

On a notion of partially conditionally identically distributed sequences

Sandra Fortini*, Sonia Petrone, and Polina Sporysheva
Bocconi University, Milan, Italy

March 7, 2017

Abstract

A notion of conditionally identically distributed (c.i.d.) sequences has been studied as a form of stochastic dependence weaker than exchangeability, but equivalent to it in the presence of stationarity. We extend such notion to families of sequences. Paralleling the extension from exchangeability to partial exchangeability in the sense of de Finetti, we propose a notion of *partially c.i.d.* dependence, which is shown to be equivalent to partial exchangeability for stationary processes. Partially c.i.d. families of sequences preserve attractive limit properties of partial exchangeability, and are asymptotically partially exchangeable. Moreover, we provide strong laws of large numbers and two central limit theorems. Our focus is on the asymptotic agreement of predictions and empirical means, which lies at the foundations of Bayesian statistics. Natural examples of partially c.i.d. constructions are interacting randomly reinforced processes satisfying certain conditions on the reinforcement.

Keywords. Exchangeability. Partial exchangeability. Reinforced processes. Spreadability. Limit theorems. Prediction. Bayesian nonparametrics.

1 Introduction.

Exchangeability is a central notion in many areas of probability and related fields; we refer to Kingman [1978], Aldous [1985], Austin [2008], Kallenberg [2005], Aldous [2010] for classical, wide references. In Bayesian statistics, exchangeability is the fundamental probabilistic structure at the basis of learning, expressing the subjective probabilistic description of repeated experiments under similar conditions. Exchangeable sequences are conditionally independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.).

However, forms of competition, selection, and other sources of non stationarity, may break exchangeability, although the system may converge, asymptotically, to an exchangeable steady state. Thus, weaker notions of stochastic dependence, that do not assume stationarity, yet preserve some main asymptotic properties of exchangeable processes, are of theoretical and applied interest. Based on results by Kallenberg [1988], Berti et al. [2004] introduce a notion of *conditionally identically distributed* (c.i.d.) sequences, as a form of stochastic dependence weaker than exchangeability but equivalent to it for stationary sequences. Roughly speaking, a sequence of random variables $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is c.i.d. if, for every $n \geq 0$, X_{n+1}, X_{n+2}, \dots are conditionally identically distributed, given the past X_1, \dots, X_n (for $n = 0$ the property reads X_1, X_2, \dots

*Corresponding author. Department of Decision Sciences, Bocconi University, Via Roentgen 1, 20123 Milano, Italy. E-mail address: sandra.fortini@unibocconi.it

are identically distributed). A precise definition is given in Section 2. These processes are the starting point of our study.

Notions of partial exchangeability are needed for more complex phenomena, which can still be described by some form of probabilistic invariance, under specific subclasses of permutations. See Diaconis and Freedman [1980], Kallenberg [2005], Aldous [2010]. A basic notion is partial exchangeability in the sense of de Finetti [de Finetti, 1937] (called internal exchangeability for a family of sequences by Aldous [1985]). In Bayesian statistics, partial exchangeability in the sense of de Finetti is the fundamental probabilistic dependence behind inference for multiple experiments. Roughly speaking, observations are exchangeable within each experiment, but not across experiments; the probabilistic dependence among sequences allows borrowing strength across experiments. Throughout this paper, by partial exchangeability we mean partial exchangeability in the sense of de Finetti. Again, different forms of non-stationarity may break the symmetry of partial exchangeability. It seems natural to ask how the notion of c.i.d. sequences can be extended to a notion of *partially* c.i.d. processes, the way that partial exchangeability extends exchangeability. Such extension is the main objective of the present work.

We introduce a notion of *partially c.i.d.* families of sequences that is shown to be equivalent to partial exchangeability under stationarity. Then, we prove that partially c.i.d. sequences preserve some main limit properties of partially exchangeable sequences. In particular, the joint predictive distributions and the joint empirical distributions converge (weakly) to the same random limit, almost surely. Moreover, partially c.i.d. sequences are asymptotically partially exchangeable. The asymptotic agreement of frequencies and predictions is of fundamental interest in Bayesian statistics, where probability has a subjective interpretation, showing the frequentist basis of the subject's probabilistic learning. Such agreement is ensured (in the subject's opinion) for exchangeable and partially exchangeable sequences. Our result shows that it is still ensured when relaxing the assumption of stationarity from partial exchangeability. Marginally, these results are not surprising, as partially c.i.d. sequences are marginally c.i.d. and the limit behavior of c.i.d. sequences has been studied (Berti et al. [2004], Berti et al. [2012]). Yet, for multiple sequences, the *joint* limit behavior is not obvious, as the sequences are stochastically dependent. Notice that they remain asymptotically dependent, if the random marginal limit measures are dependent.

These limit results are refined in Section 5, where we provide a strong law of large numbers for partially c.i.d. sequences, and in Section 6, where we give two central limit theorems, for the scaled cumulative forecast errors and the scaled difference between empirical means and predictions, respectively. Beyond fundamental issues, the possibility of approximating predictions by empirical means, with an approximation error given by a central limit theorem, can be of interest for hypothesis testing and model checking as well as for facilitating computations in Bayesian prediction with large sample size.

Areas of applications include interacting evolutionary phenomena that, while not being stationary, tend towards an equilibrium state of partial exchangeability. We provide several examples throughout the paper. In particular, a natural class of partially c.i.d. families of sequences are interacting randomly reinforced processes satisfying certain conditions on the random reinforcement (see Section 4). In the case of a single sequence, constructions based on a time-varying or random reinforcement (see Pemantle [2007]) are indeed main examples of c.i.d. sequences. The time-dependent urn scheme of Pemantle [1990b] is a basic case, and further examples are Randomly Reinforced Urns (RRUs), a special case of Generalized Pólya Urns (see Athreya and Ney [1972], and Pemantle [2007]), with a diagonal and random replacement

matrix. In the classical two-color Pólya urn, a ball is drawn at each step, and returned to the urn together with an additional ball of the same color. Then the sequence of colors extracted at successive draws is exchangeable. However, the number of additional balls placed in the urn at each step, the *reinforcement*, may be random, making the sequence of colors no longer exchangeable. In fact, if the random reinforcements are independent of the color extracted, the generated sequence of colors is c.i.d. Areas of application include adaptive clinical trials (Hu and Rosenberger [2006], Baldi Antognini and Giovagnoli [2015]), sequential design, two armed bandit problems and reinforcement learning (Beggs [2005]) and Bayesian inference. The two-color randomly reinforced urn scheme proposed by Durham and Yu [1990] for response-adaptive clinical trials generates a c.i.d. sequence under the null hypothesis of equivalence of the two treatments. Extensions and theoretical properties are given, among others, by Durham et al. [1998], Muliere et al. [2006], May and Flournoy [2009]; see Flournoy et al. [2012] for a review. The notion of partially c.i.d. sequences extends the spectrum of application to multiple experiments, for example clinical trials in multiple centers. There is an increasing interest in interacting randomly reinforced processes in many fields (see e.g. Paganoni and Secchi [2004]; Crimaldi et al. [2015]). Yet, the literature is somehow fragmented, as many results are tailored for specific constructions and aims; the notion of partially c.i.d. processes may provide a useful reference framework.

Processes with reinforcement are the basis of many important constructions in Bayesian nonparametric inference; extensions to a random reinforcement are of interest also in this area (Bassetti et al. [2010], Airoidi et al. [2014]). Applications to competitive networks are shown by Caldarelli et al. [2013] and c.i.d. sequences arise as a particular case of the generalized Indian Buffet process [Berti et al., 2015] for competitive feature selection. Multivariate extensions of these constructions do not appear to have been studied. In fact, a problem of interest in Bayesian nonparametrics is to characterize partially exchangeable families of reinforced processes with a tractable form of the predictive laws. However, this problem is somehow unsolved (see the discussion in Wade et al. [2011], Lee et al. [2013] and Bacallado et al. [2015]). Natural constructions of dependent reinforced processes fail to be partially exchangeable. However, they may generate partially c.i.d., therefore asymptotically partially exchangeable, sequences. Implicitly, these partially c.i.d. constructions characterize novel classes of prior distributions for dependent random measures, as the weak limits of the joint predictive distributions. However, finding explicit expressions of these prior distributions is difficult. Some results for c.i.d. or “quasi-c.i.d.” sequences are in Durham et al. [1998] and Aletti et al. [2007, 2012, 2013]. Pemantle [1990a] gives non-convergence results that apply to partially c.i.d. sequences. The potential of stochastic approximation methods for randomized urn schemes is further highlighted by Laruelle and Pagés [2013]. A study of the explicit limit law for partially c.i.d. sequences is beyond the aim of this paper. Yet, we show an example, with dependent Gaussian sequences, for which the limit law can be computed and has a parametric expression (Section 4).

We start our study with a brief review of c.i.d. sequences, including some facts that appear to be novel, in Section 2. We introduce the notion of partially c.i.d. sequences in Section 3 and prove some main limit results in Section 4. A strong law of large numbers and two central limits theorems are presented in Sections 5 and 6. Several examples are provided throughout the paper.

2 Exchangeability, spreadability and c.i.d. sequences.

Let $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random variables defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, with each X_n taking values in a Polish space \mathbb{X} , endowed with the Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{X} . Spaces of probability measures are endowed with the topology of weak convergence and with the sigma-algebra generated by the evaluation maps. A random probability measure is a random element taking values in a space of probability measures. Conditional distributions refer to regular versions; equalities of random probability measures hold \mathbb{P} -almost surely (\mathbb{P} -a.s.). Additionally, we use $X_{1:n}$ to denote the vector (X_1, \dots, X_n) ; (X_n) to denote the sequence $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $\stackrel{d}{=}$ to denote equality in distribution.

The sequence (X_n) is exchangeable if its probability law is invariant under any finite permutation, that is, if

$$(X_1, X_2, \dots) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_{\pi(1)}, X_{\pi(2)}, \dots)$$

for any permutation π of \mathbb{N} for which $\pi(n) = n$, except for a finite number of n 's.

An equivalent notion of invariance under subsequence selection, or spreading invariance, is discussed in Kingman [1978] and Aldous [1985]. Following the terminology of Kallenberg [1988], we say that a sequence (X_n) is *spreadable* if

$$(X_1, X_2, \dots) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_{k_1}, X_{k_2}, \dots) \quad \text{for every } k_1 < k_2 < \dots.$$

It is easy to show that an exchangeable sequence is spreadable, and the converse implication is proved by Ryll-Nardzewski [1957]. By de Finetti's representation theorem, the law of an exchangeable sequence is a mixture of distributions of i.i.d. random variables (Aldous [1985], Part I, Section 3). Ryll-Nardzewski [1957] proves that the same conclusion holds for spreadable sequences. In fact, Kallenberg [1988] notices that the representation theorem is a consequence of the mean ergodic theorem, and can be proved for stationary sequences that satisfy a condition weaker than spreadability.

Proposition 2.1 [Kallenberg, 1988, Proposition 2.1]. *A stationary sequence (X_n) that satisfies*

$$(X_1, \dots, X_n, X_{n+1}) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_1, \dots, X_n, X_{n+k}) \quad \text{for all integers } k \geq 1 \text{ and } n \geq 1 \quad (1)$$

is exchangeable.

Notice that (1) is equivalent to $(X_1, \dots, X_n, X_{n+1}) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_1, \dots, X_n, X_{n+2})$ for all $n \geq 1$. Condition (1) says that all future observations are conditionally identically distributed, given the past. Extending this notion, Berti et al. [2004] give the following definition. Assume that the sequence (X_n) is adapted to a filtration $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \geq 0}$. Then, (X_n) is *conditionally identically distributed with respect to the filtration \mathcal{G}* , or \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. whenever

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+k}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n] = \mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

for all $k \geq 1$, $n \geq 0$ and all bounded measurable functions $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Roughly speaking, the future observations X_{n+k} are identically distributed, given the past \mathcal{G}_n . In particular, the X_n are marginally identically distributed. When considering the natural filtration, i.e. when \mathcal{G}_n is the sigma-field generated by (X_1, \dots, X_n) and $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$, (X_n) is called *naturally c.i.d.*, or, simply, c.i.d., omitting the filtration. If (X_n) is \mathcal{G} -c.i.d., then (X_n) is also c.i.d. with respect to any coarser filtration to which it is adapted; in particular, it is c.i.d. An exchangeable sequence is clearly c.i.d.

The following proposition (Kallenberg [1988] Proposition 2.2, and Berti et al. [2004]) gives equivalent conditions.

