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1. **Introduction.** Since the appearance of the paper by Chernoff and Savage (1958) an ever increasing effort is devoted to study the problem of asymptotic normality of two-sample linear rank statistics. Pyke and Shorack (1968), using the concept of weak convergence of certain empirical processes, give an alternative proof of the Chernoff—Savage theorem. Their proof shows that the theorem holds even for a larger class of score functions than initially established. Motivated by interest in the robustness of the two-sample linear rank statistics, Fears and Mehra (1974), using the approach of Pyke and Shorack, establish the asymptotic normality of linear rank statistics for strictly stationary \( \phi \)-mixing sequences of random variables satisfying certain regularity conditions.

The purpose of the present investigation is two-fold. For \( \phi \)-mixing sequences we waive the stationarity assumption and considerably weaken the condition imposed by Fears and Mehra (1974) on the mixing numbers. Secondly, we establish, under slightly stronger assumptions on the mixing numbers, analogous results for strong mixing sequences of random variables.

Let \( \{X_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty} \) be a sequence of random variables and let \( F_{m,n} \) denote the \( \sigma \)-field generated by \( \{X_m, X_{m+1}, \ldots, X_n\}, 1 \leq m < n \leq \infty \). Further, let \( A \in F_{1,m} \) and \( B \in F_{m+n,\infty} \). Then \( \{X_m\} \) is said to be \( \phi \)-mixing or uniformly mixing if

\[
|P(AB) - P(A)P(B)| \leq \phi(n)P(A),
\]

where \( \phi(n) \) is a nonincreasing function of positive integers with

\[
0 \leq \phi(n) \leq 1 \text{ and } \lim_{n \to \infty} \phi(n) = 0.
\]

The sequence \( \{X_m\} \) is said to be \( \alpha \)-mixing or strongly mixing if

\[
|P(AB) - P(A)P(B)| \leq \alpha(n),
\]
the $k^{th}$ order statistic of the combined sample $X_1, \ldots, X_m, Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ and $c_{NK}, 1 \leq k \leq N$, are a given set of constants with $N = m + n$. As in Pyke and Shorack (1968), $T_N$ has another representation that employs certain two-sample empirical processes, viz.,

$$T_N = \int_0^1 F_{mN}^{-1}d\nu_N, \tag{1.2}$$

where $F_{mN}(G_n)$ denotes the empirical distribution function (d.f.) of $X_1, \ldots, X_m(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n), H_N = \lambda F_m + (1 - \lambda)G_n$, with $\lambda_N = m/N$ and $H_N^{-1}(t) = \inf\{x: H_N(x) \geq t\}$, and $\nu_N$ is the signed measure which assigns measure $c_{NK}$ at the point $k/N, k = 1, \ldots, N$. Define $H_\lambda = \lambda F + (1 - \lambda)G$ with $\lambda = \lim_{N \to \infty} \lambda_N$ where $F(G)$ is the marginal d.f. of $X(Y)$. Pyke and Shorack (1968) prove the asymptotic normality of

$$T_N^* = N^{1/2}(T_N - \mu_N) = \int_0^1 L_N(t)d\nu_N(t), \tag{1.3}$$

where $\mu_N = \int_0^1 FH_N^{-1}d\nu_N$ and $L_N(t) = [F_{mN}^{-1}(t) - FH_N^{-1}(t)]$ with $H = H_\lambda$, by establishing the weak convergence of $L_N(t)$ to a well defined Gaussian process.

Adopting the approach of Pyke and Shorack, Fears and Mehra (1974) prove a corresponding result where $\{X_m\}$ and $\{Y_n\}$ are strictly stationary uniform mixing sequences satisfying the condition $\sum_{n=1}^\infty n^2[\phi(n)]^{1/2} < \infty$. The method of proof developed by Pyke and Shorack (1968) consists of three
main parts. First, the weak convergence is proved for the one-sample process

\[ m^{1/2} [F_m^{-1}(t) - t]/q(t), \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.4)

where \( q(t) = K[t(1 - t)]^{1/2-\delta}, 0 \leq t \leq 1 \) and some \( \delta, 0 < \delta < 1/2, \)
then the weak convergence of \( L_N(t) \) is established and, finally, the
asymptotic distribution of \( T_N^* \) is obtained. This is the path we follow
to present our results, being brief whenever possible.
2. Two-sample linear rank statistics for uniform mixing processes.

