

Estimating the logarithm of characteristic function and stability parameter for symmetric stable laws

Jüri Lember*

Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Tartu, Estonia,
jyri@ut.ee

Annika Krutto†

Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Tartu, Estonia
 Department of Biostatistics, University of Oslo, Norway,
krutto@ut.ee

Abstract

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be an i.i.d. sample from symmetric stable distribution with stability parameter α and scale parameter γ . Let φ_n be the empirical characteristic function. We prove an uniform large deviation inequality: given preciseness $\epsilon > 0$ and probability $p \in (0, 1)$, there exists universal (depending on ϵ and p but not depending on α and γ) constant $\bar{r} > 0$ so that

$$P\left(\sup_{u>0:r(u)\leq\bar{r}} |r(u) - \hat{r}(u)| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq p,$$

where $r(u) = (u\gamma)^\alpha$ and $\hat{r}(u) = -\ln |\varphi_n(u)|$. As an applications of the result, we show how it can be used in estimation unknown stability parameter α .

Keywords: Stable laws, large deviation inequalities, parameter estimation;

MSC codes: Stable laws 60E07; Confidence regions 62F25

*Estonian institutional research funding IUT34-5, Estonian Research Council grant PRG865

†Estonian institutional research funding IUT34-5

1 Introduction and preliminaries

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be an i.i.d. sample from stable law with characteristic function $\varphi(u) = \exp[-(\gamma|u|)^\alpha + i\omega(u)]$, where $\omega(u) = u[\beta\gamma \tan \frac{\pi\alpha}{2}(|\gamma u|^{\alpha-1} - 1) + \delta]$ for $\alpha \neq 1$ and $\omega(u) = u[-\beta\gamma \frac{2}{\pi} \ln(\gamma|u|) + \delta]$ for $\alpha = 1$, and $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, $\beta \in [-1, 1]$, $\gamma > 0$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ are (unknown) stability, skewness, scale and shift parameters, respectively. Basic properties of stable distributions can be found in [15, 13, 9]. Let F_n be the empirical distribution function, and φ_n the empirical characteristic function, i.e.

$$\varphi_n(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\{iux\} dF_n(x), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (1.1)$$

Let $r(u) = -\ln|\varphi(u)| = (\gamma|u|)^\alpha$ and $\hat{r}(u) = -\ln|\varphi_n(u)|$. Estimating the parameters of stable law is a notoriously hard problem (see, e.g., [8, Section 2], [15, Chapter 4]). Simple empirical characteristic function based closed form estimates were proposed in [11]. In particular, the stability parameter estimator is

$$\hat{\alpha} = \frac{\ln \hat{r}(u_1) - \ln \hat{r}(u_2)}{\ln u_1 - \ln u_2}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $0 < u_2 < u_1$ are fixed arguments and $\hat{r}(u) = -\ln|\varphi_n(u)|$. Since for any u , $\hat{r}(u) \rightarrow (\gamma|u|)^\alpha$, a.s., we see that any choice of $0 < u_2 < u_1$ gives consistent estimator. The same points $0 < u_2 < u_1$ can be used to give consistent closed form estimators also to other parameters γ , β , δ of stable law (see [5, Theorem 1]). Despite the asymptotic consistency holds for any pair u_1, u_2 , in practice the right choice of u_1 and u_2 is crucial and the universal selection of these values has remained unsolved (e.g., [10, 1, 3]). Recently, [6] suggests that the choice of u_1 and u_2 should be fixed based on the preciseness of $\hat{\alpha}$, that is, on the preciseness of $\hat{r}(u)$. Clearly, the preciseness of $\hat{\alpha}$ depends on how well $\hat{r}(u_i)$ and estimates $r(u_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$.




Figure 1: The values of $r(u) = u^\alpha$ vs $\hat{r}(u)$ of single replicates (simulated with [12]) of stable law with $\gamma = 1$, $\delta = 0$, $\beta = 0$ for $\alpha = 0.2$ in (a), $\alpha = 1$ in (b) and $\alpha = 1.8$ in (c).




Figure 2: The values of $r(u) = u^\alpha$ vs $\hat{r}(u)$ of single replicates (simulated with [12]) of stable law with $\gamma = 1$, $\delta = 0$, $\beta = 0$ for $\alpha = 0.2$ in (a), $\alpha = 1$ in (b) and $\alpha = 1.8$ in (c).

Figure 1 and Figure 2 show that $\hat{r}(u)$ is relatively accurate estimate of $r(u)$ only in a small interval $(0, \bar{u}]$, where \bar{u} obviously depends on sample size n , but unfortunately also on α – the smaller α , the smaller also \bar{u} . So, there seems not to exist an universal (that applies for any $\alpha \in (0, 2]$) upper bound \bar{u} so that $\sup_{u \in (0, \bar{u}]} |\hat{r}(u) - r(u)|$ were small for any α even when $\gamma > 0$ is known. It is clearly evident from Figure 1 and Figure 2, that too big u_2 makes the estimate of α very imprecise. Observe that $0 < u_2 < u_1$ cannot also be very small, because then $\ln u_1 - \ln u_2$ is also very small and that affects the preciseness of $\hat{\alpha}$ even when $\hat{r}(u_i) \approx r(u_i)$, $i = 1, 2$. On the other hand, Figure 1 and Figure 2 as well as simulations in [6] suggest that despite the possible non-existence of universal \bar{u} , there might exist an universal (not depending on α and γ) \bar{r} so that $\sup_{0 < u: r(u) \leq \bar{r}} |\hat{r}(u) - r(u)|$ is relatively small.

Our main theoretical result states that for symmetric ¹ stable laws such universal \bar{r} exists.

Theorem 1.1. *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be an i.i.d. sample from symmetric stable law. Fix $\epsilon > 0$, $p \in (0, 1)$. Then there exists $n_o(\epsilon, p) < \infty$ such that for every $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ and $n > n_o$*

$$P\left(\sup_{0 < u: r(u) \leq \bar{r}} |r(u) - \hat{r}(u)| > \epsilon\right) \leq p, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\bar{r}(\epsilon, p, n) > 0$ is independent of α and γ .

Theorem is proved in Subsection 2. From Theorem 1.1 it follows that with probability $1 - p$, $|r(u_i) - \hat{r}(u_i)| \leq \epsilon$, given n is big enough and u_i is chosen such that $r(u_i) \leq \bar{r}$, $i = 1, 2$. Therefore, in order to apply (1.2), it makes sense not to fix arguments u_1 and

¹For mathematical tractability in formulas, in particular in tail estimation in (1.7) and (2.3), we provide our results for symmetric stable laws. Similar construction of proof can be applied for general stable laws.

u_2 , but the values $\hat{r}(u_1)$ and $\hat{r}(u_2)$ instead. The obtained estimate is then

$$\hat{\alpha} = \frac{\ln(\bar{r} - \epsilon) - \ln(\underline{r} + \epsilon)}{\ln u_1 - \ln u_2}, \quad (1.4)$$

where, ϵ , \bar{r} and \underline{r} are carefully chosen constants and

$$u_1 = \inf\{u : \hat{r}(u) = \bar{r} - \epsilon\}, \quad u_2 = \sup\{u : \hat{r}(u) = \underline{r} + \epsilon\}. \quad (1.5)$$

The estimates of parameters $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ at u_1 and u_2 based on $\bar{r} - \epsilon = 0.5$ and $\underline{r} + \epsilon = 0.1$ were proposed and studied in [6]. The current article thus provides theoretical justification to the such method of argument selection.

