

Non-central moderate deviations for fractional Skellam processes

Jeonghwa Lee*

Claudio Macci†

August 15, 2022

Abstract

The term *moderate deviations* is often used in the literature to mean a class of large deviation principles that, in some sense, fills the gap between a convergence in probability to zero (governed by a large deviation principle) and a weak convergence to a centered Normal distribution. We talk about *non-central moderate deviations* when the weak convergence is towards a non-Gaussian distribution. In this paper we present non-central moderate deviation results for two fractional Skellam processes in the literature (see [13]). We also establish that, for the fractional Skellam process of type 2 (for which we can refer the recent results for compound fractional Poisson processes in [1]), the convergences to zero are usually faster because we can prove suitable inequalities between rate functions.

Keywords: Mittag-Leffler function, inverse of stable subordinator, weak convergence.

2000 Mathematical Subject Classification: 60F10, 60F05, 60G22, 33E12.

1 Introduction

A large deviation principle provides some asymptotic bounds for a family of probability measures on the same topological space \mathcal{X} ; moreover one often refers to a family of \mathcal{X} -valued random variables, $\{C_t\}$, whose laws are those probability measures. These asymptotic bounds are expressed in terms of a *speed function* v_t (that tends to infinity) and a lower semicontinuous *rate function* $I : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$. The concept of large deviation principle is a basic definition in the theory of large deviations; this theory allows to compute the probabilities of rare events on an exponential scale (see [7] as a reference of this topic).

The term *moderate deviations* is often used in the literature to mean a class of large deviation principles that, in some sense, fills the gap between two asymptotic regimes:

1. the convergence of C_t in probability to zero, which is governed by a large deviation principle with speed v_t ;
2. the weak convergence of $\sqrt{v_t}C_t$ to a centered Normal distribution.

The speed functions and the random variables involved in these large deviation principles depend on some scalings in a suitable class; moreover the large deviation principles in this class are governed by the same quadratic rate function that uniquely vanishes at zero. Typically the scalings consist of families of positive numbers $\{a_t : t > 0\}$ such that

$$a_t \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } v_t a_t \rightarrow \infty,$$

*Address: Department of Statistics, Truman State University, Violette Hall 2138, 100 E. Normal Avenue, Kirksville, MO 63501, USA. e-mail: jlee@truman.edu

†Address: Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma Tor Vergata, Via della Ricerca Scientifica, I-00133 Rome, Italy. e-mail: macci@mat.uniroma2.it

and one can show that $\{\sqrt{v_t a_t} C_t\}$ satisfies the large deviation principle with speed $\frac{1}{a_t}$; note that $\frac{1}{a_t}$ has a lower intensity than the speed v_t , and this explains the use of the term *moderate*. We also recall that we recover the two asymptotic regimes stated above for $a_t = \frac{1}{v_t}$ (in this case $v_t a_t \rightarrow \infty$ fails) and for $a_t = 1$ (in this case $a_t \rightarrow 0$ fails).

The term *non-central moderate deviations* has been recently used in the literature when we have a class of large deviation principles that, in some sense, fills the gap between a convergence to a constant (typically zero) and the weak convergence towards a non-Gaussian distribution. Some examples of non-central moderate deviations can be found in [8], where the weak convergences are towards Gumbel, exponential and Laplace distributions. In that reference the interested reader can find some other previous references in the literature with some other examples.

The aim of this paper is to present some examples of non-central moderate deviations based on *fractional Skellam processes*. In these examples we always have $v_t = t$, and therefore the scalings are families of positive numbers $\{a_t : t > 0\}$ such that

$$a_t \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } t a_t \rightarrow \infty. \tag{1}$$

Skellam processes are given by the difference of two independent Poisson processes. In this paper we consider two fractional Skellam processes studied in [13]; some more recent generalized versions of these processes can be found in [10] and [11]. The fractional Skellam processes in [13] are closely related to the definition of the fractional Poisson process in the literature. We recall that a fractional Poisson process is obtained as an independent random time-change of a Poisson process with an inverse of stable subordinator (see e.g. [3], [4] and [14]); here we are referring to the time fractional Poisson process and, for the definitions of space and space-time fractional Poisson process, the interested reader can refer to [15] (see also [12] as a very recent paper on time-changed space-time fractional Poisson processes). Then the fractional Skellam processes studied in [13] are obtained in a quite natural way as follows.

- *Fractional Skellam process of type 1.* A difference between two independent fractional Poisson processes (so we have two independent random time-changes for each one of the involved fractional Poisson processes);
- *Fractional Skellam process of type 2.* An independent random time-change of a Skellam process with an inverse of stable subordinator.

It is easy to check (see Remark 2.3) that fractional Skellam process of type 2 is a particular compound fractional Poisson process (and this is not surprising because a Skellam process is a particular compound Poisson process; see Remark 2.1). Therefore, the moderate deviation results for fractional Skellam process of type 2 can be obtained from [1]. Here, since we deal with random time-changes of Skellam processes, for completeness we recall the references [5] and [6].

We conclude with the outline of the paper. We start with some preliminaries in Section 2. The results for the fractional Skellam processes of type 1 and 2 are presented in Sections 3 and 4, respectively. Finally in Section 5 we compare some rate functions and we presents some plots.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we recall some preliminaries on large deviations and on fractional Skellam processes.

2.1 On large deviations

Here we present definitions and results for families of real random variables $\{Z_t : t > 0\}$ defined on the same probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) ; moreover, in view of what follows, we consider the case $t \rightarrow \infty$. We start with the definition of large deviation principle (see e.g. [7], pages 4-5). A family

of numbers $\{v_t : t > 0\}$ such that $v_t \rightarrow \infty$ (as $t \rightarrow \infty$) is called a *speed function*, and a lower semicontinuous function $I : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is called a *rate function*. Then $\{Z_t : t > 0\}$ satisfies the large deviation principle (LDP from now on) with speed v_t and a rate function I if

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{v_t} \log P(Z_t \in C) \leq - \inf_{x \in C} I(x) \quad \text{for all closed sets } C,$$

and

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{v_t} \log P(Z_t \in O) \geq - \inf_{x \in O} I(x) \quad \text{for all open sets } O.$$

Moreover the rate function I is said to be *good* if, for every $\beta \geq 0$, the level set $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : I(x) \leq \beta\}$ is compact. The following well-known theorem provides a sufficient condition to have an LDP, and makes it easy to compute the corresponding speed and rate functions (see e.g. Theorem 2.3.6(c) in [7]).

