

**Part III**  
**Asymptotic Theory**

# 1. Introduction

## 1. Modes of Convergence

In this section, we will study various modes of convergence for a sequence  $\{X_n\}$  of random variables.

**Definition 1 (a.s. convergence)** *Let  $X_n$  be defined on a common probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ . We say that  $\{X_n\}$  converges almost surely to  $X$  if*

$$\mathbf{P} \{ \omega \mid X_n(\omega) \rightarrow X(\omega) \} = 1$$

and write  $X_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} X$ .

**Remark** We may equivalently formulate the a.s. convergence as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \{ \omega : |X_n(\omega) - X(\omega)| > \varepsilon \text{ i.o.} \} &= \mathbf{P} \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k \geq n} \{ \omega : |X_k(\omega) - X(\omega)| > \varepsilon \} \\ &= \mathbf{P} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{ \omega : |X_n(\omega) - X(\omega)| > \varepsilon \} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

or similarly as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \{ \omega : |X_n(\omega) - X(\omega)| < \varepsilon \text{ ev.} \} &= \mathbf{P} \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{k \geq n} \{ \omega : |X_k(\omega) - X(\omega)| < \varepsilon \} \\ &= \mathbf{P} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{ \omega : |X_n(\omega) - X(\omega)| < \varepsilon \} \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

**Definition 2 (convergence in probability)** *Let  $X_n$  be defined on a common probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ . We say that  $\{X_n\}$  converges in probability to  $X$  if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\mathbf{P} \{ \omega : |X_n(\omega) - X(\omega)| > \varepsilon \} \rightarrow 0$$

and denote by  $X_n \rightarrow_p X$ .

**Definition 3 (convergence in  $L^p$ )** Let  $X_n$  be defined on a common probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ . We say that  $\{X_n\}$  converges in  $L^p$  to  $X$  if

$$\mathbf{E}|X_n - X|^p \rightarrow 0$$

and write  $X_n \rightarrow_{L^p} X$ .

**Remark** Most commonly considered is the case  $p = 2$ , i.e.  $L^2$ -convergence, which we often refer to as the *mean squared error* convergence.

For a random variable  $X$  defined on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ , we define the *distribution* of  $X$  to be the probability measure given by

$$P_X(B) = \mathbf{P} \circ X^{-1}(B)$$

for any Borel set  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})$ , the Borel  $\sigma$ -field on  $\mathbf{R}$ .

**Definition 4 (convergence in distribution)** We say that  $\{X_n\}$  converges in distribution to  $X$  if

$$\mathbf{E}f(X_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}f(X)$$

for every function  $f$  that is bounded and continuous a.s. in  $P_X$ , and write in symbols  $X_n \rightarrow_d X$ .

### Remarks

(a) In the above definition, the function  $f$  need not be continuous at every point. It suffices that  $f$  is continuous with  $P_X$  probability 1, i.e.,  $f$  may be discontinuous on a set  $N$  such that  $P_X(N) = 0$ .

(b) For the convergence in distribution,  $\{X_n\}$  need not be defined on a common probability space. It is not a convergence of  $\{X_n\}$ , but that of probability measures  $\{P_n\}$  induced by  $\{X_n\}$ . We may regard it as a convergence in the set of probability measures with some weak topology. For this reason, it is often referred to as the *weak convergence*.

(c) Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be two probability measures on  $(\mathbf{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}))$ . Then  $P = Q$  if and

only if  $P(B) = Q(B)$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})$ . We may show that the condition holds if and only if  $\int f dP = \int f dQ$  for every bounded and continuous  $f$ . Our definition of convergence in distribution may similarly be motivated.

In what follows, we let  $F_n$  (and  $F$ ) and  $\varphi_n$  (and  $\varphi$ ), respectively, be the distribution and characteristic functions of  $X_n$  (and  $X$ ).

**Lemma 1** *The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $X_n \rightarrow_d X$ .
- (b)  $\mathbf{E}f(X_n) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}f(X)$  for every bounded and uniformly continuous  $f$ .
- (c)  $F_n(t) \rightarrow F(t)$  for every continuity point  $t$  of  $F$ .
- (d)  $\varphi_n(t) \rightarrow \varphi(t)$  for all  $t$ .