Note that estimating the parameters via two points u_1 and u_2 as in (1.2) deserves more attention in the recent literature and specifying u_1 and u_2 via \hat{r} function as in (1.5) is not the only option. In [1], $u_1 = 1$ and u_2 is taken such that the distance between Cauchy ($\alpha = 1$) and Gaussian ($\alpha = 2$) characteristic functions at u_2 were maximal. The idea of maximizing the distance between characteristic functions is further developed in [3], where an iterative 8-step algorithm for specifying u_1 and u_2 is proposed. Although the idea of maximizing discrepancy between characteristic functions (or rather between r -functions) is quite natural, and the simulations in [3] show good behaviour of that choice in practice, the proposed algorithm in [3] is still ad hoc in nature and lacks theoretical justification. In particular, it is not clear that it allows to choose u_1 and u_2 so that the inequality (1.6) below holds.

The proof of the Theorem 1.1 is constructive, but the goal of it is to show that universal \bar{r} exists, not to optimize the constant, i.e. to find the biggest possible \bar{r} and smallest possible n_o . It means that the \bar{r} constructed in the proof is probably too small for practical use. Although, for every u , γ and α , $\hat{r}(u) \rightarrow r(u)$, a.s. as n grows, our upper bound satisfies $\bar{r}(\epsilon, p, n) \leq w_o < 1$, where w_o is a constant depending on ϵ . Thus \bar{r} is always bounded away from 1 and does not increase to the infinity as n grows. This need not necessarily be the deficiency of the proof, rather than necessary property. To see that, assume the inequality (1.3) holds with some $\bar{r} > 1$. Then it follows that

$$P\left(\sup_{u \in (0, \bar{u}]} |r(u) - \hat{r}(u)| > \epsilon\right) \leq p,$$

where $\bar{u} = \sqrt{\frac{\bar{r}}{\gamma}}$, so that the universal upper bound (that applies for any α) \bar{u} would exist. However, there is no evidence at all that such an \bar{u} exists, suggesting that the a.s. convergence $\hat{r}(u) \rightarrow r(u)$ is not uniform over small α – for every u and n there exists α small enough so that the difference $|r(u) - \hat{r}(u)|$ is still big. If so, then \bar{r} must always remain smaller than 1. The situation is different, when we bound the unknown stability parameters α below from zero, i.e. we assume the existence of $\underline{\alpha} > 0$ (which can be arbitrary small) such that the unknown parameter α belongs to $[\underline{\alpha}, 2]$. In this case the upper bound $\bar{r}(\epsilon, p, n, \underline{\alpha})$ satisfies $\lim_n \bar{r}(\epsilon, p, n, \underline{\alpha}) = \infty$ (Corollary 2.1), and in this case also the upper bound \bar{u} exists. The existence of $\underline{\alpha}$ is common assumption

in practice (e.g., [7, 4, 8] suggest $\underline{\alpha} = 0.5$) and we keep this additional assumption in Theorem 2.1, that provides a uniform bound similar to (1.3) to the difference of logarithms $|\ln \hat{r}(u) - \ln r(u)|$. Theorem 2.1 is actually a simple corollary of Theorem 1.1, but the additional assumption about the existence of $\underline{\alpha}$ is necessary, because if r is very small, then $|\ln \hat{r} - \ln r|$ can be rather big even when r is very close to \hat{r} .

Section 3 is devoted to the applications of Theorem 2.1 in the light of large deviation inequalities for $\hat{\alpha}$. We show how the upper bound from Theorem 2.1 can be used to solve the two basic questions related with estimate $\hat{\alpha}$ in (1.4):

- Given precision $\epsilon_1 > 0$, probability p and lower bound $\underline{\alpha}$, find $\bar{r}, \underline{r}, \epsilon$ (needed to construct $\hat{\alpha}$ in (1.4)) and possibly small sample size n so that

$$P(|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha| > \epsilon_1) \leq p. \quad (1.6)$$

- Given sample size n and $\underline{\alpha}$, find $\bar{r}, \underline{r}, \epsilon$ and possibly small ϵ_1 so that (1.6) holds. In other words, find exact i.e. non-asymptotic confidence interval to α .

The solutions of these questions are formulated as Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2.

The bound in Theorem 2.1 is constructed using the basic bound $\bar{r}(\epsilon, p, n)$ provided by Theorem 1.1. Thus the ϵ_1 and required sample size n in the inequality (1.6) depend heavily on the function \bar{r} . Unfortunately, the function \bar{r} constructed in Section 2 is not explicitly given and, hence, difficult to work with. Although the main goal of the present paper is just to show that the function \bar{r} exists, in Section 4, we discuss another possibility to construct \bar{r} . The new construction gives analytically more tractable bound, the price for it is bigger minimal required sample size n_o and lower bound. Also the upper bound \bar{r} constructed in Section 4 is also strictly smaller than 1 for every n . So we have two different constructions with the same property, and this allows us to conjecture that even the best bound \bar{r} is always smaller than 1 and we also conjecture that the universal upper bound \bar{u} does not exist.

Preliminaries. For $0 < \alpha < 2$ every stable distribution has tail(s) that are asymptotically power laws with heavy tails (e.g., [9, Theorem 1.12], [13, Property 1.2.15],

$$\begin{aligned} F(t) &\sim c_\alpha \gamma^\alpha (1 - \beta) |t|^{-\alpha}, & \text{when } t \rightarrow -\infty, \\ 1 - F(t) &\sim c_\alpha \gamma^\alpha (1 + \beta) t^{-\alpha}, & \text{when } t \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where $c_\alpha = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)}{\pi} \sin \frac{\pi\alpha}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} c_\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 2} c_\alpha = 0$. For symmetric stable laws ($\beta = 0$) these results imply the existence of constants² $L(\alpha)$ so that

$$F(t) \leq L(\alpha) \left(\frac{|t|}{\gamma} \right)^{-\alpha}, \quad \forall t < 0, \quad (1 - F(t)) \leq L(\alpha) \left(\frac{t}{\gamma} \right)^{-\alpha}, \quad \forall t > 0, \quad (1.7)$$

²For general stable laws it implies for the existence of constants $L_1(\alpha, \beta) = L(\alpha)(1 - \beta)$ and $L_2(\alpha, \beta) = L(\alpha)(1 + \beta)$ with $(1 - \beta) \in [-2, 0]$ and $(1 + \beta) \in [0, 2]$.

