## A CONVERGENCE THEOREM FOR EXTREME VALUES FROM GAUSSIAN SEQUENCES<sup>1</sup>

## BY ROY E. WELSCH

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Let  $\{X_n, n=0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \cdots\}$  be a stationary Gaussian stochastic process with means zero, variances one, and covariance sequence  $\{r_n\}$ . Let  $M_n = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  and  $S_n = \text{second largest } \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ . Limit properties are obtained for the joint law of  $M_n$  and  $S_n$  as n approaches infinity. A joint limit law which is a function of a double exponential law is known to hold if the random variables  $X_i$  are mutually independent. When  $M_n$  alone is considered Berman has shown that a double exponential law holds in the case of dependence provided either  $r_n \log n \to 0$  or  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n^2 < \infty$ . In the present work it is shown that the above conditions are also sufficient for the convergence of the joint law of  $M_n$  and  $S_n$ . Weak convergence properties of the stochastic processes  $M_{[nt]}$  and  $S_{[nt]}$  with  $0 < a \le t < \infty$  are also discussed.

1. Introduction. This paper extends and simplifies a theorem obtained by the author in Section 4 of [5]. The reader is assumed to have some acquaintance with those results.

Let  $\{X_n, n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \cdots\}$  be a discrete parameter stationary Gaussian stochastic process, characterized by expectation, and covariance function, respectively:

(1.1) 
$$E(X_n) = {}_{\Delta} 0,$$
 
$$E(X_i X_{i+n}) = {}_{\Delta} r_n, \qquad r_0 = {}_{\Delta} 1.$$

This paper treats some of the limit properties of the random variables

$$M_n = \max\{X_1, \dots, X_n\},$$
  
 $S_n = \text{ second largest } \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}.$ 

A double exponential limit law is known to hold for  $M_n$  if the random variables  $X_i$  are mutually independent, that is  $r_n = 0$ ,  $n \neq 0$ . Berman [1] has shown that the same law holds in the case of dependence provided either

$$(1.2) r_n \log n \to 0, or$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n^2 < \infty.$$

The author [5] has shown that the processes  $\{M_{[nt]}, S_{[nt]}\}$ , properly normalized, and with  $0 < a \le t < \infty$ , converge weakly in the Skorohod space  $D^2[a, \infty)$  when

Received May 8, 1972; revised October 13, 1972.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This research was supported in part by the U. S. Army Research Office (Durham) under Contract No. DA-31-124-ARO-D-209.

AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 62G30; Secondary 60G15, 62E20.

Key words and phrases. Order statistics, Gaussian processes, extreme-value theory, weak convergence.

the Gaussian sequence is strong-mixing and

$$(1.4) r_n \log n = O(1).$$

The limit law is the same as that which occurs in the independent case.

Condition (1.4) is weaker than (1.2) but we imposed the strong-mixing condition. In many cases strong-mixing is difficult to verify and it is natural in view of Berman's work to see if the weak convergence results mentioned above hold when the strong-mixing assumption is dropped and just (1.2) or (1.3) is assumed. The purpose of this paper is to show that this is, in fact, true. The reader is referred to [6] for some examples of why it is of interest to consider the joint distribution of  $M_n$  and  $S_n$ . A more extensive discussion of the maxima of stationary Gaussian processes is contained in [3].

2. Some properties of Gaussian distributions. Let  $(r_{ij})$  be a  $k \times k$  symmetric positive definite matrix with 1's along the diagonal, and let  $\phi_k(x_1, \dots, x_k; r_{ij}, 1 \le i < j \le k)$  be the k-dimensional Gaussian density function with mean vector 0 and covariance matrix  $(r_{ij})$ ;  $\phi_k$  is a function of the x's and the k(k-1)/2 parameters  $r_{ij}$ . Define:

$$(2.1) \tilde{Q}_k(c, d, \alpha, \{r_{ij}\}) = \int_{-\infty}^c dx_1 \cdots \int_{-\infty}^c dx_{\alpha-1} \int_d^\infty dx_\alpha \int_{-\infty}^c dx_{\alpha+1} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^c dx_k \times \phi_k(x_1, \dots, x_k; \{r_{ij}\}).$$

The integral from d to  $\infty$  will always be on the  $\alpha$ th dummy variable and we assume that  $0 < c \le d$ .