**Proof** It is trivial that (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b). To see that (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (c), consider

$$f_t(x) = \mathbf{I}\{x \leq t\}$$

Clearly,  $f_t$  is bounded, and continuous a.s. in  $P_X$  whenever  $t$  is a continuity point of  $F$ . It thus follows that  $F_n(t) = \mathbf{E}f_t(X_n)$  converges to  $F(t) = \mathbf{E}f_t(X)$  for such point  $t$ . For the implication (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (d), look at the class of functions

$$f_t(x) = e^{itx}$$

For every  $t$ , the function  $f_t$  is bounded and continuous. Therefore,  $\varphi_n(t) = \mathbf{E}f_t(X_n)$  converges to  $\varphi(t) = \mathbf{E}f_t(X)$ . The proofs for other implications are more involved and omitted. ■

**Definition 5 (convergence of moments)** *We say that  $\{X_n\}$  converges to  $X$  in the  $p$ -th moment if*

$$\mathbf{E} X_n^p \rightarrow \mathbf{E} X^p$$

**Remark** Let  $\hat{\theta}_n$  be an estimator of the parameter  $\theta$ . For  $\hat{\theta}_n$  to be a good estimator, it must be *consistent* and *asymptotically normal*, if properly standardized. The estimator

$\hat{\theta}_n$  is said to be consistent if it converges to  $\theta$ . It is called *strongly* or *weakly* consistent, depending upon whether the mode of convergence is almost sure or in probability. The asymptotic normality implies

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta) \rightarrow_d \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$$

for some covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ .

## 2. Relationships among Modes of Convergence

In below we summarize the relationships existing among various modes of convergence introduced in the previous section.

### Theorem 2

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \rightarrow_{a.s.} & \text{(a)} & & \text{(c)} & \\ & \implies & \rightarrow_p & \implies & \rightarrow_d \\ \rightarrow_{L^p} & \text{(b)} & & & \end{array}$$

**Proof** To show (a), notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \{|X_n - X| > \varepsilon\} &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \bigcup_{k \geq n} \{|X_k - X| > \varepsilon\} \\ &= \mathbf{P} \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k \geq n} \{|X_k - X| > \varepsilon\} \end{aligned}$$

Part (b) follows directly from the Chebyshev inequality

$$\mathbf{P} \{|X_n - X| > \varepsilon\} \leq \frac{\mathbf{E}|X_n - X|^p}{\varepsilon^p}$$

For (c), pick an arbitrary  $f$  that is bounded and uniformly continuous. Let  $M = \sup |f(x)|$ , and for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  choose  $\delta$  such that

$$|X_n - X| \leq \delta \quad \text{implies} \quad |f(X_n) - f(X)| \leq \varepsilon$$

We have

$$|f(X_n) - f(X)| \leq \varepsilon + 2M \mathbf{I} \{|X_n - X| > \delta\}$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{E}f(X_n) - \mathbf{E}f(X)| &\leq \mathbf{E}|f(X_n) - f(X)| \\ &\leq \varepsilon + 2M \mathbf{P}\{|X_n - X| > \delta\} \end{aligned}$$

from which the stated implication is immediate. ■

Other implications do not hold, as we will see in the following counterexamples.

**Counterexamples** Consider a probability space  $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}[0, 1], \lambda)$ , where  $\lambda$  is the Lebesgue measure and  $\mathcal{B}[0, 1]$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -field on  $[0, 1]$ . Define a sequence  $\{X_n\}$  of random variables by

$$X_n(\omega) = n^{\frac{1}{p}} \mathbf{I}\left\{0 \leq \omega \leq \frac{1}{n}\right\}$$

for  $p > 0$ , and a sequence  $\{Y_n\}$  by

$$Y_n = \mathbf{I}\left\{\frac{b-1}{a} \leq \omega \leq \frac{b}{a}\right\}$$

for  $n = \frac{a(a-1)}{2} + b$  with  $a = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $1 \leq b \leq a$ .