Figure 3 plots the function $t \mapsto F(t)|t|^\alpha$ for different α -values and $\gamma = 1$ in the range $[-5, 0]$ and $[-10^7, 0]$. Increasing the interval shows similar pattern, hence it is clear that there exists $L < \infty$ so that $\sup_{\alpha \in (0, 2]} L(\alpha) \leq L$. Throughout the paper, we keep L undetermined, although one can take it as $\frac{1}{2}$. It is also obvious that L is independent of γ .




Figure 3: Plotting $t \mapsto F(t)|t|^\alpha$ (calculated with [12]) for different α -values with $\gamma = 1$, $\delta = 0$, $\beta = 0$ in the range $[-5, 0]$ and $[-10^7, 0]$.

In what follows, we shall use the following elementary inequalities: for any $x, y > 0$,

$$|\ln x - \ln y| \leq \frac{|x - y|}{x \wedge y} = \frac{|x - y|}{x} \vee \frac{|x - y|}{x - |x - y|},$$

we obtain that $|\ln x - \ln y| > \epsilon$ implies $\frac{|x - y|}{x} > \frac{\epsilon}{1 + \epsilon}$. Thus, for any $\bar{u} > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$

$$P\left(\sup_{u \in (0, \bar{u}]} |r(u) - \hat{r}(u)| > \epsilon\right) \leq P\left(\sup_{u \in (0, \bar{u}]} e^{r(\bar{u})} |\varphi(u) - \varphi_n(u)| > \frac{\epsilon}{1 + \epsilon}\right). \quad (1.8)$$

Observe that (1.8) holds for any estimate φ_n .

2 Main results

2.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Bounding the difference of characteristic functions. Recall φ_n is the standard empirical estimate given by (1.1). To bound $|\varphi(u) - \varphi_n(u)|$ we use the approach in [2]

as follows. For every $0 < K < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi_n(u) - \varphi(u)| &= \left| \int e^{iux} d(F_n(x) - F(x)) \right| \leq \left| \int_{-\infty}^{-K} e^{iux} d(F_n(x) - F(x)) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_{-K}^K e^{iux} d(F_n(x) - F(x)) \right| + \left| \int_K^{\infty} e^{iux} d(F_n(x) - F(x)) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|e^{iux}| = 1$ for every u and x , the first term can be bounded

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{-K} e^{iux} d(F_n(x) - F(x)) \right| &\leq \int_{-\infty}^{-K} |e^{iux}| dF_n(x) + \int_{-\infty}^{-K} |e^{iux}| dF(x) \leq F_n(-K) + F(-K) \\ &\leq \|F_n - F\| + 2F(-K), \end{aligned}$$

where $\|F_n - F\| := \sup_x |F_n(x) - F(x)|$. The last inequality holds, because $F_n(-K) \leq \|F_n - F\| + F(-K)$. Similarly, the third term can be estimated above by $\|F_n - F\| + 2(1 - F(K))$. To estimate the second term, we use the integration by parts

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-K}^K e^{iux} d(F_n(x) - F(x)) \right| &= \left| e^{iux} (F_n(x) - F(x)) \Big|_{-K}^K - iu \int_{-K}^K e^{iux} (F_n(x) - F(x)) dx \right| \\ &\leq |F_n(-K) - F(-K)| + |F_n(K) - F(K)| + |u| \int_{-K}^K |F_n(x) - F(x)| dx \\ &\leq 2\|F_n - F\| + |u| \cdot \|F_n - F\| \cdot 2K. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any K

$$|\varphi_n(u) - \varphi(u)| \leq 4\|F_n - F\| + |u| \cdot \|F_n - F\| \cdot 2K + 2F(-K) + 2(1 - F(K)). \quad (2.1)$$

For any $\delta > 0$, let $K(\delta)$ be so big that $F(-K) \leq \frac{\delta}{8}$. Then also $1 - F(K) \leq \frac{\delta}{8}$ and (2.1) implies

$$|\varphi_n(u) - \varphi(u)| \leq \frac{\delta}{2} + 4\|F_n - F\| + |u| \cdot \|F_n - F\| \cdot 2K(\delta). \quad (2.2)$$

By (1.7), we can take

$$K(\delta) = \left(\frac{8L}{\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \gamma \quad (2.3)$$

and so with $u > 0$, by (2.2) and (2.3)

$$|\varphi_n(u) - \varphi(u)| \leq \frac{\delta}{2} + 2\|F_n - F\| \left(2 + \left(\frac{8Lr(u)}{\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right). \quad (2.4)$$

Bounding r . Recall $\bar{r} = r(\bar{u})$. Fix $\bar{u} > 0$ and define $\bar{\epsilon} = \epsilon e^{\bar{r}}$. We now use Dworetzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz inequality [14, p. 268]):

$$P(\|F_n - F\| > \epsilon) \leq 2 \exp[-2n\epsilon^2]$$

to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(e^{r(\bar{u})} \sup_{u \leq \bar{u}} |\varphi_n(u) - \varphi(u)| > \epsilon\right) &\leq P\left(\|F_n - F\| \geq \frac{(\bar{\epsilon} - \delta/2)\delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{2(2\delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + (8L\bar{r})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})}\right) \\
&= P\left(\|F_n - F\| \geq \frac{2^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}(\bar{\epsilon} - \delta/2)(\frac{\delta}{2})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{2(2^{1+\frac{1}{\alpha}}(\frac{\delta}{2})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + (8L\bar{r})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})}\right) \\
&= P\left(\|F_n - F\| \geq \frac{(\bar{\epsilon} - \delta/2)(\frac{\delta}{2})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{2(2(\frac{\delta}{2})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + (4L\bar{r})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}})}\right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp\left[-\frac{n}{8} \cdot \left(\frac{(\bar{\epsilon} - \delta/2)(\frac{\delta}{2})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{(\frac{\delta}{2})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + \frac{1}{2}(4L\bar{r})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}\right)^2\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$k(\alpha, \epsilon, \bar{r}) = \frac{1}{8} \left[\max_{0 \leq x \leq \bar{\epsilon}} \frac{(\bar{\epsilon} - x)}{1 + \frac{1}{2}(\frac{4L\bar{r}}{x})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \right]^2.$$

From (1.8), we obtain

$$P\left(\sup_{u \in (0, \bar{u}]} |r(u) - \hat{r}(u)| > \epsilon\right) \leq 2 \exp[-nk(\alpha, \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}, \bar{r})] = p$$

which is equivalent to $k(\alpha, \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}, \bar{r}) = \frac{\ln(2/p)}{n}$, and so the desired upper bound for any α , denoted by $r_n(\alpha)$ is the solution of the following equality

$$k\left(\alpha, \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}, r_n\right) = \frac{\ln(2/p)}{n}. \quad (2.5)$$

Observe that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} k\left(\alpha, \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}, r\right) = \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\right)^2.$$

Hence the following condition gives a lower bound for minimal sample size n so that $r_n(\alpha) > 0$:

$$n > 8 \ln(2/p) \left(\frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon}\right)^2. \quad (2.6)$$

