Applied Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 3, 2009, no. 35, 1699 - 1714

Inequalities for Convolution Ratios under Local Approximation

Kenneth S. Berenhaut¹

Department of Mathematics, Wake Forest University Winston-Salem, NC, 27109, USA berenhks@wfu.edu

Donghui Chen

Department of Mathematics, Wake Forest University Winston-Salem, NC, 27109, USA chend6@wfu.edu

Abstract

This paper studies preservation of the convolution property under locally approximating functions for sums of independent random variables. Upper and lower bounds for limits of convolution ratios are given.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 60F05, 60E10, 62E20, 60G50, 60E05

Keywords: Inequalities, Convolution ratios, Local limit theorems, Normal approximation, Moment generating functions

1 Introduction

This paper studies preservation of the convolution property under locally approximating functions for sums of independent random variables. In particular, suppose X is a random variable satisfying $E(X) = \mu$ and $Var(X) = \sigma^2 < \infty$ and that X_1, X_2, \ldots is a sequence of independent and identically distributed random variables each with the same distribution as X. In addition, suppose that X has probability function p, where p is either a density or a probability mass function, and denote the support set of X by $S_X = \{x : p(x) > 0\}$. Let $p^{(i)}$ be the *i*-fold convolution of p (i.e. the probability function for the partial sum $S_i = X_1 + X_2 + \cdots + X_i$).

¹Corresponding author.

Let $\phi_{n\mu,n\sigma^2}$ be the density for a normal random variable, N, with mean $n\mu$ and variance $n\sigma^2$, i.e.

$$\phi_{n\mu,n\sigma^2}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma\sqrt{n}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-n\mu}{\sqrt{n\sigma}}\right)^2}, \qquad -\infty < x < \infty.$$
(1)

For any random variable Y, let m_Y denote the moment generating function (m.g.f.) of Y defined via

$$m_Y(t) = E(e^{tY}) \tag{2}$$

for $-\infty < t < \infty$. As well, for random variables Y_1 and Y_2 , define R_{Y_1,Y_2} via

$$R_{Y_1,Y_2}(t) = \frac{m_{Y_1}(t)}{m_{Y_2}(t)}.$$
(3)

Note that for a normal random variable, N, with density as in (1) for n = 1,

$$m_N(t) = e^{t\mu + \frac{t^2\sigma^2}{2}}.$$
 (4)

For the remainder of the paper N will always denote a random variable with moment generating function as in (4) where the values of μ and σ should be clear from the context.

There are many well-known local limit theorems for random variables where the associated attracting distribution is the normal (see Gnedenko and Kolomogrov [6] and Petrov [8], and many others). Two such results are the following two theorems.

Theorem 1 Suppose X takes values of the form b + Mh, $M = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, ...,$ with probability 1, where b is a constant and h > 0 is the maximal span of the distribution. Then

$$\sup_{M} \sigma \sqrt{n} \left| p^{(n)}(nb + Mh) - h\phi_{n\mu,n\sigma^2}(nb + Mh) \right| \to 0.$$
(5)

Theorem 2 Suppose p is a density, and that there exists a K such that $p_K(x)$ is bounded. Then

$$\sup_{x} \sigma \sqrt{n} \left| p^{(n)}(x) - \phi_{n\mu, n\sigma^2}(x) \right| \to 0.$$
(6)

For related results see for instance [4-6, 8-12].

Motivated by the following simple one-step conditioning equality implied by independence

$$p^{(n)}(x) = E(p^{(n-1)}(x-X)),$$
(7)

we have the following definition.

Definition 1 For any two functions f and g, define the "convolution ratio", $H_{f,g}^X$ of f and g with respect to X via

$$H_{f,g}^{X}(x) = \frac{E(f(x-X))}{g(x)}$$
(8)

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(x) \neq 0$.

Note that if Y is a random variable, independent of X, f is the probability function for Y and g is the probability function for X + Y, then $H_{f,g}^X \equiv 1$. In particular, we have that for n > 1,

$$H_{p^{(n-1)},p^{(n)}}^X(x) = 1, \qquad x \in \mathcal{S}_{S_n},$$
(9)

where \mathcal{S}_{S_n} is the support set of S_n .

Along the lines suggested by (7) and Theorems 1 and 2, we have the following definition.