The Chernoff-Savage theorem for the two-sample linear rank statistics $T^*_N$ will be established in this section for uniform mixing sequences. The proof proceeds in the following three stages:

(a) One sample empirical process. Let $U_m(t) = m^{1/2} \left[ F_m^{-1}(t) - t \right]$, $0 \leq t \leq 1$, and $V_m(t) = U_m(t)/q(t)$. The following main result of this subsection establishes the weak convergence of $V_m(t)$ to a Gaussian process where $\{X_m\}$ is a uniform mixing sequence with $\phi(m) = O(m^{-2})$, not necessarily stationary. Because of the substantial weakening of assumptions on the sequence, a new proof is thus required. Though the proof is slightly long, its important contribution should compensate it.

**THEOREM 2.1.** Let $\{X_m\}$ be a uniform mixing sequence with $\phi(m) = O(m^{-2})$.

Then $V_m(t)$ converges weakly to a Gaussian process $V(t) = U(t)/q(t)$ where $EU(t) = 0$ and, for $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$,

$$EU(s) U(t) = \lim_{m \to \infty} EU_m(s) U_m(t) = L(s, t), \text{ say} \quad (2.1)$$

provided that the right hand side of (2.1) exists.

**PROOF.** First we shall show that $U_m(t)$ converges weakly to $U(t)$ and then use this result to establish that $V_m(t)$ converges weakly to $V(t)$.

The proof of the first assertion is an extension of a result of Yoshihara (1974) where strict stationarity is assumed; so we shall only mention the necessary changes in his proof. That the finite dimensional distributions
are asymptotically normal follows from Corollary 1 (f) of Withers (1975) since $\phi(m) = O(m^{-2})$ implies that $\sum_{j=1}^{J} i^2 \phi(i) \leq K_j, j = 1, \ldots, m$.

To establish the tightness we need to show that, for all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1$ and some $\gamma > 0$,

$$E[U_m(t) - U_m(s)]^4 \leq C_\gamma (t - s)^{1+\gamma}$$

(2.2)

where $C_\gamma$ is a constant depending on $\gamma$. Let

$$\eta_j = I(s < F(X_j) \leq t) - (t - s), j = 1, \ldots, m.$$  

(2.3)

Then $U_m(t) - U_m(s) = m^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j$ and

$$E[U_m(t) - U_m(s)]^4 = m^{-2} E(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j)^4.$$  

(2.4)

In what follows all generic constants will be denoted by $K$. Following Yoshihara (1974) we define $\ell = \frac{m^\lambda}{\ell_m} = [m^\lambda]$ for $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $p = p_m = [m/2\ell]$, where $[x]$ denotes the integral part of $x$. Let $V_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} i^n 2i + j$, $V_i^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} i^n (2i + 1) + j$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, p - 1$ and $V_p = \sum_{j=1}^{m} i^n (2p + 1) + j$. Then

$$E(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j)^4 = E(\sum_{i=0}^{p} V_i + \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} V_i')^4 \leq 8[E(\sum_{i=0}^{p} V_i)^4 + E(\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} V_i')^4].$$

(2.5)

Note that

$$E(\sum_{i=0}^{p} V_i)^4 = E(\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} V_i)^4 + 4EV_p (\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} V_i)^3 + 6EV_p^2 (\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} V_i)^2$$

$$+ 4EV_p^3 (\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} V_i) + EV_p^4$$

