## ON THE EXISTENCE OF EXPONENTIAL MOMENTS OF RADEMACHER SUMS

RY

## **WOJCIECH NIEMIRO (WARSZAWA)**

Let  $r_1, r_2, \ldots$  be a Rademacher sequence, i.e.  $r_i$  are independent identically distributed random variables:  $P(r_i = 1) = P(r_i = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$ . It is well known (cf., for instance, [2], Chapter V, Section 8) that if  $a_1, a_2, \ldots$  is a sequence of positive numbers such that  $\sum a_i^2 < \infty$  (this assumption guarantees the convergence a.s. of  $\sum a_i r_i$ , then  $E \exp \left(t \left(\sum a_i r_i\right)^2\right) < x$  for every real t. In the present paper the existence of exponential moments of order greater than 2 of sums of Rademacher series will be examined. The question is when the inequality E exp  $(t | \sum a_j r_j|^r) < \infty$  holds. We shall prove the following

THEOREM. Let  $0 \le q < 1$ . If  $a_1, a_2, \ldots$  satisfies the condition

$$\sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} a_j^2 = O(n^{-q}),$$

then for r < 2/(1-q) the mean value  $E \exp(t | \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i r_i|^r)$  is finite for every t.

The Theorem is the generalization of Marcus' result in [1] and the most important part of our proof is also due to him. The special case  $a_i = j^{-s}$  is considered in [1]. Our Theorem is also the strengthening of the following theorem proved by Hoffmann-Jørgensen in his unpublished paper:

If q is one of the numbers  $\frac{1}{2}$ , 1,  $\frac{3}{2}$ , 2, ... and  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , ... satisfies the condition

$$\sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} a_j^2 = o(n^{-q}),$$

then E exp  $(t | \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j r_j|^{2(1+q)})$  is finite for every t. Evidently, 2/(1-q) > 2(q+1) for 0 < q < 1 and our Theorem is

stronger.

From now on we assume that  $a_1, a_2, \ldots$  is a sequence such that

$$a_j > 0$$
 and  $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j^2 < \infty$ .

We shall use the following notation:

$$s_n = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j, \quad \sigma_n = \sum_{j=n+1}^x a_j^2, \quad \sigma = \sum_{j=1}^x a_j^2.$$

Let us begin with the following three lemmas:

LEMMA 1. E exp  $(t \sum a_i r_i) \leq \exp(t^2 \sigma/2)$ .

LEMMA 2.  $P(\sum a_j r_j > t) \le \exp(-t^2/2\sigma)$ .

Lemma 1 is a well-known fact and Lemma 2 is its immediate consequence.

LEMMA 3.  $P(\sum a_j r_j > 2s_n) \leq \exp(-s_n^2/2\sigma_n)$ .

Proof. We have

$$P(\sum_{j=1}^{r} a_j r_j > 2s_n) \leqslant P(\sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j r_j > s_n) + P(\sum_{j=n+1}^{r} a_j r_j > s_n).$$

The first term is equal to 0 and so Lemma 2 (applied to the sequence  $r_{n+1}, r_{n+2}, \ldots$  instead of  $r_1, r_2, \ldots$ ) gives us the required inequality.

Now, let us notice that to prove our Theorem it is sufficient to show that its assumption implies the estimate  $\sigma_n = O(s_n^{-r})$  for every r < 2q/(1-q) for n large enough. Indeed, assume that the last estimate is valid, i.e.  $\sigma_n \leq As_n^{-r}$  for some positive constant A and for large n. Without loss of generality we may assume  $\sum a_j = \infty$ . For every u sufficiently large there exists n such that  $u-1 < 2s_n < u$ . By Lemma 3 we have

$$P(\sum a_i r_i > u) \le P(\sum a_i r_i > 2s_n) \le \exp(-s_n^2/2\sigma_n)$$

and

$$\exp(-s_n^2/2\sigma_n) \le \exp(-(2A)^{-1}s_n^{2+r}) \le \exp(-(2A)^{-1}[(u-1)/2]^{2+r})$$

$$\le \exp(-Bu^{2+r})$$

Evidently, the obtained tail probability estimate implies

$$E \exp \left(t \left| \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_j r_j \right|^{2+r} \right) < \infty.$$

Now, it is sufficient to notice that if r runs over the interval (0, 2q(1-q)), then r+2 runs over (2, 2(1-q)).

