

ANNALES DE L'I. H. P., SECTION B

HIROSHI SATO

MASAKAZU TAMASHIRO

Multiplicative chaos and random translation

Annales de l'I. H. P., section B, tome 30, n° 2 (1994), p. 245-264

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPB_1994__30_2_245_0

© Gauthier-Villars, 1994, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de l'I. H. P., section B » (<http://www.elsevier.com/locate/anihpb>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

Multiplicative chaos and random translation

by

Hiroshi SATO * and Masakazu TAMASHIRO

Department of Mathematics, Kyushu University-33,
Hakozaki, Fukuoka, 812 Japan

ABSTRACT. — Let $\mathbf{G} = \{G_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ be a standard Gaussian sequence and $\mathbf{Y} = \{Y_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ an independent non-negative random sequence which is also independent of \mathbf{G} . We shall analyse the conditions on \mathbf{Y} for the equivalence (=mutual absolute continuity) of the measures $\mu_{\mathbf{G}}$ and $\mu_{\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{Y}}$ on \mathbf{R}^∞ induced by \mathbf{G} and $\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{Y}$, respectively. This problem implies a typical example of the multiplicative chaos. In particular we shall analyse in detail the case where Y_k 's are two valued in view of the regularity of the multiplicative chaos and, as an application, give a negative answer to a conjecture of J.-P. Kahane on the regularity of the multiplicative chaos.

Key words : Multiplicative chaos, absolute continuity.

RÉSUMÉ. — Soit $\mathbf{G} = \{G_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ une suite de variables aléatoires gaussiennes et $\mathbf{Y} = \{Y_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ une suite de variables aléatoires non-négatives indépendantes qui soit aussi indépendante de \mathbf{G} . On donne les conditions sur \mathbf{Y} pour l'équivalence des mesures $\mu_{\mathbf{G}}$ et $\mu_{\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{Y}}$ sur \mathbf{R}^∞ induites par \mathbf{G} et $\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{Y}$, respectivement. Ce problème fournit un exemple typique du chaos multiplicatif. En particulier, on analyse en détail le cas où Y_k sont deux-valorées au point de vue de la régularité du chaos multiplicatif et, comme application, on donne une réponse négative à une des conjectures de J.-P. Kahane sur la régularité du chaos multiplicatif.

A.M.S. Classification: primary 60G30, secondary 60G40.

* Research was partially supported by SFB 170, "Geometrie und Analysis", Göttingen.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let T be a compact metric space and $\{X_k(t, \omega)\}_{t \in T} (k \geq 1)$ an independent family of centered Gaussian processes on a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we assume that

$$p_k(s, t) = E[X_k(s, \omega)X_k(t, \omega)] \geq 0 (s, t \in T)$$

and $X_k(t, \omega)$ is $(\Sigma \otimes \mathcal{F})$ -measurable, where Σ is the Borel field of T , and define

$$M_n(t, \omega) = \exp \left[\sum_1^n \left\{ X_k(t, \omega) - \frac{1}{2} p_k(t, t) \right\} \right]. \tag{1.1}$$

Then, for every fixed $t \in T$, $\{M_n(t, \omega)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is naturally a positive martingale.

For every $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(T)$, the collection of all finite measures on (T, Σ) , define a random measure $M \sigma$ by

$$\int_T \phi(t) (M \sigma)(\omega, dt) = \lim_n \int_T M_n(t, \omega) \phi(t) \sigma(dt) \quad \text{a.s.,}$$

for every continuous function ϕ on T . After Kahane [2] the above map $M; \sigma \in \mathcal{M}(T) \rightarrow M \sigma$ is called a *multiplicative chaos*, and $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(T)$ is said to be *M-regular* or *M-singular* according as $E[(M \sigma)(T)] = \sigma(T)$ or 0.

When T is the d -dimensional torus, σ is the Lebesgue measure and the covariance functions satisfy

$$\sum_k p_k(s, t) = \xi \log \frac{1}{\|s-t\|} + O(1)$$

for some $\xi > 0$, Kahane [2] proved that σ is *M-regular* if $\xi < 2d$ and *M-singular* if $\xi \geq 2d$. In other words σ is *M-regular* if and only if

$$\int_T \int_T \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_k p_k(s, t) \right] \sigma(ds) \sigma(dt) < \infty.$$

We should remark that this result implies the complete solution to the problem of absolute continuity of measures in the 2-space time dimensional Høegh-Krohn's model of quantum fields, which has been investigated by many authors (Høegh-Krohn [1], Kusuoka [7] and its references).

For $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(T)$ and $u \geq 0$ define

$$I(u; \sigma) = \int_T \int_T \exp \left[\frac{u}{2} \sum_k p_k(s, t) \right] \sigma(ds) \sigma(dt) \leq \infty.$$

Then Kahane posed the following conjecture.

Conjecture (Kahane [4]). — Let M be a multiplicative chaos. Then $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(T)$ is M -regular if and only if σ is expressed as a sum $\sum_n \sigma_n$ (convergence in total variation) of $\sigma_n \in \mathcal{M}(T)$ such that $I(1; \sigma_n) < \infty$.

