Applied Probability Trust (14 December 2010)

CHARACTERIZATION OF TAILS THROUGH HAZARD RATE AND CONVOLUTION CLOSURE PROPERTIES

ANASTASIOS G. BARDOUTSOS,* *University of the Aegean*

DIMITRIOS G. KONSTANTINIDES,** *University of the Aegean*

Abstract

We use the properties of the Matuszewska indices to show asymptotic inequalities for hazard rates. We discuss the relation between membership in the classes of dominatedly or extended rapidly varying tail distributions and corresponding hazard rate conditions. Convolution closure is established for the class of distributions with extended rapidly varying tails.

Keywords: Subexponentiality; extended rapidly varying tail; dominatedly varying tail; Matuszewska indices; hazard rate functions.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 60E05
Secondary 91B30

1. Introduction

In this paper we intend to discuss Pitman's criterion for subexponentiality (see [9, Theorem 2]). Some extensions of previous results about the characterization of distribution classes through their hazard rates appeared as byproducts. The motivation was the need for understanding and calculating the monotonicity condition required in these theorems. The ultimate goal is to substitute the monotonicity property with some limit relation.

Consider the Lebesgue convolution for densities f_1 and f_2 on $[0\,,\infty)$:

$$f_1 \star f_2(x) = \int_0^x f_1(y) f_2(x-y)dy\,,$$

and the convolution formula for the corresponding distributions

$$\overline{F_1 * F_2}(x) = \overline{F}_2(x) + \int_0^x \overline{F}_1(x-y)dF_2(y)\,,$$

where $\overline{F}(u) = 1 - F(u)$ denotes the right tail of any distribution F.

For $u > 1$, write $\overline{F}_\star(u) := \liminf_{x\to\infty} \overline{F}(ux)/\overline{F}(x)$ and $\overline{F}^\star(u) := \limsup_{x\to\infty} \overline{F}(ux)/\overline{F}(x)$. We write $m(x) \sim g(x)$ as $x \to \infty$ for the limit relation $\lim_{x\to\infty} m(x)/g(x) = 1$ and introduce the following classes of distributions F:

1. We say that F has extended rapidly varying tail , if $\overline{F}^\star(u) < 1$, for some $u > 1$. We write $F \in \mathcal{E}$.

* Postal address: Dept. of Statistics and Actuarial - Financial Mathematics,University of the Aegean Karlovassi, GR-83 200 Samos, Greece Tel.+3022730-33634, E-mail: sasm10007@sas.aegean.gr
** Postal address: Dept. of Statistics and Actuarial - Financial Mathematics, University of the Aegean Karlovassi, GR-83 200 Samos, Greece Tel. +3022730-82333, E-mail: konstant@aegean.gr

2. F has a subexponential distribution, if $\overline{F^{2*}}(x) \sim 2\overline{F}(x)$. We write $F \in \mathcal{S}$.
3. F has a long tail if $\overline{F}(x-y) \sim \overline{F}(x)$ for $y \in (-\infty\,, \infty)$. We write $F \in \mathcal{L}$.
4. F has dominatedly varying tail, if $\overline{F}_\star(u) > 0$ for all (or eq. for some) $u > 1$ or, equivalently, $\overline{F}^\star(u) < \infty$, for all (or eq. for some) $0 < u < 1$. We write $F \in \mathcal{D}$.

Recall that for a positve function g on $(0, \infty)$ the upper Matuszewska index γ_g is defined as the infimum of those values α for which there exists a constant C such that for each $U > 1$, as $x \to \infty$,

$$g(ux)/g(x) \leq C(1 + o(1))\, u^\alpha \quad \text{uniformly in } u \in [1, U],$$

and the lower Matuszewska index δ_g is defined as the supremum of those values β for which, for some $D > 0$ and all $U > 1$, as $x \to \infty$,

$$g(ux)/g(x) \geq D(1 + o(1))\, u^\beta \quad \text{uniformly in } u \in [1, U].$$

