \Phi(0+) + \int_0^x M(u) du.$$

This implies

$$(2.2) \quad K^*(s) = e^{-s\Phi(0+)} - s \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} M(x) dx .$$

Because it has been so easy to derive these "classical" results for non-negative random variables, we thought it worthwhile and convenient to do so and at the same time introduce our notations. There is one further result we shall need which does not lie quite so near the surface. It transpires that, if (1.1) holds,  $K(x)$  cannot be any distribution function whose transform happens to have the form (2.2). In fact  $K(x)$  must be of "Lévy class L" which is the case if and only if  $M(e^x)$  is a convex function for  $-\infty < x < \infty$ . A minor consequence is that  $M(x)$  is continuous in  $0 < x < \infty$ . We refer to Feller (1966) or Gnedenko and Kolmogorov (1954) for a treatment of this convexity property.

One further preliminary needs discussion. A minor irritation in our work is that in various places we would wish a variable to be an integer and it may not be. When we write  $S_n$  and  $n$  is not an integer we shall mean by  $S_n$  the partial sum  $X_1 + \dots + X_k$ , where  $k$  is the least integer not less than  $n$ . If  $a < b$  are not integers we shall denote sums such as

$$\sum_{a < j \leq b} u_j$$

more simply as

$$\sum_a^b u_j \quad .$$

This will save some typographical problems.

Let us now consider the proof of Theorem 1. We begin by showing that if the theorem is once proved for  $R(x) \equiv x^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ , then it will follow for the general case by a rather amusing trick. Indeed, we shall only need the theorem proved for  $\alpha$  arbitrarily small. Let us suppose, therefore, that the theorem has been established when  $R(x) = x^\alpha$ . Suppose  $L(x)$  is an arbitrary function of slow growth and  $\gamma > \alpha$ . Let  $b(x)$  be a non-decreasing continuous function of  $x > 0$ , taking integer values when  $x$  is an integer, and such that

$$b(x) \sim x^{\gamma/\alpha} [L(x)]^{1/\alpha}, \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since  $\gamma > \alpha$  we have that  $b(x)/x$  and thence  $b(x+1) - b(x)$  are increasing for large  $x$ .

Suppose  $\{X_n\}$  to be a sequence of non-negative, independent random variables, such that

$$P \left\{ \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{\lambda(n)} \leq \xi \right\} \longrightarrow K(\xi), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Define a new sequence of random variables  $\{Y_n\}$  as follows. If the suffix  $k = b(r)+1$  for some  $r$  then  $Y_k = X_{r+1}$  (we can take  $b(0) = 1$  so  $Y_1 = X_1$ ); otherwise let  $P\{Y_k = 0\} = 1$ . Let us define a continuous non-decreasing  $\mathcal{G}(x)$  such that  $\mathcal{G}(n) = r$  for all integers  $n$  satisfying  $b(r) \leq n < b(r+1)$ . It is not



difficult to see that  $\mathcal{Q}(x)$  varies regularly with exponent  $(\alpha/\gamma)$  and that

$$P \left\{ \frac{\sum_1^n Y_j}{\lambda(\mathcal{Q}(n))} \leq \xi \right\} \longrightarrow K(\xi), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus  $\{Y_n\}$  is a sequence of random variables to which Theorem 1 applies, with  $\lambda(\mathcal{Q}(n))$  in place of  $\lambda(n)$ ; we note that  $\lambda(\mathcal{Q}(x))$  varies regularly, with exponent  $(\alpha/\beta\gamma)$ .

Now let  $M(x)$  be the maximum  $k$  such that  $Y_1 + \dots + Y_k \leq x$ . Then, noting that  $b(\Lambda(x))$  asymptotically equals the inverse of  $\lambda(\mathcal{Q}(n))$ , we have

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{E} \left\{ [M(x)]^\alpha \right\} \sim [\Lambda(x)]^\gamma L(\Lambda(x)) I(\beta\gamma).$$

But

$$\mathcal{E} \left\{ [M(x)]^\alpha \right\} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (n^\alpha - (n-1)^\alpha) P \left\{ Y_1 + \dots + Y_n \leq x \right\}$$

and, since so many  $Y$ 's are almost surely zero, we find this equation means

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} \left\{ [M(x)]^\alpha \right\} &= \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} ([b(r)]^\alpha - [b(r-1)]^\alpha) P \left\{ X_1 + \dots + X_r \leq x \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{E} \left\{ [b(N(x))]^\alpha \right\} \\ &= \mathcal{E} R(N(x)), \end{aligned}$$

if  $R(x) = x^\gamma L(x)$ . Thus, from (2.3) we have

$$\varepsilon R(N(x)) \sim R(\Lambda(x)) I(\beta\gamma),$$

as was to be proved.

Let us now consider the proof of Theorem 1 for the case  $R(x) \equiv x^\alpha$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ .

For fixed  $\xi > 0$  and varying  $x > 0$ , set  $n = \Lambda(x/\xi)$ . Then  $n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} P \left\{ N(x) \geq \Lambda(x/\xi) \right\} &= P \left\{ S_n \leq x \right\} \\ &= P \left\{ S_n \leq \xi \lambda(n) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.4) \quad \longrightarrow K(\xi), \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

provided  $\xi$  is a continuity point of  $K$ .

Since  $\Lambda(x)$  has exponent  $\beta > 0$ , we can write  $\Lambda(x) = x^\beta L(x)$  where  $L(x)$  is a function of slow growth.