(2.6)
where
\[ \mathbb{E}(\sum_{i=0}^{D-1} V_i)^h \leq 4! \sum_{i=0}^{D-1} \mathbb{E} |V_iV_{i+j}V_{i+j+k}V_{i+j+k+u}| \]
\[ \leq 4! \left( \sum_{i=0}^{D-1} \mathbb{E} |V_i|^h \right)^4 + \sum_{i=0}^{D-1} \sum_{j=1}^{D-p-1} \left( \mathbb{E} V_i^3 V_{i+j} \right) + \mathbb{E} V_i^2 V_{i+j} + \mathbb{E} V_i^2 V_{i+j}^2 \]
\[ + \sum_{i=0}^{D-1} \sum_{j=1}^{D-p-1} \sum_{k=1}^{D-1} \left( \mathbb{E} V_i^2 V_{i+j} V_{i+j+k} \right) + \mathbb{E} V_i^2 V_{i+j} V_{i+j+k}^2 \]
\[ + \sum_{i=0}^{D-1} \sum_{j,k,u}^{D-1} \mathbb{E} V_i^2 V_{i+j} V_{i+j+k} V_{i+j+k+u}. \] (2.7)

The above expression will be further bounded, term by term as follows.
Checking the proof of Lemma 1 of Billingsley (1968), p. 170, one can show that the same result holds without the assumption of stationarity. Thus it follows from this lemma and the assumption \( \phi(m) = O(m^{-2}) \) that, for \( m \) sufficiently large,
\[ |EV_i^3 V_{i+j}| \leq k^{\frac{3}{2}} (EV_i^{h_1} V_{i+j}^{h_2})^{1/4} \] (2.8a)
\[ |EV_i V_{i+j}^3| \leq k^{\frac{1}{2}} (EV_i^{h_1} V_{i+j}^{h_2})^{1/4} \] (2.8b)
\[ |EV_i^2 V_{i+j}^{2}| \leq k^{\frac{1}{2}} (EV_i^{h_1} V_{i+j}^{h_2})^{1/4} + EV_i^2 EV_{i+j}^{2} \] (2.8c)
\[ |EV_i^2 V_{i+j} V_{i+j+k}| \leq k^{\frac{1}{2}} (EV_i^{h_1} V_{i+j}^{h_2} V_{i+j+k}^{h_3})^{1/4} \] (2.8d)
\[ |EV_i V_{i+j}^2 V_{i+j+k}| \leq k^{\frac{3}{2}} (EV_i^{h_1} V_{i+j}^{h_2} V_{i+j+k}^{h_3})^{1/4} \] (2.8e)
\[ |EV_i V_{i+j} V_{i+j+k}^2| \leq k^{\frac{3}{2}} (EV_i^{h_1} V_{i+j}^{h_2} V_{i+j+k}^{h_3})^{1/4} \] (2.8f)

and
\[ |EV_i V_{i+j} V_{i+j+k} V_{i+j+k+u}| \leq k^{\frac{3}{2}} (EV_i^{h_1} V_{i+j}^{h_2} V_{i+j+k}^{h_3} V_{i+j+k+u}^{h_4})^{1/4}. \] (2.8g)

The above upper bounds are functions of \( EV_i^2 \) and \( EV_i^h \). We shall obtain upper
bounds only for $\mathcal{E}_V^2$ and $\mathcal{E}_V^4$, the same arguments apply to finite bounds

similar to (2.10) and (2.11) below for $\mathcal{E}_V^2$ and $\mathcal{E}_V^4$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, p - 1$.

Now

$$\mathcal{E}_V^4 \leq 4 \prod_{i=1}^p \left( \sum_{j=1}^p \left( \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^p \right) \right)$$

(2.9)

where $\sum_{j=1}^p$, $\sum_{j=1}^p$, and $\sum_{j=1}^p$ are, respectively, the summations over all

indices $i, j, k, u \geq 1, j + k + u \leq m - i$ such that $j \geq \max (k, u), k \geq \max (j, u)$

and $u \geq \max (j, k)$. Similar to the proof of Lemma 1 of Yoshihara (1974),

where the assumptions of common marginal $F$ and uniform mixing for $\{X_m\}$

rather than stationarity are crucial, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_V^4 \leq K(t - s) \ell \left( \sum_{j=1}^p \phi^{1/2}(j) \right)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \phi(j)$$

$$\leq K(t - s)(\ell \log \ell)^2,$$

(2.10)

since, for $m$ sufficiently large, $\sum_{j=1}^p \phi^{1/2}(j) = o(\log \ell)$ and

