ON A COMBINATORIAL STRONG LAW OF LARGE NUMBERS
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Abstract: We derive strong laws of large numbers for combinatorial sums
\( \sum_{i} X_{ni \pi_n(i)} \), where \( \|X_{nij}\| \) are \( n \times n \) matrices of random variables with finite fourth moments and \((\pi_n(1), \ldots, \pi_n(n))\) are uniformly distributed random permutations of \(1, \ldots, n\) independent with \(X\)'s. We do not assume the independence of \(X\)'s, but this case is included as well. Examples are discussed.
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1. Introduction

Let \( \{\|X_{nij}\|_{i,j=1}^{n}\}_{n=2}^{\infty} \) be a sequence of matrices of random variables and \( \{\pi_n\}_{n=2}^{\infty} \) be a sequence of random permutations of \(1, 2, \ldots, n\). Put

\[ S_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{ni \pi_n(i)} \]

for all \( n \geq 2 \), where \( \pi_n = (\pi_n(1), \pi_n(2), \ldots, \pi_n(n)) \). Sums \( S_n \) are called the combinatorial sums.

If distributions of centered and normalized combinatorial sums converge weakly to the normal law, then one says that a combinatorial central limit theorem (CLT) holds true. If centered and normalized combinatorial sums converge almost surely (a.s.) to a constant, then one says that a combinatorial strong law of large numbers (SLLN) holds. Replacing strong convergence by convergence in probability, one arrives at a combinatorial weak law of large numbers (WLLN).

One cannot construct an interesting theory without additional assumptions on type of dependence of \(X\)'s and \( \pi_n \) and their distributions. We follow a general line in which \(X\)'s and \( \pi_n \) are independent and \( \pi_n \) has the uniform distribution.

Assume that for every \( n \), components of \( \|X_{nij}\| \) are independent, matrix \( \|X_{nij}\|_{i,j=1}^{n} \) and permutation \( \pi_n \) are independent and \( \pi_n \) has the uniform distribution on the set of permutations of \(1, 2, \ldots, n\). Moreover, we also assume that \( EX_{nij} = c_{nij} \) and

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{nij} = 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{nij} = 0, \]

for all \( 1 \leq i, j \leq n \) and \( n \). In results for combinatorial sums, the last condition provides that combinatorial sums \( S_n \) are centered at zero. Indeed,

\[ EX_{ni \pi_n(i)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{nij} = 0. \]
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If $\sigma^2_{nij} = DX_{nij} = EX^2_{nij} - (EX_{nij})^2$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $n \geq 2$, then we have

$$B_n = DS_n = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} c^2_{nij} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \sigma^2_{nij},$$

for all $n$. Hence, the norming sequence in combinatorial CLT is $\sqrt{B_n}$.

One can easily derive sufficient conditions for the combinatorial CLT from Esseen inequalities which give bounds for the accuracy of the normal approximation of distributions of $S_n/\sqrt{B_n}$. One can find such inequalities in von Bahr [1], Ho and Chen [2], Botlthausen [3], Goldstein [4], Neammanee and Suntornchost [5], Neammanee and Rattanawong [6], Chen and Fang [7] for $X$'s with finite third moments. Earlier asymptotic results on combinatorial CLT may be found in references therein. Frolov [8,9] derived generalizations of Esseen bounds for combinatorial sums to the cases of finite moments of order $2 + \delta$, $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and infinite variations. Moderate deviations for combinatorial sums have been investigated in Frolov [10]. Esseen bounds for combinatorial random sums may be found in Frolov [11].

Together with CLT and large deviations, SLLN plays an important role in probability and statistics. In this paper, we derive the combinatorial SLLN. Note that properties of combinatorial sums $S_n$ for independent $X$'s are quite different from those of sums of independent random variables. First, combinatorial sums are sums of dependent random variables. Second, many summands of $S_n$ and $S_{n+1}$ can be different even when $\|X_{nij}\|$ is a sub-matrix of $\|X_{n+1, i,j}\|$ with $X_{nij} = X_{n+1, i,j}$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. This is the result of randomness of permutations $\pi_n$. It follows that we have no monotonicity of combinatorial sums for positive $X$'s. Remember that monotonicity of sums of positive i.i.d. random variables are essentially used in the proof of the Kolmogorov SLLN. We also have no analogues of results on convergence of series of independent random variables. Moreover, we will not assume the independence of $X$'s. This reduces our possibilities to prove strong limit theorems for combinatorial sums. Therefore, we obtain bounds for forth moments of combinatorial sums and apply the Borel–Cantelli lemma.

