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INDEPENDENCE OF SOME POLYNOMIAL STATISTICS AND OF THE SAMPLE MEAN
A. É. Eremenko
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Let $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ be a random vector in $R^{n}$ with independent components. By a polynomial statistic we mean a random variable $P(x)=P\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$, where $P$ is a polynomial in the coordinates of the vector $x$. We assume that $x$ is a sample with replacement, i.e., that the random variables have the same distribution $F(t)$. One of the important characterization problems of mathematical statistics consists of determining the functions $F(t)$ for which two polynomial statistics, $P_{1}(x)$ and $P_{2}(x)$, can be independent random variables. When one of the statistics is linear, the general method of solving such problems is that of differential equations. By this method the case when $P_{1}$ is a linear form and $P_{2}$ a quadratic one has been relatively completely treated ([1], Sec. 4.2).

In the present note we study third-degree statistics independent of a linear form. We shall consider a linear form of the type $L(x)=x_{1}+\ldots+x_{n}, n \geqslant 2$. Any linear form with nonzero coefficients can be reduced to this type by a substitution $x_{j}^{\prime}=\alpha_{j} x j$. Let $P(x)$ be a polynomial of degree $m$ with real coefficients. The polynomial $P$ is called admissible if at least one term $x_{j}^{m}$ appears in the irreducible expression of $P$ with a nonzero coefficient. We denote by $d_{k}(1 \leqslant k \leqslant m)$ the sum of the coefficients of terms of degree $k$ in the polynomial P. Without loss of generality we can assume that the constant term in $P$ vanishes.

THEOREM 1. Let $x$ be a sample with replacement, and $P$ be an admissible statistic of degree $m$ such that one of the numbers $d_{k} \neq 0$. If $P(x)$ and $L(x)$ are independent random variables, then $P(x)=$ const almost surely (a.s.).

The case of $d_{k}=0$ for all $k$ has been successfully investigated only with $m=3$. Let $P$ be a third-degree polynomial. We put

$$
\begin{equation*}
P(x)=\sum_{i, j, k=1}^{n} c_{i j k} x_{i} x_{j} x_{k}+\sum_{i, j=1}^{n} c_{i j} x_{i} x_{j}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{j} x_{j}, c_{i j k}, c_{i j}, c_{j} \in \mathbf{R} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we introduce the notation $a_{1}=\sum_{i=1 i} c_{i i}, a_{2}=\sum_{i \neq j}\left(c_{i i j}+c_{i j i}+c_{j i i}\right), a_{3}=\frac{1}{6} \sum_{i<j<k} c_{i j k}, a_{4}=\sum_{i} c_{j j}, a_{5}=$
$\sum_{i j}, a_{6}=$
THEOREM 2. Let $x$ be a sample with replacement and $P(x)$ be an admissible statistic of the the form (1) with at least one of the numbers $\alpha_{j} \neq 0$. If $P(x)$ and $L(x)$ are independent random variables, then either $x$ is a normal vector, or $P(x)=$ const a.s.

Proof of Theorem 1. We denote by $f$ the characteristic function (c.f.) of the distribution function $F$ of the random variables $x_{j}$. From the independence of $P(x)$ and $L(x)$, and from Theorem 8.12 in [2], in view of the polynomial $P$ being admissible, it follows that $f$ is an entire function of a finite order. Using again the independence, and arguing as in the proof of a theorem in [2] (Lemma 8.3.1), we obtain a differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum a_{j_{1} \ldots i_{n}} \frac{f^{\left(j_{1}\right)}}{f} \ldots \frac{f^{\left(i_{n}\right)}}{f}=A \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the summation $i s$ extended to all sets of indices such that $j_{1}+\ldots+j_{n} \leqslant m$, and $a_{j_{1} \ldots j_{n}}$ and $A$ are some constants satisfying $\sum_{j_{1}+\ldots+j_{n}=k} a_{j_{1} \ldots j_{n}}=(\sqrt{-1})^{k} d_{k}, k=1, \ldots, m$.
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Applying the Wyman-Valiron method ([3], Chap. V), we use the formula $f(j)(\zeta) / f(\zeta)=$ $(1+o(1))(\nu(r) / \zeta) j, j=1,2, \ldots$. Here $r=|\zeta| \rightarrow \infty$, disregarding a set of finite logarithmic measure, and $\zeta$ is the point at which $f$ attains its maximum module on the circle $|z|=r$, while $\nu(\mathrm{r})$ is the central index ([3], (8)). Substituting this formula in (2) we find $\sum_{k=1}^{m}\left((\sqrt{-1})^{k} d_{k}+\right.$ $o(1))(v(r) / \zeta)^{k}=A, r \rightarrow \infty$, and owing to the conditions of the theorem, at least one of the num-
bers $d_{k} \neq 0$. It follows that $\nu(r)=O(r)$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$, and consequently the function $f$ is of the exponential type.