The classes $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are linked to the Matuszewska indices of the tails $\overline{F}$ (see [3]). For any distribution F on $(0, \infty)$ with infinite support, $F \in \mathcal{D}$ if and only if $\gamma_{\overline{F}} < \infty$, and $F \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only if $\delta_{\overline{F}} > 0$. In what follows, we always assume that F has a positive Lebesgue density f. Then the following relations hold (see [1, Theorem 2.1.5]):

$$\gamma_f = \inf\,\{-\log f_\star(u)/\log u : u > 1\} = -\lim_{u\to\infty} \log f_\star(u)/\log u\,,$$

where $f_\star(u) = \liminf_{x\to\infty} f(ux)/f(x)\,$, and

$$\delta_f = \sup\,\{-\log f^\star(u)/\log u : u > 1\} = -\lim_{u\to\infty} \log f^\star(u)/\log u\,,$$

where $f^\star(u) = \limsup_{x\to\infty} f(ux)/f(x)$. Using the Matuszewska indices, one can establish Potter-type inequalities for f; see [1, Proposition 2.2.1]. For example, if $\gamma_f < \infty$, then for every $\gamma > \gamma_f$ there exist constants $C'(\gamma)\,$, $x_0' = x_0'(\gamma)$ such that

$$f(y)/f(x) \geq C'(\gamma)(y/x)^{-\gamma}\,, \quad y \geq x \geq x_0'. \tag{1.1}$$

If $\delta_f > -\infty$ then for every $\delta < \delta_f$ there exist constants $C(\delta)\,$, $x_0 = x_0(\delta)$ such that

$$f(y)/f(x) \leq C(\delta)(y/x)^{-\delta}\,, \quad y \geq x \geq x_0. \tag{1.2}$$

In what follows, we say that the distributions F_1 and F_2 are max-sum equivalent, if

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \overline{F_1 * F_2}(x)/(\overline{F}_1(x) + \overline{F}_2(x)) = 1.$$

2. The class of distributions with extended rapidly varying tails

We say that the distribution F on $(0, \infty)$ is heavy tailed if $\int_0^\infty e^{sx} dF(x) = \infty$ for all $s > 0$ and light tailed, otherwise. The class $\mathcal{E}$ contains both light and heavy tailed distributions. For example, the exponential and Pareto distributions are members of $\mathcal{E}$. Moreover, the class $\mathcal{E}$ is not closed under max-sum equivalence. For example, for exponential $F_i = F$ exponential with parameter λ we have $\lim_{x\to\infty} \overline{F * F}(x)/(2\overline{F}(x)) = \infty$.

In what follows, we will need the hazard rate $h(x) = f(x)/\overline{F}(x)$ for any distribution F on $(0, \infty)$ with positive density f. We also write

$$M_1 = \liminf_{x\to\infty} xh(x) \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \limsup_{x\to\infty} xh(x)\,.$$

Whenever we consider a sequence F_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, of such distributions, we will use the corresponding symbols h_i, M_1^i, M_2^i.

We say that a density has bounded increase if $\delta_f > -\infty$; see [1, Definition, page 71]. Most of the densities of interest in statistics and probability theory satisfy this condition, e.g. the gamma and Weibull densities.

Under the assumption of an eventually non-increasing density (such that $f(y) \le f(x)$, for all $x \ge y \ge x_0$), the following equivalences were established:

1. $F \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only if $M_1 > 0$; see [8, Proposition 6].
2. $F \in \mathcal{D}$ if and only if $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$ if and only if $M_2 < \infty$; see [7, Corollary 3.4].

We generalize these results by substituting the condition of an eventually non-increasing density f by the assumption that f has bounded increase. This allows one to avoid the verification of the monotonicity property of f, and restricts one to the calculation of δ_f through $f^\star(u)$.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume F is a distribution supported on $(0,\,\infty)$ with positive Lebesgue density f such that f has bounded increase. Then $F \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only if $M_1 > 0$.*

Proof. By assumption, we have $\delta_f > -\infty$ and therefore inequality (1.2) holds for $\delta < \delta_f$. Let us start with the converse assertion, i.e. we assume $M_1 > 0$. We write for any $u > 1$

$$\overline{F}(ux)/\overline{F}(x) = \overline{F}(ux)/\left(\int_x^{ux} f(t)dt + \overline{F}(ux)\right)\,. \tag{2.1}$$