$\sum_{j=1}^p (j + 1)^2 \phi(j) = o(\ell)$. Similarly, it can be shown that

$$\mathcal{E}_V^2 \leq K \ell (t - s).$$

(2.11)

Note that, for $m$ sufficiently large, there exists an $\varepsilon$, $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda$, such

that $(\log m)^2 \leq m^\varepsilon$. Now collecting terms from (2.8) to (2.11), we obtain

$$E\left( \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} V_i \right) \leq K(m^2(t - s)^2 + m^\varepsilon(t - s)),$$

(2.12)

for some $\gamma > 0$. Next, note that
\[ EV_p \left( \sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i \right)^3 = E_{\sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i} = V_{2p \ell + 1} \sum_{j=2p \ell + 1}^{E_{\sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i}} \]
\[ \leq KE^{3/4} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i \right)^{4/2} \]
\[ EV_p \left( \sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i \right)^2 \leq K(\ell^{-1} + 1)E^{1/2} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i \right)^{4/2} V_{P}^{1/2} \]
\[ \leq K[E(\sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i)^{4/2} V_{P}^{1/2}] \]
\[ EV_p \left( \sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i \right)^2 \leq K^{1/4} (2p + 1)E(\sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i)^{4/2} V_{P}^{1/2} \] (2.13a)

and

\[ EV_p \left( \sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i \right)^2 \leq K^{1/4} (2p + 1)[E(\sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i)^{4/2} V_{P}^{1/2}] \] (2.13b)

Hence, for sufficiently large \( m \), there exists a \( \gamma > 0 \) such that

\[ E \left( \sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i \right)^{4/2} \leq K[m^2(t - s)^2 + m^{1+\gamma}(t - s)] \] (2.14a)

Similarly, it can be shown that, there exists a \( \gamma > 0 \) such that, for \( m \)
sufficiently large,

\[ E \left( \sum_{i=0}^{P-1} V_i \right)^{4/2} \leq K[m^2(t - s)^2 + m^{1+\gamma}(t - s)] \] (2.14b)

Therefore (2.2) follows. The rest of the proof of the tightness coincides
with that of Yoshihara (1974), and hence, is omitted. To complete the
proof of the theorem it remains to show that, given \( \epsilon > 0 \), there exist a
\( \theta \epsilon (0, 1/2) \) and an integer \( M = M(\epsilon, \phi, \delta, K) \) such that for all \( m \geq M \)

\[ P \left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 2} \left| V_m(t) \right| \geq \epsilon \right] \geq \epsilon \] (2.15)

Let \( g_t(X_j) = I(F(X_j) \leq t) - t, j = 1, \ldots, m, 0 \leq t \leq 1 \). The balance of
the proof is analogous to Lemma 2.1 of Fears and Mehra (1974). Let
\[ 0 < s_1 < s_2 < \ldots < s_R = \theta < 1/2 \] be \( R \) distinct points with \( s_r = r\theta/R, \, r = 1, 2, \ldots, R. \) For any pair \((j, k)\) such that \( 1 < j < k \leq R \) define

\[
\eta_i^* = \left[ g_{s_k}(X_i)/q(s_{k-1}) \right] - \left[ g_{s_j}(X_i)/q(s_{j-1}) \right], \quad i = 1, \ldots, m. \quad (2.16)
\]

Set \( \eta_i = \eta_i^*/\left\{ 2\left[ \sum_{j<r} q^{-2}(s_{r-1}) \right]^{1/2} \right\}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m. \) Then it follows from (2.7) and (2.8) of Fears and Mehra (1974), where the stationarity is not essential, that \( E_{F_i}^2 \leq \theta/R \) and \( E\left[ g_{s_k}(X_i)/q(s_{k-1}) \right]^2 \leq 2(\theta/R)\sum_{j<r} q^{-2}(s_{r-1}), \)