2. Combinatorial SLLN

Let $\{\|X_{nij}\|_{i,j=1}^{n} = 1\}_{n=2}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of matrices of random variables with $EX_{nij} = c_{nij}$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $n \geq 2$ and $\{\pi_n\}_{n=2}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of random permutations of $1, 2, \ldots, n$. Assume that for every $n \geq 2$, relation

$$c_{ni} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{nij} = 0, \quad c_{n,j} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{nij} = 0, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq i, j \leq n, \tag{2.1}$$

holds, $\pi_n$ has the uniform distribution on the set of permutations of $1, 2, \ldots, n$ and $\|X_{nij}\|$ and $\pi_n$ are independent. For all $n \geq 2$, put

$$S_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_{n1\pi_{n}(i)},$$

where $\pi_n = (\pi_n(1), \pi_n(2), \ldots, \pi_n(n))$.

Note that if condition (2.1) is not satisfied, then one can center $X$'s as follows. Put

$$X'_{nij} = X_{nij} - \frac{1}{n} c_{ni} - \frac{1}{n} c_{n,j} + \frac{1}{n^2} c_{n..}, \quad \text{where } c_{n..} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} c_{nij}.$$

It is not difficult to check that condition (2.1) holds with $EX'_{nij}$ instead of $c_{nij}$.

The next result is the combinatorial SLLN.
Theorem 1. Suppose that the above assumptions hold and \( E X_{nij}^4 < \infty \) for all \( i, j \) and \( n \). For every \( n \), put \( C_n = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} E X_{nij}^4 \) and \( M_n = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 4} \{ m_{ni} \} \), where

\[
m_{n1} = \max_{1 \leq i \neq j \neq k \neq l \leq n} \left\{ \left| \sum_{p \neq q \neq r \neq s} (E X_{nij} X_{nkj} X_{nk\ell} X_{n\ell s} - c_{nip} c_{njq} c_{nkr} c_{n\ell s}) \right| \right\},
\]

\[
m_{n2} = \max_{1 \leq i \neq j \neq k \neq l \leq n} \left\{ \left| \sum_{p \neq q \neq k} (E X_{nij}^2 X_{nkj} X_{nk\ell} - E X_{nij}^2 E X_{n\ell j}) \right| \right\},
\]

\[
m_{n3} = \max_{1 \leq i \neq j \neq k \neq l \leq n} \left\{ \left| \sum_{p \neq q \neq k} (E X_{nij}^2 X_{nkj}^2 - E X_{nij}^2 E X_{n\ell j}^2) \right| \right\},
\]

\[
m_{n4} = \max_{1 \leq i \neq j \neq k \neq l \leq n} \left\{ \left| \sum_{p \neq q \neq k} (E X_{nij}^3 X_{nkj} - E X_{nij}^3 E X_{n\ell j}) \right| \right\}.
\]

Let \( \{ b_n \}_{n=2}^{\infty} \) be a sequence of positive constants. Assume that the series \( \sum_n (C_n n^2 + M_n) b_n^{-4} \) converges.

Then

\[
\frac{S_n}{b_n} \to 0 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.2)
\]

Proof. For all natural \( n \) and \( k \), denote \( (n)_k = n(n - 1) \cdots (n - k + 1) \).

Put \( \xi_i = X_{n\pi_n(i)} \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \). We have

\[
E S_n^4 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} E \xi_i^4 + 4 \sum_{i \neq j} E \xi_i^2 \xi_j^2 + 3 \sum_{i \neq j} E \xi_i^2 \xi_j^2 + 6 \sum_{i \neq j \neq k \neq l} E \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k \xi_l,
\]

where \( 1 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n \) in the last four sums. Since \( X \)'s and \( \pi_n \) are independent and \( \pi_n \) is uniformly distributed, we get

\[
E \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k \xi_l = \frac{1}{(n)_4} \sum_{p \neq q \neq r \neq s} E X_{nij} X_{nkj} X_{nk\ell} X_{n\ell s}.
\]

Hence,

\[
|E \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k \xi_l| \leq \frac{1}{(n)_4} M_n + \frac{1}{(n)_4} |T_0|, \quad \text{where} \quad T_0 = \sum_{p \neq q \neq r \neq s} c_{nip} c_{njq} c_{nkr} c_{n\ell s}.
\]

It is clear that

\[
T_0 = \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p}^{n} \sum_{r \neq q \neq p}^{n} \sum_{s \neq q \neq p \neq r}^{n} c_{nip} c_{njq} c_{nkr} c_{n\ell s}.
\]

By condition (2.1), we have

\[
\sum_{s \neq q \neq p \neq r} c_{nls} = -(c_{nlp} + c_{nlq} + c_{nlr}).
\]

