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ABSTRACT
Callaert and Veraverbeke (1981) recently obtained a Berry-Esseen type bound of order $\mathrm{n}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for Studentized non degenerate U-statistics of degree two. The condition these authors need to obtain this order bound is the finiteness of the 4.5 th absolute moment of the kernel $h$. In this note it is shown that this assumption can be weakened to that of a finite (4+ع) th absolute moment of the kernel h, for some $\varepsilon>0$. Our proof resembles part of Helmers and van Zwet (1982) where an analogous result is obtained for the Student t-statistic. The present note extends this to Studentized U-statistics.
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[^1]Let $X_{1}, X_{2}, \ldots, X_{n}, n \geq 2$ be i.i.d. random variables with common distribution function $F$. Let $h(x, y)$ be a realvalued function, symmetric in its arguments, and with Eh $\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)=v$. Define a U-statistic by

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{n}=\binom{n}{2}^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i<j \leq n} \sum_{i} h\left(x_{i}, x_{j}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and suppose that $g\left(X_{1}\right)=E\left[h\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)-v \mid X_{1}\right]$ has a positive variance $\sigma_{g}^{2}$. Let

$$
S_{n}^{2}=4(n-1)(n-2)^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[(n-1)^{-1} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{n} h\left(X_{i}, X_{j}\right)-U_{n}\right]^{2}
$$

and note that $n^{-1} S_{n}^{2}$ is the jackknife estimator of the variance of $U_{n}$; i.e. $S_{n}^{2}$ is the sample variance of the "pseudo-values" $n U_{n}-(n-1) U_{n-1}^{i}$, where

$$
U_{n-1}^{i}=\binom{n-1}{2}^{-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j<k \leq n \\ j \neq i, k \neq i}} \sum h\left(X_{j}, X_{k}\right)
$$

for $i=1,2$, ..., $n$.
THEOREM. If $\mathrm{E}\left|\mathrm{h}\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}, \mathrm{X}_{2}\right)\right|^{4+\varepsilon}<\infty$, for some $\varepsilon>0$, and $\sigma_{\mathrm{g}}^{2}>0$ then, for $\mathrm{n} \rightarrow \infty$
(2) $\sup _{x}\left|P\left(\left\{n^{\frac{1}{2}} S_{n}^{-1}\left(U_{n}-v\right) \leq x\right\}\right)-\Phi(x)\right|=O\left(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$

Callaert and Veraverbeke (1981) proved the theorem for the special case $\varepsilon=\frac{1}{2}$. The purpose of this note is to show that the theorem is also valid in its present form. Our proof will rely heavily on the proof given by Callaert and Veraverbeke. However, to deal with the part of their proof which required the full force of their 4.5 th absolute moment assumption we will modify their proof and employ the following lemma to obtain a sharper result.

LEMMA Let

$$
\text { (3) } V_{n}=\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{-1} \sum_{1 \leq i<j \leq n} \sum h_{n}\left(x_{i}, x_{j}\right)
$$

be a U-statistic with a varying kermel $h_{n}$ of the form
(4) $h_{n}=\alpha+n^{-1} \beta$
where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are symmetric functions of its two arruments with $E \alpha\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)=$ and $\mathrm{E} \beta\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}, \mathrm{X}_{2}\right)=0$. Suppose that $\gamma\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}\right)=\mathrm{E}\left[\alpha\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}, \mathrm{X}_{2}\right)-v \mid \mathrm{X}_{1}\right]$ has a positive variance $\sigma_{\gamma}^{2}$. If $E\left|\gamma\left(X_{1}\right)\right|^{3}<\infty$ and, for some $\eta>0$,
(5) $E\left|\alpha\left(X_{1}, X_{2}^{\gamma}\right)\right|^{\frac{5}{3}+\eta_{<\infty}} E\left|\beta\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)\right|^{1+\eta_{<\infty}}$
then, for $n \rightarrow \infty$
(6) $\sup _{x}\left|F\left(\left\{\tau_{n}^{-1}\left(V_{n}-v\right) \leq x\right\}\right)-\Phi(x)\right|=0\left(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$
where $\tau_{n}^{2}=4 n^{n}{ }^{-1} \sigma_{\gamma}^{2}$
PROOF. The 1emma is a simple consequence of theorem 4.1 of [2].

