

On sequences of expected maxima and expected ranges*

Nickos Papadatos[†]

*Department of Mathematics, Section of Statistics and Operational Research,
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Panepistemiopolis, 157 84 Athens, Greece.*

Abstract

We investigate conditions in order to decide whether a given sequence of real numbers represents expected maxima or expected ranges. The main result provides a novel necessary and sufficient condition, relating an expected maxima sequence to a translation of a Bernstein function through its Lévy-Khintchine representation.

MSC: Primary 62G30; 60E05; Secondary 44A60.

Key words and phrases: expected maxima; expected ranges; Bernstein functions, Lévy-Khintchine representation, order statistics.

1 Introduction

Let X be an integrable random variable (r.v.) and suppose that $X_{1:k} \leq \dots \leq X_{k:k}$ are the order statistics arising from k independent copies of X . Based solely on the expected values of order statistics,

$$\mu_{i:k} = \mathbb{E} X_{i:k}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

Hoeffding (1953) constructed a sequence of r.v.'s X_k that converges weakly to X , and thus, characterized the distribution function (d.f.) F of X through the triangular array $\mu_{i:k}$. Since each $\mu_{i:k}$ is a linear function of $\mu_{i:i}$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ (see Arnold *et al.* (1992), p. 112, or David and Nagaraja (2003), p. 45), it follows at once that the sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of the expected maxima $\mu_k = \mu_{k:k}$ uniquely determines the d.f. Hill and Spruill (1994), using a theorem of Müntz (1914), improved this result by showing that F is characterized by any subsequence $\{\mu_{k(j)}\}_{j=1}^\infty$ with $\sum_{j=1}^\infty 1/k(j) = \infty$.

Moreover, Hill and Spruill (1994, 2000) proved the following continuity result:

THEOREM 1.1. Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of integrable r.v.'s, $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ a sequence of real numbers, and write $\mu_k(X_n)$ for the expected maxima of k iid copies of X_n . If $\mu_k(X_n) \rightarrow \mu_k$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k \geq 1$ then the following are equivalent.

- (i) There exists an integrable r.v. X such that $X_n \rightarrow_d X$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (\rightarrow_d denotes weak convergence) and $\mu_k(X) = \mu_k$ for all $k \geq 1$.
- (ii) $\mu_k = o(k)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \mu_j = o(k)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

*Work partially supported by the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens' Research fund under Grant 70/4/5637.

[†]e-mail: npapadat@math.uoa.gr, url: users.uoa.gr/~npapadat/

To conclude weak convergence based on this result, it is helpful to recognize whether a given sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ represents expected maxima of some r.v. This question received its own interest, going back to Kadane (1971, 1974), Mallows (1973), Huang (1998) and Kolodynski (2000). In the sequel, a sequence that represents expected maxima of some r.v. will be called *Expected Maxima Sequence* (EMS, for short). Kadane (1974) proved that a necessary and sufficient condition for EMS is that the sequence $\{\mu_{k+2} - \mu_{k+1}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ is the moment sequence of a finite measure in the *open* interval $(0, 1)$; that is, there exists a finite measure τ in $[0, 1]$ such that

$$\tau(\{0\}) = \tau(\{1\}) = 0 \text{ and } \mu_{n+2} - \mu_{n+1} = \int_{[0,1]} u^n d\tau(u), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots \quad (1.1)$$

According to famous Hausdorff's (1921) characterization, this is equivalent to

$$(-1)^s \Delta^s (\mu_{k+2} - \mu_{k+1}) \geq 0, \quad s \geq 0, \quad k \geq 0,$$

(cf. Huang, 1998), where Δ is the forward difference operator ($\Delta^0 \alpha_k = \alpha_k$, $\Delta^1 \alpha_k = \Delta \alpha_k = \alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k$, $\Delta^{s+1} = \Delta \Delta^s$), *plus* conditions on the sequence μ_k that guarantee $\tau(\{0\}) = \tau(\{1\}) = 0$. Kolodynski (2000) completed Huang's result, proving that the boundary conditions on the measure τ are equivalent to $\mu_k = o(k)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \mu_j = o(k)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, another complete characterization of EMS's is as follows (see Kolodynski, 2000).

THEOREM 1.2. A sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ represents the expected maxima of a non-degenerate integrable r.v. if and only if the following three conditions are satisfied.

- (i) $(-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \mu_k > 0$ for all $s \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$.
- (ii) $\mu_k = o(k)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.
- (iii) $\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \mu_j = o(k)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

The purpose of the present work is to give some more light on these necessary and sufficient conditions, noting that it is rather difficult to check either Kadane's condition (1.1) or (i)–(iii) of Theorem 1.2 in practical situations; we thus provide a much easier sufficient condition (of a different nature) in Corollary 3.3. In Section 2 we present an alternative proof of Theorem 1.2; the interest in this proof lies in its constructive part (see Remark 2.1(b)).

Section 3 contains the main results, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, with illustrative examples indicating their usefulness. The main result of Theorem 3.1 characterizes the EMS's using a novel method that relates any such sequence to a translation of a suitable Bernstein function through its Lévy-Khintchine representation. Finally, in Section 4 we provide similar results concerning sequences of expected ranges. Several examples are given.

2 A probabilistic proof of Theorem 1.2

For completeness of the presentation we give a probabilistic proof that only uses the result from Hill and Spruill (see Theorem 1.1, above) plus the Hoeffding construction; thus, we do not invoke results from the moment problem.

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Assume first that $\mu_k = \mathbb{E} X_{k:k} = \mu_k(X)$ for some integrable and

non-degenerate r.v. X with d.f. F . Then we have

$$\mu_k = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [I(x > 0) - F^k(x)] dx$$

(I denotes an indicator function), and thus, $(-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \mu_k = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F^k(x)(1 - F(x))^s dx > 0$. Also,

$$\frac{\mu_k}{k} = \int_0^1 u^{k-1} F^{-1}(u) du,$$

where $F^{-1}(u) = \inf\{x : F(x) \geq u\}$, $0 < u < 1$, is the left continuous inverse of F . Thus, by dominated convergence we conclude that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_k}{k} = 0$. Similarly,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 (1-u)^{k-1} F^{-1}(u) du = 0,$$

and it is easily seen that $\int_0^1 (1-u)^{k-1} F^{-1}(u) du = -\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \mu_j$.

Conversely, assume that (i)–(iii) are satisfied and define the numbers

$$\beta_{i,n} = \frac{n!}{(i-1)!(n-i)!} \sum_{j=0}^{n-i} \binom{n-i}{j} \frac{(-1)^j}{i+j} \mu_{i+j}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad n \geq 1. \quad (2.1)$$

It is easily checked that for every $n \geq 2$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$,

$$\beta_{i+1,n} - \beta_{i,n} = \binom{n}{i} (-1)^{n-i+1} \Delta^{n-i} \mu_i > 0.$$

Therefore, we can define the sequence of discrete uniform r.v.'s X_n by

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n = \beta_{i,n}) = \frac{1}{n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

noting that the support of X_n is the set $\{\beta_{1,n}, \dots, \beta_{n,n}\}$ with $\beta_{1,n} < \beta_{2,n} < \dots < \beta_{n,n}$. Fix now $k \geq 1$ and set $Z_{n,k} = \max\{X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,k}\}$, where $X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,k}$ are iid copies of X_n . It is clear that $\mathbb{P}(Z_{n,k} = \beta_{i,n}) = (i/n)^k - ((i-1)/n)^k$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k(X_n) = \mathbb{E} Z_{n,k} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_{i,n} \left[\left(\frac{i}{n} \right)^k - \left(\frac{i-1}{n} \right)^k \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\left(\frac{i}{n} \right)^k - \left(\frac{i-1}{n} \right)^k \right] \frac{n!}{(i-1)!(n-i)!} \sum_{j=0}^{n-i} \binom{n-i}{j} \frac{(-1)^j}{i+j} \mu_{i+j}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $s = i + j$ so that $s \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $j = s - i$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k(X_n) &= \sum_{s=1}^n \binom{n}{s} \frac{\mu_s}{n^k} \sum_{i=1}^s (-1)^{s-i} \binom{s-1}{i-1} [i^k - (i-1)^k] \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^n \binom{n}{s} \frac{\mu_s}{n^k} \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} (-1)^{s-1-i} \binom{s-1}{i} [(i+1)^k - i^k] \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^n \binom{n}{s} \frac{\mu_s}{n^k} \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{m} \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} (-1)^{s-1-i} \binom{s-1}{i} i^m \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the term i^m should be treated as 1 if $i = m = 0$.

