Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae

S. Amghibech

On the Borel-Cantelli Lemma and moments

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 2006

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.

This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* `http://project.dml.cz`

On the Borel-Cantelli Lemma and moments

S. Amghibech

Abstract. We present some extensions of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma in terms of moments. Our result can be viewed as a new improvement to the Borel-Cantelli Lemma. Our proofs are based on the expansion of moments of some partial sums by using Stirling numbers. We also give a comment concerning the results of Petrov V.V., *A generalization of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma*, Statist. Probab. Lett. **67** (2004), no. 3, 233–239.

Keywords: Borel-Cantelli Lemma, Stirling numbers

Classification: Primary 60A10, 60F15; Secondary 05A18

1. Introduction

The Borel-Cantelli lemmas play the central role in the proofs of many probability laws including the law of large numbers and the law of the iterated logarithm. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, that is a triple consisting of a space Ω, a σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of Ω, and a probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. If X is a nonnegative random variable, the expectation of X, denoted $\mathbb{E}(X)$, is

$$\mathbb{E}(X) = \int X d\mathbb{P}.$$

Recall that

Theorem 1.1 (Borel-Cantelli Lemmas)**.** *Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ be an infinite sequence of events on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Denote the probability of A_k by p_k.*

(1) *If $\sum p_k$ converges, then with probability one only finitely many of the events A_k occur.*
(2) *If the events A_k are mutually independent, and if $\sum p_k$ diverges, then with probability one, infinitely many of the events A_k occur.*

Many attempts were made in order to weaken the independence condition in the second part of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma. This condition means mutual independence of events.

In 1959, Erdös and Rényi [2] found that the condition of pairwise independence of events $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ can be replaced by the weaker condition $\mathbb{P}(A_k \cap A_j) \leq \mathbb{P}(A_k)\mathbb{P}(A_j)$ for every k and j such that $k \neq j$.

In 1962, Rényi [8, Lemma C, p. 391] showed that, if $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ are arbitrary events fulfilling the conditions

$$(1.1) \qquad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_n) = \infty$$

and

$$(1.2) \qquad \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j)}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_i)\right)^2} = 1,$$

then $\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n) = 1$.

In 1963, Lamperti [4] formulated the following proposition. If $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ is a sequence of events such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_n) = \infty$ and $\mathbb{P}(A_k \cap A_j) \leq C\mathbb{P}(A_k)\mathbb{P}(A_j)$ for all $k, j > N$ and some constants C and N, then $\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n) > 0$.

In 1964, Kochen and Stone [3], see also Spitzer [9, P3, p. 317], proved the following result. If condition (1.1) is satisfied and if

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j)}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_i)\right)^2} \leq C$$

then $\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n) \geq \frac{1}{C}$.

In 1983, Ortega and Wschebor [5] proved that if conditions (1.1) and

$$(1.3) \qquad \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i<j \leq n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j) - \mathbb{P}(A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_j)}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_i)\right)^2} \leq 0$$

are satisfied, then $\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n) = 1$. Note that this result can be obtained from Rényi's one.

In 2002, Petrov [6] formulated the following result. If $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ is a sequence of events such that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_n) = \infty$ and $\mathbb{P}(A_k \cap A_j) \leq C\mathbb{P}(A_k)\mathbb{P}(A_j)$ for all $k, j > L$ such that $k \neq j$ and some constants $C \geq 1$ and L, then $\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n) \geq \frac{1}{C}$.

In 2004, Petrov [7] "improved" these results as follows:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of events satisfying condition* (1.1). *Let H be an arbitrary real constant. Put*

$$\alpha_H = \liminf \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i<j \leq n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j) - H\mathbb{P}(A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_j)}{\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_k)\right)^2}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n) \geq \frac{1}{H + 2\alpha_H}.$$

We show below that

$$H + 2\alpha_H = \liminf \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j)}{(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_k))^2} \, .$$

In this paper, we present two extensions in terms of moment of order p as follows:

2. Main result and comments

Theorem 2.1. *If* $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ *is a sequence of events such that* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_n)$ *diverges and*

$$(2.1) \qquad\qquad \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p} A_{i_j} \right) \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{p} \mathbb{P}(A_{i_j})$$

for all $i_p > i_{p-1} > \cdots > i_1 > L$ *and some constants* $C \geq 1$ *and* L, *then*

$$\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n) \geq \frac{1}{C^{1/(p-1)}} \, .$$

Let $\mathbb{I}_{A_n}$ be the indicator of the event A_n. We put $S_n := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{A_k}$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let* $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ *be a sequence of events such that* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_n) = \infty$. *Let* $p \geq 2$ *be an arbitrary integer. Put*

$$\alpha := \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \mathbb{P}(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p} A_{i_j})}{(\mathbb{E}(S_n))^p} \, .$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n) \geq \frac{1}{(p!\alpha)^{1/(p-1)}} \, .$$