Theorem 2.1 (Gärtner Ellis Theorem). *Assume that, for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists*

$$\Lambda(\theta) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{v_t} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{v_t \theta Z_t} \right]$$

as an extended real number; moreover assume that the origin $\theta = 0$ belongs to the interior of the set

$$\mathcal{D}(\Lambda) := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R} : \Lambda(\theta) < \infty\}.$$

Furthermore let Λ^ be the function defined by*

$$\Lambda^*(x) := \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \{\theta x - \Lambda(\theta)\}.$$

Then, if Λ is essentially smooth and lower semi-continuous, then $\{Z_t : t > 0\}$ satisfies the LDP with speed v_t and good rate function Λ^ .*

We also recall (see e.g. Definition 2.3.5 in [7]) that Λ is essentially smooth if the interior of $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ is non-empty, the function Λ is differentiable throughout the interior of $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$, and Λ is steep, i.e. $|\Lambda'(\theta_n)| \rightarrow \infty$ whenever $\{\theta_n : n \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of points in the interior of $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$ which converge to a boundary point of $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)$. A particular simple case (which always occurs in the applications of the Gärtner Ellis Theorem in this paper) is when $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda) = \mathbb{R}$ and Λ is a differentiable function; indeed, in such a case, the function Λ is essentially smooth (the steepness condition holds vacuously) and lower semi-continuous.

2.2 On fractional Skellam processes

We start with the definition of the (non-fractional) Skellam process. Let $\{N_{\lambda_1}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ and $\{N_{\lambda_2}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ be two independent Poisson processes with intensities $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$, respectively. In particular we consider the notation $\underline{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$. Then the process $\{S_{\underline{\lambda}}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ defined by

$$S_{\underline{\lambda}}(t) := N_{\lambda_1}(t) - N_{\lambda_2}(t)$$

is called Skellam process. Moreover, for each fixed $t \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta S_{\underline{\lambda}}(t)}] = \exp((\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1) + \lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1))t) \quad (\text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}).$$

Remark 2.1. *It is easy to check that $\{S_{\underline{\lambda}}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ can be seen as a compound Poisson process $\{\sum_{k=1}^{N_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}(t)} X_k : t \geq 0\}$, where $\{X_k : k \geq 1\}$ and $\{N_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ are independent, $\{X_k : k \geq 1\}$ are i.i.d. random variables such that*

$$P(X_k = 1) = 1 - P(X_k = -1) = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2},$$

and $\{N_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a Poisson process with intensity $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2$.

In view of what follows we recall some other preliminaries. We start with the definition of the Mittag-Leffler function (see e.g. [9], eq. (3.1.1))

$$E_\nu(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{\Gamma(\nu k + 1)}.$$

It is known (see Proposition 3.6 in [9] for the case $\alpha \in (0, 2)$; indeed α in that reference coincides with ν in this paper) that we have

$$\begin{cases} E_\nu(x) \sim \frac{e^{x^{1/\nu}}}{\nu}, & \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty \\ \frac{1}{x} \log E_\nu(x) \rightarrow 0 & \text{as } x \rightarrow -\infty \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

(this is the correct version of eq. (3) in [1]; indeed we need the condition presented here for $x \rightarrow -\infty$, instead of $E_\nu(x) \rightarrow 0$).

Now we recall some moment generating functions which can be expressed in terms of the Mittag-Leffler function. If we consider the inverse of the stable subordinator $\{L_\nu(t) : t \geq 0\}$, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta L_\nu(t)}] = E_\nu(\theta t^\nu) \quad (\text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}). \quad (3)$$

This formula appears in several references with $\theta \leq 0$ only; however this restriction is not needed because we can refer to the analytic continuation of the Laplace transform with complex argument.

The fractional Poisson process $\{N_{\nu,\lambda}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is defined by

$$N_{\nu,\lambda}(t) := N_\lambda(L_\nu(t)),$$

where $\{N_\lambda(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a (non-fractional) Poisson process with intensity λ , independent of $\{L_\nu(t) : t \geq 0\}$; it is known that

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta N_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}] = E_\nu(\lambda(e^\theta - 1)t^\nu) \quad (\text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}).$$

Now we are ready to provide the definitions of two fractional Skellam processes and their moment generating functions (see [13], Definitions 3.1-3.2 and Theorems 3.1-3.2). In particular we consider the notation $\underline{\nu} = (\nu_1, \nu_2)$ for $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in (0, 1)$.

Fractional Skellam process of type 1. It is the process $\{Y_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ defined by

$$Y_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}(t) := N_{\nu_1,\lambda_1}(t) - N_{\nu_2,\lambda_2}(t),$$

where $\{N_{\nu_1,\lambda_1}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ and $\{N_{\nu_2,\lambda_2}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ are two independent fractional Poisson processes. Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Y_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}(t)}] = E_{\nu_1}(\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1)t^{\nu_1}) E_{\nu_2}(\lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1)t^{\nu_2}) \quad (\text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}).$$

Remark 2.2. Some results for $\{Y_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ presented below concern the case $\nu_1 = \nu_2$; in this case we set $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ for some $\nu \in (0, 1)$, and use the notation $Y_{\nu,\lambda}(t)$ in place of $Y_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}(t)$.

