

A note on the empirical process of strongly dependent stable random variables

Emanuele Taufer

Department of Economics and Management, University of Trento
EMANUELE.TAUFER@UNITN.IT

March 29, 2022

Abstract

This paper analyzes the limit properties of the empirical process of α -stable random variables with long range dependence. The α -stable random variables are constructed by non-linear transformations of bivariate sequences of strongly dependent gaussian processes. The approach followed allows an analysis of the empirical process by means of expansions in terms of bivariate Hermite polynomials for the full range $0 < \alpha < 2$. A weak uniform reduction principle is provided and it is shown that the limiting process is gaussian. The results of the paper differ substantially from those available for empirical processes obtained by stable moving averages with long memory. An application to goodness-of-fit testing is discussed.

Keywords: Empirical process, stable distribution, Hermite polynomial, goodness-of-fit, Kolmogorov-Smirnov.

1 Introduction

Consider a sequence of random variables (rv) X_1, \dots, X_n , with common continuous cumulative distribution function (CDF) F , constituting a sample from a strictly stationary and ergodic time series $\{X_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ where $\mathbb{Z} = \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$. For $\mathbb{1}\{A\}$ being the indicator function of the event A , let F_n denote the empirical distribution function (EDF) of the sequence, i.e. $F_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{X_i \leq x\}$. It is well known that the empirical process (EP)

$$\sqrt{n}(F_n(x) - F(x)) \tag{1}$$

converges to a non-degenerate Gaussian process either in the case where $\{X_i\}$ is a sequence of *i.i.d.* or weakly dependent rv.

The behavior of the EP is quite different in the case of long range dependence (LRD) where proper normalizing constants are of order $n^{D/2}$, $0 < D < 1$ and the weak limit, if it exists, is a degenerate process in x .

This paper studies the weak limit of $(F_n(x) - F(x))$, properly normalized, when the sample is formed by a sequence of strongly dependent stable random variables with index of stability $0 < \alpha < 2$.

One of the mainstream approaches in the study of LRD processes is via expansions, by means of orthogonal polynomials, of non-linear functionals of Gaussian LRD processes. In the case discussed here, if F denotes the CDF of a stable rv X and Φ the CDF of a standard normal rv Z , one has $\mathbb{1}\{X \leq x\} = \mathbb{1}\{F^{-1} \circ \Phi(Z) \leq x\} = \mathbb{1}\{Z \leq F \circ \Phi^{-1}(x)\}$; in this framework it is quite simple to provide an expansion of the indicator function in an appropriate L_2 space. However, given that analytic expressions of F^{-1} , with a few exceptions, are not available, this approach may not be optimal if one, for simulation, validation and testing purposes, wishes to generate stable rv given a sequence of LRD gaussian rv.

In this paper an approach based on a bivariate expansion is proposed. This will allow to provide fast and reliable methods of stable rv generation starting from an LRD gaussian sequence and, at the same time provide an analytic framework for the analysis of the EP. Some key results in this respect are due to Chambers et al. (1976) and Weron (1996) as far as stable rv are concerned. Specific papers considering the EP of non-linear transformation of LRD gaussian sequences discussing techniques relevant here are those of Dehling and Taqqu (1989), Csörgö and Mielniczuk (1996) and Leonenko and Sakhno (2001). We also refer the interested reader to the excellent reviews of Dehling and Philipp (2002) for a general discussion on EP techniques and Koul and Surgailis (2002) for a specific analysis of the LRD case. Other relevant literature discussing bivariate (and multivariate) expansion on non-linear functionals of LRD gaussian sequences and other bivariate expansions are Arcones (1994), Leonenko and Taufer (2001), Leonenko et al. (2002), Lévy-Leduc et al. (2011), Leonenko and Taufer (2013), Lévy-Leduc and Taqqu (2014).

Another mainstream approach in the study of LRD processes, which will not be discussed here, is based on linear processes (or moving averages). In this line of study, specific papers devoted to the EP are those of Ho and Hsing (1996), Giraitis and Surgailis (1999) and Koul and Surgailis (2001) which, in particular, consider the case of stable innovations with $1 < \alpha < 2$ and where a non-gaussian weak limit is obtained.

It is worth noting that the approach followed here provides a discussion of the full range $0 < \alpha < 2$, new to the literature, and provides a gaussian weak limit. These results show the essential different nature, when outside the gaussian case, of LRD moving average processes and LRD processes obtained by non-linear transformation of gaussian sequences.

The results obtained can find applications in the analysis of statistical functionals based on the EP. Relevant and recent examples in the literature concern the analysis of goodness of fit tests, such as, e.g. Jammalamadaka and Taufer (2006), Taufer (2009), Dehling et al. (2013), Koul et al. (2013), Ghosh (2013).

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 contains background arguments while in Section 3 the EP of stable rv is discussed. A final section presents applications and simulations to substantiate the theoretical findings.

2 Background

In this section, some needed key features of stable rv will be recalled and a bivariate expansion, in terms of Hermite polynomials, of the EP of LRD stable random variables will be provided.

In order to define exactly the sequence X of stable rv we state the following assumption where the classical set-up for a sequence of LRD gaussian random variables is defined:

Assumption 1. *Let $Z_i^{(1)}$ and $Z_i^{(2)}$ be independent copies of a sequence of gaussian random variables with null mean and unit variance and, for $j = 1, 2$, $r(k) = \mathbb{E}(Z_i^{(j)}, Z_{i+k}^{(j)}) = L(k)k^{-D}$ with $L(k)$ a slowly varying function and $0 < D < 1$.*

2.1 Stable rv

For $0 < \alpha \leq 2$, write $X \sim S_\alpha(\beta, \sigma, \mu)$ to denote an α -stable rv with asymmetry $\beta \in [-1, 1]$, scale $\sigma > 0$ and location $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, with characteristic function ψ given by (here $i = \sqrt{-1}$)

$$\log \psi(z) = \begin{cases} i\mu z - \sigma^\alpha |z|^\alpha [1 - i\beta \operatorname{sign}(z) \tan(\frac{\pi\alpha}{2})], & \alpha \neq 1 \\ i\mu z - \sigma |z| [1 + i\beta \operatorname{sign}(z) \frac{2}{\pi} \log(|z|)], & \alpha = 1. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

