

INEQUALITIES FOR MULTIVARIATE COMPOUND POISSON DISTRIBUTIONS¹

BY RICHARD S. ELLIS

University of Massachusetts

This paper proves a converse to a theorem of L. D. Brown and Y. Rinott concerning positive dependence ordering for multivariate compound Poisson distributions.

We say that a one-parameter family of probability distributions $\{Q_t, t \geq 0\}$ forms a *compound Poisson family* if for each $t \geq 0$,

$$(1) \quad Q_t = e^{-\lambda t} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\lambda t)^k}{k!} F_k,$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is fixed and F_k denotes the k -fold convolution of some distribution F . Q_t represents the distribution of the random sums $U_1 \cdots + U_{N(t)}$, where $\{U_i\}$ are independent with common distribution F and $N(t)$ is a Poisson (λt) variable independent of $\{U_i\}$. In this paper we prove a converse to a theorem of Brown and Rinott (1988) involving compound Poisson families.

Let n be a positive integer, define $\mathcal{A} = \{A: A \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}\}$, and to each nonempty set A in \mathcal{A} associate a number $t(A) \geq 0$. Let Q_t be a compound Poisson family and let $\{Z_A, A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ be independent random variables with Z_A distributed according to $Q_{t(A)}$. Define $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ by

$$(2) \quad X_i = \sum_{A: i \in A} Z_A, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

\mathbf{X} is said to have a *multivariate compound Poisson distribution* with parameter $\mathbf{t} = \{t(A), \emptyset \neq A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ based on the family Q_t . Let \mathbf{Y} have a multivariate compound Poisson distribution with parameter $\mathbf{t}^* = \{t^*(A), \emptyset \neq A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ based on the same family Q_t . Part (a) of the following theorem proves a converse to Theorem 1.2(i) in Brown and Rinott (1988). Part (b) of the following theorem is proved in Theorem 1.2(ii) in Brown and Rinott (1988) in somewhat greater generality (for multivariate infinitely divisible distributions). We have included part (b) because its proof is similar in spirit to that of part (a).

In a preliminary version of their paper, L. D. Brown and Y. Rinott had a proof of part (a) for the multivariate Poisson case. I am grateful to them for bringing the problem to my attention.

Received June 1986.

¹Supported in part by NSF grants MCS-82-19848 and DMS-85-21536. This paper was written while the author was visiting the Department of Statistics, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, January-June, 1986.

AMS 1980 subject classifications. 60E05, 60G99.

Key words and phrases. Multivariate compound Poisson distributions, positive dependence ordering.

THEOREM 1. (a) Assume that $P\{U_1 > 0\}$ and that $E\{\exp(\alpha U_1)\} < \infty$ for all $\alpha > 0$. Then

$$(3) \quad P\{\mathbf{X} \geq \mathbf{c}\} \leq P\{\mathbf{Y} \geq \mathbf{c}\}, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{c} \in R^n,$$

implies that

$$(4) \quad \sum_{A: A \supseteq B} t(A) \leq \sum_{A: A \supseteq B} t^*(A), \quad \text{for all } B \neq \emptyset, B \in \mathcal{A}.$$

(b) Assume that $U_1 \geq 0$ and $U_1 \neq 0$. Then

$$(5) \quad P\{\mathbf{X} \leq \mathbf{c}\} \leq P\{\mathbf{Y} \leq \mathbf{c}\}, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{c} \in R^n,$$

implies that

$$\sum_{A: A \cap B \neq \emptyset} t(A) \geq \sum_{A: A \cap B \neq \emptyset} t^*(A), \quad \text{for all } B \neq \emptyset, B \in \mathcal{A}.$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 1(a). Let B be any nonempty set in \mathcal{A} and let $\alpha_i, i \in B$, be positive numbers. Then

$$(6) \quad \sum_{i \in B} \alpha_i X_i = \sum_{i \in B} \alpha_i \sum_{A: i \in A} Z_A = \sum_{A: A \cap B \neq \emptyset} \left(\sum_{i \in A \cap B} \alpha_i \right) Z_A.$$

Note that for each set A satisfying $A \supseteq B$, the corresponding term in the sum contains all of the $\alpha_i, i \in B$; for each set A satisfying $A \cap B \neq \emptyset, A \not\supseteq B$, the corresponding term in the sum contains only a proper subset of the $\alpha_i, i \in B$. For each nonempty set A in \mathcal{A} ,

$$(7) \quad Z_A = U_1 + \dots + U_{N(t(A))},$$

and so for $\alpha > 0$,

$$(8) \quad \log E\{\exp(\alpha Z_A)\} = \lambda t(A)[m(\alpha) - 1], \quad \text{where } m(\alpha) = E\{\exp(\alpha U_1)\}.$$

Since $\{Z_A, A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ are independent,

$$(9) \quad \log E\left\{\exp\left(\sum_{i \in B} \alpha_i X_i\right)\right\} = \sum_{A: A \cap B \neq \emptyset} \lambda t(A) \left[m\left(\sum_{i \in A \cap B} \alpha_i\right) - 1 \right].$$

If we set each $\alpha_i, i \in B$, equal to $k > 0$, then

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} \log E\left\{\exp\left(k \sum_{i \in B} X_i\right)\right\} &= \sum_{A: A \supseteq B} \lambda t(A)[m(|B|k) - 1] \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{A: A \cap B \neq \emptyset \\ A \not\supseteq B}} \lambda t(A)[m(|A \cap B|k) - 1]. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} \log E\left\{\exp\left(k \sum_{i \in B} Y_i\right)\right\} &= \sum_{A: A \supseteq B} \lambda t^*(A)[m(|B|k) - 1] \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{A: A \cap B \neq \emptyset \\ A \not\supseteq B}} \lambda t^*(A)[m(|A \cap B|k) - 1]. \end{aligned}$$

If $|B| = 1$, then the second terms on the right-hand sides of (10) and (11) are absent.

