

# An exact bound on the truncated-tilted mean for symmetric distributions

Iosif Pinelis

*Department of Mathematical Sciences  
Michigan Technological University  
Houghton, Michigan 49931, USA  
E-mail: [ipinelis@mtu.edu](mailto:ipinelis@mtu.edu)*

**Abstract:** An exact upper bound on the Winsorised-tilted mean,  $\frac{\mathbb{E} X e^{h(X \wedge w)}}{\mathbb{E} e^{h(X \wedge w)}}$ , of a symmetric random variable  $X$  in terms of its second moment is given. Such results are used in work on nonuniform Berry–Esseen-type bounds for general nonlinear statistics.

**AMS 2010 subject classifications:** Primary 60E15; secondary 60E10, 60F05.

**Keywords and phrases:** exact upper bounds, Winsorization, truncation, nonuniform Berry–Esseen bounds, Cramér tilt transform, symmetric distributions.

Cramér’s tilt transform of a random variable (r.v.)  $X$  is a r.v.  $X_h$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} f(X_h) = \frac{\mathbb{E} f(X) e^{hX}}{\mathbb{E} e^{hX}}$$

for all nonnegative Borel functions  $f$ , where  $h$  is a real parameter. This transform is an important tool in the theory of large deviation probabilities  $\mathbb{P}(X > x)$ , where  $x > 0$  is a large number; then the appropriate value of the parameter  $h$  is positive. Unfortunately, if the right tail of the distribution of  $X$  decreases slower than exponentially, then  $\mathbb{E} e^{hX} = \infty$  for all  $h > 0$  and thus the tilt transform is not applicable. The usual recourse then is to replace  $X$  in the exponent by its truncated counterpart, say  $X \mathbb{I}\{X \leq w\}$  or  $X \wedge w$ , where  $w$  is a real number. As shown in [2, 4], of the two mentioned kinds of truncation, it is the so-called Winsorization,  $X \wedge w$ , of the r.v.  $X$  that is more useful in the applications considered there.

In particular, in [4] one needs a good upper bound on the mean

$$\mathbb{E}_{h,w} X := \frac{\mathbb{E} X e^{h(X \wedge w)}}{\mathbb{E} e^{h(X \wedge w)}}. \quad (1)$$

of the Winsorised-tilted distribution of  $X$ . Note that  $\mathbb{E}_{h,w} X$  is well defined and finite for any  $h \in (0, \infty)$ , any  $w \in \mathbb{R}$ , and any r.v.  $X$  such that  $\mathbb{E}(0 \vee X) < \infty$ .

In [2], exact upper bounds on the denominator  $\mathbb{E} e^{h(X \wedge w)}$  of the ratio in (1) were provided, along with applications to pricing of certain financial derivatives.

Take any positive real numbers  $h$  and  $w$ . In [1], exact upper bounds on  $\mathbf{E}_{h,w} X$  given the first two moments of  $X$ . In particular, by [1, Theorem 2.4(II)],

$$\mathbf{E}_{h,w} X < \frac{e^{hw} - 1}{w} \mathbf{E} X^2 \quad (2)$$

for any real-valued r.v. with  $\mathbf{E} X = 0$  and  $\mathbf{E} X^2 \in (0, \infty)$ ; it is also shown in [1] that the factor  $\frac{e^{hw}-1}{w}$  in (2) is the best possible one.

The purpose of this note is to show that in the case when (the distribution of)  $X$  is symmetric, the factor  $\frac{e^{hw}-1}{w}$  in (2) can be improved to  $\frac{\text{sh } hw}{w}$ ; we write  $\text{sh}$  and  $\text{ch}$  in place of  $\sinh$  and  $\cosh$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $X$  be any symmetric real-valued r.v. with  $\mathbf{E} X^2 \in (0, \infty)$ . Then*

$$0 < \mathbf{E}_{h,w} X < \frac{\text{sh } hw}{w} \mathbf{E} X^2. \quad (3)$$

*Remark 2.* The factor  $\frac{\text{sh } hw}{w}$  in (3) is the best possible one. More specifically,

$$\lim_{\sigma \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sup \left\{ \mathbf{E}_{h,w} X : \mathbf{E} X^2 = \sigma^2, X \text{ is symmetric} \right\} = \frac{\text{sh } hw}{w}.$$

In view of Theorem 1, this follows if we let  $X$  take values  $-w$ ,  $0$ , and  $w$  with probabilities  $\frac{\sigma^2}{2w^2}$ ,  $1 - \frac{\sigma^2}{w^2}$ , and  $\frac{\sigma^2}{2w^2}$ , respectively, for  $\sigma \in (0, w)$ , and then let  $\sigma \downarrow 0$ . Note here that the case of interest in applications in [4] is precisely when  $\mathbf{E} X^2$  is arbitrarily small. Also, in those applications  $hw$  may be rather large, and then the symmetric-case factor  $\frac{\text{sh } hw}{w}$  will be almost twice as small as the general zero-mean-case factor  $\frac{e^{hw}-1}{w}$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.* By [1, Proposition 2.6(II)],  $\mathbf{E}_{h,w} X$  is increasing in  $h > 0$ , so that  $\mathbf{E}_{h,w} X > \mathbf{E} X = 0$ , and the first inequality in (3) follows.