An alternative representation, justified by considerations of analytic nature (see Zolotarev (1986), Theorem C.3), which will be relevant for our development is

$$\log \psi(z) = \begin{cases} i\mu z - \sigma_2^\alpha |z|^\alpha \exp\{-i\beta_2 \operatorname{sign}(z) \frac{\pi}{2} K(\alpha)\}, & \alpha \neq 1 \\ i\mu z - \sigma_2 |z| [\frac{\pi}{2} + i\beta_2 \operatorname{sign}(z) \log(|z|)], & \alpha = 1 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $K(\alpha) = \alpha - 1 + \operatorname{sign}(1 - \alpha)$. The parameters of representations (2) and (3) can be connected: for $\alpha = 1$, it holds that $\beta_2 = \beta$ and $\sigma_2 = 2\sigma/\pi$; while for $\alpha \neq 1$ one has σ and σ_2 , β and β_2 related by the equations

$$\tan\left(\frac{\beta_2 \pi K(\alpha)}{2}\right) = \beta \tan\left(\frac{\pi\alpha}{2}\right), \quad \sigma_2 = \sigma \left(1 + \beta^2 \tan^2\left(\frac{\pi\alpha}{2}\right)\right)^{1/(2\alpha)}. \quad (4)$$

Chambers et al. (1976) introduced a fast algorithm for generating α -stable rv; later Weron (1996) provided proof details about the algorithm; using when possible, for continuity, the notation established in Weron (1996), define

$$\gamma = \gamma(Z^{(1)}) = \pi\Phi(Z^{(1)}) - \pi/2 \quad \text{and} \quad W = W(Z^{(2)}) = -\log\left(1 - \Phi(Z^{(2)})\right). \quad (5)$$

and let

$$\gamma_0 = -\beta_2 \frac{\pi K(\alpha)}{2\alpha}. \quad (6)$$

Note that $\gamma \sim U\left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right)$, a uniform r.v. in the interval $\left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right)$ and $W \sim E(1)$, an exponential rv with mean 1.

For $\alpha \neq 1$ let $X = G_0(Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)})$ where

$$G_0(z_1, z_2) = \frac{\sin(\alpha(\gamma(z_1) - \gamma_0))}{(\cos \gamma(z_1))^{1/\alpha}} \left(\frac{\cos(\gamma(z_1) - \alpha(\gamma(z_1) - \gamma_0))}{W(z_2)} \right)^{(1-\alpha)/\alpha}; \quad (7)$$

for $\alpha = 1$ let $X = G_1(Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)})$ where

$$G_1(z_1, z_2) = \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \beta_2 \gamma(z_1) \right) \tan(\gamma(z_1)) - \beta_2 \log \left(\frac{W(z_2) \cos(\gamma(z_1))}{\pi/2 + \beta_2 \gamma(z_1)} \right). \quad (8)$$

From Chambers et al. (1976), Weron (1996) we have the following proposition:

Proposition 1. *Let γ , W and γ_0 be defined respectively as in (5) and (6); let $G_0(\cdot)$ and $G_1(\cdot)$ be defined respectively as in (7) and (8). Then: for $\alpha \neq 1$, $X = G_0(Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)})$ is $S_\alpha(\beta_2, 1, 0)$ in the representation (3); for $\alpha = 1$, $X = G_1(Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)})$ is $S_1(\beta_2, 1, 0)$ in the representation (3).*

Proposition 1 suffices for generating $S_\alpha(\beta, \sigma, \mu)$ rv as the class is invariant under affine transformations of the type $X \mapsto aX + b$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. More specifically, if $X \sim S_\alpha(\beta, 1, 0)$, then $Y \sim S_\alpha(\beta, \sigma, \mu)$ for

$$Y = \begin{cases} \sigma X + \mu, & \alpha \neq 1 \\ \sigma X + \frac{2}{\pi} \beta \sigma \log \sigma + \mu, & \alpha = 1. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Finally we recall that, if $F(x, \alpha, \beta_2)$ represents the CDF of a $S_\alpha(\beta_2, 1, 0)$ r.v., for any admissible parameters α and β_2 (or β), the following equality holds

$$F(x, \alpha, \beta_2) = 1 - F(-x, \alpha, -\beta_2), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (10)$$

2.2 Hermite polynomials expansion of the EP

From the discussion in 2.1 it follows that we can represent the EDF of a stable rv as

$$F_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{X_i \leq x\} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{G_k(Z_i^{(1)}, Z_i^{(2)}) \leq x\}, \quad k = 0, 1, \quad (11)$$

where $k = 1$ if $\alpha = 1$ and $k = 0$ in all other cases $0 < \alpha < 2$. We are not explicitly interested in the gaussian case as it can be solved directly in a much simpler way; indeed the transformation (7) reduces to the well known Box-Muller transformation for $\alpha = 2$ and $\beta_2 = 0$.

Since the function $\mathbb{1}\{(G_k(Z_i^{(1)}, Z_i^{(2)}) \leq x)\}$ $k = 0, 1$ is square integrable with respect to the standard gaussian density, we are going to provide an expansion of (1) in terms of orthogonal Hermite polynomials.

Let $\phi(u)$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the standard gaussian density and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{R}^2, \phi(u)\phi(v) du dv)$ be the Hilbert space of real measurable functions $H(u, v)$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} [H^2(u, v)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} H^2(u, v) \phi(u) \phi(v) du dv < \infty \quad (12)$$

and let H_m denote the standard Hermite polynomials, i.e. $H_m(u) = (-1)^m \phi^{-1}(u) \frac{d^m}{du^m} \phi(u)$. Since the system $\{H_{m_1}(u)H_{m_2}(v)\}_{m_1 \geq 0, m_2 \geq 0}$ is a complete orthogonal system for \mathcal{L}_2 , for every x there exists an expansion

$$\mathbb{1}\{X_i \leq x\} = \mathbb{1}\{G_k(Z_i^{(1)}, Z_i^{(2)}) \leq x\} = \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 + m_2 \geq m} \frac{J_{m_1, m_2}^k(x)}{m_1! m_2!} H_{m_1}(Z_i^{(1)}) H_{m_2}(Z_i^{(2)}), \quad k = 0, 1, \quad (13)$$

converging in \mathcal{L}_2 with coefficients

$$J_{m_1, m_2}^k(x) = \mathbb{E}^{Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)}} \left[\mathbb{1}\{G_k(Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)}) \leq x\} H_{m_1}(Z^{(1)}) H_{m_2}(Z^{(2)}) \right], \quad k = 0, 1. \quad (14)$$

When not explicitly necessary, we will suppress dependence of the J 's coefficients and other quantities on k and refer generally to an $S_\alpha(\beta_2, 1, 0)$ r.v., $0 < \alpha < 2$ obtained via the transformation G_1 if $\alpha = 1$ and G_0 otherwise.