Thus

$$\frac{\Lambda(x/\xi)}{\Lambda(x)} \longrightarrow \frac{1}{\xi^\beta}, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

and so, from (2.3), we have

$$P \left\{ \frac{N(x)}{\Lambda(x)} \geq \frac{1}{\xi^\beta} \right\} \longrightarrow K(\xi), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

or,

$$(2.5) \quad P \left\{ \frac{N(x)}{\Lambda(x)} \geq u \right\} \longrightarrow K(u^{-1/\beta}), \quad x \rightarrow \infty.$$

But

$$E \left\{ \left[ \frac{N(x)}{\Lambda(x)} \right]^\alpha \right\} = \alpha \int_0^\infty u^{-1} P \left\{ \frac{N(x)}{\Lambda(x)} \geq u \right\} du .$$

Thus we can infer from (2.4) and Fatou's lemma that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} E \left\{ \left[ \frac{N(x)}{\Lambda(x)} \right]^\alpha \right\} &\geq \alpha \int_0^\infty u^{\alpha-1} K(u^{-1/\beta}) du \\ &= I(\alpha\beta) . \end{aligned}$$

In the case when  $I(\alpha\beta) = \infty$  the theorem is proved. From now on we suppose  $I(\alpha\beta) < \infty$ . By dominated convergence we see that, for any  $C > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \alpha \int_0^C u^{\alpha-1} P \left\{ \frac{N(x)}{\Lambda(x)} \geq u \right\} du \\ = \alpha \int_0^C u^{\alpha-1} K(u^{-1/\beta}) du . \end{aligned}$$

The proof will be complete if we can show that, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can choose  $C = C(\epsilon)$  so that

$$(2.6) \quad \int_C^\infty u^{\alpha-1} P \left\{ \frac{N(x)}{\Lambda(x)} \geq u \right\} du < \epsilon$$

for all sufficiently large  $x$ .

For integer  $j$ , let us write  $G_j(x) \equiv P \left\{ S_j \leq x \right\} = P \left\{ N(x) \geq j \right\}$ .

Then (2.6) may be rewritten

$$\sum_{j \geq C} \Lambda(x) \int_{\left(\frac{j}{\Lambda(x)}\right)}^{\left(\frac{j+1}{\Lambda(x)}\right)} u^{\alpha-1} P \left\{ N(x) \geq u \Lambda(x) \right\} du < \epsilon,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j \geq C} G_{j+1}(x) \int_{\left(\frac{j}{\Lambda(x)}\right)}^{\left(\frac{j+1}{\Lambda(x)}\right)} u^{\alpha-1} du$$

Thus we see that our theorem will be proved if we can show that, for all large  $x$ ,

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_{j > C\Lambda(x)} j^{(\alpha-1)} G_j(x) < \epsilon [\Lambda(x)]^\alpha$$

The proof that, when  $I(\alpha\beta) < \infty$ , (2.7) must be true, is quite involved and is given the following two sections.

### 3. Completion of proof when $\Phi(0+) = 0$

Lemma 3.1. If  $\Phi^*(s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-sx} d\Phi(x)$  then, for all  $x > 0$ ,  $\Phi^*(1/x) \leq \Phi(x)$ . Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha\beta)} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\Phi(x)/x} \frac{dx}{x^{1+\alpha\beta}} \leq I(\alpha\beta).$$


---

Proof. The argument depends on the convexity of  $M(e^x)$ . Thus, if  $x > 0$  and  $y > 0$ ,

$$2 M(x) \leq M(xy) + M(xy^{-1}).$$

Evidently,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi*(x^{-1}) - \Phi(x) &= \frac{1}{x} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-u/x} \Phi(u) du - \Phi(x) \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} e^{-y} [\Phi(yx) - \Phi(x)] dy \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} e^{-y} \left\{ \int_x^{xy} M(u) du \right\} dy. \\ &= J_1 - J_2, \text{ say,} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \int_1^{\infty} e^{-y} \left\{ \int_x^{xy} M(u) du \right\} dy, \\ J_2 &= \int_0^1 e^{-y} \left\{ \int_{xy}^x M(u) du \right\} dy. \end{aligned}$$

If, in  $J_2$ , we set  $u = x/v$  we find

$$J_2 = x \int_0^1 e^{-y} \left\{ \int_1^{1/y} M(x/v) \frac{dv}{v^2} \right\} dy$$

and so, by the convexity of  $M(e^x)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} -J_2 &\leq x \int_0^1 e^{-y} \left\{ \int_1^{1/y} M(xv) \frac{dv}{v^2} \right\} dy \\ &\quad - 2x M(x) \int_0^1 e^{-y} \left\{ \int_1^{1/y} \frac{dv}{v^2} \right\} dy. \end{aligned}$$

But  $M(x)$  is non-increasing, and so

$$\begin{aligned} -J_2 &\leq -x M(x) \int_0^1 e^{-y} (1 - y) dy \\ &= - \frac{x M(x)}{e}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the monotonicity of  $M(x)$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &\leq x M(x) \int_1^\infty e^{-y} (y - 1) dy \\ &= \frac{x M(x)}{e}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently  $J_1 - J_2 \leq 0$  and  $\Phi^*(x^{-1}) \leq \Phi(x)$  as claimed. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\Phi(x)/x} \frac{dx}{x^{1+\alpha\beta}} &\leq \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\Phi^*(1/x)/x} \frac{dx}{x^{1+\alpha\beta}} \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} \frac{K^*(1/x)}{x^{1+\alpha\beta}} dx \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{e^{-u/x}}{x^{1+\alpha\beta}} dx dK(u) \\ &= \Gamma(\alpha\beta) \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{u^{\alpha\beta}} dK(u). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma. Notice, by the way, that it has not used  $\Phi(0+) = 0$ .

Lemma 3.2. Suppose  $\Phi(0+) = 0$ . Then, given any  $\delta > 0$ , one can find  $0 < a < b < \delta$ , such that

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left( \frac{\Phi(x)}{x} \right) \leq - \frac{\alpha\beta}{x} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}},$$

for all  $a \leq x \leq b$ .