Theorem 2.3. *Let* $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ *be a sequence of events such that* $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(A_n) = \infty$. *Let* $p \geq 2$ *be an arbitrary integer. Then we have*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(\mathbb{E}(S_n))^p} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{p} \mathbb{P}(A_{i_j}) = \frac{1}{p!}$$

and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}(S_n^p)} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p} A_{i_j} \right) = \frac{1}{p!} \, .$$

Obviously we have $\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{I}_{A_n}) = \mathbb{P}(A_n)$, thus $\mathbb{E}S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_k)$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$\mathbb{E}(S_n) = \mathbb{E}(S_n \mathbb{I}_{\bigcup_{k=1}^{n} A_k}) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{n} A_k\right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{A_i \cap A_j}\right)^{1/2}$$

for arbitrary events $A_1, A_2, \ldots A_n$, and hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{n} A_k\right) \geq \frac{(\mathbb{E}(S_n))^2}{\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j)}$$

which is the Chung Erdös inequality [1]. Which gives

$$\limsup \frac{(\mathbb{E}(S_n))^2}{\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j)} \leq 1.$$

From this inequality, the fact that the condition (1.1) is satisfied,

$$\mathbb{E}(S_n^2) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j) = \mathbb{E}(S_n) + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j)$$

and

$$2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbb{P}(A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_j) = (\mathbb{E}S_n)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_i)^2$$

we get, the conditions (1.2) and (1.3) are equivalent, and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(\mathbb{E}(S_n))^2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbb{P}(A_i)\mathbb{P}(A_j) = \frac{1}{2}$$

which gives

$$H + 2\alpha_H = \liminf \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \mathbb{P}(A_i \cap A_j)}{(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{P}(A_k))^2}$$

because of (if (a_n) converges and (b_n) arbitrary, then $\liminf(a_n + b_n) = \lim a_n + \liminf b_n$). Thus the result of [7] is the same as those of [9] and [3].

3. Stirling numbers and moments of S_n

In order to obtain an exact expression of $\mathbb{E}(S_n^p)$, we need the following notions on the Stirling numbers which can be found in [10].

For each positive integer n, let

$$(t)_n := t(t-1)\ldots(t-n+1) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$$

be the descending (falling) factorial. Also define $(t)_0 = 1$. *Stirling numbers of first kind*, denoted by $s(n,k)$, and *Stirling numbers of the second kind*, denoted $S(n,k)$ with $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, are defined to be the coefficients in the expression

$$(t)_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} s(n,k)t^k$$

and in the expression

$$t^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} S(n,k)(t)_k.$$

We know also that if $c(n,k)$ denotes the number of permutations π of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ with exactly k cycles, then $s(n,k) = (-1)^{n-k}c(n,k)$. And if we denote by $P(n,k)$ the set of all partitions of an n-set into k nonempty subsets (blocs), then

$$S(n,k) = |P(n,k)|.$$

So we just mention that the two groups of numbers have similar properties and their generating functions are given by

$$\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} S(n,k)\frac{z^n}{n!} = \frac{1}{k!}(\exp(z) - 1)^k$$

and

$$\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} s(n,k)\frac{z^n}{n!} = \frac{1}{k!}[\log(1+z)]^k.$$

We will be mostly concerned with Stirling numbers of the first and second kind in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n$ be a sequence of measurable sets, and p be a positive integer. Then we have*

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{A_k}\right)^p = \sum_{k=0}^{p} S(p,k)k! \sum_{1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \le n} \mathbb{I}_{\cap_{j=1}^{k} A_{i_j}}$$

and

$$p! \sum_{1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \le n} \mathbb{I}_{\cap_{j=1}^{p} A_{i_j}} = \sum_{k=0}^{p} s(p,k)\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{A_k}\right)^k.$$

PROOF: Remark that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, we have $\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{A_k}(\omega) = t$ if and only if

$$k! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq n} \mathbb{I}_{\bigcap_{j=1}^{k} A_{i_j}}(\omega) = (t)_k$$

which gives the result. □

By taking the expectation, the following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n$ be a sequence of events, and p be a positive integer. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{A_k} \right)^p = \sum_{k=0}^{p} S(p,k) k! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{k} A_{i_j} \right)$$

and

$$p! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p} A_{i_j} \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{p} s(p,k) \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{A_k} \right)^k.$$

4. Proofs of theorems

We shall often need Jensen's inequality which is as follows. If g is a convex function and X random variable such that $\mathbb{E}|g(X)| < \infty$ then

$$g(\mathbb{E}X) \leq \mathbb{E}(g(X)).$$

Recall that $S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{I}_{A_k}$, and assume the sequence of events $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ satisfies (1.1).