Note that by a change of variable technique, from Proposition 1, $J_{0,0}^k(x) = F(x)$ where F indicates the CDF of a $S_\alpha(\beta_2, 1, 0)$ r.v., $0 < \alpha < 2$. It follows that we have the \mathcal{L}_2 expansion

$$F_n(x) - F(x) = \sum_{q \geq m} \sum_{m_1 + m_2 = q} \frac{J_{m_1, m_2}(x)}{m_1! m_2!} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_{m_1}(Z_i^{(1)}) H_{m_2}(Z_i^{(2)}). \quad (15)$$

Define here $m = m(x)$ as the Hermite rank of the function $\mathbb{1}\{G_1(u, v) \leq x\}$ (similarly for G_0), that is $m = m(x) = \min\{m_1 + m_2 = m : J_{m_1, m_2}(x) \neq 0\}$. By the well known property of Hermite polynomials, with δ_m^n indicating Kronecker's delta, $\mathbb{E}H_m(Z_0)H_n(Z_k) = \delta_m^n m! r^m(k)$, from which,

$$\mathbb{V}(F_n(x)) = \sum_{q \geq m} \sum_{m_1 + m_2 = q} \frac{[J_{m_1, m_2}(x)]^2}{m_1! m_2!} \sigma_{n, q}^2 \quad (16)$$

with

$$\sigma_{n, q}^2 = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[H_{m_1}(Z_i^{(1)}) H_{m_1}(Z_j^{(1)}) \right] \mathbb{E} \left[H_{m_2}(Z_i^{(2)}) H_{m_2}(Z_j^{(2)}) \right] = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n r^q(|i - j|). \quad (17)$$

For $0 < D < 1/m$ we obtain, as $N \rightarrow \infty$, that $\sigma_{n, m}^2 \sim c(m, D) L^m(n) n^{-mD}$ with the constant $c(m, D) = 2[(1 - mD)(2 - mD)]^{-1}$, i.e. , if the rank of the expansion (13) is m , and $0 < D < 1/m$ then the EP exhibits LRD.

$F_n(x)$ can then be expressed as a bivariate expansion in Hermite polynomials. A uniform reduction principle as well as weak convergence results for this case are discussed by Leonenko and Sakhno (2001) and Leonenko et al. (2002), based on the results of Taqqu (1975), Taqqu (1979), Dobrushin and Major (1979) and Dehling and Taqqu (1989) using a construction of multiple Wiener Itô integrals with dependent integrators as proposed in Fox and Taqqu (1987). These previous result are summarized in the following proposition:

Proposition 2. *Let Assumption 1 hold and the functions $\mathbb{1}\{G_0(u, v) \leq x\}$ and $\mathbb{1}\{G_1(u, v) \leq x\}$ have Hermite rank $m \geq 1$ and $0 < D < 1/m$. Let $d_{n,m}^2 = c(m, D) n^{-mD} L^m(n)$ and define, for $t \in [0, 1]$,*

$$D([nt], x) = d_{n,m}^{-1}[nt] (F_{[nt]}(x) - F(x))$$

Then,

a) $D(n, x)$ converges, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, in \mathcal{L}_2 to

$$d_{n,m}^{-1} \left(\sum_{m_1+m_2=m} \frac{J_{m_1, m_2}(x)}{m_1! m_2!} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_{m_1}(Z_i^{(1)}) H_{m_2}(Z_i^{(2)}) \right) \quad (18)$$

b) $\{D([nt], x); -\infty \leq x \leq \infty; 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ converges, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ to the process

$$\left\{ \sum_{m_1+m_2=m} \frac{J_{m_1, m_2}(x)}{m_1! m_2!} Z_{m_1, m_2}(t); -\infty \leq x \leq \infty; 0 \leq t \leq 1 \right\} \quad (19)$$

in the sense of weak convergence in the space $D[-\infty, \infty] \times [0, 1]$, equipped with sup-norm.

The processes $Z_{m_1, m_2}(t)$, $m_1, m_2 \geq 0$, $m_1 + m_2 = m$ are given as multiple Wiener-Itô integrals of the form

$$Z_{m_1, m_2}(t) = K(m, D) \int_{\mathbb{R}^m}' \frac{e^{it(\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_m)}}{i(\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_m)} \prod_{j=1}^m |\lambda_j|^{(D-1)/2} \prod_{j=1}^{m_1} W_1(d\lambda_j) \prod_{j=m_1+1}^{m_2} W_2(d\lambda_j) \quad (20)$$

where W_1 and W_2 are independent copies of a complex valued gaussian white noise on \mathbb{R} and

$$K(m, D) = \frac{\frac{1}{2}(1 - mD)(2 - mD)}{\sqrt{m! \Gamma(D) \sin[(1 - D)\pi/2]}}. \quad (21)$$

The symbol of integration $\int_{\mathbb{R}^m}'$ stands to indicate that the hyper diagonals $\{\lambda_j = \lambda_k, j \neq k\}$ are excluded from the domain of integration. Note that $Z_{m_1, m_2}(1)$ is gaussian for $m_1 + m_2 = 1$ and that the normalizing factor $K(m, D)$ ensures unit variance of $Z_{m_1, m_2}(1)$.

Remark 1. *As discussed in the introduction, one could consider the simpler non-linear transformation, for Z satisfying Assumption 1, $X = G(Z)$ for $G = F^{-1} \circ \Phi$, in which case an L_2 expansion in terms of Hermite polynomials would result in*

$$F_n(x) - F(x) = \sum_{q \geq m} \frac{J_q(x)}{q!} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H_q(Z_i) \quad (22)$$

with G having Hermite rank $m = 1$ since $H_1(Z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}\{Z \leq F \circ \Phi^{-1}(x)\} Z] = -\phi(F \circ \Phi^{-1}(x))$. Although this approach would be much simpler for asymptotic analysis, the bivariate case will be considered in detail here for the reasons discussed in the introduction.