\( i = 1, \ldots, m. \) Next, in the proof of the tightness of \( U_m(t) \) we have demonstrated that the stationarity is unessential, thus Lemma 2 of Yoshihara (1974) becomes: If \( \{Z_i\} \) is a sequence of uniform mixing random variables such that \( EZ_i = 0, \) \( EZ_i^2 \leq \tau, \) \( EZ_i \leq C\tau \) for some constant \( C > 0, \) and \( |Z_i| \leq 1, \) then there exists a number \( \gamma, \) \( 0 < \gamma < 1, \) such that

\[
E\left( \sum_{i=1}^m Z_i \right)^4 \leq K(m^{2-\gamma} + m^2 \tau^2) \quad \text{for some constant } K > 0. \]

We now apply this result to the sequence \( \{\eta_i\}. \) Note that, for \( i = 1, \ldots, m, \) \( E\eta_i = 0, \) \( E\eta_i^2 \leq \theta/R, \) and that, from (2.9) and (2.10) of Fears and Mehra (1974), \( |\eta_i| \leq 1. \) It remains to show that there exists a positive constant \( C \) such that \( E|\eta_i| \leq C\theta/R \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m. \) For any pair \((j, k),\) we have

\[
E|\eta_i| \leq \left\{ 2\left[ \sum_{j<r} q^{-2}(s_{r-1}) \right]^{1/2} \right\}^{-1} E\left| \frac{g_{s_k}(X_i)}{q(s_{k-1})} - \frac{g_{s_j}(X_i)}{q(s_{j-1})} \right|. \quad (2.17)
\]

The second factor in the RHS of (2.17) is majorized by
- 11 -

\[ q^{-1}(s_{k-1})E|g_{s_k}(X_1) - g_{s_j}(X_1)| + E|g_{s_j}(X_1)|[q^{-1}(s_{j-1}) - q^{-1}(s_{k-1})] \]

\[ \leq 2q^{-1}(s_{k-1})(s_k - s_j) + 2s_j[q^{-1}(s_{j-1}) - q^{-1}(s_{k-1})] \]

\[ = 2\left[ \frac{s_k}{q(s_{k-1})} - \frac{s_j}{q(s_{j-1})} \right] + 4s_j[q^{-1}(s_{j-1}) - q^{-1}(s_{k-1})]. \] (2.18)

The above inequality follows from the fact that \( E|W - EW| \leq 2E|W| \) for any random variable \( W \) with \( E|W| < \infty \). To obtain a suitable bound for the RHS of (2.18), we recall that \( q(t) = K[t(1 - t)]^{\frac{1}{2} - \delta} \) for all \( t \in [0, 1] \), \( \delta \in (0, 1/2) \), and \( K > 0 \). Thus \( 0 < q(t) \leq K \) for any \( t \in (0, 1) \) and the RHS of (2.18) is then majorized by

\[ \frac{2K}{q(s_{k-1})}\left[ \frac{s_k}{q(s_{k-1})} - \frac{s_j}{q(s_{j-1})} \right] + \frac{4Ks_j}{q(s_{j-1})}[q^{-1}(s_{j-1}) - q^{-1}(s_{k-1})]. \] (2.19)

Now, from (2.4) and (2.6) of Fears and Mehra (1974), and the inequality 
\[ |q^2(s_{r-1})/q^2(s_{r-2})| < 2 \] for all \( 2 < r \leq R \), our (2.19) is bounded above by

\[ 12 K(\theta/R)[\sum_{j<r\leq k}q^{-2}(s_{r-1})]. \]

Therefore, with \( C = 6K[\sum_{j<r\leq k}q^{-2}(s_{r-1})]^{1/2} \), we have

\[ E|\eta_1| \leq C(\theta/R). \] (2.20)
Hence, for $m$ sufficiently large, there exists a number $\gamma$, $0 < \gamma < 1$, such that

$$
E \left| \frac{U_m(s_k)}{q(s_{k-1})} - \frac{U_m(s_j)}{q(s_{j-1})} \right| \leq K \left[ \sum_{j < r < k} q^{-2}(s_{r-1}) \right] \left[ \frac{\theta}{R} \right]^2 + \frac{\theta}{R} m^{-\gamma},
$$