Proof. Let us set  $\psi(x) = x^{-1} \Phi(x) = x^{-1} \int_1^x M(u) du$ , and note that  $\psi(x)$  is consequently differentiable and non-increasing. Suppose that for

some  $\delta > 0$  and almost all  $x \leq \delta$ ,

$$-x \psi'(x) \leq \alpha \beta + \sqrt{x}.$$

By integration we have

$$\psi(x) \leq \psi(\delta) + \alpha \beta \log(\delta/x) + 2\sqrt{\delta} - 2\sqrt{x}.$$

Thus

$$\int_0^\delta e^{-\psi(x)} \frac{dx}{x^{1+\alpha\beta}} \geq \frac{e^{\psi(\delta)+2\sqrt{\delta}}}{\delta^{\alpha\beta}} \int_0^\delta \frac{e^{2\sqrt{x}}}{x} dx.$$

The integral on the right diverges and so we have a contradiction, in view of Lemma 3.1. Thus, if  $E$  denotes the set of  $x$ -points where

$$-x \psi'(x) > \alpha \beta + \sqrt{x},$$

then the intersection  $E \cap (0, \delta)$  must have strictly positive Lebesgue measure for every  $\delta > 0$ . But  $-x \psi'(x) = \psi(x) - M(x)$ ; and both  $M(x)$  and  $\psi(x)$  are continuous. Thus  $-x \psi'(x)$  is continuous and so, in any interval  $(0, \delta)$  there must be a sub-interval  $(a, b)$ ,  $0 < a < b < \delta$ , such that

$$\inf_{x \in (a, b)} -x \psi'(x) \geq \alpha \beta + \sqrt{x}.$$

This proves the lemma.



Lemma 3.3. If  $\Phi(0+) = 0$  then there exists a constant  $A > \alpha\beta$ , together with  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\eta > 0$ , such that for all large  $n$

$$\frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{en}^n \lambda(j) \left\{ 1 - F_j(\eta \lambda(j)) \right\} \geq A.$$


---

Proof. Choose  $\rho > 0, 0 < \gamma < 1$ . For any integer  $P$  and all  $n \geq \gamma^{-P}$  define

$$\begin{aligned} T_{n,P}(\rho, \gamma) &= \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{n\gamma^P}^{n\gamma^{(P-1)}} \int_0^{\lambda(j)} \left\{ 1 - F_j(\rho u) \right\} du \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^{n\gamma^{(P-1)}} \int_0^{\lambda(n\gamma^P)} \left\{ 1 - F_j(\rho u) \right\} du \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^{n\gamma^P} \int_0^{\lambda(n\gamma^P)} \left\{ 1 - F_j(\rho u) \right\} du. \end{aligned}$$

We know that, for every  $\xi > 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^{\xi \lambda(n)} \left\{ 1 - F_j(u) \right\} du \longrightarrow \Phi(\xi).$$

We also know that  $\lambda(n)$  varies regularly, with exponent  $1/\beta$ . Thus, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(n\gamma^P) &\sim \gamma^{1/\beta} \lambda(n\gamma^{(P-1)}), \\ \lambda(n\gamma^{(P-1)}) &\sim \gamma^{(P-1)/\beta} \lambda(n). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{n,p}(\rho, \gamma) \geq \frac{\gamma^{(p-1)/\beta}}{\rho} \Phi(\gamma^{1/\beta} \rho) - \frac{\gamma^{p/\beta}}{\rho} \Phi(\rho),$$

and so, for any large integer  $k$ ,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{p=1}^k T_{n,p}(\rho, \lambda) \geq d_k, \text{ say,}$$

where

$$d_k = \left\{ \frac{\Phi(\gamma^{1/\beta} \rho)}{\gamma^{1/\beta} \rho} - \frac{\Phi(\rho)}{\rho} \right\} \sum_{p=1}^k \gamma^{p/\beta}.$$

Evidently, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $d_k \rightarrow d_\infty$  with

$$d_\infty = \frac{\gamma^{1/\beta}}{(1 - \gamma^{1/\beta})} \left\{ \frac{\Phi(\gamma^{1/\beta} \rho)}{\gamma^{1/\beta} \rho} - \frac{\Phi(\rho)}{\rho} \right\}.$$

But, by lemma 3.2, we can choose  $\gamma$  and  $\rho$  in such a way that

$$-x \psi'(x) \geq \alpha \beta + \sqrt{x}$$

for all  $x$  such that  $\gamma^{1/\beta} \rho \leq x \leq \rho$ . However, by the mean value theorem, there is a  $\theta$ ,  $0 < \theta < 1$ , such that

$$\psi(\rho) - \psi(\rho \gamma^{1/\beta}) = \rho(1 - \gamma^{1/\beta}) \psi'(\rho - \theta \rho [1 - \gamma^{1/\beta}]).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{\gamma^{1/\beta}}{(1-\gamma^{1/\beta})} \left\{ \psi(\rho \gamma^{1/\beta}) - \psi(\rho) \right\} \\
 & \geq \rho \gamma^{1/\beta} \left\{ \frac{\alpha \beta}{\rho - \theta \rho [1 - \gamma^{1/\beta}]} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho - \theta \rho [1 - \gamma^{1/\beta}]}} \right\} \\
 & \geq \rho \gamma^{1/\beta} \left\{ \frac{\alpha \beta}{\rho} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right\} \\
 & = \gamma^{1/\beta} \left\{ \alpha \beta + \sqrt{\rho} \right\} .
 \end{aligned}$$