On the other hand let $X = \{X_k(\omega)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be an *i.i.d.* random sequence defined on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(T)$ a probability measure on (T, Σ) and $Y = \{Y_k(t)\}_{k \geq 1}$ an independent random sequence defined on (T, Σ, σ) . Then $X + Y = \{X_k(\omega) + Y_k(t)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is defined on the product probability space $(\Omega \times T, \mathcal{F} \otimes \Sigma, P \otimes \sigma)$ and X and Y are independent. The authors [6, 8, 9] investigated the problem of the equivalence of the probability measures μ_X and μ_{X+Y} on \mathbb{R}^∞ induced by X and $X + Y$, respectively.

In particular let $G = \{G_k(\omega)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be a standard Gaussian sequence on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , $Y = \{Y_k(t)\}_{k \geq 1}$ an independent non-negative random sequence on (T, Σ, σ) and

$$M_n(t, \omega) = \exp \left[\sum_1^n \left\{ G_k(\omega) Y_k(t) - \frac{1}{2} Y_k(t)^2 \right\} \right]. \tag{1.2}$$

Then (1.2) defines a multiplicative chaos M for $X_k(t, \omega) = Y_k(t) G_k(\omega)$ and we have

$$I(u; \sigma) = \int_T \int_T \exp \left[\frac{u}{2} \sum_k Y_k(s) Y_k(t) \right] \sigma(ds) \sigma(dt).$$

On the other hand μ_G and μ_{G+Y} are equivalent ($\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$) or singular ($\mu_G \perp \mu_{G+Y}$) according as σ is M -regular or M -singular. Owing to the well known Kakutani dichotomy [5] we have either $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ or $\mu_G \perp \mu_{G+Y}$. To characterize the equivalence of μ_G and μ_{G+Y} is our first aim. In Section 2 we shall prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.

$$\sum_k \sigma(Y_k > \varepsilon) < \infty$$

and

$$\sum_k \mathbf{E}_\sigma [Y_k; Y_k \leq \varepsilon]^2 < \infty \tag{1.3}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ imply $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$.

Conversely $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ implies

$$\sum_k \sigma(Y_k > \varepsilon)^2 < \infty$$

and (1.3) for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

As a corollary we obtain a positive answer to the conjecture in the case where $\sup_k Y_k \leq L$ σ -a.s. for some $L \geq 0$ (Proposition 1).

In particular we analyse, in Section 3, when $Y = \{ \varepsilon(a_k, p_k) \}_{k \geq 1}$ is an independent random sequence with distributions

$$\sigma(\varepsilon(a_k, p_k) = a_k) = p_k, \quad \sigma(\varepsilon(a_k, p_k) = 0) = 1 - p_k, \quad (1.4)$$

where $a_k > 0$ and $0 < p_k < 1$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Define

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{a_k^2} \log \frac{1+p_k}{p_k}.$$

Then, relating to the Kahane's conjecture, we shall prove:

THEOREM 2. - (a) Assume $\sup_k a_k < \infty$. Then $I(u; \sigma) < \infty$ for some $u > 0$ implies $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$. Conversely, $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ implies $I(u; \sigma) < \infty$ for every $u > 0$. Consequently we have $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ if and only if $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$.

(b) Assume $\sup_k a_k = \infty$, and define $\underline{\alpha} = \liminf_{\{k; a_k > 1\}} \alpha_k$ and $\bar{\alpha} = \limsup_{\{k; a_k > 1\}} \alpha_k$.

(b-i) Assume $\underline{\alpha} > \frac{3}{2}$. Then $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ if and only if $I(2; \sigma) < \infty$.

(b-ii) Assume $\frac{1}{2} \leq \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Then $I(2; \sigma) < \infty$ implies $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$. Conversely, $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ implies $I(1-\varepsilon; \sigma) < \infty$ for every $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$.

(b-iii) Assume $\bar{\alpha} < \frac{1}{2}$. Then $I(2\bar{\alpha} + \varepsilon; \sigma) < \infty$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ implies $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$. In particular $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$ implies $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$. Conversely $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ implies $I((2\underline{\alpha} - \varepsilon)_+; \sigma) < \infty$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, where a_+ denotes $\max(a, 0)$.

More precisely we shall analyse the case (b-ii). Define

$$\theta = \sup \{ u \geq 0; I(u; \sigma) < \infty \}$$

and

$$\lambda(x) = 2 - \left(\frac{3}{2} - x \right)^2, \quad x \geq 0.$$

Then we shall prove:

THEOREM 3. - Assume $\sup_k a_k = \infty$ and $\frac{1}{2} \leq \underline{\alpha} = \bar{\alpha} = \alpha \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Then $\lambda(\alpha) < \theta$ implies $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$. Conversely $\lambda(\alpha) > \theta$ implies $\mu_G \perp \mu_{G+Y}$.

As an application we shall give a negative answer to the Kahane's conjecture by giving examples in Section 4.

2. GENERAL CASE

Let $\mathbf{G} = \{G_k(\omega)\}_{k \geq 1}$ be a standard Gaussian sequence defined on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}(T)$ a probability measure and $\mathbf{Y} = \{Y_k(t)\}_{k \geq 1}$ an independent non-negative random sequence defined on (T, Σ, σ) . Define

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{2}\right], \quad x \in \mathbf{R}$$

and

$$Z_k(x) = \int_T \exp\left[x Y_k(t) - \frac{1}{2} Y_k(t)^2\right] \sigma(dt) - 1, \quad x \in \mathbf{R}, k \in \mathbf{N}. \quad (2.1)$$

Then the following theorem is our starting point.

THEOREM 4. [6, Theorem 2]. — *The next four statements are equivalent.*

(a) σ is M -regular, where M is the multiplicative chaos defined by (1.2).

