



FUNDAÇÃO
GETULIO VARGAS

EPGE

Escola de Pós-Graduação
em Economia

Ensaio Econômicos

Escola de

Pós Graduação

em Economia

da Fundação

Getulio Vargas

Nº 522

ISSN 0104-8910

Central limit theorem for asymmetric kernel functionals

***Marcelo Fernandes
Paulo Klinger Monteiro***

Fevereiro de 2004

Title

Central limit theorem for asymmetric kernel functionals

Running Head

Asymmetric kernel functionals

Authors

Marcelo Fernandes

Paulo Klinger Monteiro

Affiliation

Graduate School of Economics

Getulio Vargas Foundation

Mailing Address

Praia de Botafogo, 190

22250-900 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

Phone: +55 21 2559 5827

Fax: +55 21 2553 8821

E-mails

mfernand@fgv.br

pklm@fgv.br

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to Sergio O. Parreiras, four anonymous referees, and seminar participants at the 5th World Congress of the Bernoulli Society for Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics and the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics (Guanajuato, 2000) for valuable comments. Fernandes acknowledges with gratitude a Jean Monnet Fellowship at the European University Institute, where part of this research was done, as well as the financial support from CNPq-Brazil. The usual disclaimer applies.

Abstract

Asymmetric kernels are quite useful for the estimation of density functions with bounded support. Gamma kernels are designed to handle density functions whose supports are bounded from one end only, whereas beta kernels are particularly convenient for the estimation of density functions with compact support. These asymmetric kernels are nonnegative and free of boundary bias. Moreover, their shape varies according to the location of the data point, thus also changing the amount of smoothing. This paper applies the central limit theorem for degenerate U-statistics to compute the limiting distribution of a class of asymmetric kernel functionals.

Keywords

asymmetric kernel, beta kernel, boundary bias, central limit theorem, density estimation, gamma kernel, U-statistic theory.

1 Introduction

Fixed kernels are not appropriate to estimate density functions whose supports are bounded in view that they engender boundary bias due to the allocation of weight outside the support in the event that smoothing is applied near the boundary. A proper asymmetric kernel never assigns weight outside the density support and therefore should produce better estimates of the density near the boundary. Chen (1999 and 2000) show indeed that replacing fixed with asymmetric kernels substantially increases the precision of density estimation close to the boundary. In particular, beta kernels are particularly appropriate to estimate densities with compact support, whereas gamma kernels are more convenient to handle density functions whose supports are bounded from one end only. These asymmetric kernels are nonnegative and free of boundary bias. Moreover, their shape varies according to the location of the data point, thus also changing the amount of smoothing.

This paper derives the asymptotic behavior of asymmetric kernel functionals by applying a central limit theorem for degenerate U-statistics with variable kernel. The motivation is simple. It is often the case that one must derive the limiting distribution of density functionals such as

$$(1.1) \quad I_n = \int_A \varphi(x) [\hat{f}(x) - f(x)]^2 dx,$$

where $\varphi(\cdot)$ is a bounded regular function and \hat{f} is an asymmetric kernel estimate of the true density f with support A . Examples abound in econometrics and statistics. Indeed, a central limit theorem for the density functional (1.1) is useful to study the order of closeness between the integrated square error and the mean integrated squared error in the ambit of nonparametric kernel estimation of densities with bounded support. Although there are sharp results for nonparametric density estimation based on fixed kernels, e.g. Bickel and Rosenblatt (1973) and Hall (1984), no results are available for asymmetric kernel density estimation.

Further, goodness-of-fit test statistics are usually driven by second-order asymptotics (e.g. Ait-Sahalia, Bickel and Stoker, 2001), hence density function-

als such as (1.1) arise very naturally in that context. Consider, for instance, one of the goodness-of-fit tests advanced by Fernandes and Grammig (2004) for duration models, which gauges how large is

$$(1.2) \quad \Lambda(f, \theta) = \int_0^\infty [\Gamma_\theta(x) - \Gamma_f(x)]^2 f(x) dx,$$

where $\Gamma_\theta(\cdot)$ and $\Gamma_f(\cdot)$ denote the parametric and nonparametric hazard rate functions, respectively. It follows from the functional delta method that the asymptotic behavior of (1.2) is driven by the leading term of the second functional derivative, namely

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\Gamma_f(x)}{1 - F(x)} [\hat{f}(x) - f(x)]^2 dx.$$

As duration data are nonnegative by definition, gamma kernels are called for so as to avoid boundary bias in the density estimation.

Let X_1, \dots, X_n be a random sample from an unknown probability density function f defined on a support A , which is either $A = [0, \infty)$ or $A = [0, 1]$. The nonparametric estimate \hat{f} of the density function f uses the appropriate asymmetric kernel estimator, namely the gamma kernel for $A = [0, \infty)$ and the beta kernel for $A = [0, 1]$. As in any kernel density estimation, the smoothing bandwidth, say b , converges to zero as the sample size grows. We are now ready to formulate the main result.

Theorem. Suppose that φ is a bounded regular function and the density function f and its first and second derivatives are bounded and square integrable on A . Assuming further that b is of order $o(n^{-4/9})$, it then ensues that

$$(1.3) \quad n b^{1/4} I_n - \frac{b^{-1/4}}{2\sqrt{\pi}} E_x \left[c_A^{-1/2}(x) \varphi(x) \right] \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma_A^2),$$

where $\sigma_A^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} E_x \left[c_A^{-1/2}(x) \varphi^2(x) f(x) \right]$ and the boundary correction depends on the support A with $c_{[0, \infty)}(x) = x$ and $c_{[0, 1]}(x) = x(1 - x)$.

As is apparent, the boundary correction $c_A(\cdot)$ is the sole distinction between the limiting distributions of the two asymmetric kernel functionals. Because the support is bounded only from below in the gamma kernel case, it suffices to

control for values of x close to the origin. In the context of beta kernels, it is necessary to deal with x in the vicinity of both boundaries of the unit interval. We defer until the next section, which reviews the properties of beta and gamma kernels, to comment upon the bandwidth condition $b = o(n^{-4/9})$. Lastly, we split the proof of the theorem into two parts: Sections 3 and 4 demonstrate the result for the gamma and beta kernel functionals, respectively.

2 Asymmetric kernels

Instead of the usual nonparametric kernel density estimator

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{x - X_i}{h}\right),$$

where K is a fixed kernel function and h is a smoothing bandwidth, consider the asymmetric kernel estimator

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_A(X_i),$$

where $K_A(\cdot)$ corresponds either to the gamma kernel

$$K_{x/b+1,b}(u) = \frac{u^{x/b} \exp(-u/b)}{\Gamma(x/b + 1)b^{x/b+1}} \mathbb{1}(u \geq 0)$$

or to the beta kernel

$$K_{x/b+1,(1-x)/b+1}(u) = \frac{u^{x/b}(1-u)^{(1-x)/b}}{B(x/b + 1, (1-x)/b + 1)} \mathbb{1}(0 \leq u \leq 1)$$

according to the density support A . As usual, the smoothing bandwidth b converges to zero as the sample size n grows.

Asymmetric kernel estimators are boundary bias free in that the bias is of order $O(b)$ both near the boundaries and in the interior of the support (Chen, 1999 and 2000). The absence of boundary bias is due to the fact that asymmetric kernels have the same support of the underlying density, and hence no weight is assigned outside the density support. The trick is that asymmetric kernels are flexible enough to vary their shape and the amount of smoothing according to the location within the support.

On the other hand, the asymptotic variance of asymmetric kernels is of higher order $O(n^{-1}b^{-1})$ near the boundaries than in the interior, which is of order $O(n^{-1}b^{-1/2})$. Nonetheless, the impact on the integrated variance is negligible, so that it does not affect the mean integrated square error. Furthermore, the optimal bandwidth $b_* = O(n^{-2/5}) = O(h_*^2)$, where h_* is the optimal bandwidth for fixed nonnegative kernel estimators (Chen, 1999 and 2000). Accordingly, both beta and gamma kernel density estimators achieve the optimal rate of convergence for the mean integrated squared error of nonnegative kernels.¹

It is readily seen that the bandwidth condition $b = o(n^{-4/9})$ induces undersmoothing in the density estimation. Other limiting conditions on the bandwidth are also applicable, but they would result in different terms for the bias in (1.3). For instance, the bandwidth condition $b = O(n^{-2/5})$ that entails asymptotically optimal pointwise density estimates yields an additional term driving the asymptotic distribution of (1.1). Accordingly, that would lead to another component in the variance whose estimation would require the estimate of the second-order derivative of the density function as in Härdle and Mammen (1993), for example.