Definition 2 For n > 1, set

$$C_{X,\tilde{p}}(x,n) = H^{X}_{\tilde{p}_{n-1},\tilde{p}_{n}}(x) = \frac{E(\tilde{p}_{n-1}(x-X))}{\tilde{p}_{n}(x)}$$
(10)

where $\tilde{\mathbf{p}} = (\tilde{p}_i)_{i>1}$ is a sequence of real valued functions.

For our current consideration, \tilde{p}_i in (10) will be a candidate approximating function for $p^{(i)}$.

The following result, which will be useful for our computations, was recently proven (see [1]).

Theorem 3 Suppose $\tilde{p}_i = \phi_{n\mu,n\sigma^2}$, if X is continuous (or $\tilde{p}_i = h\phi_{n\mu,n\sigma^2}$, if X is defined on a lattice with maximal span h), and let N be a normally distributed random variable with mean μ and variance σ^2 . Then

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} C_{X, \tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}}(tn, n) = \frac{m_X \left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)}{m_N \left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)} = R_{X, N} \left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right), \tag{11}$$

provided that the numerator in the middle quotient exists, and otherwise $C_{X,\tilde{p}}(tn,n)$ is unbounded. We will refer to the quantity in (11) as $L_X(t)$.

Note that when $\tilde{p}_i(x)$ is taken as in Theorem 3, then $\tilde{p}_i(x) > 0$ for all (i, x). If $\tilde{p}_i = p^{(i)}$ for all i (i.e. the approximation is exact for all (i, x)), then, by (7), $C_{X,\tilde{p}}(x,n) = 1$ for $x \in \mathcal{S}_{S_n}$ (the support set of S_n). In this sense $C_{X,\tilde{p}}(x,n)$ (for $x \in \mathcal{S}_{S_n}$) may be viewed as a measure of the quality of the n^{th} order approximation, locally at x, with regard to preservation of the inherent convolution property.

Remark. The value $\lim_{n\to\infty} C_{X,\tilde{p}}(tn,n)$ in (11) addresses preservation of the convolution property, for values t in the support set of $\bar{X}_n = S_n/n$, for large n. Note that if $t \in \mathcal{S}_{S_m/m}$ for some m > 1 then $t \in \mathcal{S}_{S_n/n}$ for infinitely many n. Note as well that the set $\mathcal{U}_X = \bigcup_{n>1} \mathcal{S}_{S_n/n}$ is dense in the interval $\{x : \inf\{\mathcal{S}_X\} \leq x \leq \sup\{\mathcal{S}_X\}\}$ (where the infimum or supremum may be infinite). In what follows, we will be interested in developing bounds for $L_X(t)$ for $t \in \mathcal{U}_X$ for some distributions which are heavily used in practice.

Remark. Note that ratios $R_{X,N}(t)$ occur when considering Cornish-Fisher expansions (see for instance [13]).

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we consider bounds for $L_X(t)$ where X is Bernoulli with parameter p, while Section 3 includes discussion of uniformly distributed (continuous and discrete) random variables X. Section 4 addresses bounds for some X with unbounded support. Some bounds for a variety of distributions, discussed in the paper, are summarized in the following table.

Table 1: Optimal global bounds for $L_X(t)$ for $t \in \mathcal{U}_X$

X	Lower bound	Upper bound
Bernoulli(1/2)	$(e^{1/2} + e^{-3/2})/2$	1
$\operatorname{Bernoulli}(p)$	$(e^{1/2} + e^{-3/2})/2$	Unbounded
Uniform on $\{0, 1,, T - 1\}$	$e^{3/2}(1-e^{-6})/6$	1
Uniform on $[a, b]$	$e^{3/2}(1-e^{-6})/6$	1
$\text{Exponential}(\lambda)$	$e^{1/2}/2$	Unbounded
$\operatorname{Poisson}(\lambda)$	$e^{-\lambda/2 + \lambda/e}$	Unbounded
$\operatorname{Geometric}(p)$	$e^{-1/2}/2$	Unbounded

2 Bernoulli Random Variables

Suppose X is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter p, i.e. P(X = 1) = pand P(X = 0) = 1 - p with $0 . Then <math>\mu = p$, $\sigma^2 = p(1 - p)$, $m_X(t) = pe^t + (1 - p)$ and $\mathcal{U}_X \subset [0, 1]$. In light of Theorem 3, we have

$$L_X(t) = \frac{m_X \left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)}{m_N \left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)} = R_{X,N} \left(\frac{t-p}{p(1-p)}\right)$$
$$= (1-p)e^{\frac{(t^2-p^2)}{2p(p-1)}} + pe^{\frac{(t-p)(t+p-2)}{2p(p-1)}}.$$
(12)

