ON THE RATE OF COMPLETE CONVERGENCE FOR WEIGHTED SUMS OF ARRAYS OF RANDOM ELEMENTS
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Abstract. Let \( \{V_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\} \) be an array of rowwise independent random elements which are stochastically dominated by a random variable \( X \) with \( E|X|^\theta \gamma + \theta \log(\rho |X|) < \infty \) for some \( \rho > 0, \alpha > 0, \gamma > 0, \theta > 0 \) such that \( \theta + \alpha/\gamma < 2 \). Let \( \{a_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\} \) be an array of suitable constants. A complete convergence result is obtained for the weighted sums of the form \( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{nk} V_{nk} \).

1. Introduction

The concept of complete convergence of a sequence of random variables was introduced by Hsu and Robbins [5] as follows. A sequence \( \{U_n, n \geq 1\} \) of random variables converges completely to the constant \( \theta \) if

\[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P(|U_n - \theta| > \epsilon) < \infty \quad \text{for all } \epsilon > 0. \]

The classical Hsu-Robbins-Erdős theorem (Erdős [3, 4]) states that, for a sequence \( \{X_n, n \geq 1\} \) of independent and identically distributed random variables, \( \sum_{k=1}^{n} X_k/n \) converges completely to \( EX_1 \) if and only if the variance of \( X_1 \) is finite. Baum and Katz [2] obtained an elegant generalization of Hsu-Robbins-Erdős theorem, namely they proved that, for \( r \geq 1 \) and \( 1 \leq t < 2r \leq 2t \), \( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-2}P(|\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (X_k - EX_1)| > n^{r/t} \epsilon) < \infty \) for all \( \epsilon > 0 \) if and only if \( E|X_1|^t < \infty \).

Many authors extended the above results to Banach space valued random elements, for example, see Ahmed et al. [1], Hu et al. [6, 7],
Kuczmaszewska and Szynal [8], Sung [9], and Wang et al. [11]. A sequence of Banach space valued random elements is said to converge completely to the 0 element in the Banach space if the corresponding sequence of norms converges completely to 0.

Hu, Rosalsky, Szynal and Volodin [7] presented a general result (cf. Theorem 1 below) establishing complete convergence for the row sums of an array of rowwise independent but not necessarily identically distributed Banach space valued random elements. Their result also specified the corresponding rate of convergence. The Hu, Rosalsky, Szynal and Volodin [7] result unifies and extends previously obtained results in the literature in that many of them (for example, results of Hsu and Robbins [5], Hu et al. [6], Kuczmaszewska and Szynal [8], Sung [9], Volodin et al. [10], and Wang et al. [11]) follow from it.

In the following we assume that \( \{V_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\} \) is an array of rowwise independent random elements in a real separable Banach space and \( \{a_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\} \) is an array of constants. Denote

\[
S_n \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{nk} V_{nk}.
\]

In the next theorem the weights \( a_{nk} \) are built into the array (that is, \( a_{nk} = 1 \) for all \( k \) and \( n \)).

**Theorem 1.** (Hu et al. [7]) Let \( \{c_n, n \geq 1\} \) be a sequence of positive constants. Suppose that

1. \( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(||V_{nk}|| > \epsilon) < \infty \) for all \( \epsilon > 0 \),
2. \( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E||V_{nk}||^q \right)^J < \infty \) for some \( 0 < q \leq 2 \) and \( J \geq 2 \),
3. \( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} V_{nk} P \to 0 \),

and

4. if \( \liminf_{n \to \infty} c_n = 0 \), then \( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(||V_{nk}|| > \delta) = o(1) \) for some \( \delta > 0 \).

Then

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n P(||S_n|| > \epsilon) < \infty \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0.
\]
It is implicitly assumed in Theorem 1 that the series $S_n$ converges a.s.

The article Hu et al. [6] is devoted to presenting applications of Theorem 1 to obtain new complete convergence results. Theorem 2 generalizes results of Hsu and Robbins [5], Kuczmaszewska and Szynal [8], Sung [9], Wang et al. [11] in three directions, namely:

(i) Banach space valued random elements instead of random variables are considered.

(ii) An array rather than a sequence is considered.

(iii) The rate of convergence is obtained.