Proposition 2.2 *The following properties (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent:*

- (i) *The sequence (X_n) is \mathcal{G} -c.i.d.*
- (ii) *The process of predictive measures $Q_n(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n]$ is a measure-valued \mathcal{G} -martingale.*
- (iii) *For each finite \mathcal{G} -stopping time τ , $X_{\tau+1} \stackrel{d}{=} X_1$.*

The martingale condition (ii) asserts that (Q_n) is a sequence of random probability measures satisfying $\mathbb{E}[Q_{n+1}(A) \mid \mathcal{G}_n] = Q_n(A)$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., for every $n \geq 0$ and every $A \in \mathcal{X}$ (Horowitz [1985]); this is equivalent to:

$$(\mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+1}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n])_{n \geq 0} \text{ is a } \mathcal{G}\text{-martingale, for all bounded measurable functions } f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}. \quad (2)$$

We present below some facts, that appear to be novel, which provide further insights into the connections with the notion of exchangeability. Further characterizations are given by Berti et al. [2004, 2012].

An exchangeable sequence can be characterized by the sequence of predictive distributions $(Q_n)_{n \geq 0}$, with $Q_0 := \mathbb{P}[X_1 \in \cdot]$ and $Q_n := \mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} \in \cdot \mid X_{1:n}]$, for $n \geq 1$ [Fortini et al., 2000]. In particular, a necessary condition for (Q_n) to define an exchangeable probability law for (X_n) is that Q_n is a symmetric function of (X_1, \dots, X_n) . For c.i.d. sequences, the symmetric role of past observations in prediction is lost. Indeed, a c.i.d. sequence (X_n) is exchangeable if and only if $\mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} \in \cdot \mid X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n]$ is symmetric in (A_1, \dots, A_n) , for every $n \geq 1$ and every A_1, \dots, A_n with $\mathbb{P}[X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n] > 0$. This result is proved as a Corollary of Proposition 3.6 in Section 3.

A second fact is related to the lack of a de Finetti-type representation theorem for c.i.d. sequences. If (X_n) is exchangeable, by de Finetti's representation theorem there exists a random probability measure α such that, conditionally on α , X_1, X_2, \dots are i.i.d, with distribution α ; α is called the *directing random measure* of (X_n) and coincides \mathbb{P} -a.s. with the weak limit of both the sequence of the empirical distributions and the sequence of the predictive distributions of (X_n) (Aldous [1985]). Thus, although an exchangeable sequence (X_n) may describe an *evolutionary* process, the representation theorem implies that (X_n) is probabilistically equivalent to *static* random sampling from its directing measure. The possible lack of stationarity clearly implies that no equivalence with a static phenomenon, that is, no similar representation result, is possible for c.i.d. sequences. Intuitively, X_n is sampled from an evolving population that has unpredictable dynamics and converges to a random steady state. The following proposition gives a state-space like construction.

Proposition 2.3 *Consider a process (X_n, F_n) where F_n are random probability measures on \mathbb{X} . If the following conditions hold:*

- (i) *conditionally on (F_n) , the X_n are independent and the conditional distribution of X_n is F_n ;*
- (ii) *(F_n) is a measure-valued martingale with respect to its natural filtration,*

then the process (X_n) is c.i.d.

PROOF. We prove that, under (i) and (ii), (X_n) is \mathcal{G} -c.i.d., where $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ and \mathcal{G}_n is the sigma-field generated by $(X_{1:n}, F_{1:n})$. Therefore, it is also c.i.d. By (i) and (ii), $\mathbb{P}[X_k \in \cdot] = \mathbb{E}[F_k(\cdot)] = \mathbb{E}[F_1(\cdot)] = \mathbb{P}[X_1 \in \cdot]$. Furthermore, by (i), for every $n \geq 1$, every bounded continuous functions g, g_1, \dots, g_n and every $A \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[g_1(X_1)g_2(X_2) \dots g_n(X_n)g(F_{n+k}(A)) | F_{1:n}] = \mathbb{E}[g(F_{n+k}(A)) | F_{1:n}] \prod_{s=1}^n \mathbb{E}[g_s(X_s) | F_s];$$

therefore, $F_{n+k}(A)$ is conditionally independent of $X_{1:n}$, given $F_{1:n}$. Then, for any $k \geq 1$, $n \geq 1$ and $A \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[X_{n+k} \in A | X_{1:n}, F_{1:n}] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{P}[X_{n+k} \in A | X_{1:n}, (F_n)] | X_{1:n}, F_{1:n}] = \mathbb{E}[F_{n+k}(A) | F_{1:n}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[F_{n+1}(A) | F_{1:n}] = \mathbb{E}[F_{n+1}(A) | X_{1:n}, F_{1:n}] = \mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} \in A | X_{1:n}, F_{1:n}] \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality follows from the martingale property (ii). Thus, (X_n) is \mathcal{G} -c.i.d.

□

Abusing notation, we will write $X_n | F_n \stackrel{ind}{\sim} F_n$ to denote the dependence structure under (i) above. The following example, which elaborates from Example 1.3 in Berti et al. [2004], suggests that a c.i.d. process may have a state-space representation in terms of a finite-dimensional latent process (θ_n) converging to a random limit, a result that we do not pursue further here.

Example 2.4 Let (X_n, θ_n) be described by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} X_n &= \theta_n + \epsilon_n, & \epsilon_n &\stackrel{ind}{\sim} N(0, c - b_n); \\ \theta_n &= \theta_{n-1} + v_n, & v_n &\stackrel{ind}{\sim} N(0, b_n - b_{n-1}), \quad n \geq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

for some $0 = b_0 < b_1 < b_2 < \dots < c$, with $b_n \rightarrow c' < c$, and with θ_0 , (ϵ_n) and (v_n) independent. For brevity, let θ_0 be a fixed constant. In other words,

$$X_n | \theta_n \stackrel{ind}{\sim} N(\theta_n, c - b_n)$$

and (θ_n) is the damped random walk described by the state equation (3). It is easy to show that the process (X_n) is c.i.d., with $X_n \stackrel{id}{\sim} N(\theta_0, c)$ (where $\stackrel{id}{\sim}$ means identically distributed). Some computations show that $\theta_n = \theta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n v_i$ converges in distribution to a random limit $\theta \sim N(\theta_0, c')$ (indeed, (θ_n) is a uniformly integrable martingale, therefore it converges a.s. to a random limit θ). Moreover, the predictive distribution of X_{n+1} , given $X_{1:n}$, converges to a $N(\theta, c - c')$. By Lemma 8.2 in Aldous [1985], this implies that (X_n) is asymptotically exchangeable, and the exchangeable limit law has directing random measure given by $N(\theta, c - c')$; that is, roughly speaking, $X_n | \theta \stackrel{id}{\sim} N(\theta, c - c')$ for large n .

Although generally not exchangeable, \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. sequences preserve some attractive limit properties of exchangeable sequences [Berti et al., 2004]. In particular, \mathbb{P} -a.s., the empirical distributions $\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}(\cdot)/n$ and the predictive distributions $\mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} \in \cdot | \mathcal{G}_n]$ converge to the same random probability measure α . Moreover, $\mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} \in \cdot | \mathcal{G}_n] = \mathbb{E}[\alpha(\cdot) | \mathcal{G}_n]$. Convergence of the predictive distributions to α implies that the sequence (X_n) is asymptotically exchangeable and the exchangeable limit law has directing measure α ; that is, $(X_{n+1}, X_{n+2}, \dots) \xrightarrow{d} (Z_1, Z_2, \dots)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for some exchangeable sequence (Z_n) directed by α . This fact motivates referring to α as the *directing random measure* of the c.i.d. sequence. Further asymptotic results and uniform limit theorems for c.i.d. sequences were given, among others, by Berti et al. [2004, 2012].

3 Partially c.i.d. sequences

Our aim is to extend the notion of c.i.d. sequences to arrays of random variables $[X_{n,i}]_{n \geq 1; i \in I}$, where I is a finite or countable set. We introduce a notion of *partially c.i.d.* sequences, that can be regarded as a weaker form of partial exchangeability, in the same sense that the c.i.d. property is a weaker form of exchangeability.

An array of random variables $[X_{n,i}]$ is partially exchangeable (in the sense of de Finetti) if its probability law is invariant under separate finite permutations of the columns, that is

$$[X_{n,i}] \stackrel{d}{=} [X_{\pi_i(n),i}]$$

for all finite permutations $\pi_i, i \in I$. Marginally, the columns $(X_{n,i})_{n \geq 1}$ are exchangeable, but a family of exchangeable sequences is not necessarily partially exchangeable. For example, two exchangeable sequences (X_n) and (Y_n) , where $X_n = Y_n$ for all n , are not partially exchangeable, unless their distributions are degenerate. Similarly, an interesting notion of partially c.i.d. dependence should require appropriate conditions for a family of c.i.d. sequences to be partially c.i.d. We proceed along the lines of Section 2 and, as a first step, we extend the notion of spreadability to families of sequences. Let us introduce the notion of *partial spreadability* as invariance of the joint probability law under separate selection of subsequences along the columns.

Definition 3.1 *An array $[X_{n,i}]_{n \geq 1; i \in I}$ of random variables is partially spreadable if*

$$[X_{n,i}] \stackrel{d}{=} [X_{k_n^{(i)},i}], \quad \text{for every } k_1^{(i)} < k_2^{(i)} < \dots, i \in I. \quad (4)$$

Clearly, a partially exchangeable array satisfies (4). The reverse implication is also true.

Proposition 3.2 *A partially spreadable array $[X_{n,i}]$ is partially exchangeable.*

PROOF. Let J be a finite subset of I and j be a fixed element in J . Let $Z = [X_{n,i}]_{n \geq 1; i \in J \setminus \{j\}}$, and, for every $n \geq 1$, let $U_n = (Z, X_{n,j})$. By (4), the sequence (U_n) is spreadable. By the results in Ryll-Nardzewski [1957], (U_n) is exchangeable. In other words, $(X_{n,j})_{n \geq 1}$ is exchangeable over Z (Aldous [1985], Section 3). Since this holds for every finite $J \subset I$ and for every $j \in J$, the array $[X_{n,i}]$ is partially exchangeable (Aldous [1985], Proposition 3.8).

□

Let us now regard the rows of $[X_{n,i}]$ as the values of a process $(\mathbf{X}_n^I)_{n \geq 1}$, where $\mathbf{X}_n^I = (X_{n,i}, i \in I)$. If the process (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is stationary, then a weaker form of spreadability is sufficient for partial exchangeability. The following result extends Proposition 2.1.

Theorem 3.3 *A stationary process (\mathbf{X}_n^I) that satisfies*

$$(\mathbf{X}_{1:n}^J, \mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{J \setminus \{j\}}, X_{n+1,j}) \stackrel{d}{=} (\mathbf{X}_{1:n}^J, \mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{J \setminus \{j\}}, X_{n+2,j}) \quad \text{for every } n \geq 0, j \in J \text{ and every finite } J \subset I, \quad (5)$$

is partially exchangeable, where (5) reads $(\mathbf{X}_1^{J \setminus \{j\}}, X_{1,j}) \stackrel{d}{=} (\mathbf{X}_1^{J \setminus \{j\}}, X_{2,j})$ when $n = 0$.

PROOF. Since (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is stationary, we can embed it in a doubly infinite sequence $(\mathbf{X}_n^I)_{-\infty < n < \infty}$. Marginally, each sequence $(X_{n,i})$ is stationary and c.i.d., therefore, by Proposition 2.1, exchangeable. Let us denote by α_i its directing random measure. Let J be a finite subset of I , j a fixed element of J and m a fixed

positive integer. For every $n \geq 1$, let $Z_n = (\mathbf{X}_{1:m}^J, \mathbf{X}_{m+1}^{J \setminus \{j\}}, X_{m+n,j})$. Since (Z_n) is stationary and c.i.d., it is exchangeable. In other words, $(X_{m+n,j})_{n \geq 1}$ is exchangeable over $(\mathbf{X}_{1:m}^J, \mathbf{X}_{m+1}^{J \setminus \{j\}})$ (Aldous [1985] Section 3). By Proposition 3.8 in Aldous [1985], $(X_{m+1,j}, X_{m+2,j}, \dots)$ are conditionally i.i.d. with common law α_j , given $(\alpha_j, (\mathbf{X}_{1:m}^J, \mathbf{X}_{m+1}^{J \setminus \{j\}}))$. Since (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is stationary, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $X_{k,j}$ is conditionally independent of $(X_{h,i} : (h,i) \neq (k,j), k-n \leq h \leq k, i \in J)$, given α_j . Therefore, $X_{k,j}$ is conditionally independent of $(X_{h,i} : (h,i) \neq (k,j), h \leq k, i \in J)$, given α_j . Since $\alpha_i = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{s=1}^n \delta_{X_{k-s,i}}/n$ (\mathbb{P} -a.s.), $X_{k,j}$ is also conditionally independent of $(\alpha_i : i \neq j)$, given α_j . Thus, for every n

$$\mathbb{P}[\cap_{i \in J} \cap_{k=1}^n (X_{k,i} \in A_{k,i}) \mid \alpha_i, i \in J] = \prod_{i \in J} \prod_{k=1}^n \alpha_i(A_{k,i}), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

and (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is partially exchangeable.