For simplicity, we will write L(t, p) to represent $L_X(t)$. We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 4 Suppose X is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter p. Then, for all 0 < t < 1,

$$L_X(t) = L(t,p) \ge L(t,1/2) \ge L(0,1/2) = \frac{1}{2}(e^{\frac{1}{2}} + e^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \approx 0.9359.$$
 (13)

Proof: For 0 , we have

$$L(t,p) = e^{\frac{(t^2 - p^2)}{2p(p-1)}} - pe^{\frac{(t^2 - p^2)}{2p(p-1)}} + pe^{\frac{(t-p)(t+p-2)}{2p(p-1)}}.$$
(14)

We will show that, as a function of p, L(t, p) is increasing for $p \in (0, t)$, attains its maximum at p = t, and is decreasing for $p \in (t, 1)$.

Differentiating with respect to p in (14) gives,

$$\frac{d}{dp}L(t,p) = \frac{(t-p)(2p-1)}{2p(p-1)} \left(\frac{t+p}{p}e^{\frac{(t^2-p^2)}{2p(p-1)}} - \frac{t+p-2}{p-1}e^{\frac{(t-p)(t+p-2)}{2p(p-1)}}\right)
= \frac{(t-p)(2p-1)(t+p-2)}{2p(p-1)^2}e^{\frac{(t-p)(t+p-2)}{2p(p-1)}} \left(\frac{(t+p)(p-1)}{p(p+t-2)}e^{\frac{(t-p)}{p(p-1)}} - 1\right)
= \frac{(t-p)(2p-1)(t+p-2)}{2p(p-1)^2}e^{\frac{(t-p)(t+p-2)}{2p(p-1)}}g_p(t),$$
(15)

say.

Now,

$$\frac{d}{dt}g_p(t) = e^{\frac{t-p}{p(p-1)}} \frac{t^2 - 2t + 2tp - p^2}{p^2(t+p-2)^2}
= e^{\frac{t-p}{p(p-1)}} \frac{-2t(1-t) - (t-p)^2}{p^2(t+p-2)^2} < 0.$$
(16)

Thus $g_p(t)$ is a decreasing function of t. Since t = p is the only zero of

 $g_p(t), g_p(t) > 0$ for $t \in (0, p)$, and $g_p(t) < 0$ for $t \in (p, 1)$. Employing (15), $\frac{d}{dp}L(t, p) < 0$ for 0 0 for $\frac{1}{2} , which implies that, for <math>0 < t < 1$,

$$\min_{0$$

hence we have the first inequality in (13).

Now, suppose p = 1/2, and let

$$h(t) = L(t, 1/2)$$

= $\frac{1}{2}e^{-2(t^2 - \frac{1}{4})} + \frac{1}{2}e^{-2(t - \frac{1}{2})(t - \frac{3}{2})}.$ (18)

Differentiating in (18) with respect to t, gives

$$h'(t) = 2te^{-2(t-\frac{1}{2})(t-\frac{3}{2})} \left(\frac{1}{t} - 1 - e^{-(4t-2)}\right)$$

= $2te^{-2(t-\frac{1}{2})(t-\frac{3}{2})}e^{2-4t} \left(\frac{t^{-1} - 1}{e^{2-4t}} - 1\right)$
= $2te^{-2(t-\frac{1}{2})(t-\frac{3}{2})}e^{2-4t} \left(e^{q(t)} - 1\right),$ (19)

where

$$q(t) = \log\left(\frac{t^{-1}-1}{e^{2-4t}}\right) = \log(t^{-1}-1) - (2-4t)$$
$$= (2-4t)\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4^i} \frac{(2-4t)^{2i}}{2i+1}.$$
(20)

Combining (19) and (20), gives that L(t, 1/2) is increasing for $0 < t < \frac{1}{2}$, and decreasing for $\frac{1}{2} < t < 1$. Thus,

$$\max_{0 < t < 1} L(t, 1/2) = L(1/2, 1/2) = 1$$
(21)

and

$$\min_{0 < t < 1} L(t, 1/2) = L(0, 1/2) = L(1, 1/2) = \frac{1}{2} (e^{\frac{1}{2}} + e^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \approx 0.9359.$$
(22)

We now turn to consideration of uniformly distributed random variables.

3 Uniformly Distributed Random Variables

In this section we consider bounds for uniformly distributed random variables.

