

# A WEAK LAW OF LARGE NUMBERS FOR DEPENDENT RANDOM VARIABLES \*

IOANNIS KARATZAS †

WALTER SCHACHERMAYER ‡

April 11, 2023

*To the memory of A.N. Kolmogorov (1903–1987) on the occasion of the 120<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his birth*

## Abstract

Every sequence  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  of random variables with  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} (M \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(|f_k| > M)) = 0$  contains a subsequence  $f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}, \dots$  that satisfies, together with all its subsequences, the weak law of large numbers:  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} ((1/N) \sum_{n=1}^N f_{k_n} - D_N) = 0$ , in probability. Here  $D_N$  is a “corrector” random variable with values in  $[-N, N]$ , for each  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . These correctors are all equal to zero when  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(f_n^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq M\}}) = 0$  holds for every  $M \in (0, \infty)$ .

*AMS 2020 Subject Classification:* Primary 60A10; Secondary 60F99.

*Keywords:* Weak law of large numbers, hereditary convergence, subsequence principle, weak convergence, truncation, generalized mathematical expectation, nonlinear expectation

## 1 Introduction

On a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , consider real-valued measurable functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots$ . If these are independent and have the same distribution with  $\mathbb{E}(|f_1|) < \infty$ , the celebrated KOLMOGOROV strong law of large numbers (SLLN: [13]; [12]; [7], section 2.4) states that the “sample average”  $(f_1 + \dots + f_N)/N$  converges  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e. to the “ensemble average”  $\mathbb{E}(f_1) = \int_{\Omega} f_1 d\mathbb{P}$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

A deep result of KOMLÓS [14], already 56 years old but always very striking, asserts that such “stabilization via averaging” occurs within *any* sequence  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  of measurable, real-valued functions which is bounded in  $\mathbb{L}^1$ , i.e., satisfies  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}(|f_n|) < \infty$ . More precisely, there exist then an integrable function  $f_*$  and a subsequence  $\{f_{k_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $(f_{k_1} + \dots + f_{k_N})/N$  converges to  $f_*$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e. as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ; and the same holds “hereditarily”, i.e., for any further subsequence of  $\{f_{k_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

We have also another celebrated result of KOLMOGOROV, the weak law of large numbers (WLLN: [13]; [5], section 5.2; [7], § 2.2.3) for a sequence  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  of real-valued, measurable functions which

---

\* We are indebted to Albert SHIRYAEV for pointing out to us the concept of generalized mathematical expectations in KOLMOGOROV [13], a remark which prompted this investigation. We are grateful to Tomoyuki ICHIBA, Donghan KIM, Andrew LYASOFF and Nathan SOEDJAK for their careful reading of the manuscript and their incisive comments.

† Departments of Mathematics and Statistics, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027 (e-mail: [ik1@columbia.edu](mailto:ik1@columbia.edu)). Support from National Science Foundation Grant DMS-20-04977 is gratefully acknowledged.

‡ Faculty of Mathematics, University of Vienna, Oskar-Morgenstern-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria (email: [walter.schachermayer@univie.ac.at](mailto:walter.schachermayer@univie.ac.at)). Support from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) under grant P-28861 and grant P-35197 is gratefully acknowledged.

are independent. If these have the same distribution and satisfy the weak- $\mathbb{L}^1$ -type condition

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( M \cdot \mathbb{P}(|f_1| > M) \right) = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

(rather than the stronger  $\mathbb{E}(|f_1|) < \infty$ ), then the WLLN

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f_n - D_N \right) = 0, \quad \text{in probability} \tag{1.2}$$

holds for the sequence of “correctors”

$$D_N := \mathbb{E} \left( f_1 \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_1| \leq N\}} \right), \quad N \in \mathbb{N}; \tag{1.3}$$

whereas, if the independent functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  do not have the same distribution but satisfy

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{P}(|f_n| > N) = 0, \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left( f_n^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq N\}} \right) = 0, \tag{1.4}$$

then again the convergence in probability (WLLN) in (1.2) holds, though now with correctors

$$D_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left( f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq N\}} \right), \quad N \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{1.5}$$

It was shown in [9], [8] ([5], Theorem 5.2.3) that, for independent  $f_1, f_2, \dots$ , the conditions in (1.4) are not only sufficient but also necessary for the existence of a sequence  $D_1, D_2, \dots$  of real numbers with the property (1.2). Let us also note, that the correctors in both (1.3), (1.5) satisfy  $|D_N| \leq N$ ; and that they are all equal to zero, if the distribution of each of the  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  is symmetric.