The expression in the curly brackets is a multiple of a Stirling number of the second kind; see Charalambides (2002), Theorem 8.4 and p. 164. Despite this, we can assign a simple probabilistic meaning to the sum, showing that it vanishes whenever $1 \leq m < s - 1$. Indeed, define

$$S(s, m) := \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} (-1)^{s-1-i} \binom{s-1}{i} i^m,$$

and consider m distinct balls and $s - 1$ distinct cells ($s \geq 2, m \geq 1$). If we put the balls into the cells at random, then the probability that every cell is occupied by at least one ball is given by the inclusion-exclusion principle:

$$p(s, m) := \mathbb{P}(\text{every cell contains at least one ball}) = \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} (-1)^i \binom{s-1}{i} \left(\frac{s-1-i}{s-1} \right)^m.$$

Hence,

$$p(s, m) = \frac{1}{(s-1)^m} \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} (-1)^{s-1-i} \binom{s-1}{i} i^m = \frac{1}{(s-1)^m} S(s, m).$$

Since the probability $p(s, m)$ is obviously zero whenever $1 \leq m < s - 1$, we conclude that $S(s, m) = 0$ for $s \geq 3$ and $m = 1, \dots, s - 2$. In other words, and since $S(s, 0) = 0$ for $s \geq 2$, we can write $S(s, m) = S(s, m)I(s \leq m + 1)$, $m \geq 0, s \geq 2$, where I stands for the indicator function. Moreover, since $p(s, s - 1) = \frac{(s-1)!}{(s-1)^{s-1}}$ (for $s \geq 2$), and $S(1, 0) = 1$ by convention, we also have

$$S(s, s - 1) = (s - 1)! \text{ and } S(s, 0) = I(s = 1), \quad s \geq 1.$$

Therefore,

$$S(s, m) = S(s, m)I(s \leq m + 1), \quad m \geq 0, s \geq 1.$$

Using this observation we see that for $n \geq k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k(X_n) &= \sum_{s=1}^n \left(\sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \binom{k}{m} S(s, m) I(s \leq m + 1) \right) \binom{n}{s} \frac{\mu_s}{n^k} \\ &= \sum_{s=1}^k \left(\sum_{m=s-1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{m} S(s, m) \right) \binom{n}{s} \frac{\mu_s}{n^k}, \end{aligned}$$

because for $s > k$ we have $I(s \leq m + 1) = 0$ for all $m = 0, \dots, k - 1$. Hence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k(X_n) = \sum_{s=1}^k \left(\sum_{m=s-1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{m} S(s, m) \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \binom{n}{s} \frac{\mu_s}{n^k}.$$

Clearly, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \binom{n}{s} \frac{\mu_s}{n^k} = 0$ for $s < k$. Thus, only the last term ($s = k$) survives, obtaining

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_k(X_n) = \binom{k}{k-1} S(k, k-1) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \binom{n}{k} \frac{\mu_k}{n^k} = k S(k, k-1) \frac{\mu_k}{k!} = \mu_k.$$

Since $\mu_k(X_n) \rightarrow \mu_k$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k \geq 1$ and, by assumption, (ii) and (iii) are satisfied, it follows from Theorem 1.1 that there exists an integrable X such that $X_n \rightarrow_d X$ and $\mu_k(X) = \mu_k$ for all k , completing the proof. \square

REMARK 2.1. (a) The construction used in the proof follows the line of Hoeffding (1953); the difference here is that the numbers $\beta_{i,n}$ in (2.1) are not assumed to be expectations of (some) order statistics.

(b) The proof shows that, under (i), we can always construct a sequence X_n such that $\mu_k(X_n) \rightarrow \mu_k$ for all $k \geq 1$. However, without (ii) and (iii) it is possible that $X_n \rightarrow_d Y$ with $\mu_k(Y) \neq \mu_k$; see the examples given in Kolodynski (2000) and in Hill and Spruill (1994).

EXAMPLE 2.1. Let $\mu_k = k - \frac{1}{k+1}$. Then, the values $m_k = \mu_{k+2} - \mu_{k+1} = 1 + \frac{1}{(k+2)(k+3)}$ correspond to the moments of a finite measure in the interval $[0, 1]$. More specifically, one can verify that $m_k = \frac{7}{6} \mathbb{E} Y^k$ where $F_Y = \frac{6}{7} F_1 + \frac{1}{7} F_2$ with F_1 being the degenerate d.f. at 1 (the Dirac measure) and F_2 is the d.f. of a Beta(2, 2) r.v. with density $f_2(y) = 6y(1-y)$, $0 < y < 1$. Also, a direct calculation using Newton's formula shows that for $k \geq 0$ and $s \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^{j+1} \binom{s}{j} \left(k + j - \frac{1}{k+j+1} \right) &= 0 + s \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} (-1)^j \binom{s-1}{j} + \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j \binom{s}{j} \int_0^1 x^{k+j} dx \\ &= sI(s=1) + \int_0^1 x^k (1-x)^s dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using the above calculation, it is seen that

$$(-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \mu_k = \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^{j+1} \binom{s}{j} \mu_{k+j} = I(s=1) + \frac{k!s!}{(k+s+1)!} > 0, \quad k \geq 1, \quad s \geq 1,$$

and $\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \mu_j = \frac{k}{k+1} - I(k=1)$. Thus, μ_k satisfies (i) and (iii), but it is not an EMS since it fails to satisfy (ii). After some algebra it can be seen that the numbers $\beta_{i,n}$ in (2.1) are given by $\beta_{i,n} = \frac{i}{n+1} - 1 + nI(i=n)$ and the sequence of discrete uniform r.v.'s X_n , constructed in the proof, converges weakly to a Uniform(-1, 0) r.v. X with $\mu_k(X) = -\frac{1}{k+1}$; thus, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\mu_k(X_n) \rightarrow \mu_k$ for all $k \geq 1$ (because (i) is satisfied – see Remark 2.1(b)), $X_n \rightarrow_d X$ and $\mu_k(X) \neq \mu_k$ for all k . A similar calculation reveals that the sequence $\widetilde{\mu}_k = \frac{k}{k+1} - I(k=1) = 1 - \frac{1}{k+1} - I(k=1)$ satisfies

$$(-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \widetilde{\mu}_k = I(k=1) + \frac{k!s!}{(k+s+1)!} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \widetilde{\mu}_j = k - \frac{1}{k+1}, \quad k \geq 1, \quad s \geq 1.$$

Therefore, (i) and (ii) hold but (iii) fails for $\widetilde{\mu}_k$. Now, the corresponding r.v.'s X_n are uniformly distributed over $\{\frac{i}{n+1} - nI(i=1)\}_{i=1}^n$ and, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\mu_k(X_n) \rightarrow \widetilde{\mu}_k$ for all $k \geq 1$, $X_n \rightarrow_d X$ which is Uniform(0, 1) and, of course, $\mu_k(X) = \frac{k}{k+1} \neq \widetilde{\mu}_k$ only for $k=1$; cf. the example in Hill and Spruill (2000). Note that $\widetilde{\mu}_k$ and μ_k are dual sequences in the sense that if μ_k were the EMS for some r.v. X then $\widetilde{\mu}_k$ would be the EMS for $-X$ and vice-versa; see Kolodynski (2000), p. 297.

3 Necessary and sufficient conditions via integral forms

Although the problem of characterizing sequences that represent expected maxima is completely solved by Theorem 1.2 (or (1.1)), it is usually a difficult task to check the conditions (i)–(iii) (equiv., to verify existence of τ in (1.1)) for a given sequence, e.g., $\mu_k = \sqrt{k}$ or $\mu_k = \log k$. In this section we seek for a different kind of necessary and sufficient conditions, involving the notion of *integral forms*, according to the following definition (see also Definition 3.2, below).

DEFINITION 3.1. We say that a function $g : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ admits a generalized integral form (GIF, for short) if there exists a finite (positive) measure μ in $(0, \infty)$, and measurable functions h and s , with $h \geq 0$, such that

$$\int_{(0, \infty)} h(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) d\mu(y) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad g(x) = \int_{(0, \infty)} h(y) (s(y) - e^{-xy}) d\mu(y), \quad x \geq 1. \quad (3.1)$$

We shall denote by \mathcal{G} the class of all such functions and by \mathcal{G}^* the subset of \mathcal{G} that contains all nonconstant functions $g \in \mathcal{G}$; (3.1) will be denoted by $g = G_s(h; \mu)$. In the particular case where $h(y) = h_0(y)$, with

$$h_0(y) = \frac{e^y}{1 - e^{-y}}, \quad 0 < y < \infty, \quad (3.2)$$

we say that g is written in canonical form, and we denote (3.1) by $g = G_s(\mu) \equiv G_s(h_0; \mu)$.

Before proceeding to the main result we present some auxiliary results.

LEMMA 3.1. Every $g \in \mathcal{G}$ can be written in canonical form.

Proof: For $g = G_s(h; \mu) \in \mathcal{G}$ we can define the measure ν by

$$\nu(A) = \int_A e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) h(y) d\mu(y), \quad A \text{ Borel}, A \subseteq (0, \infty).$$

By (3.1) ν is finite, since $\int_{(0, \infty)} d\nu(y) = \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) h(y) d\mu(y) < \infty$. Thus,

$$g(x) = \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y) (s(y) - e^{-xy}) (e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) h(y)) d\mu(y) = \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y) (s(y) - e^{-xy}) d\nu(y)$$

for all $x \geq 1$, showing that $g = G_s(\nu)$. \square

LEMMA 3.2. Let $g_1 = G_{s_1}(\mu_1)$ and $g_2 = G_{s_2}(\mu_2)$ be two functions in \mathcal{G} . Then, the following are equivalent:

- (i) $g_1(k) - g_2(k) = c$ (constant), $k = 1, 2, \dots$
- (ii) $g_1(x) - g_2(x) = c$ (constant) for all $x \geq 1$.
- (iii) $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

Proof: Since the implications (iii) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (i) are trivial, we show (i) \Rightarrow (iii). Clearly, (i) implies $g_2(k) - g_2(1) = g_1(k) - g_1(1)$, i.e.,

$$\int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y) (e^{-y} - e^{-ky}) d\mu_1(y) = \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y) (e^{-y} - e^{-ky}) d\mu_2(y), \quad k = 2, 3, \dots \quad (3.3)$$

Consider the measures ν_i ($i = 1, 2$) defined by $\nu_i((0, u]) = \mu_i([-\log u, \infty))$, $0 < u < 1$. Changing variables $y = -\log u$ in (3.3), and since $h_0(-\log u) = 1/(u(1-u))$, we obtain

$$\int_{(0,1)} (1+u+\dots+u^n) d\nu_1(u) = \int_{(0,1)} (1+u+\dots+u^n) d\nu_2(u), \quad n = 0, 1, \dots$$

By induction on n it follows that the finite measures ν_1 and ν_2 have all their moments equal, and since they have bounded supports, they are identical; see, e.g., Billingsley (1995), p. 388, Theorem 30.1. Therefore, for every $y \in (0, \infty)$, $\mu_1((0, y]) = \nu_1([e^{-y}, 1)) = \nu_2([e^{-y}, 1)) = \mu_2((0, y])$, showing that $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. \square

COROLLARY 3.1. The measure μ in the canonical form of $g \in \mathcal{G}$ is unique. In particular, $g(x) = G_s(\mu)(x) = 0$ if and only if $\mu = 0$; any non-vanishing constant function $g \notin \mathcal{G}$.