3 Gamma kernel functionals

In this section, we show that the asymptotic behavior of gamma kernel functionals of the form (1.1) is indeed as claimed in (1.3). The proof builds on U-statistic theory in that we decompose the functional so as to force the emergence of a degenerate U-statistic. Let $r_n(x, X) = \varphi^{1/2}(x)K_{x/b+1, b}(X)$ and $\check{r}_n(x, X) = r_n(x, X) - \mathbb{E}_X[r_n(x, X)]$, where the subscript of the expectation operator indicates the random quantity that it refers to. In addition, denote by \int the integral over the density support $A = [0, \infty)$ and by \oint multiple integrals. Letting the absence of subscript in the expectation operator denote the

¹ Nonnegative kernels define the class of second-order kernel functions. Higher-order kernels may bring about some bias reduction at the expense of assuming negative values (see Müller, 1984, for a list).

expectation over (X_1, \dots, X_n) then yields

$$\begin{aligned} I_n &= \int \varphi(x) [\hat{f}(x) - \mathbb{E}\hat{f}(x)]^2 dx + \int \varphi(x) [\mathbb{E}\hat{f}(x) - f(x)]^2 dx \\ &\quad + 2 \int \varphi(x) [\hat{f}(x) - \mathbb{E}\hat{f}(x)] [\mathbb{E}\hat{f}(x) - f(x)] dx, \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently, $I_n = I_{1n} + I_{2n} + I_{3n} + I_{4n}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{1n} &= \frac{2}{n^2} \sum_{i < j} \int \check{r}_n(x, X_i) \check{r}_n(x, X_j) dx \\ I_{2n} &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_i \int \check{r}_n^2(x, X_i) dx \\ I_{3n} &= \int \varphi(x) [\mathbb{E}\hat{f}(x) - f(x)]^2 dx \\ I_{4n} &= 2 \int \varphi(x) [\hat{f}(x) - \mathbb{E}\hat{f}(x)] [\mathbb{E}\hat{f}(x) - f(x)] dx. \end{aligned}$$

The first term stands for a degenerate U-statistic and contributes with the variance in the limiting distribution, whereas the second term gives the asymptotic bias. In turn, the third and the fourth terms are negligible provided that the bandwidth b is of order $o(n^{-4/9})$.

We start by deriving the first and second moments of $r_n(x, X)$. Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_X [r_n(x, X)] = \varphi^{1/2}(x) \int K_{x/b+1, b}(X) f(X) dX = \varphi^{1/2}(x) \mathbb{E}_\zeta [f(\zeta)],$$

where $\zeta \sim \mathcal{G}(x/b + 1, b)$. Applying a Taylor expansion yields

$$\mathbb{E}_\zeta [f(\zeta)] = f(x) + O(b),$$

illustrating the fact that the gamma kernel density estimation has a uniform bias of order $O(b)$ as singled out by Chen (2000). Put differently, the order of magnitude of the bias does not depend on the location within the density support and, as a consequence, $\mathbb{E}_X [r_n(x, X)] = \varphi^{1/2}(x) f(x) + O(b)$.

We compute the second moment of $r_n(x, X)$ in a similar fashion. It ensues from the properties of the gamma density that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_X [r_n^2(x, X)] &= \varphi(x) \int K_{x/b+1, b}^2(X) f(X) dX \\ &= \varphi(x) B_b(x) \mathbb{E}_\eta [f(\eta)], \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta \sim \mathcal{G}(2x/b + 1, b/2)$ and

$$(3.1) \quad B_b(x) = \frac{\Gamma(2x/b + 1)/b}{2^{2x/b+1}\Gamma^2(x/b + 1)}.$$

Given that $\mathbb{E}_\eta[f(\eta)] = f(x) + O(b)$, it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(I_{2n}) &= \frac{1}{n} \int \mathbb{E}_X [r_n^2(x, X)] dx - \frac{1}{n} \int \mathbb{E}_X^2 [r_n(x, X)] dx \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \int \varphi(x) B_b(x) [f(x) + O(b)] dx + O(n^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \int \varphi(x) B_b(x) f(x) dx + O(n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $R(z) \equiv \sqrt{2\pi} \exp(-z) z^{z+1/2} / \Gamma(z+1)$. By rewriting (3.1) in terms of the R -function, one obtains

$$(3.2) \quad B_b(x) = \frac{R^2(x/b)}{R(2x/b)} \frac{b^{-1/2} x^{-1/2}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}.$$

According to Brown and Chen's (1999) Lemma 3, $R(z)$ is a monotonic increasing function that converges to one as $z \rightarrow \infty$ and $R(z) \leq 1$ for any $z > 0$. Moreover, if x/b is large enough, the difference between one and the first fraction in (3.2) is negligible and hence one may consider that $\sqrt{bx} B_b(x) = 1/(2\sqrt{\pi})$ (Chen, 2000). It therefore follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(I_{2n}) &= \frac{1}{n} \int \varphi(x) B_b(x) f(x) dx + O(n^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \int_0^b \varphi(x) B_b(x) f(x) dx + \frac{1}{n} \int_b^\infty \varphi(x) B_b(x) f(x) dx + O(n^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

It then suffices to write the first integral in terms of $\omega = x/b$ to show that the first term is at most of order $O(1/n)$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}(I_{2n}) = \frac{b^{-1/2}}{n} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^\infty x^{-1/2} \varphi(x) f(x) dx + O(n^{-1})$$

by the dominated convergence theorem, provided that $\mathbb{E}[x^{-1/2} \varphi(x)]$ is finite.

It therefore ensues that

$$n b^{1/4} \mathbb{E}(I_{2n}) - \frac{b^{-1/4}}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \mathbb{E}[x^{-1/2} \varphi(x)] = o(1).$$

In addition, we show in the appendix that

$$(3.3) \quad V(I_{2n}) = O(n^{-3}b^{-2} + n^{-3}b^{-1}).$$

It then follows that $V(n b^{1/4} I_{2n}) = n^2 b^{1/2} V(I_{2n}) = O(n^{-1} b^{-3/2})$, which is by assumption of order $o(1)$. Applying Chebyshev's inequality thus results in

$$n b^{1/4} I_{2n} - \frac{b^{-1/4}}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \mathbb{E} \left[x^{-1/2} \varphi(x) \right] = o_p(1).$$

The fact that $b = o(n^{-4/9})$ also ensures that the third and fourth terms are negligible if properly normalized. Indeed, I_{3n} is proportional to the integrated squared bias of the gamma kernel density estimation, hence it is of order $O(b^2)$. The bandwidth condition then guarantees that $n b^{1/4} I_{3n} = O(n b^{9/4}) = o(1)$. Further,

$$\mathbb{E}(I_{4n}) = 2 \int \varphi(x) \mathbb{E}_X [\hat{f}(x) - \mathbb{E}\hat{f}(x)] [\mathbb{E}\hat{f}(x) - f(x)] dx = 0,$$

whereas $\mathbb{E}(I_{4n}^2) = O(n^{-1} b^2)$ analogously to Hall (1984, Lemma 1). This means that $\mathbb{E}(n^2 b^{1/2} I_{4n}^2) = O(n b^{5/2}) = o(n^{-1/10})$, and thus it stems from Chebyshev's inequality that $n b^{1/4} I_{4n} = o_p(1)$.

