

ASYMPTOTICS FOR RELATIVE FREQUENCY WHEN POPULATION IS DRIVEN BY ARBITRARY EVOLUTION

Silvano Fiorin

Dipartimento di Scienze Statistiche, via C. Battisti, 241-35121
Padova, Italy - fiorin@stat.unipd.it

ABSTRACT Strongly consistent estimates are shown ,via relative frequency,for the probability of "white balls" inside a dichotomous urn when such a probability is an arbitrary continuous time dependent function over a bounded time interval.The asymptotic behaviour of relative frequency is studied in a nonstationary context using a Riemann-Dini type theorem for SLLN of random variables with arbitrarily different expectations; furthermore the theoretical results concerning the SLLN can be applied for estimating the mean function of unknown form of a general nonstationary process.

1 INTRODUCTION

Several different areas of statistics deal with an urn model including "white" and "black" balls with probability p and $1 - p$ respectively. In this very classical context a time dependent component is introduced: p is replaced with $p_0(t)$ which denotes a time varying quantity $0 \leq p_0(t) \leq 1$ in such a way that at any instant $t \in [0, T]$ only one observation is taken from the corresponding urn with probability $p_0(t)$ and the random variable $Y(t)$ is obtained such that $P(Y(t) = 1) = p_0(t), P(Y(t) = 0) = 1 - p_0(t), E(Y(t)) = p_0(t) \forall t \in [0, T]$, defining the nonstationary process

$$\{Y(t) : t \in [0, T]\} \quad (1)$$

with mean function $E(Y(t)) = p_0(t)$. The description of the above model is specified introducing some reasonable assumptions:

A 1 *the continuity is assumed for the usually unknown mean function $p_0 : [0, T] \mapsto [0, 1]$;*

A 2 *for any fixed pair of instants $t_1, t_2 \in [0, T]$ the independence is assumed for the random variables $Y(t_1)$ and $Y(t_2)$.*

This assumption is introduced in order to apply the Rajchman theorem(see next section). Namely:only pairwise uncorrelation is requested for $Y(t_1)$ and $Y(t_2)$ but,it can be easily checked in this case, the uncorrelation implies independence; furthermore independence is here a very mild condition:in fact we may suppose that the total number of white and black balls in the urn is big enough that the knowledge of $Y(t_1) = 1$ or $Y(t_1) = 0$ does not produce a meaningful modification of the probability distribution for $Y(t_2)$.

The main purpose is estimating the unknown function p_0 , i.e. the mean function $p_0(t) = E(Y(t))$ of the nonstationary process (1), which is an arbitrary

continuous map from $[0, T]$ into $[0, 1]$.

i) An approach to estimation for the mean function $m(\cdot)$ of a nonstationary process was given by M.B. Priestley (see [5] at page 587 and [6] at page 140) when the form of m is known and the case is suggested of a polynomial function in t . Vice versa : "with no information on the form of m we obviously cannot construct a consistent estimate of it". The approach here adopted is quite different from classical methods of time series analysis; the only information available for m is the continuity property over $[0, T]$ and no approximation of m is introduced by continuous functions of a known form. The estimation technique involves the process (1) which is a specified case of nonstationarity but the theoretical results given in the last section hold true for a general nonstationary process. The case (1) is only a concrete example of a process having no regularity properties; nevertheless the continuity for the mean function m is a reasonable and not restrictive assumption which denotes compatibility with a context of an arbitrary but not brutal evolution for the composition of the urn.

ii) The urn evolution has effects concerning sampling; for instance if the observations number n is big enough a not slight time interval will be needed in order to receive the n observations which surely are not values taken by the same random variable. Then, for sake of simplification, we assume that any r.v. $Y(t)$ may be observed at most only one time. The point of view we adopt is then characterized by a strong nonstationarity and the consistent estimation for the mean $m(t_0)$ at a fixed time t_0 may appear as a very hard objective.

iii) The answer to above arguments is the relative frequency

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_j) \quad (2)$$

where $\{t_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ are the first n observation times of a sequence $\{t_j : j \geq 1\} \subset [0, T]$ and the main purpose is that of getting consistent estimations of $m(t) = p_0(t)$ via almost sure convergence for the sequence (2). The SLLN is then the theoretical tool needed in the below analysis, but the classical approach based on the zero-mean r.v.'s $(Y(t_j) - p_0(t_j))$, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (Y(t_j) - p_0(t_j)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s.} \quad (3)$$

is not enough: in fact we need convergence for (2) with the not zero mean r.v.'s $Y(t_j)$. This argument, investigated by Fiorin [4] is now improved with the help of new results given in section (5).

iv) The convergence of (2) is studied via the sequence $\{E(Y(t_j)) = p_0(t_j) :$

$j \geq 1\}$ and permutations (i.e. bijections) $\pi : N \rightarrow N$: in fact, if a permutation π is introduced, the possible almost sure limit of

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_{\pi(j)}) \quad (4)$$

is depending on π . If $\{P_{\pi n}^0\}$ is a sequence of probability measures, where each $P_{\pi n}^0$ assigns mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{p_0(t_{\pi(j)}) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, then the "weak" or "vague" convergence for the sequence $\{P_{\pi n}^0\}$ to a probability measure P^0 implies almost sure convergence of (4) to the limit $\int_0^1 I(v) dP^0(v)$ where $I(v)$ is the identity map over $[0, 1]$ and P^0 depends on the sequence $\{Y(t_j) : j \geq 1\}$ and on permutation π . All the below analysis is based on the possibility of finding a permutation π in such a way that the convergence of (4) is driven to a limit $\int_0^1 I(v) dP^0(v)$ where P^0 is a previously chosen probability measure over $[0, 1]$; under a theoretical point of view this is a result for SLLN (4) which is the analogous of the well known Riemann-Dini theorem for real simply convergent (but not absolutely convergent) series. Under the operative point of view the strongly consistent estimates, i.e. the a.s. limits $\int_0^1 I(v) dP^0(v)$, are the result of an experimental design based on choosing:

- I) the sequence of observation times $\{t_j : j \geq 1\} \subset [0, T]$;
- II) the permutation $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j \geq 1\}$.

2 CONVERGENCE ELEMENTS

If the observation times $\{t_j : j \geq 1\}$ are given jointly with the observable r.v.'s $\{Y(t_j) : j \geq 1\}$, an intuitive approach for studying the almost sure convergence for (2) is suggested by the classical Rajchman theorem

Theorem 1 *If the $Y(t_j)$'s are pairwise uncorrelated and their second moments have a common bound then*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (Y(t_j) - p_0(t_j))$$

is convergent to 0 almost surely.

Because of assumption A2) and the inequality $|Y(t_j)| \leq 1$ the $Y(t_j)$'s satisfy theorem (1) and then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (Y(t_j) - p_0(t_j)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s..} \quad (5)$$

Now an intuitive and simple condition which implies (together with (5)) the almost sure convergence for (2) is the possible limit for the deterministic sequence

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_j) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n E(Y(t_j)). \quad (6)$$

In fact, if such a limit exists, i.e.

$$L = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_j),$$

we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_j) \rightarrow L \text{ a.s..}$$

Definition 1 Let us define as a "pseudoempirical measure" (P.E.M. hereafter) any probability measure giving the weight $\frac{1}{n}$ to each of the assigned points $\{x_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, where the "pseudo" means that the x_j 's are arbitrarily fixed deterministic values and not a sequence of i.i.d. observations.

The notion of "Vague Convergence" (V.C. hereafter) is introduced mainly for application to sequences of P.E.M.'s; such a concept, which implies existence of limit L for the sequence (6), is the main technical tool for studying the asymptotic behaviour of relative frequency (2). Only the really necessary elements for below analysis are here given; for an exhaustive exposition see Chung [3].

Definition 2 A sequence $\{\mu_n : n \geq 1\}$ of probability measures (P.M. hereafter) defined over the Borel σ -field B^1 of R^1 is said to converge vaguely to the P.M. μ iff there exists a dense subset D of R^1 such that

$$\mu_n(a, b] \rightarrow \mu(a, b], \forall a \in D, b \in D, a < b.$$

Theorem 2 (see Theorem 4.3.1, page 85 Chung [3]) The sequence of P.M.'s μ_n is vaguely convergent to the P.M. μ if and only if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(a, b] = \mu(a, b]$$

for every continuity interval $(a, b]$ of μ , i.e. for every interval whose endpoints satisfy $\mu(a) = \mu(b) = 0$.

By theorem (2) the equivalence is stated between vague and weak convergence for P.M.'s μ_n to μ . A further classical result needed in the below proofs is the following characterization of V.C.:

Theorem 3 (see Theorem 4.4.2.,page 93 Chung [3]) μ_n is vaguely convergent to μ if and only if the convergence is stated

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_R f d\mu_n = \int_R f d\mu$$

for each bounded,continuous and real f .

Even if vague and weak convergence of P.M.'s are equivalent,in the main proofs the V.C. is preferable because the convergence has to be proved $\mu_n(a, b] \rightarrow \mu(a, b]$ for countably many a, b in a dense subset of R .