It follows that

\[
T_0 = -\sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p}^{n} \sum_{r \neq p \neq q} c_{nip} c_{njq} c_{nkr} (c_{nlp} + c_{nlq} + c_{nlr})
\]

\[
= -\sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} c_{nip} c_{njq} (c_{nlp} + c_{nlq}) \sum_{r \neq p \neq q} c_{nkr} - \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} c_{nip} c_{njq} \sum_{r \neq p \neq q} c_{nkr} c_{n\ell r} = -T_1 - T_2
\]

\[
T_1 = \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} c_{nip} c_{njq} (c_{nlp} + c_{nlq}), \quad T_2 = \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} c_{nip} c_{njq} \sum_{r \neq p \neq q} c_{nkr} c_{n\ell r}.
\]
for all $i \neq j \neq k \neq l$. Using again condition (2.1), we have

$$T_1 = -\sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} c_{nlp} c_{nlq} (c_{nlp} + c_{nlq}) (c_{nkp} + c_{nkq}).$$

By the Lyapunov inequality, it follows that $|c_{ni}| \leq (E|X_{ni}|^4)^{1/4} \leq C_n^{1/4}$. It yields that

$$|T_1| \leq 4n^2 C_n.$$

Furthermore,

$$T_2 = \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} c_{njp} c_{njq} \left( \sum_{r=1}^{n} (nkp c_{nlp} + c_{nkq} c_{nlq}) \right)$$

$$= \left( \sum_{r=1}^{n} c_{nkr} c_{nlr} \right) \sum_{p=1}^{n} c_{njp} \sum_{q \neq p} c_{njq} - \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} c_{njp} c_{njq} (c_{nkp} c_{nlp} + c_{nkq} c_{nlq})$$

$$= - \left( \sum_{r=1}^{n} c_{nkr} c_{nlr} \right) \sum_{p=1}^{n} c_{njp} - \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} c_{njp} c_{njq} (c_{nkp} c_{nlp} + c_{nkq} c_{nlq}).$$

In the last equality, we have applied condition (2.1). Using again inequalities $|c_{ni}| \leq C_n^{1/4}$, we get

$$|T_2| \leq 3n^2 C_n.$$

Therefore, for all $i \neq j \neq k \neq l$, inequalities

$$|E \xi_i \xi_j \xi_k \xi_l| \leq \frac{1}{(n)_4} (7n^2 C_n + M_n)$$

hold. For all $i \neq j \neq k$, we have

$$E \xi_i^2 \xi_j \xi_k = \frac{1}{(n)_3} \sum_{p \neq q \neq r} E X_{njp}^2 X_{njq} X_{nkr}$$

and

$$|E \xi_i^2 \xi_j \xi_k| \leq \frac{1}{(n)_3} M_n + \frac{1}{(n)_3} |T_3|,$$

where

$$T_3 = \frac{1}{(n)_3} \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} E X_{njp}^2 c_{njq} \sum_{r \neq p \neq q} c_{nkr} = - \frac{1}{(n)_3} \sum_{p=1}^{n} \sum_{q \neq p} E X_{njp}^2 c_{njq} (c_{nkp} + c_{nkq}).$$

Since $E X_{ni}^2 \leq (E X_{ni}^4)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{C_n}$ and $|c_{ni}| \leq C_n^{1/4}$ for all $i$ and $j$, the latter implies that

$$|E \xi_i^2 \xi_j \xi_k| \leq \frac{1}{(n)_3} (2n^2 C_n + M_n)$$

for all $i \neq j \neq k$.

For all $i \neq j$, we get

$$E \xi_i^2 \xi_j^2 = \frac{1}{(n)_2} \sum_{p \neq q} E X_{njp}^2 X_{njq}^2,$$

$$E \xi_i^3 \xi_j = \frac{1}{(n)_2} \sum_{p \neq q} E X_{njp}^3 X_{njq},$$
\[ E\xi_i^2\xi_j^2 \leq \frac{1}{(n)_2} M_n + \frac{1}{(n)_2} \sum_{p \neq q} EX_{nip}^2 EX_{njq}^2, \]
\[ |E\xi_i^3\xi_j| \leq \frac{1}{(n)_2} M_n + \frac{1}{(n)_2} \sum_{p \neq q} EX_{nij}^3, \]

Applying inequalities \[ |c_{nij}| \leq C^{1/4}, \quad EX_{nij}^2 \leq \sqrt{C_n} \] and \[ |EX_{nij}^3| \leq (EX_{nij}^4)^{4/3} \leq \sqrt{C_n} \] for all \( i \) and \( j \), we have

\[ E\xi_i^2\xi_j^2 \leq \frac{1}{(n)_2} (n^2C_n + M_n), \quad |E\xi_i^3\xi_j| \leq \frac{1}{(n)_2} (n^2C_n + M_n), \quad (2.6) \]

for all \( i \neq j \).