Fractional Skellam process of type 2. It is the process $\{Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ defined by

$$Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t) := S_\lambda(L_\nu(t)),$$

where the Skellam process $\{S_\lambda(t) : t \geq 0\}$ and the inverse of the stable subordinator $\{L_\nu(t) : t \geq 0\}$ are independent. Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}] = E_\nu((\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1) + \lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1))t^\nu) \quad (\text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}).$$

Remark 2.3. We have recalled that the fractional Poisson process can be seen as a time changed (non-fractional) Poisson process with an independent inverse of the stable subordinator. Then, by taking into account Remark 2.1, we can say that $\{Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is distributed as the compound fractional Poisson process $\{\sum_{k=1}^{N_{\nu,\lambda_1+\lambda_2}(t)} X_k : t \geq 0\}$, where $\{X_k : k \geq 1\}$ and $\{N_{\nu,\lambda_1+\lambda_2}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ are independent, $\{X_k : k \geq 1\}$ are i.i.d. random variables as in Remark 2.1, and $\{N_{\nu,\lambda_1+\lambda_2}(t) : t \geq 0\}$ is a fractional Poisson process.

Remark 2.4. Assume that $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ for some $\nu \in (0, 1)$ (and recall the slight change of notation explained in Remark 2.2 for the fractional Skellam process of type 1). Then, if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, the random variables $Y_{\nu,\lambda}(t)$ and $Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t)$ are symmetric (around zero); namely $Y_{\nu,\lambda}(t)$ and $Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t)$ are distributed as $-Y_{\nu,\lambda}(t)$ and $-Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t)$, respectively. Then we have some consequences highlighted in Remarks 3.3 and 4.3.

3 Non-central moderate deviations for the type 1 process

We start with the first result for which we could have $\nu_1 \neq \nu_2$.

Proposition 3.1. Let $\Psi_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}^{(1)}$ be the function defined by

$$\Psi_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta) := \begin{cases} (\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1))^{1/\nu_1} & \text{if } \theta \geq 0 \\ (\lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1))^{1/\nu_2} & \text{if } \theta < 0. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Then $\left\{\frac{Y_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}(t)}{t} : t > 0\right\}$ satisfies the LDP with speed $v_t = t$ and good rate function $I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}$ defined by

$$I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(x) := \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \{\theta x - \Psi_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta)\}. \quad (5)$$

Proof. We prove this proposition by applying the Gärtner Ellis Theorem. More precisely we have to show that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{t\theta \frac{Y_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}(t)}{t}} \right] = \Psi_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta) \quad (\text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}), \quad (6)$$

where $\Psi_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}^{(1)}$ is the function in (4).

The case $\theta = 0$ is immediate. Moreover we remark that

$$\log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{t\theta \frac{Y_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}(t)}{t}} \right] = \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\theta Y_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}(t)} \right] = \log E_{\nu_1}(\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1)t^{\nu_1}) + \log E_{\nu_2}(\lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1)t^{\nu_2}).$$

Then, by taking into account the asymptotic behaviour of the Mittag-Leffler function in (2), we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log E_{\nu_1}(\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1)t^{\nu_1}) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log E_{\nu_2}(\lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1)t^{\nu_2}) = (\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1))^{1/\nu_1} \quad \text{for } \theta > 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log E_{\nu_1}(\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1)t^{\nu_1}) + \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log E_{\nu_2}(\lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1)t^{\nu_2}) = (\lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1))^{1/\nu_2} \quad \text{for } \theta < 0.$$

Thus the limit in (6) is checked.

In conclusion the desired LDP holds noting that the function $\Psi_{\underline{\nu},\lambda}^{(1)}$ in (4) is finite (for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$) and differentiable. \square

Remark 3.1. In general we do not have an explicit expression for the rate function $I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}$ in Proposition 3.1 (see (5)). However, if $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \frac{1}{2}$, then we have

$$I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(x) = \begin{cases} x \log \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 + \frac{2x}{\lambda_1^2}} \right) - \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\lambda_1^2 + 2x} - \frac{\lambda_1}{2} \right)^2 & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ -x \log \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{2x}{\lambda_2^2}} \right) - \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\lambda_2^2 - 2x} - \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \right)^2 & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, after some computations, one can check that the supremum in (5) (with $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \frac{1}{2}$) is attained at $\theta = 0$ for $x = 0$, at $\theta = \log \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 + \frac{2x}{\lambda_1^2}} \right)$ for $x > 0$, and at $\theta = -\log \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - \frac{2x}{\lambda_2^2}} \right)$ for $x < 0$.

From now on we assume that ν_1 and ν_2 coincide, and therefore we consider the change of notation in Remark 2.2 for $\nu = \nu_1 = \nu_2$. Moreover we set

$$\alpha_1(\nu) := 1 - \nu. \quad (7)$$

Proposition 3.2. Assume that $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ for some $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and let $\alpha_1(\nu)$ be defined in (7). Then $\{t^{\alpha_1(\nu)} \frac{Y_{\nu, \lambda}(t)}{t} : t > 0\}$ converges weakly to $\lambda_1 L_\nu^\circ(1) - \lambda_2 L_\nu^{\circ\circ}(1)$, where $L_\nu^\circ(1)$ and $L_\nu^{\circ\circ}(1)$ are two i.i.d. random variables distributed as $L_\nu(1)$.

Proof. We have to check that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\theta t^{\alpha_1(\nu)} \frac{Y_{\nu, \lambda}(t)}{t}} \right] = \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[e^{\theta(\lambda_1 L_\nu^\circ(1) - \lambda_2 L_\nu^{\circ\circ}(1))}]}_{= E_\nu(\lambda_1 \theta) E_\nu(-\lambda_2 \theta)} \quad (\text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R})$$