(b) $\mu_{\mathbf{G}} \sim \mu_{\mathbf{G} + \mathbf{Y}}$.

(c) $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$ converges almost surely.

(d) For some, so that any, $K (\geq 1)$

(d-1) $\sum_k \mathbf{E}[Z_k(G_k); Z_k(G_k) > K] < \infty$

and

(d-2) $\sum_k \mathbf{E}[Z_k(G_k)^2; Z_k(G_k) \leq K] < \infty$.

Proof of Theorem 1. — For any $\varepsilon > 0$ decompose $Z_k(G_k)$ into

$$\begin{aligned} Z_k(G_k) &= \mathbf{E}_{\sigma} \left[\exp\left[G_k Y_k - \frac{1}{2} Y_k^2\right] - 1; Y_k > \varepsilon \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbf{E}_{\sigma} \left[\exp\left[G_k Y_k - \frac{1}{2} Y_k^2\right] - 1; Y_k \leq \varepsilon \right] \\ &= V_{\varepsilon}(G_k) + W_{\varepsilon}(G_k), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{E}_{σ} denotes the expectation with respect to σ . Then, from the same arguments as in [6, Lemma 1, Theorem 4] and [8, Theorem 3.2 (B)], $\sum_k \sigma(Y_k > \varepsilon) < \infty$ implies the almost sure absolute convergence of $\sum_k V_{\varepsilon}(G_k)$, and (1.3) implies the L^2 -convergence, therefore the almost sure convergence, of $\sum_k W_{\varepsilon}(G_k)$. Thus we obtain the sufficiency.

Conversely assume the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$. Then, since $Y_k \geq 0$, $Z_k(x)$ is increasing and continuous in x , and

$Z_k(1) < \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}\right]$, Theorem 4(d-2) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \infty > \sum_k \mathbf{E} \left[Z_k(G_k)^2; Z_k(G_k) \leq \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}\right] \right] \\ & \geq \sum_k \int_0^1 Z_k(x)^2 g(x) dx \geq \int_0^1 g(x) dx \sum_k Z_k(0)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have $\sum_k Z_k(0)^2 = \sum_k \mathbf{E}_\sigma \left[1 - \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2} Y_k^2\right] \right]^2 < \infty$, which implies $\sum_k \sigma(Y_k > \varepsilon)^2 < \infty$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

Next we shall prove (1.3). For any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $Z_k(x) < \exp\left[\frac{9}{2}\varepsilon^2\right]$ for every $x \in [0, 3\varepsilon)$. Then Theorem 4(d-2) implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \infty > \sum_k \mathbf{E} \left[Z_k(G_k)^2; Z_k(G_k) \leq \exp\left[\frac{9}{2}\varepsilon^2\right] \right] \\ & \geq \sum_k \int_{2\varepsilon}^{3\varepsilon} Z_k(x)^2 g(x) dx \\ & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_k \int_{2\varepsilon}^{3\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}_\sigma \left[\exp\left[-\frac{(x-Y_k)^2}{2}\right] - \exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{2}\right] \right]^2 \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}x^2\right] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_k \sigma(Y_k > \varepsilon)^2 < \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \infty > \sum_k \int_{2\varepsilon}^{3\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}_\sigma \left[\exp\left[-\frac{(x-Y_k)^2}{2}\right] - \exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{2}\right]; Y_k \leq \varepsilon \right]^2 \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}x^2\right] dx \\ & = \sum_k \int_{2\varepsilon}^{3\varepsilon} \mathbf{E}_\sigma \left[\int_0^1 (x-tY_k) \exp\left[-\frac{(x-tY_k)^2}{2}\right] dt Y_k; Y_k \leq \varepsilon \right]^2 \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}x^2\right] dx \\ & \geq \varepsilon^2 \exp[-9\varepsilon^2] \int_{2\varepsilon}^{3\varepsilon} \exp\left[\frac{1}{2}x^2\right] dx \sum_k \mathbf{E}_\sigma [Y_k; Y_k \leq \varepsilon]^2, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

PROPOSITION 1. — (a) Assume $\sup_k Y_k < \infty$, σ -a.s.. Then $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$ implies $\mu_{\mathbf{G}} \sim \mu_{\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{Y}}$.

(b) Assume $\sup_k Y_k < L$, σ -a.s. for some $L > 0$. Then $\mu_{\mathbf{G}} \sim \mu_{\mathbf{G}+\mathbf{Y}}$ if and only if $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$.

Proof. — Since $\{Y_k(t)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is an independent random sequence, we have

$$I(1; \sigma) = \prod_k \int_T \int_T \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} Y_k(t) Y_k(s) \right] \sigma(ds) \sigma(dt),$$

and thus we have $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k \left\{ \int_T \int_T \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} Y_k(t) Y_k(s) \right] \sigma(ds) \sigma(dt) - 1 \right\} \\ = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \int_T Y_k(t) \sigma(dt) \int_T Y_k(s) \sigma(ds) \int_0^1 \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} Y_k(t) Y_k(s) x \right] dx < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

(a) Assume $\sup_k Y_k < \infty$, σ -a.s. and $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$. Then we have $\sum_k \sigma(Y_k > L) < \infty$ for some $L > 0$ so that $\sum_k \mathbf{E}_\sigma[Y_k : Y_k \leq L]^2 < \infty$ implies the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$ by Theorem 1. In fact, since $Y_k \geq 0$, $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \infty > \sum_k \int_T Y_k(t) \sigma(dt) \int_T Y_k(s) \sigma(ds) \int_0^1 \\ \times \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} Y_k(t) Y_k(s) x \right] dx \geq \sum_k \mathbf{E}_\sigma[Y_k : Y_k \leq L]^2. \end{aligned}$$