Finally, for every \( i \), we get

\[ E\xi_i^4 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p=1}^{n} EX_{nij}^4 \leq C_n. \quad (2.7) \]

Substituting bounds (2.4)–(2.7) in equality (2.3), we have

\[ ES_n^4 \leq nC_n + (4 + 3 + 12 + 7)n^2C_n + 4M_n \leq 27(n^2C_n + M_n). \]

It follows that

\[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(|S_n| \geq \varepsilon b_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{ES_n^4}{\varepsilon^4 b_n^4} \leq 27 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n^2C_n + M_n}{\varepsilon^4 b_n^4} < \infty \]
for all \( \varepsilon > 0 \). By the Borel–Cantelly lemma, we obtain

\[ \frac{S_n}{b_n} \to 0 \quad a.s. \]

Note that \( \sum_n DS_n b_n^{-2} < \infty \) is a sufficient condition for relation (2.2). For independent \( X \)'s, \( M_n = 0 \) and, using formula for \( DS_n \) from Section 1, we see that \( DS_n \) has an order \( n \) in various partial cases. So, if \( b_n = n \), the last series always diverges while the series from Theorem 1 can converge. For example, the latter holds for bounded (uniformly over \( n \)) random variables.

**Remark 1.** One can find further conditions sufficient for combinatorial SLLN by applications of bounds for \( ES_n^{2k} \) with \( k \geq 3 \) which may be derived in the same way as before.

Condition (2.1) is symmetric relatively to rows and columns of matrices of means. Substituting in (2.3) the formulae for the expectations, we can interchange sums over numbers of rows and columns. Further, we can apply the second equality in (2.1) instead of the first one. Hence, we arrive at the next remark.

**Remark 2.** In Theorem 1, one can interchange indices in maxima and sums in the definitions of \( m_{n1}, \ldots, m_{n4} \).

Theorem 1 yields the following result.

**Corollary 1.** If the conditions of Theorem 1 hold and series \( \sum_n (n^2C_n + M_n)n^{-4p} \) converges for some \( p > 0 \), then

\[ \frac{S_n}{n^p} \to 0 \quad a.s. \]
Note that if the series from Corollary 1 diverges, then its conclusion can fail. Indeed, let \( \{ \eta_n \} \) be a sequence of independent random variables such that \( P(\eta_n = n^p) = P(\eta = -n^p) = 1/2 \) for all \( n \). Put \( X_{nij} = \eta_i \) for all \( i, j \) and \( n \). Then \( C_n = E\eta_n^4 = n^{4p} \), \( M_n = 0 \) and
\[
S_n = \eta_1 + \eta_2 + \cdots + \eta_n.
\]
Assuming that \( n^{-p}S_n \to 0 \) a.s., we have
\[
\frac{\eta_n}{n^p} = \frac{S_n}{n^p} - \frac{S_{n-1}}{(n-1)^p} \cdot \frac{(n-1)^p}{n^p} \to 0 \quad \text{a.s.}
\]
that contradicts to relation \( P(n^{-p}\eta_n = 1) = 1/2 \) for all \( n \).

It is clear that \( M_n = 0 \) provided every quadruple of different elements of matrices \( \|X_{nij}\| \) is a set of independent random variables. Moreover, \( M_n = 0 \) when rows of \( \|X_{nij}\| \) are independent while elements of one row may be dependent.

These conditions are much more less than mutual independence, but it is useful to have an example with positive \( M_n \).

To this end, we consider matrices \( \|X_{nij}\| \) with \( m \)-dependent rows, where \( m \) is a fixed natural number. The latter means that \( i \)-th and \( k \)-th rows are independent when \( |i - k| > m \). (The case \( m = 0 \) correspond to independence.) At the same time, we do not assume that random variables of one rows are independent.

Note that there is a simple way to construct such matrix. Take matrix \( \|X_{nij}\| \) of independent random variables and replace every even row by previous odd ones. Then rows will be \( 1 \)-dependent. The construction for \( m > 1 \) follows the same pattern.

For simplicity, put \( m = 1 \) and assume that \( C_n = C \) for all \( n \). It is clear, that all items of sums in the definitions of \( m_{n1} \) are bounded by \( 2C \) and many of them equal to zero by independence of "far" rows. The number of zero items in \( m_{n1} \) is bounded from below by \( n(n-2)(n-4)(n-6) \). Hence, the number of non-zero items is less than \( (n)_4 - n(n-2)(n-4)(n-6) = O(n^3) \) as \( n \to \infty \). It follows that \( m_{n1} = O(n^3) \) as \( n \to \infty \). Maxima \( m_{n2} \), \( m_{n3} \) and \( m_{n4} \) have the same or smaller order. So, the series in Theorem 1 converges provided series \( \sum_n n^3 b_n^{-4} \) converges. By Theorem 1, we have
\[
\frac{S_n}{n(\ln n)^q} \to 0 \quad \text{a.s.}
\]
for all \( q > 1/4 \).
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