(here we take into account that $L_\nu^\circ(1)$ and $L_\nu^{\circ\circ}(1)$ are i.i.d., and the expression of the moment generating function in eq. (3)). This can be readily done noting that, for two suitable remainders $o\left(\frac{1}{t^{2\nu}}\right)$ such that $t^{2\nu} o\left(\frac{1}{t^{2\nu}}\right) \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\theta t^{\alpha_1(\nu)} \frac{Y_{\nu, \lambda}(t)}{t}} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\theta \frac{Y_{\nu, \lambda}(t)}{t^\nu}} \right] = E_\nu(\lambda_1 (e^{\theta/t^\nu} - 1) t^\nu) E_\nu(\lambda_2 (e^{-\theta/t^\nu} - 1) t^\nu) \\ &= E_\nu \left(\lambda_1 \left(\frac{\theta}{t^\nu} + \frac{\theta^2}{2t^{2\nu}} + o\left(\frac{1}{t^{2\nu}}\right) \right) t^\nu \right) E_\nu \left(\lambda_2 \left(-\frac{\theta}{t^\nu} + \frac{\theta^2}{2t^{2\nu}} + o\left(\frac{1}{t^{2\nu}}\right) \right) t^\nu \right) \\ &= E_\nu \left(\lambda_1 \left(\theta + \frac{\theta^2}{2t^\nu} + t^\nu o\left(\frac{1}{t^{2\nu}}\right) \right) \right) E_\nu \left(\lambda_2 \left(-\theta + \frac{\theta^2}{2t^\nu} + t^\nu o\left(\frac{1}{t^{2\nu}}\right) \right) \right); \end{aligned}$$

then we get the desired limit letting t go to infinity (for each fixed $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$). \square

Proposition 3.3. Assume that $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ for some $\nu \in (0, 1)$ and let $\alpha_1(\nu)$ be defined in (7). Then, for every family of positive numbers $\{a_t : t > 0\}$ such that (1) holds, the family of random variables $\left\{ \frac{(a_t t)^{\alpha_1(\nu)} Y_{\nu, \lambda}(t)}{t} : t > 0 \right\}$ satisfies the LDP with speed $1/a_t$ and good rate function $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}$ defined by

$$I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) := \begin{cases} (\nu^{\nu/(1-\nu)} - \nu^{1/(1-\nu)}) \left(\frac{x}{\lambda_1} \right)^{1/(1-\nu)} & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ (\nu^{\nu/(1-\nu)} - \nu^{1/(1-\nu)}) \left(\frac{x}{-\lambda_2} \right)^{1/(1-\nu)} & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We prove this proposition by applying the Gärtner Ellis Theorem. More precisely we have to show that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1/a_t} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\theta}{a_t} \frac{(a_t t)^{\alpha_1(\nu)} Y_{\nu, \lambda}(t)}{t}} \right] = \tilde{\Psi}_{\nu, \lambda}^{(1)}(\theta) \quad (\text{for all } \theta \in \mathbb{R}), \quad (8)$$

where $\tilde{\Psi}_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}$ is the function defined by

$$\tilde{\Psi}_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta) := \begin{cases} (\lambda_1\theta)^{1/\nu} & \text{if } \theta \geq 0 \\ (-\lambda_2\theta)^{1/\nu} & \text{if } \theta < 0; \end{cases}$$

indeed, since the function $\tilde{\Psi}_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}$ is finite (for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$) and differentiable, the desired LDP holds noting that the Legendre transform $(\tilde{\Psi}_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)})^*$ of $\tilde{\Psi}_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}$, i.e. the function $(\tilde{\Psi}_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)})^*$ defined by

$$(\tilde{\Psi}_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)})^*(x) := \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \{\theta x - \tilde{\Psi}_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta)\} \quad (\text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}),$$

coincides with the function $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}$ in the statement of the proposition (for $x = 0$ the supremum is attained at $\theta = 0$, for $x > 0$ the supremum is attained at $\theta = \frac{1}{\lambda_1}(\frac{\nu x}{\lambda_1})^{\nu/(1-\nu)}$, for $x < 0$ the supremum is attained at $\theta = -\frac{1}{\lambda_2}(\frac{\nu x}{\lambda_2})^{\nu/(1-\nu)}$).

So we conclude the proof by checking the limit in (8). The case $\theta = 0$ is immediate. Moreover we remark that, for two suitable remainders $o\left(\frac{1}{(a_t t)^{2\nu}}\right)$ such that $(a_t t)^{2\nu} o\left(\frac{1}{(a_t t)^{2\nu}}\right) \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\theta}{a_t} \frac{(a_t t)^{\alpha_1(\nu)} Y_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}{t}} \right] &= \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\theta \frac{Y_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}{(a_t t)^\nu}} \right] \\ &= \log E_\nu(\lambda_1(e^{\theta/(a_t t)^\nu} - 1)t^\nu) + \log E_\nu(\lambda_2(e^{-\theta/(a_t t)^\nu} - 1)t^\nu) \\ &= \log E_\nu \left(\lambda_1 \left(\frac{\theta}{(a_t t)^\nu} + \frac{\theta^2}{2(a_t t)^{2\nu}} + o\left(\frac{1}{(a_t t)^{2\nu}}\right) \right) t^\nu \right) \\ &+ \log E_\nu \left(\lambda_2 \left(-\frac{\theta}{(a_t t)^\nu} + \frac{\theta^2}{2(a_t t)^{2\nu}} + o\left(\frac{1}{(a_t t)^{2\nu}}\right) \right) t^\nu \right) \\ &= \log E_\nu \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{a_t^\nu} \left(\theta + \frac{\theta^2}{2(a_t t)^\nu} + (a_t t)^\nu o\left(\frac{1}{(a_t t)^{2\nu}}\right) \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \log E_\nu \left(\frac{\lambda_2}{a_t^\nu} \left(-\theta + \frac{\theta^2}{2(a_t t)^\nu} + (a_t t)^\nu o\left(\frac{1}{(a_t t)^{2\nu}}\right) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by taking into account the asymptotic behaviour of the Mittag-Leffler function in (2), we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1/a_t} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\theta}{a_t} \frac{(a_t t)^{\alpha_1(\nu)} Y_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}{t}} \right] = (\lambda_1 \theta)^{1/\nu} \quad \text{for } \theta > 0,$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{1/a_t} \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{\theta}{a_t} \frac{(a_t t)^{\alpha_1(\nu)} Y_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}{t}} \right] = (-\lambda_2 \theta)^{1/\nu} \quad \text{for } \theta < 0.$$

Thus the limit in (8) is checked. \square

Remark 3.2. The set $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) < \infty\} = \mathbb{R}$ (see Proposition 3.3) coincides with the support of the weak limit in Proposition 3.2.