It is not difficult to see that

$$X_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} 0 \quad \text{but not} \quad X_n \rightarrow_{L^p} 0$$

We indeed have  $X_n(\omega) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $\omega \in (0, 1]$ , but  $\mathbf{E}X_n^p = 1$  for all  $n$ . On the contrary,

$$Y_n \rightarrow_{L^p} 0 \quad \text{but not} \quad Y_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} 0$$

Clearly,  $\mathbf{E}Y_n^p = 1/a \rightarrow 0$ , but  $Y_n(\omega)$  does not converge for any  $\omega \in [0, 1]$ .

### Remarks

(a) It is also obvious from the above counter examples that  $\rightarrow_p$  does not imply  $\rightarrow_{a.s.}$  nor  $\rightarrow_{L^p}$ . If  $\rightarrow_p \Rightarrow \rightarrow_{a.s.}$ , for instance, it falsely follows that  $\rightarrow_{L^p} \Rightarrow \rightarrow_p \Rightarrow \rightarrow_{a.s.}$ , i.e.,  $\rightarrow_{L^p} \Rightarrow \rightarrow_{a.s.}$ .

(b) It is clearly untrue that  $\rightarrow_d \Rightarrow \rightarrow_p$  because the former does not even require that  $\{X_n\}$  be defined on a common probability space. If, however, they are defined on a

common probability space, then the implication does hold, as laid out in Theorem 3 (b) below.

**Theorem 3**

(a) If  $X_n \rightarrow_p X$ , then there exists a subsequence  $\{X_{n_k}\}$  such that  $X_{n_k} \rightarrow_{a.s.} X$ .

(b) Let  $\{X_n\}$  be defined on a common probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ , and  $c$  be a constant. If  $X_n \rightarrow_d c$ , then  $X_n \rightarrow_p c$ .

**Proof** For (a), let  $X_n \rightarrow_p X$ . Since

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ |X_n - X| > \frac{1}{2^k} \right\} \rightarrow 0$$

for any  $k$ , we may choose  $n_k$  for each  $k$  such that

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ |X_{n_k} - X| > \frac{1}{2^k} \right\} \leq \frac{1}{2^k}$$

Now notice that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ |X_{n_k} - X| > \frac{1}{2^k} \right\} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} < \infty$$

Then it follows from Borel-Cantelli lemma that

$$\mathbf{P} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ |X_{n_k} - X| > \frac{1}{2^k} \right\} = 0$$

i.e.

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ |X_{n_k} - X| > \frac{1}{2^k} \text{ i.o.} \right\} = 0$$

as was to be shown.

To show part (b), let

$$f_c(x) = \mathbf{I}\{|x - c| > \varepsilon\}$$

for a given  $\varepsilon > 0$ . If  $X_n \rightarrow_d c$ , then  $\mathbf{E}f_c(X_n) = \mathbf{P}\{|X_n - c| > \varepsilon\}$  converges to  $\mathbf{E}f_c(c) = 0$ , since  $f_c$  is continuous at  $c$ . The stated result thus follows easily. ■

### 3. Basics of Asymptotic Analysis

We introduce in this section some basic tools for asymptotic analysis.

**Theorem 4** *Let  $f$  be a continuous function. Then we have*

- (a) *If  $X_n \rightarrow_{a.s.} X$ , then  $f(X_n) \rightarrow_{a.s.} f(X)$ .*
- (b) *If  $X_n \rightarrow_p X$ , then  $f(X_n) \rightarrow_p f(X)$ .*
- (c) *If  $X_n \rightarrow_d X$ , then  $f(X_n) \rightarrow_d f(X)$ .*

Part (c), in particular, is called the *continuous mapping theorem*(CMT).

**Proof** Part (a) is obvious, since due to the continuity of  $f$

$$X_n(\omega) \rightarrow X(\omega) \quad \text{implies} \quad f(X_n(\omega)) \rightarrow f(X(\omega))$$

for all  $\omega$ .