The existence of $\bar{r} = \inf_{\alpha \in (0, 2]} r_n(\alpha)$. The following lemma shows that $\inf_{\alpha \in (0, 2]} r_n(\alpha) > 0$, hence the universal (not depending on α and γ) bound \bar{r} exists. Since $\epsilon/(1+\epsilon) < 1$, without loss of generality, in the lemma we consider $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. The lemma finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.1. *Fix $1 > \epsilon > 0$ and n such that $n > 8 \frac{\ln(2/p)}{\epsilon^2}$. Let $r_n(\alpha)$ be the solution of the equality $k(\alpha, \epsilon, r) = \frac{\ln(2/p)}{n}$. Then $r_n(\alpha)$ is continuous strictly positive function on $(0, 2]$ and $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} r_n(\alpha) > 0$. In particular, $\bar{r} = \inf_{\alpha \in (0, 2]} r_n(\alpha) > 0$.*

Proof. For every $\alpha > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, define function

$$h(r, x) = \frac{(\epsilon e^{-r} - x)}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{4Lr}{x} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}, \quad x \in (0, \epsilon e^{-r}], \quad r > 0.$$

Let us fix $r > 0$ and denote $c = 4Lr$. Let

$$x'(\epsilon, r) = \arg \max_{0 \leq x \leq \epsilon e^{-r}} \frac{(\epsilon e^{-r} - x)}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c}{x} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} = \arg \max_{0 \leq x \leq \epsilon e^{-r}} h(x, r).$$

Since $x \mapsto h(x, r)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing function, the maximizer x' exists and is unique. It is not difficult to see that x' must satisfy the following equalities:

$$\frac{(\epsilon e^{-r} - x')}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c}{x'} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} = \epsilon e^{-r} - (1 + \alpha)x' \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \frac{2\alpha}{c^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} (x')^{1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}} = \epsilon e^{-r} - (1 + \alpha)x'.$$

The inequality in the left implies that

$$k(\alpha, \epsilon, r) = \frac{1}{8} \left[\sup_{x \in (0, \epsilon e^{-r})} h(x, r) \right]^2 = \frac{1}{8} (\epsilon e^{-r} - (1 + \alpha)x')^2. \quad (2.7)$$

The equality in the right implies $x' < \frac{\epsilon e^{-r}}{1 + \alpha}$ and is equivalent to $x' \left(\frac{2\alpha}{c^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} (x')^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + (1 + \alpha) \right) = \epsilon e^{-r}$. Hence we obtain

$$\epsilon e^{-r} \left(\frac{2\alpha}{c^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}} \left(\frac{\epsilon e^{-r}}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + (1 + \alpha) \right)^{-1} < x' < \frac{\epsilon e^{-r}}{1 + \alpha}. \quad (2.8)$$

Define function

$$f(x) = x \left(2\alpha \left(\frac{x}{c} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} + (1 + \alpha) \right), \quad x \in (0, \epsilon e^{-r}]. \quad (2.9)$$

Thus x' is the solution of the equality $f(x) = \epsilon e^{-r}$.

Suppose now $\alpha_m \rightarrow \alpha_o > 0$. Let f_m and f_o be as f with α_m and α_o instead of α , respectively and let x_m and x_o be the solutions of the equalities $f_m(x) = \epsilon e^{-r}$ and $f_o(x) = \epsilon e^{-r}$. Clearly, for any $x \in (0, \epsilon e^{-r}]$, it holds $f_m(x) \rightarrow f_o(x)$. However, since $\alpha_o > 0$, by (2.8) we see that there exists $y > 0$ so that $x_m \in (y, \epsilon e^{-r}]$ eventually since obviously $\sup_{x \in [y, \epsilon e^{-r}]} |f_m(x) - f_o(x)| \rightarrow 0$, we obtain that $x_m \rightarrow x_o$ and by (2.7), thus $k(\alpha_m, \epsilon, r) \rightarrow k(\alpha_o, \epsilon, r)$. Now observe that for any $\alpha > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} k(\alpha, \epsilon, r) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{8}$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} k(\alpha, \epsilon, r) = 0$. Moreover $r \mapsto k(\alpha, \epsilon, r)$ is strictly decreasing function. For such functions, pointwise convergence implies uniform convergence, so that as m grows

$$\sup_{r \geq 0} |k(\alpha_m, \epsilon, r) - k(\alpha_o, \epsilon, r)| \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.10)$$

The uniform convergence implies that the solutions of the equalities $k(\alpha_m, \epsilon, r) = \ln(2/p)/n$ converge as well, i.e. $r_n(\alpha_m) \rightarrow r_n(\alpha_o)$, provided $n > 8 \frac{\ln(2/p)}{\epsilon^2}$ so that the

solutions exists.

We have proven that the function $r_n(\alpha)$ is continuous on the set $(0, 2]$. Let us now consider the case $\alpha_m \rightarrow 0$. From the equalities $f_m(x_m) = \epsilon e^{-r}$, it follows that

$$\lim_m x_m = \begin{cases} c, & \text{when } c \leq \epsilon e^{-r}; \\ \epsilon e^{-r}, & \text{when } c > \epsilon e^{-r}, \end{cases}$$

where $c = 4Lr$. Therefore, for every fixed $r > 0$,

$$k(\alpha_m, \epsilon, r) = \frac{1}{8}(\epsilon e^{-r} - (1 + \alpha_m)x_m)^2 \rightarrow k(0, \epsilon, r)$$

with

$$k(0, \epsilon, r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{8}(c - \epsilon e^{-r})^2, & \text{if } c \leq \epsilon e^{-r} \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow r \leq W\left(\frac{\epsilon}{4L}\right);$$

where W stands for Lambert W -function. Observe that $r \mapsto k(0, \epsilon, r)$ is strictly decreasing function with limits $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} k(0, \epsilon, r) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{8}$ and $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} k(0, \epsilon, r) = 0$. Hence (2.10) holds with $\alpha_o = 0$. This, in turn, implies that $r_n(\alpha_m) \rightarrow r_n(0)$, where $r_n(0)$ is the solution of the equality $k(0, \epsilon, r_n(0)) = \frac{\ln(2/p)}{n}$. Since $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} k(0, \epsilon, r) = \frac{\epsilon^2}{8}$, and by assumption $\frac{\epsilon^2}{8} > \frac{\ln(2/p)}{n}$, we see that $r_n(0) > 0$. Hence $r_n(\alpha)$ is continuous strictly positive function on $[0, 2]$, thus $\inf_{\alpha \in (0, 2]} r_n(\alpha) > 0$. \square

2.2 Bounding $\ln r$

We are now interested in finding the probabilistic bounds on difference $|\ln r(u) - \ln \hat{r}(u)|$, where, as previously, X_1, \dots, X_n is iid sample from symmetric stable law, $r(u) = -\ln |\varphi(u)| = (\gamma|u|)^\alpha$ and $\hat{r}(u) = -\ln |\varphi_n(u)|$. For that an additional assumption has to be made. In the present subsection, we assume that there exists a known lower bound $0 < \underline{\alpha}$ such that the parameter space is $[\underline{\alpha}, 2]$ instead of $(0, 2]$. The crucial benefit of knowing the lower bound of $\underline{\alpha}$ is the fact that the bound \bar{r} from Theorem 1.1 increases to infinity as n grows. Recall that the bound \bar{r} in lacks this property: although \bar{r} increases with n , it always satisfies $\bar{r} < W\left(\frac{\epsilon}{2L(1+\epsilon)}\right) < 1$ and, as argued in Introduction, such a property might be unavoidable. Bounding the parameter space away from zero, we have a new bound that tends to infinity as n increases. Let us formulate it as a corollary.