(b) Assume $\sup_k Y_k < L$, σ -a.s. for some $L > 0$. Then we obtain “if” part by (a). Conversely assume the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$. Then, by Theorem 1, we have $\sum_k \mathbf{E}_\sigma[Y_k]^2 = \sum_k \mathbf{E}_\sigma[Y_k : Y_k \leq L]^2 < \infty$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k \int_T Y_k(t) \sigma(dt) \int_T Y_k(s) \sigma(ds) \int_0^1 \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} Y_k(t) Y_k(s) x \right] dx \\ \leq \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} L^2 \right] \sum_k \mathbf{E}_\sigma[Y_k]^2 < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (b). \square

In Section 4 (4.3) we shall give an example that $\sup_k Y_k < \infty$, σ -a.s. and $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ do not imply $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$.

3. TWO-VALUED CASE

In this section we consider the case $Y = \{\varepsilon(a_k, p_k)\}$. By definition (1.4) and (2.1) we have

$$Z_k(x) = p_k \left(\exp \left[a_k x - \frac{1}{2} a_k^2 \right] - 1 \right), \quad k \in \mathbf{N}, x \in \mathbf{R}.$$

By Theorem 4, M-regularity of σ , the equivalence of μ_G and μ_{G+Y} and the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$ are equivalent. Relating to the conjecture, we shall characterize them in terms of

$$I(u; \sigma) = \prod_k \left\{ 1 + p_k^2 \left(\exp \left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2 \right] - 1 \right) \right\}.$$

First we shall prove the following.

PROPOSITION 2. - (a) $\sum_k p_k < \infty$ implies the almost sure absolute convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$.

(b) $I(2; \sigma) < \infty$ implies the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$.

Proof. - (a) Assume $\sum_k p_k < \infty$. Then

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\sum_k |Z_k(G_k)| \right] = \sum_k p_k \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \exp \left[a_k x - \frac{1}{2} a_k^2 \right] - 1 \right| g(x) dx \leq 2 \sum_k p_k < \infty,$$

which proves (a).

(b) Assume $I(2; \sigma) < \infty$. Since $\{Z_k(G_k)\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent random variables with mean 0, $\sum_k \mathbf{E}[Z_k(G_k)^2] < \infty$ implies the L^2 -convergence, consequently the almost sure convergence, of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$. In fact we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k \mathbf{E}[Z_k(G_k)^2] &= \sum_k p_k^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\exp \left[a_k x - \frac{1}{2} a_k^2 \right] - 1 \right)^2 g(x) dx \\ &= \sum_k p_k^2 (\exp[a_k^2] - 1) < \infty. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Decompose \mathbf{N} into

$$\mathbf{N} = \{k \geq 1; a_k \leq 1\} \cup \{k \geq 1; a_k > 1\} = \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2.$$

Remark 1. – We have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_1} p_k^2 a_k^2 < \infty$ if and only if

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_1} p_k^2 \left(\exp \left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2 \right] - 1 \right) < \infty$$

for some, so that any, $u > 0$.

The next lemma is immediately derived from Proposition 2 and Remark 1.

LEMMA 1. – (a) $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k < \infty$ implies the almost sure convergence of $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} Z_k(G_k)$.

(b) $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_1} p_k^2 a_k^2 < \infty$ implies the almost sure convergence of $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_1} Z_k(G_k)$.

The following lemma plays a central role in our discussion.

LEMMA 2. – $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$ converges almost surely if and only if

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_1} p_k^2 a_k^2 < \infty, \tag{3.1}$$

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 < \infty, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k \int_{a_k(\alpha_k - (1/2))}^{a_k(\alpha_k + (1/2))} g(x) dx < \infty \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \int_{a_k((3/2) - \alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx < \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. – Assume the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$. Then, by Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \infty &> \sum_k \mathbf{E}_\sigma [\varepsilon(a_k, p_k) : \varepsilon(a_k, p_k) \leq 1]^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_1} p_k^2 a_k^2, \\ \infty &> \sum_k \sigma(\varepsilon(a_k, p_k) > 1)^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.1) and (3.2).

Since $Z_k(x)$ is strictly increasing and $Z_k\left(a_k\left(\alpha_k + \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) = 1$, we have by Theorem 4 (d-1) and (d-2)

$$\begin{aligned} \infty > \sum_k \mathbf{E}[Z_k(G_k); Z_k(G_k) > 1] &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k \int_{a_k(\alpha_k + (1/2))}^{\infty} \\ &\quad \times \left(\exp\left[a_k x - \frac{1}{2} a_k^2 \right] - 1 \right) g(x) dx \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k \int_{a_k(\alpha_k - (1/2))}^{a_k(\alpha_k + (1/2))} g(x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.3), and

$$\begin{aligned} \infty > \sum_k \mathbf{E}[Z_k(G_k)^2; Z_k(G_k) \leq 1] &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \int_{-\infty}^{a_k(\alpha_k + (1/2))} \\ &\quad \times \left(\exp\left[a_k x - \frac{1}{2} a_k^2 \right] - 1 \right)^2 g(x) dx \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \left\{ \exp[a_k^2] \int_{a_k((3/2) - \alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx - 2 \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \int_{a_k((1/2) - \alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx + \int_{-a_k((1/2) + \alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx \right\} \\ &\geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \left\{ \exp[a_k^2] \int_{a_k((3/2) - \alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx - 2 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

thus, by (3.2), this proves (3.4).