In the following proposition we show that every function $g \in \mathcal{G}^*$ is a translation of a *Bernstein function*. Recall that a non-negative function $\beta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is called Bernstein if it is continuous on $[0, \infty)$, infinitely differentiable in $(0, \infty)$, and its n -th order derivative $\beta^{(n)}$ satisfies $(-1)^{n+1}\beta^{(n)}(x) \geq 0$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots, x > 0$); cf. Schilling *et al.* (2012), p. 21, Definition 3.1 (in the sequel, the value $\beta(0)$ will be defined by continuity as $\beta(0+)$).

PROPOSITION 3.1. Let $g = G_s(h; \mu) \in \mathcal{G}^*$. Then g is continuous on $[1, \infty)$, infinitely differentiable in $(1, \infty)$, and its n -th order derivative is given by

$$(-1)^{n+1}g^{(n)}(x) = \int_{(0,\infty)} y^n h(y) e^{-xy} d\mu(y) > 0, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, x > 1. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof: Notice that the RHS of (3.4) is strictly positive for all $x > 1$, because it can be written as $\int_{(0,\infty)} y^n h_0(y) e^{-xy} d\nu(y)$, where $\nu \neq 0$ is the measure in the canonical form of g ; see Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.1. Also, the function g is continuous at $x = 1$ since for $y > 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, $1 - e^{-\epsilon y} \leq 1 - e^{-y}$. Hence, by (3.1) and dominated convergence, $g(1 + \epsilon) - g(1) = \int_{(0,\infty)} h(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-\epsilon y}) d\mu(y) \rightarrow 0$, as $\epsilon \searrow 0$.

Regarding (3.4), we see that

$$\frac{\partial^n}{\partial x^n} (h(y)(s(y) - e^{-xy})) = (-1)^{n+1} y^n h(y) e^{-xy} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots)$$

is continuous in $x > 1$ for every fixed $y > 0$. Fix $\delta > 1$. Then, with $\theta = \delta - 1 > 0$,

$$y^n h(y) e^{-xy} \leq h(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) \frac{y^n e^{-\theta y}}{1 - e^{-y}} \leq h(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) \sup_{y>0} \frac{y^n e^{-\theta y}}{1 - e^{-y}}, \quad x > \delta, y > 0.$$

The (positive) function $t(y) = y^n e^{-\theta y} / (1 - e^{-y})$ is bounded:

$$t(y) \leq \frac{y}{1 - e^{-y}} \leq \frac{1}{1 - e^{-1}}, \quad 0 < y \leq 1; \quad t(y) \leq \frac{y^n e^{-\theta y}}{1 - e^{-1}} \leq \frac{\max\{e^{-\theta}, (n/\theta)^n e^{-n}\}}{1 - e^{-1}}, \quad y > 1.$$

Thus, choosing, e.g., $C = \max\{1, (n/\theta)^n e^{-n}\} / (1 - e^{-1})$, we see that

$$\left| \frac{\partial^n}{\partial x^n} (h(y)(s(y) - e^{-xy})) \right| = y^n h(y) e^{-xy} \leq C h(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}), \quad y > 0, x > \delta.$$

Since the dominant function $K(y) = Ch(y)e^{-y}(1 - e^{-y})$ is integrable with respect to μ , it is permitted to differentiate (3.1) under the integral sign (see, e.g., Ferguson 1996, p. 124), obtaining (3.4) for $x > \delta > 1$; and since $\delta > 1$ is arbitrary, we conclude (3.4). \square

Proposition 3.1 shows that if $g \in \mathcal{G}^*$ then the function $B(x) := g(x+1) - g(1)$, $x \geq 0$, is Bernstein (of a particular form). It is known that every Bernstein function β can be expressed by its *Lévy-Khintchine representation* (LKR, for short)

$$\beta(x) = a_0 + a_1x + \int_{(0,\infty)} (1 - e^{-xy}) d\nu(y), \quad x \geq 0; \quad (3.5)$$

see Schilling *et al.* (2012), p. 21, Theorem 3.2. Of course it is much simpler to verify the converse, i.e., every function that is expressed as in (3.5) is Bernstein (cf. the proof of Proposition 3.1). The triplet $(a_0, a_1; \nu)$ in LKR is uniquely determined by β , the measure ν satisfies $\int_{(0,\infty)} \min\{1, y\} d\nu(y) < \infty$, and the constants a_0, a_1 are non-negative. Comparing the LKR of B with the canonical form of $g = G_s(\mu) \in \mathcal{G}^*$, we see that (see (3.1))

$$a_0 + a_1x + \int_{(0,\infty)} (1 - e^{-xy}) d\nu(y) = g(x+1) - g(1) = \int_{(0,\infty)} e^{-y}h_0(y)(1 - e^{-xy}) d\mu(y), \quad x \geq 0.$$

That is, $a_0 = a_1 = 0$ and $d\nu(y) = e^{-y}h_0(y)d\mu(y)$ is the LKR of $B(x) = g(x+1) - g(1)$. Conversely, if \mathcal{B}^* denotes the class of Bernstein functions with LKR triplet $(0, 0; \nu)$, $\nu \neq 0$, it is not difficult to show that $g(x+1) - g(1) \in \mathcal{B}^*$ implies $g \in \mathcal{G}^*$. Hence, $g \in \mathcal{G}^*$ if and only if $B \in \mathcal{B}^*$, and we conclude the following:

PROPOSITION 3.2. A function $g : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to \mathcal{G}^* if and only if $B(x) := g(x+1) - g(1)$, $x \geq 0$, is a Bernstein function that admits a Lévy-Khintchine representation of the form (3.5) with $a_0 = a_1 = 0$, $\nu \neq 0$.

We are now in a position to state and prove the main result.

THEOREM 3.1. For a real sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ the following are equivalent:

- (i) There exists a non-degenerate integrable r.v. X such that $\mu_k(X) = \mu_k$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$.
- (ii) The sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is the restriction to the natural numbers of a function $g \in \mathcal{G}^*$ (for \mathcal{G}^* see Definition 3.1), i.e., $\mu_k = g(k)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$.
- (iii) There exists a Bernstein function B with Lévy-Khintchine triplet $(0, 0; \nu)$, $\nu \neq 0$ (see (3.5)), such that $\mu_k = \mu_1 + B(k-1)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$.

If one of (i), (ii), (iii) is fulfilled by $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, then the function $g \in \mathcal{G}^*$ in (ii) is unique, and admits the representation

$$g(x) = \int_{(0,\infty)} \frac{\lambda e^y}{1 - e^{-y}} \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\lambda} e^{-y}(1 - e^{-y}) + e^{-y} - e^{-xy} \right) dF_Y(y), \quad x \geq 1, \quad (3.6)$$

where $\lambda = \mu_2 - \mu_1$, F_Y is the d.f. of the r.v. $Y = -\log F(V)$, F is the d.f. of X , and the r.v. V has density

$$f_V(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda} F(x)(1 - F(x)), \quad -\infty < x < \infty;$$

the Bernstein function B in (iii), which is also unique, is related to g by $B(x) = g(x+1) - \mu_1$, $x \geq 0$.

Proof: (ii) \Rightarrow (i). Suppose that $\mu_k = g(k)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, for some $g = G_s(h; \mu) \in \mathcal{G}^*$. It suffices to verify conditions (i)–(iii) of Theorem 1.2 for μ_k . From (3.4), $g'(x) > 0$ for $x > 1$. Hence, by monotone convergence and by continuity of g at 1+,

$$\int_1^x g'(t) dt = \lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} \int_{1+\epsilon}^x g'(t) dt = \lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} [g(x) - g(1 + \epsilon)] = g(x) - g(1), \quad x > 1. \quad (3.7)$$

It should be noted that differentiability of g in $(1, \infty)$ plus continuity at 1 are not sufficient for concluding (3.7), as the example $g(x) = (x-1) \sin(1/(x-1))$ shows. Now, by induction on s (and by using (3.7) when $k = 1$), it is easily seen that

$$\sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^{s-j} \binom{s}{j} g(k+j) = \int_k^{k+1} \int_{t_1}^{t_1+1} \cdots \int_{t_{s-1}}^{t_{s-1}+1} g^{(s)}(t_s) dt_s \dots dt_2 dt_1, \quad s \geq 1, k \geq 1. \quad (3.8)$$

Therefore, since $\mu_{k+j} = g(k+j)$,

$$(-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \mu_k = \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^{j+1} \binom{s}{j} g(k+j) = \int_k^{k+1} \int_{t_1}^{t_1+1} \cdots \int_{t_{s-1}}^{t_{s-1}+1} (-1)^{s+1} g^{(s)}(t_s) dt_s \dots dt_2 dt_1;$$

the last expression verifies condition (i) of Theorem 1.2, because the integrand is strictly positive (see (3.4)). Condition (ii) of Theorem 1.2 is simply deduced from dominated convergence since $(1 - e^{-ky})/k \leq 1 - e^{-y}$ and, obviously, $(1 - e^{-ky})/k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Hence,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_k}{k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_{k+1} - \mu_1}{k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{(0, \infty)} e^{-y} h(y) \left(\frac{1 - e^{-ky}}{k} \right) d\mu(y) = 0.$$

Set now $\nu_k = \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \mu_j$, so that $\nu_1 = -\mu_1$. It is not hard to check that $\nu_{s+1} - \nu_s = (-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \mu_1 > 0$, where $\Delta^s \mu_1 = \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^{s-j} \binom{s}{j} \mu_{j+1}$. Defining $y_s := (-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \mu_1 > 0$, we have

$$\nu_k = -\mu_1 + \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \mu_1 = -\mu_1 + \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} y_s.$$