The above theorem (3) can be directly applied for convergence of sequence (6) via the equality

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_j) = \int_0^1 p dP_n^0 \quad (7)$$

where P_n^0 is the P.E.M. giving weight $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{p_0(t_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$. Thus a condition which implies the convergence of (6) is the vague convergence for the sequence of P.E.M.'s P_n^0 to a P.M. P^0 . In fact if P_n^0 is V.C. to P^0 , having $p_0(t_j) \in [0, 1] \forall j$, and taking the function

$$f(p) = p \quad \forall p \in [0, 1]$$

$$f(p) = 1 \quad \forall p \in [1, +\infty)$$

$$f(p) = 0 \quad \forall p \in (-\infty, 0],$$

by theorem (3),the convergence is stated

$$\int_0^1 p dP_n^0 \rightarrow \int_0^1 p dP^0$$

i.e.

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_j) \rightarrow \int_0^1 p dP^0 \quad (8)$$

which jointly with theorem (1) implies

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_j) \rightarrow \int_0^1 p dP^0 \text{ a.s..} \quad (9)$$

Remark 1 For the almost sure convergence (9) an alternative proof is given by theorem (6) below: working with the sequence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_j)$ its direct approximation to the integral $\int_0^1 p dP^0$ is proved.

The central argument concerning convergence (9) is the assumption of vague convergence for P_n^0 to P^0 . Several questions may arise: for instance it is evident that such a condition is not so easy to reach. In fact the restrictivity of this assumption will be evident via Definition (2): for an assigned sequence of expectations $\{E(Y(t_j)) = p_0(t_j) : j \geq 1\}$ and a fixed interval $(a, b] \subset [0, 1]$ the convergence $P_n^0(a, b] \rightarrow P^0(a, b]$ holds true where

$$P_n^0(a, b] = \frac{n(a, b]}{n}$$

and $n(a, b]$ is the total number of points $\{p_0(t_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ belonging to $(a, b]$: this means that inside the first n elements of the sequence $\{p_0(t_j) : j \geq 1\}$ the proportion of points falling into $(a, b]$ is "so regular" to approach a limit $P^0(a, b]$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$. And this for an arbitrary deterministic sequence $\{p_0(t_j) : j \geq 1\} \subset [0, 1]$.

Our purpose, in the sequel, will consist of a strategy to obtain a vaguely convergent sequence of P.E.M.'s P_n^0 ; recalling I) and II) at the end of introduction, we may choose an experimental design which consists of two steps; we may decide when to observe the continuous time process $\{Y(t) : t \in [0, T]\}$ and then we choose the observation times consisting of a sequence $\{t_j : j \geq 1\} \subset [0, T]$. Not only: we may decide also, for each n fixed, the n observable r.v.'s to choose inside $\{Y(t_j) : j \geq 1\}$, i.e. we do not consider necessarily the first n r.v.'s $\{Y(t_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ but we select $\{Y(t_{\pi(j)}) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ with the respective expectations $\{E(Y(t_{\pi(j)})) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ where $\{\pi(j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ are the first n values taken by a permutation (a bijection) $\pi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, in such a way that, if $P_{\pi n}$ denotes the P.E.M. giving mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, the sequence $P_{\pi n}$ is vaguely or weakly convergent to some P.M. P_π . Then, using the relevant property that the induced measures $p_0(P_{\pi n})$'s and $p_0(P_\pi)$ keep the weak convergence, we reach the V.C. $p_0(P_{\pi n}) \rightarrow p_0(P_\pi)$, where $p_0(P_{\pi n})$ assigns mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{p_0(t_{\pi(j)}) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$. But, for a complete description of the above strategy, we need to introduce the relevant tool of permutations.

3 PERMUTATIONS

Given the family of r.v.'s $\{Y(t_j) : j \geq 1\}$ with expectations $\{E(Y(t_j)) = p_0(t_j) : j \geq 1\}$, for any assigned bijection $\pi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ the respective process may be defined

$$\{Y(t_{\pi(j)}) : j \geq 1\}$$

with expectations $\{E(Y(t_{\pi(j)})) = p_0(t_{\pi(j)}) : j \geq 1\}$ and the P.E.M.'s $P_{\pi n}^0$ which gives mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{p_0(t_{\pi(j)}) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$. A direct comparison shows

that P_n^0 and $P_{\pi n}^0$, in the general case, define different probability measures over the Borel σ -field $B[0, 1]$. Consequently the possible vague limits P^0 and P_π^0 , if they exist, are different P.M.'s and, applying Theorem (3) and Theorem (6), we have:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_j) \rightarrow \int_0^1 p dP^0 \text{ and } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_j) \rightarrow \int_0^1 p dP^0 a.s.$$

and using permutation π

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_{\pi(j)}) \rightarrow \int_0^1 p dP_\pi^0 \text{ and } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_{\pi(j)}) \rightarrow \int_0^1 p dP_\pi^0 a.s..$$

Permutations are an important argument in below analysis with several implications concerning estimation; then this topic needs further attention: the vague convergence for a sequence of P.M.'s $P_{\pi n}^0$ was introduced above only as an hypothesis. Now, in order to obtain an estimation procedure, the following three steps have to be examined:

1) the vague convergence for an assigned sequence of P.E.M.'s $P_{\pi n}^0$ has really to be proved.

2) Given the sequence of points $\{t_j : j \geq 1\} \subset [0, T]$, the class \mathcal{M} has to be found of P.M.'s P over $B[0, T]$ for which a permutation $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j \geq 1\}$ can be computed such that the P.E.M.'s $P_{\pi n}$ (which assigns weight $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j = 1, \dots, n\}$) are vaguely convergent to P and then the induced measures $p_0(P_{\pi n})$ over $B[0, 1]$ are vaguely convergent to $p_0(P)$ (because of continuity of p_0), where

$$p_0(P_{\pi n})(B) = P_{\pi n}(p_0^{-1}(B)) \text{ and } p_0(P)(B) = P(p_0^{-1}(B)) \forall B \in B[0, 1].$$

3) The possibility of choosing a measure $P \in \mathcal{M}$, and then of computing a permutation $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j \geq 1\}$ such that, applying theorem (6),

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_{\pi(j)}) \rightarrow \int_0^1 p dp_0(P) a.s.,$$

is a good chance for consistent estimation: through the choice of the vague limit measure P and of π the convergence for the SLLN may be driven to different limit values.

A rigorous characterization of class \mathcal{M} is given by definition (6) which needs more technical details given later; nevertheless it may be useful to anticipate the content of assumption under which \mathcal{M} contains infinitely many measures: if the set of points $\{t_j : j \geq 1\} \subset [0, T]$ has at least two different limit values, i.e. if there are at least two values $L_1 \neq L_2$ such that there exist two subsequences

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_{j_1(k)} = L_1 \text{ and } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_{j_2(k)} = L_2,$$

then \mathcal{M} contains infinitely many probability measures.

Furthermore, for an assigned measure $P \in \mathcal{M}$, the procedure of finding a permutation $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j \geq 1\}$ such that the respective P.E.M.'s $P_{\pi n}$ are vaguely convergent to the assigned P is available in the proof of theorem (7). Our aim consists now in applying the above results for estimation.

4 ESTIMATING p_0

As examples of estimation problems two different procedures are shown below where suitable choices of the sequences of observation times $\{t_j : j \geq 1\}$ and of permutations $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j \geq 1\}$ imply almost sure convergence for SLLN $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_{\pi(j)})$ to different estimations.

4.1 PROBLEM 1

Let us suppose to choose a sequence of observation times $\{t_j : j \geq 1\}$ which is dense into $[0, T]$; then by Corollary (1) the class \mathcal{M} contains the uniform probability measure P_U over $B[0, T]$ which is characterized by the respective density function $f_U(t) = \frac{1}{T} \forall t \in [0, T]$ and, applying the proof of theorem (7) a permutation $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j \geq 1\}$ is computed such that the P.E.M.'s $P_{\pi n}$ are vaguely convergent to P_U . Now, for a fixed interval $(a, b] \subset [0, T]$ and for any assigned natural n , the following set is introduced:

$$A(\pi, n, (a, b]) = \{t_{\pi(j)} \in (a, b] : j = 1, \dots, n\}$$

whose meaning is evident: among the points $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ only the $t_{\pi(j)}$'s falling inside $(a, b]$ are collected. If $n(a, b]$ is the total number of points $t_{\pi(j)}$'s belonging to $A(\pi, n, (a, b])$ and the relative frequency is introduced

$$\frac{1}{n(a, b]} \sum_{t_{\pi(j)} \in A(\pi, n, (a, b])} Y(t_{\pi(j)}) \quad (10)$$

the a.s. convergence for (10), when $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then necessarily $n(a, b] \rightarrow \infty$, is stated by below theorem

Theorem 4 *The sequence of r.v.'s (10), when $n \rightarrow \infty$ is a strongly consistent estimate of $p_0(\underline{t})$ for some points $\underline{t} \in [a, b]$.*

Proof of Theorem By Corollary (1) to main Theorem (7) a permutation $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j \geq 1\}$ can be found such that the P.E.M.'s $P_{\pi n}$ are vaguely convergent to the uniform measure P_U (with density function $f_U(t) = \frac{1}{T} \forall t \in [0, T]$), where