**Theorem 2.** (Hu et al. [6]). Suppose that the array \( \{V_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\} \) is stochastically dominated by a random variable \( X \). That is,

\[
P(||V_{nk}|| > x) \leq CP(|X| > x) \text{ for all } x > 0 \text{ and for all } k \geq 1 \text{ and } n \geq 1,
\]

where \( C \) is a positive constant. Assume that

\[
\sup_{k \geq 1} |a_{nk}| = O(n^{-\gamma}) \text{ for some } \gamma > 0, \text{ and}
\]

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_{nk}| = O(n^\alpha) \text{ for some } \alpha \in [0, \gamma).
\]

If

\[E|X|^{1+(1+\alpha+\beta)/\gamma} < \infty \text{ for some } \beta \in (-1, \gamma - \alpha - 1], \text{ and } S_n \xrightarrow{P} 0,\]

then

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^\beta P(||S_n|| > \epsilon) < \infty \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0.
\]

The proof of Theorem 2 is rather complicated once it uses the Stieltjes integral techniques, summation by parts lemma and so on. The initial objective of an investigation resulted in the paper Ahmed et al. [1] was only to find a simpler proof. But it appears that they were able to establish a more general result and with simpler proof. The result presented in Theorem 3 below is more general than the main result of Hu et al. [6], since rates of convergence for moving averages can be established, which cannot be proved using Theorem 2.

**Theorem 3.** (Ahmed et al. [1]) Suppose that the array \( \{V_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\} \) is stochastically dominated by a random variable \( X \). Assume
that
\[ \sup_{k \geq 1} |a_{nk}| = O(n^{-\gamma}) \text{ for some } \gamma > 0, \]
and
\[ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_{nk}| = O(n^\alpha) \text{ for some } \alpha < \gamma. \]

Let \( \beta \) be such that \( \alpha + \beta \neq -1 \) and fix \( \delta > 0 \) such that \( \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} + 1 < \delta \leq 2. \) If
\[ E|X|^\nu < \infty, \text{ where } \nu = \max\{1 + \frac{1 + \alpha + \beta}{\gamma}, \delta\}, \]
and
\[ S_n \stackrel{P}{\rightarrow} 0, \]
then
\[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^\beta P(||S_n|| > \epsilon) < \infty \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0. \]

Theorem 3 was slightly generalized in Volodin et al. [10] as follows.

**Theorem 4.** (Volodin et al. [10]) Suppose that the array \( \{V_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\} \) is stochastically dominated by a random variable \( X. \) Assume that
\[ \sup_{k \geq 1} |a_{nk}| = O(n^{-\gamma}) \text{ for some } \gamma > 0, \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_{nk}|^\theta = O(n^\alpha) \]
for some \( 0 < \theta \leq 2 \) and any \( \alpha \) such that \( \theta + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} < 2. \) Let \( \beta \) be such that \( \alpha + \beta \neq -1 \) and fix \( \delta > \theta \) such that \( \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} + \theta < \delta \leq 2. \) If
\[ E|X|^\nu < \infty, \text{ where } \nu = \max\{\theta + 1 + \frac{1 + \alpha + \beta}{\gamma}, \delta\}, \text{ and } S_n \stackrel{P}{\rightarrow} 0, \]
then
\[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^\beta P(||S_n|| > \epsilon) < \infty \text{ for all } \epsilon > 0. \]

If \( \beta < -1, \) then the conclusions of Theorems 3 and 4 are immediate and hence Theorems 3 and 4 are of interest only for \( \beta \geq -1. \) In particular, the case \( \beta = -1 \) is of special interest. Ahmed et al. [1] conjectured that when \( \beta = -1, \) the assumption \( E|X|^\nu < \infty \) can be replaced by \( E|X|^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}+1} \log^\rho(|X|) < \infty \) (\( \rho > 0 \)) in Theorem 3. In the context of Theorem 4 this conjecture should be rewritten as: when \( \beta = -1, \) the
assumption $E|X|^\rho < \infty$ can be replaced by the strictly weaker assumption $E|X|^{\frac{2}{\gamma} + \theta} \log^\theta(|X|) < \infty$ ($\rho > 0$). In this paper we give the positive answer on this conjecture.