If it can be shown that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} y_k = 0$ then it will follow that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_k}{k} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{y_1 + \cdots + y_{k-1}}{k} = 0,$$

which means that the sequence μ_k satisfies condition (iii) of Theorem 1.2. Due to (3.1),

$$\begin{aligned} y_k &= \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{j+1} \binom{k}{j} g(j+1) = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{j+1} \binom{k}{j} \int_{(0, \infty)} h(y) (s(y) - e^{-(j+1)y}) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)} h(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y})^k d\mu(y) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

by dominated convergence.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii). Let F be the d.f. of X , and set $\alpha = \inf\{x : F(x) > 0\}$, $\omega = \sup\{x : F(x) < 1\}$. By the assumption that X is non-degenerate it follows that $-\infty \leq \alpha < \omega \leq +\infty$, and the open interval (α, ω) has strictly positive (or infinite) length. We define the family of d.f.'s $\{F^t, t \geq 1\}$, and let us denote by X_t a generic r.v. with d.f. F^t , so that $X_1 = X$. Since X is integrable, the same is true for each X_t . Indeed, $F^t(x) \leq F(x)$ and $1 - F^t(x) \leq t(1 - F(x))$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \geq 1$, showing that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} X_t^- &= \int_{-\infty}^0 F^t(x) dx \leq \int_{-\infty}^0 F(x) dx < \infty, \\ \mathbb{E} X_t^+ &= \int_0^{\infty} (1 - F^t(x)) dx \leq t \int_0^{\infty} (1 - F(x)) dx < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

where $X^+ = \max\{X, 0\}$, $X^- = \max\{-X, 0\}$, denotes, resp., the positive and negative part of any r.v. X . This enables us to define the function $g : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g(t) := \mathbb{E} X_t = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [I(x > 0) - F^t(x)] dx, \quad t \geq 1;$$

by definition, $g(k) = \mu_k$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots$. For $t \in [1, \infty)$ write

$$\begin{aligned}g(t) - g(1) &= \int_{\alpha}^{\omega} [F(x) - F^t(x)] dx = \int_{\alpha}^{\omega} F(x)(1 - F(x)) \frac{F(x) - F^t(x)}{F(x)(1 - F(x))} dx \\ &= \int_{\alpha}^{\omega} F(x)(1 - F(x)) \frac{e^{-\delta(x)} - e^{-t\delta(x)}}{e^{-\delta(x)}(1 - e^{-\delta(x)})} dx, \quad \text{where } \delta(x) = -\log F(x); \quad (3.9)\end{aligned}$$

note that $0 < F(x) < 1$ for all $x \in (\alpha, \omega)$, so that $\delta(x) > 0$. Setting $\lambda = \mu_2 - \mu_1 = g(2) - g(1) = \int_{\alpha}^{\omega} F(x)(1 - F(x)) dx > 0$, we readily see that $f_V(x) := F(x)(1 - F(x))/\lambda$ defines a probability density on \mathbb{R} with support (α, ω) . Consider an r.v. V with density f_V . Then (3.9) can be rewritten as

$$g(t) - g(1) = \lambda \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{e^{\delta(V)}}{1 - e^{-\delta(V)}} (e^{-\delta(V)} - e^{-t\delta(V)}) \right\}, \quad t \geq 1,$$

where $\delta(V) = -\log F(V)$ is a strictly positive r.v., because $\alpha < V < \omega$ w.p. 1. Setting $Y := \delta(V) > 0$, we get

$$g(t) - g(1) = \lambda \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{e^Y}{1 - e^{-Y}} (e^{-Y} - e^{-tY}) \right\} = \lambda \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)(e^{-y} - e^{-ty}) dF_Y(y), \quad t \geq 1,$$

where $h_0(y) = e^y/(1 - e^{-y})$ (see (3.2)) and F_Y is the d.f. of Y . If we introduce the measure μ defined by $\mu(A) = \lambda \mathbb{P}(Y \in A)$ for Borel $A \subseteq (0, \infty)$, the above relation takes the form

$$g(t) - g(1) = \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)(e^{-y} - e^{-ty}) d\mu(y), \quad t \geq 1.$$

Moreover, since $h_0(y) > 0$,

$$0 < \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)e^{-y}(1 - e^{-y}) d\mu(y) = \int_{(0, \infty)} d\mu(y) = \mu((0, \infty)) = \lambda < \infty.$$

Observing that

$$g(1) = \mu_1 = \frac{\mu_1}{\lambda} \int_{(0,\infty)} d\mu(y) = \int_{(0,\infty)} h_0(y) \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\lambda} e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) \right) d\mu(y),$$

we get

$$g(t) = g(1) + (g(t) - g(1)) = \int_{(0,\infty)} h_0(y) \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\lambda} e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) + e^{-y} - e^{-ty} \right) d\mu(y), \quad t \geq 1;$$

this shows both (3.1) and (3.6).

Finally, the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) follows from Proposition 3.2, and uniqueness (of g and μ) is evident from Lemma 3.2. \square

The following definition provides a helpful tool in verifying whether a given function g belongs to \mathcal{G}^* .

DEFINITION 3.2. Let $g : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an arbitrary function. We say that g admits an integral form (IF, for short) if there exist measurable functions $h_1 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $s : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with $h_1 \geq 0$, such that

$$0 < \int_0^\infty h_1(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) dy < \infty \quad (3.10)$$

and

$$g(x) = \int_0^\infty h_1(y) (s(y) - e^{-xy}) dy, \quad x \geq 1. \quad (3.11)$$

We shall denote by \mathcal{I} the class of all such functions and, provided that h_1 satisfies (3.10), the representation (3.11) will be denoted by $g = I_s(h_1)$.

LEMMA 3.3. $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*$.

Proof: Assume that $g = I_s(h_1) \in \mathcal{I}$ and define the (positive) measure μ by

$$\mu((0, y]) = \int_0^y h_1(x) e^{-x} (1 - e^{-x}) dx, \quad y > 0.$$

By definition, μ is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure on $(0, \infty)$, with Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{d\mu(y)}{dy} = h_1(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}), \quad \text{for almost all } y > 0.$$

Clearly μ is finite, and (3.11) can be rewritten as

$$g(x) = \int_0^\infty h_0(y) (s(y) - e^{-xy}) \left(h_1(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) \right) dy = \int_{(0,\infty)} h_0(y) (s(y) - e^{-xy}) d\mu(y), \quad x \geq 1,$$

showing the integral representation in (3.1). Moreover, from (3.10),

$$0 < \int_{(0,\infty)} h_0(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) d\mu(y) = \int_{(0,\infty)} d\mu(y) = \int_0^\infty h_1(y) e^{-y} (1 - e^{-y}) dy < \infty.$$

Hence, $g = G_s(\mu)$ with $\mu \neq 0$. \square

COROLLARY 3.2. The function h_1 in the integral representation (3.11) of any $g = I_s(h_1) \in \mathcal{I}$ is (almost everywhere) unique.

Proof: If we express $g = I_s(h_1) \in \mathcal{G}$ in its canonical form as $g = G_s(\mu)$ (see Lemma 3.1), then the function $h_1(y)/h_0(y)$ is a Radon-Nikodym derivative of μ with respect to Lebesgue measure. The result follows from Corollary 3.1 and the fact that the Radon-Nikodym derivative is almost everywhere unique. \square

We can now state the following result which provides a sufficient condition that is useful for most practical situations.

COROLLARY 3.3. If a function $g : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belongs to \mathcal{I} (see Definition 3.2) then the sequence $\mu_k = g(k)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$, represents the expected maxima sequence of an integrable non-degenerate random variable.

Proof: Evident from Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.3. \square

If $g = G_s(\mu) \in \mathcal{G}^*$ (see Definition 3.1) and the measure μ has a Radon-Nikodym derivative h_μ with respect to Lebesgue measure, the condition (3.1) is equivalent to (3.10) and (3.11). Indeed, in this case,

$$g(x) = \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)(s(y) - e^{-xy}) d\mu(y) = \int_0^\infty h_\mu(y)h_0(y)(s(y) - e^{-xy}) dy,$$

and it is sufficient to choose $h_1 = h_0 \cdot h_\mu$. Hence, $g = G_s(\mu) \in \mathcal{I}$ if and only if the measure μ in the canonical form of g is (non-zero and) absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. However, given an *arbitrary* sequence μ_k , even if it can be shown that it is an EMS (using, e.g., Theorem 1.2, Theorem 3.1, Corollary 3.3, or (1.1)), we would like to decide if it corresponds to an absolutely continuous r.v. We note at this point that the condition $g \in \mathcal{I}$ is neither necessary nor sufficient for concluding that the EMS $\{g(k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ corresponds to a density (see Remark 3.1, below). An interesting exception where this fact can be deduced automatically is described by the following definition.

DEFINITION 3.3. Denote by \mathcal{F} the subclass of absolutely continuous r.v.'s X with interval supports $(\alpha, \omega) = (\alpha_X, \omega_X)$, $-\infty \leq \alpha < \omega \leq +\infty$, having a differentiable d.f. F in (α, ω) , and such that their density $f(x) = F'(x)$ is strictly positive and continuous in (α, ω) .

THEOREM 3.2. For a given sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) The sequence μ_k represents an expected maxima sequence of an integrable r.v. $X \in \mathcal{F}$.
- (ii) There is an extension $g : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the sequence μ_k (that is, $\mu_k = g(k)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$), such that g admits an integral representation of the form (3.11), with h_1 satisfying (3.10) and, furthermore, h_1 is strictly positive and continuous in $(0, \infty)$.