PROOF OF THE THEOREM. As in [1] we write
(7)

$$
\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(U_{n}-v\right)}{S_{n}}=\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(U_{n}-v\right)}{2 \sigma_{g}} 2 \sigma_{g} S_{n}^{-1}
$$

and establish a stochastic expansion for $2 \sigma \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{C}^{-1}$. Using nothing more than the finiteness of $E\left|h\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)\right|^{4+\varepsilon}$, for some $\varepsilon>0$, it is proved in [1] that (8) $2 \sigma_{g} \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{n}}^{-1}=1-\frac{1}{8} \sigma_{\mathrm{g}}^{-2} \mathrm{n}^{-1} \sum_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)+\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{n}}$
where the function $f$ is given by
(9) $f(x)=4\left(g^{2}(x)-\sigma_{g}^{2}\right)+8 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(y)(h(x, y)-g(x)-g(y)) d F(y)$
for real $x$ and $R_{n}$ is a remainder term which is of order $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\ln n)^{-1}$, except on a set with probability $O\left(\mathrm{n}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$, as $\mathrm{n} \rightarrow \infty$.
It follows directly from (7) and (8) (cf L1」, page 197) that
(10) $P\left(\left\{\left|n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(U_{n}-v\right) R_{n}\right| \geq 2 \sigma_{g} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\}\right)$

$$
\leq P\left(\left\{\left|R_{n}\right| \geq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\ln n)^{-1}\right\}\right)+P\left(\left\{\left|n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(U_{n}-\nu\right)\right| \geq 2 \sigma_{g} \ln n\right\}\right)=O\left(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)
$$

where we have applied the lemma (with $\alpha=h$ and $\beta=0$ ) to obtain the orderbound in the last line. As in [1], (7), (8) and (10) together imply that it suffices now to establish a Berry-Esseen bound for

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{n}=2^{-1} \sigma_{g}^{-1} n^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(U_{n}-v\right)\left(1-\frac{1}{8} \sigma_{g}^{-2} n_{1-1}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f\left(X_{i}\right)\right) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

instead of obtaining such a bound for $n^{\frac{1}{2}} S_{n}^{-1}\left(U_{n}-v\right)$.
By slightly modifying the decomposition of $W_{n}$ employed in [1] we write
(12) $W_{n}=W_{n 1}+W_{n 2}$
where $2 \sigma_{g} r^{-\frac{1}{2}} W_{n 1}+v$ is a U-statistic with varying kernel $h_{n}$ of the form $V_{n}(c f(3))$ with $h_{n}=\alpha+n^{-1} \beta$ where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are given by
(13) $\alpha(x, y)=h(x, y)-\frac{1}{8} \sigma_{g}^{-2}(g(x) f(y)+g(y) f(x))$
(14) $\quad \beta(x, y)=-\frac{1}{8} \sigma_{g}^{-2}((h(x, y)-v)(f(x)+f(y))-2(g(x) f(y)+g(y) f(x))-2 \mu)$
with $\mu={\underset{-}{\infty}} g(x) f(x) d F(x)$ and where $W_{n 2}$ is a remainder term satisfying
$E W_{n 2}=O\left(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$ and
(15) $P\left(\left\{\left|W_{n 2}-E W_{n 2}\right| \geq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\}^{W}\right)=O\left(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$

We note in passing that $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{n} 1}$ and $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{n} 2}$ are precisely equal to the terms $\frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2 \sigma_{g}} U_{n}^{*}+Z_{n 1}-E Z_{n 1}+Z_{n 2}$ and $E Z_{n 1}+Z_{n 3}$ in [1] which together form the decomposition of $W_{n}$ employed in that paper. The orderbound (15) was proved in [1] requiring $\sigma_{g}^{2}>0$ and the finiteness of $E h^{4}\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)$. Thus $W_{n 2}$ is also of negligible order of magnitude under our present assumptions. It remains to consider $W_{n 1}$. The statistic $2 \sigma_{g} n_{-\frac{1}{2}} W_{n 1}+v$ is a U-statistic of the form $V_{n}(c f(3))$ with varying kernel $h_{n}=\alpha+n^{-1} \beta$ where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are given by (13) and (14) and satisfy the requirements $E \alpha\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)=\nu$ and $E \beta\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)=0$.