□

Condition (5) implies that, for any $j \in I$, future values of $X_{n,j}$ are conditionally identically distributed, given the past observations $(\mathbf{X}_{1:n}^I)$ and the concomitant values $(\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}})$ of the other variables. More generally, given a filtration $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \geq 0}$, we introduce the following definition.

Definition 3.4 *A sequence (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is said to be partially conditionally identically distributed with respect to a filtration \mathcal{G} (briefly, partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d.), if it is adapted to \mathcal{G} and, for every $j \in I$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+1,j}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n^j] = \mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+k,j}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n^j] \quad (6)$$

for all $k \geq 1, n \geq 0$ and all bounded measurable functions $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

where $\mathcal{G}_n^j = \mathcal{G}_n \vee \sigma(X_{n+1,i} : i \neq j)$.

When \mathcal{G} is the natural filtration of (\mathbf{X}_n^I) , with $\mathcal{G}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$, the process is said to be naturally partially c.i.d. or, simply, partially c.i.d. Clearly, in this case condition (6) reduces to (5). It is easy to show that, if (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d., then it is also partially c.i.d. with respect to any coarser filtration to which it is adapted; in particular, it is partially c.i.d. A partially exchangeable array satisfies (5), thus it is partially c.i.d.

Condition (6) means that each sequence $(X_{n,j})_{n \geq 1}$ is c.i.d. with respect to the filtration $\mathcal{G}^j = (\mathcal{G}_n^j)_{n \geq 0}$. This allows us to formulate equivalent conditions (extending Proposition 2.2).

Proposition 3.5 *The following properties (i), (ii) and (iii) are equivalent.*

(i) *The sequence (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d.;*

(ii) *For any $j \in I$ and every bounded measurable function $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(\mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+1,j}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n^j])_{n \geq 0}$ is a \mathcal{G}^j -martingale;*

(iii) *For every $n \geq 0$, and $j \in I$, $(\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}}, X_{\tau+1,j}) \stackrel{d}{=} (\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}}, X_{n+1,j})$, for all finite \mathcal{G} -stopping times τ satisfying $\tau \geq n$.*

PROOF. Conditions (i) and (ii) are equivalent, by Proposition 2.2. To prove that (ii) implies (iii), fix $n \geq 0$ and $j \in I$ and let $\tau \geq n$ be a finite \mathcal{G} -stopping time. Let $f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded measurable function and let $B \in \mathcal{X}^{I \setminus \{j\}}$. Since $(\mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+k+1,j}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}} \in B\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_{n+k}^j])_{k \geq 0}$ is a bounded martingale and $\tau - n$

is a finite stopping time, with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{G}_{n+k})_{k \geq 0}$, by Doob optional stopping theorem, $\mathbb{E}[f(X_{\tau+1,j})\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}} \in B\}}] = \mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+1,j})\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}} \in B\}}]$, which implies (iii). To prove that (iii) implies (i), let us fix $B \in \mathcal{X}$, $C \in \mathcal{X}^{I \setminus \{j\}}$, $A \in \mathcal{G}_n$ and let $\tau = (n+1)\mathbb{1}_A + n\mathbb{1}_{A^c}$. Then, τ is a finite \mathcal{G} -stopping time and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[(X_{n+2,j} \in B) \cap (\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}} \in C) \cap A\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[(X_{\tau+1,j} \in B) \cap (\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}} \in C)\right] - \mathbb{P}\left[(X_{\tau+1,j} \in B) \cap (\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}} \in C) \cap (\tau = n)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left[(X_{n+1,j} \in B) \cap (\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^{I \setminus \{j\}} \in C) \cap A\right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 3.3 shows that stationarity is a sufficient condition for a partially c.i.d. process to be partially exchangeable. The following proposition gives a sufficient condition in terms of the predictive distributions.

Proposition 3.6 *Let (\mathbf{X}_n^I) be a partially c.i.d. process. Suppose that, for every finite $J \subset I$ and every $j \in J$, $n \geq 0$, permutations $(\pi_i)_{i \in J}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[X_{n+1,j} \in \cdot \mid \bigcap_{(m,i) \in H_{n,j}} (X_{m,i} \in A_{m,i})\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[X_{n+1,j} \in \cdot \mid \bigcap_{(m,i) \in H_{n,j}} (X_{\pi_i(m),i} \in A_{m,i})\right], \\ \text{where } H_{n,j} &= \{(m,i) \neq (n+1,j) : m \leq n+1, i \in J\}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for all $A_{m,i}$ such that the conditioning sets have positive probability. Then (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is partially exchangeable.

PROOF. By Theorem 3.3, we only need to prove that (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is a stationary process, which is true if (\mathbf{X}_n^J) is stationary for every finite $J \subset I$. Let J be a finite subset of I . Without loss of generality, we can assume that $J = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us define the following ordering in $\mathbb{N} \times J$:

$$(1,1) \prec (1,2) \prec \dots \prec (1,d) \prec (2,1) \prec (2,2) \prec \dots \prec (2,d) \prec (3,1) \prec \dots \prec (3,d) \prec \dots \quad (8)$$

For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, let us denote by $K_N \subset \mathbb{N} \times J$ the set of the first N pairs in (8). We prove that

$$\mathbb{P}[\bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m,i} \in A_{m,i})] = \mathbb{P}[\bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m+1,i} \in A_{m,i})] \quad \text{for every } [A_{m,i}]_{(m,i) \in K_N} \in \mathcal{X}^N \quad (9)$$

for every N , which implies stationarity of (\mathbf{X}_n^J) . The proof is done by induction on N . The property is trivially true for $N = 1$, since $(X_{n,1})_{n \geq 1}$ is c.i.d. Suppose that (9) holds for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $A_{m,i}$, with $(m,i) \in K_{N+1}$, be fixed subsets in \mathcal{X} . Let (n,j) denote the largest element of K_N and let (n',j') denote its subsequent element in (8). Then $n' \geq n$ and $j' \neq j$. If $\mathbb{P}[\bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m,i} \in A_{m,i})] = 0$, then, by the induction hypothesis, $\mathbb{P}[\bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m+1,i} \in A_{m,i})] = 0$ and (9) holds with $N+1$ in the place of N , since both terms of the equality are equal to zero. Conversely, suppose that $\mathbb{P}[\bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m,i} \in A_{m,i})] > 0$. By the induction hypothesis $\mathbb{P}[\bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m+1,i} \in A_{m,i})] > 0$. By the p-c.i.d. condition and the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_{N+1}} (X_{m,i} \in A_{m,i})\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[X_{n',j'} \in A_{n',j'} \mid \bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m,i} \in A_{m,i})\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m,i} \in A_{m,i})\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left[X_{n'+1,j'} \in A_{n',j'} \mid \bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m,i} \in A_{m,i})\right] \mathbb{P}\left[\bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m+1,i} \in A_{m,i})\right]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $(n'+1,j')$ is the largest element in K_{N+d+1} , by (7),

$$\mathbb{P}\left[X_{n'+1,j'} \in A_{n',j'} \mid \bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m,i} \in A_{m,i})\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[X_{n'+1,j'} \in A_{n',j'} \mid \bigcap_{(m,i) \in K_N} (X_{m+1,i} \in A_{m,i})\right].$$

Hence (9) holds for $N+1$ in the place of N , and the thesis follows.

□

Corollary 3.7 *A c.i.d. sequence (X_n) is exchangeable if and only if, for every $n \geq 1$ and permutation π ,*

$$\mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} \in \cdot \mid X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_n \in A_n] = \mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} \in \cdot \mid X_{\pi(1)} \in A_1, \dots, X_{\pi(n)} \in A_n],$$

for all A_1, \dots, A_n such that the conditioning sets have positive probability.

Intuitively, a c.i.d. sequence is exchangeable if the order of the past observations is *totally irrelevant* for predictions based on whatever information about the past. A different set of predictive conditions that characterize an exchangeable probability law is given by Fortini et al. [2000].

Example 3.8 [Interacting randomly reinforced processes]. As discussed in the Introduction, processes with reinforcement are a powerful way to generate exchangeable sequences. However, even natural extensions to systems of dependent reinforced processes break stationarity and are not partially exchangeable. In fact, they are partially c.i.d. under quite natural assumptions on the updating rule. Consider a family of sequences $(X_{n,i})_{n \geq 1}$, $i \in I$, that evolve according to the following randomly reinforced scheme. Let $w_{0,i}$ be known positive scalars and $W_{1,i}, W_{2,i}, \dots$ be positive random variables, for every $i \in I$. Let $\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma(\mathbf{X}_{1:n}^I, \mathbf{W}_{1:n}^I)$. Assume that $X_{1,i} \sim \nu_i(\cdot)$ for a given distribution ν_i , and for any $n \geq 1$

$$Q_{n,i}(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}[X_{n+1,i} \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n] = \frac{w_{0,i}\nu_i(\cdot) + \sum_{k=1}^n W_{k,i}\delta_{X_{k,i}}(\cdot)}{w_{0,i} + \sum_{k=1}^n W_{k,i}}, \quad i \in I. \quad (10)$$

The generative rule (10) produces a system of reinforced processes. For binary random variables, the interacting randomly reinforced urns by Paganoni and Secchi [2004] are examples of the construction (10). Other important reinforced schemes are special cases. If $W_{n,i} = 1$ for all n and i , (10) describes independent Pólya sequences [Blackwell and MacQueen, 1973], that is, independent, internally exchangeable sequences $(X_{n,i})_{n \geq 1}$ driven by a Dirichlet process with base measure $w_{0,i}\nu_i$. For time-varying or random weights $W_{n,i}$, marginal exchangeability is generally lost; however, such extensions are of interest in many applications. For a single sequence (i.e. $I = \{1\}$), a randomly reinforced scheme of the kind (10) is considered by Bassetti et al. [2010] as a (c.i.d.) generalization of exchangeable species sampling models; further developments are given in Airolidi et al. [2014]. The predictive system (10) envisages extensions to multiple populations.

Indeed, the interest in the generative rule (10) is that one can introduce interaction across the sequences, through the weights $W_{n,i}$, which are generally stochastically dependent; in particular, each $W_{n,i}$ may be a function of the observed values of the other sequences. Nonetheless, it is natural to assume that the populations are updated independently, that is,

- (a) conditionally on \mathcal{G}_n , the $X_{n+1,i}$, $i \in I$, are independent.

If, moreover,

- (b) the random weight $W_{n,i}$ is conditionally independent of $X_{n,i}$, given \mathcal{G}_{n-1} , for any $n \geq 1, i \in I$, then (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. To see this, write the predictive distribution (10) recursively:

$$Q_{n,i}(\cdot) = A_{n,i}\delta_{X_{n,i}}(\cdot) + (1 - A_{n,i})Q_{n-1,i}(\cdot), \quad (11)$$

where $A_{n,i} = W_{n,i}/(w_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n W_{k,i})$. By (11) and assumptions (a) and (b), for every $n \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[Q_{n+1,i}(\cdot) \mid \mathcal{G}_n^i \vee \sigma(W_{n+1,i})] = \mathbb{E}[A_{n+1,i}\delta_{X_{n+1,i}}(\cdot) + (1 - A_{n+1,i})Q_{n,i}(\cdot) \mid \mathcal{G}_n^i \vee \sigma(W_{n+1,i})] = Q_{n,i}(\cdot).$$

Thus, $[X_{n,i}]$ is partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. Notice that (10) and (11) are equivalent. Indeed, (10) can be retrieved from (11) by defining, recursively, $w_{0,i} = 1$ and $W_{n,i} = (w_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} W_{k,i})A_{n,i}/(1 - A_{n,i})$.

Forms of interaction in the partially c.i.d. system (10) may include common weights: $W_{n,i} = W_n$ for any $i \in I$ and $n \geq 1$; interaction through the weights: $W_{n,i} = w_{n,i}(X_{k,j} : k \leq n, j \neq i)$; interaction through common (observable or latent) variables: $W_{n,i} = w_{n,i}(Z_k : k \leq n)$ for any i . In the latter, $\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma(\mathbf{X}_{1:n}^I, Z_{1:n})$, and one further assumes that Z_{n+1} is conditionally independent of \mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I , given \mathcal{G}_n . A further extension is to let $W_{n,i} = w_{n,i}(Z_{1:n}, \mathbf{X}_{1:n}^{I \setminus \{i\}})$.