(2.21)

where $K$, here and in what follows, denotes generic constants not necessarily the same. If $0 < \epsilon < 1$ is a fixed real number such that $(\epsilon/m) < (\theta/R)$, then the RHS of (2.21) is majorized by

$$
K \left[ \sum_{j < r < k} q^{-2}(s_{r-1}) \right]^2 (1 + \epsilon^{-\gamma})(\theta/R)^{1+\gamma}.
$$

(2.22)

Similarly, we also have

$$
E \left| \frac{U_m(s_k)}{q(s_{k-1})} \right| \leq K \left[ \sum_{j < r < k} q^{-2}(s_{r-1}) \right] (1 + \epsilon^{-\gamma})(\theta/R)^{1+\gamma}.
$$

(2.23)

Thus it follows from Theorem 12.2 of Billingsley (1968) with

$$
\xi_j = U_m(s_j)/q(s_j), \quad \epsilon_j = [U_m(s_{j+1})/q(s_j)] - [U_m(s_j)/q(s_{j-1})]
$$

for $j = 2, \ldots, R - 1$, that

$$
P[ \max_{1 \leq j \leq R} \left| \frac{U_m(s_{j+1})}{q(s_j)} \right| \geq \epsilon ] \leq (K/\epsilon)^4 \left[ \sum_{j < r < k} q^{-2}(s_{r-1}) \right] (1 + \epsilon^{-\gamma})(\theta/R)^{1+\gamma},
$$

(2.24)

where $0 < \gamma < 1$. Given $\epsilon > 0$ and $\theta > 0$, if $m$ is sufficiently large it follows that an $R$ can be chosen so that $(\epsilon/m)^4(1+\gamma) < (\theta/R) < (\epsilon/2m)^2(1+\gamma)$ and $(KR^\delta)^{-1} < \epsilon^{1/2}/4$. Thus for this choice of $R$ we have for some $K$, $0 < K < \infty$, depending on $\phi$ and $q$. 

\[ P\left[ \sup_{\theta \leq t \leq 0} \left| \frac{U_m(t)}{q(t)} \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] \]

\[ \leq P\left[ 2 \max_{1 \leq j \leq R} \left| \frac{U_m(s_j)}{q(s_j)} \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] + P\left[ \left| \frac{U_m(s_1)}{q(s_1)} \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] \]

\[ \leq (K/\varepsilon^4)(1 + \varepsilon^{-\gamma})\int_0^\theta q^{-2}(t)dt \cdot 2 + K \varepsilon^{-2 s_1^2}, \quad (2.25) \]

since \( E[U_m(s_1)/q(s_1)]^2 \leq K s_1^2 \). By choosing \( \theta \) sufficiently small, the last upper bound of (2.25) can be made less than \( \varepsilon/m \) for \( m \) sufficiently large. But, as in (2.19) of Fears and Mehra (1974), we have

\[ P\left[ \sup_{0 \leq t \leq \theta} \left| \frac{U_m(t)}{q(t)} \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right] \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (2.26) \]

Now (2.15) follows from (2.25) and (2.26). The rest of the proof proceeds exactly as in Theorem 2.1 of Fears and Mehra (1974) with obvious modifications. \( \square \)

(b) Weak Convergence of \( L_m(t) \). The proof of Theorem 3.1 of Fears and Mehra (1974) may be adopted verbatim to our case after replacing their Theorem 2.1 by our Theorem 2.1 and their Lemma 2.1 by our (2.15). Thus Theorem 3.1 of Fears and Mehra (1974) remains valid without the stationarity assumption and with \( \phi(m) = O(m^{-2}) \) and \( \phi(n) = O(n^{-2}) \).