Conversely (3.1) implies the almost sure convergence of $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_1} Z_k(G_k)$ by Lemma 1 (b). On the other hand, by Theorem 4, (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4) implies the almost sure convergence of $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} Z_k(G_k)$, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 2. — We have proved Lemma 2 for a decomposition of \mathbf{N} according as $a_k \leq 1$ or $a_k > 1$. But it is not difficult to show that Lemma 2 is true for any decomposition of \mathbf{N} according as $a_k \leq \varepsilon$ or $a_k > \varepsilon$, where ε is an arbitrary positive number.

Remark 3. — Since the series (3.1)~(3.4) are of positive terms, for any decomposition $N = \bigcup_{j=1}^n \mathcal{X}_j$, $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$ converges almost surely if and only if $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{X}_j} Z_k(G_k)$, $j=1, 2, \dots, n$, separately converge almost surely.

PROPOSITION 3. — (a) If $\alpha_k > -\frac{1}{a_k} + \frac{3}{2}$ for every $k \in \mathcal{N}_2$, then $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$ converges almost surely if and only if $I(2; \sigma) < \infty$.

(b) If $\alpha_k \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for every $k \in \mathcal{N}_2$, then $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$ converges almost surely if and only if (3.1) and $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k < \infty$.

Proof. — (a) $I(2; \sigma) < \infty$ implies the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$ by Proposition 2(b).

Conversely assume $\alpha_k > -\frac{1}{a_k} + \frac{3}{2}$ for every $k \in \mathcal{N}_2$ and the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$. Then we have by Lemma 2

$$\infty > \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \int_{a_k((3/2)-\alpha_k)}^\infty g(x) dx \geq \int_1^\infty g(x) dx \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2].$$

On the other hand we have by Lemma 2(3.1) and Remark 1

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_1} p_k^2 (\exp[a_k^2] - 1) < \infty.$$

Therefore we have $\sum_k p_k^2 (\exp[a_k^2] - 1) < \infty$ and, consequently, $I(2; \sigma) < \infty$.

(b) By Lemma 1, (3.1) and $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k < \infty$ imply the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$.

Conversely assume the almost sure convergence of $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$. Since

$\alpha_k - \frac{1}{2} \leq 0$ and $a_k \left(\alpha_k + \frac{1}{2} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for every $k \in \mathcal{N}_2$, we have, by Lemma 2

$$\infty > \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k \int_{a_k(\alpha_k - (1/2))}^{a_k(\alpha_k + (1/2))} g(x) dx \geq \int_0^{1/2} g(x) dx \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k,$$

consequently $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k < \infty$. Then Lemma 2 completes the proof of (b). \square

Proof of theorem 2. – (a) is proved by Proposition 1 (b).

(b) Assume $\sup_k a_k = \infty$.

(b-i) Assume $\underline{\alpha} > \frac{3}{2}$. Then $\alpha_k > \frac{3}{2}$ for large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, so that Proposition 3 (a) and Theorem 4 prove (b-i).

(b-ii) Assume $\frac{1}{2} \leq \underline{\alpha} \leq \bar{\alpha} \leq \frac{3}{2}$.

$I(2; \sigma) < \infty$ implies $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ by Proposition 2 (b) and Theorem 4.

Conversely assume $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ and fix any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. Then, by Theorem 4, $\sum_k Z_k(G_k)$ converges almost surely and we have (3.2) by Lemma 2. Choose $\tau > 0$ such that $\tau < \sqrt{1+\varepsilon} - 1$ and also choose $k_0 \in \mathcal{N}_2$ such that $k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2$ implies $\alpha_k \geq \frac{1}{2} - \tau$. Then we have by Theorem 4 and Lemma 2

$$\begin{aligned} \infty &> \sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \int_{a_k((3/2)-\alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx \\ &\geq \sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \int_{(1+\tau)a_k}^{\sqrt{1+\varepsilon}a_k} g(x) dx \\ &\geq \frac{\sqrt{1+\varepsilon} - (1+\tau)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2} a_k^2\right], \end{aligned}$$

which proves (b-ii).

(b-iii) Assume $\bar{\alpha} < \frac{1}{2}$. Then $\alpha_k < \frac{1}{2}$ for large $k \in \mathbb{N}$, thus we have $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ if and only if (3.1) and $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k < \infty$ by Proposition 3 (b) and

Theorem 4. On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we may choose $k_0 \in \mathcal{N}_2$, by definition, such that $k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2$ implies

$$\left(\underline{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\right)_+ \leq \frac{1}{a_k^2} \log \frac{1+p_k}{p_k} \leq \bar{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon.$$

It is easy to check

$$\frac{1}{2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\left(\underline{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\right)_+ a_k^2\right] \leq p_k \leq p_k^2 \exp\left[\left(\bar{\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon\right) a_k^2\right]$$

for $k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2$, which proves (b-iii). \square

For the proof of Theorem 3 we shall give the next lemma. Define

$$\lambda'(x, y) = 2x - \left(y - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2, \quad x, y \geq 0,$$

and note that $\lambda'(x, x) = \lambda(x)$ for every $x \geq 0$.