Let us prove the second inequality in (3). By rescaling, without loss of generality (w.l.o.g.)  $h = 1$ . For all real  $x$  and  $j \in \{0, 1\}$ , let

$$f_j(x) := x^j e^{x \wedge w} \quad \text{and} \quad g_j(x) := \frac{1}{2}(f_j(x) + f_j(-x)),$$

using the convention  $0^0 := 1$ ; then

$$\mathbf{E} g_j(|X|) = \mathbf{E} f_j(X) = \mathbf{E} X^j e^{h(X \wedge w)}. \quad (4)$$

So, (3) will follow if one can show that

$$d := d(u, v, w) := 2[g_1(u) + g_1(v) - \frac{\text{sh } hw}{w} (g_0(u)v^2 + g_0(v)u^2)] < 0 \quad (5)$$

for all positive real  $u, v, w$ ; indeed, then it will be enough to replace  $u$  and  $v$  in (5) by independent copies (say  $U$  and  $V$ ) of the r.v.  $|X|$ , take the expectation, and use (4). At this point, one should note that  $d$  may equal 0 if  $u$  or  $v$  equals 0; in particular,  $d = 0$  if  $u = 0$  and  $v = w$ ; however, the condition  $\mathbf{E} X^2 \in (0, \infty)$

in Theorem 1 implies that  $|X| > 0$  with a nonzero probability, which will result in the second inequality in (3) being strict indeed.

So, it remains to prove the inequality (5). Since  $u$  and  $v$  are interchangeable there, w.l.o.g.  $0 < u \leq v$ . Then (at least) one of the following three cases must occur:

- Case 1:  $0 < w \leq u \leq v$ ;
- Case 2:  $0 < u \leq w \leq v$ ;
- Case 3:  $0 < u \leq v \leq w$ .

In each of these three cases,  $d$  can be expressed without using the minimum function  $\wedge$ .

In the subsequent treatment of each of these three cases, the default ranges of the variables  $u$ ,  $v$ , and  $w$  will be determined by the conditions of the case under consideration. For instance, if in Case 1 (say) an expression in  $u, v, w$  is stated to be concave in  $u$  or increasing in  $v$ , this will mean that it is concave in  $u \in [w, v]$  (for any given  $v$  and  $w$  such that  $0 < w \leq v$ ) or, respectively, increasing in  $v \in [u, \infty)$  (for any given  $u$  and  $w$  such that  $0 < w \leq u$ ).

As usual, let  $\partial_z$  denote the operator of partial differentiation with respect to a variable  $z$ .

#### Case 1

In this case,

$$d = (e^w - e^{-u})u + (e^w - e^{-v})v - \frac{\text{sh } w}{w} (e^w(u^2 + v^2) + e^{-v}u^2 + e^{-u}v^2),$$

whence

$$\partial_v^2 d = e^{-v}(2 - v) - \frac{\text{sh } w}{w} (e^{-v}u^2 + 2e^{-u} + 2e^w) \quad (6)$$

and  $\partial_v^3 d = e^{-v}(v - 3 + \frac{u^2 \text{sh } w}{w})$ . So,  $\partial_v^2 d$  may change in sign at most once, and only from  $-$  to  $+$ , if  $v$  increases from  $u$  to  $\infty$ . Therefore,

$$\partial_v^2 d \leq (\partial_v^2 d)|_{v=u} \vee (\partial_v^2 d)|_{v=\infty-}. \quad (7)$$

Let  $d_2 := d_2(u, w) := we^u (\partial_v^2 d)|_{v=u}$ . Then  $d_2(u, 0+) = 0$  and  $\partial_w d_2 = -2(e^{u+2w} - 1) - u - (2 + u^2) \text{ch } w < 0$ , so that  $d_2 < 0$  or, equivalently,  $(\partial_v^2 d)|_{v=u} < 0$ . It is also clear from (6) that  $(\partial_v^2 d)|_{v=\infty-} < 0$ . So, by (7),  $\partial_v^2 d < 0$  and hence  $d$  is strictly concave in  $v \in [u, \infty)$ .