Now it follows from Theorem 2.2.2 in [2] that the set of points of growth of $F(t)$ is bounded, i.e., that the $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}$ are a.s. bounded. The proof is completed by applying the following lemma:

LEMMA. Assume that the random variables $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}$ in a sample with replacement are a.s.bounded at least on one side, and that an arbitrary statistic $P(x)$ does not depend on $L(x)$. Then $P(x)=$ const a.s.

This lemma is proved by an argument analogous to one adduced in [1].
Proof of Theorem 2. In view of Theorem 1, we can assume that $d_{k}=0(k=1,2,3)$. Equation (2) with $m=3$ takes the form

$$
\begin{gather*}
i\left(a_{1} \frac{f^{\prime \prime \prime}}{f}+a_{2} \frac{f^{\prime \prime} f^{\prime}}{f \cdot f}+a_{3}\left(\frac{f^{\prime}}{f}\right)^{3}\right)+a_{4} \frac{f^{\prime \prime}}{f}+a_{5}\left(\frac{f^{\prime}}{f}\right)^{2}=A  \tag{3}\\
i=\sqrt{-1}, \quad A \in \mathbf{R}
\end{gather*}
$$

the constant $A$ being the expectation of $P(x)$ taken with the opposite sign. Since the statistic $P$ is admissible, the solution of this equation ought to be an entire function of finite order. Putting $w=f^{\prime} / \mathrm{f}$, we get $\mathrm{i}\left(\alpha_{1} \mathrm{w}^{\prime \prime}+\left(3 a_{1}+\alpha_{2}\right) \mathrm{w}^{\prime} \mathrm{w}\right)+\alpha_{4} \mathrm{w}^{\prime}=A$. Here we used the fact that $\alpha_{6}=\mathrm{d}_{1}=0, \alpha_{4}+\alpha_{5}=\mathrm{d}_{2}=0, a_{1}+\alpha_{2}+a_{3}=\mathrm{d}_{3}=0$. Integrating and multiplying by -i, we obtain the Riccati equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{1} w^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2}\left(3 a_{1}+a_{2}\right) w^{2}-i a_{4} w=-i A z+C, A \in \mathbf{R}, C \in \mathbf{C} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We distinguish several cases: 1. $\alpha_{1} \neq 0,3 \alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2} \neq 0, \mathrm{~A} \neq 0$. We shall show that in this case the equation (3) cannot have entire characteristic solutions. By means of the substitution $w=\frac{2 a_{1}}{3 a_{1}+a_{2}} y+\frac{i a_{4}}{3 a_{1}+a_{2}}=\alpha y+\beta$ we reduce (4) to the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime}+y^{2}=i A_{1} z+C_{1}, \quad A_{1} \in \mathbf{R}, C_{1} \in \mathbf{C} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is well known that all the solutions of this equationare meromorphic functions with an infinite number of poles, all the residua being equal to 1 . Therefore, $\mathrm{y}=\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$, where v is some entire function. Obviously, $f(x)=(v(z))^{\alpha} \exp \beta z$. For the function $v$ we have the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
v^{\prime \prime}=\left(i A_{1} z+C_{1}\right) v, A_{1} \in \mathbf{R}, C_{1} \in \mathbf{C} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