Remark 3.3. Assume that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. Then: if $\nu_1 = \nu_2$, the rate function $I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}$ in Proposition 3.1 is a symmetric function (we can say this, even if an explicit expression of $I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}$ is not available, because $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}$ is a symmetric function); the weak limit in Proposition 3.2 is a symmetric random variable; the rate function $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}$ in Proposition 3.3 is a symmetric function.

4 Non-central moderate deviations for the type 2 process

The results in this section can be derived directly from the results in [1]; indeed, by taking into account Remark 2.3, the fractional Skellam process of type 2 is a particular compound fractional Poisson process. So we only give the statements of propositions without proofs.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}$ be the function defined by*

$$\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta) := \begin{cases} (\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1) + \lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1))^{1/\nu} & \text{if } \lambda_1(e^\theta - 1) + \lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1) \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda_1(e^\theta - 1) + \lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1) < 0. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Then $\left\{ \frac{Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}{t} : t > 0 \right\}$ satisfies the LDP with speed $v_t = t$ and good rate function $I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}$ defined by

$$I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(x) := \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \theta x - \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta) \}.$$

Remark 4.1. *The LDP in Proposition 4.1 with $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda$ coincides with the LDP in Proposition 4.2 in [2] with $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \lambda$. Indeed the function Λ_ν in that proposition is defined by*

$$\Lambda_\nu(\theta) := \begin{cases} (\Lambda(\theta))^{1/\nu} & \text{if } \Lambda(\theta) \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \Lambda(\theta) < 0, \end{cases}$$

where, after some computations, one can check that

$$\Lambda(\theta) = \frac{\lambda(e^{2\theta} + 1)}{e^\theta} - 2\lambda = \lambda(e^\theta - 1 + e^{-\theta} - 1).$$

The next two propositions can be derived from Propositions 3.2-3.3 in [1]. By Remark 2.3 we have $Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t) \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\nu,\lambda_1+\lambda_2}(t)} X_k$, where

$$\mu := E(X_k) = \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \text{ and } \sigma^2 := \text{Var}(X_k) = \frac{4\lambda_1\lambda_2}{(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^2}$$

coincide with μ and σ^2 in [1]. Moreover we set

$$\alpha_2(\nu) := \begin{cases} 1 - \nu/2 & \text{if } \mu = 0, \text{ i.e. if } \lambda_1 = \lambda_2, \\ 1 - \nu & \text{if } \mu \neq 0, \text{ i.e. if } \lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

which coincides with $\alpha(\nu)$ in [1]. Also note that, if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$, we take into account that $\sqrt{\frac{4\lambda_1\lambda_2}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}} = \sqrt{2\lambda}$ in Proposition 4.2, and $\frac{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}{2\lambda_1\lambda_2} = \frac{1}{\lambda}$ in Proposition 4.3.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\alpha_2(\nu)$ be defined in (10). Then:*

- if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$, then $\{t^{\alpha_2(\nu)} \frac{Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}{t} : t > 0\}$ converges weakly to $\sqrt{2\lambda L_\nu(1)}W$, where W is a standard Normal distributed random variable, and independent to $L_\nu(1)$;
- if $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, then $\{t^{\alpha_2(\nu)} \frac{Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}{t} : t > 0\}$ converges weakly to $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)L_\nu(1)$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\alpha_2(\nu)$ be defined in (10). Then, for every family of positive numbers $\{a_t : t > 0\}$ such that (1) holds, the family of random variables $\left\{ \frac{(a_t)^{\alpha_2(\nu)} Z_{\nu,\lambda}(t)}{t} : t > 0 \right\}$ satisfies the LDP with speed $1/a_t$ and good rate function $I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}$ defined by:*

- if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$,

$$I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x) := ((\nu/2)^{\nu/(2-\nu)} - (\nu/2)^{2/(2-\nu)}) \left(\frac{x^2}{\lambda} \right)^{1/(2-\nu)};$$

- if $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$,

$$I_{\text{MD},\Delta}^{(2)}(x) := \begin{cases} (\nu^{\nu/(1-\nu)} - \nu^{1/(1-\nu)}) \left(\frac{x}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}\right)^{1/(1-\nu)} & \text{if } x \geq 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } x < 0; \end{cases}$$

- if $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$,

$$I_{\text{MD},\Delta}^{(2)}(x) := \begin{cases} (\nu^{\nu/(1-\nu)} - \nu^{1/(1-\nu)}) \left(\frac{x}{-(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)}\right)^{1/(1-\nu)} & \text{if } x \leq 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

Remark 4.2. The sets $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : I_{\text{MD},\Delta}^{(2)}(x) < \infty\}$ (see Proposition 4.3) coincide with the supports of the weak limits in Proposition 4.2: we mean \mathbb{R} if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, $[0, \infty)$ if $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, and $(-\infty, 0]$ if $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$.

Remark 4.3. Assume that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. Then: the rate function $I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.1 is a symmetric function (we can say this, even if an explicit expression of $I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}$ is not available, because $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}$ is a symmetric function); the weak limit in Proposition 4.2 is a symmetric random variable; the rate function $I_{\text{MD}}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.3 is a symmetric function.

5 Comparisons between rate functions

In this section we compare the rate functions for the two types of fractional Skellam process, and for different values of ν . Moreover we present some plots.

5.1 Results and remarks

All the LDPs presented in the previous sections are governed by rate functions that uniquely vanish at $x = 0$. So, as we explain below, it is interesting to compare the rate functions, at least around $x = 0$.

Remark 5.1. Throughout this section we always assume that $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ for some $\nu \in (0, 1)$. So we simply write $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}$ in place of the function $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}$ in Proposition 3.1 (see (4)).

We start by comparing $I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}$ in Proposition 3.1 and $I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 5.1. Assume that $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ for some $\nu \in (0, 1)$. Then $I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(0) = I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(0) = 0$ and, for $x \neq 0$, we have $I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(x) > I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(x) > 0$.