It proves convenient to define $\log(x) = \max\{1, \ln(x)\}$, where $\ln(x)$ denotes the natural logarithm. The symbol $C$ denotes a positive constant which is not necessarily the same one in each appearance, the symbol $[x]$ denotes the greatest integer in $x$, and for a finite set $A$ the symbol $\#A$ denotes the number of elements in the set $A$.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we present three lemmas which will be used to prove our main result.

**Lemma 1.** Let $\{a_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\}$ be an array of constants such that for some $\theta > 0$, some $\alpha$, and any $n \geq 1$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_{nk}|^{\theta} \leq n^\alpha.$$  

Let $\{\phi(j), j \geq 1\}$ be an increasing sequence of positive numbers and

$$I_{nj} = \left\{ k \mid \frac{1}{n^{\gamma} \phi(j + 1)} < |a_{nk}| \leq \frac{1}{n^{\gamma} \phi(j)} \right\}, j \geq 1, n \geq 1,$$

where $\gamma$ is a constant. Then for any $m \geq 1$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \#I_{nj} \leq n^{\alpha + \gamma \theta} \phi^\theta(m + 1).$$

**Proof.** Really,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \#I_{nj} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sum_{k \in I_{nj}} |a_{nk}|^{\theta} \cdot \frac{1}{|a_{nk}|^{\theta}}$$

$$\leq n^{\gamma \theta} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \phi^\theta(j + 1) \sum_{k \in I_{nj}} |a_{nk}|^\theta \leq n^{\alpha + \gamma \theta} \phi^\theta(m + 1).$$

**Lemma 2.** Let $\{V_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\}$ be an array of random elements which are stochastically dominated by a random variable $X$. Let
\{a_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\} be an array of constants such that
\[ \sup_{k \geq 1} |a_{nk}| \leq n^{-\gamma} \quad \text{for some } \gamma > 0 \]
and
\[ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_{nk}|^\theta \leq n^\alpha \quad \text{for some } \theta > 0 \text{ and some } \alpha. \]

Then for any \( \epsilon > 0 \) and all \( n \geq 1 \)
\[ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(||a_{nk}V_{nk}|| > \epsilon) \leq Cn^{\alpha} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} k^{\gamma \theta} P(k < \left| \frac{X}{\epsilon} \right|^{1/\gamma} \leq k + 1). \]

**Proof.** In Lemma 1 consider \( \phi(j) = j^\gamma, j \geq 1 \). Then
\[ I_{nj} = \left\{ k \left| \frac{1}{(n(j + 1))^\gamma} < |a_{nk}| \leq \frac{1}{(nj)^\gamma} \right. \right\} \quad \text{for } j \geq 1 \text{ and } n \geq 1 \]
and
\[ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \sharp I_{nj} \leq n^{\alpha + \gamma \theta (m + 1)^{\gamma \theta}}. \]

Mention that the condition sup\( k \geq 1 \) \( |a_{nk}| \leq n^{-\gamma} \) ensures us that, for any \( n \geq 1 \), \( \cup_{j \geq 1} I_{nj} = \{k|a_{nk} \neq 0\} \). It follows that
\[ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(||a_{nk}V_{nk}|| > \epsilon) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in I_{nj}} P(||a_{nk}V_{nk}|| > \epsilon) \]
\[ \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in I_{nj}} P(||V_{nk}|| > \epsilon(nj)^\gamma) \]
\[ \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sharp I_{nj} P(||V_{nk}|| > (nj)^\gamma) \]
\[ = C \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sharp I_{nj} \sum_{k=nj}^{\infty} P(k < \left| \frac{X}{\epsilon} \right|^{1/\gamma} \leq k + 1) \]
\[ = C \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} P(k < \left| \frac{X}{\epsilon} \right|^{1/\gamma} \leq k + 1) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sharp I_{nj} \]
Lemma 3. Let all the conditions of Lemma 2 be satisfied and $\alpha \geq 0$. Then for all $\epsilon > 0$
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\|a_{nk}V_{nk}\| > \epsilon) \leq CE \left|\frac{X}{\epsilon}\right|^{\frac{\alpha + \gamma}{\gamma}} I(|X| > \epsilon n^\gamma).
\]

Proof. By Lemma 2
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\|a_{nk}V_{nk}\| > \epsilon) \\
\leq C \gamma^\alpha \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} P\left(k < \left|\frac{X}{\epsilon}\right|^{1/\gamma} \leq k + 1\right) k^{\gamma \theta} \\
\leq C \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} P\left(k < \left|\frac{X}{\epsilon}\right|^{1/\gamma} \leq k + 1\right) k^{\gamma \theta + \alpha} \text{ (since } \alpha \geq 0) \\
\leq CE \left|\frac{X}{\epsilon}\right|^{\frac{\alpha + \gamma}{\gamma}} I(|X| > \epsilon n^\gamma).
\]

3. Main result

In this section, we state and prove our main result.