Finally, recall that $I_{1n} = \sum_{i < j} H_n(X_i, X_j)$, where

$$H_n(X_i, X_j) = \frac{2}{n^2} \int \check{r}_n(x, X_i) \check{r}_n(x, X_j) dx.$$

As is apparent, I_{1n} is a degenerate U-statistic as $H_n(X_i, X_j)$ is symmetric, centered, and $\mathbb{E} [H_n(X_i, X_j) | X_j] = 0$ almost surely. To see why, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [H_n(X_i, X_j) | X_j] &= \frac{2}{n^2} \int \check{r}_n(x, X_j) \mathbb{E} [\check{r}_n(x, X_i) | X_j] dx \\ &= \frac{2}{n^2} \int \check{r}_n(x, X_j) \mathbb{E} [\check{r}_n(x, X_i)] dx, \end{aligned}$$

which equals zero because the mean of $\check{r}_n(x, X)$ is by construction zero. We then apply Theorem 4.7.3 of Koroljuk and Borovskich (1994, page 163) for degenerate U-statistics, which states that if, for some $k > 1$,

$$(3.4) \quad \frac{\mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2} [G_n^k(X_1, X_2)] + n^{1-k} \mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2} [H_n^{2k}(X_1, X_2)]}{\mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2}^k [H_n^2(X_1, X_2)]} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $G_n(X_1, X_2) = \mathbb{E}_X [H_n(X, X_1) H_n(X, X_2)]$, then

$$I_{1n} \xrightarrow{d} N \left(0, \frac{n^2}{2} \mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2} [H_n^2(X_1, X_2)] \right).$$

We start by establishing that the denominator is of order $O(n^{-4k} b^{-k/2})$ as a by-product of the derivation of the asymptotic variance σ_G^2 of $n b^{1/4} I_{1n}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_G^2 &\equiv \frac{n^4 b^{1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2} [H_n^2(X_1, X_2)] \\
&= 2 b^{1/2} \oint \left[\int \check{r}_n(x, X_1) \check{r}_n(x, X_2) dx \right]^2 f(X_1, X_2) d(X_1, X_2) \\
&= 2 b^{1/2} \oint \check{r}_n(x, X_1) \check{r}_n(x, X_2) \check{r}_n(y, X_1) \check{r}_n(y, X_2) f(X_1) f(X_2) d(x, y, X_1, X_2) \\
&= 2 b^{1/2} \oint \left[\int \check{r}_n(x, X) \check{r}_n(y, X) f(X) dX \right]^2 d(x, y) \\
&= 2 b^{1/2} \oint \mathbb{E}_X^2 [\check{r}_n(x, X) \check{r}_n(y, X)] d(x, y) \\
&= 2 b^{1/2} \oint \gamma_n^2(x, y) d(x, y),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_n(x, y) = C_n(x, y) - \bar{C}_n(x, y)$, $C_n(x, y) \equiv \mathbb{E}_X [r_n(x, X) r_n(y, X)]$, and $\bar{C}_n(x, y) \equiv \mathbb{E}_X [r_n(x, X)] \mathbb{E}_X [r_n(y, X)]$. It is easy to show that the latter equals $\varphi^{1/2}(x) \varphi^{1/2}(y) f(x) f(y) + O(b)$, whereas

$$\begin{aligned}
C_n(x, y) &= \varphi^{1/2}(x) \varphi^{1/2}(y) \int K_{x/b+1, b}(X) K_{y/b+1, b}(X) dF(X) \\
&= \varphi^{1/2}(x) \varphi^{1/2}(y) B_b(x, y) \int K_{(x+y)/b+1, b/2}(X) dF(X) \\
&= \varphi^{1/2}(x) \varphi^{1/2}(y) B_b(x, y) \mathbb{E}_\varsigma [f(\varsigma)],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varsigma \sim \mathcal{G}[(x+y)/b+1, b/2]$ and

$$(3.5) \quad B_b(x, y) = \frac{\Gamma[(x+y)/b+1]}{\Gamma(x/b+1) \Gamma(y/b+1)} \frac{b^{-1}}{2^{(x+y)/b+1}}.$$

As before, we rewrite (3.5) in terms of the R -function so as to get

$$\begin{aligned}
B_b(x, y) &= \frac{R\left(\frac{x}{b}\right) R\left(\frac{y}{b}\right)}{R\left(\frac{x+y}{b}\right)} \left(\frac{x+y}{2x}\right)^{\frac{x}{b}+\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{x+y}{2y}\right)^{\frac{y}{b}+\frac{1}{4}} \frac{b^{-1/2} x^{-1/4} y^{-1/4}}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \\
&= \bar{B}_b(x, y) [\Delta(x, y)]^{\frac{1}{b}},
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$(3.6) \quad \bar{B}_b(x, y) = \frac{R\left(\frac{x}{b}\right) R\left(\frac{y}{b}\right)}{R\left(\frac{x+y}{b}\right)} \left(\frac{x+y}{2x}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{x+y}{2y}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{b^{-1/2} x^{-1/4} y^{-1/4}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}$$

$$(3.7) \quad \Delta(x, y) = \left(\frac{x+y}{2x}\right)^x \left(\frac{x+y}{2y}\right)^y.$$

Applying a Taylor expansion to $\mathbb{E}_\zeta[f(\zeta)]$ then yields

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_G^2 &= 2b^{1/2} \oint \varphi(x)\varphi(y) \left\{ B_b(x, y) \left[f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) + O(b) \right] - f(x)f(y) \right\}^2 d(x, y) \\ &= 2b^{1/2} \oint \varphi(x)\varphi(y) B_b^2(x, y) \left[f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \right]^2 d(x, y) \{1 + o(1)\} \\ &= 2b^{1/2} \oint \varphi(x)\varphi(y) \bar{B}_b^2(x, y) [\Delta(x, y)]^{\frac{2}{b}} \left[f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \right]^2 d(x, y) \{1 + o(1)\},\end{aligned}$$

which reduces to

$$\sigma_G^2 = 2\sqrt{2\pi}b \int x^{1/2} \varphi^2(x) \bar{B}_b^2(x, x) f(x) dF(x) \{1 + o(1)\},$$

by Lemma A.4 in the appendix.

The second and third terms on the right-hand side of (3.6) equal one if $x = y$, resulting in $\bar{B}_b(x, x) = B_b(x)$. It then holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_G^2 &= 2\sqrt{2\pi}b \int_0^\infty x^{1/2} \varphi^2(x) B_b^2(x) f(x) dF(x) \{1 + o(1)\} \\ &= 2\sqrt{2\pi}b \int_0^b x^{1/2} \varphi^2(x) B_b^2(x) f(x) dF(x) + o(1) \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{2\pi}b \int_b^\infty x^{1/2} \varphi^2(x) B_b^2(x) f(x) dF(x) \\ &= 2\sqrt{2\pi}b \int_b^\infty x^{1/2} \varphi^2(x) \left(\frac{b^{-1}x^{-1}}{4\pi}\right) f(x) dF(x) + o(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \mathbb{E} \left[x^{-1/2} \varphi^2(x) f(x) \right] + o(1),\end{aligned}$$

for b small enough.

Denote by Ψ_n and Λ_n the first and second terms of the numerator in (3.4), respectively. We show that $\Psi_n \leq O(n^{-4k} b^{1-5k/4})$ and then demonstrate that $\Lambda_n = O(n^{1-5k} b^{\frac{1-2k}{2}})$, ensuring that (3.4) holds for $1 < k < 4/3$.² Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_n &\equiv \mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_X^k [H_n(X, X_1)H_n(X, X_2)] \right\} \\ &= 4^k n^{-4k} \mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_X^k \left[\oint \check{r}_n(x, X)\check{r}_n(y, X)\check{r}_n(x, X_1)\check{r}_n(y, X_2) d(x, y) \right] \right\} \\ &= 4^k n^{-4k} \mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2} \left\{ \left[\oint \gamma_n(x, y)\check{r}_n(x, X_1)\check{r}_n(y, X_2) d(x, y) \right]^k \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

² There is no loss of generality in treating k as an integer. For any $k > 1$, there is an integer $k_1 > 1$ such that $k = k_1/k_2$ and, by Jensen's inequality, $\mathbb{E}(Z^k) \leq [\mathbb{E}(Z^{k_1})]^{1/k_2}$ for any nonnegative random variable Z .