The following is an example of the construction (10), where no latent variables are introduced, so that the predictive distribution given the natural filtration has a simple form.

Example 3.9 Consider the system (10) where $I = \{1, 2\}$, the marginal law ν_i is the uniform distribution on the unit interval and the random weights $W_{n,i}$ are defined recursively through (11), by letting $A_{n,i} = \beta_n X_{n,j}$ for $j \neq i$, where (β_n) is a fixed sequence of positive numbers, with $\beta_1 = 1$ and $\beta_n \leq 1$. These assumptions could be relaxed, allowing for more than two sequences and for different marginal laws. The independence assumptions (a) and (b) in Example 3.8 are satisfied, thus (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is partially-c.i.d. The sequence of parameters (β_n) allows to tune the relative weights of past observations in the predictive distributions. For example, if $\beta_n = 1$ for every n , then the expected weight of $X_{n,i}$ in the prediction of $X_{n+1,i}$ is $1/2$, and observations that are far away in the past have negligible weight; conversely, if $\beta_n = 2/(n+1)$, then the expected weight of $X_{n,i}$ is $1/(n+1)$ and all past observations have roughly the same weight.

The interaction between the two sequences induces a positive correlation in the joint law of $(X_{n,1}, X_{n,2})$, for every n . Indeed, $\mathbb{E}[(X_{2,1} - 1/2)(X_{2,2} - 1/2)] = \mathbb{E}[(X_{1,1} - 1/2)^2(X_{1,2} - 1/2)^2] = 1/144$, so that $\text{Corr}(X_{2,1}, X_{2,2}) = 1/12$. Furthermore, denoting by \mathcal{G} the natural filtration of (\mathbf{X}_n^I) ,

$$\mathbb{E}[(X_{n+1,1} - 1/2)(X_{n+1,2} - 1/2)] - \mathbb{E}[(X_{n,1} - 1/2)(X_{n,2} - 1/2)] = \beta_n^2 \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}[X_{n,1} | \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] \mathbb{V}[X_{n,2} | \mathcal{G}_{n-1}]] \geq 0.$$

Since the standard deviations are constant, the correlation between $X_{n,1}$ and $X_{n,2}$ is an increasing function of n and is, therefore, strictly positive for every $n > 1$.

4 Asymptotic partial exchangeability

As seen in Section 2, c.i.d. sequences are asymptotically exchangeable. Here, we prove that partially c.i.d. processes are asymptotically partially exchangeable.

Clearly, asymptotic partial exchangeability does not follow from marginal properties. If an array $[X_{n,i}]$ is partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d., then each of its columns is \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. and the marginal predictive distributions $\mathbb{P}[X_{n+1,i} \in \cdot | \mathcal{G}_n]$ converge to the *marginal directing measure* α_i on \mathbb{X} . This implies that the vector $(\mathbb{P}[X_{n+1,i} \in \cdot | \mathcal{G}_n], i \in I)$ converges to the vector of random measures $(\alpha_i, i \in I)$. However, these properties are not sufficient to ensure the asymptotic conditional independence required for partial exchangeability. Let us recall that, by the representation theorem for partially exchangeable sequences (see Aldous [1985], Section 3), an array $[X_{n,i}]$ is partially exchangeable if and only if there exist random probability measures $(\alpha_i, i \in I)$ such that, conditionally on $(\alpha_i, i \in I)$, the sequences $(X_{n,i})$ are independent, with $X_{n,i} | (\alpha_j, j \in I) \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \alpha_i, i \in I$.

In order to prove the asymptotic partial exchangeability of partially c.i.d. arrays, we show that the *joint* predictive distribution $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G}_n]$ converges a.s. (which is not an immediate consequence of the marginal c.i.d. property, because the sequence (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is not c.i.d.); and that it converges to the product random probability measure $\times_{i \in I} \alpha_i$. This implies asymptotic partial exchangeability (Theorem 4.3).

Moreover, we show that, as for partially exchangeable sequences, the empirical distributions converge a.s. to the same limit as the predictive distributions. Here, convergence is meant as weak convergence. However, with a little more effort, we can prove that the predictive and the empirical distributions converge *point-wise*. This is the content of Proposition 4.2. The point-wise convergence will also become useful in Section 5. The basic step for the proof is given by the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.1 *Let (\mathbf{X}_n^I) be a partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. process. Then, for every finite $J \subset I$ and every bounded and measurable functions f_i , $i \in J$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i \in J} f_i(X_{n+1,i}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n \right] \rightarrow \prod_{i \in J} \int f_i d\alpha_i \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. and in } L^1, \quad (12)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \prod_{i \in J} f_i(X_{k,i}) \rightarrow \prod_{i \in J} \int f_i d\alpha_i \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. and in } L^1, \quad (13)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where α_i is the marginal directing measure of $(X_{n,i})_{n \geq 1}$.

PROOF. Since the f_i are bounded, L^1 convergence is a consequence of the a.s. convergence. The proof of (12) proceeds by induction on $k = |J|$, the cardinality of J . For $k = 1$, let $J = \{i\}$. Since $(X_{n,i})$ is \mathcal{G} -c.i.d., (12) holds for indicators [Berti et al., 2004] and extends by linearity to simple functions. Now let f be bounded and measurable. Then, $\mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+1,i}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n]$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. Let V_f be its \mathbb{P} -a.s. limit. To prove that $V_f = \int f d\alpha_i$, it is sufficient to approximate f from below with a sequence $(g_m)_{m \geq 1}$ of simple functions satisfying $f - g_m < 1/m$. Then, \mathbb{P} -a.s. $\int f d\alpha_i - \int g_m d\alpha_i < 1/m$ and $\mathbb{E}[f(X_{n+1,i}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n] - \mathbb{E}[g_m(X_{n+1,i}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n] < 1/m$, which implies that $V_f - V_{g_m} < 1/m$. Since, for every m , $V_{g_m} = \int g_m d\alpha_i$, then $V_f = \int f d\alpha_i$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. Thus, (12) holds for $|J| = 1$. Let us now prove that, if (12) holds for some J , then it also holds for $J \cup \{j\}$, where j is any element of $I \setminus J$. By the definition of partially c.i.d. array,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i \in J \cup \{j\}} f_i(X_{n+1,i}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i \in J} f_i(X_{n+1,i}) \int f_j d\alpha_j \mid \mathcal{G}_n \right] = A_n + \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i \in J} f_i(X_{n+1,i}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n \right] \mathbb{E}[f_j(X_{n+1,j}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n]$$

where

$$|A_n| \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\prod_{i \in J} |f_i(X_{n+1,i})| \left| \int f_j d\alpha_j - \mathbb{E} \left[\int f_j d\alpha_j \mid \mathcal{G}_n \right] \right| \middle| \mathcal{G}_n \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

since $\prod_{i \in J} |f_i(X_{n+1,i})|$ is bounded and $\left| \int f_j d\alpha_j - \mathbb{E} \left[\int f_j d\alpha_j \mid \mathcal{G}_n \right] \right| = \left| \int f_j d\alpha_j - \mathbb{E}[f_j(X_{n+1,j}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \right|$ is bounded and converges to zero a.s. Using the induction hypothesis, we obtain (12) for $J \cup \{j\}$ in the place of J .

Let us now prove (13). Since the left hand side in (13) is uniformly bounded, the L^1 convergence follows from almost sure convergence. Let $Y_k = \prod_{i \in J} f_i(X_{k,i})$ and

$$M_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{Y_{k+1} - \mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_k]}{k+1}.$$

Then $(M_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is a martingale and satisfies $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[M_n^2] < \infty$. Hence, M_n converges almost surely. By the Kronecker Lemma,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (Y_{k+1} - \mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1} | \mathcal{G}_k]) \rightarrow 0, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

By (12), $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1} | \mathcal{G}_k]/n \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} f d\alpha_i$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. Hence, (13) holds.

□

Proposition 4.2 *Let (\mathbf{X}_n^I) be a partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. process, with marginal directing measures $(\alpha_i : i \in I)$. Then, there exists $N \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}[N] = 0$ such that, for every $\omega \in N^c$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I \in B | \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{\mathbf{X}_k^I}(B)(\omega) = \alpha(B)(\omega) \quad \text{for every } B \in \mathcal{X}^I, \quad (14)$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I) | \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(\mathbf{X}_k^I)(\omega) = \int f d\alpha(\omega) \quad \text{for every bounded measurable } f, \quad (15)$$

where $\alpha = \times_{i \in I} \alpha_i$.

PROOF. Let $P_{n+1}(\cdot) := \mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I \in \cdot | \mathcal{G}_n]$, $\hat{P}_n(\cdot) := n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{\mathbf{X}_k^I}(\cdot)$, $E_{n+1}(f) := \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I) | \mathcal{G}_n]$ and $\hat{E}_n(f) := n^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n f(\mathbf{X}_k^I)$.

Since \mathcal{X} is countably generated, by Lemma 4.1, there exists $N \in \mathcal{F}$, with $\mathbb{P}[N] = 0$, and a class $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{X}$ generating \mathcal{X} , closed under complements, finite intersections and disjoint finite unions, such that, for all $B \in \mathcal{S} = \{\times_{i \in J} A_i \times \mathbb{X}^{I \setminus J} : J \text{ finite}, A_i \in \mathcal{C}, i \in J\}$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{n+1}(B)(\omega) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{P}_n(B)(\omega) = \alpha(B)(\omega) \quad \text{for every } \omega \in N^c. \quad (16)$$

Property (16) extends easily to countable disjoint unions of events in \mathcal{S} and, using Dynkin Lemma, to every $B \in \mathcal{X}^I$. This proves (14).

We now prove (15). If f is a simple function, by (14), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{n+1}(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{E}_n(f) = \int f d\alpha$ for every $\omega \in N^c$. If f is non negative, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a simple function $f^{(\epsilon)}$ such that $0 \leq f - f^{(\epsilon)} < \epsilon$. Hence, for every $\omega \in N^c$,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{n+1}(f)(\omega) \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{n+1}(f^{(\epsilon)})(\omega) \geq \int f^{(\epsilon)} d\alpha(\omega) \geq \int f d\alpha(\omega) - \epsilon.$$

Since the above inequalities hold for every $\epsilon > 0$, $\liminf E_{n+1}(f)(\omega) \geq \int f d\alpha(\omega)$. If $M = \sup f$, then $M - f$ is bounded and non negative; hence $\limsup E_{n+1}(f)(\omega) \leq M - \int (M - f) d\alpha(\omega) \leq \int f d\alpha(\omega)$. Thus the limit $\lim_n \mathbb{E}_{n+1}(f)(\omega) = \int f d\alpha(\omega)$ exists. By linearity, the property extends to functions f taking positive and negative values. By repeating the same reasoning, with \hat{E}_n replacing E_{n+1} , we obtain the thesis.

□

From Proposition 4.2, it follows that the predictive distributions $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I \in \cdot | \mathcal{G}_n]$ converge weakly to the product random probability measure $\alpha = \times_{i \in I} \alpha_i$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. This implies that (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is asymptotically exchangeable with directing measure α [Aldous, 1985, Lemma 8.2]. Being α a product measure, (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is asymptotically partially exchangeable. This proves the following

Theorem 4.3 Let (\mathbf{X}_n^I) be a partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. process with marginal directing measures $(\alpha_i, i \in I)$. Then, (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is asymptotically partially exchangeable, and the partially exchangeable limit law has directing measures $(\alpha_i, i \in I)$.

Theorem 4.3 justifies referring to $(\alpha_i, i \in I)$ as the directing random measures of the partially c.i.d. sequence (\mathbf{X}_n^I) . From Theorem 4.3 it follows that a stationary partially c.i.d. sequence is partially exchangeable. This is another proof of Theorem 3.3, since (5) implies the partially c.i.d. condition.

Example 4.4 [A Gaussian partially c.i.d. model]. Finding the explicit expression of the limit laws α_i is, in general, a difficult task. Yet, we present here a partially c.i.d. system for which the limit law is available and has a parametric expression. Details on computations are given in the Appendix.