It follows that, if the assumptions of the lemma are satisfied, we have the Berry-Esseen bound
(16) $\sup _{x}\left|P\left(\left\{W_{n 1} \leq x\right\}\right)-\Phi(x)\right|=O\left(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right)$.

To check the assumptions needed for (16) we note first that in this case $\gamma\left(X_{1}\right)=E\left[\alpha\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)-v \mid X_{1}\right]=E\left[h\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)-v \mid X_{1}\right]=g\left(X_{1}\right)$ and an app1ication of Jensen's inequality for conditional expectations yields $E\left|g\left(X_{1}\right)\right|^{3} \leq E\left|h\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)-\nu\right|^{3}<\infty$, so that the assumptions $\sigma_{\gamma}^{2}=0$ and $E\left|\gamma\left(X_{1}\right)\right|^{3}<\infty \quad$ of the lemma are clearly satisfied. Secondly we verify assumption (5) of the lemma. By the independence of $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$, the $c_{r}$-inequality, and the relations (13) and (14) we see that it suffices to show that the $\left(\frac{5}{3}+\eta\right)$ th absolute moments of $h\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right), g\left(X_{1}\right)$ and $f\left(X_{1}\right)$ and the ( $1+\eta$ ) th absolute moment of $h\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right) . f\left(X_{1}\right)$ are all finite, for some $\eta>0$. In view of the remark following (16) we need only to consider the last two of these moments. Application of Schwarz inequality, the $c_{r}$-inequality and relation (9) easily leads to the requirements $E\left(G\left(X_{1}\right)\right)^{4+4 n^{2}}<\infty, E\left(h\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)\right)^{2+2 n^{2}}<\infty$. Jensen's inequality for conditional expectations can be applied once more to find that we only need $\operatorname{Eh}\left(X_{1}, X_{2}\right)^{4+4 \eta}<\infty$ to guarantee this. As $\eta>0$ is arbitrary, the proof of (16) is now complete. Combining (16) with (15), the remark preceeding (15) and the argument leading to (11) completes the proof of the theorem.

## REMARKS

1. The idea behind the present modification of the proof given by Callaert \& Veraverbeke (1981) is that by applying the Berry-Esseen bound (6) to $W_{n 1}$ we implicitly use rather delicate characteristic functions methods, whereas in Callaert \& Veraיerbeke (1981) crude momentbounds are employed to deal with part of $W_{n 1}$. As a consequence it is possible to relax their 4.5th absolute momentassumption - which Callaert \& Veraverbeke (1981) really need only in their treatment of the $W_{n 1}$-term - to that of a finite $(4+\varepsilon)$ th absolute moment for the kernel $h$, for some $\varepsilon>0$.
2. If we take $h(x, y)=\frac{1}{2}(x+y)$ the statistic $n^{\frac{1}{2}} S_{n}^{-1}\left(U_{n}-\nu\right)$ reduces to the onesample Student t-statistic. For this very special case the theorem was proved in Helmers and van Zwet (1982) in a similar fashion. Note, however, that in this case $W_{n 1}$ simplifies, whereas $W_{n 2}$ becomes even non random so that relation (15) is superfluous. The theoremyields the rate $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for the accuracy of the normal approximation for Student's $t$, provided $0<E\left|X_{1}\right|^{4+\varepsilon}<\infty$, for some $\varepsilon>0$, whereas Callaert and Veraverbeke (1981) need a finite and positive 4.5 th absolute moment for $F$ to prove this.
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