Moreover, if (i) or (ii) holds, then the function g is unique, and the continuous version of h_1 in the integral representation (3.11) is uniquely determined by

$$h_1(y) = \frac{e^{-y}}{f(F^{-1}(e^{-y}))}, \quad 0 < y < +\infty, \quad (3.12)$$

where f and F^{-1} are, respectively, the density and the inverse d.f. of the unique r.v. $X \in \mathcal{F}$ with expected maxima μ_k ; any other version h_2 is equal to h_1 almost everywhere in $(0, \infty)$.

Proof: Assume first that (i) holds, let F be the d.f. of X , and set $(\alpha, \omega) = \{x : 0 < F(x) < 1\}$. Since $X \in \mathcal{F}$, $\lambda := \mu_2 - \mu_1 > 0$. Using (3.6) and the fact that V has density

$$f_V(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda} F(x)(1 - F(x)), \quad \alpha < x < \omega,$$

the additional assumption $X \in \mathcal{F}$ implies that $Y = -\log F(V)$ has a continuous, strictly positive, density

$$f_Y(y) = \frac{e^{-2y}(1 - e^{-y})}{\lambda f(F^{-1}(e^{-y}))}, \quad 0 < y < \infty,$$

with f and F^{-1} being, respectively, the derivative and the ordinary inverse of the restriction in (α, ω) of F . Substituting $dF_Y(y) = f_Y(y)dy$ in (3.6) we get (ii) with h_1 as in (3.12).

Assume now that (ii) holds. From (3.11),

$$\mu_k - \mu_1 = g(k) - g(1) = \int_0^\infty h_1(y)(e^{-y} - e^{-ky}) dy, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.13)$$

Also, Corollary 3.3 shows that the sequence $\mu_k = g(k)$ is an EMS of a unique (non-degenerate) r.v. X . It remains to show that $X \in \mathcal{F}$, i.e., that its d.f. F belongs to \mathcal{F} . To this end, define the function

$$G(u) := \begin{cases} c_1 - \int_u^{1/2} \frac{1}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt, & 0 < u \leq 1/2, \\ c_1 + \int_{1/2}^u \frac{1}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt, & 1/2 < u < 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

where c_1 is a constant to be specified later. By the assumption on h_1 , G is strictly increasing and differentiable in the interval $(0, 1)$. Moreover, G is integrable, since by (3.10) and Tonelli's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 |G(u) - c_1| du &= \int_0^{1/2} \int_u^{1/2} \frac{1}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt du + \int_{1/2}^1 \int_{1/2}^u \frac{1}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt du \\ &= \int_0^{1/2} h_1(-\log t) dt + \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{1-t}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt \\ &= \int_{\log 2}^\infty e^{-y} h_1(y) dy + \int_0^{\log 2} (1 - e^{-y}) h_1(y) dy < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Let U be a Uniform $(0, 1)$ r.v. and define the r.v. $Y := G(U)$ with d.f. F_Y ; that is, $G = F_Y^{-1}$. Clearly, $\mathbb{E}|Y| = \mathbb{E}|G(U)| < \infty$. We can show that $Y \in \mathcal{F}$. Indeed, setting $\alpha_Y := \lim_{u \searrow 0} G(u)$, $\omega_Y := \lim_{u \nearrow 1} G(u)$, we see that $G : (0, 1) \rightarrow (\alpha_Y, \omega_Y)$ is strictly increasing and differentiable, with continuous, strictly positive, derivative $G'(u) = h_1(-\log u)/u$. This means that its inverse, $G^{-1} = F_Y : (\alpha_Y, \omega_Y) \rightarrow (0, 1)$, has also a continuous, strictly positive, derivative $f_Y(y) = F_Y'(y) = 1/G'(G^{-1}(y))$. Observe that $F_Y(y) = G^{-1}(y)$ tends to 0 as y approaches α_Y from above, so that, by monotone convergence,

$$\int_{\alpha_Y}^y f_Y(x) dx = \lim_{a \searrow \alpha_Y} \int_a^y F_Y'(x) dx = \lim_{a \searrow \alpha_Y} [F_Y(y) - F_Y(a)] = F_Y(y), \quad \alpha_Y < y < \omega_Y.$$

Taking limits as $y \nearrow \omega_Y$ in the above relation, and using again monotone convergence and the fact that $G^{-1}(y)$ tends to 1 as $y \nearrow \omega_Y$, we see that

$$\int_{\alpha_Y}^{\omega_Y} f_Y(x) dx = \lim_{y \nearrow \omega_Y} \int_{\alpha_Y}^y f_Y(x) dx = \lim_{y \nearrow \omega_Y} F_Y(y) = \lim_{y \nearrow \omega_Y} G^{-1}(y) = 1;$$

hence, $Y \in \mathcal{F}$. According to the implication (i) \Rightarrow (ii), the sequence $\tilde{\mu}_k := \mu_k(Y)$ admits an extension $g_2 : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$g_2(x) = \int_0^\infty h_2(y)(s_2(y) - e^{-xy}) dy, \quad x \geq 1,$$

such that h_2 satisfies (3.10) (with h_2 in place of h_1) and is continuous and strictly positive in $(0, \infty)$. Therefore, we have

$$\tilde{\mu}_k - \tilde{\mu}_1 = g_2(k) - g_2(1) = \int_0^\infty h_2(y)(e^{-y} - e^{-ky}) dy, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.15)$$

We can calculate the same quantities directly from $G = F_Y^{-1}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_k - \tilde{\mu}_1 &= \int_0^1 ku^{k-1} G(u) du - \int_0^1 G(u) du \\ &= - \int_0^{1/2} ku^{k-1} \int_u^{1/2} \frac{1}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt du + \int_0^{1/2} \int_u^{1/2} \frac{1}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt du \\ &\quad + \int_{1/2}^1 ku^{k-1} \int_{1/2}^u \frac{1}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt du - \int_{1/2}^1 \int_{1/2}^u \frac{1}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt du. \end{aligned}$$

Since all integrands in the last four integrals are non-negative, we can interchange the order of integration. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_k - \tilde{\mu}_1 &= - \int_0^{1/2} t^{k-1} h_1(-\log t) dt + \int_0^{1/2} h_1(-\log t) dt \\ &\quad + \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{1-t^k}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt - \int_{1/2}^1 \frac{1-t}{t} h_1(-\log t) dt \\ &= \int_{\log 2}^\infty (-e^{-ky} + e^{-y}) h_1(y) dy + \int_0^{\log 2} ((1 - e^{-ky}) - (1 - e^{-y})) h_1(y) dy \\ &= \int_0^\infty (e^{-y} - e^{-ky}) h_1(y) dy, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3.16) \end{aligned}$$

From (3.13), (3.15) and (3.16) we see that

$$g(k) - g(1) = \mu_k - \mu_1 = \tilde{\mu}_k - \tilde{\mu}_1 = g_2(k) - g_2(1), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

Therefore, since g and g_2 belong to $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*$, it follows from Lemma 3.2 that $g(x) - g_2(x) = \mu_1 - \tilde{\mu}_1$ (constant), $x \geq 1$. Choosing the constant c_1 in (3.14) so that $\tilde{\mu}_1 = \mu_1$, we get $\tilde{\mu}_k = \mu_k$ for all k , which implies that $g = g_2$ and $F = F_Y \in \mathcal{F}$.

Uniqueness of g and h_1 follow immediately from Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2, respectively. \square

REMARK 3.1. Assume that $g \in \mathcal{G}^*$. The additional assumption $g \in \mathcal{I}$ is neither necessary nor sufficient for the EMS $\{g(k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ to arise from an absolutely continuous r.v.:

(a) Consider the r.v. X with density $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}I(-2 < x < -1) + \frac{1}{2}I(1 < x < 2)$ so that $\mu_k = \mu_k(X) = 2(k/(k+1) - 2^{-k})$. Hence, $\mu_1 = 0$, $\lambda = \mu_2 - \mu_1 = 5/6$, and from (3.6) we see that $F_Y = \frac{3}{5}F_1 + \frac{2}{5}F_2$, where F_1 is the degenerate d.f. at $\log 2$ and the d.f. F_2 has density $f_2(y) = 6e^{-2y}(1 - e^{-y})$, $y > 0$. Since $\mu(\{\log 2\}) = \lambda \mathbb{P}(Y = \log 2) = \frac{1}{2}$, the function $g(x) = 2(x/(x+1) - 2^{-x}) = G_s(\mu)(x) \in \mathcal{G}$ has a non absolutely continuous canonical measure μ . Thus, $g \notin \mathcal{I}$.

(b) For $h_1(y) = I(0 < y < 1)$ and $s(y) = 1$ (3.11) yields $I_s(h_1)(x) = g(x) = 1 - (1 - e^{-x})/x$, $x \geq 1$. It is easily checked that the particular EMS $\{g(k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ corresponds to the d.f. F with inverse $F^{-1}(u) = (1 + \log u)I(e^{-1} < u < 1)$. However, this F does not have a density, since it assigns probability $1 - e^{-1}$ at the point zero.