Think of unevenly spaced, synchronous observations on K variables. Let $T_1 < T_2 < \dots$ denote the times at which observations are taken. Assume that $T_n < \infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for every $n \geq 1$. For every $n \geq 0$, let $t_n = T_{n+1} - T_n$ denote the inter-arrival times ($T_0 = 0$), and let $X_{n,i}$ denote the observation on the i -th variable at time T_n , $i \in I = \{1, \dots, K\}$. Assume that the $X_{n,i}$ ($i \in I$) are conditionally independent given $\mathcal{G}_{n-1} = \sigma(T_{1:n}, \mathbf{X}_{1:n-1}^I)$, and that T_{n+1} is conditionally independent of $\mathbf{X}_n^I := (X_{n,i} : i = 1, \dots, K)$, given \mathcal{G}_{n-1} , with

$$\begin{cases} X_{1,j} \sim Q_{0,j} = N(\mu_{1,j}, \sigma_{1,j}^2), \\ X_{n,j} | \mathcal{G}_{n-1} \sim Q_{n-1,j} = N(\mu_{n,j}, \sigma_{n,j}^2), \quad n \geq 2 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where $\mu_{1,j} \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma_{1,j}^2 > 0$ and $\mu_{n,j}$ is given by the *last tick* (or *piecewise-constant*) interpolation scheme of the process (see e.g. Gençay et al. [2001], Hayashi and Yoshida [2005]):

$$\mu_{n,j} = \frac{t_0 \mu_{1,j} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} t_k X_{k,j}}{T_n}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

A sufficient condition for $[X_{n,i}]$ to be partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. is

$$\sigma_{n,j}^2 = \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} [1 - t_k^2 / T_{k+1}^2] \sigma_{1,j}^2, \quad n \geq 2.$$

Then, defining $\lambda_n = t_n / T_{n+1}$, we can write

$$\begin{cases} \mu_{n,j} = (1 - \lambda_{n-1}) \mu_{n-1,j} + \lambda_{n-1} X_{n-1,j} \\ \sigma_{n,j}^2 = (1 - \lambda_{n-1}^2) \sigma_{n-1,j}^2 \end{cases} \quad n \geq 2. \quad (18)$$

By Proposition 4.2, there exist K random probability measures $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K$ such that $(Q_{n,1}, \dots, Q_{n,K}) \rightarrow (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K)$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., and $\mathbb{P}[\mathbf{X}_n^I \in \cdot | \mathbf{X}_{1:n-1}^I, T_{1:n}] \rightarrow \alpha_1 \times \dots \times \alpha_K$. It can be proved that

$$\alpha_i = N(\mu_i, \gamma \sigma_{1,i}^2) \quad (i = 1, \dots, K),$$

with $\gamma = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - \lambda_k^2)$ and

$$\mu_i | \gamma \stackrel{ind}{\sim} N(\mu_{1,i}, (1 - \gamma) \sigma_{1,i}^2).$$

Hence, the random probability measures $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K$ are not independent, unless γ has a degenerate distribution. For example, they are not independent when the observations arrive at a Poisson process rate.

5 A strong law of large numbers

In this section, we provide a strong law of large numbers (SLLN) for $f(\mathbf{X}_n^I)$, with f measurable and $[X_{n,i}]$ a partially c.i.d. array with directing random measures $(\alpha_i, i \in I)$. Notice that the sequence $(f(\mathbf{X}_n^I))$ is not c.i.d. in general. Since the SLLN is based on the convergence of $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I) \mid \mathcal{G}_n]$, we first give sufficient conditions for

$$\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I) \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \rightarrow \int f d\alpha \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad (19)$$

where $\alpha = \times_{i \in I} \alpha_i$. We know, from Proposition 4.2, that (19) holds if f is bounded and measurable. The following proposition shows that a necessary and sufficient condition for $(f(\mathbf{X}_n^I))$ to satisfy (19) is predictive uniform integrability. We say that a sequence (Y_n) of real-valued random variables is \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable if Y_n is integrable for every $n \geq 1$ and

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[|Y_{n+1}| \mathbb{1}_{\{|Y_{n+1}| > k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \rightarrow 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (20)$$

Proposition 5.1 *Let (\mathbf{X}_n^I) be a partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. process with directing random measures $(\alpha_i, i \in I)$ and let $f : \mathbb{X}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function. Then, the following conditions are equivalent*

- (i) $f(\mathbf{X}_n^I)$ is \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable;
- (ii) $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X}_{n+1}^I) \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \rightarrow \int f d\alpha < \infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $\alpha = \times_{i \in I} \alpha_i$.

PROOF. Let $Y_n = f(\mathbf{X}_n^I)$ and, for every fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $f_k = f \mathbb{1}_{\{f \leq k\}}$.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii). We prove the result for nonnegative f . The general case can be obtained by linearity. We know, from Proposition 4.2, that $\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} \leq k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n]$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to $\int f_k d\alpha$. Hence,

$$\liminf_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \geq \liminf_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} \leq k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \geq \int f_k d\alpha \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Since $\int f_k d\alpha \rightarrow \int f d\alpha$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\liminf_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \geq \int f d\alpha \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

To show the reverse inequality, let $N_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that $\mathbb{P}[N_1] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} \leq k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega)$ converges to $\int f_k d\alpha(\omega)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in N_1^c$. Let N_2 be a null set such that the convergence in (20) holds for every $\omega \in N_2^c$. Then, for every $\omega \in N_2^c$ and every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} > k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) < \epsilon$. Hence, for every $\omega \in N_1^c \cap N_2^c$,

$$\limsup_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) \leq \limsup_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} \leq k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) + \epsilon \leq \int f_k d\alpha(\omega) + \epsilon \leq \int f d\alpha(\omega) + \epsilon.$$

Since this holds for every ϵ , $\limsup_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \leq \int f d\alpha$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. Hence, $\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n]$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to $\int f d\alpha$. To show that $\int f d\alpha < \infty$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., notice that, for every $\omega \in N_1^c \cap N_2^c$,

$$\limsup_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) \leq \limsup_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} \leq k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) + \sup_n \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} > k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) \leq k + \epsilon.$$

(ii) \Rightarrow (i). Since $\mathbb{E}[|Y_{n+1}| \mathbb{1}_{\{|Y_{n+1}| > k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] = \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1}^+ \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1}^+ > k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] + \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1}^- \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1}^- > k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n]$, it is sufficient to prove predictive uniform integrability for non negative f . For every k and n ,

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} > k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \leq \left| \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] - \int f d\alpha \right| + \left| \int f d\alpha - \int f_k d\alpha \right| + \left| \int f_k d\alpha - \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} \leq k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \right|.$$

Let N be such that $\mathbb{P}[N] = 0$ and, for every $\omega \in N^c$, $\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n] \rightarrow \int f d\alpha$ and $\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} \leq k\}}] \rightarrow \int f_k d\alpha$ for every k . Since $\int f d\alpha < \infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., then, for every fixed ϵ and $\omega \in N^c$, there exists k such that $|\int f d\alpha(\omega) - \int f_k d\alpha(\omega)| < \epsilon/3$. For such a k , let n_0 be such that, for every $n \geq n_0$, $|\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) - \int f d\alpha(\omega)| < \epsilon/3$ and $|\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} \leq k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) - \int f_k d\alpha(\omega)| < \epsilon/3$. Then,

$$\sup_{n \geq n_0} \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} > k\}} \mid \mathcal{G}_n](\omega) < \epsilon.$$

□

By Proposition 5.1, predictive uniform integrability implies (19). If $f(\mathbf{X}_n^I)$ is also dominated in L^1 , then we get the SLLN. We say that a sequence (Y_n) of real-valued random variables is *dominated in L^1* if

$$\int_0^\infty \sup_n \mathbb{P}[|Y_n| > x] dx < \infty. \quad (21)$$

(Y_n) is dominated in L^1 if and only if $|Y_n|$ is stochastically dominated by an integrable random variable Y , for any n .

Theorem 5.2 (SLLN) *Let (\mathbf{X}_n^I) be a partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. process with directing random measures $(\alpha_i, i \in I)$, and let $f : \mathbb{X}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function. If $(f(\mathbf{X}_n^I))$ is \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable and dominated in L^1 , then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n f(\mathbf{X}_k^I) \rightarrow \int f d\alpha, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

where $\alpha = \times_{i \in I} \alpha_i$.

PROOF. We prove the theorem for nonnegative f . The general case can be obtained by linearity.

For every $n \geq 1$, let $Y_n = f(\mathbf{X}_n^I)$ and $Y_n^* = Y_n \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_n \leq n\}}$. Furthermore, let $F(x) = \inf_n \mathbb{P}[Y_n \leq x]$. Then,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[Y_n \neq Y_n^*] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[Y_n > n] \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - F(n)).$$

By (21), $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - F(n)) < \infty$. Hence, $\mathbb{P}[Y_n \neq Y_n^* \text{ i.o.}] = 0$. It is therefore sufficient to prove that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n Y_k^* \rightarrow \int f d\alpha$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. Let

$$M_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{Y_{k+1}^* - \mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1}^* \mid \mathcal{G}_k]}{k+1}.$$

Then M_n is a \mathcal{G} -martingale and, by (21),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[M_n^2] &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1}^* - \mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1}^* \mid \mathcal{G}_k]]^2}{(k+1)^2} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_k^{*2}]}{k^2} \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\int_0^k x \mathbb{P}[Y_k > x] dx}{k^2} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sum_{h=1}^k h(1 - F(h-1))}{k^2} \leq 2 \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} h(1 - F(h-1)) \sum_{k=h}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^2} \leq 4 \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} (1 - F(h-1)), \end{aligned}$$

which is finite, by (21). It follows that M_n converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. Hence,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{Y_{k+1}^* - \mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1}^* \mid \mathcal{G}_k]}{k+1} < \infty \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

By Kronecker's Lemma,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (Y_{k+1}^* - \mathbb{E}[Y_{k+1}^* | \mathcal{G}_k]) \rightarrow 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The proof is complete if we can show that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1}^* | \mathcal{G}_n] \rightarrow \int f d\alpha \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (22)$$

Since (Y_n) is \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable, by Proposition 5.1 $\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n]$ converges to $\int f d\alpha$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. On the other hand, \mathcal{G} -predictive uniform integrability implies that $\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} > n+1\}} | \mathcal{G}_n]$ converges to zero \mathbb{P} -a.s. Hence, (22) holds.

□

The following propositions give sufficient conditions for a sequence (Y_n) to be \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable and dominated in L^1 .

Proposition 5.3 *Let (Y_n) and (Y'_n) be sequences of real-valued random variables, such that $|Y_n| \leq |Y'_n|$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for every n .*

(i) *If (Y'_n) is \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable, then (Y_n) is \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable.*

(ii) *If (Y'_n) is dominated in L^1 , then (Y_n) is dominated in L^1 .*

Proposition 5.4 *Let (Y_n) be a sequence of real-valued random variables, and $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{G}_n)$ a filtration.*

(i) *If $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[|Y_{n+1}|^r | \mathcal{G}_n] < \infty$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. for some $r > 1$, then (Y_n) is \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable.*

(ii) *If $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[|Y_n|^r] < \infty$, for some $r > 1$, then (Y_n) is dominated in L^1 .*

The proofs of Propositions 5.3 and 5.4 follow from standard arguments.

Proposition 5.5 *If (Y_n) is a \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. sequence of integrable real-valued random variables, then (Y_n) is \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable and dominated in L^1 .*

PROOF. It is enough to prove the thesis for non-negative Y_n . The result can be extended by linearity. Since $\int_0^\infty \sup_n \mathbb{P}[Y_n > x] dx = \mathbb{E}[Y_1] < \infty$, (Y_n) is dominated in L^1 . To prove predictive uniform integrability, we use Proposition 5.1 with $\mathbf{X}_n^I = Y_n$ and f the identity function, and show that $\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n]$ converges almost surely to $\int y \alpha(dy)$, where α is the directing random measure of (Y_n) . We first show that $(\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n])_{n \geq 0}$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. The martingale property follows from Proposition 2.2 if the distribution of Y_1 has bounded support, and can be extended to the general case by truncation and the monotone convergence theorem. Uniform integrability follows from $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n] \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n] > a\}}] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_{n+1} > a\}}]$ \mathbb{P} -a.s., which holds by conditional Jensen's inequality, and from uniform integrability of (Y_n) . Being a uniformly integrable martingale, $(\mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n])_{n \geq 0}$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to an integrable random variable V such that $\mathbb{E}[V | \mathcal{G}_n] = \mathbb{E}[Y_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n]$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. To prove that $V = \int y \alpha(dy)$, let us define, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $b_k(y) = y \mathbb{1}_{\{y \leq k\}}$. Then, $\mathbb{E}[b_k(Y_{n+1}) | \mathcal{G}_n]$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to $V_k = \int b_k(y) \alpha(dy)$ by Proposition 4.2, and $\mathbb{E}[V_k | \mathcal{G}_n] = \mathbb{E}[b_k(Y_{n+1}) | \mathcal{G}_n]$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. Let us prove that V_k converges to V \mathbb{P} -a.s. as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, $\mathbb{E}[V - V_k] = \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_1 > k\}}] \rightarrow 0$, as $k \rightarrow \infty$, since $Y_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{Y_1 > k\}} \rightarrow 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s. and is bounded by Y_1 , which is integrable. Thus, the sequence of non negative random variables $(V - V_k)$ converges to zero in probability,

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Being a monotone sequence, $(V - V_k)$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to zero, as $k \rightarrow \infty$. On the other hand, $V_k = \int b_k(y)\alpha(dy) \rightarrow \int y\alpha(dy)$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where the last convergence follows from the monotone convergence theorem. Hence, $V = \int y\alpha(dy)$ \mathbb{P} -a.s.