Corollary 2.1. *Assume $\underline{\alpha} > 0$ to be given. Fix $\epsilon > 0$, $p \in (0, 1)$ and let $n_o(\epsilon, p) < \infty$ be as in Theorem 1.1. Then for every $n > n_o$ there exists $\bar{r}(\epsilon, p, n, \underline{\alpha})$ independent of α and γ such that $\lim_n \bar{r}(\epsilon, p, n, \underline{\alpha}) = \infty$ and*

$$P\left(\sup_{u>0:r(u)\leq\bar{r}} |r(u) - \hat{r}(u)| > \epsilon\right) \leq p,$$

for every $\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, 2]$ and $\gamma > 0$.

Proof. Fix $0 < \underline{\alpha} < 2$ and take r_o so big that $4Lr_o > \epsilon e^{-r_o}$. Then for every $r \geq r_o$ and for every $x \in [0, \epsilon e^{-r}]$, the function

$$\alpha \mapsto \frac{(\epsilon e^{-r} - x)}{1 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\epsilon 4Lr}{x} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}$$

is increasing in α . Therefore

$$k(\alpha, \epsilon, r) \geq k(\underline{\alpha}, \epsilon, r), \quad \forall \alpha \geq \underline{\alpha} \quad r \geq r_o. \quad (2.11)$$

Now observe that when $\alpha > 0$, then for every r , it holds $x' < \frac{\epsilon e^{-r}}{1+\alpha}$, thus $k(\alpha, \epsilon, r) = \frac{1}{8} (\epsilon e^{-r} - (1+\alpha)x')^2 > 0$. Since $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} k(\alpha, \epsilon, r) = 0$, it follows that $\lim_n r_n(\alpha) = \infty$. Therefore, there exists $n(r_o, \underline{\alpha})$ so big that $r_n(\underline{\alpha}) > r_o$. From (2.11), it follows that when $n > n_o$, it holds $r_n(\alpha) \geq r_n(\underline{\alpha})$, $\forall \alpha \geq \underline{\alpha}$. Hence $\lim_n \inf_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, 2]} r_n(\alpha) = \lim_n r_n(\underline{\alpha}) = \infty$. The inequality in the statement now follows from Theorem 1.1. \square

Theorem 2.1. Assume $\underline{\alpha} > 0$ to be given. Fix $\epsilon > 0$, $p \in (0, 1)$ and $\underline{r} > 0$. Take $n_1(\epsilon, p, \underline{\alpha}, \underline{r})$ as minimal n such that

$$\bar{r} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \underline{r}, p, n, \underline{\alpha} \right) > \underline{r}, \quad n_1(\epsilon, p, \underline{\alpha}, \underline{r}) \geq n_o \left(\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \underline{r}, p \right), \quad (2.12)$$

where $n_o(\epsilon, p)$ is as in Theorem 1.1 and the function \bar{r} is as in Corollary 2.1. Then for every $n \geq n_1$, $\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, 2]$ and $\gamma > 0$

$$P \left(\sup_{u: r(u) \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]} |\ln r(u) - \ln \hat{r}(u)| > \epsilon \right) \leq p, \quad (2.13)$$

where $\bar{r} = \bar{r} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \underline{r}, p, n, \underline{\alpha} \right) > \underline{r}$.

Proof. By Corollary 2.1, such a finite n_1 exists. Now, for any $n > n_1$, by Corollary 2.1 again,

$$P \left(\sup_{u: r(u) \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]} |\ln r(u) - \ln \hat{r}(u)| > \epsilon \right) \leq P \left(\sup_{u: r(u) \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]} |r(u) - \hat{r}(u)| > \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon} \underline{r} \right) \leq p.$$

\square

3 Applications of Theorem 2.1

Recall the estimate $\hat{\alpha}$ in (1.4). The construction of $\hat{\alpha}$ requires fixing the constants \underline{r}, \bar{r} and ϵ . The following simple lemma shows how Theorem 2.1 can be used to prove a large deviation inequality for $\hat{\alpha}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $\underline{r} < \bar{r}$ and ϵ are chosen such that $\bar{r} - 2\epsilon > \underline{r} + 2\epsilon$ and (2.13) holds for some $p \in (0, 1)$. Take $\epsilon_1 > 0$ so big that*

$$\frac{\epsilon_1}{4} \ln \left(\frac{\bar{r} - 2\epsilon}{\underline{r} + 2\epsilon} \right) \geq \epsilon. \quad (3.1)$$

Then

$$P\left(|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha| \geq \epsilon_1\right) \leq p. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Since $u \mapsto \hat{r}(u)$ is continuous, we have by (1.4) that $\hat{r}(u_1) = \bar{r} - \epsilon$ and $\hat{r}(u_2) = \underline{r} + \epsilon$. Let

$$E = \left\{ \sup_{u: r(u) \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]} |\ln r(u) - \ln \hat{r}(u)| \leq \epsilon \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$

On the event E , it holds $|\hat{r}(u_i) - r(u_i)| \leq \epsilon$ for $i = 1, 2$ and so $\bar{r} - 2\epsilon \leq r(u_1) \leq \bar{r}$ and $\underline{r} \leq r(u_2) \leq \underline{r} + 2\epsilon$. Therefore, on the set E , for any $\epsilon_1 > 0$ the following implications hold

$$\begin{aligned} \{|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha| \geq \epsilon_1\} &= \left\{ \left| \frac{\ln(\bar{r} - \epsilon) - \ln(\underline{r} + \epsilon)}{\ln u_1 - \ln u_2} - \frac{\ln r(u_1) - \ln r(u_2)}{\ln u_1 - \ln u_2} \right| > \epsilon_1 \right\} \\ &= \left\{ |(\ln \hat{r}(u_1) - \ln r(u_1)) + (\ln r(u_2) - \ln \hat{r}(u_2))| > \epsilon_1 \ln(u_1/u_2) \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \sup_{u: r(u) \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]} |\ln r(u) - \ln \hat{r}(u)| > \frac{\epsilon_1}{2} \ln(u_1/u_2) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \sup_{u: r(u) \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]} |\ln r(u) - \ln \hat{r}(u)| > \frac{\epsilon_1}{2\alpha} \ln(r(u_1)/r(u_2)) \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \sup_{u: r(u) \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]} |\ln r(u) - \ln \hat{r}(u)| > \frac{\epsilon_1}{4} \ln \left(\frac{\bar{r} - 2\epsilon}{\underline{r} + 2\epsilon} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We have thus shown that

$$E \cap \{|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha| \geq \epsilon_1\} \subseteq \left\{ \sup_{u: r(u) \in [\underline{r}, \bar{r}]} |\ln r(u) - \ln \hat{r}(u)| > \frac{\epsilon_1}{4} \ln \left(\frac{\bar{r} - 2\epsilon}{\underline{r} + 2\epsilon} \right) \right\}.$$