3.1 Discrete uniformly distributed random variables

Suppose X takes value on $B = \{0, 1, \ldots T - 1\}$ with constant probability $P(X = i) = \frac{1}{T}$ for $i \in B$ (where we assume T > 3; the case T = 2 was covered in Section 2). The mean and the variance of X are $\mu = \frac{T-1}{2}$ and $\sigma^2 = \frac{T^2-1}{12}$, respectively and $\mathcal{U}_X \subset [0, T-1]$. In addition,

$$m_X(t) = \frac{1 - e^{Tt}}{1 - e^t} \frac{1}{T}.$$
(23)

Employing Theorem 3, we have

$$L_X(t) = \frac{m_X \left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)}{m_N \left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)} = R_{X,N} \left(\frac{6(2t-T+1)}{T^2-1}\right)$$
$$= \left(\frac{e^{-6T\frac{-2t+T-1}{T^2-1}}-1}{e^{-6\frac{-2t+T-1}{T^2-1}}-1}\right) \frac{e^{\frac{3}{2}\frac{(T-1)^2-4t^2}{T^2-1}}}{T}$$
$$= \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{T-1} e^{-\frac{3(-2t+T-1)(-T+4i+1-2t)}{2(T^2-1)}}}{T}.$$
(24)

For simplicity, here we will write L(t,T) to represent $L_X(t)$. We will prove the following

Theorem 5 Suppose X is uniformly distributed on B. Then $L_X(t)$ is maximized at $t = \frac{T-1}{2}$ and minimized at t = 0. In addition, for all $t \in [0, T-1]$,

$$1 > L(t,T) \geq L(0,T) = \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{6T}{T+1}} - 1}{e^{-\frac{6}{T+1}} - 1}\right) \frac{e^{\frac{3}{2}\frac{T-1}{T+1}}}{T}$$

$$\geq \lim_{T \to \infty} L(0,T) = \frac{1 - e^{-6}}{6} e^{3/2} \approx 0.745097\dots$$
 (25)

The next lemma will be useful in proving the final inequality in (25), for generalizations see [2].

Lemma 1 Set $s = e^{-6}$, and define the function f via

$$f(x) = \frac{1 - s^{1-x}}{1 - s^x} \frac{x}{1 - x} s^{\frac{x}{2}}.$$
(26)

Then, f(x) is monotonically increasing for 0 < x < 1/4.

Proof: Taking the natural log of f in (26) gives

$$\ln f(x) = \ln(1 - s^{1-x}) - \ln(1 - s^x) + \ln x - \ln(1 - x) + \frac{x}{2}\ln s.$$
 (27)

Differentiating, simplifying and noting that $s = e^{-6}$ and 0 < x < 1, we have

$$\frac{d}{dx}\ln f(x) = 3 + \frac{1}{1-x} - \left(\frac{6}{1-s^x} - \frac{1}{x}\right) - \frac{6}{s^{x-1}-1} \\
\geq 4 - \left(\frac{6}{1-s^x} - \frac{1}{x}\right) - \frac{6}{s^{x-1}-1} \\
= 4 - h(x) - k(x),$$
(28)

say.

Since $k'(x) = 36s^{x-1}(s^{x-1}-1)^{-2} \ge 0$, we have that k(x) is increasing on 0 < x < 1/4 and thus

$$k(x) \le k(1/4) \le 0.068. \tag{29}$$

Also,

$$h'(x) = \frac{-36x^2s^x - 2s^x + 1 + s^{2x}}{(1 - s^x)^2x^2} = \frac{r(x)}{(1 - s^x)^2x^2}$$

where

$$r'(x) = 12s^{x}(1 - 6x + 18x^{2} - e^{-6x}).$$
(30)

Since $e^{-6x} \leq 1 - 6x + 18x^2$ for all x, r(x) is monotonically increasing, and $r(x) \geq r(0) = 0$. Thus, $h'(x) \geq 0$, and hence

$$h(x) \le h(1/4) \le 3.724 \tag{31}$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{d}{dx}\ln f(x) \ge 4 - 0.068 - 3.724 > 0 \tag{32}$$

and the result is proven.

Proof of Theorem 5. Differentiating $L_X(t)$ in (24) with respect to t, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}L(t,T) = \frac{12Te^{-\frac{3(2t-T+1)^2}{2(T^2-1)}}}{T^2-1} \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} (i-t)e^{\frac{3(2i-T+1)(2t-T+1)}{T^2-1}} \\
= \frac{12Te^{-\frac{3(2t-T+1)^2}{2(T^2-1)}}}{T^2-1} K_T(t),$$
(33)

say.