LEMMA 1. If  $r_{ij} \equiv r_{ji}$  then

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{Q}_k}{\partial r_{hl}} = \int_{-\infty}^{c} \cdots \int_{d}^{\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{c} \phi_k(x_1, \dots, x_{h-1}, c, x_{h+1}, \dots, x_{l-1}, c, x_{l+1}, \dots, x_k) \\ \times \prod_{j \neq h, j \neq l} dx_j$$

when  $h \neq \alpha$ ,  $l \neq \alpha$ ,  $h \neq l$ , and

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{\partial \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_k}{\partial r_{\alpha l}} = -\int_{-\infty}^{c} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{c} \phi_k(x_1, \dots, x_{\alpha-1}, d, x_{\alpha+1}, \dots, x_{l-1}, c, x_{l+1}, \dots, x_k) \times \prod_{j \neq \alpha, j \neq l} dx_j$$

with a corresponding expression when  $h \neq \alpha$  and  $l = \alpha$ .

PROOF. A complete proof is contained on page 481 of the paper by Slepian [4]. Only the essential ideas will be given here. The k-variate Gaussian density is given in terms of its characteristic function by

$$\phi_k(x_1, \dots, x_k; \{r_{ij}\}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt_1 \dots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt_k \exp\left[i\sum x_j t_j - \frac{1}{2}\sum r_{ij} t_i t_j\right].$$

From this expression it is easy to see that

$$\frac{\partial \phi_k}{\partial r_{i,i}} = \frac{\partial^2 \phi_k}{\partial x_i \partial x_i} \qquad j > i$$

which allows integration over  $x_i$  and  $x_j$ , giving (2.2) and (2.3) and completing the proof of Lemma 1.

If the upper limits of integration in (2.2) are replaced by  $(\infty, \dots, \infty)$  then the value of the integral is increased. Now integrate k-3 variables from  $-\infty$  to  $+\infty$  to obtain

(2.4) 
$$\frac{\partial \tilde{Q}_k}{\partial r_{hl}}(c, d, \alpha, \{r_{ij}\}) \leq \int_d^\infty \phi_3(c, c, x_\alpha; \Sigma(h, l, \alpha)) dx_\alpha$$

where

$$\Sigma(h, l, \alpha) = {}_{\Delta} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r_{hl} & r_{h\alpha} \\ r_{lh} & 1 & r_{l\alpha} \\ r_{\alpha h} & r_{\alpha l} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We note that if the limits of integration in (2.3) are replaced by  $(\infty, \dots, \infty)$  then

(2.5) 
$$\left| \frac{\partial \tilde{Q}_k}{\partial r_{\alpha l}} \right| \leq \phi_2(c, c; r_{\alpha l}) = (2\pi)^{-1} (1 - r_{\alpha l}^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left[-c^2/(1 + r_{\alpha l})\right].$$

Since  $\{X_n\}$  is a stationary process,  $r_{ij}$  is a function of the difference j = i, i < j; we write  $r_{j-i} = r_{ij}$ . The function  $\tilde{P}_k$  is defined as

$$\tilde{P}_k(c, d, \alpha, r_1, \dots, r_{k-1}) = \tilde{Q}_k(c, d, \alpha, \{r_{ij}\})$$

and the partial derivatives are given by the chain rule as

$$\partial \tilde{P}_{k}/\partial r_{j} = \sum_{l-h=j} \partial \tilde{Q}_{k}/\partial r_{hl}$$
.

Let the sequences  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$  be defined as

(2.6) 
$$a_n = (2 \log n)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$b_n = (2 \log n)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2} (2 \log n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\log \log n + \log 4\pi).$$

It is known (Cramér, page 374) that when  $r_n = 0$ ,  $n \neq 0$ 

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P\{M_n \le a_n x + b_n\} = \exp(-e^{-x}) = \Delta G(x)$$

for all x.