LEMMA 3. — Assume $\limsup_k a_k > 1$, (3.1), (3.2) and $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha_k \leq -\frac{1}{a_k} + \frac{3}{2}$

for every $k \in \mathcal{N}_2$.

- (a) (i) If $\lambda'(\bar{\alpha}, \underline{\alpha}) < \theta$, then we have (3.3).
 (ii) If $\lambda'(\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}) > \theta$, then (3.3) does not hold.
 (b) (i) If $\lambda(\bar{\alpha}) < \theta$, then we have (3.4).
 (ii) If $\lambda(\underline{\alpha}) > \theta$, then (3.4) does not hold.

Proof. — Before proving the lemma we shall remark that $\frac{1}{2} \leq \alpha \leq \bar{\alpha} \leq \frac{3}{2}$, $0 \leq \lambda'(\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}) \leq \lambda'(\bar{\alpha}, \underline{\alpha}) \leq 2$ and $1 \leq \lambda(\underline{\alpha}) \leq \lambda(\bar{\alpha}) \leq 2$, and that (3.2) implies $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k = 0$, consequently,

$$\underline{\alpha} = \liminf_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} \alpha_k = \liminf_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} \frac{1}{a_k^2} (-\log p_k).$$

Therefore, for any $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$, we may choose $k(\delta) \in \mathcal{N}_2$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\bar{\alpha} + \delta} \log \frac{1 + p_k}{p_k} \leq a_k^2 \leq \frac{1}{\underline{\alpha} - \delta} (-\log p_k) \quad (3.5)$$

for every $k \geq k(\delta)$, $k \in \mathcal{N}_2$.

On the other hand (3.1) implies

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_1} p_k^2 \left(\exp \left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2 \right] - 1 \right) < \infty$$

for every $u > 0$ and we have by (3.2)

$$\theta = \sup \left\{ u \geq 0; \sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp \left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2 \right] < \infty \right\}. \quad (3.6)$$

(a-i) Assume $\lambda'(\bar{\alpha}, \underline{\alpha}) < \theta$ and fix any $u, u_0 \geq 0$ such that $\lambda'(\bar{\alpha}, \underline{\alpha}) < u_0 < u < \theta$. Then, by (3.6), we have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2\right] < \infty$. According as $\underline{\alpha} > \frac{1}{2}$ or $\underline{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2}$, choose $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that $\lambda'(\bar{\alpha} + \delta, \underline{\alpha} - \delta) \leq u_0$ and $\underline{\alpha} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \delta$ or $\lambda'(\bar{\alpha} + \delta, \frac{1}{2}) \leq u_0$. Then we have

$$\frac{(\underline{\alpha} - \delta - (1/2))_+^2 + u_0}{2(\bar{\alpha} + \delta)} - 1 \geq 0,$$

$$a_k\left(\alpha_k - \frac{1}{2}\right) = \left(\frac{1}{a_k^2} \log \frac{1+p_k}{p_k} - \frac{1}{2}\right) a_k \geq \left(\underline{\alpha} - \delta - \frac{1}{2}\right)_+ a_k$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} a_k^2 \geq \frac{1}{2(\bar{\alpha} + \delta)} (-\log p_k)$$

for every $k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2$. Consequently we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k \int_{a_k(\alpha_k - (1/2))}^{a_k(\alpha_k + (1/2))} g(x) dx \\ & \leq \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} a_k p_k g\left(a_k\left(\alpha_k - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} a_k p_k \exp\left[-\frac{a_k^2}{2} \left(\underline{\alpha} - \delta - \frac{1}{2}\right)_+^2\right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} a_k p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{u_0}{2} a_k^2\right] p_k^{u_0 + (\underline{\alpha} - \delta - (1/2))_+^2 / 2 (\bar{\alpha} + \delta) - 1} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2\right] a_k \exp\left[-\frac{u - u_0}{2} a_k^2\right] < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (a-i).

(a-ii) Assume $\lambda'(\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}) > \theta$ and fix any $u \geq 0$ such that $\lambda'(\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}) > u > \theta$. Then, by (3.6), we have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2\right] = \infty$. Choose $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that $\lambda'(\underline{\alpha} - \delta, \bar{\alpha} + 2\delta) \geq u$. Then we have

$$\frac{(\bar{\alpha} + 2\delta - (1/2))^2 + u}{2(\underline{\alpha} - \delta)} - 1 \leq 0,$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k \int_{a_k(\alpha_k - (1/2))}^{a_k(\alpha_k + (1/2))} g(x) dx \\ \geq & \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k \int_{a_k(\alpha_k - (1/2))}^{a_k(\alpha_k - (1/2)) + \delta a_k} g(x) dx \\ \geq & \delta \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k a_k g\left(a_k\left(\alpha_k - \frac{1}{2}\right) + \delta a_k\right) \\ \geq & \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2} \pi} \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k \exp\left[-\frac{a_k^2}{2} \left\{\bar{\alpha} + 2\delta - \frac{1}{2}\right\}^2\right] \\ \geq & \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2} \pi} \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2\right] = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (a-ii).

(b-i) Assume $\lambda(\bar{\alpha}) < \theta$.

If $\bar{\alpha} = \frac{3}{2}$, then $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] < \infty$ by $\lambda\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) = 2$ and (3.6), thus we obtain the conclusion.