Jensen's inequality then ensures that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_n &\leq 4^k n^{-4k} \oint \left[\frac{\gamma_n(x, y)}{f(x)f(y)} \right]^k |\check{r}_n(x, X_1)\check{r}_n(y, X_2)|^k dF(x, y) dF(X_1) dF(X_2) \\ &= 4^k n^{-4k} \oint \left[\frac{\gamma_n(x, y)}{f(x)f(y)} \right]^k \mathbb{E}_X |\check{r}_n(x, X)|^k \mathbb{E}_X |\check{r}_n(y, X)|^k dF(x, y).\end{aligned}$$

However, centering implies that $\mathbb{E}_X |\check{r}_n(u, X)|^k$ is at most of the same order of $\mathbb{E}_X [r_n^k(u, X)] = O\left(B_b^{(k)}(u)\right)$, where

$$B_b^{(k)}(u) = \frac{R^k(u/b)}{R(ku/b)} (2\pi b)^{\frac{1-k}{2}} k^{-1/2} \leq O\left(b^{\frac{1-k}{2}}\right).$$

It thus follows that

$$\Psi_n \leq O\left(n^{-4k} b^{-k/4} \left[B_b^{(k)}(x)\right]^2\right) = O\left(n^{-4k} b^{1-5k/4}\right)$$

in view that $\gamma_n(x, y) = O(b^{-1/4})$. In turn, the second term of the numerator in (3.4) reads

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_n &\equiv n^{1-k} \mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2} [H_n^{2k}(X_1, X_2)] \\ &= 2^{2k} n^{1-5k} \oint \left[\int \check{r}_n(x, X_1)\check{r}_n(x, X_2) dx \right]^{2k} dF(X_1) dF(X_2) \\ &= 2^{2k} n^{1-5k} \oint \prod_{i=1}^{2k} \check{r}_n(x_i, X_1)\check{r}_n(x_i, X_2) dx_i dF(X_1) dF(X_2) \\ &= 2^{2k} n^{1-5k} \oint \mathbb{E}_X^2 \left[\prod_{i=1}^{2k} \check{r}_n(x_i, X) \right] d(x_1, \dots, x_{2k}),\end{aligned}$$

which is of order $O\left(n^{1-5k} b^{\frac{1-2k}{2}}\right)$ by Lemma A.5 in the appendix. The quantity $n b^{1/4} I_n / \sigma_G$ therefore weakly converges to a standard normal distribution, which implies that

$$n b^{1/4} I_n - \frac{b^{-1/4}}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \mathbb{E} \left[x^{-1/2} \varphi(x) \right] \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma_G^2).$$

This proves the main result for the gamma kernel functionals.

4 Beta kernel functionals

In the sequel, we derive in similar fashion the limiting distribution of the beta kernel functional using the decomposition $I_n = I_{1n} + I_{2n} + I_{3n} + I_{4n}$. The

only difference is that $r_n(x, X)$ now represents $\varphi^{1/2}(x)K_{x/b+1, (1-x)/b+1}(X)$ and \int denotes the integral over the unit interval $A = [0, 1]$. Again, the first term stands for a degenerate U-statistic and contributes with the asymptotic variance, whereas the second term provides the asymptotic bias. The third and the fourth terms are, once more, negligible as long as the bandwidth b is of order $o(n^{-4/9})$. As before, this assumption precludes the use of the optimal bandwidth that is of order $O(n^{-2/5})$ as shown in Chen (1999).

To begin, note that $\mathbb{E}_X[r_n(x, X)] = \varphi^{1/2}(x)\mathbb{E}_\zeta[f(\zeta)]$, where ζ has a beta distribution $\mathcal{B}(x/b + 1, (1-x)/b + 1)$. Chen (1999) demonstrates that the beta kernel density estimation has a uniform bias of order $O(b)$, and hence it turns out that $\mathbb{E}_X[r_n(x, X)] = \varphi^{1/2}(x)f(x) + O(b)$.

The second moment of $r_n(x, X)$ reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_X[r_n^2(x, X)] &= \varphi(x) \int K_{x/b+1, (1-x)/b+1}^2(X) f(X) dX \\ &= \varphi(x) A_b(x) \mathbb{E}_\eta[f(\eta)],\end{aligned}$$

where $\eta \sim \mathcal{B}(2x/b + 1, 2(1-x)/b + 1)$ and

$$A_b(x) = \frac{B[2x/b + 1, 2(1-x)/b + 1]}{B^2[x/b + 1, (1-x)/b + 1]}.$$

Chen (1999) shows that $\mathbb{E}_\eta[f(\eta)] = f(x) + O(b)$, thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(I_{2n}) &= \frac{1}{n} \int \mathbb{E}_X[r_n^2(x, X)] dx - \frac{1}{n} \int \mathbb{E}_X^2[r_n(x, X)] dx \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \int \varphi(x) A_b(x) [f(x) + O(b)] dx + O(n^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

For b small enough, Chen (1999) shows that $A_b(x)$ may be approximated according to the location of x within the support. More precisely, x/b and $(1-x)/b$ grows without bound as b shrinks to zero in the interior of the support, whereas either x/b or $(1-x)/b$ converges to some nonnegative constant c in the boundaries. The approximation is such that

$$A_b(x) \sim \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} b^{-1/2} [x(1-x)]^{-1/2} & \text{if } x/b \text{ and } (1-x)/b \rightarrow \infty \\ \frac{\Gamma(2c+1)/b}{2^{2c+1}\Gamma^2(c+1)} & \text{if } x/b \text{ or } (1-x)/b \rightarrow c, \end{cases}$$

which implies that $A_b(x)$ is of larger order near the boundary. As before, there is no impact in $\mathbb{E}(I_{2n})$.

Let $\kappa = b^{1-\epsilon}$, where $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(I_{2n}) &= \frac{1}{n} \int \varphi(x) A_b(x) [f(x) + O(b)] dx + O(n^{-1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \int_0^\kappa + \int_\kappa^{1-\kappa} + \int_{1-\kappa}^1 \varphi(x) A_b(x) [f(x) + O(b)] dx + O(n^{-1}) \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}n} \int_\kappa^{1-\kappa} b^{-1/2} [x(1-x)]^{-1/2} \varphi(x) [f(x) + O(b)] dx \\
&\quad + O(n^{-1}b^{-\epsilon} + n^{-1}) \\
&= \frac{b^{-1/2}}{2\sqrt{\pi}n} \int_0^1 \varphi(x) [x(1-x)]^{-1/2} f(x) dx + o(n^{-1}b^{-1/2})
\end{aligned}$$

as long as ϵ is properly chosen and $\mathbb{E}\{[x(1-x)]^{-1/2}\varphi(x)\}$ is finite. Further, as in the previous section, $V(I_{2n}) = O(n^{-3}b^{-2} + n^{-3}b^{-1})$, which means that $V(nb^{1/4}I_{2n}) = O(n^{-1}b^{-5/2}) = o(1)$. It thus ensues from the Chebyshev's inequality that $nb^{1/4}I_{2n} - \frac{b^{-1/4}}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \mathbb{E}\{[x(1-x)]^{-1/2}\varphi(x)\} = o_p(1)$.

Applying the same techniques as in the previous section, it is straightforward to demonstrate that the third and fourth terms are negligible provided that the bandwidth is of order $o(n^{-4/9})$. It remains to compute the variance of the degenerate U-statistic $I_{1n} = \sum_{i < j} H_n(X_i, X_j)$, viz.

$$\sigma_B^2 = \frac{n^4 b^{1/2}}{2} \mathbb{E}_{X_1, X_2} [H_n^2(X_1, X_2)] = 2b^{1/2} \oint [C_n(x, y) - \bar{C}_n(x, y)]^2 d(x, y),$$

where $\bar{C}_n(x, y) = \varphi^{1/2}(x)\varphi^{1/2}(y)f(x)f(y) + O(b)$ as before. In turn,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_n(x, y) &= \varphi^{1/2}(x)\varphi^{1/2}(y) \int K_{x/b+1, (1-x)/b+1}(X) K_{y/b+1, (1-y)/b+1}(X) dF(X) \\
&= \varphi^{1/2}(x)\varphi^{1/2}(y) A_b(x, y) \int K_{(x+y)/b+1, (1-x-y)/b+1}(X) dF(X) \\
&= \varphi^{1/2}(x)\varphi^{1/2}(y) A_b(x, y) \mathbb{E}_\varsigma[f(\varsigma)],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varsigma \sim \mathcal{B}[(x+y)/b+1, (2-x-y)/b+1]$ and

$$A_b(x, y) = \frac{B[(x+y)/b+1, (1-x-y)/b+1]}{B[x/b+1, (1-x)/b+1] B[y/b+1, (1-y)/b+1]}.$$