We can choose  $\gamma < 1$  sufficiently close to unity to make  $\gamma^{1/\beta} \{ \alpha \beta + \sqrt{\rho} \} > \alpha \beta$  without spoiling our argument. Thus  $d_\infty > \alpha \beta$ , and so there is a large  $k$  such that  $d_k > \alpha \beta$ . This means that, if we set  $\epsilon = \gamma^{k/\beta}$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{\epsilon n}^n \int_0^{\lambda(j)} \left\{ 1 - F_j(\rho u) \right\} du > \alpha \beta .$$

However, for any small  $\delta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{\epsilon n}^n \int_0^{\lambda(j)\delta} \left\{ 1 - F_j(\rho u) \right\} du \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_1^n \int_0^{\lambda(n)\delta} \left\{ 1 - F_j(\rho u) \right\} du
 \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\rho \lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^{\lambda(j)\rho\delta} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du.$$

Therefore

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j \in n} \int_0^{\lambda(j)\delta} \{1 - F_j(\rho u)\} du \leq \frac{\Phi(\rho\delta)}{\rho},$$

and the right member can be made arbitrarily small by choice of  $\delta$  (since  $\Phi(0+) = 0$ ). It now follows that, for a suitably small  $\delta$ ,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j \in n} \int_{\lambda(j)\delta}^{\lambda(j)} \{1 - F_j(\rho u)\} du > \alpha \beta.$$

But, since  $\{1 - F_j(x)\}$  is a non-increasing function of  $x$ , this in turn implies

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j \in n} \lambda(j) \{1 - F_j(\rho\delta\lambda(j))\} > \alpha \beta.$$

If we set  $\eta = \rho\delta$  the lemma is proved.

We are now in a position to complete the task of this section. Let  $\Omega(x)$  be a non-decreasing function,  $\Omega(0) = 0$ , and let  $\Omega(x)$  increase only through jumps at the points  $x = \lambda(j)$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots$ ; the saltus at  $x = \lambda(j)$  is to be  $\{1 - F_j(\eta\lambda(j))\}$ . Lemma 3.3 then shows that for some  $A > \alpha\beta$  and all

$x \geq x_0$  (A),

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{1}{x} \int_{\epsilon x}^x u d\Omega(u) \geq A$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \int_{\epsilon \lambda(n)}^{\lambda(n)} u d\Omega(u) &= \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \left\{ 1 - F_j(\eta \lambda(j)) \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\eta \lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^{\eta \lambda(j)} \left\{ 1 - F_j(u) \right\} du. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{x} \int_{\epsilon x}^x u d\Omega(u) \leq \frac{\phi(\eta)}{\eta} < \infty,$$

and so there exists a finite B such that

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{1}{x} \int_{\epsilon x}^x u d\Omega(u) \leq B$$

for all  $x \geq x_0$ .

From (3.1) we have, if  $y > x \geq x_0$ ,

$$\int_x^y \frac{1}{u^2} \left\{ \int_{\epsilon u}^u v d\Omega(v) \right\} dv \geq A \log \frac{y}{x}.$$

But, by Fubini's Theorem (or integration by parts),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_x^y \frac{1}{u^2} \left\{ \int_{\epsilon u}^u v d\Omega(v) \right. du \\ = \int_x^y d\Omega(u) + \frac{1}{x} \int_{\epsilon x}^x u d\Omega(u) \\ \left. - \epsilon \int_{\epsilon x}^x d\Omega(u) - \frac{1}{y} \int_x^y u d\Omega(u) \right. . \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for  $y > x \geq x_0$ ,

$$\int_x^y d\Omega(u) \geq A \log \left( \frac{y}{x} \right) - B,$$

and so, if  $y \geq y_0$ , where

$$y_0 = \exp \left( \frac{2B}{A - \alpha\beta} \right),$$

we shall have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_x^y d\Omega(u) &\geq \left( \frac{A + \alpha\beta}{2} \right) \log \left( \frac{y}{x} \right) \\ &= \nu \log \frac{y}{x}, \quad \text{say,} \end{aligned}$$

where  $v > \alpha\beta$ . Thus, if  $\lambda(n) \geq (x/\eta) y_0$  and  $(x/\eta) \geq x_0$ ,

$$\sum_{\Lambda(x/\eta)}^n \left\{ 1 - F_j(\eta \lambda(j)) \right\} \geq v \log \left( \frac{\lambda(n)}{(x/\eta)} \right),$$

whence,

$$\sum_{\Lambda(x/\eta)}^n \left\{ 1 - F_j(x) \right\} \geq v \log \left( \frac{\lambda(n)}{(x/\eta)} \right)$$

and, a fortiori,

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_1^n \left\{ 1 - F_j(x) \right\} \geq v \log \left( \frac{\lambda(n)}{(x/\eta)} \right).$$

From rather obvious probabilistic considerations we have

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} G_n(x) &\leq \prod_{j=1}^n F_j(x) \\ &\leq e^{-\sum_1^n \{1 - F_j(x)\}} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if  $\lambda(n) \geq x y_0/\eta$  and if  $x \geq x_0 \eta$ , from (3.3) and (3.4) we find

$$G_n(x) \leq \left( \frac{x}{\eta \lambda(n)} \right)^v.$$

The inequality on  $n$  is equivalent to one of the form  $n \geq C \Lambda(x)$ , for  $C$

sufficiently large. Thus

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{n > C\Lambda(x)} n^{\alpha-1} G_n(x) \leq \left(\frac{x}{\eta}\right)^v \sum_{n > C\Lambda(x)} \frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{[\lambda(n)]^v} .$$

At this point we need the following result on regularly varying functions.

Lemma 3.4. If  $Z(n)$  varies regularly with exponent  $\gamma$  and if  $\gamma + \alpha < 0$   
then, as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sum_{n=t}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-1} Z(n) \sim \frac{t^{\alpha} Z(t)}{|\gamma + \alpha|} .$$


---

This lemma is closely analogous to a familiar result involving an integral in place of a summation (see Theorem 1, p. 273, of Feller (1966) where, however, the proof of a vital lemma is incorrect, though salvable). For this reason no proof of Lemma 3.4 seems necessary.