## 1.1 Preview

The purpose of this Note is to present a version of the weak law of large numbers which is valid for a sequence of *arbitrarily dependent* random variables, and “hereditarily”, i.e., along an appropriate subsequence of the given sequence, as well as along all further subsequences of this subsequence.

The result is formulated in the next section as Theorem 2.1, and proved in section 3. It can be construed as yet another manifestation of the “principle of subsequences”. Motivated by the work of KOMLÓS [14], this principle was enunciated by CHATTERJI [3] and was further clarified, buttressed and extended by ALDOUS [1], BERKES-PÉTER [2]; we refer also to the excellent survey [4].

The proof of Theorem 2.1, considerably simpler than its counterpart for the strong law in [14], appears in section 3. It is based on truncation and weak convergence arguments, which provide sufficient conditions for the resulting correctors to be equal to zero. It does not seem possible to deduce Theorem 2.1 from the above-mentioned general subsequence principle, as formulated on the first page of [4] (see also the first page of [2]): the result here is not cast in terms of a norm, as that principle requires. And although it might turn out to be possible to deduce this, or a related, result from the abstract considerations in Theorem 2 of [2], the directness, simplicity and brevity of the approach adopted here have quite a bit going for them.

Ramifications are taken up in section 4; as are examples, which show that Theorem 2.1 cannot be subsumed by the abovementioned KOMLÓS Hereditary SLLN.

## 2 Result

We consider real-valued measurable functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ , and introduce for every  $M \in (0, \infty)$  the quantities

$$\tau_n(M) := M \cdot \mathbb{P}(|f_n| > M), \quad \tau(M) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_n(M). \quad (2.1)$$

**Theorem 2.1. A General, Hereditary WLLN.** *In the above context, we impose the weak- $\mathbb{L}^1$ -type condition*

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \tau(M) = 0. \quad (2.2)$$

*There exist then a sequence of corrector random variables  $D_1, D_2, \dots$  with  $\mathbb{P}(|D_N| \leq N) = 1$  for every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , and a subsequence  $\{f_{k_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of the original sequence, such that the WLLN*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f_{k_n} - D_N \right) = 0, \quad \text{in probability} \quad (2.3)$$

*is satisfied hereditarily; i.e., not just along  $\{f_{k_n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  but also along all its subsequences.*

As we shall see in the proof of Theorem (2.1), the correctors  $D_1, D_2, \dots$  correspond to the generalized mathematical expectations in KOLMOGOROV [13], §6.4; they are also related to the nonlinear expectations developed by PENG in [16]. The correctors can be chosen as  $D_N = 0$  for every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  whenever, for each  $M \in (0, \infty)$ , we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( f_n^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq M\}} \right) = 0 \quad (2.4)$$

or, more generally,  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} (f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq M\}} \cdot \xi) = 0$  for every  $\xi \in \mathbf{L}^2$ .

The hereditary aspect of the convergence in (2.3) holds automatically under independence; but requires attention in the present generality. The condition (2.2) can be thought of as an “omnibus”, in that it implies both conditions in (1.4). As shown in the Examples of section 4, the condition (2.2) (or a suitable modification of it) is satisfied in contexts with  $\mathbb{E}(|f_n|) = \infty, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ ; as well as in contexts where  $\mathbb{E}(|f_n|) < \infty$  holds for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , but no subsequence exists which is bounded in  $\mathbb{L}^1$  (and thus the KOMLÓS [14] theorem cannot be applied). We note also that the requirement

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( M \cdot \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(|f_n| > M) \right) = 0$$

of (2.2) implies  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(|f_n| > M) = 0$  (boundedness in  $\mathbb{L}^0$ , or tightness); and is implied by  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}(|f_n| \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| > M\}}) = 0$  (uniform integrability).