$P_{\pi n}$ assigns mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j = 1, \dots, n\}$; thus, for each fixed interval $(a, b] \subset [0, T]$, we have

$$P_{\pi n}(a, b] = \frac{n(a, b]}{n} \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(a, b]}{n} = P_U(a, b] = \frac{b-a}{T}$$

and this because each $(a, b]$ is a P_U -continuity set. Now for a fixed $(a, b]$ let us denote by $P_{(\pi n(a, b])}$ the probability measure giving mass $\frac{1}{n(a, b]}$ to each point $t_{\pi(j)} \in A(\pi, n, (a, b])$ in such a way that

$$P_{(\pi n(a, b])}(c, d] = \frac{n(c, d]}{n(a, b]} \quad \forall (c, d] \subset (a, b],$$

where $n(c, d]$ is defined analogously to $n(a, b]$. Let us observe that, because of the equality

$$\frac{n(c, d]}{n(a, b]} = \frac{n(c, d]/n}{n(a, b]/n} = P_{\pi n}(c, d] \frac{1}{P_{\pi n}(a, b]},$$

and the vague convergence $P_{\pi n} \rightarrow P_U$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n(c, d]}{n(a, b]} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{\pi n}(c, d] \frac{1}{\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{\pi n}(a, b]} = \frac{d-c}{T} \frac{T}{b-a} = \frac{d-c}{b-a},$$

i.e.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{(\pi n(a, b])}(c, d] = \frac{d-c}{b-a}$$

and the sequence of P.E.M.'s $P_{(\pi n(a, b])}$ is vaguely convergent to uniform measure $P_{U(a, b]}$ having density function $f_{U(a, b]}(t) = \frac{1}{b-a} \forall t \in (a, b]$. Denoting with $p_0(P_{(\pi n(a, b])})$ and $p_0(P_{U(a, b]})$ the induced measures by p_0 , i.e.

$$p_0(P_{(\pi n(a, b])})(B) = P_{(\pi n(a, b])}(p_0^{-1}(B)) \text{ and } p_0(P_{U(a, b]})(B) = P_{U(a, b]}(p_0^{-1}(B)),$$

$\forall B \in \mathcal{B}[0, 1]$; because of continuity of p_0 , the vague convergence of $P_{(\pi n(a, b])}$ to $P_{U(a, b]}$ implies the vague convergence of $p_0(P_{(\pi n(a, b])})$ to $p_0(P_{U(a, b]})$ and then, by Theorem (6), the convergences hold true

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n(a, b]} \sum_{t_{\pi(j)} \in A(\pi, n, (a, b])} p_0(t_{\pi(j)}) = \int_0^1 p dp_0(P_{U(a, b]})$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n(a, b]} \sum_{t_{\pi(j)} \in A(\pi, n, (a, b])} Y(t_{\pi(j)}) \rightarrow \int_0^1 p dp_0(P_{U(a, b]}) a.s.;$$

finally, by standard analysis arguments,

$$\int_0^1 p dp_0(P_{U(a, b]}) = \int_a^b p_0(t) dP_{U(a, b]} = \int_a^b p_0(t) \frac{1}{b-a} dt =$$

$$\frac{1}{b-a}p_0(\underline{t})(b-a) = p_0(\underline{t})$$

where \underline{t} is a point whose existence is stated by the mean value Theorem for integral of the continuous p_0 function and proof is now complete.

4.2 PROBLEM 2

Our interest is now concerning a strongly consistent estimate of $p_0(t)$ where $t \in [0, T]$ is assigned. The elementary solution given by $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i(t)$ and based on the observations $Y_1(t), \dots, Y_n(t)$ of the r.v. $Y(t)$ has no meaning in our context; in fact we may suppose that, when n is big enough, taking n observations at the same instant t is not possible and then we necessarily need n observation instants t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n with the respective r.v.'s $Y(t_1), Y(t_2), \dots, Y(t_n)$ and their expectations $p_0(t_1), p_0(t_2), \dots, p_0(t_n)$, and this because our urn model has a time dependent composition.

Our aim consists in proving the following result:

Theorem 5 *If $\{t_j : j \geq 1\}$ is any convergent sequence to t , then $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_j)$ is a strongly consistent estimate of $p_0(t)$.*

Proof of Theorem. A first elementary proof is given proving that the convergence $p_0(t_j) \rightarrow p_0(t)$ implies convergence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_j) \rightarrow p_0(t)$. In fact, because of convergence $p_0(t_j) \rightarrow p_0(t)$, for fixed $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ there exists k such that $|p_0(t_j) - p_0(t)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \forall j > k$, and then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_j) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^k p_0(t_j) + \frac{n-k}{n} \frac{\sum_{j=k+1}^n p_0(t_j)}{n-k}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\sum_{j=k+1}^n p_0(t_j)}{n-k} - p_0(t) \right| &= \left| \frac{\sum_{j=k+1}^n p_0(t_j)}{n-k} - \frac{(n-k)p_0(t)}{n-k} \right| \leq \\ \frac{1}{n-k} \sum_{j=k+1}^n |p_0(t_j) - p_0(t)| &\leq \frac{1}{n-k} (n-k) \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \forall n > k. \end{aligned}$$

Finally the limits $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^k p_0(t_j) \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{n-k}{n} \rightarrow 1$, when $n \rightarrow \infty$, allows us to state the existence of n_0 such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_j) - p_0(t) \right| < \epsilon \quad \forall n > n_0;$$

proving that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n p_0(t_j) = p_0(t)$, which jointly with the almost sure convergence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (Y(t_j) - p_0(t_j)) \rightarrow 0$ (apply Rajchman Theorem) completes the proof.

The same result may be proved also via vague convergence of P.E.M.'s P_n^0 which assigns weight $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{p_0(t_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\} \forall n$ fixed. If $(a, b]$ is an interval having t as an internal point, then there exists k such that $p_0(t_j) \in (a, b] \forall j > k$ and $P_n^0(a, b] \rightarrow 1$, while if t is internal to the complement of $(a, b]$ we have that $P_n^0(a, b] \rightarrow 0$, proving that P_n^0 is vaguely convergent to $P = \delta_t$ which assigns weight 1 to point t . Applying Theorem (6) the result is proved.

Applying again the above technique a consistent estimation is found for the difference

$$[p_0(t) - p_0(t^-)] \text{ where } p_0(t^-) = \lim_{s \rightarrow t^-} p_0(s)$$

if the function p_0 is right continuous with left limits. In fact if $\{t_j : j \geq 1\}$ and $\{s_j : j \geq 1\}$ are two sequences satisfying

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} t_j = t^+ \text{ and } \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} s_j = t^-$$

we have

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} p_0(t_j) = p_0(t) \text{ and } \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} p_0(s_j) = p_0(t^-),$$

thus applying the above Theorem (5) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_j) \rightarrow p_0(t) \text{ and } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(s_j) \rightarrow p_0(t^-) \text{ a.s.}$$

and then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(t_j) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y(s_j) \rightarrow [p_0(t) - p_0(t^-)] \text{ a.s..}$$

5 A RIEMANN-DINI TYPE THEOREM FOR SLLN

The well known Riemann-Dini theorem for real numbers series is extended to strong laws of large numbers for real random variables. Namely: if $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j$ is a simply but not an absolutely convergent series of real numbers and $\alpha \in \mathcal{R} \cup \{\infty, -\infty\}$ is an assigned value, then there exists a permutation (i.e. a bijection $\pi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$) such that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_{\pi(j)} = \alpha$. Analogously, given a sequence of real random variables $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ having arbitrarily different and finite expectations $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$, it is shown, under suitable assumptions, that for any fixed real number β belonging to a wide class $B \subset \mathcal{R}$, there exists a permutation $\pi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the sequence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_{\pi(j)}$ is almost surely

convergent to β when $n \rightarrow \infty$. The main technical tool is the study of convergence for the sequences of measures P_n which assigns probability mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each value $\{E(Y_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ and of the deep interplay between the possible limits of sequences $\{P_n : n \geq 1\}$ and the permutations of values $\{E(Y_{\pi(j)}) : j \geq 1\}$ where $\pi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is an assigned bijection.

5.1 PRELIMINARY ELEMENTS

As an introductory argument a simple but meaningful example may help in showing the goal of our analysis.

EXAMPLE 1

Let us suppose that there exists a partition for the sequence of real r.v.'s $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ into two subsequences denoted by $\{Y_{l_k} : k \geq 1\}$ and $\{Y_{n_k} : k \geq 1\}$ satisfying

$$\{Y_j : j \geq 1\} = \{Y_{l_k} : k \geq 1\} \cup \{Y_{n_k} : k \geq 1\} \quad (11)$$

where $E(Y_{l_k}) = L_1, E(Y_{n_k}) = L_2, \forall k \geq 1$.