Therefore, in Case 1 it suffices to show that  $d|_{v=u} < 0$  and  $(\partial_v d)|_{v=u} < 0$ . Introduce  $\tilde{d} := e^{u+w} \frac{w}{u} d$ . Then  $\partial_u^2 (\tilde{d}|_{v=u}) = 2e^{u+2w} (w - (2 + u) \text{sh } w) < 0$ , since  $\text{sh } w > w$ . So,  $\tilde{d}|_{v=u}$  is strictly concave in  $u$ . Further,  $(\tilde{d}|_{v=u})|_{u=w} = -(e^w - 1)^3 (1 + e^w) w < 0$ .

One can see that

$$(\partial_u (\tilde{d}|_{v=u}))|_{u=w} = 1 + e^{2w} (w + 2e^w w - e^{2w} (1 + w)) < 0 \quad (8)$$

for all  $w > 0$ . Such inequalities, of the form  $P(w, e^w) < 0$  for some polynomial  $P$  of two variables, can be proved in a rather algorithmic manner. Indeed, let  $n \geq 1$

be the degree of  $P$  in  $w$ . “Solving” the inequality  $P(w, e^w) < 0$  for  $w^n$ , one can rewrite it as  $\delta(w) := w^n - P_1(w, e^w) < 0$  or  $\delta(w) > 0$  (depending on the sign of the coefficient of  $w^n$  in  $P$ ), where  $P_1$  is some polynomial of degree  $\leq n - 1$  in  $w$ . Then  $\delta'(w)$  will be a polynomial of degree  $\leq n - 1$  in  $w$ , so that one can proceed by induction, ultimately reducing the problem to one on the sign of a polynomial in  $e^w$  only. One can use a computer algebra system to (such as Mathematica) to execute such routine calculations, which appears to be a much more reliable and faster way to deal with such matters. In Mathematica, algorithms for solving inequalities like (8) are implemented in the command **Reduce**, which we indeed use to verify (8), as well as a few other similar inequalities. Similar methods were used e.g. in [3].

It follows that  $\tilde{d}|_{v=u} < 0$  and hence indeed  $d|_{v=u} < 0$ . Now (in Case 1) it only remains to verify that  $d_1 := d_1(u, w) := we^u(\partial_v d)|_{v=u} < 0$ .

Using again the inequality  $w < \text{sh } w$  (together with the conditions  $0 < w \leq u$  of Case 1), one observes that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_u^2 d_1 &= 2 \text{sh } w + e^{u+w}(w - 2(2 + u) \text{sh } w) \\ &\leq 2 \text{sh } w + e^{2w}(w - 2(2 + w) \text{sh } w), \end{aligned}$$

and the latter expression can be seen to be negative for all  $w > 0$  – using again the command **Reduce**, say. So,  $d_1$  is concave in  $u$ . Yet another **Reduce** shows that  $d_1|_{u=w} < 0$  for  $w > 0$ . Moreover,

$$(\partial_u d_1)|_{u=w} e^{-w}/2 = (w - \text{sh } w) \text{ch } w - (\text{ch } w + 2w \text{sh } w) \text{sh } w < 0;$$

here we again used the inequality  $w < \text{sh } w$ . This implies that indeed  $d_1 < 0$ , which completes the proof of (5) in Case 1.

### Case 2

In this case,

$$d = 2u \text{sh } u + v(\text{sh } v + \text{sh } w + \text{ch } w) - v \text{ch } v - \frac{\text{sh } w}{w} (u^2(e^{-v} + e^w) + 2v^2 \text{ch } u),$$

whence, introducing

$$d_1 := we^v \partial_v d, \tag{9}$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-v} \partial_v^2 d_1 &= w \text{ch } w + (w - 4(2 + v) \text{ch } u) \text{sh } w \\ &\leq w \text{ch } w + (w - 4(2 + w)) \text{sh } w < 0; \end{aligned}$$

the last inequality here can be obtained via another **Reduce**, and the penultimate inequality follows by the condition  $w \leq v$  of Case 2. So,

$$d_1 \text{ is concave in } v. \tag{10}$$

Note that the definition (9) of  $d_1$ , used in the present Case 2, differs from the definition of  $d_1$  used in Case 1.