If, in (3.5) we let  $v = \alpha\beta + \delta\beta$ ,  $\delta > 0$ , then the function

$$Z(n) = \{\lambda(n)\}^{-v}$$

varies regularly with exponent  $-(\alpha + \delta)$ . Thus we can appeal to Lemma 3.4 to find that, as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sum_{n > C\Lambda(x)} \frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{[\lambda(n)]^v} \sim \frac{[C\Lambda(x)]^{\alpha}}{\delta[\lambda(C\Lambda(x))]^v} \sim \frac{[\Lambda(x)]^{\alpha}}{\delta C^{\delta} x^v} .$$



We then, finally, deduce from (3.5) that

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{[\Lambda(x)]^\alpha} \sum_{n > C\Lambda(x)} n^{\alpha-1} G_n(x) \leq \frac{1}{\delta \eta^\nu C^\delta} .$$

Since  $C$  can be chosen arbitrarily large, the theorem is proved for the case  $\Phi(0+) = 0$ .

4 Completions of proof when  $\Phi(0+) > 0$

The following lemma, needed here, generalizes a result buried in Smith (1964).

Lemma 4.1. Let  $\{X_n\}$  be a sequence of independent, non-negative, random variables with distribution functions  $\{F_n(x)\}$ . Set, for  $x > 0$ ,

$$\Phi_n(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^{x\lambda(n)} \left\{ 1 - F_j(u) \right\} du.$$

If, for some  $x > 0$ ,  $\Phi_n(x)$  is a bounded function of  $n$  and if there is a  $\delta > 0$  such that, for every  $x > 0$ ,

$$(4.1) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_n(x) \geq \delta ,$$

then, for any  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can find  $C(\epsilon)$  such that for all large  $x$ , using established notation,

$$\sum_{j > C\Lambda(x)} j^{(\alpha-1)} G_j(x) < \epsilon [\Lambda(x)]^\alpha .$$

Proof. Suppose that  $\phi_n(\zeta) \leq A < \infty$  for all  $n$  and some fixed  $\zeta > 0$ . From the fact that (4.1) holds we must be able to find an unbounded non-decreasing function  $w(\lambda(n))$  such that, for all large  $n$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^{\lambda(n)/w(\lambda)} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du \geq \delta .$$

This inequality remains valid if we replace  $w(\lambda)$  by a more slowly increasing  $w_1(\lambda) \leq w(\lambda)$ . Thus, by Lemma 9 of Smith (1964) we may suppose that  $w(\lambda)$  is continuous, non-decreasing, and unbounded, and that  $\lambda/w(\lambda)$  is an increasing function of  $\lambda$ . Let us define  $\ell(\lambda) = \log w(\lambda)$ ; evidently  $\lambda/\ell(\lambda)$  is also, for all large  $\lambda$ , an increasing function. Let us now set

$$t(n) = \frac{\lambda(n) \ell(n)}{w(n)} .$$

Then

$$\frac{t(n)}{\ell(t(n))} = \frac{\lambda(n)}{w(n)} \frac{\log w(n)}{\log w(t(n))} .$$

However, for all large  $n$ ,  $\lambda(n) \geq t(n)$ ; therefore

$$\frac{t(n)}{\ell(t(n))} \geq \frac{\lambda(n)}{w(n)} .$$

Thus, whenever  $\lambda(r) \geq t(n)$ , or, equivalently,  $r \geq \Lambda(t(n))$ , we shall have

$$\frac{\lambda(r)}{\ell(\lambda(r))} \geq \frac{\lambda(n)}{w(n)} .$$

Therefore, for all large  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^{\Lambda(t(n))-1} \int_0^{\lambda(n)/w(\lambda(n))} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du \\ & + \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{\Lambda(t(n))}^n \int_0^{\lambda(j)/\ell(\lambda(j))} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du \geq \delta , \end{aligned}$$

that is, say,

$$T_1(n) + T_2(n) \geq \delta .$$

Choose a small  $\eta > 0$ . Since  $t(n)/\lambda(n) = \ell(n)/w(n) \rightarrow 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we shall have  $t(n) < \eta \lambda(n)$  for all large  $n$ . Also, since  $w(\lambda(n)) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we shall have  $\lambda(n)/w(\lambda(n)) < \xi \eta \lambda(n)$  for all large  $n$ .

Thus

$$T_1(n) < \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_1^{\Lambda(\eta \lambda(n))} \int_0^{\xi \eta \lambda(n)} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du .$$

But  $\Lambda(\eta \lambda(n)) \sim \eta^\beta n$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and so  $\Lambda(\eta \lambda(n)) < 2\eta^\beta n$

for all large  $n$ . Therefore

$$T_1(n) < \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_1^{2\eta^\beta n} \int_0^{\zeta_{\eta\lambda(n)}} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du .$$

However  $\lambda(2\eta^\beta n) \sim 2^{1/\beta} \eta \lambda(n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and so  $\lambda(2\eta^\beta n) > \eta \lambda(n)$  for all large  $n$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} T_1(n) &< \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_1^{2\eta^\beta n} \int_0^{\zeta_{\lambda(2\eta^\beta n)}} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du \\ &< \frac{\lambda(2\eta^\beta n)}{\lambda(n)} A . \end{aligned}$$

We may then infer that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_1(n) < 2^{1/\beta} \eta A .$$

Thus, since  $\eta$  is arbitrarily small, we conclude that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_2(n) \geq \delta$$

and so there must exist some  $\delta_1 > 0$  such that, for all large  $n$ ,

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{1}{\lambda(n)} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\lambda(j)/\ell(\lambda(j))}{\lambda(n)} \left\{ 1 - F_j(u) \right\} du \geq \delta_1.$$

For a given large  $x$  define  $r^* = r^*(x)$  as the greatest integer such that  $\lambda(r^*)/\ell(\lambda(r^*)) \leq x$ . Let  $s^* = s^*(x)$  be the greatest integer such that  $\lambda(s^*)/\ell(\lambda(s^*)) \leq (1 + \epsilon)x$ . Choose a large  $C > 0$  and consider the following three cases.