To prove our Theorems, we need the following lemmas:

Lemma 4.1. *We have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{n} A_k \right)^{(p-1)} \geq \frac{(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p}{\mathbb{E}(S_n^p)}.$$

PROOF: By using Hölder's inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E}(S_n) = \mathbb{E}(S_n \mathbb{I}_{\bigcup_{k=1}^{n} A_k}) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{n} A_k \right)^{(p-1)/p} (\mathbb{E}(S_n^p))^{1/p}$$

which proves the lemma. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let $p > 1$ be a real number, and I be an infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$. If there exists $c \geq 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}(S_n^p) \leq c(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p$ for all $n \in I$, then*

$$\lim_{I \ni n \to \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(S_n^q)}{(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p} = 0$$

for all $0 < q < p$.

PROOF: Let $n \in I$. From Jensen's inequality it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(S_n^q) \leq (\mathbb{E}(S_n^p))^{\frac{q}{p}}.$$

Because of the assumption of the lemma it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}(S_n^q) \leq c^{\frac{q}{p}} (\mathbb{E}S_n)^q$$

and hence

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}(S_n^q)}{(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p} \leq c^{\frac{q}{p}} (\mathbb{E}S_n)^{q-p}$$

which proves our statement since $\lim \mathbb{E}S_n = \infty$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $p > 1$ be an integer, and I be an infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$. If there exists $c \geq 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}(S_n^p) \leq c(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p$ for all $n \in I$, then*

$$\lim_{I \ni n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq n} \mathbb{P}(\bigcap_{j=1}^k A_{i_j})}{(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p} = 0$$

for any integer $0 < k < p$.

PROOF: By using Corollary 3.2, we get

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^k A_{i_j} \right) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{j=0}^k s(k,j) \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{I}_{A_i} \right)^j.$$

Hence

$$\frac{1}{(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^k A_{i_j} \right) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{j=0}^k s(k,j) \frac{\mathbb{E}S_n^j}{(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p}$$

and by applying Lemma 4.2 we get the result. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 4.4. *Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer, and I be an infinite subset of $\mathbb{N}$. If there exists $c \geq 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}(S_n^p) \leq c(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p$ for all $n \in I$, then*

$$\lim_{I \ni n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^p A_{i_j} \right) - \sum_{m \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^p A_{i_j} \right) \right) = 0.$$

PROOF: This follows from the fact that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^p A_{i_j} \right) - \sum_{m \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^p A_{i_j} \right)$$

$$\leq m \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{p-1} \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p-1} A_{i_j} \right)$$

and Lemma 4.3.   □

Lemma 4.5. *For every integer $m \geq 1$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbb{P}(A_{i_j}) - \sum_{m \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbb{P}(A_{i_j}) \right) = 0.$$

PROOF: This follows from the fact that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbb{P}(A_{i_j}) - \sum_{m \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^p \mathbb{P}(A_{i_j})$$

$$\leq m \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{p-1} \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{p-1} \mathbb{P}(A_{i_j}) \leq \frac{m}{(p-1)!} (\mathbb{E}S_n)^{p-1}.$$

□

The main part of the proof of Theorem 2.3 (second part) is the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$ be positive numbers and p a positive integer. Then the following inequality*

$$(4.1) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right)^p - p! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^p a_{i_j} \leq \sum_{j=2}^p \binom{p}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right)^{p-j} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^j$$

holds. In particular if $a_i \in [0,1]$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \right)^p - p! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{p} a_{i_j} \leq \sum_{j=2}^{p} \binom{p}{j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \right)^{p+1-j}.$$

PROOF: Remark that the left side of inequality (4.1) is less than or equal to

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{j=2}^{p} \binom{p}{j} a_k^j \left(- a_k + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \right)^{p-j}.$$

Now by the fact that $-a_k + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i$ we obtain the first inequality.

The second part follows from the first one by using $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i^j$ for $j \geq 2$ and $a_i \in [0,1]$. $\qquad \square$

Lemma 4.7. *We have*

$$\left| \mathbb{E}(S_n^p) - p! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p} A_{i_j} \right) \right| \leq (p! - 1) \left(\mathbb{E}(S_n^p) \right)^{(p-1)/p}$$

for all n such that $\mathbb{E}(S_n) \geq 1$.