Proof. We start noting that, for the function $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}$ in Proposition 3.1 (see Remark 5.1 and (4)) and the function $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.1 (see (9) respectively), we have

$$\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}(0) = \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(0) = 0; \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta) > \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta) \text{ for } \theta \neq 0. \quad (11)$$

The first statement in (11) is immediate. For the second statement we have two cases (for completeness we remark that $\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1) + \lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1) \geq 0$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$).

- If $\theta > 0$, then

$$\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1) > \max\{\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1) + \lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1), 0\}$$

which yields $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta) > \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta)$ by taking the power with exponent $1/\nu$;

- If $\theta < 0$, then

$$\lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1) > \max\{\lambda_1(e^\theta - 1) + \lambda_2(e^{-\theta} - 1), 0\}$$

which yields $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta) > \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta)$ again, by taking the power with exponent $1/\nu$.

Thus (11) is checked.

We also remark that, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, there exist $\theta_x^{(1)}, \theta_x^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(x) = \theta_x^{(1)}x - \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta_x^{(1)}) \text{ and } I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(x) = \theta_x^{(2)}x - \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta_x^{(2)});$$

moreover $\theta_x^{(1)} = \theta_x^{(2)} = 0$ if $x = 0$, and $\theta_x^{(1)}, \theta_x^{(2)} \neq 0$ if $x \neq 0$. Then, if $x \neq 0$, we get

$$I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(x) = \theta_x^{(1)}x - \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta_x^{(1)}) < \theta_x^{(1)}x - \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta_x^{(1)}) \leq \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}}\{\theta x - \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta)\} = I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(x),$$

where the strict inequality holds by (11), and by taking into account that $\theta_x^{(1)} \neq 0$. \square

The next Proposition 5.2 provides a similar result which concerns the comparison of $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}$ in Proposition 3.3 and $I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.3. In particular it is possible to obtain the same strict inequality, for all $x \neq 0$, only if $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ (note that in such a case $\alpha_1(\nu) = \alpha_2(\nu) = 1 - \nu$ by (7) and (10)).

Proposition 5.2. *We have $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(0) = I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(0) = 0$. Moreover, if $x \neq 0$, we have two cases.*

1. If $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, then $I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x) > I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) > 0$.
2. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$, there exists $\delta_{\nu,\lambda} > 0$ such that: $I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x) > I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) > 0$ if $0 < |x| < \delta_{\nu,\lambda}$, $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) > I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x) > 0$ if $|x| > \delta_{\nu,\lambda}$, and $I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x) = I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) > 0$ if $|x| = \delta_{\nu,\lambda}$.

Proof. The equalities $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(0) = I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(0) = 0$ (case $x = 0$) are immediate. So, in what follows, we take $x \neq 0$. We start with the case $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, and we have two cases.

- Assume that $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$. Then for $x < 0$ we have $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) < \infty = I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x)$. For $x > 0$ we have $\frac{x}{\lambda_1} < \frac{x}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}$, which is trivially equivalent to $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) < I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x)$.
- Assume that $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$. Then for $x > 0$ we have $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) < \infty = I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x)$. For $x < 0$ we have $\frac{x}{-\lambda_2} < \frac{x}{-(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)}$, which is trivially equivalent to $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) < I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x)$.

Finally, if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda$ for some $\lambda > 0$, the statement to prove trivially holds noting that, for two constants $c_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}, c_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)} > 0$, we have $I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(x) = c_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}|x|^{1/(1-\nu)}$ and $I_{\text{MD},\lambda}^{(2)}(x) = c_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}|x|^{1/(1-\nu/2)}$. \square

Proposition 5.1 tells us that, if we compare the rate functions in Propositions 3.1 and 4.1, the rate function of the fractional Skellam process of type 2 is larger than that of the fractional Skellam process of type 1. Proposition 5.2 tells us the same for the rate functions in Propositions 3.3 and 4.3 but, when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, the rate function of the fractional Skellam process of type 2 is larger only around $x = 0$.

These inequalities between rate functions allow to say that the convergence of random variables for the fractional Skellam process of type 2 is faster than the corresponding convergence for the fractional Skellam process of type 1. We explain this by considering the LDPs in Proposition 3.1, with $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ for some $\nu \in (0, 1)$, and in Proposition 4.1. Indeed, for every $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P \left(\frac{|Y_{\nu,\lambda}(t)|}{t} > \delta \right) = -J_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(\delta), \text{ where } J_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(\delta) := \min\{I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(\delta), I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(-\delta)\}$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P \left(\frac{|Z_{\nu, \Delta}(t)|}{t} > \delta \right) = -J_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(\delta), \text{ where } J_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(\delta) := \min\{I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(\delta), I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(-\delta)\};$$

therefore $J_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(\delta) > J_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(\delta) > 0$ and, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, J_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(\delta) - J_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(\delta))$, there exists t_ε such that

$$\frac{P \left(\frac{|Z_{\nu, \Delta}(t)|}{t} > \delta \right)}{P \left(\frac{|Y_{\nu, \Delta}(t)|}{t} > \delta \right)} < e^{-t(J_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(\delta) - J_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(\delta) - \varepsilon)} \text{ for all } t > t_\varepsilon,$$

where $e^{-t(J_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(\delta) - J_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}(\delta) - \varepsilon)} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Obviously we can follow the same lines to obtain a similar estimate starting from LDPs in Propositions 3.3 and 4.3; in this case, when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, δ has to be chosen small enough (see Proposition 5.2). Here we do not repeat all the computations; however we can say that, if we set

$$J_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(\delta) := \min\{I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(\delta), I_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(-\delta)\} \text{ and } J_{\text{MD}}^{(2)}(\delta) := \min\{I_{\text{MD}, \Delta}^{(2)}(\delta), I_{\text{MD}, \Delta}^{(2)}(-\delta)\},$$

we have $J_{\text{MD}}^{(2)}(\delta) > J_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(\delta) > 0$ and, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, J_{\text{MD}}^{(2)}(\delta) - J_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(\delta))$, there exists t_ε such that