3 Hermite rank of the stable-EP

For $(Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)}) = (Z_1, Z_2)$ satisfying Assumption 1 (indeed only normality and independence are exploited) the main result of this section is the proof that the functions $\mathbb{1}\{G_0(Z_1, Z_2) \leq x\}$ and $\mathbb{1}\{G_1(Z_1, Z_2) \leq x\}$ have Hermite rank $m = 1 \forall x$ and consequently the asymptotic distribution of (1), properly normalized, is gaussian. Explicit formulae for the coefficients are presented. As there are several cases, the result is presented in three separate theorems which discuss respectively the cases $0 < \alpha < 1$, $\alpha = 1$, $1 < \alpha < 2$.

Since symmetry relations (10) will be exploited in deriving the coefficients $J_{m_1, m_2}(x)$, their dependence on β_2 will be explicitly outlined by writing $J_{m_1, m_2}(x, \beta_2)$.

Also, let

$$a(\gamma) = \left(\frac{\sin \alpha(\gamma - \gamma_0)}{\cos \gamma} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)}} \frac{\cos(\gamma - \alpha(\gamma - \gamma_0))}{\cos \gamma}, \quad (23)$$

$$a_1(\gamma) = \frac{\frac{\pi}{2} + \beta_2 \gamma}{\cos \gamma} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{\beta_2} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} + \beta_2 \gamma \right) \tan \gamma \right\}. \quad (24)$$

Theorem 1. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1$; the function $\mathbb{1}\{G_0(Z_1, Z_2) \leq x\}$ has Hermite rank $m = m(x) = 1 \forall x \in (-\infty, \infty)$ with coefficients:*

a) for $x > 0$,

$$J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma_0}^{\pi/2} e^{-x \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} a(\gamma)} \Phi^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \left(\gamma + \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right) d\gamma - (\phi \circ \Phi^{-1}) \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \left(\gamma_0 + \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right), \quad (25)$$

$$J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma_0}^{\pi/2} (\phi \circ \Phi^{-1})(1 - e^{-x \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} a(\gamma)}) d\gamma; \quad (26)$$

b) for $x = 0$,

$$J_{1,0}(0, \beta_2) = -(\phi \circ \Phi^{-1}) \left(\frac{1}{\pi} \left(\gamma_0 + \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right), \quad (27)$$

$$J_{0,1}(0, \beta_2) = 0; \quad (28)$$

c) for $x < 0$, formulae can be derived from the case $x > 0$: for $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$, using formula (25), compute $J_{1,0}(-x, -\beta_2)$ while for $J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2)$, using formula (26), compute $-J_{0,1}(-x, -\beta_2)$.

Theorem 2. *Let $\alpha = 1$; the function $\mathbb{1}\{G_1(Z_1, Z_2) \leq x\}$ has Hermite rank $m = m(x) = 1 \forall x \in (-\infty, \infty)$ with coefficients:*

a) if $\beta_2 = 0$,

$$J_{1,0}(x, 0) = -(\phi \circ \Phi^{-1}) \left[\frac{1}{\pi} \left(\arctan \left(\frac{2}{\pi} x \right) + \frac{\pi}{2} \right) \right], \quad (29)$$

$$J_{0,1}(x, 0) = 0; \quad (30)$$

b) if $\beta_2 > 0$,

$$J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \exp\{-e^{-x/\beta_2} a_1(\gamma)\} \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\pi}(\gamma + \frac{\pi}{2})\right) d\gamma, \quad (31)$$

$$J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} (\phi \circ \Phi^{-1})(1 - \exp\{-e^{-x/\beta_2} a_1(\gamma)\}) d\gamma; \quad (32)$$

c) if $\beta_2 < 0$, formulae can be derived from the case $\beta_2 > 0$: for $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$, using formula (31), compute $J_{1,0}(-x, -\beta_2)$ while for $J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2)$, using formula (32), compute $-J_{0,1}(-x, -\beta_2)$.

Theorem 3. Let $1 < \alpha < 2$; the function $\mathbb{1}\{G_0(Z_1, Z_2) \leq x\}$ has Hermite rank $m = m(x) = 1 \forall x \in (-\infty, \infty)$ with coefficients:

a) for $x \geq 0$,

$$J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma_0}^{\pi/2} e^{-x \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} a(\gamma)} \Phi^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\pi}(\gamma + \frac{\pi}{2})\right) d\gamma, \quad (33)$$

$$J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma_0}^{\pi/2} (\phi \circ \Phi^{-1})(1 - e^{-x \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} a(\gamma)}) d\gamma; \quad (34)$$

b) for $x < 0$, formulae can be derived from the case $x > 0$: for $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$, using formula (33), compute $J_{1,0}(-x, -\beta_2)$ while for $J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2)$, using formula (34), compute $-J_{0,1}(-x, -\beta_2)$.

Remark 2. The formulae presented in the theorems can be seen as a generalization of integral representations discussed in Zolotarev (1986) and Weron (1996). From the numerical point of view they are quite fast to calculate although some parameter values could easily induce overflow; in the supplemental material this issue will be discussed in more detail.

Before proving the theorems, recall the definition of $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$ and $J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2)$ from (14). Also, if needed, dependence of $G_0(z_1, z_2)$ on β_2 will be highlighted by writing $G_0(z_1, z_2, \beta_2)$.

Proof of Theorem 1. Note that one can write

$$\mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2) \leq x\} = \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2) \leq x\} [\mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} + \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) \leq \gamma_0\}] \quad (35)$$

and that $G_0(z_1, z_2) > 0$ if and only if $\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0$. Consider first the case $x > 0$; from the reasoning above it follows that,

- i) $\mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2) \leq x\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} = \mathbb{1}\{0 < G_0(z_1, z_2) \leq x\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\}, x > 0$;
- ii) $\mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2) \leq x\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) \leq \gamma_0\} = \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2) \leq 0\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) \leq \gamma_0\} = \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) \leq \gamma_0\}, x > 0$.