## 3 Proof

We start with the simple but crucial idea of *truncation*. This goes back at least to the work of KHINTCHINE and KOLMOGOROV ([9], [11]), where it plays a major role in the proofs of laws of large numbers and of convergence results for series of random variables.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Under the condition (2.2), we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f_n - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq N\}} \right) = 0, \quad \text{in probability.} \quad (3.1)$$

*Proof:* For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the expression

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^N f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n|>N\}}\right| > \varepsilon\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N \{|f_n| > N\}\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{P}(|f_n| > N) \leq N \cdot \max_{1 \leq n \leq N} \mathbb{P}(|f_n| > N)$$

is dominated by  $N \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{P}(|f_n| > N) = \tau(N)$ , which tends to zero as  $N \uparrow \infty$  on the strength of (2.2).  $\square$

It follows that, in order to establish (2.3), it is enough to prove

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq N\}} - D_N \right) = 0, \quad \text{in probability} \quad (3.2)$$

for a suitable sequence  $D_1, D_2, \dots$  of correctors, and along an appropriate subsequence of  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  denoted by the same symbols for economy of exposition—as well as along all further subsequences of this subsequence.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1: For each integer  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we consider the truncated functions

$$f_n^{[-N, N]} := f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq N\}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (3.3)$$

that appear in (3.1), (3.2). These are bounded in  $\mathbb{L}^\infty$  (as they take values in  $[-N, N]$ ), thus bounded in  $\mathbb{L}^2$  as well. As a result we can extract, for each  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , a subsequence of  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  denoted by the same symbols for economy of exposition, such that the sequence in (3.3) converges weakly in  $\mathbb{L}^2$  to some  $D_N \in \mathbb{L}^2$ :

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left(f_n^{[-N, N]} \cdot \xi\right) = \mathbb{E}(D_N \cdot \xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{L}^2. \quad (3.4)$$

And by standard diagonalization arguments, we can extract then a further subsequence of  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , denoted again by the same symbols, such that the convergence in (3.4) is valid for *every*  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . Clearly, the test function  $\xi$  in (3.4) can be taken  $\sigma(f_1, f_2, \dots)$ -measurable.

It is fairly straightforward to check that these weak- $\mathbb{L}^2$  limits in (3.4) satisfy  $\mathbb{P}(|D_N| \leq N) = 1$  for every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . On the other hand, the lower-semicontinuity of the  $\mathbb{L}^2$ -norm under weak- $\mathbb{L}^2$  convergence, in this case

$$\|D_N\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n^{[-N, N]}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2},$$

gives  $\mathbb{P}(D_N = 0) = 1$  for every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , under (2.4); this also holds if, for each  $M \in (0, \infty)$  and every  $\sigma(f_1, f_2, \dots)$ -measurable  $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^2$ , we have  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(f_n \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq M\}} \cdot \xi) = 0$ .

We introduce now, for each  $M \in (0, \infty)$ , the quantities

$$\sigma_n(M) := \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E}\left(f_n^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq M\}}\right), \quad \sigma(M) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \sigma_n(M). \quad (3.5)$$

As shown by FELLER ([8], p. 235; see also [7], § 2.3.3), these quantities are related to those in (2.1) via

$$0 \leq \sigma_n(M) = \frac{2}{M} \int_0^M \tau_n(t) dt - \tau_n(M) \leq \frac{2}{M} \int_0^M \tau(t) dt \quad (3.6)$$

for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $M \in (0, \infty)$ ,<sup>1</sup> thus

$$0 \leq \sigma(M) \leq \frac{2}{M} \int_0^M \tau(t) dt, \quad M \in (0, \infty). \quad (3.7)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> In the integrand of this expression as it appears on page 235 of [8], there is a typographical error; this is here corrected. The identity in (3.6) is in fact a simple consequence of the FUBINI theorem.

From this bound (3.7) and the assumption (2.2), it follows that we have also

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \sigma(M) = 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Furthermore, we note

$$\mathbb{E}\left(f_n^{[-M,M]}\right)^2 = \mathbb{E}\left(f_n^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|f_n| \leq M\}}\right) = M \cdot \sigma_n(M) \leq M \cdot \sigma(M) \quad (3.9)$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $M \in (0, \infty)$  and therefore, on account of (3.8),

$$\mathbb{E}(D_M^2) \leq \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\left(f_n^{[-M,M]}\right)^2 \leq M \cdot \sigma(M) = o(M), \quad \text{as } M \rightarrow \infty. \quad (3.10)$$

We observe at this point that, in order to prove (3.2), and thus (2.3) as well, along a suitable subsequence, it is enough to show convergence along such a subsequence in  $\mathbb{L}^2$ , namely

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \cdot \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \left(f_n^{[-N,N]} - D_N\right)\right)^2 = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

And developing the square, we need to show that the expectations of both the sum of squares and of the double sum of cross-products, i.e.,