We will show L(t,T) is increasing for $t \in (0, \frac{T-1}{2})$, attains its maximum at $v = \frac{T-1}{2}$, and is decreasing for $t \in (\frac{T-1}{2}, T-1)$. Set $x = \frac{T-1}{2}$ and $c = \frac{12}{T^2-1}$. Expanding $K(t) = K_T(t)$ in a Taylor's series about t = x, we have

$$K(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{-\xi_n}{n!} (t-x)^n,$$
(34)

where

$$\xi_n = \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} c^{n-1} (i-x)^{n-1} (n-c(i-x)^2)$$
(35)

$$= nc^{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} (i-x)^{n-1} - c^n \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} (i-x)^{n+1}.$$
 (36)

For n = 1, we have

$$\xi_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} (1 - c(i-x)^2) = T - c \sum_{i=0}^{T-1} \left(i - \frac{T-1}{2} \right) = T - c \frac{T^3 - T}{12} = 0.$$
(37)

As well, when n is even, by symmetry we have

$$nc^{n-1}\sum_{i=0}^{T-1}(i-x)^{n-1} = 0 = c^n\sum_{i=0}^{T-1}(i-x)^{n+1},$$

and hence $\xi_n = 0$.

When $n \geq 3$ is odd, we have

$$n - c(i - x)^{2} = n - \frac{12}{T^{2} - 1}(i - x)^{2} \ge n - \frac{12}{T^{2} - 1}x^{2}$$

> $n - 3 \ge 0,$ (38)

and hence applying (35), $\xi_n > 0$.

Summarizing, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}L(t,T) = \frac{12Te^{-\frac{3(2t-T+1)^2}{2(T^2-1)}}}{T^2-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)\xi_n \left(t - \frac{T-1}{2}\right)^n \\
= \frac{12Te^{-\frac{3(2t-T+1)^2}{2(T^2-1)}}}{T^2-1} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)\xi_{2k+1} \left(t - \frac{T-1}{2}\right)^{2k+1}. \quad (39)$$

Therefore, L(t,T) is increasing for $t \in (0, \frac{T-1}{2})$, attains its maximum at $t = \frac{T-1}{2}$, and is decreasing for $t \in (\frac{T-1}{2}, T-1)$. The first and second inequalities in (25) then follow. For the third inequality note that

$$L(0,T) = \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{6T}{T+1}} - 1}{e^{-\frac{6}{T+1}} - 1}\right) \frac{e^{\frac{3}{2}\frac{T-1}{T+1}}}{T} = e^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{1 - s^{1-x}}{1 - s^x}\frac{x}{1 - x}s^{\frac{x}{2}},\tag{40}$$

where x = 1/(T+1) and $s = e^{-6}$. The result then follows from Lemma 1 upon noting that $T \ge 3$ and for f as defined in (26), $\lim_{x\to 0} f(x) = (s-1)/\ln(s)$.

3.2 Continuous uniformly distributed random variables

Suppose that X possesses a uniform distribution on the interval [a, b]. The mean and the variance of X are $\mu = \frac{b-a}{2}$ and $\sigma^2 = \frac{(b-a)^2}{12}$, respectively and $\mathcal{U}_X \subset [a, b]$.

The moment generating function of X is given by

$$m_X(t) = \frac{e^{tb} - e^{ta}}{t(b-a)}.$$
(41)

We recall the following elementary result from [1].

Lemma 2 Suppose $c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c \neq 0$, then

$$L_{cX+d}(t) = L_X\left(\frac{t-d}{c}\right).$$
(42)

Note that Lemma 2 reduces our consideration through scaling to (a, b) = (0, 1).

In light of Theorem 3, we then have, in this case,

$$L_X(t) = \frac{m_X\left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)}{m_N\left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)} = R_{X,N}\left(12t-6\right)$$
$$= \frac{e^{12t-6}-1}{(12t-6)e^{\frac{(12t-6)^2}{24}+6t-3}}.$$
(43)

For simplicity, we will write L(t) to represent $L_X(t)$. We will prove the following theorem. **Theorem 6** Suppose X is a continuous uniform [0, 1] random variable. Then,

$$1 = L(1/2) \geq L_X(t) = L(t)$$

$$\geq L(0) = L(1)$$

$$= \frac{1 - e^{-6}}{6} e^{3/2} \approx 0.7450967... \qquad (44)$$

Proof. Differentiating in (43) gives

$$L'(t) = -\frac{12t^2 - 6t + 1}{3(2t - 1)^2 e^{\frac{3(2t - 1)(2t + 1)}{2}}} \left(\frac{(12t^2 - 18t + 7)e^{12t - 6}}{12t^2 - 6t + 1} - 1\right)$$

= $-\frac{12t^2 - 6t + 1}{3(2t - 1)^2 e^{\frac{3(2t - 1)(2t + 1)}{2}}}g(t),$ (45)

say.