(c) Chernoff–Savage Theorem. Let \( \mu = \int_0^1 J(t) dF_{\varepsilon}^{-1}(t) \) where \( J \) is a nonconstant function of bounded variation on \( (\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon) \) for all \( \varepsilon, 0 < \varepsilon < 1/2 \), that induces the Lebesgue–Stieltjes measure \( \nu \) on \( (0, 1) \) and satisfies
(i) \( |J(t)| \leq K(t(1 - t))^{1/2 - \tau} \) for some \( K > 0 \) and \( 1/2 > \tau > 0 \),

(ii) \( N^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} |C_{Nj}^{*} - J\{\min[j/N, 1 - 1/N]\}| \leq \delta_{N} \), with \( \delta_{N} = o(1) \).

Assume that \( v_{N} = v_{0} + O(N^{-1/2}) \) and that \( FH^{-1} \) is differentiable a.e. \( |v| \)

for sufficiently large \( N \). Let

\[
L = (1 - \lambda_{0})(\lambda_{0}^{-1}b_{0}U(FH^{-1}) - (1 - \lambda_{0})^{-1/2}a_{0}V_{0}(CH_{\lambda_{0}}^{-1})),
\]

where \( b_{0}(a_{0}) \) is the a.c. (wrt Lebesque measure) derivative of \( FH_{\lambda_{0}}^{-1}(CH_{\lambda_{0}}^{-1}) \).

Hence we arrive at the following result.

**THEOREM 2.2.** Assume that \( \{X_{m}\} \) and \( \{Y_{n}\} \) are two independent and uniform mixing sequences of random variables having absolutely continuous finite dimensional distributions with \( \phi(m) = 0(m^{-2}) \) and \( \phi(n) = 0(n^{-2}) \).

Then, under the above conditions, \( N^{1/2}(T_{N} - \mu) \) is asymptotically normally distributed with mean 0 and variance \( \sigma^{2} = \int_{0}^{1} \int_{0}^{1} \text{cov}(L(u), L(v)) \, dv(u) \, dv(v) \).

3. **Two-sample linear rank statistics for strong mixing sequences.**

It is clear from the development of Section 2 that a result analogous to Theorem 2.2 may be established for strong mixing (but not necessarily stationary) sequences. It should be noted here that the arguments of Fears and Mehra (1974) can be adopted to show the weak convergence result for a strictly stationary strong mixing sequence with mixing number \( a(m) \) satisfying \( \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{2}[a(m)]^{1/2 - \tau} < \infty \) for some \( \tau \in (0, 1/2) \). In this
section we will again waive the stationarity assumption and assume 
\(\alpha(m) = 0(m^{-5/2-\delta})\) for some \(\delta > 0\). The following theorem obtains the weak convergence of \(V_m\) to \(V\) for a strong mixing sequence of random variables, from which the asymptotic normality of two-sample linear rank statistics is established. This is a generalization of a result of Yoshihara (1976).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \(\{X_m\}\) be a strong mixing sequence such that 
\(\alpha(m) = 0(m^{-5/2-\delta})\) for some \(\delta > 0\). Then \(V_m\) converges weakly to a Gaussian process \(V\), as defined in Theorem 2.1.

**Proof.** As in Theorem 2.1, first we show that \(U_m(t)\) converges to \(U(t), 0 \leq t \leq 1\), and then show that, given \(\epsilon > 0\), there exists a \(\theta \in (0, 1/2)\) and an integer \(M = M(\epsilon, \alpha, \delta, K)\) such that, for all \(m \geq M\),

\[
P\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq \theta} |V_m(t)| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq \epsilon. \quad (3.1)
\]

Now, that \(U_m(t)\) is asymptotically normal follows from Corollary 1(f) of Withers (1975) since 
\[
\sum_{i=1}^{J} i^2 a(i) = \sum_{i=1}^{J} i^2 0(i^{-5/2-\delta})
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{i=1}^{J} i^2 0(i^{-2}) \leq KJ \text{ for some } K > 0.
\]