Expressing the beta functions in terms of the R -function then yields

$$A_b(x, y) = \bar{A}_b(x, y) [\bar{\Delta}(x, y)]^{\frac{1}{b}},$$

where $\bar{\Delta}(u, v) \equiv \Delta(u, v) \Delta(1-u, 1-v)$ and

$$\bar{A}_b(x, y) = R_b(x, y) D(x, y) \frac{b^{-1/2} x^{-1/4} y^{-1/4}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}$$

with

$$R_b(x, y) = \frac{R(x/b)R(y/b)}{R\left(\frac{x+y}{b}\right)} \frac{R\left(\frac{1-x}{b}\right)R\left(\frac{1-y}{b}\right)}{R\left(\frac{2-x-y}{b}\right)} \frac{R(2/b)}{R^2(1/b)}$$

$$D(x, y) = \left(\frac{x+y}{2x}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{x+y}{2y}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{2-x+y}{2(1-x)}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{2-x+y}{2(1-y)}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_B^2 &= 2b \oint \varphi(x)\varphi(y) A_b^2(x, y) \mathbb{E}_\zeta[f(\zeta)] d(x, y) + O(b) \\ &= 2b \oint \varphi(x)\varphi(y) \left\{ \bar{A}_b(x, y) [\bar{\Delta}(x, y)]^{\frac{1}{b}} f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \right\}^2 d(x, y) + O(b) \end{aligned}$$

by Taylor expanding $\mathbb{E}_\zeta[f(\zeta)]$. However, the term $\bar{\Delta}(x, y)$ works similarly to the term $\Delta(x, y)$ in Lemma A.4, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_B^2 &= 2\sqrt{2\pi} b \int \varphi^2(x) \bar{A}_b^2(x, x) [x(1-x)]^{1/2} f(x) dF(x) \{1 + o(1)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int \varphi^2(x) [x(1-x)]^{-1/2} f(x) dF(x) \{1 + o(1)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \varphi^2(x) [x(1-x)]^{-1/2} f(x) \right\} \{1 + o(1)\} \end{aligned}$$

for b small enough. Applying then Koroljuk and Borovskich's (1994) central limit theorem for degenerate U-statistics gives way to

$$n b^{1/4} I_n - \frac{b^{-1/4}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \mathbb{E} \left\{ [x(1-x)]^{-1/2} \varphi(x) \right\} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \sigma_B^2),$$

which completes the proof.³

³ To demonstrate that condition (3.4) holds, it suffices to apply the same technique as before. The only difference is that, instead of $B_b^{(k)}(\cdot)$, there will be an analogous residual term, say $A_b^{(k)}(\cdot)$, stemming from the extraction of a unique beta density out of the product of k beta kernels.

References

- Aït-Sahalia, Y., Bickel, P. J. and Stoker, T. M. (2001). Goodness-of-fit tests for kernel regression with an application to option-implied volatilities, *Journal of Econometrics* **105**: 363–412.
- Bickel, P. J. and Rosenblatt, M. (1973). On some global measures of the deviations of density function estimates, *Annals of Statistics* **1**: 1071–1095.
- Brown, B. M. and Chen, S. X. (1999). Beta-Bernstein smoothing for regression curves with compact support, *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **26**: 47–59.
- Chen, S. X. (1999). Beta kernel estimators for density functions, *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* **31**: 131–145.
- Chen, S. X. (2000). Probability density function estimation using gamma kernels, *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **52**: 471–480.
- Fernandes, M. and Grammig, J. (2004). Nonparametric specification tests for conditional duration models, *Journal of Econometrics*. Forthcoming.
- Hall, P. (1984). Central limit theorem for integrated squared error multivariate nonparametric density estimators, *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **14**: 1–16.
- Härdle, W. and Mammen, E. (1993). Comparing nonparametric vs. parametric regression fits, *Annals of Statistics* **21**: 1926–1947.
- Koroljuk, V. S. and Borovskich, Y. V. (1994). *Theory of U-statistics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Müller, H.-G. (1984). Smooth optimum kernel estimators of densities, regression curves and modes, *Annals of Statistics* **12**: 766–774.

Appendix

Derivation of (3.3) Because $V(I_{2n})$ is at most of the same order of $\mathbb{E}(I_{2n}^2)$, it suffices to compute the order of the latter. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(I_{2n}^2) &= \frac{1}{n^3} \mathbb{E}_X \left[\int \check{r}_n^2(x, X) dx \right]^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n^3} \mathbb{E}_X \oint \check{r}_n^2(x, X) \check{r}_n^2(y, X) d(x, y) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^3} \oint \mathbb{E}_X [r_n^2(x, X) r_n^2(y, X)] d(x, y) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n^3} \oint \mathbb{E}_X [r_n^2(x, X)] \mathbb{E}_X^2 [r_n(y, X)] d(x, y) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n^3} \oint \mathbb{E}_X [r_n^2(y, X)] \mathbb{E}_X^2 [r_n(x, X)] d(x, y) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n^3} \oint \mathbb{E}_X^2 [r_n(x, X)] \mathbb{E}_X^2 [r_n(y, X)] d(x, y).
\end{aligned}$$

It is readily seen that the second and third terms are of order $O(n^{-3}b^{-1/2})$, whereas the fourth term is $O(n^{-3})$. It then remains to show that the first term is of order $O(n^{-3}b^{-2})$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Upsilon_n &= \mathbb{E}_X \left[\oint r_n^2(x, X) r_n^2(y, X) d(x, y) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_X \left[\oint \varphi(x) \varphi(y) K_{x/b+1, b}^2(X) K_{y/b+1, b}^2(X) d(x, y) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_X \left[\oint \varphi(x) \varphi(y) B_b(x) B_b(y) K_{2x/b+1, b/2}(X) K_{2y/b+1, b/2}(X) d(x, y) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_X \left[\oint \varphi(x) \varphi(y) B_b(x) B_b(y) B_{b/2}(x, y) K_{2(x+y)/b+1, b/4}(X) d(x, y) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\Upsilon_n = \oint \varphi(x) \varphi(y) B_b(x) B_b(y) B_{b/2}(x, y) \mathbb{E}_\omega [f(\omega)] d(x, y),$$

where $\omega \sim \mathcal{G}(2(x+y)/b+1, b/4)$. Applying a Taylor expansion results in $\mathbb{E}_\omega [f(\omega)] = f\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) + O(b) = O(1)$, whereas rewriting $B_b(\cdot)$ in terms of the R -function yields

$$B_b(u) = \frac{R^2(u/b)}{R(2u/b)} \frac{u^{-1/2} b^{-1/2}}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \leq \frac{u^{-1/2} b^{-1/2}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}.$$

Similarly, one obtains

$$B_{b/2}(x, y) = \frac{R\left(\frac{2x}{b}\right) R\left(\frac{2y}{b}\right)}{R\left(\frac{2(x+y)}{b}\right)} \left(\frac{x+y}{2x}\right)^{\frac{2x}{b} + \frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{x+y}{2y}\right)^{\frac{2y}{b} + \frac{1}{4}} \frac{b^{-1/2} x^{-1/4} y^{-1/4}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

Because $R(\cdot)$ is a monotonic increasing function that never exceeds one (Brown and Chen, 1999, Lemma 3) and $\Delta(x, y) \leq 1$, it then follows that

$$B_{b/2}(x, y) \leq \left(\frac{x+y}{2x}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{x+y}{2y}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \frac{b^{-1/2}x^{-1/4}y^{-1/4}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = \left(\frac{x+y}{xy}\right)^{1/2} \frac{b^{-1/2}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}.$$

Because both x and y are at most of order $O(b^{1-\varepsilon})$, where $\varepsilon > 0$, the first term is at most of order $O(b^{\varepsilon/2-1/2})$. It then follows that $B_{b/2}(x, y) \leq O(b^{-1})$, which implies that Υ_n is at most of order $O(b^{-2})$, completing the proof.

Lemma A.1 If $y \geq x$, then $\bar{\Delta}(y) \equiv \log \Delta(x, y) \geq -\frac{1}{4x}(y-x)^2$.

Proof The argument relies on the third-order Taylor series expansion of $\bar{\Delta}(y) = (x+y)\log(x+y) - (x+y)\log 2 - x\log x - y\log y$ around x . It follows from $\bar{\Delta}'(y) = \log(x+y) - \log 2 - \log y$, $\bar{\Delta}''(y) = (x+y)^{-1} - y^{-1} < 0$ and $\bar{\Delta}'''(y) = -(x+y)^{-2} + y^{-2} > 0$ that $\bar{\Delta}(x) = \bar{\Delta}'(x) = 0$, $\bar{\Delta}''(x) = -1/(2x)$ and $\bar{\Delta}'''(x) = 3/(4x^2)$. It thus holds that, for $x \leq x^* \leq y$,

$$\bar{\Delta}(y) = -\frac{(y-x)^2}{4x} + \frac{(y-x)^3}{6} \bar{\Delta}'''(x^*).$$

The result then immediately follows from the fact that $\bar{\Delta}'''(\cdot) \geq 0$. ■

Lemma A.2 If $t > 0$, then $\bar{\Delta}(y) \geq \frac{1}{8x^2}(y-x)^2(y-x)$ for $x(1-t) \leq y \leq x$.