For each fixed natural n let $C_n(L_1)$ and $C_n(L_2)$ denote respectively the total number of r.v.'s Y_j with $1 \leq j \leq n$ which satisfy $E(Y_j) = L_1$ or $E(Y_j) = L_2$ in such a way that $n = C_n(L_1) + C_n(L_2)$ and then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n Y_j = \sum_{k=1}^{C_n(L_1)} Y_{l_k} + \sum_{K=1}^{C_n(L_2)} Y_{n_k}.$$

Consequently we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j = \frac{C_n(L_1)}{n} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(L_1)} Y_{l_k}}{C_n(L_1)} + \frac{C_n(L_2)}{n} \frac{\sum_{K=1}^{C_n(L_2)} Y_{n_k}}{C_n(L_2)} \quad (12)$$

where

$$0 \leq \frac{C_n(L_1)}{n} \leq 1, 0 \leq \frac{C_n(L_2)}{n} \leq 1 \text{ and } \frac{C_n(L_1)}{n} + \frac{C_n(L_2)}{n} = 1. \quad (13)$$

Because of (12) the convergence for $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j$ can be shown if the following two steps procedure holds true:

a) applying the standard SLLN the convergences are stated

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(L_1)} Y_{l_k}}{C_n(L_1)} \rightarrow L_1 \text{ and } \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(L_2)} Y_{n_k}}{C_n(L_2)} \rightarrow L_2$$

almost surely when $n \rightarrow \infty$;

b)if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(L_1)}{n} = p_1, \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(L_2)}{n} = p_2, \quad (14)$$

because of (13) $p_1 + p_2 = 1$ and then the pair (p_1, p_2) defines a probability distribution over the real values L_1, L_2 . Then, under a) and b) above, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n y_j \rightarrow p_1 L_1 + p_2 L_2 \text{ almost surely.} \quad (15)$$

Now this simple case allows us to detect the main elements of our analysis:

i) a class of limit values $p_1 L_1 + p_2 L_2$ can be introduced for fixed L_1 and L_2 when the pair (p_1, p_2) is arbitrarily chosen under conditions $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $p_1 + p_2 = 1$ in such a way that for fixed L_1 and L_2 the set

$$B(L_1, L_2) = \{p_1 L_1 + p_2 L_2 : 0 \leq p_i \leq 1 (i = 1, 2), p_1 + p_2 = 1\} \quad (16)$$

defines all possible values which can be the almost sure limit for a sequence

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_{\pi(j)} \text{ where } \pi : N \rightarrow N \text{ is a permutation of } Y_j' \text{'s.}$$

ii) the existence is evident of a strict connection between any fixed value $p_1 L_1 + p_2 L_2 \in B(L_1, L_2)$ and a permutation π such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_{\pi(j)} \rightarrow p_1 L_1 + p_2 L_2$.

iii) the almost sure limit $p_1 L_1 + p_2 L_2$ can be written as an integral

$$\int_R I(v) d(p_1 \delta_{L_1} + p_2 \delta_{L_2}) \quad (17)$$

where $I(\cdot)$ is the identity map and $p_1 \delta_{L_1} + p_2 \delta_{L_2}$ is the probability measure giving mass p_1 to L_1 and p_2 to L_2 respectively. This measure is defined through the strict interplay of two components:

c1) the values L_1 and L_2 which are assigned by the expectations $E(Y_j)$'s;

c2) the probability distribution denoted with p_1 and p_2 which is the result of limits (14) and choosing a permutation of Y_j 's. Such a probability measure plays a central role in our approach: for any fixed pair (p_1, p_2) with $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$ and $p_1 + p_2 = 1$ there exists some permutations π such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_{\pi(j)} \rightarrow \int_R I(v) d(p_1 \delta_{L_1} + p_2 \delta_{L_2}) \text{ a.s.};$$

thus the limit for the SLLN is assigned by measure $p_1 \delta_{L_1} + p_2 \delta_{L_2}$. \diamond

Our aim consists in extending the above example 1 to more general situations: for instance if the set $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ contains arbitrarily different

values, including the case when $E(Y_j) \neq E(Y_k) \forall j \neq k$. The main result deals with a sequence of r.v.'s $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ under the following assumptions:

A 3 the Y_j 's are uniformly bounded i.e. there exists $M > 0$ such that $|Y_j| \leq M \forall j \geq 1$;

A 4 the Y_j 's are pairwise uncorrelated;

A 5 the Y_j 's have probability distributions and finite expectations which are arbitrarily different;

A 6 the sequence of expectations $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\} \subset [-M, M]$ has at least two different limit points, i.e. there exist at least two different values $x_1, x_2 \in [-M, M]$ which are the limits of some subsequences of $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$.

It will be shown below the existence of a wide class \mathcal{M} of probability measures P over the Borel σ -field $B(-M, M]$ such that for any assigned $P \in \mathcal{M}$ there exist some permutations $\pi: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_{\pi(j)} \rightarrow \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v) \text{ a.s..} \quad (18)$$

The representation of limits given in (18) by integrals of type $\int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v)$ gives big evidence to measure P ; not only: the convergence stated by (18) and the approach here adopted are mainly based on measures defined over the interval $(-M, M]$. Namely: P is a probability measure which is the limit in some sense of the sequence of the P.E.M. $P_{\pi n}$'s which assigns weight $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{E(Y_{\pi(j)}) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$; moreover, if the permutation π is adopted, the set of mean values $\{E(Y_{\pi(j)}) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, the P.E.M.'s $P_{\pi n}$, and the possible limit P depend on π . The detailed and rigorous definition of the class \mathcal{M} needs several technical elements which will be an argument of the below subsections.

A further intuitive argument may help in understanding the meaning of our aim; if the r.v.'s $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ satisfy above assumptions and have arbitrarily different expectations $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ a SLLN can be easily given taking the differences $\{(Y_j - E(Y_j)) : j \geq 1\}$ and then applying a well known result: see, for instance, theorem 5.1.2 at page 108 of Chung book [3]. In fact the Y_j 's are uncorrelated and with uniformly bounded second moments, then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (Y_j - E(Y_j)) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n E(Y_j) \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s..} \quad (19)$$

Of course this is not a solution to our problem :the (19) in fact states the convergence to 0 for the differences and a convergence result for $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n E(Y_j)$ is not so easy to obtain. A law of large numbers cannot be applied to the deterministic sequence $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ and also the convergence for the series $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{E(Y_j)}{j}$, in order to apply the Kronecker lemma, is not an easy one if $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ is a general sequence in the interval $(-M, M]$. On the other hand the convergence for $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n E(Y_j)$ to some value L jointly with the SLLN (19) implies that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j \rightarrow L$ a.s. solving our problem. That of finding hypotheses under which the sequence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n E(Y_j)$ is a convergent one is then a relevant tool in this context. Let us write $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n E(Y_j)$ as an integral, i.e.

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n E(Y_j) = \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP_n(v) = \int_R I_M(v) dP_n(v) \quad (20)$$

where P_n is the P.E.M. giving mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{E(Y_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, $I(v)$ is the identity map and

$$I_M(v) = I(v) \text{ if } v \in (-M, M)$$

$$I_M(v) = M \text{ if } v \in [M, \infty)$$

$$I_M(v) = -M \text{ if } v \in (-\infty, -M].$$

Because of continuity and boundedness of I_M over R^1 a favourable context for convergence of the integrals sequence

$$\left\{ \int_{R^1} I_M(v) dP_n(v) : n \geq 1 \right\}$$

is given by VAGUE CONVERGENCE for the sequence $\{P_n\}$ of probability measures. Applying Theorem 4.4.2 at page 93 of Chung book [3] we have that if P_n, P are probability measures, then $\{P_n\}$ is vaguely convergent to P if and only if

$$\int_{R^1} f(v) dP_n(v) \rightarrow \int_{R^1} f(v) dP(v)$$

for each continuous and bounded f .

Thus the vague convergence of P_n 's to P implies convergence for integrals

$$\int_{R^1} I_M(v) dP_n(v) \rightarrow \int_{R^1} I_M(v) dP(v),$$

thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n E(Y_j) = \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v) \text{ and}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j = \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v) \text{ a.s..}$$

The vague convergence of P.E.M. P_n 's is the general setting adopted for our analysis: the centrality of its role, now evident for convergence of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n E(Y_j)$, will be shown below also for directly proving the convergence of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j$.

5.2 THE TECHNICAL BACKGROUND

For a fixed natural m let us denote by $\mathcal{H}_m = \{H_r : r = 1, \dots, m\}$ a partition of the interval $(-M, M]$ into m subintervals where

$$H_1 = (-M, t_1], H_2 = (t_1, t_2], \dots, H_m = (t_{m-1}, M]; \quad (21)$$

the sequence of r.v.'s $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ is supposed to satisfy Assumption (3), ..., Assumption (6) and a permutation π , which is assigned for Y_j 's, is omitted in the notations in order to simplify formulas. A partition for $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ into a family of m subsequences is introduced on the base of the m sets $\{H_r : r = 1, \dots, m\}$: for each fixed H_r we collect the Y_j 's having the respective $E(Y_j) \in H_r$, i.e. the subsequence is introduced

$$\{Y_{jr_k} : k = 1, 2, \dots, Q(H_r)\} \quad (22)$$

where:

i) Q is the counting measure which assigns to each $B \in \mathcal{B}(-M, M]$ the respective value $Q(B)$ i.e. the total number of values $E(Y_j) \in B$. Thus the set of values taken by Q includes any natural n and also $+\infty$.

ii) The index jr is a strictly increasing map $jr : N \rightarrow N$ and any value $jr_k = jr(k)$ means that Y_j with $j = jr_k$ is the k -th element inside $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ such that $E(Y_j) \in H_r$. Thus each of the m subsequences $\{Y_{jr_k} : k = 1, \dots, Q(r)\}$ with $r = 1, \dots, m$ is characterized through the respective index, i.e. the strictly increasing map $jr : N \rightarrow N$, satisfies the following properties:

I) the m sets of values $\{jr_k = jr(k) : k = 1, 2, \dots, Q(r)\}$ for $r = 1, \dots, m$ are pairwise disjoint;

II) their union is equal to N .