Taking now ϵ_1 so big that (3.1) holds, we obtain that

$$E \cap \{|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha| \geq \epsilon_1\} \subseteq E^c$$

which obviously implies that $\{|\hat{\alpha} - \alpha| \geq \epsilon_1\} \subseteq E^c$ and so (3.2) holds. \square

Exact confidence intervals. In what follows, we shall briefly discuss how to choose $\epsilon > 0, \underline{r}, \bar{r}$ such that (3.2) holds. In particular, we shall address the following classical problems of parameter estimation:

Q1: Given lower bound $\underline{\alpha} > 0$, precision ϵ_1 and probability $p > 0$, find possibly small sample size n and constants $\underline{r}, \bar{r}, \epsilon$ (for constructing $\hat{\alpha}$) so that the estimate (1.4) satisfies inequality (3.2).

Q2: Given lower bound $\underline{\alpha} > 0$, sample size n and probability $p > 0$, find possibly small $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\underline{r}, \bar{r}, \epsilon$ (for constructing $\hat{\alpha}$) so that the estimate (1.4) satisfies inequality (3.2). In other words, find exact (non-asymptotic) confidence intervals: with probability $1 - p$: $\hat{\alpha} - \epsilon_1 \leq \alpha \leq \hat{\alpha} + \epsilon_1$.

To solve **Q1**, define for any $\rho > 0$, n and $\epsilon > 0$

$$F(n, \rho, \epsilon) := \frac{\bar{r}(\rho, p, n, \underline{\alpha}) - 2\epsilon}{\rho^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon}} + 2\epsilon} - \exp\left[\frac{4}{\epsilon_1}\epsilon\right], \quad (3.4)$$

where $\bar{r}(\rho, p, n, \underline{\alpha})$ is as in Corollary 2.1. The function F depends also on $\underline{\alpha}, \epsilon_1$ and p , but these parameters are fixed and left out from notation. Define

$$F(n, \rho) = \sup_{\epsilon > 0} F(n, \rho, \epsilon), \quad F(n) = \sup_{\rho > 0} \left[F(n, \rho) \wedge (n - n_o(\rho, p)) \right],$$

where $n_o(\rho, p)$ is as in Theorem 1.1. Now take n_1 minimal n such that $F(n_1) > 0$. Observe that $F(n)$ is increasing, so that when $F(n_1) > 0$, then $F(n) > 0$ for any $n > n_1$. The estimation procedure is now the following.

EstimationProcedure1:

1. Find n_1 such that $F(n_1) > 0$.
2. Given $n \geq n_1$ find $\rho > 0$ such that $F(n, \rho) > 0$.
3. Use ρ to find $\epsilon > 0$ such that $F(n, \rho, \epsilon) > 0$.
4. Use ρ to determine $\bar{r} = \bar{r}(\rho, p, n, \underline{\alpha})$, where $\bar{r}(\rho, p, n, \underline{\alpha})$ is as in Corollary 2.1.
5. Use ϵ and ρ to find $\underline{r} = \rho^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon}}$.
6. Use \underline{r} and \bar{r} to find u_1 and u_2 as in (1.5).
7. Estimate $\hat{r}(u)$ based on the sample of size n and the estimate of characteristic function.
8. Find $\hat{\alpha}$ as in (1.4).

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\underline{\alpha}, \epsilon_1 > 0$ and $p \in (0, 1)$ be given. Let n be the sample size satisfying $F(n) > 0$. Then the estimate $\hat{\alpha}$ obtained via EstimationProcedure1 satisfies the inequality (3.2), provided the true parameter α satisfies the inequality $\alpha \geq \underline{\alpha}$.*

Proof. According to definition of $F(n)$, the parameters $\rho > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ as specified by *EstimationProcedure1* are such that $F(n, \rho, \epsilon) > 0$ and $n > n_o(\rho, p)$. With $\underline{r} = \rho^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon}}$, we see that

$$\frac{\bar{r} - 2\epsilon}{\underline{r} + 2\epsilon} > \exp\left[\frac{4}{\epsilon_1}\epsilon\right]$$

so that the equation (3.1) holds. This equation also implies that $\bar{r} > \underline{r} + 4\epsilon$. Since $n > n_o(\rho, p)$, we have $n > n_o(\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\underline{r}, p)$. Thus both inequalities in (2.12) hold and therefore $n \geq n_1$, where $n_1(\epsilon, p, \alpha, \underline{r})$ is as in Theorem 2.1. Hence all assumptions of Theorem 2.1 are fulfilled and so (2.13) holds. Both assumptions of Lemma 3.1 are fulfilled and so the inequality (3.2) holds as well. \square

To solve **Q2**, we need to assume some minimal requirements about the given sample size n . In what follows, we assume that there exists $\rho_o > 0$ such that $n > n_o(\rho_o, p)$, where $n_o(\rho, p)$ is as in Theorem 1.1. Now we define

$$F(\epsilon_1, \rho, \epsilon) := \frac{\bar{r}(\rho, p, n, \underline{\alpha}) - 2\epsilon}{\rho^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon}} + 2\epsilon} - \exp\left[\frac{4}{\epsilon_1}\epsilon\right].$$

The function $F(\epsilon_1, \rho, \epsilon)$ also depends on n and p , but these are fixed. As previously, define

$$F(\epsilon_1, \rho) := \sup_{\epsilon > 0} F(\epsilon_1, \rho, \epsilon), \quad F(\epsilon_1) := \sup_{\rho \geq \rho_o} F(\epsilon_1, \rho).$$

Now find (as small as possible) $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that $F(\epsilon_1) > 0$.

EstimationProcedure2:

1. Given $\epsilon_1 > 0$ satisfying $F(\epsilon_1) > 0$ find $\rho \geq \rho_o$ such that $F(\epsilon_1, \rho) > 0$.
2. Use ρ to find $\epsilon > 0$ such that $F(\epsilon_1, \rho, \epsilon) > 0$
3. Use ρ to determine $\underline{r} = \underline{r}(\rho, p, n)$, where $\bar{r}(\rho, p, n, \underline{\alpha})$ is as in Corollary 2.1.
4. Use ϵ and ρ to find $\underline{r} = \rho^{\frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon}}$.
5. Use \underline{r} and \bar{r} to find u_1 and u_2 as in (1.5).
6. Estimate $\hat{r}(u)$ based on the sample of size n and the estimate of characteristic function.
7. Find $\hat{\alpha}$ as in (1.4).