Since $g'(t) = \frac{108e^{12t-6}(2t-1)^4}{(12t^2-6t+1)^2} \ge 0$ and g(1/2) = 0, we have that g(t) < 0 for $0 < t < \frac{1}{2}$ and g(t) > 0 for $\frac{1}{2} < t < 1$.

Returning to (45), we have L'(t) > 0 for $0 < t < \frac{1}{2}$ and L'(t) < 0 for $\frac{1}{2} < t < 1$, and the result follows.

3.3 Uniform distributions on non-evenly spaced points

Lemma 2 and Theorem 4 imply that the minimum value of

$$\{L_X(t): t \in \mathcal{U}_X\}$$

over all possible distributions on two points is attained when each is assigned probability 1/2. One might ask what pertains on support sets with a larger number of points. Perhaps surprisingly over distributions on three points the minimum value of $L_X(t)$ is not attained at equally spaced points as is seen in the following example.

Example. Consider a random variable X with uniformly distributed mass on the three points 0, x and 1, where 0 < x < 1. We have E[X] = (x + 1)/3, $Var(X) = 2/9(1 - x + x^2)$, $\mathcal{U}_X \subset [0, 1]$ and upon applying Theorem 3,

$$L_X(t) = 1/3 \left(1 + e^{-3/2 \frac{(-3t+1+x)x}{1+x^2-x}} + e^{-3/2 \frac{-3t+1+x}{1+x^2-x}} \right) e^{1/4 \frac{(-3t+1+x)(1+x+3t)}{1+x^2-x}}$$
(46)

For simplicity, here we will write L(t, x) to represent $L_X(t)$.

Note that Theorem 5, for T = 3, implies that $\min_{0 \le t \le 1} L(t, 1/2) = L(0, 1/2) \approx 0.8982552642$, while $L(0, 1/3) = 1/3 \left(1 + e^{-6/7} + e^{-\frac{18}{7}}\right) e^{4/7} \approx 0.8858691762$.

It would be interesting to know the relative configuration of n points with uniformly distributed mass that minimizes $L_X(t)$ over the associated set S. By Lemma 2, it suffices to restrict attention to points $0 = x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < \cdots < x_{n-1} < x_n = 1$ and $\mathcal{U}_X \subset [0, 1]$.

4 Distributions with unbounded support

In this section we consider some families of random variables with unbounded support.

4.1 Exponential random variables

Suppose X is an exponential random variable with parameter $\lambda > 0$, i.e. $p(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}$ for x > 0. Then $\mu = 1/\lambda$, $\sigma^2 = 1/\lambda^2$, $m_X(t) = \lambda/(\lambda - t)$ for $t < \lambda$ and $\mathcal{U}_X \subset [0, \infty)$. As well, $L_X(t)$ is finite only for $t < 2/\lambda$.

In light of Theorem 3, we have

$$L_X(t) = \frac{m_X\left(\frac{t-1/\lambda}{1/\lambda^2}\right)}{m_N\left(\frac{t-1/\lambda}{1/\lambda^2}\right)} = R_{X,N}\left(\lambda^2 t - \lambda\right)$$
$$= -\frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(t\lambda-1)(t\lambda+1)}}{t\lambda-2},$$
(47)

for $t < 2/\lambda$. For simplicity, we will write $L(t, \lambda)$ to represent $L_X(t)$.

We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 7 Suppose X is an exponential random variable with parameter λ . Then, for all $0 < t < 2/\lambda$,

$$L_X(t) = L(t,\lambda) \ge L(0,\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}} \approx 0.8243606355.$$
 (48)

Proof. Differentiating in (47) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}L_X(t) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(t\lambda-1)(t\lambda+1)}\lambda(t\lambda-1)^2}{(t\lambda-2)^2} > 0,$$
(49)

and the result follows.