EXAMPLE 3.1. Let $\mu_k = k^\theta$, $0 < \theta < 1$, and define $g(x) = x^\theta$, $x \geq 1$. The representation (3.11) follows from

$$x^\theta = \int_0^x \frac{\theta}{t^{1-\theta}} dt = \frac{\theta}{\Gamma(1-\theta)} \int_0^x \int_0^\infty y^{-\theta} e^{-ty} dy dt = \frac{\theta}{\Gamma(1-\theta)} \int_0^\infty y^{-\theta} \int_0^x e^{-ty} dt dy,$$

where the change in the order of integration is justified by Tonelli's theorem. Therefore,

$$x^\theta = \frac{\theta}{\Gamma(1-\theta)} \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - e^{-xy}}{y^{1+\theta}} dy, \quad x \geq 0, \quad 0 < \theta < 1. \quad (3.17)$$

Thus, (3.11) is satisfied with $h_1(y) = \beta_\theta y^{-1-\theta}$, where $\beta_\theta = \theta/\Gamma(1-\theta) > 0$, and $s(y) = 1$ (note that (3.6) suggests using a different function s , namely, $\tilde{s}(y) = e^{-y} + (e^{-y} - e^{-2y})/(2^\theta - 1)$; hence, s in the representations (3.11) or (3.1) need not be unique). Since (3.10) is obviously fulfilled, Corollary 3.3 shows that the sequence k^θ is an EMS. More precisely, Theorem 3.2 shows that the particular EMS, k^θ , corresponds to the r.v. $X \in \mathcal{F}$ with distribution inverse G given by (3.14) (with $h_1(y) = \beta_\theta y^{-1-\theta}$), that is,

$$F^{-1}(u) = G(u) = \frac{\theta}{\Gamma(1-\theta)} \int \frac{(-\log u)^{-1-\theta}}{u} du = \frac{(-\log u)^{-\theta}}{\Gamma(1-\theta)} + C.$$

Since $\mu_1 = \int_0^1 F^{-1}(u) du = 1$ we find $C = 0$ and the parent d.f. admits the explicit formula $F(x) = \exp(-\lambda x^{-1/\theta})$, $x > 0$, where $\lambda = \Gamma(1-\theta)^{-1/\theta} > 0$; thus, $1/X$ is Weibull. Moreover, it is evident from Theorem 3.2 and (3.17) that $\{(k+c)^\theta\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is an EMS for every $c \in [-1, \infty)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, and the corresponding functions in the representation (3.11) are $h_1(y) = \beta_\theta e^{-cy}/y^{1+\theta}$ and $s(y) = e^{cy}$.

EXAMPLE 3.2. Let $\mu_k = \log k$ and define $g(x) = \log x$, $x \geq 1$. To see the representation (3.11) write (for $x > 0$)

$$\log x = \int_1^x \frac{1}{t} dt = \int_1^x \int_0^\infty e^{-ty} dy dt = \int_0^\infty \int_1^x e^{-ty} dt dy = \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-y} - e^{-xy}}{y} dy \quad (3.18)$$

showing that $h_1(y) = 1/y$ and $s(y) = e^{-y}$. Again (3.10) is obviously fulfilled and Corollary 3.3 shows that the sequence $\log k$ is an EMS. More precisely, (3.14) yields $F^{-1}(u) =$

$-\log(-\log u) + C$, $0 < u < 1$. By the substitution $y = -\log u$ we find

$$\mu_1 = \int_0^1 F^{-1}(u) du = C - \int_0^\infty e^{-y} \log y dy = C + \gamma,$$

where γ is Euler's constant; see, e.g., Lagarias (2013), p. 535. Since $\mu_1 = \log 1 = 0$, it follows that $C = -\gamma$ and $F(x) = \exp(-e^{-(x+\gamma)})$ is an extreme-value (Gumbel) distribution. Furthermore, Theorem 3.2 and (3.18) enable us to verify that $\{\log(k+c)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is an EMS for every $c \in (-1, \infty)$; the corresponding functions in the representation (3.11) are $h_1(y) = e^{-cy}/y$ and $s(y) = e^{(c-1)y}$.

EXAMPLE 3.3. The harmonic number function was defined by Euler as

$$H(x) = \int_0^1 \frac{1-u^x}{1-u} du = \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-y}}{1-e^{-y}} (1-e^{-xy}) dy, \quad x > -1; \quad (3.19)$$

see Lagarias (2013), p. 532. It satisfies

$$H(0) = 0, \quad H(n) = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots), \quad H(x) = H(x-1) + \frac{1}{x}, \quad x > 0.$$

From Theorem 3.2 we conclude that for every $c \in (-2, \infty)$, the sequence $\{H(k+c)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is an EMS from an absolutely continuous r.v.; indeed, (3.19) shows that the function $g(x) = H(x+c)$ satisfies (3.10) and (3.11) with $h_1(y) = e^{-(c+1)y}/(1-e^{-y})$ and $s(y) = e^{cy}$. The standard Exponential corresponds to $c = 0$ and the standard Logistic to $c = -1$; see Example 4.1, below. The function $\psi(x) = \frac{d}{dx} \log \Gamma(x) = \Gamma'(x)/\Gamma(x)$ admits a similar representation due to Gauss; see Lagarias (2013), p. 557. It follows that $\{\psi(k+c)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is an EMS for $c > -1$. However, this fact is evident from the corresponding result for H , due to the relationship $\psi(x) + \gamma = H(x-1)$, $x > 0$. Finally, the easily verified identity

$$\mu_k := 1 + \frac{1}{2^\theta} + \cdots + \frac{1}{k^\theta} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\theta)} \int_0^\infty \frac{y^{\theta-1} e^{-y}}{1-e^{-y}} (1-e^{-ky}) dy \quad (\theta > 0, k = 1, 2, \dots)$$

shows that this μ_k is an EMS for every $\theta > 0$ (choose $h_1(y) = \Gamma(\theta)^{-1} y^{\theta-1} e^{-y}/(1-e^{-y})$ and $s(y) = 1$ in (3.11)).

REMARK 3.2. It is known that the class of Bernstein functions is closed under composition; see Schilling *et al.* (2012), p. 28, Corollary 3.8. Therefore, the connection of EMS's to Bernstein functions (Theorem 3.1) provides an additional tool in verifying that a given sequence is EMS. For instance, Example 3.1 with $c = -1$ shows that $g_1(x) := (x-1)^\theta$ ($x \geq 1$, $0 < \theta < 1$) belongs to \mathcal{I} ; thus, from Lemma 3.3 and Proposition 3.2, $B_1(x) := g_1(x+1) - g_1(1) = x^\theta$ ($x \geq 0$) is Bernstein. By the same reasoning, Example 3.2 (with $c = 0$) shows that $B_2(x) := \log(x+1)$ ($x \geq 0$) is Bernstein and, hence, $\beta(x) := B_1(B_2(x)) = (\log(x+1))^\theta$ ($x \geq 0$) is also a Bernstein function with LKR as in (3.5). Observing that $a_0 = \beta(0) = 0$ and $a_1 = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \beta(x)/x = 0$ we see that the LKR triplet of β is of the form $(0, 0; \nu)$, $\nu \neq 0$. Hence, Proposition 3.2 shows that for any $\theta \in (0, 1]$, the function $g(x) := \beta(x-1) = (\log x)^\theta$ ($x \geq 1$) belongs to \mathcal{G}^* , and we conclude from Theorem 3.1 that $(\log k)^\theta$ is an EMS. Notice that for any $\delta > 0$, $(\log x)^{1+\delta} \notin \mathcal{G}$, since the second derivative changes its sign in the interval $(1, \infty)$; see Proposition 3.1.

4 Sequences of expected ranges

Denote by $R_k(X) = X_{k:k} - X_{1:k} = \max_i X_i - \min_i X_i$ the (sample) range based on k iid copies X_1, \dots, X_k of an r.v. X . In the present section we consider the similar question concerning expected ranges. That is, we want to decide whether a given sequence $\{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ represents an *Expected Ranges Sequence* (ERS, for short), i.e., whether there exists an integrable r.v. X with

$$\mathbb{E} R_k(X) = \rho_k, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

The following result is the range analogue of Theorem 1.2.

THEOREM 4.1. A sequence $\{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is an ERS of a non-degenerate integrable r.v. if and only if the following three conditions are satisfied.

(i) $(-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \rho_k > 0$ for all $s \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$.

(ii) $\rho_k = o(k)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

(iii) $\rho_k = \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \rho_j$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Proof: The conditions (i)–(iii) are necessary. Indeed, if $\rho_k = \mathbb{E} R_k(X)$ for some integrable r.v. X with d.f. F then we have

$$\rho_k = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [1 - F^k(x) - (1 - F(x))^k] dx, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Therefore, for all $s \geq 1, k \geq 1$,

$$(-1)^{s+1} \Delta^s \rho_k = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [F^k(x)(1 - F(x))^s + F^s(x)(1 - F(x))^k] dx > 0,$$

showing (i). With $F^{-1}(u) = \inf\{x : F(x) \geq u\}$, $0 < u < 1$, we can write

$$\frac{\rho_k}{k} = \frac{\mathbb{E} R_k(X)}{k} = \int_0^1 [u^{k-1} - (1-u)^{k-1}] F^{-1}(u) du \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

by dominated convergence; this verifies (ii). Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \rho_j &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} [1 - F^j(x) - (1 - F(x))^j] dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [1 - F^k(x) - (1 - F(x))^k] dx = \rho_k, \end{aligned}$$

which is (iii).

Conversely, assume that (i)–(iii) hold, and consider the sequence $\mu_k = \frac{1}{2} \rho_k$. Obviously, the conditions (i)–(iii) of Theorem 1.2 are fulfilled by μ_k . Hence, we can find an integrable r.v. X such that $\mathbb{E} X_{k:k} = \frac{1}{2} \rho_k$ for all $k \geq 1$. Since, however, $\mathbb{E} X_{1:k} = -\sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \mathbb{E} X_{j:j}$ (for any integrable X), the condition (iii) yields $\mathbb{E} X_{1:k} = -\frac{1}{2} \rho_k$; thus, $\mathbb{E}[X_{k:k} - X_{1:k}] = \rho_k$, and the proof is complete. \square

REMARK 4.1. (a) Condition (iii) implies $\rho_1 = 0$ (trivial) and $\rho_3 = \frac{3}{2}\rho_2$. Condition (i) shows that $0 = \rho_1 < \rho_2 < \dots$.