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left(f_n^{[-N,N]} - D_N\right)^2 \quad (3.12)$$

and

$$2 \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{1 \leq j < n} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(f_j^{[-N,N]} - D_N\right)\left(f_n^{[-N,N]} - D_N\right)\right], \quad (3.13)$$

respectively, are of order  $o(N^2)$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , for the subsequence in question and for all its subsequences. Now, from (3.9), (3.10), the upper bound

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left(f_n^{[-N,N]} - D_N\right)^2 \leq 2 \sum_{n=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left(f_n^{[-N,N]}\right)^2 + 2N \cdot \mathbb{E}(D_N)^2$$

for the expression in (3.12) is already dominated by  $4N^2 \cdot \sigma(N)$ , which is of order  $o(N^2)$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  on account of (3.8).

It is instructive to recall what happens at this juncture, in the case of independent  $f_1, f_2, \dots$ : the correctors  $D_N$  are then the real constants in (1.5), so the differences  $f_n^{[-N,N]} - D_N$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, N$  are independent with zero mean, thus uncorrelated. The expectations of their cross-products in (3.13) vanish, and the argument ends here.

In the general case, when *nothing* is assumed about the finite-dimensional distributions of the  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  (in particular, when these functions are not independent), we need to guarantee, by passing to a further subsequence if necessary, that the expression in (3.13) is also of order  $o(N^2)$ , as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . One way to accomplish this, is to select the terms  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  of the (relabelled) subsequence in such a way that the differences  $f_n^{[-N,N]} - D_N$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, N$  are *nearly uncorrelated*.

We do this by induction, in the following manner: Suppose the terms  $f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}$  of the subsequence have been chosen. We select the next term  $f_n$  in such a way, that the difference  $f_n^{[-N, N]} - D_N$ , with  $N \leq e^{n^2}$ , is “almost orthogonal” to all of the preceding differences

$$f_1^{[-N, N]} - D_N, \dots, f_{n-1}^{[-N, N]} - D_N;$$

namely, that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( f_j^{[-N, N]} - D_N \right) \left( f_n^{[-N, N]} - D_N \right) \right] \right| \leq e^{-n^2} \leq \frac{1}{N} \quad (3.14)$$

holds for every  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ ,  $N \leq e^{n^2}$ . Such a choice of  $f_n$  is certainly possible on account of (3.4), and completes the induction step.

Returning to (3.13), we note that the double summation

$$2 \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor \sqrt{\log N} \rfloor} \sum_{1 \leq j < n} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( f_j^{[-N, N]} - D_N \right) \left( f_n^{[-N, N]} - D_N \right) \right] \right|$$

is then straightforward to control: each summand is bounded by  $N \cdot \sigma(N)$  on account of (3.9), (3.10), so the entire summation is of the order

$$N\sigma(N) \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor \sqrt{\log N} \rfloor} 2n \sim N\sigma(N) \cdot \log N = o(N^2),$$

as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . On the other hand, the validity of (3.14) for  $j = 1, \dots, n-1$  and  $N \leq e^{n^2}$ , implies that the double summation

$$2 \sum_{n=1+\lfloor \sqrt{\log N} \rfloor}^N \sum_{1 \leq j < n} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( f_j^{[-N, N]} - D_N \right) \left( f_n^{[-N, N]} - D_N \right) \right] \right|$$

is of the order

$$2 \sum_{n=1+\lfloor \sqrt{\log N} \rfloor}^N n e^{-n^2} \sim \int_{\sqrt{\log N}}^N 2x e^{-x^2} dx = \frac{1}{N} - e^{-N^2}$$

as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , thus certainly of order  $o(N^2)$ .

Thus, it follows that the expression of (3.13) is of order  $o(N^2)$  as well, and the argument is now complete. It is also straightforward to check that the argument works just as well for an arbitrary subsequence, of the subsequence just constructed.  $\square$

## 4 Ramifications and Examples

The condition (2.2), which reads  $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_n(M) \right) = 0$ , can be weakened to

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( \liminf_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_n(M) \right) = 0 \quad (4.1)$$

Indeed, by passing to a subsequence, this becomes

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( \limsup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_n(M) \right) = 0, \quad (4.2)$$

and one checks relatively easily that (4.2) can replace (2.2) in the inductive construction of the subsequence (of)  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . We note also that the condition (4.2) can be satisfied in situations where (2.2) fails.