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\underline{\alpha} > 0$, the sample size $n > n_o(\rho_o, p)$, where $\rho_o > 0$ and $p \in (0, 1)$ be given. Let ϵ_1 satisfy $F(\epsilon_1) > 0$. Then the estimate $\hat{\alpha}$ obtained via Estimation-Procedure2 satisfies the inequality (3.2), provided the true parameter α satisfies the inequality $\alpha \geq \underline{\alpha}$.*

Proof. According to definition of $F(\epsilon_1)$, the parameters $\rho > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ as specified by *EstimationProcedure2* are such that $F(\epsilon_1, \rho, \epsilon) > 0$. Since $\rho \mapsto n_o(\rho, p)$ is decreasing, it holds that $n > n_o(\rho, p)$. With $\underline{r} = \rho \frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon}$, we see that equation (3.1) holds. This equation also implies that $\bar{r} > \underline{r} + 4\epsilon$ and hence both inequalities in (2.12) hold and therefore $n \geq n_1$, where $n_1(\epsilon, p, \underline{\alpha}, \underline{r})$ is as in Theorem 2.1. Hence all assumptions of Theorem 2.1 are fulfilled and so (2.13) holds. Then Lemma 3.1 implies that (3.2) holds as well. \square

4 An alternative construction

Recall the construction of the \bar{r} in the proof of Theorem 1.1: the key of the construction is the large deviation inequality

$$P\left(e^{\bar{r}} \sup_{u \in (0, \bar{u}]} |\varphi_n(u) - \varphi(u)| > \epsilon\right) \leq A \exp[-n \cdot k(\alpha, \epsilon, \bar{r})], \quad (4.1)$$

where $A = 2$ and $k(\alpha, \epsilon, \bar{r}) > 0$. Then $r_n(\alpha)$ was defined as the solution of the equality

$$A \exp\left[-n \cdot k\left(\alpha, \frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}, r_n\right)\right] = p \quad (4.2)$$

and so the the desired bound $\bar{r} = \inf_{\alpha \in (0, \alpha]} r_n(\alpha)$ was obtained. In order (4.2) to have positive solution, the sample size n must satisfy $n > n_o(\epsilon, p)$. The large deviation bound (4.2) constructed in Section 2.1 is not the one possible option. We now sketch another possible construction yielding to a different inequality, and therefore, also to the different function $r_n(\alpha)$ and different bound \bar{r} . Unlike the \bar{r} obtained in Section 2.1, the new \bar{r} has more explicit form. The price for it is much bigger required sample size n_o .

Observe that by (2.2) and (2.3) the inequality $\|F_n - F\| \leq \frac{\delta}{8}$ implies that

$$|\varphi_n(u) - \varphi(u)| \leq \delta + 2\|F_n - F\| \left(\frac{8Lr(u)}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}.$$

Hence for every $\bar{u} > 0$,

$$\{e^{r(\bar{u})} \sup_{u \in (0, \bar{u}]} |\varphi(u) - \varphi_n(u)| > \epsilon\} \subset \{\|F_n - F\| > \frac{\delta}{8}\} \cup \left\{2\|F_n - F\| \left(\frac{8Lr(\bar{u})}{\delta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \geq \epsilon e^{-r(\bar{u})} - \delta\right\}.$$

Recall $\bar{\epsilon} = \epsilon e^{-\bar{r}}$ and $\bar{r} = r(\bar{u})$. Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(e^{\bar{r}} \sup_{u \in (0, \bar{u}]} |\varphi_n(u) - \varphi(u)| > \epsilon\right) &\leq P\left(\|F_n - F\| > \frac{\delta}{8}\right) + P\left(\|F_n - F\| \geq \frac{(\bar{\epsilon} - \delta)\delta^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}{2(8L\bar{r})^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}}\right). \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left[-n \cdot \frac{\delta^2}{32}\right] + 2 \exp\left[-n \cdot \frac{(\bar{\epsilon} - \delta)^2 \delta^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}}{2(8L\bar{r})^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}}\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Choose

$$\delta = \frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{1 + \alpha} = \arg \max_{\delta \in [0, \bar{\epsilon}]} (\bar{\epsilon} - \delta)^2 \delta^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}.$$

Thus plugging δ into (4.3), we obtain with $s = 2(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha})$,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(e^{\bar{r}} \sup_{u \in (0, \bar{u}]} |\varphi_n(u) - \varphi(u)| > \epsilon\right) &\leq 2 \exp\left[-n \cdot \frac{\bar{\epsilon}^2}{32(1 + \alpha)^2}\right] + 2 \exp\left[-n \cdot \left(\left(\frac{\bar{\epsilon}}{1 + \alpha}\right)^s \frac{\alpha^2}{2(8L\bar{r})^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}}\right)\right] \\ &\leq 4 \exp[-n \cdot k(\alpha, \epsilon, \bar{r})], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$k(\alpha, \epsilon, \bar{r}) = \left(\frac{\epsilon^2 e^{-2\bar{r}}}{32(1 + \alpha)^2}\right) \wedge \left(\frac{\epsilon^s e^{-s\bar{r}}}{2(1 + \alpha)^s (\bar{r}8L)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}}\right).$$

The inequality (4.2) holds with an equality, when

$$\bar{r} = r_{1,n}(\alpha) \wedge r_{2,n}(\alpha)$$

and $r_{1,n}, r_{2,n}$ are solutions of the following equalities:

$$\exp[-2r_{1,n}] = \frac{\ln(4/p)}{n} \left(\frac{1 + \epsilon}{\epsilon}\right)^2 32(1 + \alpha)^2 \quad (4.4)$$

$$\frac{d(\alpha) \exp[-sr_{2,n}]}{(r_{2,n})^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}} = \frac{\ln(4/p)}{n} \left(\frac{1 + \epsilon}{\epsilon}\right)^s, \quad \text{where } d(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha^2}{2(1 + \alpha)^s (8L)^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}} \quad (4.5)$$

Thus

$$r_{1,n}(\alpha) = -\frac{1}{2} \ln \left[\frac{\ln(4/p)}{n} \left(\frac{1 + \epsilon}{\epsilon}\right)^2 32(1 + \alpha)^2 \right]$$

and $r_{1,n}(\alpha) > 0$ holds when

$$n > \ln(4/p) \left(\frac{1 + \epsilon}{\epsilon}\right)^2 32(1 + \alpha)^2. \quad (4.6)$$

From (4.6), we obtain necessary sample size

$$n_o(\epsilon, p) = \ln(4/p) \left(\frac{1 + \epsilon}{\epsilon}\right)^2 \cdot 288. \quad (4.7)$$

The solution of equality (4.5) is

$$r_{2,n}(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\alpha + 1} W((\alpha + 1)g_n(\alpha)),$$

where W is Lambert's W-function and g_n is defined as follows

$$g_n(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha^\alpha}{2^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\alpha + 1)^{\alpha+1} 8L} \left(\frac{n}{\ln(4/p)}\right)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \left(\frac{\epsilon}{1 + \epsilon}\right)^{\alpha+1}.$$

Observe that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} g_n(\alpha) = \frac{1}{8L} \frac{\epsilon}{1 + \epsilon} =: g_o$ and $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} r_{2,n}(\alpha) = W(g_o) \in (0, 1)$. It can be shown that

$$\bar{r}(\epsilon, p, n) = \min_{\alpha} \{r_{1,n}(\alpha), r_{2,n}(\alpha)\} = \ln \kappa - \ln \left(12 \vee \frac{1 + \alpha_2}{\alpha_2}\right) > 0, \quad (4.8)$$

where $\kappa = \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon+1} \sqrt{\frac{n}{2 \ln(4/p)}}$ while $r_{1,n} > 0$ only if $\kappa > 12$ and $n > n_o$, where n_o is given by (4.7), and $\alpha_2 \in (0, 2]$ is the solution of the equality $r_{2,n}(\alpha) = \ln \kappa \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$.