Proof of the Theorem. Let us consider in the series  $a_1 + a_2 + \dots$  the following groups of terms:

$$(a_1 + a_2 + (a_3 + a_4) + (a_5 + \dots + a_8) + (a_9 + \dots + a_{16}) + \dots$$

The Schwarz inequality applied to the (p+2)-nd group gives

$$a_{2^{p+1}} + \dots + a_{2^{p+1}} \le (a_{2^{p+1}}^2 + \dots + a_{2^{p+1}}^2)^{1/2} \cdot 2^{p/2}$$

Now, using the assumption  $\sigma_n \leq An^{-q}$ , we obtain

$$a_{2p+1} + \dots + a_{2p+1} \le (A \cdot 2^{-pq} \cdot 2^p)^{1/2} = A^{1/2} \cdot 2^{p(1-q)/2}$$

Hence

$$s_{2^{p+1}} \le a_1 + A^{1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{p} 2^{k(1-q)/2} \le D \cdot 2^{(1-q)(p+1)/2}$$

for some constant D > 0 (for instance,  $D = a_1 + A^{1/2} (2^{(1-q)/2} - 1)^{-1}$ ). Let  $2^p < n \le 2^{p+1}$ . We have

$$\sigma_n \le \sigma_{2p} \le A \cdot 2^{-pq} \le C s_{2p+1}^{[-2q (1-q)][p (p+1)]}, \quad \text{where } C > A D^{2pq (1-q)(p+1)}.$$

Given r < 2q/(1-q) it is enough to choose  $\hat{p}$  so large that

$$\frac{2q}{1-q}\frac{\hat{p}}{\hat{p}+1} > r.$$

This allows us to obtain  $\sigma_n \leq C s_n^{-r}$  for  $2^p < n \leq 2^{p+1}$ , where  $p = \hat{p}$ ,  $\hat{p} + 1$ ,  $\hat{p} + 2$ , ..., i.e. for every  $n > 2^p$ . Thus the proof is complete.

Remark 1. The exponent 2/(1-q), which appears in our Theorem, is the best possible.

In fact, Marcus [1] shows that although the sequence  $a_j = j^{-(1-q)/2}$  satisfies the condition  $\sigma_n = O(n^{-q})$ , we have  $E \exp \left|\sum a_j r_j\right|^r = \infty$  for every r > 2/(1-q).

Remark 2. If the condition  $\sigma_n = O(n^{-1})$  is satisfied, then the random variable  $\sum a_i r_i$  has finite exponential moments of all orders.

Remark 3. If the condition  $\sigma_n = O(n^{-q})$  for some q > 1 is satisfied, then  $\sum a_j < \infty$  and  $\sum a_j r_j$  is a bounded random variable.

To prove this let us consider the following inequality which appears in the proof of the Theorem:

$$s_{2^{p+1}} \le a_1 + A^{1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{p} 2^{k(1-q)/2}.$$

This is also true in the case q > 1 and the proof needs no change. If q > 1, then the geometric series on the right-hand side of this inequality converges, and hence the sequence of the partial sums  $s_{2p}$  of  $\sum a_j$  is bounded.

The author wishes to express his thanks to Professor Stanisław Kwapień for his help during the preparation of the paper.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. B. Marcus, Tail probability estimates for certain Rademacher sums, preprint, Northwestern University, Evanston.
- [2] A. Zygmund, Trigonometric series, Vol. I, Cambridge University Press, 1959.

INSTITUTE OF BIOCYBERNETICS POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, WARSAW

Reçu par la Rédaction le 12. 6. 1978