Next,  $(\partial_v d_1)|_{v=w} = e^w (e^w w - 4(w+1) \operatorname{ch} u \operatorname{sh} w) + w$  is obviously decreasing in  $u > 0$ . So,  $(\partial_v d_1)|_{v=w} < (\partial_v d_1)|_{v=w, u=0+} = 3w - e^{2w}(w+2) + 2$ , which yet another **Reduce** shows to be negative for all  $w > 0$ . Thus,

$$(\partial_v d_1)|_{v=w} < 0. \quad (11)$$

Now let us show that  $d_1|_{v=w} < 0$ . One has

$$d_1|_{v=w} = d_{11} + d_{12} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{11} = d_{111} + d_{112}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d_{11} &:= e^w w (\operatorname{sh} w + \operatorname{ch} w - 3 \operatorname{ch} u \operatorname{sh} w) + (w-1)w, \\ d_{12} &:= (u^2 - e^w w \operatorname{ch} u) \operatorname{sh} w, \\ d_{111} &:= e^w w (\operatorname{ch} w - 2 \operatorname{sh} w) + (w-1)w, \\ d_{112} &:= -3(\operatorname{ch} u - 1)e^w w \operatorname{sh} w. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

It is obvious that  $d_{112} < 0$ . Also,  $d_{111} < 0$  by another **Reduce**. Next,  $\frac{1}{2 \operatorname{sh} w} \partial_u (d_1|_{v=w}) = u - 2e^w w \operatorname{sh} u$ . If  $u \geq 1/2$  then (by the condition  $u \leq w$  of Case 2)  $w \geq 1/2$ , whence  $2e^w w \operatorname{sh} u > \operatorname{sh} u > u$ , so that  $\partial_u (d_1|_{v=w}) < 0$ . Therefore, the condition  $\partial_u (d_1|_{v=w}) = 0$  would imply  $u < 1/2$  and also  $e^w w \operatorname{sh} u = u/2$ , and then  $u^2 - e^w w \operatorname{ch} u < u^2 - e^w w \operatorname{sh} u = u^2 - u/2 < 0$ , so that (by (13))  $d_{12} < 0$  and hence, by (12),  $d_1|_{v=w} < 0$ . That is,  $d_1|_{v=w} < 0$  whenever  $\partial_u (d_1|_{v=w}) = 0$ .

So, to prove the inequality  $d_1|_{v=w} < 0$  it is enough to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} d_1|_{v=w, u=0+} &= (w-1)w + e^w w (\operatorname{ch} w - 3 \operatorname{sh} w) < 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \frac{1}{w} d_1|_{v=w, u=w} &= w + (w + e^w) \operatorname{sh} w - e^w (4 \operatorname{sh} w - 1) \operatorname{ch} w - 1 < 0, \end{aligned}$$

which again can be done using **Reduce**. We conclude that indeed  $d_1|_{v=w} < 0$ .

Using also the earlier established conditions (10) and (11), as well as the Case 2 condition  $v \geq w$ , one has  $d_1 < 0$ . So, by (9),  $d$  is decreasing in  $v$ .

To complete the consideration of Case 2, it remains to show that  $d|_{v=w} < 0$ . Observe here that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \partial_u (d|_{v=w}) &= \operatorname{sh} u + u \operatorname{ch} u - 2 \frac{\operatorname{sh} w}{w} u \operatorname{ch} w - w \operatorname{sh} u \operatorname{sh} w \\ &< \operatorname{sh} u + u \operatorname{ch} u - 2u \operatorname{ch} w \leq \operatorname{sh} u - u \operatorname{ch} u < 0, \end{aligned}$$

so that  $d|_{v=w}$  is decreasing in  $u > 0$ , whereas  $d|_{v=w, u=0+} = 0$ . Thus, indeed  $d|_{v=w} < 0$ , and (5) is proved in Case 2 as well.

It remains to consider

*Case 3*

Note that  $\frac{\text{sh } w}{w}$  is increasing in  $w > 0$ . So, by (5),  $d$  is decreasing in  $w \in [v, \infty)$ , because  $g_j(u)$  and  $g_j(v)$  do not depend on  $w$  as long as  $w \geq u \vee v$ . It follows that in Case 3 w.l.o.g.  $w = v$ . Thus,  $0 < u \leq w = v$ , so that Case 3 has been quickly reduced to the already considered Case 2.

Now inequality (5) and thereby Theorem 1 are completely proved.  $\square$

**References**

- [1] PINELIS, I. Exact bounds on the truncated-tilted mean, with applications (preprint). <http://arxiv.org/abs/1103.3683>, 2011.
- [2] PINELIS, I. Exact lower bounds on the exponential moments of Winsorized and truncated random variables. *J. App. Probab.* *48* (2011), 547–560.
- [3] PINELIS, I. An asymptotically Gaussian bound on the Rademacher tails. *Electron. J. Probab.* *17* (2012), 1–22.
- [4] PINELIS, I., AND MOLZON, R. Berry-Esséen bounds for general nonlinear statistics, with applications to Pearson’s and non-central Student’s and Hotelling’s (preprint), arXiv:0906.0177v1 [math.ST].