(i)  $C \Lambda(x) < n < r^*(x)$ .

By a familiar inequality (see e.g. Smith (1964)),

$$(4.3) \quad G_n(x) \leq e^{W_n(t)}, \quad t > 0,$$

where

$$(4.4) \quad W_n(t) = tx - t \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} e^{-tu} \left\{ 1 - F_j(u) \right\} du$$

Let  $t = 1/x$  and truncate the integrals at  $x$  in (4.4) and we find

$$(4.5) \quad W_n(1/x) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{e^x} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^x \left\{ 1 - F_j(u) \right\} du.$$

Since  $\lambda(j)/\ell(\lambda(j)) \leq x$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n \leq r^*(x)$  we have from (4.2) that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^x \left\{ 1 - F_j(u) \right\} du > \lambda(n) \delta_1.$$

Thus, from (4.5),

$$W_n(1/x) \leq 1 - \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(n)}{e x},$$

and so

$$(4.6) \quad G_n(x) \leq \exp \left\{ 1 - \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(n)}{e x} \right\}, \quad n \leq r^*.$$

$$(ii) \quad \underline{r^*(x)} < n \leq \underline{s^*(x)}$$

By combining inequalities (3.4) and (4.3) we have that

$$(4.7) \quad G_n(x) \leq e^{R_n(t)}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_n(t) &= \frac{1}{2} tx - \frac{t}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^{\infty} e^{-tu} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n \{1 - F_j(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, truncating integrals,

$$(4.8) \quad R_n(1/x) \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2ex} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_0^x \{1 - F_j(u)\} du$$

(contd.)

$$- \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r^{*}+1}^n \{1 - F_j(x)\} .$$

Let us set

$$\gamma_j = \int_0^{\lambda(j)/\ell(\lambda(j))} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du ,$$

$$I_j(x) = \int_0^x \{1 - F_j(u)\} du .$$

Then (4.2) can be rewritten

$$(4.9) \quad \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \dots + \gamma_n > \delta_1 \lambda(n).$$

If  $j > r^*$  (so  $\lambda(j)/\ell(\lambda(j)) > x$ ), we have

$$\int_x^{\lambda(j)/\ell(\lambda(j))} \{1 - F_j(u)\} du = \gamma_j - I_j(x).$$

Therefore

$$(4.10) \quad \left( \frac{\lambda(j)}{\ell(\lambda(j))} - x \right) (1 - F_j(x)) \geq \gamma_j - I_j(x) .$$

But, if  $j \leq s^*(x)$ , then  $\lambda(j)/\ell(\lambda(j)) \leq (1 + e)x$ , which means

$$\left( \frac{\lambda(j)}{\ell(\lambda(j))} - x \right) \leq ex .$$

Thus, from (4.10) ,

$$1 - F_j(x) \geq \frac{\gamma_j - I_j(x)}{e^x}, \quad r^* < j \leq s^*$$

From this result and (4.8) we infer

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.11) \quad R_n(1/x) &< \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2ex} \sum_1^{r^*} \gamma_j - \frac{1}{2ex} \sum_{r^*+1}^n I_j(x) \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{2ex} \sum_{r^*+1}^n (\gamma_j - I_j(x)) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2ex} \sum_1^n \gamma_j \\
 &< \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(n)}{2ex},
 \end{aligned}$$

by (4.2). Therefore, from (4.7) we have

$$(4.12) \quad G_n(x) < \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(n)}{2ex} \right\}, \quad r^* < n \leq s^*$$

From (4.6) and (4.12) we may thus infer that



$$\sum_{n=C\Lambda(x)+1}^{s^*} n^{\alpha-1} G_n(x) < e^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{C\Lambda(x)}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-1} e^{-(\delta_1 \lambda(n)/2ex)}.$$

$$< e^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{C\Lambda(x)}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-1} \left( \frac{2ex}{\delta_1 \lambda(n)} \right),$$

if we choose  $C$  sufficiently large so that the inequality  $e^{-\zeta} < \zeta^{-1}$  is valid for  $\zeta = (\delta_1 \lambda(n)/2ex)$ . The argument used near the end of § 3 will then show that

$$(4.13) \quad \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{[\Lambda(x)]^\alpha} \sum_{n > C\Lambda(x)}^{s^*(x)} n^{\alpha-1} G_n(x)$$

can be made arbitrarily small, by choice of  $C$ .

(iii)  $s^*(x) < n$  Arguments similar to those for case (ii) show that (4.7) holds with (4.8) replaced by

$$(4.14) \quad R_n(1/x) < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2ex} \sum_1^{s^*} \gamma_j - \frac{1}{2ex} \sum_{s^*+1}^n I_j(x)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s^*+1}^n \left\{ \frac{\gamma_j - I_j(x)}{\frac{\lambda(j)}{\ell(\lambda(j))} - x} \right\}.$$

However, when  $j > s^*$ ,  $\lambda(j)/\ell(\lambda(j)) > (1+e)x$  and one can infer that

$$\left( \frac{\lambda(j)}{\ell(\lambda(j))} - x \right) > ex$$

and hence deduce that

$$(4.15) \quad R_n(1/x) < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2ex} \sum_1^{s^*} \gamma_j$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s^*+1}^n \left\{ \frac{\gamma_j}{\frac{\lambda(j)}{\ell(\lambda(j))} - x} \right\} .$$