Both (1.2) and (1.3) imply that  $r_n \to 0$ ; therefore, there exists a positive number  $\delta$  such that

$$\sup_{n} |r_n| = \delta < 1.$$

Define:  $\delta(n) = \sup_{k \ge n} |r_k|$ ,  $q_n = [n^{\beta}]$ ,  $\delta_n = \delta([q_n/2])$  where  $0 < \beta < (1 - \delta)^2/2(1 + 2\delta)^2$ . Clearly (1.2) implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \delta(n) \log n = 0, \qquad \text{and}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\delta_n\log n=0.$$

3. Convergence theorems. In this section we extend Berman's results to the joint laws of  $M_n$  and  $S_n$ .

THEOREM 1. Let  $\{X_n, n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \cdots\}$  be a stationary Gaussian sequence satisfying (1.1). If

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}r_n\log n=0$$

then

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} P\{M_n \le a_n x + b_n, S_n \le a_n y + b_n\}$$

$$= G(y)\{1 + \log[G(x)/G(y)]\} \qquad y < x$$

$$= G(x) \qquad y \ge x.$$

The following two lemmas will be needed in the proof. For convenience let  $c_n = a_n y + b_n$  and  $d_n = a_n x + b_n$ , and to avoid technical details we will assume that n is so large that  $c_n > 0$ .

LEMMA 2. Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1 are satisfied and

$$\gamma_n = (1 - 4\delta_n)/(1 + 2\delta_n)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}_n = (1 - 3\delta_n - \delta)/(1 + 2\delta)$$

where n is so large that  $(1 - 2\delta_n - \delta) > 0$ . Then

(3.1) 
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^2 [1 - \Phi(b_n \gamma_n)] \phi_2(c_n, c_n, \delta_n) \sum_{j=q_n+1}^{n-1} |r_j| = 0$$

and

(3.2) 
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n^{1+\beta} [1 - \Phi(b_n \hat{r}_n)] \phi_2(c_n, c_n, \delta_n) \sum_{j=q_n+1}^{n-1} |r_j| = 0$$

where  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is the standardized Gaussian distribution function.

PROOF. Berman [1] as part of the proof of his Theorem 3.1 has shown that

(3.3) 
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} n\phi_2(c_n, c_n, \delta_n) \sum_{j=q_n+1}^{n-1} |r_j| = 0.$$

To prove (3.1) and (3.2) we note that

(3.4) 
$$1 - \Phi(x) \le (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} x^{-1} \exp(-x^2/2) \qquad x > 0,$$

(3.5) 
$$b_{n}^{2} = 2 \log n - \log \log n + O(1), \quad \text{and} \quad$$

$$(3.6) b_n = (2 \log n)^{\frac{1}{2}} + o(1).$$

Therefore

$$n[1 - \Phi(b_n \gamma_n)] = \frac{O(1) \cdot \exp((1 - \gamma_n^2) \log n)}{\exp[((1 - \gamma_n^2)/2) \log \log n] + o(1)}.$$

Since  $1 - \gamma_n^2 = \delta_n \cdot O(1)$  and  $\delta_n \log n \to 0$ ,  $n[1 - \Phi(b_n \gamma_n)]$  is bounded and (3.1) follows from (3.3). Similarly

$$n^{\beta}[1 - \Phi(b_n \hat{\gamma}_n)] = \frac{O(1) \cdot \exp[(\beta - \hat{\gamma}_n^2) \log n]}{\exp[((1 - \hat{\gamma}_n^2)/2) \log \log n] + o(1)}$$

and (3.2) follows because  $\beta < \hat{\gamma}_n^2$  and  $1 - \hat{\gamma}_n^2 > 0$  for sufficiently large n.

LEMMA 3. If the conditions of Theorem 1 hold and y < x, then

(3.7) 
$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} |\tilde{P}_{n}(c_{n}, d_{n}, \alpha, r_{1}, \cdots, r_{n-1}) - \tilde{P}_{n}(c_{n}, d_{n}, \alpha, r_{1}, \cdots, r_{q_{n}}, 0, \cdots, 0)| \to 0.$$