To determine $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$ in case a), $x > 0$, we then need to compute

$$\begin{aligned} J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{0 < G_0(z_1, z_2) \leq x\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} z_1 \phi(z_1) \phi(z_2) dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) \leq \gamma_0\} z_1 \phi(z_1) \phi(z_2) dz_1 dz_2 \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Denote the two integrals on the *r.h.s.* of the above equation as $I_1 + I_2$. As far as I_1 is concerned, since $(1-\alpha)/\alpha > 0$ we can write (see formula details in (7)), $\mathbb{1}\{0 < G_0(z_1, z_2) \leq x\} = \mathbb{1}\{W(z_2) \geq x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma(z_1))\}$; then after making the transformation $W = W(z_2) = -\log(1-\Phi(z_2))$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{w \geq x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma(z_1))\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} z_1 \phi(z_1) e^{-w} dw dz_1 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma(z_1))} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} z_1 \phi(z_1) dz_1 \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma_0}^{\pi/2} e^{-x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma)} \phi^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\pi} (\gamma + \pi/2) \right) d\gamma \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where the last step has been obtained by the transformation $\gamma = \gamma(z_1) = \pi\Phi(z_1) - \pi/2$.

As far as I_2 is concerned, it reduces to computing

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) \leq \gamma_0\} z_1 \phi(z_1) dz_1 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}\{z_1 \leq \gamma^{-1}(\gamma_0)\} z_1 \phi(z_1) dz_1 = \phi(\gamma^{-1}(\gamma_0)) \quad (38)$$

where $\gamma^{-1}(\gamma_0) = \Phi^{-1}(\frac{1}{\pi}(\gamma_0 + \pi/2))$. Putting together the results for I_1 and I_2 yields the coefficient $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$ in case a), $x > 0$.

$J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$ in case b), $x = 0$, is simply obtained by I_2 .

To determine $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$ in case c), $x < 0$, note that since, for expectation taken with respect to Z_1 and Z_2 , $\mathbb{E}[Z_1] = 0$, then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2, \beta_2) \leq x\}] &= -\mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2, \beta_2) > x\}] \\ &= -\mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{-G_0(z_1, z_2, \beta_2) < -x\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Given the definition of G_0 in (7), we note that, for $x \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$, $-\sin(x) = \sin(-x)$, $\cos(x) = \cos(-x)$ and that $-\gamma(-Z_1) \sim U[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$. It follows that $\mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{-G_0(z_1, z_2, \beta_2) < -x\}] = -\mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(-z_1, z_2, -\beta_2) < -x\}]$ and hence, substituting into (39), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2, \beta_2) \leq x\}] = \mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2, -\beta_2) \leq -x\}]$$

from which the statement for case c), $x < 0$, of the theorem.

Consider now computation of $J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2)$ in the case $x > 0$, similarly to what done for $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$ we need to compute

$$\begin{aligned} J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{0 < G_0(z_1, z_2) \leq x\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} z_2 \phi(z_1) \phi(z_2) dz_1 dz_2 \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) \leq \gamma_0\} z_2 \phi(z_1) \phi(z_2) dz_1 dz_2 \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where we note this time that the second integral on the *r.h.s.* of the above formula is null. We then compute simply

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{w \geq x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma(z_1))\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} \Phi^{-1}(1 - e^{-w}) e^{-w} \phi(z_1) dw dz_1 \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} (\phi \circ \Phi^{-1})(1 - e^{-x^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} a(\gamma(z_1))}) \phi(z_1) dz_1 \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\gamma_0}^{\pi/2} (\phi \circ \Phi^{-1})(1 - e^{-x^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} a(\gamma)}) d\gamma
\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where, as before, the transformations $W = W(z_2) = -\log(1 - \Phi(z_2))$ and $\gamma = \gamma(z_1) = \pi\Phi(z_1) - \pi/2$ have been used in turn. From the results above and same reasoning as for the case $J_{1,0}(0, \beta_2)$, we have $J_{0,1}(0, \beta_2) = 0$. In the case $x < 0$, a parallel reasoning to the corresponding case $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2)$, yields that $\mathbb{E}[Z_2 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2, \beta_2) \leq x\}] = -\mathbb{E}[Z_2 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2, -\beta_2) \leq -x\}]$ from which the statement case *c*), $x < 0$ of the theorem. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Consider the case $\beta_2 = 0$, in which $G_1(z_1, z_2)$ reduces to $\frac{\pi}{2} \tan[\gamma(z_1)]$ and, for $\gamma(z)$ defined in (5), $J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2) = \mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{\frac{\pi}{2} \tan[\gamma(Z_1)] \leq x\}]$ reduces to (29) and $J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2) = \mathbb{E}[Z_2 \mathbb{1}\{\frac{\pi}{2} \tan[\gamma(Z_1)] \leq x\}] = 0$.

In the case where $\beta_2 \neq 0$, $G_1(z_1, z_2)$ reduces to $\beta_2 \log[a_1(\gamma(z_1))/W(z_2)]$ with a_1 defined in (24). Hence, for $\beta_2 > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, using the transformations $W = W(z_2) = -\log(1 - \Phi(z_2))$ and $\gamma = \gamma(z_1) = \pi\Phi(z_1) - \pi/2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2) &= \mathbb{E}\left[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{W(Z_2) \geq e^{-x/\beta_2} a_1(\gamma(Z_1))\}\right] \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\left\{-e^{-x/\beta_2} a_1(\gamma(z_1))\right\} z_1 \phi(z_1) dz_1
\end{aligned}$$

which reduces to (31), and

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2) &= \mathbb{E}\left[Z_2 \mathbb{1}\{W(Z_2) \geq e^{-x/\beta_2} a_1(\gamma(Z_1))\}\right] \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{w \geq e^{-x/\beta_2} a_1(\gamma(z_1))\} \Phi^{-1}(1 - e^{-w}) e^{-w} \phi(z_1) dw dz_1 \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\phi \circ \Phi^{-1})(1 - \exp\{e^{-x/\beta_2} a_1(\gamma(z_1))\}) \phi(z_1) dz_1.
\end{aligned}$$