Theorem 5. Let $\{V_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\}$ be an array of rowwise independent random elements which are stochastically dominated by a random variable $X$. Let $\{a_{nk}, k \geq 1, n \geq 1\}$ be an array of constants such that

\[
\sup_{k \geq 1} |a_{nk}| = O(n^{-\gamma}) \quad \text{for some } \gamma > 0
\]

and

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_{nk}|^{\theta} = O(n^\alpha) \quad \text{for some } \alpha > 0 \text{ and } \theta > 0 \text{ such that } \theta + \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} < 2.
\]
Assume that
\[ S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{nk} V_{nk} \xrightarrow{P} 0. \]

If \( E|X|^{\alpha + \theta} \log^\rho(|X|) < \infty \) for some \( \rho > 0 \), then
\[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} P(\|S_n\| > \epsilon) < \infty \quad \text{for all } \epsilon > 0. \]

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, we may assume that \( \sup_{k \geq 1} |a_{nk}| \leq n^{-\gamma} \) and \( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_{nk}|^\theta \leq n^\alpha \). For any \( n \geq 1 \) let
\[ V_{nk}^{(1)} = V_{nk} I(\|a_{nk} V_{nk}\| \leq 1) \text{ and } \]
\[ V_{nk}^{(2)} = V_{nk} I(\|a_{nk} V_{nk}\| > 1), \quad 1 \leq k < \infty. \]

Then
\[ S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{nk} V_{nk} = \sum_{p=1}^{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{nk} V_{nk}^{(p)} = \sum_{p=1}^{2} S_n^{(p)}, \text{ say.} \]

To prove the theorem, it suffices to show that for \( p = 1 \) and 2:
\[ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} P(\|S_n^{(p)}\| > \epsilon) < \infty \quad \text{for all } \epsilon > 0. \]

To do this, we apply Theorem 1 with \( c_n = 1/n \) to the random elements \( a_{nk} V_{nk}^{(p)}, p = 1, 2. \)

Then
\[ \max_{p=1,2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\|a_{nk} V_{nk}^{(p)}\| > \epsilon) \]
\[ \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\|a_{nk} V_{nk}\| > \epsilon) \]
\[
\leq C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{\alpha-1} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} k^{\theta} P(k < |\frac{X}{\epsilon}|^{1/\gamma} \leq k + 1) \quad \text{(by Lemma 2)}
\]
\[
= C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{\gamma} P(k < |\frac{X}{\epsilon}|^{1/\gamma} \leq k + 1) \sum_{n=1}^{k} n^{\alpha-1}
\]
\[
\leq C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{\alpha+\gamma} P(k < |\frac{X}{\epsilon}|^{1/\gamma} \leq k + 1) \quad \text{(since } \alpha > 0)\]
\[
\leq CE |\frac{X}{\epsilon}|^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} + \theta} < \infty.
\]
Hence (1) is satisfied for both series.

By Lemma 3, we have for any \( \epsilon > 0 \)
\[
P(\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_{nk}V_{nk} \| > 1) > \epsilon) \leq P(\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} \|a_{nk}V_{nk}\| > 1)
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\|a_{nk}V_{nk}\| > 1)
\]
\[
\leq CE |\frac{X}{\epsilon}|^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} + \theta} I(|X| > n^{\gamma}) = o(1),
\]
since \( E|X|^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} + \theta} < \infty \). Hence \( S_{n}^{(2)} \xrightarrow{P} 0 \). By the hypothesis \( S_{n} \xrightarrow{P} 0 \) and \( S_{n}^{(2)} = S_{n} - S_{n}^{(2)} \), we have \( S_{n}^{(1)} \xrightarrow{P} 0 \). We conclude that condition (3) from Theorem 1 is satisfied for both series.