PROOF: First we have $s(p,p) = 1$. Now, by applying Corollary 3.2, we get

$$\left| \mathbb{E}(S_n^p) - p! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p} A_{i_j} \right) \right| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} |s(p,k)| \mathbb{E}(S_n^k)$$

and, by using Jensen's inequality, we obtain $\mathbb{E}(S_n^k) \leq (\mathbb{E}S_n^p)^{k/p}$ for all $0 \leq k \leq p$. Remark that if $\mathbb{E}S_n \geq 1$ then $\mathbb{E}S_n^p \geq 1$ and thus $\left(\mathbb{E}S_n^p \right)^{(p-1)/p} \geq \mathbb{E}(S_n^k)$ for all $0 \leq k \leq p-1$. We have also $\sum_{k=0}^{p-1} |s(p,k)| = p! - 1$ which completes the proof. $\qquad \square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3: Remark that $\mathbb{E}(S_n) \leq \mathbb{E}(S_n^p)$ for large n, and so the second part of the theorem follows from Lemma 4.7.

The first part of the theorem follows from Lemma 4.6 by $a_i = \mathbb{P}(A_i)$ and this completes the proof of Theorem 2.3. $\qquad \square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1: By applying Lemma 4.1, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=m+1}^{N} A_k \right)^{(p-1)} \geq \frac{(\mathbb{E}(S_N - S_m))^p}{\mathbb{E}(S_N - S_m)^p}$$

and, by applying Theorem 2.3 we have

$$(\mathbb{E}(S_N - S_m))^p \sim_{N \to \infty} p! \sum_{m+1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \le N} \prod_{j=1}^{p} \mathbb{P}(A_{i_j})$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(S_N - S_m)^p \sim_{N \to \infty} p! \sum_{m+1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \le N} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p} A_{i_j} \right).$$

Combining these with equation (2.1) we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=m+1}^{\infty} A_k \right)^{(p-1)} \ge \frac{1}{C}$$

which terminates the proof.   □

Lemma 4.8. *If $\alpha < \infty$, then there exist an infinite subset I of positive integers and a constant C such that*

$$\mathbb{E}S_n^p \le C(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p.$$

PROOF: It follows from the assumption $\alpha < \infty$ that one can choose an infinite I of positives integers such that

$$\alpha = \lim_{I \ni n \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{1 \le i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \le n} \mathbb{P}(\bigcap_{j=1}^{p} A_{i_j})}{(\mathbb{E}(S_n))^p}.$$

Now by applying Theorem 2.3 we prove the lemma.   □

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2: By applying Lemma 4.1, we get

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=m+1}^{N} A_k \right)^{(p-1)} \ge \frac{(\mathbb{E}(S_N - S_m))^p}{\mathbb{E}(S_N - S_m)^p}.$$

By applying Lemma 4.8, then Lemmas 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 we get

$$\alpha = \liminf \frac{\mathbb{E}(S_n^p)}{p!(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p},$$

thus

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=m+1}^{\infty} A_k \right)^{(p-1)} \ge \frac{1}{p!\alpha}$$

and the proof of the theorem is complete.   □

We complete this article with the following result which can be obtained by the same method.

Proposition 4.9. *Let* $A_1, A_2, \ldots$ *be a sequence of events such that* $\sum_n \mathbb{P}(A_n)$ *diverges. Let* $p > 1$ *be a real number. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\limsup A_n)^{(p-1)} \geq \limsup \frac{(\mathbb{E}S_n)^p}{\mathbb{E}S_n^p} .$$

References

[1] Chung K.L., Erdös P., *On the application of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **72** (1952), no. 1, 179–186.

[2] Erdös P., Rényi A., *On Cantor's series with convergent* $\Sigma 1/q_n$, Ann. Univ. Sci. Budapest Sect. Math. **2** (1959), 93–109.

[3] Kochen S.P., Stone C.J., *A note on the Borel-Cantelli Lemma*, Illinois J. Math. **8** (1964), 248–251.

[4] Lamperti J., *Wiener's test and Markov chains*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **6** (1963), 58–66.

[5] Ortega J., Wschebor M., *On the sequence of partial maxima of some random sequences*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **16** (1983), 85–98.

[6] Petrov V.V., *A note on the Borel-Cantelli Lemma*, Statist. Probab. Lett. **58** (2002), no. 3, 283–286.

[7] Petrov V.V., *A generalization of the Borel-Cantelli Lemma*, Statist. Probab. Lett. **67** (2004), no. 3, 233–239.

[8] Rényi A., *Probability Theory*, North-Holland Series in Applied Mathematics and Mechanics, vol. 10, North-Holland, Amsterdam-London, 1970; German version 1962, French version 1966, new Hungarian edition 1965.

[9] Spitzer F., *Principles of Random Walk*, 2nd edition, Springer, New York-Heidelberg, 1976.

[10] Van Lint J.H., Wilson R.M., *A Course in Combinatorics*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

2845 rue legare, Sainte-Foy, (qc) G1V 2H1 Canada

E-mail: amghibech@hotmail.com