□

The results are illustrated in the following examples.

Example 5.6 Let $[X_{n,i}]$ be a partially c.i.d. array, with $i = 1, \dots, p$, such that $\mathbb{E}[|X_{1,i}|^p] < \infty$ for all i . Then,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^p X_{k,i} \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^p \int x \alpha_i(dx) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}, \quad (23)$$

where $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p)$ are the directing random measures of $[X_{n,i}]$. To prove it, we can write the right-hand side of (23) as $\int f(x_1, \dots, x_p)\alpha(dx_1, \dots, dx_p)$, with $f(x_1, \dots, x_p) = \prod_{i=1}^p x_i$ and $\alpha = \times_i \alpha_i$ and apply the strong law of large numbers to $Y_n = f(X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,p})$. Notice that $|Y_n| \leq \sum_{i=1}^p |X_{n,i}|^p/p$ with $|X_{n,i}|^p$ integrable and c.i.d. with respect to the natural filtration of $[X_{n,i}]$. By Propositions 5.3 and 5.5, (Y_n) is dominated in L^1 and predictive uniformly integrable with respect to the natural filtration of $[X_{n,i}]$. By Theorem 5.2, $\sum_{j=1}^n Y_j/n$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to $\int f d\alpha$.

□

Example 5.7 Let $[X_{n,i}]$ be a partially c.i.d. array of positive random variables, with $i = 1, \dots, p$, such that $\mathbb{E}[|\log X_{1,i}|] < \infty$ for all i . Then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^p X_{k,i}\right) \rightarrow \int \log\left(\sum_{i=1}^p x_i\right) \alpha_1(dx_1) \dots \alpha_p(dx_p) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

where $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p)$ are the directing random measures of $[X_{n,i}]$. To prove this, let $Y_n = f(X_n)$, with $f(x_1, \dots, x_p) = \log(\sum_{i=1}^p x_i)$. Notice that

$$\log\left(\sum_{i=1}^p X_{n,i}\right) \leq \begin{cases} \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\log X_{n,i}| & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^p X_{n,i} < 1 \\ \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \log(X_{n,i} + 2) \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} < 2\}} + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \log X_{n,i} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{n,i} \geq 2\}} & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^p X_{n,i} \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $|Y_n| \leq \sum_{i=1}^p |\log X_{n,i}| + p \log 4$. Since $\log X_{n,i}$ is integrable and c.i.d. with respect to the natural filtration of $[X_{n,i}]$, by Propositions 5.3 and 5.5, $(\log(\sum_{i=1}^p X_{n,i}))$ is predictive uniformly integrable with respect to the natural filtration of $[X_{n,i}]$ and dominated in L^1 . By theorem 5.2, $\sum_{k=1}^n Y_k/n$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to $\int f d\alpha$.

□

6 Central limit theorems

This section deals with the central limit problem for $(f_i(X_{n,i}), i \in I)$, when $[X_{n,i}]$ is partially c.i.d. and the f_i are real valued functions defined on \mathbb{X} . Notice that, if $[X_{n,i}]$ is partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d., the array $[f_i(X_{n,i})]$ is also partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. Therefore, we can rename $f_i(X_{n,i})$ as $X_{n,i}$, to simplify the notation. Thus, throughout the current section, the $X_{n,i}$ are assumed to be *real-valued* random variables.

We give two Central Limit Theorems (CLTs) for the empirical sums $(\sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,i}, i \in I)$, suitably centered and scaled. The choice of the centering focuses on the agreement between predictions and

empirical means. Namely, we prove CLTs for the scaled cumulative forecast errors $\sum_{k=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}])$ and for the approximation errors $\sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,i}/n - \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n]$. In statistical inference, these forms of CLTs may provide a basis for model checking and for the approximation of predictions, in problems such as Bayesian forecasting with large samples, discrete time filtering and sequential procedures, where prediction is the main focus of interest but exact computations are costly. It is worth noticing that we deal with the *joint* scaled differences, for $i \in I$. Thus, the CLTs will involve a multivariate Gaussian distribution, when I is finite, or a Gaussian measure on \mathbb{R}^I , when I is countable.

As in the case of exchangeable and c.i.d. sequences, CLTs for partially c.i.d. sequences are given in terms of stable convergence. Stable convergence is stronger than convergence in distribution and weaker than convergence in probability. We recall some basic notions regarding stable convergence, and refer the reader to Aldous [1985] and Häusler and Luschgy [2015] for further reading. Roughly speaking, stable convergence means convergence of the conditional distributions. A sequence (Z_n) of random variables defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and taking values in a Polish space \mathbb{X} *converges stably* if, for each non-null event A , the conditional distribution of Z_n given A converges weakly. If Z_n converges stably, then there exists a *representing* random measure $\beta(\cdot; \omega)$ such that one can write

$$\mathbb{P}[Z_n \in \cdot | A] \mathbb{P}[A] \rightarrow \int_A \beta(\cdot; \omega) \mathbb{P}(d\omega),$$

and Z_n is said to *converge stably with representing measure* $\beta(\cdot; \omega)$. For $A = \Omega$, this implies that the limit measure is a mixture,

$$\mathbb{P}[Z_n \in \cdot] \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} \beta(\cdot; \omega) \mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

For example, if $\beta(\cdot; \omega)$ is a Gaussian probability law $N(\cdot; 0, \sigma^2(\omega))$, with zero mean and random variance $\sigma^2(\omega) > 0$, one has, for every B ,

$$\mathbb{P}[Z_n \in B] \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} N(B; 0, \sigma^2(\omega)) \mathbb{P}(d\omega);$$

moreover, for any A and B ,

$$\mathbb{P}[Z_n \in B, \sigma^2 \in A] \rightarrow \int_{\{\sigma^2(\omega) \in A\}} N(B; 0, \sigma^2(\omega)) \mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

If Z_n converges stably, one can extend the space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ to construct a “limit” variable Z such that the representing measure is a regular conditional distribution for Z given \mathcal{F} (see Aldous [1985], page 57). Then another relevant implication is that, if $Z_n \rightarrow Z$ stably, and $Y_n \rightarrow Y$ in probability, then (Z_n, Y_n) converges in distribution to (Z, Y) . This result allows a generalized version of the Cramér-Slutsky theorem, covering the case when Y is a random variable; see Häusler and Luschgy [2015].

The results in this section extend ideas in Berti et al. [2004] and are based on the following central limit theorem for martingale differences.

Theorem 6.1 (Hall and Heyde [1980], Theorem 3.2) *Let $[Z_{n,k}]$, $k = 1, \dots, k_n$, $n \geq 1$ be an array of real, square-integrable random variables, with $k_n \rightarrow \infty$, and let $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} Z_{n,k}$. For all n , let $\mathcal{F}_{n,0} \subset \mathcal{F}_{n,1} \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{F}_{n,k_n} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be σ -fields with $\mathcal{F}_{n,0} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. If the following conditions hold:*

$$\sigma(Z_{n,k}) \subset \mathcal{F}_{n,k} \subset \mathcal{F}_{n+1,k}; \tag{24}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_{n,k} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}] = 0; \quad (25)$$

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} |Z_{n,k}| \xrightarrow{P} 0; \quad (26)$$

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} Z_{n,k}^2] < \infty; \quad (27)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} Z_{n,k}^2 \xrightarrow{P} L, \quad (28)$$

then (S_n) converges stably with representing measure $N(0, L)$.

The first limit result that we consider deals with the sums of the *forecast errors*

$$U_{n,i} = X_{n,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{n,i} \mid \mathcal{G}_{n-1}], \quad n \geq 1, i \in I. \quad (29)$$

The limit distribution turns out to be a mixture of $N(0, \Sigma)$ probability laws, where $N(0, \Sigma)$ denotes the centered Gaussian measure on \mathbb{R}^I with correlation operator Σ (see Daletskii and Fomin [1991]). We denote by $(e_i, i \in I)$ the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^I .

Theorem 6.2 *Let $[X_{n,i}]$ be a partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. array of real-valued and square-integrable random variables, with directing random measures $(\alpha_i : i \in I)$. Let*

$$S_{n,i} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i} \mid \mathcal{G}_{k-1}])}{\sqrt{n}} \quad n \geq 1, i \in I.$$

Then, the sequence (S_n^I) converges stably with representing measure $N(0, \Sigma)$, where Σ is a diagonal operator and $\Sigma(e_i, e_i) = \sigma_{\alpha_i}^2$, with $\sigma_{\alpha_i}^2 = \int x^2 \alpha_i(dx) - (\int x \alpha_i(dx))^2$.

PROOF. It is sufficient to show that, for every finite $J \subset I$ and for every $(a_i, i \in J) \in \mathbb{R}^J$, $\sum_{i \in J} a_i S_{n,i}$ converges stably, with representing measure $N(0, \sum_{i,j \in J} a_i a_j \Sigma_{i,j})$, where $\Sigma_{i,j} = \Sigma(e_i, e_j)$ (see Häusler and Luschgy [2015], Corollary 3.19 and Proposition 3.22, and Daletskii and Fomin [1991]). We use Theorem 6.1, letting $k_n = n$, $\mathcal{F}_{n,k} = \mathcal{G}_k$ and $Z_{n,k} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i \in J} a_i U_{k,i}$, with $(U_{k,i})$ as in (29). Then $\sum_{i \in J} a_i S_{n,i} = \sum_{k=1}^n Z_{n,k}$ and checking (24)-(28) is sufficient to obtain the thesis. Conditions (24) and (25) are immediate. To prove (26), notice that

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} |Z_{n,k}| \leq \sum_{i \in J} |a_i| \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} |U_{k,i}| / \sqrt{n} \leq \sum_{i \in J} |a_i| \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} |X_{k,i}| / \sqrt{n} + \sum_{i \in J} |a_i| \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \mathbb{E}[|X_{k,i}| \mid \mathcal{G}_{k-1}] / \sqrt{n}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} |X_{k,i}| > \epsilon \sqrt{n}] &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{P}[|X_{k,i}| > \epsilon \sqrt{n}] \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{1,i}^2 > \epsilon^2 n\}}] \\ \mathbb{P}[\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \mathbb{E}[|X_{k,i}| \mid \mathcal{G}_{k-1}] > \epsilon \sqrt{n}] &\leq \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{P}[\mathbb{E}[|X_{k,i}| \mid \mathcal{G}_{k-1}] > \epsilon \sqrt{n}] \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E}[X_{1,i}^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{1,i}^2 > \epsilon^2 n\}}], \end{aligned}$$

which converges to zero, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To prove (27), notice that

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} Z_{n,k}^2] \leq \sup_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,j \in J} |a_i a_j| \mathbb{E}[\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} U_{k,i}^2]$$

and

$$\sup_n \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} U_{k,i}^2] \leq \sup_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(X_{k,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}])^2] \leq \sup_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i}^2] < \infty.$$

To prove (28), we write

$$\sum_{k=1}^n Z_{n,k}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{i \in J} a_i U_{k,i} \right)^2 = \sum_{i,j \in J} a_i a_j \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k,i} U_{k,j} \quad (30)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k,i} U_{k,j} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,i} X_{k,j} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}] \mathbb{E}[X_{k,j} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}] + E_{n,i,j} + E_{n,j,i},$$

where, for every i and j in J , $E_{n,i,j} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}]) \mathbb{E}[X_{k,j} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}]$. Since $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}])$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to zero, and $\mathbb{E}[X_{k,j} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}]$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to $\int x \alpha_j(dx)$, then $E_{n,i,j}$ converges to zero, \mathbb{P} -a.s. for every $i, j \in J$. Furthermore, by Theorem 5.2 and the computations in Example 5.6, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,i} X_{k,j}$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to $\int x^2 \alpha_i(dx)$, if $i = j$, and to $\int x \alpha_i(dx) \int x \alpha_j(dx)$, if $i \neq j$. On the other hand, by Propositions 5.1 and 5.4, $\mathbb{E}[X_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] \mathbb{E}[X_{n,j} | \mathcal{G}_{n-1}]$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to $\int x \alpha_i(dx) \int x \alpha_j(dx)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}] \mathbb{E}[X_{k,j} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}]$ converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to the same limit. Hence, $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k,i} U_{k,j}$ converges in probability to $\sigma_{\alpha_i}^2$ if $j = i$ and to zero otherwise. By (30), $\sum_{k=1}^n Z_{n,k}^2$ converges in probability to $\sum_{i,j \in J} a_i a_j \Sigma_{i,j}$. \square

The next result investigates the asymptotic behavior of the deviation of the sample mean from the conditional expectation. The assumptions involve the forecast errors $U_{n,i}$, defined in (29), and the *prediction increments*

$$\Delta E_{n,i} = \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1,i} | \mathcal{G}_n] - \mathbb{E}[X_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_{n-1}], \quad n \geq 1, i \in I. \quad (31)$$

Theorem 6.3 *Let $[X_{n,i}]$ be a partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. array of real-valued and square integrable random variables and let*

$$\tilde{S}_{n,i} := \sqrt{n} (\bar{X}_{n,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1,i} | \mathcal{G}_n]), \quad n \geq 1, i \in I,$$

where $\bar{X}_{n,i} = \sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,i}/n$. If

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i}^2] < \infty \quad \text{for every } i \in I, \quad (32)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n V_{k,i} V_{k,j} \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}(e_i, e_j), \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad \text{for every } i, j \in I, \quad (33)$$

where $V_{k,i} = U_{k,i} - k \Delta E_{k,i}$, with $U_{k,i}$ and $\Delta E_{k,i}$ as in (29) and (31), then $(\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_n^I)$ converges stably with representing measure $\mathbb{N}(0, \tilde{\Sigma})$.