**Example 4.1.** To illustrate this last point, take  $g \in \mathbb{L}^0$  with

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left( M \cdot \mathbb{P}(|g| > M) \right) > 0, \quad (4.3)$$

thus  $\mathbb{E}(|g|) = \infty$  (e.g., with CAUCHY distribution  $\mathbb{P}(g \in A) = \int_A (\pi(1+x^2))^{-1} dx$ ) and define the functions

$$f_n := g \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{|g| > n\}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (4.4)$$

also with  $\mathbb{E}(|f_n|) = \infty$ . We have then  $\tau_n(M) = M \cdot \mathbb{P}(|g| > M \vee n)$ ,  $\tau(M) = M \cdot \mathbb{P}(|g| > M)$ , so (4.3) means that (2.2) fails. However,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tau_n(M) = M \cdot \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(|g| > n) = 0$  holds for every  $M \in (0, \infty)$ , so (4.2) is satisfied.

Thus, the WLLN (2.3) follows for a suitable sequence of correctors  $D_1, D_2, \dots$ . It is also checked that the condition (2.4) is satisfied here, so all these correctors can actually be chosen equal to zero.

**Example 4.2.** To provide another illustration of Theorem 2.1 which highlights the role of condition (2.2) in a somewhat more substantial manner, let us revisit an old example from [11] (see also section 5.2 of [5]). Suppose that the functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}(f_n = \pm k) = \frac{c}{k^2 \log k}, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots \quad (4.5)$$

with constant  $2c = (\sum_{k \geq 2} k^{-2} (1/\log k))^{-1}$  and thus  $\mathbb{E}(|f_n|) = \infty$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We assume nothing about the finite-dimensional joint distributions of the  $f_1, f_2, \dots$ ; in particular, we do not require these functions to be independent.

In this setting,

$$\tau_n(M) = 2cM \sum_{k > M} \frac{1}{k^2 \log k} \sim \frac{2c}{\log M}$$

holds for integers  $M \geq 2$  in the notation of (2.1). Thus,  $\tau(M) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_n(M) \leq (2c)/\log M$ , the condition (2.2) is satisfied, and there exists a sequence  $D_1, D_2, \dots$  of correctors such that (2.3) holds for a subsequence  $f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}, \dots$  of  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  and for all further subsequences.

These correctors are all equal to zero, and  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (1/N) \sum_{n=1}^N f_n = 0$  holds in probability for the original sequence, when the  $f_1, f_2, \dots$ , are also independent; cf. Example in section 5.2 of [5].

**Remark 4.3.** Theorem 2.1 has a direct extension, with only very obvious notational changes, to the case where  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  take values in some Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , rather than the real line.

In such an extension, it does not matter whether balls or cubes of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  are considered in the truncation scheme (3.3).

## 4.1 Equivalent Change of Measure; Weak, but Not Strong, Hereditary LLN

In both Examples 4.1 and 4.2, we have  $\mathbb{E}(|f_n|) = \infty$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let us consider now situations where  $\mathbb{E}(|f_n|) < \infty$  holds for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

In the present context, this is actually the more important, indeed the ‘‘canonical’’, case, for the following reason: It has been observed by DELLACHERIE & MEYER (cf. [6], VII:57) that, given

measurable functions  $h_1, h_2, \dots$  on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with values in  $[0, \infty)$ , an equivalent probability measure  $\mathbb{Q} \sim \mathbb{P}$  can be constructed on  $\mathcal{F}$ , with  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e. bounded density  $d\mathbb{Q}/d\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}(h_n) < \infty$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In light of this result, and of the fact that convergence in probability depends only on the equivalence class of the underlying probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$ , it follows that whenever there exists a subsequence  $f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}, \dots$  of  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  with  $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}(|f_{k_n}|) < \infty$  (we drop reference to the equivalent probability measure  $\mathbb{Q} \sim \mathbb{P}$  from now on), the KOMLÓS Hereditary SLLN in [14] can be applied to this  $f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}, \dots$  and to all its subsequences.

The interesting question, then, is *whether the requirement  $\mathbb{E}(|f_n|) < \infty, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$  can coexist with both (2.2) and*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(|f_n|) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \inf_{n \geq N} \mathbb{E}(|f_n|) = \infty, \quad (4.6)$$

thus precluding the applicability of the KOMLÓS Hereditary SLLN in [14] but allowing that of the Hereditary WLLN in Theorem 2.1.

This question is answered affirmatively by the example that follows. We are greatly indebted to Andrew LYASOFF [15] for raising it, and for prompting us to construct such an example.