The condition (4) from Theorem 1 with \( \delta = 1 \) is obviously satisfied for the first series, since
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\|a_{nk}V_{nk}^{(1)}\| > 1) = 0.
\]
For the second series we have by Lemma 3 that
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\|a_{nk}V_{nk}^{(2)}\| > 1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} P(\|a_{nk}V_{nk}\| > 1)
\]
\[
\leq CE |\frac{X}{\epsilon}|^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma} + \theta} I(|X| > n^{\gamma}) = o(1).
\]
Hence, condition (4) is satisfied for both series.

Finally, we check condition (2) from Theorem 1 for both series. To do this, we introduce the following notations. For \( t > 0 \) such that
0 < t\theta < \rho$ and any $n \geq 1$, let

$$A_n = \left\{ k \mid |a_{nk}| \leq \frac{1}{n^\gamma \log^t(n)} \right\}, \quad B_n = \left\{ k \mid \frac{1}{n^\gamma \log^t(n)} < |a_{nk}| \leq \frac{1}{n^\gamma} \right\}.$$ 

Next, for any $n \geq 1$ let

$$a_{nk}^{(1)} = \begin{cases} a_{nk} & \text{if } k \in A_n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad a_{nk}^{(2)} = \begin{cases} a_{nk} & \text{if } k \in B_n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$ 

Let $r = \frac{2}{\gamma} + \theta < 2$. First we mention that

$$\max_{p=1,2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E \|a_{nk}^{(1)} V_{nk}^{(p)}\|^r \leq \sum_{k \in A_n} E \|a_{nk} V_{nk}\|^r \leq C \left( \frac{1}{n^\gamma \log^t(n)} \right)^{\alpha/\gamma} E|X|^{\alpha/\gamma + \theta} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |a_{nk}|^\theta \leq C \log^{-\alpha/\gamma}(n) E|X|^{\alpha/\gamma + \theta}.$$ 

Hence we have that

$$(5) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E \|a_{nk}^{(1)} V_{nk}^{(1)}\|^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E \|a_{nk}^{(1)} V_{nk}\|^r \leq C \log^{-\alpha/\gamma}(n) E|X|^{\alpha/\gamma + \theta}$$

and

$$(6) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E \|a_{nk}^{(2)} V_{nk}^{(2)}\|^r \leq C \log^{-\alpha/\gamma}(n) E|X|^{\alpha/\gamma + \theta}.$$ 

In order to verify condition (2) for other cases, put

$$B_{nj} = \left\{ k \mid \frac{1}{n^\gamma \log^t(j + 1)} < |a_{nk}| \leq \frac{1}{n^\gamma \log^t(j)} \right\}.$$ 

Then $\{B_{nj}, 1 \leq j \leq n - 1\}$ are disjoint, $\cup_{j=1}^{n-1} B_{nj} = B_n$, and by Lemma 1 with $\phi(j) = \log^t(j)$, $\#B_n \leq n^{\alpha + \gamma \theta} \log^t(n)$. We can estimate

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E \|a_{nk}^{(2)} V_{nk}^{(2)}\|^r = \sum_{k \in B_n} |a_{nk}|^r E\|V_{nk}\|^r I\left(\|V_{nk}\| > \frac{1}{|a_{nk}|}\right) \leq C \sum_{k \in B_n} |a_{nk}|^r E|X|^r I(|X| > n^\gamma).$$
On the rate of complete convergence

\begin{align*}
\leq C E|X|^r I(|X| > n^{-\gamma})(n^{-\gamma})^r \#B_n
\leq C E|X|^r I(|X| > n^{-\gamma}) \log^{\theta}(n)
\leq C E|X|^r \log^{\rho}(|X|) I(|X| > n^{-\gamma}) \log^{\theta-\rho}(n)
\leq C E|X|^r \log^{\rho}(|X|) \log^{\theta-\rho}(n).
\end{align*}

Next, we estimate the remaining part in the following way

\begin{align*}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E||a_{nk} V_{nk}^{(1)}||^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k \in B_{nj}} E||a_{nk} V_{nk}||^2 I(||a_{nk} V_{nk}|| \leq 1) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k \in B_{nj}} \frac{1}{(n^{-\gamma} \log^{l}(j))^2} E||V_{nk}||^2 I(||V_{nk}|| \leq n^{-\gamma} \log^{l}(j+1)) \\
&\leq C \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \#B_{nj} n^{-2\gamma} \log^{-2l}(j) E X^2 I(|X| \leq n^{-\gamma} \log^{l}(j+1)) \\
&+ C \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \#B_{nj} P(|X| > n^{-\gamma} \log^{l}(j+1)) \\
&= I_1 + I_2, \text{ say.}
\end{align*}

