

Correction to: A Glivenko-Cantelli Theorem and Strong Laws of Large Numbers for Functions of Order Statistics



Jon A. Wellner

The Annals of Statistics, Vol. 6, No. 6 (Nov., 1978), 1394.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0090-5364%28197811%296%3A6%3C1394%3ACTAGTA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-V>

The Annals of Statistics is currently published by Institute of Mathematical Statistics.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ims.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CORRECTION TO
A GLIVENKO-CANTELLI THEOREM AND STRONG
LAWS OF LARGE NUMBERS FOR FUNCTIONS
OF ORDER STATISTICS

BY JON A. WELLNER
University of Rochester

Professors Peter Gaenssler and Winfried Stute have kindly brought to my attention an error in the proof of (B) of Theorem 1 of the above-mentioned paper (*Ann. Statist.* 5 (1977) 473–480). The proof given there is valid under the additional assumption that h is concave or convex; or if $h \geq aI$ for some $a > 0$. It is easily seen however that there exist nonnegative, nondecreasing continuous functions h which satisfy

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow 0} h(t)/t = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow 0} h(t)/t = +\infty.$$

These functions are not concave or convex or bounded below by any line through the origin; hence the argument given in the first seven lines of the proof of Theorem 1 is invalid.

Fortunately, part (B) of Theorem 1 is true as stated (without an additional convexity or concavity or boundedness assumption as discussed above). Furthermore, (C) if $\int_0^1 (1/h) dI = \infty$ then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_h(\Gamma_n, I) = +\infty \quad \text{w.p. 1.}$$

The following simple proof of both (B) of Theorem 1 and (C) is due to Gaenssler and Stute.

Without loss suppose $\int_0^1 (1/h) dI = \infty$. Then for any positive integer r and $n \geq N = N(r, \varepsilon)$ the sequence

$$c_n \equiv \sup \{t \leq \varepsilon : h(t)^{-1} = 2nr\}$$

is well defined and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} c_n &= (2r)^{-1} \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} c_n (2(n+1)r - 2nr) \\ &\geq (2r)^{-1} \int_0^1 (1/h) dI - \text{constant} = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus Borel–Cantelli implies that $P(\xi_n \leq c_n \text{ i.o.}) = 1$; and consequently $P(\xi_{n_1} \leq c_n \text{ i.o.}) = 1$ also. Since $1/h$ is continuous and nonincreasing on $(0, \varepsilon)$, this implies that

$$\rho_h(\Gamma_n, 0) = \sup_{0 < t \leq 1} (\Gamma_n(t)/h(t)) \geq (nh(\xi_{n_1}))^{-1} \geq (nh(c_n))^{-1} = 2r$$

infinitely often w.p. 1, which yields (B) of Theorem 1 as claimed. Similarly,

$$\rho_h(\Gamma_n, I) \geq (2nh(\xi_{n_1}))^{-1} \geq (2nh(c_n))^{-1} = r$$

infinitely often w.p. 1, which proves (C).

It should be noted that (C) together with (A) of Theorem 1 of the paper imply that finiteness of $\int_0^1 (1/h) dI$ is both necessary and sufficient for the weighted Glivenko–Cantelli theorem for Γ_n .