Next we assume $\bar{\alpha} < \frac{3}{2}$ and fix any $u > 0$ such that $\lambda(\bar{\alpha}) < u < \theta$. Then,

by (3.6), $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2\right] < \infty$. Choose $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that

$$\bar{\alpha} + \delta < \frac{3}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad u \geq \lambda(\bar{\alpha} + \delta) = 2 - \left(\frac{3}{2} - (\bar{\alpha} + \delta)\right)^2.$$

Then from (3.5) we have

$$a_k \left(\frac{3}{2} - \alpha_k\right) \geq \left(\frac{3}{2} - (\bar{\alpha} + \delta)\right) a_k > 0$$

for every $k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \int_{a_k((3/2) - \alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx \\ \leq & \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} \frac{p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2]}{a_k(3/2 - \alpha_k)} g\left(a_k\left(\frac{3}{2} - \alpha_k\right)\right) \\ \leq & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \pi} \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \exp\left[-\frac{(3/2 - (\bar{\alpha} + \delta))^2}{2} a_k^2\right] \\ \leq & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2} \pi} \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2\right] < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (b-i).

(b-ii) Assume $\lambda(\underline{\alpha}) > \theta$ and fix any $u \geq 0$ such that $\lambda(\underline{\alpha}) > u > \theta$. Then, by (3.6), we have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2\right] = \infty$. Choose $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ such that $\lambda(\underline{\alpha} - 2\delta) \geq u$. Then we have from (3.5)

$$0 < a_k \left(\frac{3}{2} - \alpha_k\right) \leq \left(\frac{3}{2} - (\underline{\alpha} - \delta)\right) a_k$$

for every $k \geq k(\delta)$, $k \in \mathcal{N}_2$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \int_{a_k((3/2) - \alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx \\ & \geq \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \int_{((3/2) - (\underline{\alpha} - \delta)) a_k}^{((3/2) - (\underline{\alpha} - \delta)) a_k + \delta a_k} g(x) dx \\ & \geq \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \exp\left[-\frac{((3/2) - (\underline{\alpha} - 2\delta))^2}{2} a_k^2\right] \\ & \geq \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{k \geq k(\delta), k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp\left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2\right] = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (b-ii). \square

Proof of theorem 3. — First we consider the case $\alpha = \frac{3}{2} \cdot \lambda\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) = 2 < \theta$ implies $I(2; \sigma) < \infty$, thus we have $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ by Proposition 2(b) and Theorem 4.

Conversely $\lambda\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) > \theta$ implies $I(2 - 2\tau; \sigma) = \infty$ for some $0 < \tau < 1$, thus we have

$$\sum_k p_k^2 (\exp[(1 - \tau) a_k^2] - 1) = \infty.$$

Without loss of generality, by Lemma 2 and Theorem 4, we may assume (3.1) and (3.2), and consequently we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[(1 - \tau) a_k^2] = \infty.$$

Choose $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta^2 < 2\tau$ and $k_0 \in \mathcal{N}_2$ such that $k \geq k_0$, $k \in \mathcal{N}_2$ implies $\alpha_k + \delta \geq \frac{3}{2}$. Then we have

$$\sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp[a_k^2] \int_{a_k((3/2) - \alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp [a_k^2] \int_{\delta a_k}^{\sqrt{2}\tau a_k} g(x) dx \\ &\geq \frac{\sqrt{2}\tau - \delta}{\sqrt{2}\pi} \sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp [(1 - \tau) a_k^2] = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\mu_G \perp \mu_{G+Y}$ by Lemma 2 and Theorem 4.

Next we consider the case $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < \frac{3}{2}$. Choose $0 < \eta < 1$ and $k_0 \in \mathcal{N}_2$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} < \alpha_k < -\eta + \frac{3}{2} \tag{3.7}$$

for every $k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2$. $\lambda(\alpha) < \theta$ implies (3.1) and (3.2) since $\lambda(\alpha) > 1$ for $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha < \frac{3}{2}$. On the other hand, by (3.2) and (3.7), we have

$\lim_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k = 0$, so that $\lim_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} a_k = \infty$. Therefore we may choose $k_1 \geq k_0, k_1 \in \mathcal{N}_2$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} < \alpha_k < -\frac{1}{a_k} + \frac{3}{2}$$

for every $k \geq k_1$. Thus we have $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ by Lemma 3, Lemma 2 and Theorem 4.

Conversely assume $\lambda(\alpha) > \theta$. By Lemma 2 and Theorem 4, we may assume (3.1) and (3.2), consequently we have $\mu_G \perp \mu_{G+Y}$ by the same argument from above.

Finally we consider the case $\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = 1 < \theta$ implies $I(1 + \tau; \sigma) < \infty$ for some $0 < \tau < 1$, then we have (3.1), (3.2) and

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp \left[\frac{1 + \tau}{2} a_k^2 \right] < \infty.$$

Choose $k_0 \in \mathcal{N}_2$ such that $\alpha_k < \frac{1 + \tau}{2}$ for every $k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2$. Then we have

$$\sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k \leq \sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp \left[\frac{1 + \tau}{2} a_k^2 \right] < \infty,$$

so that $\mu_G \sim \mu_{G+Y}$ by Lemma 1 and Theorem 4.