As far as the case $\beta_2 < 0$, parallel reasoning exploiting symmetries, as done in the proof of Theorem 1 brings to result *c*) in Theorem 2. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Following a similar scheme of proof as in Theorem 1, consider first the case $x > 0$ and note that, since $\mathbb{E}[Z_1] = 0$, where expectation is taken *wrt* Z_1 and Z_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(Z_1, Z_2) \leq x\}] &= -\mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(Z_1, Z_2) > x\}] \\
&= -\mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(Z_1, Z_2) > x\} [\mathbb{1}\{\gamma(Z_1) > \gamma_0\} + \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(Z_1) \leq \gamma_0\}]] \\
&= -\mathbb{E}[Z_1 \mathbb{1}\{G_0(Z_1, Z_2) > x\} [\mathbb{1}\{\gamma(Z_1) > \gamma_0\}]], \quad x > 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

since G_0 cannot be greater than $x > 0$ when $\gamma(z_1) \leq \gamma_0$. Since, for $1 < \alpha < 2$, $(\alpha - 1)/\alpha > 0$, for $x > 0$ we can make the following computations:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{1,0}(x, \beta_2) &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2) > x\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} z_1 \phi(z_1) \phi(z_2) dz_1 dz_2 \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{W(z_2) > x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma(z_1))\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} z_1 \phi(z_1) \phi(z_2) dz_1 dz_2 \quad (43) \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma(z_1))} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} z_1 \phi(z_1) dz_1
\end{aligned}$$

which reduces to (33) after transforming $\gamma = \gamma(z_1) = \pi\Phi(z_1) - \pi/2$. The case for $x < 0$ can be recovered by symmetry, following a parallel reasoning as the one in the proof of Theorem 1.

As far as the second coefficient, $J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2)$ is concerned, again, following the discussion above, for $x > 0$ we can make the following computations:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{0,1}(x, \beta_2) &= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{G_0(z_1, z_2) > x\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} z_2 \phi(z_1) \phi(z_2) dz_1 dz_2 \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{W(z_2) > x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma(z_1))\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} z_2 \phi(z_1) \phi(z_2) dz_1 dz_2 \quad (44) \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \mathbb{1}\{w > x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma(z_1))\} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} \Phi^{-1}(1 - e^{-w}) e^{-w} \phi(z_1) dw dz_1 \\
&= - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{1}\{\gamma(z_1) > \gamma_0\} (\phi \circ \Phi^{-1})(1 - \exp\{-x^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)} a(\gamma(z_1))\}) \phi(z_1) dz_1
\end{aligned}$$

which reduces to (34) after transforming $\gamma = \gamma(z_1) = \pi\Phi(z_1) - \pi/2$. The case for $x < 0$ can be recovered by symmetry, following a parallel reasoning as the one in the proof of Theorem 1. \square

4 Application to goodness-of-fit testing

As an application of the results of the last section, we consider the problem of testing the simple hypothesis $H_0 : F = F_0$ for F_0 in the class of α -stable distributions with $0 < \alpha < 2$ when the data show LRD as defined in the previous sections. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic

$$K_n = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(x) - F(x)| \quad (45)$$

will be discussed in some detail. For a stable rv X defined as in Proposition 1 with $(Z^{(1)}, Z^{(2)})$ satisfying Assumption 1, Proposition 2 implies that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} d_{n,1}^{-1} |(F_n(x) - F(x)) - (J_{1,0}(x)Z_{1,0}(1) + J_{0,1}(x)Z_{0,1}(1))| = o_P(1). \quad (46)$$

Since $Z_{1,0}(1)$ and $Z_{0,1}(1)$ are two independent standard normal rv, one readily obtains that, under H_0 ,

$$d_{n,1}^{-1} \frac{K_n}{c_0} \rightarrow_D |Z|, \quad c_0 = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \sqrt{(J_{1,0}(x))^2 + (J_{0,1}(x))^2} \quad (47)$$

D	n	m	sd	$\gamma \rightarrow$	$d_n^{-1}K_n/c_0$			K_n^{sd}		
					0.8	0.9	0.95	0.8	0.9	0.95
0.2	128	1.1837	0.5484		0.6234	0.7894	0.8960	0.7810	0.8944	0.9514
	256	1.1165	0.5583		0.6676	0.8198	0.9062	0.7928	0.8922	0.9494
	512	1.0714	0.5513		0.6872	0.8380	0.9208	0.7908	0.8974	0.9496
	1024	1.0265	0.5520		0.7214	0.8586	0.9276	0.8022	0.8964	0.9480
	2048	1.0101	0.5515		0.7290	0.8616	0.9266	0.804	0.8944	0.9458
0.5	128	1.1019	0.5365		0.6856	0.8392	0.9194	0.7998	0.8944	0.9474
	256	1.0525	0.5499		0.7146	0.8546	0.9234	0.8096	0.897	0.9482
	512	1.0385	0.5503		0.7126	0.8562	0.9308	0.7972	0.9000	0.9520
	1024	0.9995	0.5532		0.7362	0.8710	0.9344	0.8084	0.9028	0.9498
	2048	0.9823	0.5498		0.7374	0.8694	0.9404	0.7938	0.8950	0.9516
0.8	128	0.9505	0.4444		0.7898	0.9208	0.9688	0.8030	0.9032	0.9510
	256	0.9540	0.4546		0.7936	0.9140	0.9650	0.8114	0.9004	0.9466
	512	0.9541	0.4798		0.7824	0.9036	0.9576	0.8042	0.8996	0.9486
	1024	0.9537	0.4921		0.7712	0.9006	0.9564	0.8026	0.9008	0.9474
	2048	0.9604	0.4915		0.7684	0.8994	0.9564	0.8008	0.9016	0.9506

Table 1: Monte Carlo estimates (N=5000) of mean, standard deviation and the theoretical probability $\gamma = P(|Z| \leq z_{\gamma/2})$ for $d_n^{-1}K_n/c_0$ and K_n^{sd} (see respectively (47) and (49)) for selected values of n and D based on the EP constructed from a Stable rv with $\alpha = 0.5$; $\beta_2 = 0.5$.

where \rightarrow_D means convergence in distribution and Z is a standard normal random variable. It is worth emphasizing that such a simple and appealing result for the KS statistics based on α -stable rv with LRD has never been derived in the literature. For analogous results for long memory moving averages see Koul and Surgailis (2010) and the reference therein which however do not include the stable case.

Similar results will be obtained for any other test based on continuous functionals of the first order difference $d_{n,1}^{-1}(F_n(x) - F(x))$ such as the Cramér-von Mises test which will obtain an asymptotic distribution related to a χ^2 -distribution with one degree of freedom.

These results are in sharp contrast with those of the i.i.d. setting. As noted by Koul and Surgailis (2010) however, the test (47) cannot distinguish $n^{1/2}$ -neighborhoods of F_0 ; see Koul and Surgailis (2010), p. 3745, for further details which will not be repeated here.