PROOF. By the law of the mean, there exist numbers  $r_i$  between 0 and  $r_i$ ,  $i = q_n + 1, \dots, n - 1$ , such that

$$\tilde{P}_{n}(c_{n}, d_{n}, \alpha, r_{1}, \dots, r_{n-1}) = \tilde{P}_{n}(c_{n}, d_{n}, \alpha, r_{1}, \dots, r_{q_{n}}, 0, \dots, 0) 
= \sum_{j=q_{n+1}}^{n-1} r_{j}(\partial \tilde{P}_{n}/\partial r_{j})(c_{n}, d_{n}, \alpha, r_{1}, \dots, r_{q_{n}}, r'_{q_{n+1}}, \dots, r'_{n-1})$$

and therefore the sum in (3.7) is less than

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} \sum_{j=q_{n}+1}^{n-1} |r_{j}| \sum_{l-h=j} |(\partial \tilde{Q}_{n}/\partial r_{hl})(c_{n}, d_{n}, \alpha, r_{1}, \cdots, r_{q_{n}}, r'_{q_{n}+1}, \cdots, r'_{n-1})|.$$

We now consider three cases:

- (i)  $l = \alpha$  or  $h = \alpha$  (both cannot occur),
- (ii)  $|l \alpha| > q_n/2$  and  $|h \alpha| > q_n/2$ ,
- (iii)  $|l \alpha| \le q_n/2$  or  $|h \alpha| \le q_n/2$  (both cannot occur),  $h \ne \alpha$  and  $l \ne \alpha$ .

In the first case (2.5) applies and

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n}\sum_{j=q_n+1}^{n-1}|r_j|\sum_{l-h=j,l=\alpha\text{ or }h=\alpha}|\partial \tilde{\mathcal{Q}}_n/\partial r_{hl}|\leq 2n\phi_2(c_n,\,c_n,\,\delta_n)\sum_{j=q_n+1}^{n-1}|r_j|$$
 which goes to 0 with  $n$  by (3.3).

For the second case we use (2.4) so that

$$\left| \frac{\partial \tilde{Q}_k}{\partial r_{kl}} \right| \leq \int_{d_n}^{\infty} \phi_3(c_n, c_n, x_{\alpha}; \Sigma'(h, l, \alpha)) dx_{\alpha}$$

where  $\Sigma'(h, l, \alpha)$  contains some primed elements. Now we compute the conditional distribution of  $x_{\alpha}$  given the first two variates, represented here by  $c_n$  (cf. Cramér, page 314). Thus

$$\int_{d_n}^{\infty} \phi_3(c_n, c_n, x_{\alpha}; \Sigma'(h, l, \alpha)) dx_{\alpha} = \phi_2(c_n, c_n, r_{hl})(1 - \Phi((d_n - \mu_n)/\sigma_n))$$

with (suppressing the primes on the elements of  $\Sigma'$ )

$$\mu_n = c_n (r_{h\alpha} + r_{l\alpha})/(1 + r_{hl})$$
 $\sigma_n^2 = (1 - r_{hl}^2 - r_{h\alpha}^2 - r_{l\alpha}^2 + 2r_{hl}r_{h\alpha}r_{l\alpha})/(1 - r_{hl}^2)$ .

By assumption

(3.8) 
$$\max(|r_{h\alpha}|, |r_{l\alpha}|, |r_{hl}|) \leq \delta_n$$

and using this fact we obtain

$$(d_n - \mu_n)/\sigma_n \ge b_n(1 - 3\delta_n)/(1 + 2\delta_n)$$

provided n is taken so large that  $1 - 3\delta_n > 0$ . Summarizing we have

where  $\gamma_n = (1 - 3\delta_n)/(1 + 2\delta_n)$ . Applying (3.1) completes the proof.

The third case is similar to the second one except (3.8) is no longer satisfied. But either  $|r_{\alpha l}| < \delta_n$  or  $|r_{\alpha h}| < \delta_n$  and, of course,  $|r_{h l}| < \delta_n$ . Conditioning as

before and recalling that  $q_n = [n^{\beta}]$  we obtain for large n

$$\begin{array}{l} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} \sum_{j=q_{n}+1}^{n-1} |r_{j}| \sum_{l-h=j, |l-\alpha| \leq q_{n}/2, |h-\alpha| \leq q_{n}/2} |\partial \tilde{Q}_{n}/\partial r_{hl}| \\ & \leq n^{1+\beta} [1 - \Phi(b_{n} \hat{\gamma}_{n})] \phi_{2}(c_{n}, c_{n}, \delta_{n}) \sum_{j=q_{n}+1}^{n-1} |r_{j}| \end{array}$$

where  $\hat{\gamma}_n = (1 - 3\delta_n - \delta)/(1 + 2\delta)$ . This converges to 0 because of (3.2).