PROOF. We can write

$$\tilde{S}_{n,i} = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_n] = \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}] \right).$$

The sequence $(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}])_{k \geq 1}$ is a martingale difference with respect to $(\mathcal{G}_k)_{k \geq 1}$. Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_k] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}] = U_{k,i} - k\Delta E_{k,i} = V_{k,i}.$$

Therefore, $\tilde{S}_{n,i} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^n V_{k,i}$. Let us fix a finite set $J \subset I$ and real numbers $(a_i, i \in J)$, and prove that $\sum_{i \in J} a_i \tilde{S}_{n,i}$ converges stably with representing measure $N(0, \sum_{i,j \in J} a_i a_j \tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j})$, where $\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j} = \tilde{\Sigma}(e_i, e_j)$. We use Theorem 6.1, with $\mathcal{F}_{n,k} = \mathcal{G}_k$ and $Z_{n,k} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i \in J} a_i V_{k,i}$. Then $\sum_{i \in J} a_i \tilde{S}_{n,i} = \sum_{k=1}^n Z_{n,k}$. Conditions (24) and (25) are immediate and (28) follows from (33), by noticing that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n Z_{n,k}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\sum_{i \in J} a_i V_{k,i} \right)^2 \rightarrow \sum_{i,j \in J} a_i a_j \tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j} \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

To prove (26) and (27), notice that

$$Z_{nn}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\sum_{i \in J} (a_i V_{k,i})^2}{n} - \frac{n-1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{(\sum_{i \in J} a_i V_{k,i})^2}{n-1} \rightarrow 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

and $Z_{n,k} = Z_{k,k} \sqrt{k/n}$. Thus, $\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} Z_{n,k}^2 \rightarrow 0$, \mathbb{P} -a.s. and

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} Z_{n,k}^2] \leq \sup_n \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}(Z_{n,k}^2) \leq \sum_{i,j \in J} |a_i a_j| \sup_n \mathbb{E}|\tilde{S}_{n,i} \tilde{S}_{n,j}| < \infty.$$

Thus, by Theorem 6.1, the thesis follows.

□

Example 6.4 [Interacting randomly reinforced processes (Ctd)]. As an illustration of Theorems 6.2 and 6.3, let us consider again the interacting randomly reinforced process of Example 3.8. Assume that the $X_{n,i}$ are generated independently as in (11). Interaction is given by common weights W_n , where $W_n \sim p_W$ independently from the past and from the concomitant values $X_{n,i}$. Let us assume that the common distribution p_W has finite second moment, and that the $X_{n,i}$ are square-integrable, \mathbb{R} -valued random variables. Hence, (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d., where $\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma(\mathbf{X}_{1:n}^I, \mathbf{W}_{1:n}^I)$. By Proposition 5.5, $(X_{n,i})_{n \geq 1}$ and $(X_{n,i}^2)_{n \geq 1}$ are \mathcal{G} -predictive uniformly integrable and dominated in L^1 . Hence, $\mathbb{E}[X_{n+1,i} | \mathcal{G}_n] \rightarrow \int x \alpha_i(dx) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_{n+1,i}^2 | \mathcal{G}_n] \rightarrow \int x^2 \alpha_i(dx) < \infty$, \mathbb{P} -a.s., where $(\alpha_i : i \in I)$ are the directing random measures of the array $[X_{n,i}]$. Let us denote $\mu_{\alpha_i} = \int x d\alpha_i$ and $\sigma_{\alpha_i}^2 = \int x^2 \alpha_i(dx) - \mu_{\alpha_i}^2$; furthermore, let $\Phi(\cdot; 0, \sigma^2)$ be the distribution function of the Gaussian law with parameters 0 and σ^2 , with the proviso that $\Phi(\cdot; 0, 0)$ represents the distribution degenerate at 0.

By Theorem 6.2 and the properties of stable convergence, for every finite $J \subset I$ and every $s_j \neq 0, j \in J$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\bigcap_{i \in J} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}]) \leq \sqrt{n} s_i \right) \right] \rightarrow \int \prod_{i \in J} \Phi(s_i; 0, \sigma_{\alpha_i}^2(\omega)) \mathbb{P}(d\omega), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Moving to Theorem 6.3, notice that

$$U_{n,i} = (X_{n,i} - \mu_{n,i}), \quad \Delta E_{n,i} = \frac{(X_{n,i} - \mu_{n,i}) W_n}{w_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n W_k}, \quad V_{n,i} = (X_{n,i} - \mu_{n,i}) \left(1 - \frac{W_n}{w_0/n + \sum_{k=1}^n W_k/n} \right),$$

where $\mu_{n,i} = \mathbb{E}[X_{n,i} | \mathcal{G}_{n-1}]$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_n \mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i}^2] &\leq \sup_n \mathbb{E}[V_{n,i}^2] \leq \sup_n \mathbb{E}[X_{n,i}^2] \left(1 + \sup_n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{W_k}{W_n} \right)^{-2} \right] \right) \\ &\leq \sup_n \mathbb{E}[X_{n,i}^2] \left(1 + \sup_n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{W_k^2}{W_n^2} \right] \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $1/0 := \infty$ and the last inequality comes from the convexity of $f(x) := 1/x^2$. The above inequalities show that a sufficient condition for (32) to hold is $\mathbb{E}[1/W_1^2] < \infty$. We restrict our attention to this case. To prove (33), notice that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n V_{k,i} V_{k,j} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \mu_{k,i})(X_{k,j} - \mu_{k,j}) \left(1 - \frac{W_k}{w_0/k + \sum_{h=1}^k W_h/k} \right)^2.$$

Moreover, $[W_n, \mathbf{X}_n^I]_{n \geq 1}$ is a partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. array, with directing measures $(p_W, (\alpha_i : i \in I))$ and, proceeding as in Example 5.6, it can be proved that the sequence of products $(X_{n,i} X_{n,j})_{n \geq 1}$ is predictive uniformly integrable and dominated in L^1 , for every $i, j \in I$. Since $\mathbb{E}[X_{n,i} X_{n,j} W_n^2] = \mathbb{E}[X_{n,i} X_{n,j}] \mathbb{E}[W_n^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_{n,i} X_{n,j} W_n^2 | \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] = \mathbb{E}[X_{n,i} X_{n,j} | \mathcal{G}_{n-1}] \mathbb{E}[W_n^2]$, the sequence of products $(X_{n,i} X_{n,j} W_n^2)_{n \geq 1}$ is also predictive uniformly integrable and dominated in L^1 . The same reasoning applies to $(X_{n,i} W_n^2)_{n \geq 1}$. Thus, by Theorem 5.2, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,i} X_{k,j} &\xrightarrow{a.s.} \begin{cases} \mu_{\alpha_i} \mu_{\alpha_j} & j \neq i \\ (\sigma_{\alpha_i}^2 + \mu_{\alpha_i}^2) & j = i \end{cases} \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,i} X_{k,j} W_k^2 &\xrightarrow{a.s.} \begin{cases} \mu_{\alpha_i} \mu_{\alpha_j} \mathbb{E}[W_1^2] & j \neq i \\ (\sigma_{\alpha_i}^2 + \mu_{\alpha_i}^2) \mathbb{E}[W_1^2] & j = i \end{cases} \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,i} W_k^2 &\xrightarrow{a.s.} \mu_{\alpha_i} \mathbb{E}[W_1^2], \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where $\mu_{\alpha_i} = \int x \alpha_i(dx)$ and $\sigma_{\alpha_i}^2 = \int x^2 \alpha_i(dx) - \mu_{\alpha_i}^2$. Noticing that $\mu_{n,i} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mu_{\alpha_i}$ and $1/(w_0/n + \sum_{k=1}^n W_k/n) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1/\mathbb{E}[W_1]$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n V_{k,i} V_{k,j} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \begin{cases} \sigma_{\alpha_i}^2 \mathbb{V}(W_1)/\mathbb{E}[W_1]^2 & j = i \\ 0 & j \neq i, \end{cases}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In the above equation, $\mathbb{E}[W_1] > 0$, since we are assuming $\mathbb{E}[1/W_1^2] < \infty$.

Therefore, the assumptions of Theorem 6.3 are satisfied, and, for every finite $J \subset I$ and every $s_i \neq 0$ ($i \in J$),

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\bigcap_{i \in J} \left(\bar{X}_{n,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n] \leq \frac{s_i}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right] \rightarrow \int \prod_{i \in J} \Phi \left(s_i; 0, \sigma_{\alpha_i}^2(\omega) \frac{\mathbb{V}[W_1]}{\mathbb{E}[W_1]} \right) \mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

Notice that, if $\mathbb{V}[W_1] = 0$ (i.e. if the $(X_{n,i})_{n \geq 1}$ are independent sequences of exchangeable random variables), then $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_{n,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1} | \mathcal{G}_n])$ converges in probability to zero.

□

In the above example, S_n and \tilde{S}_n have a similar behaviour. In particular, the limiting covariance matrices are both diagonal. This is not always the case, as the next example shows.

Example 6.5 Let us consider the partially c.i.d. array $[X_{n,i}]_{n \geq 1, i=1,2}$ defined in Example 3.9. Since the $X_{n,i}$'s are bounded, they are square integrable. Hence, $\mu_{\alpha_i} = \int x \alpha_i(dx) < \infty$ and $\sigma_{\alpha_i}^2 = \int x^2 \alpha_i(dx) - \mu_{\alpha_i}^2 < \infty$. By Theorem 6.2, for every $s_1, s_2 \neq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\bigcap_{i=1}^2 \left[\frac{\sum_{k=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{k,i} | \mathcal{G}_{k-1}])}{\sqrt{n}} \leq s_i \right] \right] \rightarrow \int \prod_{i=1}^2 \Phi(s_i; 0, \sigma_{\alpha_i}^2(\omega)) \mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

Let us now turn to Theorem 6.3. A trivial calculation shows that, for every k and i ,

$$V_{k,i} = (1 - k\beta_k X_{k,j}) (X_{k,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{k+1,i} | \mathcal{G}_k]).$$

The above equation suggests that $\sqrt{n}(\bar{X}_{n,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1,i} | \mathcal{G}_n])$ may fail to converge, for specific settings of (β_n) (e.g. if $\beta_n = 1$ for every n). Here, we consider $\beta_n = 2/(n+1)$. Condition (32) holds, since $(V_{n,i})_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded and

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\tilde{S}_{n,i}^2] \leq \sup_n \mathbb{E}[V_{n,i}^2] < \infty.$$

Furthermore, \mathbb{P} -a.s.