Write

$$T_n = \sum_{s^*+1}^n \left\{ \frac{\gamma_j}{\frac{\lambda(j)}{\ell(\lambda(j))} - x} \right\}$$

and

$$\Gamma_j = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \dots + \gamma_j .$$

Then

$$T_n = \frac{\Gamma_n}{\frac{\lambda(n)}{\ell(\lambda(j))} - x} - \frac{\Gamma_{s^*}}{\frac{\lambda(s^*+1)}{\ell(\lambda(s^*+1))} - x}$$

(contd.)

$$+ \sum_{s^{*+1}}^{n-1} \Gamma_j \left\{ \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda(j)}{\ell(\lambda(j))}^{-x}} - \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda(j+1)}{\ell(\lambda(j+1))}^{-x}} \right\}$$

We may assume  $s^*(x)$  to be large, so that  $\Gamma_j > \delta_1 \lambda(j)$  for all  $j$  in the range. Thus

$$T_n > \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(n)}{\frac{\lambda(n)}{\ell(\lambda(n))}^{-x}} - \frac{\Gamma_{s^*}}{\frac{\lambda(s^*+1)}{\ell(\lambda(s^*+1))}^{-x}}$$

$$+ \delta_1 \sum_{s^{*+1}}^{n-1} \lambda(j) \left\{ \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda(j)}{\ell(\lambda(j))}^{-x}} - \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda(j+1)}{\ell(\lambda(j+1))}^{-x}} \right\}$$

$$= \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(s^*+1) - \Gamma_{s^*}}{\frac{\lambda(s^*+1)}{\ell(\lambda(s^*+1))}^{-x}}$$

$$+ \delta_1 \sum_{s^{*+2}}^n \left\{ \frac{\lambda(j) - \lambda(j-1)}{\frac{\lambda(j)}{\ell(\lambda(j))}^{-x}} \right\}$$

If we use this last inequality in (4.14) we find

$$(4.16) \quad 2R_n(x^{-1}) < 1 - \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(s^*+1)}{\frac{\lambda(s^*+1)}{\ell(\lambda(s^*+1))} - x} - \delta_1 \ell(\lambda(s^*+2)) \sum_{s^*+2}^n \left\{ \frac{\lambda(j) - \lambda(j-1)}{\lambda(j)} \right\}$$

If  $|x-j| < 1$  then  $\lambda(x)/\lambda(j) \rightarrow 1$  as  $x$  and  $j$  increase. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s^*+2}^n \left\{ \frac{\lambda(j) - \lambda(j-1)}{\lambda(j)} \right\} &\sim \int_{s^*+1}^n \frac{d\lambda(x)}{\lambda(x)} \\ &= \log \left( \frac{\lambda(n)}{\lambda(s^*+1)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for some  $\delta_2$ ,  $0 < \delta_2 < \delta_1$ , we have from (4.16) that, for all large  $x$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} 2R_n(x^{-1}) < 1 - \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(s^*+1)}{\frac{\lambda(s^*+1)}{\ell(\lambda(s^*+1))} - x} \\ - 2\delta_2 \ell(\lambda(s^*+1)) \log \left( \frac{\lambda(n)}{\lambda(s^*+1)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We must thus conclude from (4.7) that, when  $n > s^*$ ,

$$G_n(x) < \left[ \frac{\lambda(s^*+1)}{\lambda(n)} \right]^{\delta_2 \ell(\lambda(s^*+1))} e^{-\psi(x)},$$



where

$$(4.17) \quad \psi(x) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(s^*(x)+1)}{2 \left( \frac{\lambda(s^*+1)}{\ell(\lambda(s^*+1))} - x \right)}.$$

For sufficiently large  $x$ ,  $\delta_2 \ell(\lambda(s^*(x)+1)) > \chi > \alpha \beta$ , and so

$$\sum_{s^*+1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-1} G_n(x) < e^{\psi(x)} [\lambda(s^*+1)]^{\chi} \sum_{s^*+1}^{\infty} \frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{[\lambda(n)]^{\chi}}$$

But  $[\lambda(n)]^{-\chi}$  varies regularly with exponent  $-\chi/\beta$ , and so, from Lemma 3.4 we have, as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sum_{s^*+1}^{\infty} \frac{n^{\alpha-1}}{[\lambda(n)]^{\chi}} \sim \frac{\beta(s^*+1)^{\alpha}}{[\lambda(s^*+1)]^{\chi} |\chi - \alpha \beta|}$$

Therefore

$$(4.18) \quad \sum_{s^*+1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-1} G_n(x) = o((s^*+1)^{\alpha} e^{\psi(x)}),$$

Since

$$\frac{\lambda(s^*+1)}{\ell(\lambda(s^*+1))} = \left( \frac{\lambda(s^*+1)}{\lambda(s^*)} \right) \left( \frac{\ell(\lambda(s^*))}{\ell(\lambda(s^*+1))} \right) \left( \frac{\lambda(s^*)}{\lambda(\ell(s^*))} \right)$$

$$\leq \left( \frac{\lambda(s^{*+1})}{\lambda(s^*)} \right) (1+e) x ,$$

it is clear that for large  $x$

$$\frac{\lambda(s^{*+1})}{L(\lambda(s^{*+1}))} \leq (1+2e)x .$$

Therefore, from (4.17) ,

$$(4.19) \quad \psi(x) < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\delta_1 \lambda(s^{*+1})}{4ex} .$$

Furthermore, if we represent  $\lambda(x) = x^{1/\beta} L(x)$ , where  $L(x)$  is a function of slow growth,

$$(4.20) \quad \left( \frac{s^{*+1}}{\Lambda(x)} \right)^{1/\beta} = \frac{\lambda(s^{*+1})}{x} \cdot \frac{L(\Lambda(x))}{L(s^{*+1})} .$$