(b) The random variable X , constructed in the sufficiency proof of Theorem 4.1, is symmetric, i.e., $X \stackrel{d}{=} -X$ (where $\stackrel{d}{=}$ means equality in distribution). To see this, let $Y_i = -X_i$ with X_i being iid copies of X used in the proof. Then $\mathbb{E} Y_{k:k} = \mathbb{E} \max\{-X_1, \dots, -X_k\} = -\mathbb{E} \min\{X_1, \dots, X_k\} = \frac{1}{2}\rho_k = \mathbb{E} X_{k:k}$ for all $k \geq 1$; thus, by the result of Hoeffding we see that X and Y have the same d.f. In fact, this is the *unique symmetric* r.v. having the given expected ranges. Indeed, if Y is any symmetric r.v. with $\mathbb{E} R_k(Y) = \rho_k$ then, since $\mathbb{E} Y_{k:k} = -\mathbb{E} Y_{1:k}$ (by symmetry), we should have $\rho_k = 2 \mathbb{E} Y_{k:k}$ for all $k \geq 1$.

(c) For any integrable Y we can find a *symmetric* integrable X with the same expected ranges. Indeed, if $\rho_k = \mathbb{E} R_k(Y)$ for arbitrary Y (not necessarily symmetric), then the sequence ρ_k satisfies the conditions (i)–(iii) of Theorem 4.1. Thus, based on these values ρ_k , we can construct X as in the necessity proof, and this X is symmetric. This fact seems to be quite surprising at a first glance. However, we observe that a d.f. F is symmetric (i.e., it corresponds to a symmetric r.v. X) if and only if $F^{-1}(u) = -F^{-1}((1-u)+)$, $0 < u < 1$, where $F^{-1}(t+)$ denotes the right hand limit of F^{-1} at the point $t \in (0, 1)$. Using this, it is easy to verify that the left continuous inverses of the d.f.'s of X and Y are related through

$$F_X^{-1}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \left[F_Y^{-1}(u) - F_Y^{-1}((1-u)+) \right], \quad 0 < u < 1. \quad (4.1)$$

We conclude that the r.v. X , whose distribution inverse is defined by (4.1), is the unique symmetric r.v. with the same expected ranges as Y .

EXAMPLE 4.1. It is well-known that the order statistics from the exponential distribution have means

$$\mathbb{E} Y_{i:k} = \sum_{j=k-i+1}^k \frac{1}{j}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k,$$

and, therefore,

$$\rho_k = \mathbb{E} R_k(Y) = \mathbb{E}[Y_{k:k} - Y_{1:k}] = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{k-1} \quad (\rho_1 = 0).$$

From Theorem 4.1 and Remark 4.1 we know that there exists a unique symmetric r.v. X with expected ranges ρ_k . Since $F^{-1}(u) = -\log(1-u)$, (4.1) shows that

$$F_X^{-1}(u) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{u}{1-u} \right), \quad 0 < u < 1,$$

which corresponds to a Logistic r.v. with mean zero and variance $\frac{\pi^2}{12}$. This is in accordance with the recurrence relation $\mu_{k+1} = \frac{1}{k} + \mu_k$, satisfied by the expected maxima of the standard Logistic distribution (with mean zero and variance $\frac{\pi^2}{3}$), first obtained by Shah (1970); see also Arnold *et al.* (1992), p. 83.

EXAMPLE 4.2. The expected ranges of a Bernoulli(p) r.v. are $1 - p^k - (1-p)^k$. The same expected ranges are obtained from a three-valued r.v., assigning (equal) probabilities $\min\{p, 1-p\}$ at $\pm \frac{1}{2}$, and the remaining mass $1 - 2 \min\{p, 1-p\}$ at zero.

REMARK 4.2. If Y is symmetric around its mean μ then, obviously, the symmetric r.v. with the same expected ranges is $X = Y - \mu$. In particular, if Y is $\text{Uniform}(a, b)$ then X is $\text{Uniform}(-\frac{1}{2}(b-a), \frac{1}{2}(b-a))$; if Y is $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ then X is $N(0, \sigma^2)$. However, it should be noted that there exist non-normal (non-uniform) r.v.'s with expected ranges like normal (uniform); see Arnold *et al.* (1992), pp. 145–146. To highlight the situation, assume that X is $N(0, 1)$ with density ϕ , and let Φ be its d.f. with inverse Φ^{-1} . Let $0 < \epsilon < \sqrt{2\pi}$ and define $h(u) = \Phi^{-1}(u) + u(1-u)\epsilon$. Then, $h \in L^1(0, 1)$ and $h'(u) = \frac{1}{\phi(\Phi^{-1}(u))} + (1-2u)\epsilon > 0$ for all $u \in (0, 1)$. The fact that $h'(u) > 0$ is obvious for $0 < u \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and it remains to verify that

$$\epsilon < \frac{1}{(2u-1)\phi(\Phi^{-1}(u))}, \quad \frac{1}{2} < u < 1.$$

This is indeed satisfied because

$$\inf_{1/2 < u < 1} \left\{ \frac{1}{(2u-1)\phi(\Phi^{-1}(u))} \right\} = \frac{1}{\sup_{1/2 < u < 1} \{(2u-1)\phi(\Phi^{-1}(u))\}} \geq \sqrt{2\pi}$$

since

$$\sup_{1/2 < u < 1} \{(2u-1)\phi(\Phi^{-1}(u))\} = \sup_{x > 0} \{(2\Phi(x)-1)\phi(x)\} \leq \sup_{x > 0} \phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

Defining the r.v. $Y = h(U)$, where U is $\text{Uniform}(0, 1)$, we see that $F_Y^{-1} = h$; thus, Y is non-normal, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} R_k(Y) &= k \int_0^1 (u^{k-1} - (1-u)^{k-1}) \Phi^{-1}(u) du \\ &\quad + k\epsilon \int_0^1 (u^{k-1} - (1-u)^{k-1}) u(1-u) du \\ &= k \int_0^1 (u^{k-1} - (1-u)^{k-1}) \Phi^{-1}(u) du = \mathbb{E} R_k(X) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Similar examples can be found for most r.v.'s. For example, a $\text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ r.v. X has the same expected ranges as a $\text{Beta}(1/2, 1)$ r.v. Y with density $f_Y(y) = (2\sqrt{y})^{-1}I(0 < y < 1)$.

From Remark 4.2 it is clear that, in contrast to the expected maxima sequences, the sequences of expected ranges are far from characterizing the location family of the distribution.

We summarize these facts in the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.2. (i) A sequence $\{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ represents the expected ranges of an integrable r.v. if and only if it represents the expected maxima of a symmetric (around zero) integrable r.v. (ii) For every integrable Y there exists a unique symmetric integrable X with the same expected ranges as Y ; X and Y are related through (4.1). (iii) The integrable r.v.'s X and Y have the same expected ranges if and only if the (generalized) inverses F_X^{-1} and F_Y^{-1} of their d.f.'s satisfy

$$F_X^{-1}(u) - F_Y^{-1}(u) = F_X^{-1}((1-u)+) - F_Y^{-1}((1-u)+), \quad 0 < u < 1, \quad (4.2)$$

that is, if and only if the function $h(u) = F_X^{-1}(u) - F_Y^{-1}(u)$ is symmetric around $\frac{1}{2}$ for almost all $u \in (0, 1)$.

Proof: (i) and (ii) are discussed in Remark 4.1; note that the symmetric r.v. X whose expected maxima are the expected ranges of Y is given by (cf. (4.1))

$$F_X^{-1}(u) = F_Y^{-1}(u) - F_Y^{-1}((1-u)+), \quad 0 < u < 1.$$

To see (iii), assume first that $h := F_X^{-1} - F_Y^{-1}$ is almost everywhere symmetric around $\frac{1}{2}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} R_k(X) - \mathbb{E} R_k(Y) = k \int_0^1 [u^{k-1} - (1-u)^{k-1}] h(u) du = 0 \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1,$$

because the integrand, $g(u) = [u^{k-1} - (1-u)^{k-1}]h(u)$, is antisymmetric around $\frac{1}{2}$ (i.e., $g(1-u) = -g(u)$ for almost all u).

Conversely, $\mathbb{E} R_k(X) = \mathbb{E} R_k(Y)$ for all k implies

$$\int_0^1 [u^{k-1} - (1-u)^{k-1}] [F_X^{-1}(u) - F_Y^{-1}(u)] du = \int_0^1 u^{k-1} g(u) du = 0 \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1,$$

where $g(u) = [F_X^{-1}(u) - F_Y^{-1}(u)] - [F_X^{-1}(1-u) - F_Y^{-1}(1-u)]$. Since $g \in L^1(0,1)$ and $\int_0^1 u^n g(u) du = 0$ for $n = 0, 1, \dots$, it follows that $g = 0$ almost everywhere in $(0,1)$. This means that for almost all $u \in (0,1)$,

$$F_X^{-1}(u) - F_Y^{-1}(u) = F_X^{-1}(1-u) - F_Y^{-1}(1-u),$$

which, taking left limits to both sides, yields (4.2). \square

Therefore, every ERS is just a translation of an EMS from a symmetric r.v. (around its mean), and we can apply Theorem 3.1 to get the following characterization.

THEOREM 4.3. Let \mathcal{X}_s be the class of non-degenerate, integrable r.v.'s that are symmetric around their means. A sequence $\{\mu_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is an EMS from an r.v. $X \in \mathcal{X}_s$ if and only if it can be extended to a function $g = G_s(\mu) \in \mathcal{G}^*$ and, furthermore, the (unique) measure μ in the canonical form of g satisfies

$$\mu((0, y]) = \mu\left(\left[-\log(1 - e^{-y}), \infty\right)\right), \quad 0 < y < \infty. \quad (4.3)$$

If such an extension g exists, it is unique (and it is given by (3.6)).