$$\frac{P \left(\frac{(at)^{\alpha_2(\nu)} |Z_{\nu, \Delta}(t)|}{t} > \delta \right)}{P \left(\frac{(at)^{\alpha_1(\nu)} |Y_{\nu, \Delta}(t)|}{t} > \delta \right)} < e^{-(J_{\text{MD}}^{(2)}(\delta) - J_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(\delta) - \varepsilon)/at} \text{ for all } t > t_\varepsilon,$$

where $e^{-(J_{\text{MD}}^{(2)}(\delta) - J_{\text{MD}}^{(1)}(\delta) - \varepsilon)/at} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 5.2. *We can say that it is not surprising that the convergence of random variables for the fractional Skellam process of type 2 is faster than the corresponding convergence for the fractional Skellam process of type 1. Indeed the fractional Skellam process of type 1 is defined with two independent random time-changes for the involved fractional Poisson processes; on the contrary, for the fractional Skellam process of type 2, we have a unique independent random time-change. So, in some sense, in the second case we have less randomness. Moreover, if we compare the asymptotic behavior (as $t \rightarrow \infty$) of the variances provided by Remarks 3.1 and 3.2 in [13], i.e.*

$$\text{Var}[Y_{\nu, \Delta}(t)] = \frac{t^\nu(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}{\Gamma(1 + \nu)} + \frac{(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2)t^{2\nu}}{\nu} \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(2\nu)} - \frac{1}{\nu\Gamma^2(\nu)} \right)$$

and

$$\text{Var}[Z_{\nu, \Delta}(t)] = \frac{t^\nu(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}{\Gamma(1 + \nu)} + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 t^{2\nu} \left(\frac{2}{\Gamma(2\nu + 1)} - \frac{1}{\Gamma^2(1 + \nu)} \right),$$

in the second case we have smaller asymptotic variances. Indeed we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Var}[Y_{\nu, \Delta}(t)]}{t^{2\nu}} > \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Var}[Z_{\nu, \Delta}(t)]}{t^{2\nu}},$$

noting that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Var}[Y_{\nu, \Delta}(t)]}{t^{2\nu}} = \frac{\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2}{\nu} \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(2\nu)} - \frac{1}{\nu\Gamma^2(\nu)} \right)$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{Var}[Z_{\nu, \Delta}(t)]}{t^{2\nu}} = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 \left(\frac{2}{\Gamma(2\nu + 1)} - \frac{1}{\Gamma^2(1 + \nu)} \right),$$

where

$$\frac{2}{\Gamma(2\nu + 1)} - \frac{1}{\Gamma^2(1 + \nu)} = \frac{2}{2\nu\Gamma(2\nu)} - \frac{1}{\nu^2\Gamma^2(\nu)} = \frac{1}{\nu} \left(\frac{1}{\Gamma(2\nu)} - \frac{1}{\nu\Gamma^2(\nu)} \right)$$

and $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 < \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2$.

Now we consider comparisons between rate functions for different values of $\nu \in (0, 1)$. We mean the rate functions in Propositions 3.1 and 4.1, and we restrict our attention to a comparison in around $x = 0$. In view of what follows we consider some slightly different notation: $I_{\text{LD},\nu}^{(1)}$ in place of $I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}$ in Proposition 3.1, with $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ for some $\nu \in (0, 1)$, and $I_{\text{LD},\nu}^{(2)}$ in place of $I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\nu, \eta \in (0, 1)$ be such that $\eta < \nu$. Then, for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, we have $I_{\text{LD},\eta}^{(k)}(0) = I_{\text{LD},\nu}^{(k)}(0) = 0$ and, for some $\delta > 0$, $I_{\text{LD},\eta}^{(k)}(x) > I_{\text{LD},\nu}^{(k)}(x) > 0$ for $0 < |x| < \delta$.*

Proof. Throughout we take an arbitrarily fixed $k \in \{1, 2\}$. Then, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $\theta_x^{(\nu,k)} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$I_{\text{LD},\nu}^{(k)}(x) = \theta_x^{(\nu,k)}x - \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(k)}(\theta_x^{(\nu,k)});$$

we recall that we are referring to the function $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}$ in (4) (see also Remark 5.1) and to the function $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}$ in (9). We can also say that $\theta_x^{(\nu,k)} = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$ and, moreover, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $0 \leq \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(1)}(\theta_x^{(\nu,k)}) < 1$ if $|x| < \delta$. Then, by taking into account the same formulas with η in place of ν , it is easy to check that

$$0 \leq \Psi_{\eta,\lambda}^{(k)}(\theta_x^{(\nu,k)}) < \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(k)}(\theta_x^{(\nu,k)}) < 1$$

(see (4) and (9)); moreover we take into account that $\frac{1}{\eta} > \frac{1}{\nu}$, whence we obtain

$$I_{\text{LD},\nu}^{(k)}(x) = \theta_x^{(\nu,k)}x - \Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(k)}(\theta_x^{(\nu,k)}) < \theta_x^{(\nu,k)}x - \Psi_{\eta,\lambda}^{(k)}(\theta_x^{(\nu,k)}) \leq \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \{\theta x - \Psi_{\eta,\lambda}^{(k)}(\theta)\} = I_{\text{LD},\eta}^{(k)}(x).$$

This completes the proof. \square

As a consequence of Proposition 5.3 we can present some estimates that allow to compare the convergence to zero of different families of random variables for different values of $\nu \in (0, 1)$. Roughly speaking we can say the smaller the ν , the faster the convergence of the random variables to zero. This could be explained by presenting a modified version of the computations presented just after the proof of Proposition 5.2; here we omit the details.

Finally we present a remark about the differentiability at the origin ($x = 0$) of the rate functions $I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}$ and $I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}$ in Propositions 3.1 and 4.1.