But, from the familiar canonical representation of  $L(x)$  due to Karamata (1930),

$$L(x) = a(x) e^{\int_1^x \frac{\mathcal{E}(u)}{u} du} ,$$

where  $a(x) \rightarrow 1$  and  $\mathcal{E}(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  . Thus, for some finite  $A_1 > 0$

$$\frac{L(\Lambda(x))}{L(s^{*+1})} \leq A_1 \exp \left\{ - \int_{\Lambda(x)}^{s^{*+1}} \frac{\mathcal{E}(u)}{u} du \right\}$$

$$\leq A_1 \left( \frac{s^{*+1}}{\Lambda(x)} \right)^{\epsilon/\beta},$$

for all large  $x$  and arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$ . Thus, from (4.20),

$$(4.21) \quad \left( \frac{s^{*+1}}{\Lambda(x)} \right)^{(1-\epsilon)/\beta} \leq A_1 \left( \frac{\lambda(s^{*+1})}{x} \right).$$

From (4.18), (4.19), and (4.21) we then deduce

$$(4.22) \quad \frac{1}{[\Lambda(x)]^\alpha} \sum_{s^{*+1}}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-1} G_n(x) \\ = O \left( [\omega(x)]^{\alpha\beta/(1-\epsilon)} e^{-\delta_1 \omega(x)/4e} \right),$$

say, where  $\omega(x) = \lambda(s^*(x)+1)/x$ . But  $\lambda(s^{*+1}) > (1+\epsilon)x \ell(\lambda(s^{*+1}))$ , and so  $\omega(x) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus we have, finally, from (4.22) that

$$\frac{1}{[\Lambda(x)]^\alpha} \sum_{s^{*+1}}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-1} G_n(x) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

This result, coupled with the arbitrary smallness of (4.13), completes the proof of the theorem.



### References

- Feller, W. (1966), An introduction to probability theory and its applications , Vol. II, Wiley, New York.
- Gnedenko, B.V. and Kolmogorov, A.N. (1954), Limit distributions for sums of independent random variables, Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, Mass.
- Karamata, J. (1930), "Sur un mode de croissance régulière des fonctions", Mathematics (Cluj), 4 , 38-53.
- Smith, W.L. (1964), "On the elementary renewal theorem for non-identically distributed variables", Pacific J. Math., 14 , 673-699.
- Smith, W.L. (1967), "On the weak law of large numbers and the generalized elementary renewal theorem", to appear in Pacific J. Math.
- Williamson, J.A. (1966), "A relation between a class of limit laws and a renewal theorem", Illinois J. Math. 10, 210- 219.

## DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&amp;D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)		2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	
		2b. GROUP	
3. REPORT TITLE ON INFINITELY DIVISIBLE LAWS AND A RENEWAL THEOREM FOR NON-NEGATIVE RANDOM VARIABLES.			
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) Technical Report			
5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial) Smith, Walter L.			
6. REPORT DATE February 1967		7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 39	7b. NO. OF REFS 6
8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. NONR-855-(09)		9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) Institute of Statistics Mimeo Series Number 511.	
b. PROJECT NO. RR-003-05-01		9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)	
c.			
d.			
10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES Distribution of the document in unlimited.			
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Logistics and Mathematical Statistics Br. Office of Naval Research Washington, D. C. 20360	
13. ABSTRACT  Let $\{X_n\}$ be an infinite sequence of independent non-negative random variables such that, for some regularly varying non-decreasing function $\lambda(n)$ , with exponent $1/\beta$ , $0 < \beta < \infty$ , as $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,			
$P \left\{ \frac{X_1 + \dots + X_n}{\lambda(n)} \leq x \right\} \rightarrow K(x)$			
at all continuity points of some d.f. $K(x)$ . Let $\Lambda(x)$ be the function inverse to $\lambda(n)$ , let $R(x)$ be any other regularly varying function of exponent $\alpha > 0$ . Then, if $N(x)$ is the maximum $k$ for which $X_1 + \dots + X_k \leq x$ , it is proved that, as $x \rightarrow \infty$ ,			
$\varepsilon R(N(x)) \sim I(\alpha\beta) R(\Lambda(x))$			
where			
$I(\alpha\beta) = \int_0^\infty \frac{1}{u^{\alpha\beta}} dK(u)$			
and this latter integral may diverge.			

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Renewal Theory Infinitely divisible laws Positive Random Variables Regularly varying functions						

**INSTRUCTIONS**

1. **ORIGINATING ACTIVITY:** Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization (*corporate author*) issuing the report.
- 2a. **REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION:** Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.
- 2b. **GROUP:** Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.
3. **REPORT TITLE:** Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.
4. **DESCRIPTIVE NOTES:** If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.
5. **AUTHOR(S):** Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.
6. **REPORT DATE:** Enter the date of the report as day, month, year; or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.
- 7a. **TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES:** The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.
- 7b. **NUMBER OF REFERENCES:** Enter the total number of references cited in the report.
- 8a. **CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER:** If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.
- 8b, 8c, & 8d. **PROJECT NUMBER:** Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.
- 9a. **ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S):** Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.
- 9b. **OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S):** If the report has been assigned any other report numbers (*either by the originator or by the sponsor*), also enter this number(s).
10. **AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES:** Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those

imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

- (1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- (2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."
- (3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."
- (4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."
- (5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through \_\_\_\_\_."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. **SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES:** Use for additional explanatory notes.
12. **SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY:** Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (*paying for*) the research and development. Include address.
13. **ABSTRACT:** Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (C), or (U).

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. **KEY WORDS:** Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, roles, and weights is optional.