Then the m subsequences $\{Y_{jr_k} : k = 1, \dots, Q(r)\}$ for $r = 1, \dots, m$ are a partition of $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$. Now, for each fixed natural n and given $\{Y_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ and $\{E(Y_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, let us define the quantities $\{c_n(r) : r = 1, \dots, m\}$ as

$$C_n(r) = \sum_{j=1}^n I_{H_r}(E(Y_j)) \quad (23)$$

where $I_{H_r}(E(Y_j)) = 1$ if $E(Y_j) \in H_r$ and $I_{H_r}(E(Y_j)) = 0$ if $E(Y_j) \notin H_r$; $C_n(r)$ is then the total number of values in the set $\{E(Y_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$

falling inside the interval H_r . The following quantity is a generalization of (12) concerning EXAMPLE 1

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j = \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{C_n(r)}{n} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} Y_{jr_k}}{C_n(r)}. \quad (24)$$

A technical tool for below proofs consists in studying the limit for the second member of (24) when $n \rightarrow \infty$. A two step procedure is pointed out dealing, for a fixed r , with the two sequences $\frac{C_n(r)}{n}$ and $\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} Y_{jr_k}}{C_n(r)}$. Of course the interesting case is when H_r contains infinitely many $E(Y_j)$'s and then $\frac{C_n(r)}{n}$ may be convergent to a non zero limit.

STEP 1 The convergence is assumed

$$P(H_r) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(r)}{n} \quad \forall r = 1, \dots, m,$$

where P is an assigned probability measure over the Borel σ -field $B(-M, M]$.

STEP 2 If H_r includes infinitely many values $E(Y_j)$'s, then the SLLN can be applied to the sequence

$$\frac{1}{C_n(r)} \sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} Y_{jr_k} = \frac{1}{C_n(r)} \sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} (Y_{jr_k} - E(Y_{jr_k})) + \frac{1}{C_n(r)} \sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} E(Y_{jr_k}). \quad (25)$$

Because of Assumptions (3) and (4) the SLLN (see Theorem 5.1.2 of Chung book [3]) is applied to the first term in second member of (25)

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} (Y_{jr_k} - E(Y_{jr_k})) \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s..}$$

The inclusion $E(Y_{jr_k}) \in H_r = (t_{r-1}, t_r]$ means $t_{r-1} < E(Y_{jr_k}) \leq t_r$ and then the below inequality

$$t_{r-1} < \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} E(Y_{jr_k})}{C_n(r)} \leq t_r \quad (26)$$

states that the oscillations of the sequence $\frac{1}{C_n(r)} \sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} E(Y_{jr_k})$ can be made arbitrarily small if the length of H_r is small and the above steps imply that

$$\left| \frac{C_n(r)}{n} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} Y_{jr_k}}{C_n(r)} - P(H_r) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} E(Y_{jr_k})}{C_n(r)} \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s.} \quad (27)$$

and

$$\left| \sum_{r=1}^m \frac{C_n(r)}{n} \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} Y_{jr_k}}{C_n(r)} - \sum_{r=1}^m P(H_r) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} E(Y_{jr_k})}{C_n(r)} \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ a.s..} \quad (28)$$

We are now ready for the below statement:

Lemma 1 *If the sequence of r.v.'s $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ satisfies Assumptions (3),(4) and if, for ϵ fixed, there exists a partition of $(-M, M]$ into subsets $\{H_r : r = 1, \dots, m\}$ such that:*

i) the length of each H_r is not greater than ϵ ;

ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(r)}{n} = P(H_r) \forall r = 1, \dots, m$ where P is an assigned probability measure over $B(-M, M]$, then there exists a set A with probability one such that for each $\omega \in A$ the existence is proved of a natural value $n_0(\epsilon, \omega)$ satisfying

$$|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j(\omega) - \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v)| < 2\epsilon, \quad \forall n > n_0(\epsilon, \omega).$$

PROOF OF LEMMA (1) . The sequence of r.v.'s $\{Y_{jr_k} : k \geq 1\}$ satisfies Assumptions (3) and (4) and then, applying Theorem 5.1.2 of Chung book [3], the existence is proved for a set $A_r \subset \Omega$ with $\mu(A_r) = 1$, where μ is the probability measure defined over Ω , such that

$$\frac{1}{C_n(r)} \sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} (Y_{jr_k} - E(Y_{jr_k})) \rightarrow 0$$

over the set A_r . Of course the above arguments are concerning a set H_r including infinitely many values $E(Y_j)$'s in such a way that $C_n(r) \rightarrow \infty$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$; now using (25), the convergence (27) can be directly proved. Through iterations of above procedure for each $r = 1, \dots, m$ the existence is given of sets $\{A_r : r = 1, \dots, m\}$ with $\mu(A_r) = 1 \forall r = 1, \dots, m$ and then through the intersection $A = \cap_{r=1}^m A_r$ we have that $\mu(A) = 1$ and (28) holds true. If the value

$$\sum_{r=1}^m P(H_r) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} E(Y_{jr_k})}{C_n(r)}$$

is thought as the integral of a simple function taking a constant value over each interval H_r , than its distance from $\int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v)$ can be estimated using standard arguments:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{r=1}^m P(H_r) \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} E(Y_{jr_k})}{C_n(r)} - \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v) \right| \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{r=1}^m \int_{H_r} \left| \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} E(Y_{jr_k})}{C_n(r)} - I(v) \right| dP(v) \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{r=1}^m \epsilon P(H_r) = \epsilon \sum_{r=1}^m P(H_r) = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and this recalling that $\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{C_n(r)} E(Y_{jr_k})}{C_n(r)} \in H_r \forall r = 1, \dots, m$ and if the length of each H_r is at most ϵ . The result follows from (28) and the last inequalities.

5.3 THE MEASURES P_n, P, Q

Two types of measures introduced above have a central role:

1) the counting measure Q (see (22)), whose values $Q(B)$ assigns the total number of $E(Y_j)$'s falling into B , $\forall B \in B(-M, M]$; Q is based on the position of $E(Y_j)$'s inside $(-M, M]$ and may take any natural value and $+\infty$ too.

2) keeping on account of Q , and a fixed permutation π for Y_j 's and $E(Y_j)$'s, the quantities $\frac{C_n(r)}{n}$ were introduced (see (23) and (24)) for each H_r with $r = 1, \dots, m$; $C_n(r)$ is the total number of values $E(Y_j)$'s belonging to H_r . If a different permutation π' is chosen for Y_j 's, different values $C'_n(r)$ will be generated. Thus if the limit exists $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C'_n(r)}{n} = P'(H_r) \forall r = 1, \dots, m$, where P' is a probability measure over $B(-M, M]$, the P' depends on measure Q and permutation π' . A more general way to define the quantities $\frac{C_n(r)}{n}$ is that of introducing the probability measure P_n which assigns the mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each value $\{E(Y_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ for n fixed and then

$$P_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \delta_{E(Y_j)} \quad (29)$$

defines a probability measure over $B(-M, M]$ which is referred as "pseudoempiric measure" (P.E.M.) where the "pseudo" means that $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ is a deterministic and not an i.i.d. sequence of observations. The above limits, if they exist, may be rewritten as

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(H_r) = P(H_r) \forall r = 1, \dots, m \quad (30)$$

and the close interplay between permutation π and measure P is one of the interesting aspects which characterize the context with arbitrarily different expectations $E(Y_j)$'s, where the P.E.M. P_n 's and the possible limit measure P are strictly dependent on π . If $E(Y_j) = v_0 \forall j \geq 1$, i.e. if we consider the classical case, then we have $P_n = P = \delta_{v_0}$, and this for any assigned permutation π showing that the classical case is invariant with respect to permutations.

5.4 THE CONVERGENCE OF P_n 's TO P

This subsection deals mainly with the type of convergence to adopt for the sequence of P.E.M. P_n 's to P . Each P_n and P are defined over the Borel σ -field $B(-M, M]$ and then it may appear as a natural request to ask that the convergence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(B) = P(B)$ holds true for each $B \in B(-M, M]$. The following example shows that convergence $P_n(B) \rightarrow P(B) \forall B \in B(-M, M]$

is a too restrictive request for our purposes.