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n V_{k,i} V_{k,j} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{k,i} - \mu_{k,i}) (X_{k,j} - \mu_{k,j}) \left(1 - \frac{2k}{k+1} X_{k,i}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2k}{k+1} X_{k,j}\right) \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j}, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

where

$$\tilde{\Sigma} = 4 \begin{bmatrix} \int (x - \mu_{\alpha_1})^2 (x - 1/2)^2 \alpha_1(dx) & \sigma_{\alpha_1}^2 \sigma_{\alpha_2}^2 \\ \sigma_{\alpha_1}^2 \sigma_{\alpha_2}^2 & \int (x - \mu_{\alpha_2})^2 (x - 1/2)^2 \alpha_2(dx) \end{bmatrix}.$$

According to Theorem 6.3,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\bigcap_{i=1}^2 \left(\bar{X}_{n,i} - \mathbb{E}[X_{n+1,i} | \mathcal{G}_n] \leq \frac{s_i}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right] \rightarrow \int \Phi(s_1, s_2; 0, \tilde{\Sigma}(\omega)) \mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

□

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Pietro Rigo for helpful suggestions. We sincerely thank the anonymous referees for their very accurate reviews. The authors have been partially supported by grants from Bocconi University and PRIN grant 2015SNS29B.

References

- E.M. Airoldi, T. Costa, F. Bassetti, F. Leisen, and M. Guindani. Generalized species sampling priors with latent beta reinforcements. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109:1466–1480, 2014.
- D.J. Aldous. Exchangeability and related topics. *École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIII 1983*, 1117:1–198, 1985.
- D.J. Aldous. More uses of exchangeability: Representations of complex random structures. In N. H. Bingham and C. M. Goldie, editors, *Probability and Mathematical Genetics: Papers in Honour of Sir John Kingman*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

- G. Aletti, C. May, and P. Secchi. On the distribution of the limit proportion for a two-color, randomly reinforced urn with equal reinforcement distributions. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 39:690–707, 2007.
- G. Aletti, C. May, and P. Secchi. A functional equation whose unknown is $p([0, 1])$ -valued. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 25:1207–1232, 2012.
- G. Aletti, A. Ghiglietti, and A.M. Paganoni. Randomly reinforced urn designs with prespecified allocations. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 50:486–498, 2013.
- K.B. Athreya and P.E. Ney. *Branching Processes*. Berlin:Springer-Verlag, 1972.
- T. Austin. On exchangeable random variables and the statistics of large graphs and hypergraphs. *Probability Surveys*, 5:80–145, 2008.
- S. Bacallado, P. Diaconis, and S. Holmes. de Finetti priors using Markov chain Monte Carlo computations. *Statistics and Computing*, 25:797–808, 2015.
- A. Baldi Antognini and A. Giovagnoli. *Adaptive Designs for Sequential Treatment Allocation*. CRC Press, 2015.
- F. Bassetti, I. Crimaldi, and F. Leisen. Conditionally identically distributed species sampling sequences. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 42:433–459, 2010.
- A.W. Beggs. On the convergence of reinforcement learning. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 122:1–36, 2005.
- P. Berti, L. Pratelli, and P. Rigo. Limit theorems for a class of identically distributed random variables. *Annals of Probability*, 32:2029–2052, 2004.
- P. Berti, L. Pratelli, and P. Rigo. Limit theorems for empirical processes based on dependent data. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 17:1–18, 2012.
- P. Berti, I. Crimaldi, L. Pratelli, and P. Rigo. Central limit theorems for an Indian buffet model with random weights. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 25:523–547, 2015.
- D. Blackwell and J. B. MacQueen. Ferguson distributions via Pólya urn schemes. *Annals of Statistics*, 1: 353–355, 1973.
- G. Caldarelli, A. Chessa, I. Crimaldi, and F. Pammolli. Weighted networks as randomly reinforced urn processes. *Physical Review E*, 87:020106(R), 2013.
- I. Crimaldi, P. Dai Pra, and I.G. Minelli. Fluctuation theorems for synchronization of interacting Pólya’s urns. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 126:930–947, 2015.
- I. L. Daletskii and S. V. Fomin. *Measures and Differential Equations in Infinite-dimensional Space*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.

- B. de Finetti. Sur la condition de «équivalence partielle». *Colloque consacré à la théorie des probabilités, Université de Genève, 12-16 octobre, 1937. Hermann et C.ie, Paris, 1938-39, Actual. sci. industr. 730 5-18 vol. VI . English translation: On the Condition of Partial Exchangeability, in Studies in Inductive Logic and Probability, 2 (1980) 193-205, 1937.*
- P. Diaconis and D. Freedman. de Finetti theorem for Markov chains. *Annals of Probability*, 8:115–130, 1980.
- S. D. Durham, N. Flournoy, and W. Li. A sequential design for maximizing the probability of a favourable response. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 26:479–495, 1998.
- S.D. Durham and K.F. Yu. Randomized play-the leader rules for sequential sampling from two populations. *Probability in Engineering and Information Science*, 4:355–367, 1990.
- N. Flournoy, C. May, and P. Secchi. Asymptotically optimal response-adaptive designs for allocating the best treatment: An overview. *International Statistical Review*, 80:293–305, 2012.
- S. Fortini, L. Ladelli, and E. Regazzini. Exchangeability, predictive distributions and parametric models. *Sankhyā, Series A*, 62:86–109, 2000.
- R. Gençay, M. Dacorogna, U. A Muller, O. Pictet, and R. Olsen. *An Introduction to High-Frequency Finance*. Academic Press, 2001.
- P. Hall and C. C. Heyde. *Martingale Limit Theory and Its Application*. New York:Academic Press, 1980.
- E. Häusler and H. Luschgy. *Stable Convergence and Stable Limit Theorems*. New York:Springer, 2015.
- T. Hayashi and N. Yoshida. On covariance estimation of non-synchronously observed diffusion processes. *Bernoulli*, 11:359–379, 2005.
- J Horowitz. Measure-valued random processes. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 70:213–236, 1985.
- F. Hu and W.F. Rosenberger. *The Theory of Response-Adaptive Randomization in Clinical Trials*. New York:Wiley, 2006.
- O. Kallenberg. Spreading and predictable sampling in exchangeable sequences and processes. *Annals of Probability*, 16:508–534, 1988.
- O. Kallenberg. *Probabilistic Symmetries and Invariance Principles*. New York:Springer, 2005.
- J.F.C. Kingman. Uses of exchangeability. *Annals of Probability*, pages 183–197, 1978.
- S. Laruelle and G. Pagés. Randomized urn models revisited using stochastic approximation. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 23:1409–1436, 2013.
- J. Lee, F.A. Quintana, P. Mueller, and L. Trippa. Defining predictive probability functions for species sampling models. *Statistical Science*, 28:209–222, 2013.

- C. May and N. Flournoy. Asymptotics in response-adaptive designs generated by a two-color, randomly reinforced urn. *Annals of Statistics*, 37:1058–1078, 2009.
- P. Muliere, A. M. Paganoni, and P. Secchi. A randomly reinforced urn. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 136:1853–1874, 2006.
- A.M. Paganoni and P. Secchi. Interacting reinforced-urn systems. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 36: 791–804, 2004.
- R. Pemantle. Nonconvergence to unstable points in urn models and stochastic approximations. *Annals of Probability*, 18:698–712, 1990a.
- R. Pemantle. A time-dependent version of Pólya’s urn. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 3:627–637, 1990b.
- R. Pemantle. A survey of random processes with reinforcement. *Probability Surveys*, 4:1–79, 2007.
- C. Ryll-Nardzewski. On stationary sequences of random variables and the de Finetti’s equivalence. *Colloquium Mathematicae*, 4:149–156, 1957.
- S. Wade, S. Mongelluzzo, and S. Petrone. An enriched conjugate prior for Bayesian nonparametric inference. *Bayesian Analysis*, 6:359–385, 2011.

7 Appendix.

Here we provide some complements for Section 4.

Proposition 7.1 *Consider the Gaussian predictive system described in Example 4.4. Then:*

- (i) *the process (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is \mathcal{G} -partially c.i.d. with directing measures $\alpha_i = \text{N}(\mu_i, \gamma\sigma_{1,i}^2)$, where $\gamma = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - \lambda_k^2)$ and the random means μ_i are conditionally independent, given γ , with $\mu_i \mid \gamma \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{N}(\mu_{1,i}, (1 - \gamma)\sigma_{1,i}^2)$, $i = 1, \dots, K$.*
- (ii) *The random probability measures $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K$ are not stochastically independent when the observations arrive at a Poisson process rate.*

PROOF

(i) For showing that $X_{n+2,i} \mid \mathcal{G}_n^i \stackrel{d}{=} X_{n+1,i} \mid \mathcal{G}_n^i$, let us work with the characteristic function, and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(isX_{n+2,i}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n^i] &= \exp(is((1 - \lambda_{n+1})\mu_{n+1,i} - s^2(1 - \lambda_{n+1}^2)\sigma_{n+1,i}^2/2))\mathbb{E}[\exp(is\lambda_{n+1}X_{n+1,i}) \mid \mathcal{G}_n^i] \\ &= \exp(is(\mu_{n+1,i} - s^2\sigma_{n+1,i}^2/2)) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (\mathbf{X}_n^I) is partially \mathcal{G} -c.i.d. By Proposition 4.2, the marginal directing measure α_i is the limit of the predictive distribution $P_{n,i}$, which is a $\text{N}(\mu_{n,i}, \sigma_{n,i}^2)$ as in (17). For each i , the sequence $(\mu_{n,i})$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. Hence, $\mu_{n,i}$ converges to an integrable random variable μ_i , \mathbb{P} -a.s. As for the variances, the sequence $(\sigma_{n,i}^2)$ is decreasing and non negative. Hence, it converges \mathbb{P} -a.s. to

a non negative random variable σ_i^2 . By the recursive equations (18), one obtains $\sigma_i^2 = \gamma\sigma_{1,i}^2$, where $\gamma = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty}(1 - \lambda_k^2)$. Thus, $P_{n,i} \rightarrow N(\mu_i, \sigma_i^2)$.

To find the probability distribution of the random vector $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K)$, notice that, conditionally on $\lambda := (\lambda_n)$, $(X_{1:n})$ has a Gaussian distribution. Therefore, given λ , the vector $\mu_n = (\mu_{n,1}, \dots, \mu_{n,K})$ is Gaussian, with expectation $\mu_1 = (\mu_{1,1}, \dots, \mu_{1,K})$. Furthermore, since $\mu_{n,1}, \dots, \mu_{n,K}$ are conditionally independent, given λ , then μ_1, \dots, μ_K are also conditionally independent given λ . To compute the conditional variances, notice that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mu_{n,i}^2 | \lambda] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left((1 - \lambda_{n-1})\mu_{n-1,i} + \lambda_{n-1}X_{n-1,i}\right)^2 | \lambda\right] = (1 - \lambda_{n-1}^2)\mathbb{E}[\mu_{n-1,i}^2 | \lambda] + \lambda_{n-1}^2(\mu_{1,i}^2 + \sigma_{1,i}^2)$$

Given the initial value $\mathbb{E}[\mu_{1,i}^2 | \lambda] = \mu_{1,i}^2$, the unique solution of the above system is

$$\mathbb{E}[\mu_{n,i}^2 | \lambda] = \mu_{1,i}^2 + \left[1 - \prod_{k=1}^{n-1}(1 - \lambda_k^2)\right] \sigma_{1,i}^2.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{V}[\mu_{n,i} | \lambda] = \left[1 - \prod_{k=1}^{n-1}(1 - \lambda_k^2)\right] \sigma_{1,i}^2.$$

Since μ_i is the limit of $\mu_{n,i}$,

$$\mu_i | \lambda \sim N(\mu_{1,i}, (1 - \gamma)\sigma_{1,i}^2),$$

with $\gamma = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty}(1 - \lambda_k^2)$. Since the conditional distribution of (μ_1, \dots, μ_K) , given λ , is a function of γ , then (i) holds.

(ii) The random probability measures $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K$ are conditionally independent, given γ , but are not stochastically independent, unless γ has a degenerate distribution. For example, $Cov(\mu_i^2, \mu_j^2) = \sigma_{1,i}^2\sigma_{1,j}^2\mathbb{V}(\gamma)$. When the observations arrive at a Poisson process rate, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$ are independent random variables, and $\lambda_n \sim \beta(1, n)$. Thus

$$\mathbb{E}[\gamma] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - \mathbb{E}[\lambda_k^2]) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{k=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{2}{(k+1)(k+2)}\right) = 1/3$$

while

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}[\gamma] &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\lambda_k^4 - 2\lambda_k^2 + 1] - \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - \mathbb{E}[\lambda_k^2]) \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{k=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{4}{(k+1)(k+2)} + \frac{24}{(k+1)(k+2)(k+3)(k+4)}\right) - \prod_{k=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{2}{(k+1)(k+2)}\right)^2 \right) \\ &\geq \frac{4}{45} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{k=2}^n \left(1 - \frac{2}{(k+1)(k+2)}\right)^2 > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence γ is not constant, therefore α_i is not degenerate and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K$ are not stochastically independent.

□