Since $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} r_{2,n}(\alpha) = W(g_o)$, it holds that for any n $\bar{r} < 1$, and so the alternative construction satisfies our conjecture. However, it is possible to show the for any $\underline{\alpha} > 0$,

$$\bar{r}(\epsilon, p, n, \underline{\alpha}) = \inf_{\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, 2]} r_n(\alpha) \rightarrow \infty.$$

So we have another construction that confirms our conjecture that the universal bound \bar{r} satisfies the inequality $\bar{r} < 1$ and the universal bound \bar{u} does not exists.

5 Comparison of r_n and \bar{r}

Fix $\epsilon = 0.1$, $p = 0.1$ and $L = 1/2$. We find the values of $r_n(\alpha)$ obtained in Section 2.1 as follows: first we numerically find x' as the solution of the equality $f(x) = ee^{-r}$, where $f(x)$ is given by (2.9), then we calculate $k(\alpha, \epsilon, r)$ given by (2.7) and then r_n can be found as solution of (2.5). We compare the obtained values of $r_n(\alpha)$ with the ones obtained in Section 4: $r_n(\alpha) = \min\{r_{1,n}(\alpha), r_{2,n}(\alpha)\}$, where $r_{1,n}(\alpha)$ is the solution of equality (4.4) and $r_{2,n}(\alpha)$ is the solution of equality (4.5). Note that by (4.7) we have $r_{1,n}(\alpha) > 0$ only if $n > n_o \approx 128550$. Figure 4 plots both constructions of r_n versus $\alpha \in (0.01, 2]$ for different sample sizes n . Obviously, in Figure 4 (a) the $r_n(a)$ obtained




Figure 4: The values of r_n vs α with $\epsilon = 0.1$, $p = 0.1$ and $n = 1000$ in (a), $n = 128551 > n_o$ in (b) and $n = 300000$ in (c).

by the alternative construction in Section 4 is 0 because $n < n_o$. However, the values of r_n obtained by Section 2.1 are small but positive. In Figure 4 (b) both constructions give positive results (because $n = n_o + 1$) while alternative construction gives smaller (more conservative) values, with drop after $\alpha = 1.5$ (and minimum over α is at $\alpha = 2$). In Figure 4 (c) the large sample size such as $n = 3 \cdot 10^5$ is used and both $r_n(\alpha)$ behave




Figure 5: The values of \bar{r} vs n with $\epsilon = 0.1$, $p = 0.1$ and $\underline{\alpha} = 0.01$ in (a), $\underline{\alpha} = 0.1$ in (b) and $\underline{\alpha} = 0.5$ in (c).

in concordance while the alternative construction yields smaller values for all values of α . Next we compare the values of $\bar{r} = \min_{\alpha \in (\underline{\alpha}, 2]} r_n(\alpha)$ obtained by Section 2.1 and Section 4. Figure 5 plots \bar{r} versus n for different lower limits $\underline{\alpha}$. It is clearly evident from Figure 5 that \bar{r} is increasing in n (while alternative construction requires $n > n_o$). Setting lower limit from $\underline{\alpha} = 0.1$ to $\underline{\alpha} = 0.5$ increases the values of \bar{r} approximately twice. All in all, in our example the construction given by Section 2.1 yields much bigger (less conservative) values of \bar{r} than the more explicit form construction given by Section 4.

References

- [1] Bibalan, M. H., H. Amindavar, and M. Amirmazlaghani (2017). Characteristic function based parameter estimation of skewed alpha-stable distribution: An analytical approach. *Signal Process.* 130, 323–336.
- [2] Csörgo, S. (1981). Limit behaviour of the empirical characteristic function. *The Annals of Probability* 9(1), 130–144.
- [3] Kakinaka, S. and K. Umeno (2020). Flexible two-point selection approach for characteristic function-based parameter estimation of stable laws. Online at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.11499>.
- [4] Kogon, S. M. and D. B. Williams (1998). Characteristic function based estimation of stable distribution parameters. In R. J. Adler, R. E. Feldman, and M. S. Taqqu (Eds.), *A Practical Guide to Heavy Tails*, pp. 311–335. Boston: Birkhäuser.
- [5] Krutto, A. (2016). Parameter estimation in stable law. *Risks* 4(4), 43.

- [6] Krutto, A. (2018). Empirical cumulant function based parameter estimation in stable laws. *Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis de Mathematica* 22(2), 311–338.
- [7] McCulloch, J. H. (1996). Financial applications of stable distributions. In G. Maddala and C. Rao (Eds.), *Statistical Methods in Finance*, Volume 14 of *Handbook of Statistics*, pp. 393 – 425. Elsevier.
- [8] Nolan, J. P. (2001). Maximum likelihood estimation and diagnostics for stable distributions. In O. Barndorff-Nielsen, S. Resnick, and T. Mikosch (Eds.), *Lévy Processes*, pp. 379–400. Boston: Birkhäuser.
- [9] Nolan, J. P. (2018). *Stable Distributions - Models for Heavy Tailed Data*. Boston: Birkhäuser. In progress, Chapter 1 online at <http://fs2.american.edu/jpnolan/www/stable/stable.html>.
- [10] Paulson, A. S., E. W. Holcomb, and R. A. Leitch (1975). The estimation of the parameters of the stable laws. *Biometrika* 62(1), 163–170.
- [11] Press, J. S. (1972). Estimation in univariate and multivariate stable distributions. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 67(340), 842–846.
- [12] Robust Analysis Inc. (2017). *STABLE 5.3 R Version for Windows*. Washington, DC, USA: Robust Analysis Inc. <http://www.robustanalysis.com/>.
- [13] Samorodnitsky, G. and M. S. Taqqu (1994). *Stable Non-Gaussian Random Processes: Stochastic Models with Infinite Variance*. New York: Chapman & Hall.
- [14] van der Vaart, A. (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [15] Zolotarev, V. (1986). *One-dimensional Stable Distributions*, Volume 65 of *Translations of mathematical monographs*. American Mathematical Society.