For (b), let  $X_n \rightarrow_p X$  and  $f(X_{n_k})$  be an arbitrary subsequence of  $f(X_n)$ . Now it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} X_n \rightarrow_p X &\implies X_{n_k} \rightarrow_p X \\ &\implies \exists \{X_{n_{k_i}}\} \text{ such that } X_{n_{k_i}} \rightarrow_{a.s.} X \\ &\implies f(X_{n_{k_i}}) \rightarrow_{a.s.} f(X) \\ &\implies f(X_{n_{k_i}}) \rightarrow_p f(X) \end{aligned}$$

We have thus shown that any subsequence  $f(X_{n_k})$  of  $f(X_n)$  has a subsequence  $f(X_{n_{k_i}})$  such that  $f(X_{n_{k_i}}) \rightarrow_p f(X)$ , which implies that  $f(X_n) \rightarrow_p f(X)$ .

For part (c), it suffices to show that

$$\mathbf{E}g(f(X_n)) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}g(f(X))$$

for  $X_n \rightarrow_d X$  and  $g$  continuous and bounded. This however follows directly from the definition of the convergence in distribution of  $X_n$  to  $X$ , since  $g \circ f$  is continuous and bounded. ■

In what follows, let  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$  be sequences of real numbers. We define

**Definition 6** We write  $x_n = o(a_n)$  and  $y_n = O(b_n)$ , respectively, when

$$\frac{x_n}{a_n} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{y_n}{b_n} \right| < M$$

for  $M > 0$ .

**Remarks**

(a) In particular,  $x_n = o(1)$  if the sequence  $\{x_n\}$  converges to zero, and  $y_n = O(1)$  if the sequence  $\{y_n\}$  is bounded.

(b) We may write

$$o(a_n) = a_n o(1) \quad \text{and} \quad O(b_n) = b_n O(1)$$

in general.

(c) The equality containing  $o$  and  $O$  is not really an equality. For instance,  $o(1) = O(1)$ , but  $O(1) \neq o(1)$ .

(d) For  $y_n = O(1)$ , it suffices to have  $|y_n| < M$  for large  $n$ . If  $|y_n| < M$  for all  $n > N$ , say, then it follows that  $|y_n| < M_*$  for all  $n$  with  $M_* = \max\{y_1, \dots, y_N, M\}$ .

**Lemma 5**

(a)  $O(o(1)) = o(1)$

(b)  $o(O(1)) = o(1)$

(c)  $o(1)O(1) = o(1)$

**Proof** For part (a), let  $x_n = o(1)$  and  $y_n = O(x_n)$ . With  $M$  such that  $|y_n/x_n| < M$ , we have

$$|y_n| < M|x_n| \rightarrow 0$$

which shows that  $y_n \rightarrow 0$ , as required.

For (b), assume  $x_n = O(1)$  and  $y_n = o(x_n)$ . Choose  $M$  such that  $|x_n| < M$ . Then it follows that

$$\frac{|y_n|}{M} < \left| \frac{y_n}{x_n} \right| \rightarrow 0$$

as was to be shown.

To prove (c), let  $x_n = o(1)$  and  $y_n = O(1)$ . Then, for  $M$  such that  $|y_n| < M$ ,

$$|x_n y_n| < |x_n| M \rightarrow 0$$

which yields the stated result. ■

**Remark** In general, we have

$$O(o(a_n)) = O(a_n o(1)) = a_n O(o(1)) = a_n o(1) = o(a_n)$$

for the result comparable to part (a) of Lemma 5.

**Definition 7** We write  $X_n = o_p(a_n)$  if  $X_n/a_n$  converges in probability to zero. Moreover,  $Y_n = O_p(b_n)$  if for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $M > 0$  such that

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \left| \frac{Y_n}{b_n} \right| > M \right\} < \varepsilon$$

**Remarks**

(a) In particular,  $X_n = o_p(1)$  if  $X_n \rightarrow_p 0$ . When  $Y_n = O_p(1)$ , there exists  $M$  such that  $\mathbf{P}\{|Y_n| > M\} < \varepsilon$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . In this case, we say that  $Y_n$  is stochastically bounded.

(b) The remarks (b) - (d) for  $o$  and  $O$  also hold for  $o_p$  and  $O_p$ , with obvious modifications.