Here we used the fact that if a random variable $Y$ is stochastically dominated by a random variable $X$, then for all $s > 0$ and $b > 0$

\[ E|Y|^s I(|Y| \leq b) \leq C E|X|^s I(|X| \leq b) + C b^s P(|X| > b). \]

Let $\mu = 2 - \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} - \theta > 0$. Since $\frac{x^\mu}{\log^{\rho}(x)} \uparrow$ as $x \to \infty$,

\[ \frac{x^\mu}{\log^{\rho}(x)} \leq \frac{(n^{-\gamma} \log^{l}(j+1))^\mu}{\log^{\rho}(n^{-\gamma} \log^{l}(j+1))} \leq C \frac{n^{\gamma \mu} \log^{l \mu}(j)}{\log^{\rho}(n)}, \]

if $x \leq n^{-\gamma} \log^{l}(j+1)$. Then

\begin{align*}
I_1 &\leq C \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \#B_{nj} n^{-2\gamma} \log^{-2l}(j) E|X|^r \log^{\rho}(|X|) \frac{n^{\gamma \mu} \log^{l \mu}(j)}{\log^{\rho}(n)} \\
&= C \frac{n^{\gamma \mu - 2\gamma}}{\log^{\rho}(n)} E|X|^r \log^{\rho}(|X|) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \log^{l \mu - 2l}(j) \#B_{nj}
\end{align*}
\[ \leq C \frac{n^{\gamma - 2\gamma}}{\log^\rho(n)} E|X|^r \log^\rho(|X|) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sharp B_{nj} \quad \text{(since } t \mu - 2t < 0) \]

\[ \leq CE|X|^r \log^\rho(|X|) \log^{t_\rho}(n). \]

Clearly, \( I_2 \) is dominated by

\[ CP(|X| > n^\gamma) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sharp B_{nj} \leq CP(|X| > n^\gamma) n^{\alpha + \gamma \theta} \log^\theta(n) \]

\[ \leq CE|X|^r \log^\rho(|X|) \log^{t_\rho}(n). \]

Hence

\[ \sum_{k=1}^\infty E\|a_{nk} V_n^{(1)}\|^2 \leq CE|X|^{\alpha/\gamma + \theta} \log^\rho(|X|) \log^{t_\rho}(n). \]

Take \( J \) such that \( J(\rho - t_\theta) \geq 2 \) and \( Jt_\alpha/\gamma \geq 2 \). We have by (5) and (8) that

\[ \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty E\|a_{nk} V_n^{(1)}\|^2 \right)^J \]

\[ = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty E\|a_{nk} V_n^{(1)}\|^2 \right)^J \]

\[ \leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \left( CE|X|^r/\gamma + \theta \log^{-t_\alpha/\gamma}(n) + CE|X|^{\alpha/\gamma + \theta} \log^\rho(|X|) \log^{t_\rho}(n) \right)^J \]

\[ \leq C \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n \log^2(n)}, \]

since \( E|X|^{\alpha/\gamma + \theta} \log^\rho(|X|) < \infty \). Hence for the first series condition (2) from Theorem 1 is satisfied with \( q = 2 \).

Next, by (6) and (7) we have that

\[ \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty E\|a_{nk} V_n^{(2)}\|^r \right)^J \]

\[ = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty E\|a_{nk} V_n^{(2)}\|^r \right)^J \]

\[ = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{k=1}^\infty E\|a_{nk} V_n^{(2)}\|^r \right)^J \]
≤ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \left( CE|X|^{\alpha/\gamma+\theta} \log^{-\alpha/\gamma}(n) + CE|X|^{\alpha/\gamma+\theta} \log^a(|X|) \log^{\theta-a}(n) \right)^J \\
\leq C \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \log^2(n)}.

Hence for the second series condition (2) from Theorem 1 is satisfied with \( q = r \).

Therefore all conditions from Theorem 1 are satisfied for both series, and so the proof is complete.
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