4.2 Poisson random variables

Suppose X is a Poisson random variable with parameter $\lambda > 0$, i.e. $P(X = i) = e^{-\lambda} \lambda^i / i!$ for i = 0, 1, 2, ... Then $\mu = \lambda$, $\sigma^2 = \lambda$, $m_X(t) = e^{\lambda(e^t - 1)}$ and $\mathcal{U}_X \subset [0, \infty)$.

In light of Theorem 3, we have

$$L_X(t) = \frac{m_X\left(\frac{t-\lambda}{\lambda}\right)}{m_N\left(\frac{t-\lambda}{\lambda}\right)} = R_{X,N}\left(t/\lambda - 1\right)$$
$$= e^{1/2\left(-\lambda^2 + 2\lambda^2 e^{-\frac{-t+\lambda}{\lambda}} - t^2\right)\lambda^{-1}},$$
(50)

for t > 0. For simplicity, we will write $L(t, \lambda)$ to represent $L_X(t)$.

We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 8 Suppose X is a Poisson random variable with parameter λ . Then, for all $0 < t < \infty$,

$$L_X(t) = L(t,\lambda) \ge L(0,\lambda) = e^{-\lambda \frac{e-2}{2e}} \approx e^{-.1321205588\lambda}.$$
 (51)

Proof. Differentiating in (50) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}L_X(t) = \left(\lambda e^{\frac{t}{\lambda}-1} - t\right) e^{1/2\left(-\lambda^2 + 2\lambda^2 e^{-\frac{-t+\lambda}{\lambda}} - t^2\right)\lambda^{-1}} \lambda^{-1}.$$
(52)

Noting that $e^{x-1} > x$ for all $x \ge 0$ (see for instance Mitrinović [7], page 266), we have that $\frac{d}{dt}L_X(t) \ge 0$ for t > 0, and the result follows.

4.3 Geometric random variables

Suppose X is a geometric random variable with parameter 0 , i.e. $<math>P(X = i) = p(1-p)^{i-1}$ for i = 1, 2, 3, ... Then $\mu = 1/p, \sigma^2 = (1-p)/p^2$, $\mathcal{U}_X \subset [1, \infty], m_X(t) = e^t p/(1-e^t(1-p))$ for $t < \log(1/(1-p))$ and $L_X(t)$ is finite only for $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$, where

$$\mathcal{T}_{p} = \left\{ t : \frac{t - \frac{1}{p}}{\frac{1 - p}{p^{2}}} < \log\left(\frac{1}{1 - p}\right) \right\} \\
= \left\{ t : t < \frac{1}{p} + \log\left(\frac{1}{1 - p}\right) \frac{1 - p}{p^{2}} \right\}.$$
(53)

In light of Theorem 3, we have

$$L_X(t) = \frac{m_X \left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)}{m_N \left(\frac{t-\mu}{\sigma^2}\right)} = R_{X,N} \left(\frac{p(tp-1)}{1-p}\right)$$
$$= \frac{e^{\frac{1}{2} \frac{(1-tp)(1-p(2-t))}{1-p}}p}{1-(1-p)e^{\frac{p(tp-1)}{1-p}}},$$
(54)

for $t \in \mathcal{T}_p$. For simplicity, we will write L(t,p) to represent $L_X(t)$. We will prove the following theorem.

Theorem 9 Suppose X is a geometric random variable with parameter p. Then, for all $t \in U_X$,

$$L_X(t) = L(t,p) \ge L(1,p) = \frac{e^{\frac{1}{2}(p-1)}p}{1-(1-p)e^{-p}}$$

$$\ge L(1,0+) = \frac{1}{2}e^{-\frac{1}{2}} \approx 0.3032653298....$$
(55)

Proof. For the second inequality in (55), note that

$$\frac{d}{dp}L(1,p) = 1/2 \frac{e^{-1/2p+1/2} \left(-2+p\right) \left(e^{-p}(p+1)-1\right)}{\left(1-e^{-p}+e^{-p}p\right)^2} > 0,$$
(56)

for 0 , since the function <math>f defined by $f(p) = e^{-p}(p+1) - 1$ is decreasing for p on (0, 1) and f(0) = 0.