This equation reduces to Airey's equation ([4], No. 23.4). Any solution of the equation (6) is known to be an entire function of completely regular growth of order $3 / 2$. Consequently, the Phragmen-Lindelöf indicator $h(\theta)$ of the function $f$ coincides with the indicator of the function $v$ and, by the property of the ridge of an entire characteristic function $f$, satisfies the conditions

$$
\begin{array}{cl}
h(\theta) \leqslant h\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)(\sin \theta)^{3 / 2}, & 0 \leqslant \theta \leqslant \pi, \\
h(\theta) \leqslant h\left(-\frac{\pi}{2}\right)|\sin \theta|^{3 / 2}, & \pi \leqslant \theta \leqslant 2 \pi . \tag{8}
\end{array}
$$

We are going to show that the indicator of the solution of (5) cannot have the properties (7) and (8). Let, e.g., $A_{1}>0$. From the asymptotic relations adduced in [4] it follows that Eq. (6) has two linearly independent solutions, $v_{1}$ and $v_{2}$, with respective indicators
$h_{1}(\theta)=x \cos \left(\frac{3}{2}\left(\theta+\frac{\pi}{6}\right)\right),-\frac{\pi}{2} \leqslant \theta \leqslant \frac{3 \pi}{2}, h_{2}(\theta)=-x \cos \left(\frac{3}{2}\left(\theta+\frac{\pi}{6}\right)\right),-\frac{7 \pi}{6} \leqslant \theta \leqslant \frac{5 \pi}{6}, x>0$. For any solution $v$ of equation (6) we have $v=\gamma_{1} v_{1}+\gamma_{2} v_{2}\left(\gamma_{1}\right.$ and $\gamma_{2}$ being constants). If $\gamma_{1}=0$, then $h_{2}(\theta)=h(\theta)$; if $\gamma_{2}=0$, then $h(\theta)=h_{1}(\theta)$; if $\gamma_{1} \gamma_{2} \neq 0$, then $h(\theta)=\left|x \cos \frac{3}{2}(\theta+\pi / 6)\right|$ in the neighborhood of the point $\theta=-\pi / 2$. All the three cases are incompatible with (8). The case of $A_{1}<0$ is treated similarly; we then obtain a contradiction with (7).
2. $\alpha_{1} \neq 0,3 \alpha_{2}+\alpha_{2} \neq 0, \mathrm{~A}=0$. Repeating the arguments of case 1 as far as Eq. (6), we find $v^{\prime \prime}=C_{1} v$. Hence $v(z)=\gamma_{1} \exp \left(\sqrt{C_{1}} z\right)+\gamma_{2} \exp \left(-\sqrt{C_{1}} z\right)$. Consequently, the function $f(z)=$ $(v(z))^{\alpha} \exp \beta z$ is of the exponential type. Therefore, the random variables xj are a.s. bounded, and it follows from the lemma that $P(x)=$ const a.s.
3. $\alpha_{1} \neq 0,3 \alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}=0$. Equation (4) takes the form $a_{1} w^{\prime}-i a_{4} w=i A z+C$. The general solution of this equation is $w=C_{1} \exp \left(\frac{a_{4}}{a_{1}} i z\right)+Q(z), Q$ being a polynomial. If $C_{1} a_{4} \neq 0$, then $f(z)=\exp \int w(z) d z \quad$ is a function of an infinite order. This contradicts Theorem 8.12 in [2]. If $\mathrm{C}_{1} \alpha_{4}=0$, then $\mathrm{f}(z)$ is an entire function without zeros, and according to Theorem 3.13 in [2] the random variables $x_{j}$ are normal.
4. $\alpha_{1}=0$. Equation (4) takes the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 / 2 a_{2} w^{2}-i a_{4} w=-i A z+C . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

If the values of the coefficients are such that (9) are meromorphic solutions, then w is a polynomial of the first degree, and we return to the normal distribution.

Hence the proof is complete.
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