In order to appreciate the precision of the asymptotic approximation a small Monte Carlo study where the data generated satisfy the set up defined in Section 2 is performed. In order to implement the Monte Carlo experiment the following steps are taken (for further details see the supplemental material):

- i) generate two random sequences (Z_1, Z_2) satisfying Assumption 1 with covariance function $r(k) = (1+k^2)^{-D/2}$. Note that we can write $r(k) = k^{-D}L(k)$ with $L(k) = k^D(1+k^2)^{-D/2}$.
- ii) Apply transformations (7) (or (8)) to the above sequences;
- iii) Compute the empirical process and the KS statistics.

D	n	m	sd	$\gamma \rightarrow$	$d_n^{-1}K_n/c_0$			K_n^{sd}		
					0.8	0.9	0.95	0.8	0.9	0.95
0.2	128	1.1242	0.5613		0.6508	0.8198	0.9074	0.7938	0.8964	0.9510
	256	1.0714	0.5681		0.6826	0.8308	0.9142	0.7890	0.8902	0.9478
	512	1.0267	0.5655		0.7124	0.8478	0.9258	0.7912	0.8944	0.9486
	1024	0.9873	0.5679		0.7254	0.8600	0.9310	0.7942	0.8934	0.9494
	2048	0.9494	0.5755		0.7498	0.8718	0.9308	0.8014	0.8956	0.9454
0.5	128	1.0596	0.5509		0.7032	0.8516	0.9250	0.8040	0.9014	0.9452
	256	1.0122	0.5490		0.7202	0.8636	0.9344	0.7976	0.8988	0.9510
	512	0.9911	0.5709		0.7296	0.8628	0.9320	0.7996	0.9000	0.9494
	1024	0.9446	0.5633		0.7546	0.8762	0.9372	0.8036	0.8964	0.9466
	2048	0.9164	0.5707		0.7618	0.8814	0.9466	0.7944	0.9002	0.9534
0.8	128	0.9196	0.4440		0.8064	0.9278	0.9708	0.8028	0.9036	0.9488
	256	0.9128	0.4656		0.8066	0.9180	0.9652	0.8104	0.8998	0.9478
	512	0.9154	0.4798		0.7964	0.9114	0.9638	0.8032	0.8978	0.9506
	1024	0.9148	0.4936		0.7912	0.9070	0.9606	0.8028	0.8978	0.9470
	2048	0.9192	0.5060		0.7878	0.9064	0.9548	0.8056	0.9028	0.9464

Table 2: MonteCarlo estimates (N=5000) of mean, standard deviation and the theoretical probability $\gamma = P(|Z| \leq z_{\gamma/2})$ for $d_n^{-1}K_n/c_0$ and K_n^{sd} (see respectively (47) and (49)) for selected values of n and D based on the EP constructed from a Stable rv with $\alpha = 1$; $\beta_2 = 0$.

D	n	m	sd	$\gamma \rightarrow$	$d_n^{-1}K_n/c_0$			K_n^{sd}		
					0.8	0.9	0.95	0.8	0.9	0.95
0.2	128	1.1646	0.5595		0.6178	0.8006	0.9016	0.7866	0.8998	0.9562
	256	1.1182	0.5767		0.6478	0.8180	0.9094	0.7924	0.9036	0.9534
	512	1.0598	0.5579		0.6868	0.8426	0.9268	0.7954	0.9036	0.9528
	1024	1.0232	0.5654		0.7020	0.8524	0.9292	0.7856	0.8972	0.9562
	2048	1.0101	0.5706		0.7090	0.8512	0.9300	0.7900	0.8954	0.9526
0.5	128	1.0895	0.5392		0.6938	0.8472	0.9258	0.8010	0.9004	0.9526
	256	1.0631	0.5464		0.7062	0.8468	0.9248	0.7978	0.9018	0.9494
	512	1.0306	0.5588		0.7148	0.8566	0.9270	0.8032	0.9022	0.9514
	1024	1.0122	0.5534		0.7264	0.8656	0.9322	0.8050	0.9020	0.9502
	2048	0.9988	0.5556		0.7294	0.8698	0.9368	0.8008	0.9036	0.9498
0.8	128	0.9448	0.4433		0.7962	0.9210	0.9686	0.8052	0.9010	0.9486
	256	0.9519	0.4598		0.7872	0.9160	0.9652	0.8064	0.9060	0.9498
	512	0.9635	0.4782		0.7628	0.9022	0.9618	0.7954	0.9012	0.9524
	1024	0.9695	0.4891		0.7674	0.8976	0.9558	0.8010	0.9008	0.9486
	2048	0.9738	0.5079		0.7632	0.8856	0.9484	0.8058	0.8962	0.9472

Table 3: MonteCarlo estimates (N=5000) of mean, standard deviation and the theoretical probability $\gamma = P(|Z| \leq z_{\gamma/2})$ for $d_n^{-1}K_n/c_0$ and K_n^{sd} (see respectively (47) and (49)) for selected values of n and D based on the EP constructed from a Stable rv with $\alpha = 1.5$; $\beta_2 = 0.8$.

Tables 1 to 3 contain the summary of three experiments analyzing the asymptotic distribution of the KS statistic respectively for the case where $X \sim S_{0.5}(0.5, 1, 0)$, $X \sim S_1(0, 1, 0)$ and $X \sim S_{1.5}(0.8, 1, 0)$. Each case, defined by sample size ($n = 128, 256, 512, 1024, 2048$) was replicated $N = 5000$ times. If we define with $K_{n,i}$ $i = 1, \dots, N$ the i -th KS statistic obtained by an EP constructed on n generated stable rv and $K_{n,i}^* = d_{n,1}^{-1} \frac{K_{n,i}}{c_0}$, i.e. the theoretically-standardized version of the KS statistic, in the tables below the following quantities are reported:

- a) the mean and the standard deviation, simply computed as

$$m = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N K_{n,i}^*, \quad sd = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (K_{n,i}^* - m)^2}; \quad (48)$$

- b) the empirical probability $P(d_{n,1}^{-1} \frac{K_n}{c_0} \leq z_{\gamma/2})$ where z_{γ} is the γ percentile of the standard normal distribution, i.e., if $Z \sim N(0, 1)$, then $P(Z \leq z_{\gamma}) = \gamma$;
- c) the empirical probability $P(K_n^{sd} \leq z_{\gamma/2})$ where K_n^{sd} is the empirically standardized version of the KS statistic adjusted to the theoretical mean and variance of the rv $|Z|$, i.e.

$$K_{n,i}^{sd} = \frac{(K_{n,i}^* - m) \sqrt{\pi - 2}}{sd \sqrt{\pi}} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \quad (49)$$

where $E|Z| = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} = 0.7979$ and $\sqrt{V|Z|} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi-2}}{\sqrt{\pi}} = 0.6028$.