By hypothesis $P\{X \geq c\} \leq P\{Y \geq c\}$ for all $c \in R^n$. Thus,

$$(12) \quad P\left\{\bigcap_{i \in B} \{X_i \geq c_i\}\right\} \leq P\left\{\bigcap_{i \in B} \{Y_i \geq c_i\}\right\},$$

for all real $c_i, i \in B$. This implies that [see Brown and Rinott (1988), Section 1, or integrate by parts]

$$(13) \quad \log E\left\{\exp\left(k \sum_{i \in B} X_i\right)\right\} \leq \log E\left\{\exp\left(k \sum_{i \in B} Y_i\right)\right\}.$$

Lemma 2 below together with (10) and (11) implies that

$$(14) \quad \log E\left\{\exp\left(k \sum_{i \in B} X_i\right)\right\} = m(|B|k) \left(\lambda \sum_{A: A \supseteq B} t(A) + o(1)\right), \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

$$(15) \quad \log E\left\{\exp\left(k \sum_{i \in B} Y_i\right)\right\} = m(|B|k) \left(\lambda \sum_{A: A \supseteq B} t^*(A) + o(1)\right), \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Part (a) of Theorem 1 is a consequence of (13), (14) and (15). \square

LEMMA 2. Assume that $P\{U_1 > 0\} > 0$ and that $m(\alpha) = E\{\exp(\alpha U_1)\} < \infty$ for all $\alpha > 0$. Then $m(|B|k) \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$(16) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m(|A \cap B|k)}{m(|B|k)} = 0,$$

for each set A satisfying $A \cap B \neq \emptyset, A \not\supseteq B$.

PROOF. There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $P\{U_1 \geq \varepsilon\} > 0$. Thus,

$$(17) \quad m(|B|k) \geq E\left\{\exp(|B|k U_1) \cdot 1_{\{U_1 \geq \varepsilon\}}\right\} \geq e^{|B|k\varepsilon} P\{U_1 \geq \varepsilon\},$$

which tends to ∞ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. If A satisfies $A \cap B \neq \emptyset, A \not\supseteq B$, then $|A \cap B| < |B|$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \frac{m(|A \cap B|k)}{m(|B|k)} &\leq \frac{e^{|A \cap B|k\varepsilon} + E\left\{\exp(|A \cap B|k U_1) \cdot 1_{\{U_1 \geq \varepsilon\}}\right\}}{E\left\{\exp(|B|k U_1) \cdot 1_{\{U_1 \geq \varepsilon\}}\right\}} \\ &\leq \frac{e^{|A \cap B|k\varepsilon}}{e^{|B|k\varepsilon} P\{U_1 \geq \varepsilon\}} + \frac{1}{e^{(|B|-|A \cap B|)k\varepsilon}}, \end{aligned}$$

which tends to 0 as $k \rightarrow \infty$. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 1(b). Let B be any nonempty set in \mathcal{A} and let $\alpha_i, i \in B$, be positive numbers. By hypothesis, $P\{X \leq c\} \leq P\{Y \leq c\}$ for all $c \in R^n$. Thus,

$$(18) \quad P\left\{\bigcap_{i \in B} \{X_i \leq c_i\}\right\} \leq P\left\{\bigcap_{i \in B} \{Y_i \leq c_i\}\right\},$$

for all real $c_i, i \in B$. This implies that [see Brown and Rinott (1988), Section 1, or integrate by parts]

$$(19) \quad \log E\left\{\exp\left(-k \sum_{i \in B} X_i\right)\right\} \leq \log E\left\{\exp\left(-k \sum_{i \in B} Y_i\right)\right\}, \quad \text{for } k > 0.$$

As in the proof of part (a),

$$(20) \quad \log E\left\{\exp\left(-k \sum_{i \in B} X_i\right)\right\} = \sum_{A: A \cap B \neq \emptyset} \lambda t(A) [m(-|A \cap B|k) - 1],$$

$$(21) \quad \log E\left\{\exp\left(-k \sum_{i \in B} Y_i\right)\right\} = \sum_{A: A \cap B \neq \emptyset} \lambda t^*(A) [m(-|A \cap B|k) - 1],$$

where $m(\alpha) = E\{\exp(\alpha U_1)\}$. For each set A satisfying $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$,

$$(22) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m(-|A \cap B|k) = P\{U_1 = 0\} < 1.$$

Hence part (b) follows from (19), (20) and (21). \square

REFERENCE

BROWN, L. D. and RINOTT, Y. (1988). Inequalities for multivariate infinitely divisible processes. *Ann. Probab.* **16** 642-657.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS
 UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
 AMHERST, MASSACHUSETTS 01033