Remark 5.3. *The rate function $I_{\text{LD}}^{(1)}$ in Proposition 3.1 is differentiable for every choice of λ_1 and λ_2 . On the contrary the rate function $I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}$ in Proposition 4.1 is differentiable only if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$; in fact, if $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$, the rate function $I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}$ is not differentiable at $x = 0$ because left and right derivatives $\partial_x I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(0-)$ and $\partial_x I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(0+)$ do not coincide. This fact can be explained noting that the function $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}$ has a flat piece equal to zero near $\theta = 0$. More precisely we have the two following cases.*

- If $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2$, then $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta) = 0$ in a left neighborhood of $\theta = 0$, and we have

$$\partial_x I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(0-) < 0 \text{ and } \partial_x I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(0+) = 0;$$

- If $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$, then $\Psi_{\nu,\lambda}^{(2)}(\theta) = 0$ in a right neighborhood of $\theta = 0$, and we have

$$\partial_x I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(0-) = 0 \text{ and } \partial_x I_{\text{LD}}^{(2)}(0+) > 0.$$

5.2 Some plots

We start with Figure 1 which shows that the rate functions $I_{LD}^{(1)}(x)$ and $I_{LD}^{(2)}(x)$ when $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \nu$ for various sets of parameters $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \nu)$. In each case the plots agree with the statements in Proposition 5.1, i.e. $I_{LD}^{(2)}(x) > I_{LD}^{(1)}(x) > 0$ for $x \neq 0$ and $I_{LD}^{(2)}(0) = I_{LD}^{(1)}(0) = 0$. In particular, if $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$, the rate functions are symmetric (around zero) as announced in Remarks 3.3 and 4.3. The plots also agree with the statements in Remark 5.3 about the differentiability at the origin.




Figure 1: Top left: $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \nu) = (1, 3, .7)$. Top right: $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \nu) = (5, 1, .3)$. Bottom left: $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \nu) = (2, 2, .5)$. Bottom right: $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \nu) = (.5, .5, .5)$.

In Figure 2 we present the plots of $I_{MD}^{(1)}(x)$ and $I_{MD,\lambda}^{(2)}(x)$ when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. For each set of parameters, the plots agree with a statement of Proposition 5.2: $I_{MD}^{(1)}(x)$ is smaller than $I_{MD,\lambda}^{(2)}(x)$ when x is within a bounded interval that includes zero, and becomes larger outside of that interval.

Finally in Figure 3 we present the plots of $I_{LD}^{(1)}(x)$ and $I_{LD}^{(2)}(x)$ for different values of ν . These




Figure 2: Left: $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2, \nu = .5$. Right: $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = .5, \nu = .3$.

plots agrees with the statements in Proposition 5.3. The rate function $I_{LD}^{(1)}$ is always smooth (even if, in particular for the case $\nu = 0.1$, one can have the impression that $I_{LD}^{(1)}$ is a piecewise linear function with an angular point at $x = 0$); on the contrary, as announced in Remark 5.3, we have $\partial_x I_{LD}^{(2)}(0-) = 0$ (even if, in particular for the case $\nu = 0.1$, one can have the impression that $\partial_x I_{LD}^{(2)}(0-) < 0$) and $\partial_x I_{LD}^{(2)}(0+) > 0$.




Figure 3: Left: $I_{LD}^{(1)}(x)$ with $\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 3$. Right: $I_{LD}^{(2)}(x)$ with $\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 3$.

Funding. CM acknowledges the support of MIUR Excellence Department Project awarded to the Department of Mathematics, University of Rome Tor Vergata (CUP E83C18000100006), of Univer-

sity of Rome Tor Vergata (project "Asymptotic Methods in Probability" (CUP E89C20000680005) and project "Asymptotic Properties in Probability" (CUP E83C22001780005)) and of Indam-GNAMPA.

References

- [1] L. Beghin, C. Macci (2022) Non-central moderate deviations for compound fractional Poisson processes. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 185, Paper No. 109424, 8 pp.
- [2] L. Beghin, C. Macci, B. Martinucci (2021) Random time-changes and asymptotic results for a class of continuous-time Markov chains on integers with alternating rates. *Mod. Stoch. Theory Appl.* 8, 63–91.
- [3] L. Beghin, E. Orsingher (2009) Fractional Poisson processes and related planar random motions. *Electron. J. Probab.* 14, 1790–1827.
- [4] L. Beghin, E. Orsingher (2010) Poisson-type processes governed by fractional and higher-order recursive differential equations. *Electron. J. Probab.* 15, 684–709.
- [5] K. Buchak, L. Sakhno (2017) Compositions of Poisson and gamma processes. *Mod. Stoch. Theory Appl.* 4, 161–188.
- [6] K.V. Buchak, L.M. Sakhno (2019) On the governing equations for Poisson and Skellam processes time-changed by inverse subordinators. *Theory Probab. Math. Statist.* 98, 91–104.
- [7] A. Dembo, O. Zeitouni (1998) *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*, 2nd edn. Springer.
- [8] R. Giuliano, C. Macci (2022+) Some examples of non-central moderate deviations for sequences of real random variables. Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2110.05859.pdf>
- [9] R. Gorenflo, A.A. Kilbas, F. Mainardi, S.V. Rogosin (2014) *Mittag-Leffler Functions, Related Topics and Applications*. Springer, New York.
- [10] N. Gupta, A. Kumar, N. Leonenko (2020) Fractional Skellam process of order k and beyond. *Entropy* 22, Paper No. 1193.
- [11] K.K. Kataria, M. Khandakar (2021+) Fractional Skellam process of order k . Available at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2103.09187.pdf>
- [12] K.K. Kataria, M. Khandakar (2022) Time-changed space-time fractional Poisson process. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* 40, 246–267.
- [13] A. Keress, N.N. Leonenko, A. Sikorskii (2014) Fractional Skellam processes with applications to finance. *Fract. Calc. Appl. Anal.* 17, 532–551.
- [14] M.M. Meerschaert, E. Nane, P. Vellaisamy (2011) The fractional Poisson process and the inverse stable subordinator. *Electron. J. Probab.* 16, 1600–1620.
- [15] E. Orsingher, F. Polito (2012) The space-fractional Poisson process. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 82, 852–858.