EXAMPLE 2 Let us suppose that $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ is a strictly decreasing sequence inside $(-M, M]$ such that $L = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} E(Y_j)$ and then a sequence of intervals

$$A_j = (a_j, b_j] \subset [-M, M] \quad \forall j \geq 1$$

can be constructed in such a way that

- i) A_j contains only one $E(Y_j)$ as an internal point;
- ii) $A_j \cap A_l = \emptyset \quad \forall j \neq l$. A permutation π is assigned and the corresponding sequence $\{Y_{\pi(j)} : j \geq 1\}$ is considered; for each n fixed let P_n be the P.E.M. which assigns probability mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{E(Y_{\pi(j)}) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ and then $P_n(A_{\pi(j)}) = \frac{1}{n}$ if $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $P_n(A_{\pi(j)}) = 0$ if $j > n$. Because of the equalities

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} P_n(A_{\pi(j)}) = 1 \quad \forall n \text{ fixed and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(A_{\pi(j)}) = 0 \quad \forall j \text{ fixed,}$$

the Steinhaus Lemma (see Ash book [1] at page 44) ensures the existence of a subsequence $\{A_{\pi(j_k)} : k \geq 1\}$ such that $\{P_n(\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_{\pi(j_k)}) : n \geq 1\}$ is not a convergent sequence, proving that the convergence $P_n(b) \rightarrow P(B)$ does not hold true over all sets of $B(-M, M]$, and this for any assigned permutation π . \diamond

Now the above example 2 suggests to adopt a type of convergence $P_n \rightarrow P$ which is based on a suitable subclass of $B(-M, M]$: then the VAGUE CONVERGENCE of P_n to P is considered as a driving element for main results given below. The general definition (see Chung book [3] at page 85) is given when P_n, P are subprobability measures; nevertheless, in this context, we are dealing only with probability measures and then we prefer to consider this case. Moreover, as $P_n(-M, M] = P(-M, M] = 1$ we may suppose, without loss of generality, to handle probability measures P satisfying $P(-M) = P(M) = 0$ and $Q(-M) = Q(M) = 0$, where Q is the counting measure. The above elements suggest us to use a condition for vague convergence of probability measures which is equivalent to the general one over R^1 but using only the interval $(-M, M]$. Some preliminary notions are needed to introduce the definition of vague convergence given below. In (21) we denoted as $\mathcal{H}_m = \{H_r : r = 1, \dots, m\}$ a partition of $(-M, M]$ into m subintervals $H_1 = (-M, t_1], H_2 = (t_1, t_2], \dots, H_m = (t_{m-1}, M]$.

Here a sequence of partitions for $(-M, M]$ is introduced as it follows; $\mathcal{H}_1 = (-M, M]$ contains $(-M, M]$ as its unique element. Then choosing arbitrarily a point t_3 satisfying $-M < t_3 < M$ the partition \mathcal{H}_2 is obtained consisting of two intervals $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{(-M, t_3], (t_3, M]\}$ and choosing t_4 such that $-M < t_4 < t_3$ the partition \mathcal{H}_3 consists of three intervals $\mathcal{H}_3 = \{(-M, t_4], (t_4, t_3], (t_3, M]\}$. If

t_5 is chosen with $t_3 < t_5 < M$ we have $\mathcal{H}_4 = \{-M, t_4], (t_4, t_3], (t_3, t_5], (t_5, M]\}$ and so on..... generating a sequence of partitions $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$.

Definition 3 A sequence of partitions $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$ generated by above procedure is defined to be a "progressive sequence of partitions" (P.S.P. hereafter) if $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} l_m = 0$ where l_m is the maximum length of the m intervals included into \mathcal{H}_m .

Definition 4 An interval $(a, b]$ is defined to be a continuity interval for the probability measure P defined over the Borel σ -field $B(R^1)$ if $P(a) = P(b) = 0$.

Definition 5 If P_n, P are probability measures satisfying $P(-M) = P(M) = P_n(-M) = P_n(M) = 0$ and $P(-M, M] = P_n(-M, M] = 1$, the sequence $\{P_n\}$ is defined to be vaguely convergent to P if there exists a P.S.P. $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$ such that each interval $H \in \cup_m \mathcal{H}_m$ is a continuity interval for P and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(H) = P(H)$.

5.5 THE MAIN RESULTS

Let us suppose that the sequence of P.E.M. P_n 's, satisfying Definition (5), is vaguely convergent to P . Thus the convergence holds true $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(H) = P(H)$ for each H inside a P.S.P. $\cup_m \mathcal{H}_m$ and consequently if $Q(H) = k \in N$ ($k < +\infty$), then

$$Q(H) = k \Rightarrow P(H) = 0 \quad (31)$$

or equivalently

$$P(H) > 0 \Rightarrow Q(H) = +\infty \quad (32)$$

where $Q(H)$ is the counting measure which assigns the total number of values $E(Y_j) \in H$. Condition (31) seems to be very close to absolute continuity of P with respect to Q ; nevertheless the absolute continuity is defined over the Borel σ -field $B(-M, M]$ while (31) involves only intervals inside $\cup_m \mathcal{H}_m$ where $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$ is a P.S.P.. In our context conditions (31) or (32) are more general than absolute continuity $P \ll Q$; the evidence is reached via some simple examples, and this could be the case when $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ is a convergent sequence to L and $E(Y_j) \neq L \forall j \geq 1$. If L is an interior point of $(a, b]$ then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(a, b] = 1$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(a, b] = 0$ if L is interior to the complement of $(a, b]$. Denoting as $P = \delta_L$ the probability measure giving mass 1 to L , a P.S.P. $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$ for $(-M, M]$ is easy to obtain such that each $H \in \cup_m \mathcal{H}_m$ is a P -continuity set and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(H) = P(H)$. Now $P(H) > 0$ means $P(H) = 1$ and this implies $Q(H) = +\infty$ showing that (32) holds true. Nevertheless, being $E(Y_j) \neq L \forall j$ we have $Q(L) = 0$ and $P(L) = 1$

showing that P is not absolutely continuous with respect to Q (over the Borel σ -field) and this even if (31) and (32) hold true over a P.S.P. $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$ of P -continuity sets. Condition (31) or (32) has a central role in main results described by the following two statements.

Our interest is concerning an assigned sequence of r.v.'s $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ with finite expectations $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ satisfying Assumptions (3)-(6); the P.E.M. P_n gives mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each of n values $\{E(Y_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ and Q is the counting measure defined above.

Theorem 6 *If the sequence of P.E.M. P_n 's is vaguely convergent to a probability measure P , then the convergence is satisfied*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j \rightarrow \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v) \text{ a.s..}$$

Of course P satisfies (31) and (32) with respect to Q because of vague convergence of P_n 's to P . Such a relationship shows its importance also in the main statement which is, in some sense, the converse of above Theorem (6): given a probability measure P over $B(-M, M]$ does exist a condition which ensures the existence of a permutation $\pi : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_{\pi(j)} \rightarrow \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v)$ a.s.? The answer is (32): using such a condition the class \mathcal{M} is introduced.

Definition 6 *Given the sequence of r.v.'s $\{Y_j : j \geq 1\}$ with finite expectations $\{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ satisfying Assumptions (3)-(6), let \mathcal{M} denotes the class of probability measures P over $B(-M, M]$ having a P.S.P. $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$ of P -continuity sets such that $P(H) > 0 \Rightarrow Q(H) = +\infty \forall H \in \cup_m \mathcal{H}_m$.*

Theorem 7 *For each assigned probability measure $P \in \mathcal{M}$ a permutation $\pi : N \rightarrow N$ can be computed such that the sequence of P.E.M. P_{π_n} 's (which for each n fixed assigns mass $\frac{1}{n}$ to each value $\{E(Y_{\pi(j)}) : j = 1, \dots, n\}$) is vaguely convergent to P and then (by Theorem (6))*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_{\pi(j)} \rightarrow \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v) \text{ a.s..}$$

5.6 PROOF OF MAIN RESULTS

PROOF OF THEOREM (6) Applying definitions (3),(4),(5) there exists a P.S.P. $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$ of P -continuity sets such that

- i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(H) = P(H) \forall H \in \cup_m \mathcal{H}_m$;
- ii) $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_m = 0$ where ϵ_m is the maximum length of the set of intervals

$\{H_r : r = 1, \dots, m\} = \mathcal{H}_m$.

Then, applying Lemma (1) to each fixed partition \mathcal{H}_m , the existence is shown for a set A_m such that

a) $\mu(A_m) = 1$ where μ is the probability measure defined over Ω .

b) for each $\omega \in A_m$, there exists an integer $n_0(\epsilon_m, \omega)$ such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j(\omega) - \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v) \right| < 2\epsilon_m \quad \forall n > n_0(\epsilon_m, \omega).$$

Thus the $\mu(\cap_{m=1}^{\infty} A_m) = 1$ and each $\omega \in \cap_m A_m$, satisfying statement b) above for each $m \geq 1$, shows the convergence $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j(\omega) \rightarrow \int_{-M}^M I(v) dP(v)$ a.s..

PROOF OF THEOREM (7) The starting point is a probability measure P over $B(-M, M]$ which admits a P.S.P. $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$ of P-continuity sets H 's such that $P(H) > 0 \Rightarrow Q(H) = \infty \quad \forall H \in \cup_m \mathcal{H}_m$. The below proof consists of several steps.