Conversely $\lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) > \theta$ implies $I(1-\tau; \sigma) = \infty$ for some $0 < \tau < 1$, so that

$$\sum_k p_k^2 \left(\exp \left[\frac{1-\tau}{2} a_k^2 \right] - 1 \right) = \infty.$$

By Lemma 2 and Theorem 4, we may assume (3.1) and (3.2), and consequently we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp \left[\frac{1-\tau}{2} a_k^2 \right] = \infty.$$

Choose $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta < \sqrt{1+\tau} - 1$ and $k_0 \in \mathcal{N}_2$ such that $k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2$ implies $\alpha_k + \delta \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp [a_k^2] \int_{a_k((3/2)-\alpha_k)}^{\infty} g(x) dx \\ \geq & \sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp [a_k^2] \int_{(1+\delta)a_k}^{\sqrt{1+\tau}a_k} g(x) dx \\ \geq & \frac{\sqrt{1+\tau} - (1+\delta)}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{k \geq k_0, k \in \mathcal{N}_2} p_k^2 \exp \left[\frac{1-\tau}{2} a_k^2 \right] = \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $\mu_G \perp \mu_{G+Y}$ by Lemma 2 and Theorem 4. \square

4. EXAMPLES

In this section we shall give negative answers to Kahane’s conjecture. For the two-valued sequence $Y = \{ \varepsilon(a_k, p_k) \}_{k \geq 1}$ on (T, Σ, σ) , define

$$a_k = \sqrt{\beta \log(k^\gamma + 1)}, \quad p_k = k^{-\gamma}, \quad k \in \mathbf{N},$$

where β is positive constant and $\gamma > \frac{1}{2}$. Then we have

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{a_k^2} \log \frac{1+p_k}{p_k} = \frac{1}{\beta}, \quad k \in \mathbf{N},$$

and $\alpha = \lim_k \alpha_k = \frac{1}{\beta}$. Moreover we have

$$\sum_1^n p_k^2 \exp \left[\frac{u}{2} a_k^2 \right] = \sum_1^n k^{-2\gamma} (k^\gamma + 1)^{(u/2)\beta} = O \left(\sum_1^n k^{-2\gamma + (u/2)\beta\gamma} \right), \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

for every $u > 0$, so that $\theta = \frac{2(2\gamma - 1)}{\beta\gamma}$ and $I(\theta; \sigma) = \infty$. The multiplicative chaos M defined in (1.2) is given by

$$M_n(t, \omega) = \exp \left[\sum_1^n \left\{ G_k(\omega) \varepsilon(a_k, p_k)(t) - \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon(a_k, p_k)(t)^2 \right\} \right].$$

$$(4.1) \quad \beta = \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \gamma = \frac{2}{3}.$$

In this case $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$ but σ is not M -regular. In fact we have $\sup_k a_k = \infty$, $\alpha = 2 > \frac{3}{2}$ and $\theta = 2$, so that $I(2; \sigma) = \infty$, $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$ and σ is not M -regular by Theorem 2(b-i) and Theorem 4.

$$(4.2) \quad \beta = \frac{5}{6} \text{ and } \gamma = \frac{2}{3}.$$

In this case also $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$ but σ is not M -regular. In fact we have $\sup_k a_k = \infty$, $\frac{1}{2} < \alpha = \frac{6}{5} < \frac{3}{2}$, $\theta = \frac{6}{5} > 1$ and $\lambda(\alpha) = \frac{191}{100} > \theta$, so that $I(1; \sigma) < \infty$ and σ is not M -regular by Theorem 3 and Theorem 4.

$$(4.3) \quad \beta = 3 \text{ and } \gamma = 2.$$

In this case $I(1; \sigma) = \infty$ but σ is M -regular. In fact we have

$$\sum_k p_k = \sum_k k^{-2} < \infty,$$

so that $\sup_k \varepsilon(a_k, p_k) < \infty$ σ -a.s. and σ is M -regular by Proposition 1(a) and Theorem 4.

On the other hand $\theta = 1$, hence $I(1; \sigma) = \infty$.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. HØEGH-KROHN, A General Class of Quantum Fields Without Cut-offs in Two Space Time Dimension, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, Vol. **21**, 1971, pp. 244-255.
- [2] J.-P. KAHANE, Sur le chaos multiplicatif, *Ann. Sci. Math. Québec*, Vol. **9**, (2), 1985, pp. 105-150.
- [3] J.-P. KAHANE, Positive Martingales and Random Measures, *Chin. Ann. of Math.*, **8B**, (1), 1987, pp. 1-12.
- [4] J.-P. KAHANE, From Riesz Products to Random Sets, *Harmonic Analysis* (S. Igari Ed), *Proceeding of a Conference held in Sendai, Japan, August 14-18, 1990*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, pp. 125-139.

- [5] S. KAKUTANI, On Equivalence of Infinite Product Measures, *Ann. Math.*, Vol. **49**, 1948, pp. 214-224.
- [6] K. KITADA and H. SATO, On the Absolute Continuity of Infinite Product Measure and its Convolution, *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields*, Vol. **81**, 1989, pp. 609-627.
- [7] S. KUSUOKA, *Høegh-Krohn's Model of Quantum Fields and the Absolute Continuity of Measures*, Preprint.
- [8] H. SATO and M. TAMASHIRO, Absolute Continuity of One-Sided Random Translation, To appear in *Stochastic Process Appl.*
- [9] H. SATO and T. WATARI, Some Integral Inequalities and Absolute Continuity of a Symmetric Random Translation, *J. Funct. Anal.*, Vol. 114, 1993, pp. 257-266.

*(Manuscript received August 31, 1992;
revised November 16, 1992.)*