Proof As before, the following Taylor expansion holds

$$\bar{\Delta}(y) = -\frac{(y-x)^2}{4x} + \frac{(y-x)^3}{6} \bar{\Delta}'''(x^*),$$

where $x \leq x^* \leq x(1-t)$. As $\bar{\Delta}'''$ is a decreasing function, $\bar{\Delta}'''(x^*) \leq \bar{\Delta}'''(x)$ and thus $\bar{\Delta}'''(x^*)(y-x)^3 \geq \bar{\Delta}'''(x)(y-x)^3$ for $y \leq x$. It then ensues that

$$\bar{\Delta}(y) \geq -\frac{(y-x)^2}{4x} + \frac{(y-x)^3}{8x^2} = \frac{(y-x)^2(y-x)}{8x^2},$$

completing the proof. ■

Lemma A.3 For every y , $\bar{\Delta}(y) \leq \frac{1}{8x^2}(y-x)^2(y-x)$.

Proof In view that $\bar{\Delta}'''(y) = 2(x+y)^{-3} - 2y^{-3} < 0$, the result readily follows from the fourth-order Taylor expansion

$$\bar{\Delta}(y) = -\frac{(y-x)^2}{4x} + \frac{(y-x)^2(y-x)}{8x^2} + \bar{\Delta}''''(x^*) \frac{(y-x)^4}{24},$$

where x^* lies in the interval between x and y . ■

Lemma A.4 Let $\ell(b) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \Delta^{2/b}(x, y) g(x, y) d(x, y)$ with Δ as in (3.7) and $\tilde{g}(y) = \int_0^\infty g(x, y) dx$ such that $|\tilde{g}|_\infty$ exists. It then holds that $\ell(b) = (2\pi b)^{1/2} \int_0^\infty x^{1/2} g(x, x) dx$.

Proof Let $0 < t < 1$, then

$$\ell(b) \geq \int_0^\infty \int_x^\infty \Delta^{2/b}(x, y) g(x, y) dy dx + \int_0^\infty \int_{x(1-t)}^x \Delta^{2/b}(x, y) g(x, y) dy dx.$$

Applying Lemmas A.1 and A.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(b) &\geq \int_0^\infty \int_x^\infty \exp\left[-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2xb}\right] g(x, y) dy dx \\ &\quad + \int_0^\infty \int_{x(1-t)}^x \exp\left[-\frac{(y-x)^2(y-3x)}{4x^2b}\right] g(x, y) dy dx \\ &\geq \int_0^\infty \int_x^\infty \exp\left[-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2xb}\right] g(x, y) dy dx \\ &\quad + \int_0^\infty \int_{x(1-t)}^x \exp\left[-\frac{(y-x)^2(t+2)}{4xb}\right] g(x, y) dy dx. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $z = (2xb)^{-1/2}(y-x)$ results in

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \int_x^\infty \exp\left[-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2xb}\right] g(x, y) dy dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty (2xb)^{1/2} \int_0^\infty \exp(-z^2) g\left(x, x + z(2xb)^{1/2}\right) dz dx, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\liminf_{b \rightarrow 0} b^{-1/2} \int_0^\infty \int_x^\infty \exp\left[-\frac{(y-x)^2}{2xb}\right] g(x, y) dy dx \\ &\geq \int_0^\infty \sqrt{2x} \int_0^\infty \exp(-z^2) g(x, x) dz dx \\ &= \sqrt{\pi/2} \int_0^\infty x^{1/2} g(x, x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Letting now $w = (4xb)^{-1/2}(t+2)^{1/2}(y-x)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \int_{x(1-t)}^x \exp\left[-\frac{(y-x)^2(t+2)}{4xb}\right] g(x, y) dy dx \\ &= \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\frac{4xb}{t+2}} \int_{-xt\sqrt{\frac{t+2}{4xb}}}^0 \exp(-w^2) g\left(x, x + w\sqrt{\frac{4xb}{t+2}}\right) dw dx, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \liminf_{b \rightarrow 0} b^{-1/2} \int_0^\infty \int_{x(1-t)}^x \exp \left[-\frac{(y-x)^2(t+2)}{4xb} \right] g(x, y) \, dy \, dx \\
& \geq \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\frac{4x}{t+2}} \int_{-\infty}^0 \exp(-w^2) g(x, x) \, dw \, dx \\
& = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\frac{4x}{t+2}} g(x, x) \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

It then suffices to let t shrink to zero to appreciate that

$$\liminf_{b \rightarrow 0} b^{-1/2} \ell(b) \geq \sqrt{\pi/2} \int_0^\infty x^{1/2} g(x, x) \, dx.$$

On the other hand, for $t > 0$, one may write

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell(b) &= \int_0^\infty \int_{x(t+1)}^\infty \Delta^{2/b}(x, y) g(x, y) \, dy \, dx \\
&\quad + \int_0^\infty \int_0^{x(t+1)} \Delta^{2/b}(x, y) g(x, y) \, dy \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

However, for every $y \geq x(t+1)$,

$$\bar{\Delta}(y) \leq \bar{\Delta}(x(t+1)) = x \log \frac{(t+2)^{t+2}}{2^{t+2}(t+1)^{t+1}},$$

so that $\Delta(x, y) \leq a_t^x$, where $a_t \equiv \frac{(t+2)^{t+2}}{2^{t+2}(t+1)^{t+1}} < 1$. The following inequalities then hold

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\infty \int_{x(t+1)}^\infty \Delta^{2/b}(x, y) g(x, y) \, dy \, dx &\leq \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty a_t^{2x/b} g(x, y) \, dy \, dx \\
&\leq |\tilde{g}|_\infty \int_0^\infty a_t^{2x/b} \, dx = -\frac{b|\tilde{g}|_\infty}{2 \log a_t},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{g}(x) \equiv \int g(x, y) \, dy$. It also follows from Lemma A.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\infty \int_0^{x(t+1)} \Delta^{2/b}(x, y) g(x, y) \, dy \, dx \\
& \leq \int_0^\infty \int_0^{x(t+1)} \exp \left[-\frac{(y-x)^2(y-3x)}{4x^2b} \right] g(x, y) \, dy \, dx \\
& \leq \int_0^\infty \int_0^{x(t+1)} \exp \left[-\frac{(y-x)^2(2-t)}{4xb} \right] g(x, y) \, dy \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\omega = (4xb)^{-1/2} (2-t)^{1/2} (y-x)$ results in

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^\infty \int_0^{x(t+1)} \Delta^{2/b}(x, y) g(x, y) \, dy \, dx \\
& \leq \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\frac{4xb}{2-t}} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \exp(-\omega^2) g \left(x, x + \omega \sqrt{\frac{4xb}{2-t}} \right) \, d\omega \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

It now suffices to assume that $x^{1/2} g(x, y) \leq x^{1/2} \bar{g}(x) \in L^1$ for every $y \geq x$ to ensure that

$$b^{-1/2} \ell(b) \leq \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\frac{4x}{2-t}} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \exp(-\omega^2) g\left(x, x + \omega \sqrt{\frac{4xb}{2-t}}\right) d\omega dx + o(\sqrt{b})$$

and hence

$$\limsup_{b \rightarrow 0} b^{-1/2} \ell(b) \leq \sqrt{\pi} \int_0^\infty \sqrt{\frac{4x}{2-t}} g(x, x) dx,$$

which yields the desired result for $t \rightarrow 0$. ■

Lemma A.5 Let $x_{(m)} = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$, $s_m = \sum_{j=1}^m x_j$ and

$$\Delta_m(x_{(m)}) = \frac{(s_{m-1} + x_m)^{s_{m-1} + x_m}}{m^{s_{m-1} + x_m} \prod_{i=1}^m x_i^{x_i}}.$$

Suppose that

$$g(x_{(m)}) = f^2(s_m/m) s_m \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{\varphi(x_i)}{x_i}$$

is bounded and there exists $h(x_1) \in L^1$ such that $g(x_{(m)}) \leq h(x_1)$ if $x_i \geq x_1$ for every $i \geq 2$. It then follows that $\oint \Delta_m^{1/b}(x_{(m)}) g(x_{(m)}) dx_{(m)} = O\left(b^{\frac{m-1}{2}}\right)$.