**Example 4.4.** Let us modify slightly the setting of Example 4.2, by considering functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  that satisfy

$$\mathbb{P}(f_n = \pm k) = \frac{c_n}{k^{2+(1/n)} \log k}, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots \quad (4.7)$$

with constant  $2c_n = \left( \sum_{k \geq 2} k^{-(2+(1/n))} (1/\log k) \right)^{-1}$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ; once again, *nothing* is assumed about the finite-dimensional joint distributions of these functions.

Clearly

$$\mathbb{E}(|f_n|) = 2c_n \sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{1}{k^{1+(1/n)} \log k} < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E}(f_n) = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

hold, as does

$$\sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{1}{k^{1+(1/N)} \log k} \left( \sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{1}{k^2 \log k} \right)^{-1} \leq \inf_{n \geq N} \mathbb{E}(|f_n|) < \infty$$

for every  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ . The left-most side in this inequality increases to infinity as  $N \uparrow \infty$ , so (4.6) is satisfied. On the other hand, it is checked readily that the quantity of (2.1) is here

$$\tau_n(M) = M \cdot \mathbb{P}(|f_n| > M) = M \sum_{k > M} \frac{1}{k^{2+(1/n)} \log k} \left( \sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{1}{k^{2+(1/n)} \log k} \right)^{-1},$$

and that (2.2) is satisfied as well: for some real constant  $C > 0$ , we have

$$\tau(M) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \tau_n(M) \leq \frac{C}{\log M} \left( \sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{1}{k^3 \log k} \right)^{-1} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } M \rightarrow \infty.$$

According to Theorem 2.1, there exists a sequence  $D_1, D_2, \dots$  of correctors, with the property that (2.3) holds for some subsequence  $f_{k_1}, f_{k_2}, \dots$  of  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  and for all its subsequences.

We note that in (4.7), and throughout this example, the  $1/n$  in the exponent of the denominator can be replaced by any  $a_n \in (0, 1)$  which decreases to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .



## References

- [1] ALDOUS, D.J. (1977) Limit theorems for subsequences of arbitrarily-dependent sequences of random variables. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verw. Geb.* **40**, 59-82.
- [2] BERKES, I. & PÉTER, E. (1986) Exchangeable sequences and the subsequence principle. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields* **73**, 395-413.
- [3] CHATTERJI, S.D. (1972) Un principe des sous-suites dans la théorie des probabilités. In “Séminaire des Probabilités VI”, University of Strasbourg. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **258**, 72-89. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [4] CHATTERJI, S.D. (1985) A Subsequence Principle in Probability Theory. *Jahresber. Deutsch. Math. Verein.* **87**, 91-107. B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart.
- [5] CHUNG, K.L. (1974) *A Course in Probability Theory*. Second Edition. Probability and Mathematical Statistics: A Series of Monographs and Textbooks, Vol. 21. Academic Press, New York.
- [6] DELLACHERIE, C. & MEYER, P.A. (1980) *Probabilités et Potentiel: Partie B, Théorie des Martingales*. Hermann, Paris.
- [7] DURRETT, R. (2010) *Probability: Theory and Examples*. Cambridge University Press.
- [8] FELLER, W. (1970) *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications: Volume II*. J. Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [9] GNEDENKO, B. & KOLMOGOROV, A.N. (1954) *Limit Distributions for Sums of Independent Random Variables*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Cambridge, Mass.
- [10] KHINTCHINE, A. & KOLMOGOROV, A.N. (1925) Über Konvergenz von Reihen, deren Glieder durch den Zufall bestimmt werden. *Mat. Sbornik* **32**, 668-677.
- [11] KOLMOGOROV, A.N. (1928/29) Über die Summen durch den Zufall bestimmter unabhängiger Größen. *Mathematische Annalen* **99**, 309-319; **102**, 484-488.
- [12] KOLMOGOROV, A.N. (1930) Sur la loi forte des grandes nombres. *Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris* **191**, 910-912.
- [13] KOLMOGOROV, A.N. (1933) *Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik **2** (3). Springer-Verlag, Berlin. English Translation: *Foundations of Probability Theory*, Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1950.
- [14] KOMLÓS, J. (1967) A generalization of a problem of Steinhaus. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.* **18**, 217-229.
- [15] LYASOFF, A. (2022) Personal Communication, 23 May 2022.
- [16] PENG, SH. (2019) *Nonlinear Expectations and Stochastic Calculus under Uncertainty*. Springer-Verlag, NY.