1) THE STRUCTURE OF PARTITIONS

Recalling the construction for the P.S.P. $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$, the partition \mathcal{H}_m is a class of m right closed and left open intervals $H_{rm} \subset (-M, M]$ indexed by rm i.e. $\mathcal{H}_m = \{H_{rm} : rm = 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and inside \mathcal{H}_m we separate the sets H_{rm} having positive and null P-measure:

$$\mathcal{H}_m^+ = \{H_{rm} : P(H_{rm}) > 0\} = \{H_{sm} : sm = 1, \dots, m^+\},$$

where $m^+ \leq m$ and H_{sm} is a relabeling of P-positive sets, and

$$\mathcal{H}_m^0 = \{H_{rm} : P(H_{rm}) = 0\}.$$

A sequence of partitions $\mathcal{H}_m, \mathcal{H}_{m+1}, \mathcal{H}_{m+2}, \dots$ is used which is briefly denoted as $\{\mathcal{H}_{m+i} : i \geq 1\}$ where the notation is adopted

$$\mathcal{H}_{m+i} = \{H_{r(m+i)} : r(m+i) = 1, 2, \dots, m+i\}$$

and (see the construction of partitions in subsection 5.4) \mathcal{H}_{m+i+1} is obtained partitioning only one interval $\underline{H_{r(m+i)}} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+i}$ into two subintervals denoted as

$$\underline{H_{r(m+i+1)}}, \underline{H_{r(m+i+1)+1}} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+i+1}$$

with

$$\underline{H_{r(m+i+1)}} \cup \underline{H_{r(m+i+1)+1}} = \underline{H_{r(m+i)}}$$

and including into \mathcal{H}_{m+i+1} all the remaining intervals $\mathcal{H}_{r(m+i)} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+i}$ with $r(m+i) \neq \underline{r(m+i)}$. Our goal of finding a permutation may be performed

assigning to each fixed $n \geq 1$ a corresponding value $E(Y_n) \in \{E(Y_j) : j \geq 1\}$ such that the convergence holds true

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n(H_{rm}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(H_{rm})}{n} = P(H_{rm}) \quad \forall H_{rm} \in \cup_m \mathcal{H}_m. \quad (33)$$

The idea of considering the difference

$$\left| \frac{C_n(H_{rm})}{n} - P(H_{rm}) \right| \quad (34)$$

is an intuitive one and the assigned value $E(Y_n)$ corresponding to n will be found selecting a set $H_{rm_0} \in \mathcal{H}_m$ and choosing a value $E(Y_{j_0}) \in H_{rm_0}$; thus we put $E(Y_n) = E(Y_{j_0})$. Of course a permutation has to be found such that the convergence (33) holds true $\forall H_{rm} \in \cup_m \mathcal{H}_m$, then the possibility is needed of selecting sets inside each \mathcal{H}_m for any fixed $m \geq 1$. Moreover the differences (34) are not meaningful if the sets $H_{rm} \in \mathcal{H}_m$ are taken when $m > n$: in fact the equality $C_n(H_{rm}) = 0$ is trivially satisfied for a large class of $H_{rm} \in \mathcal{H}_m$. Thus a good policy suggests that the index m of partitions depends on n , i.e. $m(n)$ is increasing with $m < n$. Recalling that a sequence of partitions $\{\mathcal{H}_{m+i} : i \geq 0\}$ is used, we assume to work with a strictly increasing sequence of naturals

$$\{n_{m+i} : i \geq 0\} \quad (35)$$

and with the sequence of "natural intervals"

$$[n_{m+i}, n_{m+i+1}) = \{n \in N : n_{m+i} \leq n < n_{m+i+1}\} \quad \forall i \geq 0 \quad (36)$$

in such a way that for each fixed $n \in [n_{m+i}, n_{m+i+1})$ the selection is performed for a set $H_{r(m+i)_0} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+i}$ and then we put $E(Y_n) = E(Y_{j_0})$ where $E(Y_{j_0})$ is a chosen value of $H_{r(m+i)_0}$. Let us observe that when for each $n \in [n_{m+h}, n_{m+h+1})$ we select a set $H_{r(m+h)_0} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+h}$, at the same time, we still select a set $H_{r(m+i)_0} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+i}$ for any $i \leq h$: in fact each assigned set $H_{r(m+h)} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+h}$ is a subset, i.e. $H_{r(m+h)} \subseteq H_{r(m+i)}$ for some $H_{r(m+i)} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+i}$ for any fixed $i \leq h$.

2) THE P-NULL SETS

Given \mathcal{H}_m and its subclass \mathcal{H}_m^0 of P-null sets, the union is taken

$$B_m^0 = \cup \{H_{rm} \in \mathcal{H}_m^0\}. \quad (37)$$

Where $n \in [n_{m+1}, n_{m+2})$ and \mathcal{H}_{m+1} is taken, let us describe the set $B_{m+1}^0 = \cup \{H_{r(m+1)} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+1}^0\}$. The class \mathcal{H}_{m+1} contains the partition into two subsets $H_{r(m+1)}, H_{r(m+1)+1}$ of only one set $H_{rm} \in \mathcal{H}_m$ and all the remaining sets $H_{rm} \in \mathcal{H}_m$ with $rm \neq \underline{rm}$. It is now useful to distinguish some cases:

i)if $P(H_{rm}) = 0$, i.e. $H_{rm} \in \mathcal{H}_m^0$, then $P(H_{r(m+1)}) = P(H_{r(m+1)+1}) = 0$ (because subset of the P-null set H_{rm}) and $B_{m+1}^0 = B_m^0$;
ii)if $P(H_{rm}), P(H_{r(m+1)}), P(H_{r(m+1)+1})$ are all positive, then we have too $B_{m+1}^0 = B_m^0$ because \mathcal{H}_{m+1}^0 and \mathcal{H}_m^0 contain the same sets.
iii)if $P(H_{rm}) > 0$ and $P(H_{r(m+1)}) > 0, P(H_{r(m+1)+1}) = 0$ (or vice versa $P(H_{r(m+1)}) = 0, P(H_{r(m+1)+1}) > 0$): the class \mathcal{H}_{m+1}^0 contains all sets of \mathcal{H}_m^0 and the new set $H_{r(m+1)+1}$. Thus $B_{m+1}^0 \supset B_m^0$ and, in the general case, we may write $B_{m+1}^0 \supseteq B_m^0$.

Of course, under iteration of above arguments, we have that $\{B_{m+i}^0 : i \geq 0\}$ is a non decreasing sequence of P-null sets where the strict inclusion $B_{m+i+1}^0 \supset B_{m+i}^0$ holds true if the set $H_{r(m+i)} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+i}$, which is partitioned into two subsets $H_{r(m+i+1)}, H_{r(m+i+1)+1} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+i+1}$, satisfies the same conditions of iii) above, i.e. $P(H_{r(m+i+1)}) > 0$ and $P(H_{r(m+i+1)+1}) > 0, P(H_{r(m+i+1)+1}) = 0$.

3) THE SELECTION TECHNIQUE

The technique we consider deals with selection of "next term" $E(Y_{n+1})$ of the permutation, when the first n values $E(Y_1), E(Y_2), \dots, E(Y_n)$ are assigned and n satisfies $n_{m+h} \leq n \leq n_{m+h+1} - 2$, where h is a fixed natural. Our purpose is that of selecting a set $H_{r(m+h)_0} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+h}$ and then to choose the $(n+1)$ -th value of permutation taking $E(Y_{n+1}) = E(Y_j)$, where $E(Y_j) \in H_{r(m+h)_0}$. The selection technique is based on two different procedures for P-null and P-positive sets. We assume here that any P-null set H_{rm} contains infinitely many values $E(Y_j)$'s; in fact the case of a P-null set H'_{rm} with finitely many values $E(Y_j)$'s is a trivial one: the convergence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(H'_{rm})}{n} = 0$ holds true under any permutation.