Proof Let $\ell_m(b) = \oint \Delta_m^{1/b}(x_{(m)}) g(x_{(m)}) dx_{(m)}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} G_m(\alpha) &= \log \Delta_m(x_{(m-1)}, \alpha) \\ &= (s_{m-1} + \alpha) \log \left(\frac{s_{m-1} + \alpha}{m} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i \log x_i - \alpha \log \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating $G_m(\alpha)$ with respect to α then gives way to

$$\begin{aligned} G'_m(\alpha) &= \log \left(\frac{s_{m-1} + \alpha}{m} \right) - \log \alpha \\ G''_m(\alpha) &= \frac{1}{s_{m-1} + \alpha} - \frac{1}{\alpha} = -\frac{s_{m-1}}{\alpha(s_{m-1} + \alpha)} < 0 \\ G'''_m(\alpha) &= -\frac{1}{(s_{m-1} + \alpha)^2} + \frac{1}{\alpha^2} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

whereas $G'''_m(\alpha) < 0$. Evaluating at $\alpha = \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}$ then yields

$$\begin{aligned} G_m \left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1} \right) &= s_{m-1} \log \left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i \log x_i \\ G'_m \left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1} \right) &= 0 \\ G''_m \left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1} \right) &= -\frac{(m-1)^2}{m s_{m-1}} \\ G'''_m \left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1} \right) &= -\left(\frac{m-1}{m s_{m-1}} \right)^2 + \left[\frac{m(m-1)}{m s_{m-1}} \right]^2 = \frac{(m-1)^2 (m^2 - 1)}{m^2 s_{m-1}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma A.4, we let $0 < t < 1$ and decompose the integral in $\ell_m(b)$ into the sum of the integral over $x_m \geq s_{m-1}^* \equiv (1+t)s_{m-1}/(m-1)$ and the integral over $x_m \leq s_{m-1}^*$. In the first case, the fact that $x_m \geq s_{m-1}^*$ and $G'(s_{m-1}^*) \leq G'\left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right) = 0$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
G_m(x_m) &\leq G_m(s_{m-1}^*) \\
&= (s_{m-1} + s_{m-1}^*) \log\left(\frac{s_{m-1} + s_{m-1}^*}{m}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i \log x_i \\
&\quad - s_{m-1}^* \log s_{m-1}^* \\
&= \frac{s_{m-1}(m+t)}{m-1} \log\left[\frac{s_{m-1}(m+t)}{m(m-1)}\right] - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} x_i \log x_i \\
&\quad - \frac{s_{m-1}(1+t)}{m-1} \log\left[\frac{s_{m-1}(1+t)}{m-1}\right] \\
&\leq \frac{s_{m-1}(m+t)}{m-1} \log\left[\frac{s_{m-1}(m+t)}{m(m-1)}\right] - s_{m-1} \log\left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right) \\
&\quad - \frac{s_{m-1}(1+t)}{m-1} \log\left[\frac{s_{m-1}(1+t)}{m-1}\right] \\
&= \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1} \log\left\{\frac{[(m+t)/m]^{m+t}}{(1+t)^{1+t}}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting a_t denote the term within curled brackets and

$$\tilde{g}(x_{(m-1)}) = \int g(x_{(m-1)}, x_m) dx_m$$

then yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\oint_{x_m \geq s_{m-1}^*} \Delta_m^{1/b}(x_{(m)}) g(x_{(m)}) dx_{(m)} \\
&\leq \oint_{x_m \geq s_{m-1}^*} a_t^{\frac{s_{m-1}}{b(m-1)}} g(x_{(m)}) dx_{(m)} \leq \oint a_t^{\frac{s_{m-1}}{b(m-1)}} \tilde{g}(x_{(m-1)}) dx_{(m-1)} \\
&\leq |\tilde{g}|_\infty \oint a_t^{\frac{s_{m-1}}{b(m-1)}} dx_{(m-1)} = |\tilde{g}|_\infty \left\{ \int a_t^{\frac{x_1}{b(m-1)}} dx_1 \right\}^{m-1} \\
&= |\tilde{g}|_\infty \left(\frac{m-1}{\log a_t}\right)^{m-1} b^{m-1} = O(b^{m-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

As for the integral over $x_m \leq s_{(m-1)}^*$, we first observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
G_m(\alpha) &= G_m\left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right) - \frac{1}{2!} \frac{(m-1)^2}{m s_{m-1}} \left(\alpha - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3!} \frac{(m-1)^2 (m^2-1)}{m^2 s_{m-1}^2} \left(\alpha - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right)^3 + \frac{1}{4!} G''''(\xi) \left(\alpha - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right)^4
\end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha \leq \xi \leq s_{(m-1)}^*$. It follows from $G''''(\xi) < 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} G_m(\alpha) &\leq G_m\left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(m-1)^2}{m s_{m-1}} \left(\alpha - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right)^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6} \frac{(m-1)^2 (m^2-1)}{m^2 s_{m-1}^2} \left(\alpha - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right)^3 \\ &= G_m\left(\frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\alpha - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right)^2 \frac{(m-1)^2}{m s_{m-1}} \\ &\quad \times \left[1 - \frac{m^2-1}{3m s_{m-1}} \left(\alpha - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

However, $x_m \leq s_{(m-1)}^*$ implies that $x_m - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1} \leq \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1} t$, and hence

$$1 - \frac{m^2-1}{3m s_{m-1}} \left(x_m - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{m+1}{3m} t.$$

Now, because

$$\Delta_m^{1/b}(x_m) \leq \Delta_{m-1}^{1/b}(x_{(m-1)}) \exp \left[-\frac{1}{b} \left(x_m - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right)^2 \frac{(m-1)^2}{2m s_{m-1}} \left(1 - \frac{m+1}{3m} t\right) \right]$$

for $x_m \leq s_{m-1}^*$, changing variables to $z_m = b^{-1/2} \left(x_m - \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1}\right)$ results in

$$\begin{aligned} &\oint_{x_m \leq s_{m-1}^*} \Delta_m^{1/b}(x_m) g(x_m) dx_m \\ &\leq b^{1/2} \oint \Delta_{m-1}^{1/b}(x_{(m-1)}) \left\{ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp \left[-z_m^2 \frac{(m-1)^2}{2m s_{m-1}} \left(1 - \frac{m+1}{3m} t\right) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times g \left(x_{(m-1)}, \frac{s_{m-1}}{m-1} + z_m b^{1/2}\right) dz_m \right\} dx_{(m-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof, it suffices to proceed by induction so as to conclude that $\ell_m(b)$ is at most of order $O\left(b^{\frac{m-1}{2}}\right)$.

ENSAIOS ECONÔMICOS DA EPGE

473. A GENERALIZATION OF JUDD'S METHOD OF OUT-STEADY-STATE COMPARISONS IN PERFECT FORESIGHT MODELS - Paulo Barelli; Samuel de Abreu Pessoa – Fevereiro de 2003 – 7 págs.
474. AS LEIS DA FALÊNCIA: UMA ABORDAGEM ECONÔMICA - Aloísio Pessoa de Araújo – Fevereiro de 2003 – 25 págs.
475. THE LONG-RUN ECONOMIC IMPACT OF AIDS - Pedro Cavalcanti G. Ferreira; Samuel de Abreu Pessoa – Fevereiro de 2003 – 30 págs.
476. A MONETARY MECHANISM FOR SHARING CAPITAL: DIAMOND AND DYBVIIG MEET KIYOTAKI AND WRIGHT – Ricardo de O. Cavalcanti – Fevereiro de 2003 – 16 págs.
477. INADAPTED CONDITIONS IMPLY THAT PRODUCTION FUNCTION MUST BE ASYMPTOTICALLY COBB-DOUGLAS - Paulo Barelli; Samuel de Abreu Pessoa – Março de 2003 – 4 págs.
478. TEMPORAL AGGREGATION AND BANDWIDTH SELECTION IN ESTIMATING LONG MEMORY - Leonardo R. Souza - Março de 2003 – 19 págs.
479. A NOTE ON COLE AND STOCKMAN - Paulo Barelli; Samuel de Abreu Pessoa – Abril de 2003 – 8 págs.
480. A HIPÓTESE DAS EXPECTATIVAS NA ESTRUTURA A TERMO DE JUROS NO BRASIL: UMA APLICAÇÃO DE MODELOS DE VALOR PRESENTE - Alexandre Maia Correia Lima; João Victor Issler – Maio de 2003 – 30 págs.
481. ON THE WELFARE COSTS OF BUSINESS CYCLES IN THE 20TH CENTURY - João Victor Issler; Afonso Arinos de Mello Franco; Osmani Teixeira de Carvalho Guillén – Maio de 2003 – 29 págs.
482. RETORNOS ANORMAIS E ESTRATÉGIAS CONTRÁRIAS - Marco Antonio Bonomo; Ivana Dall'Agnol – Junho de 2003 – 27 págs.
483. EVOLUÇÃO DA PRODUTIVIDADE TOTAL DOS FATORES NA ECONOMIA BRASILEIRA: UMA ANÁLISE COMPARATIVA - Victor Gomes; Samuel de Abreu Pessoa; Fernando A. Veloso – Junho de 2003 – 45 págs.
484. MIGRAÇÃO, SELEÇÃO E DIFERENÇAS REGIONAIS DE RENDA NO BRASIL - Enestor da Rosa dos Santos Junior; Naércio Menezes Filho; Pedro Cavalcanti Ferreira – Junho de 2003 – 23 págs.
485. THE RISK PREMIUM ON BRAZILIAN GOVERNMENT DEBT, 1996-2002 - André Soares Loureiro; Fernando de Holanda Barbosa - Junho de 2003 – 16 págs.
486. FORECASTING ELECTRICITY DEMAND USING GENERALIZED LONG MEMORY - Lacir Jorge Soares; Leonardo Rocha Souza – Junho de 2003 – 22 págs.
487. USING IRREGULARLY SPACED RETURNS TO ESTIMATE MULTI-FACTOR MODELS: APPLICATION TO BRAZILIAN EQUITY DATA - Álvaro Veiga; Leonardo Rocha Souza – Junho de 2003 – 26 págs.