The values $\gamma = 0.8, 0.9, 0.95$ corresponding to the percentiles 1.28, 1.645, 1.96 were chosen in order to evaluate especially the final part of the distribution which is more important for testing. The computation of the empirical distribution of K_n^{sd} allow to appreciate either the precision of the asymptotic normalizing constant d_n and the quality of the normal approximation.

The results in Tables 1 to 3 are quite illuminating and show that asymptotic normality (in absolute value) holds quite well for different cases of stable rv, different values of the long memory parameter and even for relatively small sample sizes n . This can be clearly appreciated by inspecting closely the results for K_n^{sd} . Inspection of the results for K_n^* show that the asymptotic normalizing constant d_n may not always be optimal, especially if D is small. The results show clear convergence to the theoretical values as sample size n increases. In the case $D = 0.8$ the 5% significant level test is quite precise, eventually a bit conservative, in all cases and for small sample sizes.

In practice one actually needs a $\log n$ - consistent estimate of the normalizing constant; one can consult Dalla et al. (2006) and the references therein for $\log n$ - consistent estimators of the relevant quantities.

References

Arcones, M. A.. Limit theorems for nonlinear functionals of stationary Gaussian sequences of vectors. Ann. Probab. 2 (1994), no. 4, 2242–2274.

- Chambers, J. M.; Mallows, C. L.; Stuck, B. W. A method for simulating stable random variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 71 (1976), no. 354, 340-344.
- Csörgő, S.; Mielniczuk, J.. The empirical process of a short-range dependent stationary sequence under Gaussian subordination. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 104 (1996), no. 1, 15-25.
- Dalla, V.; Giraitis, L.; Hidalgo, J.. Consistent estimation of the memory parameter for nonlinear time series. *J. Time Ser. Anal.* 27 (2006), no. 2, 211-251.
- Dehling, H.; Philipp, W.. Empirical process techniques for dependent data. *Empirical process techniques for dependent data*, 3-113, Birkhauser Boston, Boston, MA, 2002.
- Dehling, H. and Taqqu, M. S.. The empirical process of some long-range dependent sequences with an application to U -statistics. *Ann. Statist.* 17 (1989), no. 4, 1767-1783.
- Dehling, H.; Rooch, A.; Taqqu, M. S.. Non-parametric change-point tests for long-range dependent data. *Scand. J. Stat.* 40 (2013), no. 1, 153-173.
- Dobrushin, R. L. and Major, P.. Non-central limit theorems for non-linear functionals of Gaussian fields. *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete* 50 (1979), 27-52.
- Fox, R. and Taqqu, M. S.. Multiple stochastic integrals with dependent integrators, *J. Multivar. Anal.* 21 (1987), 105-127.
- Ghosh, S.. Normality testing for a long-memory sequence using the empirical moment generating function. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* 143 (2013), no. 5, 944-954.
- Giraitis, L.; Surgailis, D.. Central limit theorem for the empirical process of a linear sequence with long memory. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* 80 (1999), no. 1-2, 81-93.
- Ho, H.C.; Hsing, T.. On the asymptotic expansion of the empirical process of long-memory moving averages. *Ann. Statist.* 24 (1996), no. 3, 992-1024.
- Jammalamadaka, S. Rao; Taufer, E.. Use of mean residual life in testing departures from exponentiality. *J. Nonparametr. Stat.* 18 (2006), no. 3, 277-292.
- Koul, H.L.; Surgailis, D.. Asymptotics of empirical processes of long memory moving averages with infinite variance. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 91 (2001), no. 2, 309-336.
- Koul, H.L.; Surgailis, D.. Asymptotic expansion of the empirical process of long memory moving averages. *Empirical process techniques for dependent data*, 213-239, Birkhuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2002.
- Koul, H.L.; Surgailis, D.. Goodness-of-fit under long memory. *J. Statist. Plann. Infer.*, 140, (2010) 3742-3753.
- Koul, H. L.; Mimoto, N.; Surgailis, D.. Goodness-of-fit tests for long memory moving average marginal density. *Metrika* 76 (2013), no. 2, 205-224.

- Lévy-Leduc, C.; Boistard, H.; Moulines, E.; Taqqu, M. S.; Reisen, V. A.. Asymptotic properties of U-processes under long-range dependence. *Ann. Statist.* 39 (2011), no. 3, 1399-1426.
- Lévy-Leduc, C.; Taqqu, M. S. Hermite ranks and U-statistics. *Metrika* 77 (2014), no. 1, 105–136.
- Leonenko, N. N.; Sakhno, L. M.. On the Kaplan-Meier estimator of long-range dependent sequences. *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.* 4 (2001), no. 1, 17-40.
- Leonenko, N. N.; Taufer, E.. Asymptotic properties of LSE in multivariate continuous regression with long memory stationary errors. *Metron* 59 (2001), no. 1-2, 5572.
- Leonenko, N. N.; Sakhno, L.; Taufer, E.. Product-limit estimator for long- and short-range dependent sequences under gamma type subordination. *Random Oper. Stochastic Equations* 10 (2002), no. 4, 301320.
- Leonenko, N. N.; Taufer, E.. Disaggregation of spatial autoregressive processes. *Spatial Statistics* 3, 1–20.
- Taqqu, M. S.. Weak convergence to fractional brownian motion and to the Rosenblatt process, *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete* 31 (1979), 287–302.
- Taqqu, M. S.. Convergence of integrated process of arbitrary Hermite rank, *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete* 50 (1979), 53–83.
- Taufer, E.. Wilcoxon-signed rank test for long memory sequences. *Comm. Statist. Theory Methods* 38 (2009), no. 16-17, 3240-3248.
- Weron, R. On the Chambers-Mallows-Stuck method for simulating skewed stable random variables. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 28 (1996), no. 2, 165-171.
- Zolotarev, V. M.. *One-dimensional stable distributions*. Translated from the Russian by H. H. McFaden. Translation edited by Ben Silver. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 65. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1986.