To establish the tightness we follow the argument of Yoshihara (1976). Recall the definition of \(\eta_i\) in (2.3) and note that, for all \(0 \leq s \leq t \leq 1\),

\[
E|U_m(t) - U_m(s)|^4 = m^{-2}E|\sum_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j|^4
\]
\[
\leq 2km^{-2}\sum_{i=1}^{m} \left|E_{t^*} \eta_i \eta_{i+j} \eta_{i+j+k} \eta_{i+j+k+u}\right|, \quad (3.2)
\]

where \(\sum^t\) denotes the summation over all combinations of indices such that \(1 \leq i, j, k, u \leq m\) and \(j + k + u \leq m - i\). Using Lemma 1 of Davydov
(1968) without the stationarity assumption we have, for some $r > 1$,

$$|E_n(n_{i+j} n_{i+j+k} n_{i+j+k+u})| \leq |E_n n_{i+j}|$$

$$\leq 6a(j)^{1-1/r}(E|n_i|^r)^{1/r}$$

$$\leq 6a(j)^{1-1/r}(t-s)^{1/r}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

Similarly we have

$$|E(n_{i+j} n_{i+j+k}) n_{i+j+k+u}| \leq |E n_{i+j+k} n_{i+j+k+u}|$$

$$\leq 6a(u)^{1-1/r}(t-s)^{1/r}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.4)

Finally, with repeated applications of Lemma 1 of Davydov (1968), we have

$$|E(n_i n_{i+j})(n_{i+j+k} n_{i+j+k+u})|$$

$$\leq |E n_{i+j}| |E n_{i+j+k} n_{i+j+k+u}| + 6a(k)^{1-1/r}(E|n_i n_{i+j}|^r)^{1/r}$$

$$\leq 36a(j)^{2/5}a(u)^{2/5}(t-s)^{6/5} + 6a(k)^{1-1/r}(t-s)^{1/r}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.5)

Collecting terms from (3.3), (3.4), and (3.5), it follows that

$$E|U_m(t) - U_m(s)|^h$$

$$\leq K m^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha(j) \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{u=j}^{m} \alpha(j) a(u)^{2/5} (t-u)^{6/5},$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.6)

where $\sum^{(1)}$ denotes the summation over all indices $j, u \leq k, j + k + u \leq m - i$, and $K$, here and hereafter, denotes a generic constant (not necessarily the same). But for all $m$ sufficiently large,
\[ m^{-2\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{k+1} \alpha(j)^{1-\gamma} \leq m^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^{m} (k+1)^{\gamma} \alpha(k)^{1-\gamma} \leq K m^{-\rho}, \]  

where \( \rho = (5/2 + \delta)(1 - 1/r) - 2 \) with \( r > (2 + \delta)/\delta \) for some \( \delta > 0 \), as in Lemma 2 of Yoshihara (1976). Also note that, for all \( m \) sufficiently large,

\[ m^{-2\gamma} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{k=1}^{m-i} \sum_{u,k} \alpha(j)^{2/5} \alpha(u)^{2/5} \leq \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha(j)^{2/5} \right]^2 \leq K < \infty, \]

since \( \alpha(m) = O(m^{-5/2-\delta}) \), for some \( \delta > 0 \). Therefore, we have

\[ \mathbb{E} \left| U_m(t) - U_m(s) \right|^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq K [m^{-\rho} (t-s)^{1/r} + (t-s)^{6/5}]. \]

which agrees with (16) of Yoshihara (1976) with his \( \gamma = 1 - 1/r \). Thus the tightness is proved. Next, defining \( \eta \) as in (2.16) and proceeding as in Theorem 2.1 with necessary modifications, it is not difficult to see that (3.1) is satisfied. The balance of the proof remains unaffected. Theorem 3.1 is now proved. \( \square \)

Note that the argument of Fears and Mehra (1974) applies to establish the weak convergence of the \( L_N \) process. Thus the following Chernoff-Savage theorem is obtained for strong mixing sequences. The detail proof is omitted.

**Theorem 3.2.** Assume that \( \{X_m\} \) and \( \{X_n\} \) are independent and strong mixing sequences of random variables having absolutely continuous finite dimensional distributions with \( \alpha(m) = O(m^{-5/2-\delta}) \) and \( \alpha(n) = O(n^{-5/2-\delta}) \) for some \( \delta > 0 \). Then the conclusion of Theorem 2.2 holds.
REFERENCES