We consider all partitions \mathcal{H}_{m+i} with $0 \leq i \leq h$, starting with \mathcal{H}_m , its subclasses $\mathcal{H}_m^+, \mathcal{H}_m^0$ of P-positive and P-null sets respectively and B_m^0 the union of all sets in \mathcal{H}_m^0 . A subset is selected

$$N_{m+h} \subset [n_{m+h}, n_{m+h+1}) \quad (38)$$

and for each $n \in N_{m+h}$ we put $E(Y_n) = E(Y_j)$ where $E(Y_j)$ is a value belonging to B_m^0 . The choice of N_{m+h} satisfying some conditions which will be discussed later, gives the index values inside $[n_{m+h}, n_{m+h+1})$ where to place the elements $E(Y_j) \in B_m^0$. Thus if $(n+1) \in N_{m+h}$ we put $E(Y_{n+1}) = E(Y_j) \in B_m^0$, while if $(n+1) \notin N_{m+h}$ we select a subset $H_{sm_0} \in \mathcal{H}_m^+$ using the below method. For each assigned index $sm_0 = 1, 2, \dots, m^+$ let us write

$$a_{sm_0} = \left| \frac{C_n(H_{sm_0}) + 1}{n + 1} - P(H_{sm_0}) \right| + \sum_{sm=1, sm \neq sm_0}^{m^+} \left| \frac{C_n(H_{sm})}{n + 1} - P(H_{sm}) \right| \quad (39)$$

and define as \overline{sm}_0 the index satisfying

$$a_{\overline{sm}_0} = \min\{a_{sm_0} : sm_0 = 1, \dots, m^+\}. \quad (40)$$

Recalling that our goal consists in choosing a set inside \mathcal{H}_{m+h} , if the selected set $H_{\overline{sm}_0} \in \mathcal{H}_m^+$ is too included into \mathcal{H}_{m+h} we may put $E(Y_{n+1}) = E(Y_j)$ where $E(Y_j)$ is a not previously chosen value of $H_{\overline{sm}_0}$. But if $H_{\overline{sm}_0} \notin \mathcal{H}_{m+h}$, this implies that inside \mathcal{H}_{m+h} there exists a family of sets defining a partition of $H_{\overline{sm}_0}$. A first partition of $H_{\overline{sm}_0}$ into two subsets may be found inside a class \mathcal{H}_{m+i1} including two sets denoted by $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}}$ and $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}}$ such that $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}} \cup H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}} = H_{\overline{sm}_0}$ and afterwards a partition of $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}}$ into two subsets may exists inside a class \mathcal{H}_{m+i2} (where $i1 < i2 \leq h$) including two sets $H_{\underline{r(m+i2)}}$, $H_{\underline{r(m+i2)+1}}$ in such a way that $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}} = H_{\underline{r(m+i2)}} \cup H_{\underline{r(m+i2)+1}}$. For sake of simplification, and without loss of generality, we may suppose that \mathcal{H}_{m+h} contains no further subsets of $H_{\overline{sm}_0}$ than the three subsets $H_{\underline{r(m+i2)}}$, $H_{\underline{r(m+i2)+1}}$, $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}}$ and the selection of one of the three above subsets is performed below when all the three subsets have positive P-measure.

The first partition of $H_{\overline{sm}_0}$ into two subsets is introduced by \mathcal{H}_{m+i1} ; then, after selection of $H_{\overline{sm}_0}$, one of the two subsets $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}}$ or $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}}$ is chosen using a method which is the analogous of above (39) and (40) when there are only two alternatives. Thus, given the two quantities

$$b_1 = \left| \frac{C_n(H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}}) + 1}{n+1} - P(H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}}) \right| + \left| \frac{C_n(H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}}) + 1}{n+1} - P(H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}}) \right| \quad (41)$$

and

$$b_2 = \left| \frac{C_n(H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}}) + 1}{n+1} - P(H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}}) \right| + \left| \frac{C_n(H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}}) + 1}{n+1} - P(H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}}) \right| \quad (42)$$

let us denote by \overline{k}_0 the index satisfying

$$b_{\overline{k}_0} = \min\{b_1, b_2\}. \quad (43)$$

If $b_{\overline{k}_0} = b_2$ then $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}}$ is selected and we put $E(Y_{n+1}) = E(Y_j)$, where $E(Y_j)$ is a not previously chosen value of $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}}$; and this because of the inclusion $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)+1}} \in \mathcal{H}_{m+h}$. Vice versa, if $b_{\overline{k}_0} = b_1$ the selected set is $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}}$ which is not included into \mathcal{H}_{m+h} : in fact \mathcal{H}_{m+h} contains the two subsets $H_{\underline{r(m+i2)}}$ and $H_{\underline{r(m+i2)+1}}$ of $H_{\underline{r(m+i1)}}$. Then, applying again (41), (42) and (43) to $H_{\underline{r(m+i2)}}$ and $H_{\underline{r(m+i2)+1}}$, one of the two sets will be selected; thus we put $E(Y_{n+1}) = E(Y_j) \in H_{\underline{r(m+i2)}}$ if $H_{\underline{r(m+i2)}}$ is selected or $E(Y_{n+1}) =$

$E(Y_j) \in H_{r(m+i2)+1}$ if $H_{r(m+i2)+1}$ is selected.

4)SELECTING P-NULL SETS

Recalling the structure of partitions (in the first part of this proof) and considering,for each natural $i \geq 0$ fixed, the interval of naturals $[n_{m+i}, n_{m+i+1})$, our strategy consists in choosing a suitable subset

$$N_{m+i} \subset [n_{m+i}, n_{m+i+1})$$

such that $\forall n \in N_{m+i}$ a value $E(Y_n)$ is selected in such a way that $E(Y_n) = E(Y_j)$ where $E(Y_j)$ is a not previously chosen value belonging to the set B_{m+i}^0 which is the union of all P-null sets inside the partition \mathcal{H}_{m+i} .As a choice criterion for the set N_{m+i} the following elements are introduced.

Let us consider the family of quotients $\frac{C_n(B_{m+i_n}^0)}{n}$ for each $n \geq n_m$ where $m + i_n = m + i \forall n \in [n_{m+i}, n_{m+i+1})$ and $C_n(B_{m+i}^0)$ gives the total number of values in the set $\{E(Y_j) : j = 1, \dots, n\} \cap B_{m+i}^0$.

The selection of the subset $N_{m+i} \subset [n_{m+i}, n_{m+i+1}) \forall i \geq 0$ is performed in such a way that:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(B_{m+i_n}^0)}{n} = 0 \quad (44)$$

and

$$\text{all values } E(Y_j) \in \cup_{i=0}^{\infty} B_{m+i}^0 \text{ are selected.} \quad (45)$$

The limit (44) above implies the convergence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(H)}{n} = 0$ for each P-null set $H \in \cup_{i=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_{m+i}$;in fact ,if $H_{r(m+h)}^0 \in \mathcal{H}_{m+h}$ and $P(H_{r(m+h)}^0) = 0$,we have $H_{r(m+h)}^0 \subset B_{m+h}^0 \subset B_{m+i}^0 \forall i \geq h$ and then

$$\frac{C_n(H_{r(m+h)}^0)}{n} \leq \frac{C_n(B_{m+i}^0)}{n} \forall i \geq h; \text{ and thus, by limit (44), } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(H_{r(m+h)}^0)}{n} = 0.$$

We are now ready to choose the next term $E(Y_{n+1})$:if $(n+1) \in N_{m+i}$ we put $E(Y_{n+1}) = E(Y_j)$ where $E(Y_j)$ is a not previously chosen value belonging to B_{m+i}^0 , while if $(n+1) \notin N_{m+i}$ we select a P-positive set following the above procedure and the proof is now complete. \diamond

As an example/application the extension of Theorem (7) is suggested to the case of an arbitrary real bounded and dense sequence $\{t_j : j \geq 1\} \subset [0, T]$ where each t_j is not necessarily the expectation $E(Y_j)$ of an assigned random variable.Thus the basic elements concerning Theorem (7) are shown:

- i) each t_j denotes an observation time of the process $\{Y(t), \forall t \in [0, T]\}$ under the assumption that $t_j \neq t_k, \forall j \neq k$;
- ii) Q is the counting measure defined over the Borel σ -field $B[0, T]$ such that $Q(A)$ is the total number of t_j 's belonging to A, for each fixed $A \in B[0, T]$. Then $Q((a, b]) = +\infty$ for each $(a, b] \subset [0, T]$ and $Q(A)$ is a natural value if A is a finite union of points $t \in [0, T]$.

iii) The class \mathcal{M} is defined in close connection with Q : position and density of t_j 's inside $[0, T]$ are elements having a strong impact on \mathcal{M} : for instance each absolutely continuous P.M. over $[0, T]$ belongs to \mathcal{M} . In fact, if P is a P.M. over $[0, T]$ with density function $f_P(t)$, each interval H belonging to any P.S.P. $\{\mathcal{H}_m : m \geq 1\}$ of $(0, T]$ is a P -continuity set and if $P(H) > 0 \Rightarrow Q(H) = +\infty$ because of the density of t_j 's. Thus Theorem (7) may be applied to any absolutely continuous measure P over $[0, T]$.

Corollary 1 *If $\{t_j : j \geq 1\}$ is a dense subset of $[0, T]$, then for each assigned absolutely continuous probability measure P over $[0, T]$ some permutation π can be computed such that the sequence of P.E.M.'s $P_{\pi n}$, which assigns weight $\frac{1}{n}$ to each point $\{t_{\pi(j)} : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, is vaguely convergent to P .*

References

- [1] Ash, R.B.; Doleans-Dade, C.A. *Probability & measure theory*, second edition, Academic Press: London, 2000.
- [2] Chandra, T.K. *Laws of large numbers*, Narosa Publishing House: New Delhi, 2012.
- [3] Chung, K.L. *A course in probability theory*, third edition, Academic Press: London, 2001.
- [4] Fiorin, S. *Laws of large numbers for random variables with arbitrarily different and finite expectations via regression method*, Topics in statistical simulation, Volume 114, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, page 167-181: New York, 2014.
- [5] Priestley, M.B. *Spectral analysis and time series*, Volume 1, univariate series, Academic Press: London, 1981.
- [6] Priestley, M.B. *Non-linear and non-stationary time series analysis*, Academic Press: London, 1988.