Proof: Let $\mu_k = \mu_k(X)$ be the EMS of an r.v. $X \in \mathcal{X}_s$. By Theorem 3.1, μ_k admits an extension $g = G_s(\mu) \in \mathcal{G}^*$. Also, $X - \mu_1$ is symmetric around 0 and, according to Theorem 4.2(i), $\rho_k = \mu_k - \mu_1$ is an ERS. In particular, $\rho_k = \mu_k - \mu_1$ satisfies condition (iii) of Theorem 4.1, i.e., $(\mu_k - \mu_1) = \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} (\mu_j - \mu_1)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$. Substituting $\mu_j - \mu_1 = g(j) - g(1) = \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)(e^{-y} - e^{-jy}) d\mu(y)$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, k$), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)(e^{-y} - e^{-ky}) d\mu(y) &= \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)(e^{-y} - e^{-jy}) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y) \left(1 - e^{-y} - (1 - e^{-y})^k\right) d\mu(y), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Consider the measure ν defined by $\nu((0, y]) = \mu([- \log(1 - e^{-y}), \infty))$, $0 < y < \infty$. Clearly, $\nu \neq 0$ is finite. Changing variables $y = -\log(1 - e^{-w})$ in (4.4), and since $h_0(-\log(1 - e^{-w})) = h_0(w)$, $0 < w < \infty$ (see (3.2)), we obtain

$$\int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)(e^{-y} - e^{-ky}) d\mu(y) = \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(w)(e^{-w} - e^{-kw}) d\nu(w), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (4.5)$$

Setting $s_0(y) = e^{-y}$ we see that the function $g_2 := G_{s_0}(\nu) \in \mathcal{G}^*$, and (4.5) shows that $g(k) - g_2(k) = \mu_1$ (constant) for $k = 1, 2, \dots$; hence, $\mu = \nu$ (see Lemma 3.2). Therefore, for all $y \in (0, \infty)$, $\mu((0, y]) = \nu((0, y]) = \mu([- \log(1 - e^{-y}), \infty))$, $0 < y < \infty$, and (4.3) follows.

Conversely, assume that there exists an extension $g = G_s(\mu) \in \mathcal{G}^*$ of μ_k with μ satisfying (4.3). Theorem 3.1 shows that μ_k is an EMS and, thus, $\rho_k = \mu_k - \mu_1$ is also an EMS. This means that the sequence ρ_k satisfies the conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.1 (or of Theorem 1.2). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \rho_j &= \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)(e^{-y} - e^{-jy}) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)} h_0(y)(1 - e^{-y} - (1 - e^{-y})^k) d\mu(y), \quad k = 1, 2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

Substituting $y = -\log(1 - e^{-w})$ in the last integral, and in view of (4.3), it is easily seen that this integral equals ρ_k , and we conclude that the condition (iii) of Theorem 4.1 is also satisfied by ρ_k . Thus, ρ_k is an ERS and, therefore, it is an EMS from a (unique) symmetric (around 0) r.v. Y (see Theorem 4.2(i)); that is, $\mu_k = \mu_1 + \rho_k$ is the EMS of $X = \mu_1 + Y$, which is symmetric around its mean μ_1 .

Uniqueness follows from Lemma 3.2. \square

COROLLARY 4.1. A sequence $\{\rho_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is an ERS of a non-degenerate r.v. if and only if $\rho_1 = 0$ and there exists an extension $g = G_s(\mu) \in \mathcal{G}^*$ of ρ_k such that the measure μ satisfies (4.3).

COROLLARY 4.2. Assume that the function g admits an integral representation of the form (3.11) with h_1 satisfying (3.10); that is, $g = I_s(h_1) \in \mathcal{I}$. Then:

(i) The sequence $\mu_k = g(k)$ is an EMS of a symmetric (around its mean) non-degenerate r.v. if and only if

$$h_1(-\log(1 - e^{-y})) = (e^y - 1)h_1(y) \quad \text{for almost all } y \in (0, \infty). \quad (4.6)$$

(ii) The sequence $\rho_k = g(k)$ is an ERS of a non-degenerate r.v. if and only if $\rho_1 = 0$ and (4.6) is satisfied.

Proof: The assumption on g implies that $g \in \mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^*$ and thus, $g = G_s(\mu)$ for a unique $\mu \neq 0$ (see Lemmas 3.1, 3.3 and Corollary 3.1). From (3.10) we see that μ is absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure on $(0, \infty)$, with Radon-Nikodym derivative $h_\mu := h_1/h_0$ (where $h_0(y) = e^y/(1 - e^{-y})$; see (3.2)). Moreover, if ν is the measure defined by $\nu((0, y]) = \mu([- \log(1 - e^{-y}), \infty))$, $0 < y < \infty$, then ν is also absolutely continuous w.r.t. Lebesgue measure, since

$$\nu((0, y]) = \mu([- \log(1 - e^{-y}), \infty)) = \int_{-\log(1 - e^{-y})}^\infty h_\mu(x) dx, \quad 0 < y < \infty.$$

From this expression it follows that a Radon-Nikodym derivative of ν is given by

$$h_\nu(y) := \frac{d\nu(y)}{dy} = \frac{e^{-y}}{1 - e^{-y}} h_\mu(-\log(1 - e^{-y})), \quad 0 < y < \infty.$$

Since $\mu = \nu$ if and only if $h_\mu = h_\nu$ a.e. in $(0, \infty)$, we conclude that (4.3) is equivalent to (4.6). The result follows from Theorems 4.3 and 4.2(i). \square

EXAMPLE 4.3. If H is the harmonic number function, then $g(x) := H(x + c) = I_s(h_1)(x)$ ($c > -2$), where $h_1(y) = e^{-(c+1)y}/(1 - e^{-y})$ and $s(y) = e^{cy}$; see (3.19). It is easily seen that (4.6) reduces to $(e^y - 1)^{c+1} = 1$ a.e., and thus, it is satisfied if and only if $c = -1$. This shows that the only symmetric r.v. in this family is the Logistic, completing both Examples 3.3 and 4.1.

EXAMPLE 4.4. For $g(x) := \log(x + c) = I_s(h_1)(x)$ ($c > -1$), $h_1(y) = e^{-cy}/y$ and $s(y) = e^{(c-1)y}$; see (3.18). Hence, (4.6) is written as $(e^y - 1)^{c-1} = -\log(1 - e^{-y})/y$ a.e. and, obviously, this identity cannot be fulfilled (by any value of $c > -1$). Hence, all EMS's of Example 3.2 correspond to asymmetric r.v.'s.

EXAMPLE 4.5. For $g(x) := (x + c)^\theta = I_s(h_1)(x)$ ($c \geq -1$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$), $h_1(y) = \beta_\theta e^{-cy}/y^{1+\theta}$ and $s(y) = e^{cy}$ where $\beta_\theta > 0$ is a constant; see (3.17). Therefore, (4.6) is now reduced to the identity $(e^y - 1)^{c-1} = (-\log(1 - e^{-y})/y)^{1+\theta}$ a.e. Obviously, this is impossible (for all values of $c \geq -1$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$). Hence, all EMS's of Example 3.1 correspond to asymmetric r.v.'s.

EXAMPLE 4.6. For $g(x) := 1 - 1/(x + c) = I_s(h_1)(x)$ ($c > -1$), $h_1(y) = e^{-cy}$ and $s(y) = e^{(c-1)y}$. Therefore, (4.6) is now reduced to the identity $(e^y - 1)^{c-1} = 1$ a.e. Obviously, this identity is satisfied if and only if $c = 1$ (which corresponds to a standard uniform r.v.). Hence, $\{g(k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is an EMS for every $c > -1$ (Theorem 3.2), but the corresponding r.v. is asymmetric, unless $c = 1$. Using (3.14) it is recognized that $c = 0$ corresponds to the r.v. $1 - Y$, with Y being standard Exponential.

Acknowledgements. I would like to cordially thank an anonymous referee who provided a detailed review with insightful comments (corrected some mistakes), resulting to a great improvement of the presentation. Thanks are also due to Ch.A. Charalambides, V. Nestoridis and D. Gatzouras for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] ARNOLD, B.C.; BALAKRISHNAN, N.; NAGARAJA, H.N. (1992). *A First Course in Order Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [2] BILLINGSLEY, P. (1995). *Probability and Measure* (3rd ed.), John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- [3] CHARALAMBIDES, CH.A. (2002). *Enumerative Combinatorics*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL.
- [4] DAVID, H.A.; NAGARAJA, H.N. (2003). *Order Statistics* (3rd ed.), John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey.

- [5] FERGUSON, T.S. (1996). *A Course in Large-Sample Theory*. Chapman & Hall, New York.
- [6] HAUSDORFF, F. (1921). Summationmethoden und momentfolgen. I. *Math. Zeitschrift*, **9**(1), 74–109.
- [7] HILL, T.P.; SPRUILL, M.C. (1994). On the relationship between convergence in distribution and convergence of expected extremes. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **121**(4), 1235–1243.
- [8] HILL, T.P.; SPRUILL, M.C. (2000). Erratum to "On the relationship between convergence in distribution and convergence of expected extremes". *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **128**, 625–626.
- [9] Hoeffding, W. (1953). On the distribution of the expected values of the order statistics. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **24**(1), 93–100.
- [10] HUANG, J.S. (1998). Sequences of expectations of maximum-order statistics. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, **38**, 117–123.
- [11] KADANE, J.B. (1971). A moment problem for order statistics. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **42**, 745–751.
- [12] KADANE, J.B. (1974). A characterization of triangular arrays which are expectations of order statistics. *J. Appl. Probab.*, **11**, 413–416.
- [13] KOŁODYNSKI, S. (2000). A note on the sequence of expected extremes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, **47**, 295–300.
- [14] LAGARIAS, J. (2013). Euler's constant: Euler's work and modern developments. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **50**(4), 527–628.
- [15] MALLOWS, C.L. (1973). Bounds on distribution functions in terms of expectations of order statistics. *Ann. Probab.*, **1**, 297–303.
- [16] MÜNTZ, C. (1914). Über den approximationssatz von Weierstrass. *Schwartz-Festschrift*.
- [17] SCHILLING, R.L.; SONG, R.; VONDRAČEK, Z. (2012). *Bernstein Functions: Theory and Applications* (2nd ed.), de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, vol. 37, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.
- [18] SHAH, B.K. (1970). Note on moments of a logistic order statistics. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **41**(6), 2150–2152.