For the first inequality, note that

$$\frac{d}{dt}L(t,p) = \frac{p^3 t e^{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{(pt-1)(-2p+pt+1)}{1-p}} \left((1-p)e^{\frac{(pt-1)p}{1-p}} - \frac{t-1}{t}\right)}{\left(1-(1-p)e^{\frac{(pt-1)p}{1-p}}\right)^2 (1-p)}.$$
(57)

For $0 , set <math>f_p(t) = (1-p)e^{\frac{(pt-1)p}{1-p}}$, $g_p(t) = (t-1)/t$ and $U_p(t) = f_p(t) - g_p(t)$. We then have $f_p''(t) = p^4 e^{\frac{(pt-1)p}{1-p}}/(1-p) > 0$, $g_p''(t) = -2t^{-3} < 0$, $f_p'(1/p) = g_p'(1/p) = p^2$ and $f_p(1/p) = g_p(1/p) = 1-p$. Thus, $U_p''(t) > 0$ and $U_p'(1/p) = 0$. Hence, $U_p(t) > U_p(1/p) = 0$ and (57) gives that $\frac{d}{dt}L(t,p) \ge 0$ for $t \ge 1$ and 0 , and the result follows.

Remark. The above considerations raise questions as to systematic understanding of variation in behavior of L_X according to summary properties of the variable X. Characteristics of L_X under various assumptions are currently under consideration.

We close with the following table which includes the limiting convolution ratio, $L_X(t)$, for some further common distributions with unbounded support.

Distribution	Prob. Function	Mean	Variance	M.G.F.	$L_X(t)$
Gamma	$\frac{\frac{e^{-x/\theta}x^{k-1}}{\theta^k \Gamma(k)}, x > 0}{k, \theta > 0}$	k heta	$k\theta^2$	$\frac{1}{(1-\theta t)^k}$	$\frac{k^k \theta^k}{(2k\theta - t)^k} e^{-\frac{t^2 - k^2 \theta^2}{2k\theta^2}}$
Neg. Binomial	$\frac{\frac{\Gamma(r+k)}{k!\Gamma(r)}p^r(1-p)^k}{0$	$\frac{r(1-p)}{p}, r > 0$	$\frac{r(1-p)}{p^2}$	$\left(\frac{p}{1-(1-p)e^t}\right)^r$	$\frac{p^{r}e^{-\frac{p^{2}t^{2}-r^{2}(1-p)^{2}}{2r(1-p)}}}{\left(1-(1-p)e^{\frac{p^{2}t-rp(1-p)}{r(1-p)}}\right)^{r}}$
Laplace	$\frac{\frac{1}{2b}e^{-\frac{ x-\mu }{b}}}{b>0, \mu \in \mathbb{R}}$	μ	$2b^2$	$\frac{e^{\mu t}}{1-b^2t^2}$	$\frac{4b^2}{4b^2 - (t-\mu)^2}e^{-\frac{(t-\mu)^2}{4b^2}}$

Table 2: Limiting convolution ratio $L_X(t)$ for some further common distributions

References

- [1] BERENHAUT, K. S. AND CHEN, D., Moment generating functions, local approximations and one-step conditioning, Preprint, Submitted, 2007.
- [2] BERENHAUT, K. S. AND CHEN, D., Inequalities for functions with convex logarithmic derivative, Preprint, Submitted, 2007.
- [3] CHOW, Y. S. AND TEICHER, H., *Probability Theory*, Second Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [4] FELLER, W., Probability Theory and Its Applications, Vol. 2, Wiley, New York, 1966.
- [5] GNEDENKO, B. V., A local limit theorem for densities, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk* SSSR., Vol. 95(1954), pp. 5-7.
- [6] GNEDENKO B. V. AND KOLMOGOROV A. N., Limit Distributions for Sums of Independent Variables, Addison-Wesley, Boston, 1954.
- [7] MITRINOVIC, D. S., Analytic Inequalities, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1970.
- [8] PETROV, V. V., Sums of Independent Random Variables, Springer, Berlin, 1975.

- [9] PETROV, V. V., On local limit theorems for sums of independent random variables, *Theory of Probability and Its Application*, Vol. 9(1962), Issue 2, pp. 312-320.
- [10] PETROV, V. V., A local theorem for densities of sums of independent random variables, *Theory of Probability and Its Application*, Vol. 1(1956), Issue 3, pp. 316-322.
- [11] PROKHOROV, Y. V., A local theorem for densities, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR., Vol. 83(1952), pp. 797-800.
- [12] SIRAZHDINOV, S. KH. AND MAMATOV, M., On convergence in the mean for densities, *Theory of Probability and Its Application*, Vol. 7(1962), Issue 4, pp. 424-428.
- [13] WALLACE, D. L., Asymptotic approximation to distributions, The Annals of Mathematics Statistics, Vol. 29(1958), No. 3, pp. 635-654.

Received: November 30, 2007