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. When  $y \ge x$ , Berman's result applies so we consider y < x. Then

(3.9) 
$$P\{M_{n} \leq a_{n}x + b_{n}, S_{n} \leq a_{n}y + b_{n}\}$$

$$= P\{M_{n} \leq c_{n}\} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (P\{X_{\alpha} > c_{n}; X_{i} \leq c_{n}, 1 \leq i \leq n, i \neq \alpha\}$$

$$- P\{X_{\alpha} > d_{n}; X_{i} \leq c_{n}, 1 \leq i \leq n, i \neq \alpha\} ).$$

The first term in (3.9) converges to G(y) by Berman's result. Each term in the sum of (3.9) is of the form treated in Lemma 3. Hence we need only find the limit of

(3.10) 
$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} \tilde{P}_{n}(c_{n}, c_{n}, \alpha, r_{1}, \dots, r_{q_{n}}, 0, \dots, 0) \\ = \tilde{P}_{n}(c_{n}, d_{n}, \alpha, r_{1}, \dots, r_{q_{n}}, 0, \dots, 0).$$

This can be accomplished by using the proof developed in [5] for a strong-mixing sequence. For each n we are essentially considering a Gaussian sequence which is  $q_n$ -dependent. If

$$p_n = \frac{n - n^{1-\beta}}{n^{1-2\beta}}, \qquad k_n = n^{1-2\beta}$$

then

(a) 
$$k_n \to \infty$$
,  $p_n \to \infty$ 

(b) 
$$n/k_n p_n \rightarrow 1$$
,  $n = k_n(p_n + q_n)$ 

and we split the sequence of n random variables into  $k_n$  blocks of  $p_n$  random variables separated by  $k_n$  blocks of  $q_n$  random variables. Since  $q_n/n = n^{\beta-1} \to 0$  it is easy to show that only the blocks of size  $p_n$  need to be considered. These blocks may now be treated as independent of each other because  $r_{q_n+1}, r_{q_n+2}, \cdots$  are all equal to zero in (3.10). In order to complete the proof as outlined in [5] we must verify that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} k_n \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (p_n - j) P\{X_1 > c_n, X_{j+1} > c_n\} = 0$$
.

This can be accomplished by using the mean-value theorem on  $P\{X_1 > c_n, X_{j+1} > c_n\}$  as a function of  $r_j$ . The details are contained in the proof of Theorem 3 of [5].

Theorem 1 may also be proved when  $\sum_{n} r_{n}^{2} < \infty$ . Only minor modifications of the proof given above are required.

**4. Concluding remarks.** The weak convergence results of Theorem 2 of [5] are also valid. The convergence of the finite dimensional distributions of  $(M_{[nt]} - b_n)/a_n$  and  $(S_{[nt]} - b_n)/a_n$  can be proved in manner similar to that given above. Even if just the one-dimensional process  $M_{[nt]}$  is considered, it is necessary to

verify the convergence of the second maximum since this is an essential part of the tightness proof given in Theorem 2 of [5]. We are able to use that tightness proof in this case because it depends on the form of the limit law for  $S_n$  and not on the strong-mixing property.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Berman, S. M. (1964). Limit theorems for the maximum term in stationary sequences. *Ann. Math. Statist.* 35 502-516.
- [2] CRAMÉR, H. (1946). Mathematical Methods of Statistics. Princeton Univ. Press.
- [3] PICKANDS, J. (1967). Maxima of stationary Gaussian processes. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete 7 190-223.
- [4] SLEPIAN, D. (1962). The one-sided barrier problem for Gaussian noise. Bell System Tech. J. 41 463-501.
- [5] Welsch, R. E. (1971). A weak convergence theorem for order statistics from strong-mixing processes. Ann. Math. Statist. 42 1637-1646.
- [6] Welsch, R. E. (1972). Limit laws for extreme order statistics from strong-mixing processes. Ann. Math. Statist. 43 439-446.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ALFRED P. SLOAN SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT 50 MEMORIAL DRIVE CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02139