**Lemma 6**

$$(a) \ O(o_p(1)) = O_p(o(1)) = O_p(o_p(1)) = o_p(1).$$

$$(b) \ o(O_p(1)) = o_p(O(1)) = o_p(O_p(1)) = o_p(1).$$

$$(c) \ o(1)O_p(1) = o_p(1)O(1) = o_p(1)O_p(1) = o_p(1).$$

**Theorem 7** Let  $X_n \rightarrow_d X$ . Then we have

$$(a) \ X_n = O_p(1).$$

$$(b) \ X_n + o_p(1) \rightarrow_d X.$$

**Proof** For part (a), notice that we may choose sufficiently large  $M$  such that

$$\mathbf{P}\{|X| > M\} < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}\{|X| = M\} = 0$$

since  $\{|X| > M\} \downarrow \emptyset$  as  $M \uparrow \infty$ . Let  $f(x) = \mathbf{I}\{|x| > M\}$ . Since  $X_n \rightarrow_d X$  and  $f$  bounded and continuous a.s., we have  $\mathbf{E}f(X_n) = \mathbf{P}\{|X_n| > M\}$  converges to  $\mathbf{E}f(X) = \mathbf{P}\{|X| > M\}$ . Therefore,  $\mathbf{P}\{|X_n| > M\} < \varepsilon$  for large  $n$ .

For (b), let  $Y_n = o_p(1)$  and assume that  $f$  is uniformly continuous and bounded. It suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{E}f(X_n + Y_n) - \mathbf{E}f(X)| &\leq \mathbf{E}|f(X_n + Y_n) - f(X_n)| + |\mathbf{E}f(X_n) - \mathbf{E}f(X)| \\ &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

The second term can be made arbitrarily small, since  $X_n \rightarrow_d X$ . To show that the first term is also negligible, we note that

$$|f(X_n + Y_n) - f(X_n)| \leq \varepsilon + 2M \mathbf{I}\{|Y_n| > \delta\}$$

where  $M = \sup|f(x)|$  and  $\varepsilon$  and  $\delta$  are chosen as in the proof of Theorem 2. The stated result now follows from  $\mathbf{P}\{|Y_n| > \delta\} \rightarrow 0$ . ■

**Corollary 8** *If  $X_n \rightarrow_d X$  and  $Y_n \rightarrow_p c$ , then  $X_n Y_n \rightarrow_d cX$ .*

**Proof** Since  $X_n = O_p(1)$  and  $Y_n = c + o_p(1)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_n Y_n &= X_n(c + o_p(1)) \\ &= cX_n + O_p(1)o_p(1) \\ &= cX_n + o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

Apply CMT to get the stated result. ■

**Remark** Let  $\hat{\theta}_n$  be an estimator of the parameter  $\theta$  with the true value  $\theta_0$ . If  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is consistent, then

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \theta_0 + o_p(1)$$

If it is asymptotically normal, then

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \theta_0 + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

in particular.

Now we introduce so-called  $\Delta$ -method, which is useful in obtaining asymptotic distribution of nonlinear functions of  $\hat{\theta}_n$  whose distribution is asymptotically normal. Suppose

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) \rightarrow_d \mathbf{N}(0, \Sigma)$$

and  $f$  is continuous and differentiable at  $\theta_0$  with  $F(\theta) = \partial f(\theta)/\partial \theta'$ . It follows from the Taylor expansion of  $f(\theta)$  around  $\theta_0$  that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\hat{\theta}_n) &= f(\theta_0) + F(\theta_0)(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) + o(\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\|) \\ &= f(\theta_0) + F(\theta_0)(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) + o\left(O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\right) \\ &= f(\theta_0) + F(\theta_0)(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(f(\hat{\theta}_n) - f(\theta_0)) &= F(\theta_0)\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0) + o_p(1) \\ &\rightarrow_d \mathbf{N}(0, F(\theta_0)\Sigma F(\theta_0)') \end{aligned}$$

If, for instance, we let  $\theta = (\alpha, \beta)'$  and  $\hat{\theta}_n = (\hat{\alpha}_n, \hat{\beta}_n)'$ , then the limiting distribution of  $\hat{\alpha}_n/\hat{\beta}_n$  is given as above with

$$F(\theta) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial \beta}\right) = \left(\frac{1}{\beta}, -\frac{\alpha}{\beta^2}\right)$$