488. BOUNDS FOR THE PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION FUNCTION OF THE LINEAR ACD PROCESS – Marcelo Fernandes – Julho de 2003 – 10 págs.
489. CONVEX COMBINATIONS OF LONG MEMORY ESTIMATES FROM DIFFERENT SAMPLING RATES - Leonardo R. Souza; Jeremy Smith; Reinaldo C. Souza – Julho de 2003 – 20 págs.
490. IDADE, INCAPACIDADE E A INFLAÇÃO DO NÚMERO DE PESSOAS COM DEFICIÊNCIA - Marcelo Neri ; Wagner Soares – Julho de 2003 – 54 págs.
491. FORECASTING ELECTRICITY LOAD DEMAND: ANALYSIS OF THE 2001 RATIONING PERIOD IN BRAZIL - Leonardo Rocha Souza; Lacir Jorge Soares – Julho de 2003 – 27 págs.
492. THE MISSING LINK: USING THE NBER RECESSION INDICATOR TO CONSTRUCT COINCIDENT AND LEADING INDICES OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY - JoãoVictor Issler; Farshid Vahid – Agosto de 2003 – 26 págs.
493. REAL EXCHANGE RATE MISALIGNMENTS - Maria Cristina T. Terra; Frederico Estrella Carneiro Valladares – Agosto de 2003 – 26 págs.
494. ELASTICITY OF SUBSTITUTION BETWEEN CAPITAL AND LABOR: A PANEL DATA APPROACH - Samuel de Abreu Pessoa ; Silvia Matos Pessoa; Rafael Rob – Agosto de 2003 – 30 págs.
495. A EXPERIÊNCIA DE CRESCIMENTO DAS ECONOMIAS DE MERCADO NOS ÚLTIMOS 40 ANOS – Samuel de Abreu Pessoa – Agosto de 2003 – 22 págs.
496. NORMALITY UNDER UNCERTAINTY – Carlos Eugênio E. da Costa – Setembro de 2003 – 08 págs.
497. RISK SHARING AND THE HOUSEHOLD COLLECTIVE MODEL - Carlos Eugênio E. da Costa – Setembro de 2003 – 15 págs.
498. REDISTRIBUTION WITH UNOBSERVED 'EX-ANTE' CHOICES - Carlos Eugênio E. da Costa – Setembro de 2003 – 30 págs.
499. OPTIMAL TAXATION WITH GRADUAL LEARNING OF TYPES - Carlos Eugênio E. da Costa – Setembro de 2003 – 26 págs.
500. AVALIANDO PESQUISADORES E DEPARTAMENTOS DE ECONOMIA NO BRASIL A PARTIR DE CITAÇÕES INTERNACIONAIS - João Victor Issler; Rachel Couto Ferreira – Setembro de 2003 – 29 págs.
501. A FAMILY OF AUTOREGRESSIVE CONDITIONAL DURATION MODELS - Marcelo Fernandes; Joachim Grammig – Setembro de 2003 – 37 págs.
502. NONPARAMETRIC SPECIFICATION TESTS FOR CONDITIONAL DURATION MODELS - Marcelo Fernandes; Joachim Grammig – Setembro de 2003 – 42 págs.
503. A NOTE ON CHAMBERS'S "LONG MEMORY AND AGGREGATION IN MACROECONOMIC TIME SERIES" – Leonardo Rocha Souza – Setembro de 2003 – 11 págs.
504. ON CHOICE OF TECHNIQUE IN THE ROBINSON-SOLOW-SRINIVASAN MODEL - M. Ali Khan – Setembro de 2003 – 34 págs.

505. ENDOGENOUS TIME-DEPENDENT RULES AND THE COSTS OF DISINFLATION WITH IMPERFECT CREDIBILITY - Marco Bonomo; Carlos Viana de Carvalho – Outubro de 2003 – 27 págs.
506. CAPITAIS INTERNACIONAIS: COMPLEMENTARES OU SUBSTITUTOS? - Carlos Hamilton V. Araújo; Renato G. Flôres Jr. – Outubro de 2003 – 24 págs.
507. TESTING PRODUCTION FUNCTIONS USED IN EMPIRICAL GROWTH STUDIES - Pedro Cavalcanti Ferreira; João Victor Issler; Samuel de Abreu Pessoa – Outubro de 2003 – 8 págs.
508. SHOULD EDUCATIONAL POLICIES BE REGRESSIVE ? Daniel Gottlieb; Humberto Moreira – Outubro de 2003 – 25 págs.
509. TRADE AND CO-OPERATION IN THE EU-MERCOSUL FREE TRADE AGREEMENT - Renato G. Flôres Jr. – Outubro de 2003 – 33 págs.
510. OUTPUT CONVERGENCE IN MERCOSUR: MULTIVARIATE TIME SERIES EVIDENCE - Mariam Camarero; Renato G. Flôres Jr; Cecílio Tamarit – Outubro de 2003 – 36 págs.
511. ENDOGENOUS COLLATERAL - Aloísio Araújo; José Fajardo Barbachan; Mario R. Páscoa – Novembro de 2003 – 37 págs.
512. NON-MONOTONE INSURANCE CONTRACTS AND THEIR EMPIRICAL CONSEQUENCES - Aloísio Araujo; Humberto Moreira – Novembro de 2003 – 31 págs.
513. EQUILIBRIA IN SECURITY MARKETS WITH A CONTINUUM OF AGENTS - A. Araujo; V. F. Martins da Rocha; P. K. Monteiro – Novembro de 2003 – 17 págs.
514. SPECULATIVE ATTACKS ON DEBTS AND OPTIMUM CURRENCY AREA: A WELFARE ANALYSIS - Aloisio Araujo; Márcia Leon – Novembro de 2003 – 50 págs.
515. O MÉTODO GENERALIZADO DOS MOMENTOS(MGM): CONCEITOS BÁSICOS - Renato G. Flôres Jr – Novembro de 2003 – 27 págs.
516. VARIÁVEIS INSTRUMENTAIS E O MGM: USO DE MOMENTOS CONDICIONAIS - Renato G. Flôres Jr – Novembro de 2003 – 27 págs.
517. O VALOR DA MOEDA E A TEORIA DOS PREÇOS DOS ATIVOS - Fernando de Holanda Barbosa – Dezembro de 2003 – 17 págs.
518. EMPRESÁRIOS NÁNICOS, GARANTIAS E ACESSO À CRÉDITO - Marcelo Côrtes Néri; Fabiano da Silva Giovanini - Dezembro de 2003 – 23 págs.
519. DESENHO DE UM SISTEMA DE METAS SOCIAIS - Marcelo Côrtes Néri; Marcelo Xerez - Dezembro de 2003 – 24 págs.
520. A NEW INCIDENCE ANALYSIS OF BRAZILIAN SOCIAL POLICIES USING MULTIPLE DATA SOURCES - Marcelo Côrtes Néri - Dezembro de 2003 – 55 págs.
521. AN INTRA-HOUSEHOLD APPROACH TO THE WELFARE COSTS OF INFLATION - Rubens Penha Cysne – Janeiro de 2004 – 16 págs.
522. CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM FOR ASYMMETRIC KERNEL FUNCTIONALS - Marcelo Fernandes; Paulo Klinger Monteiro – Fevereiro de 2004 – 23 págs.