Now the relation (1.2) implies that

$$f(ux)/f(t) \le C(\delta)(ux/t)^{-\delta}\,, \quad ux \ge t > x \ge x_0\,.$$

Then integration yields

$$\int_x^{ux} f(t)dt \ge \left(f(ux)/C(\delta)\right)(ux)^{\delta} \int_x^{ux} t^{-\delta}dt := K(\delta,\,u)x\,f(ux)\,. \tag{2.2}$$

We substitute this lower bound into (2.1) to obtain

$$\frac{\overline{F}(ux)}{\overline{F}(x)} \le \frac{\overline{F}(ux)}{K(\delta,u)xf(ux) + \overline{F}(ux)} = \frac{1}{K(\delta,u)xh(ux)+1}\,.$$

Since $M_1 > 0$ the latter relation implies $F \in \mathcal{E}$.

Now we show the direct implication. From (2.1) we obtain

$$\overline{F}(ux)/\overline{F}(x) = 1 - \int_x^{ux} \left(f(t)/\overline{F}(x)\right)\,dt\,, \tag{2.3}$$

and from (1.2) we have

$$f(t)/f(x) \le C(\delta)(t/x)^{-\delta}, \quad t \ge x \ge x_0 \,.$$

An approach similar to the one in the inequality (2.2) yields for some constant $K'(\delta,u)$

$$\int_x^{ux} f(t)dt \le C(\delta)\, f(x) x^{\delta} \int_x^{ux} t^{-\delta} dt \le K'(\delta,u)\, x f(x)\,. \tag{2.4}$$

Hence, from (2.3) and (2.4) it follows that

$$\overline{F}(ux)/\overline{F}(x) \ge 1 - K'(\delta,u) x h(x)\,.$$

Since $F \in \mathcal{E}$ there exists $u > 1$ such that

$$M_1 = \liminf_{x\to\infty} xh(x) \ge (K'(\delta,u))^{-1} \liminf_{x\to\infty} (1 - \overline{F}(ux)/\overline{F}(x)) > 0\,.$$

This finishes the proof.

We say that a positive Lebesgue density f is extended rapidly varying if $\delta_f > 1$. In the following result we prove that this property and bounded increase of f imply $F \in \mathcal{E}$. We find an asymptotic lower bound for the hazard rate using the lower Matuszewska index.

Proposition 2.1. *If f has bounded increase with $\delta_f > 1$ then $F \in \mathcal{E}$ and for any $\delta \in (1, \delta_f)$ there are positive constants x_0, $C(\delta)$, defined in* (1.2)*, such that for all $x \ge x_0$:*

$$xh(x) \ge (\delta - 1)/C(\delta)\,. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. The inequality (1.2) is implied by the assumption $\delta_f > 1$ for $\delta < \delta_f$. Further, we integrate (1.2) for $\delta \in (1, \delta_f)$:

$$(h(x))^{-1} = \int_x^{\infty} f(y)/f(x) dy \le C(\delta) x^{\delta} \int_x^{\infty} y^{-\delta} dy = C(\delta) x/(\delta - 1)\,. \tag{2.6}$$

This proves inequality (2.5). The latter relation immediately implies that $M_1 > 0$ and therefore, by Theorem 2.1, $F \in \mathcal{E}$.

We examine the convolution closure of distributions with extended rapidly varying distributions. We write $h_{F_1 * F_2}$ for the hazard rate of $F_1 * F_2$ and

$$M_1^{(1,2)} := \liminf_{x\to\infty} x\, h_{F_1*F_2}(x)\,.$$

We need the fact that if $F_i \in \mathcal{E}$ then for every $0 < \delta < \delta_{\overline{F}_i}$ there exist constants $x_0^i = x_0^i(\delta)$ and $C_i(\delta)$ such that the following Potter-type inequality holds (see [3])

$$\overline{F_i}(x)/\overline{F}_i(y) \le C_i(\delta)(x/y)^{-\delta}\,, \quad x \ge y \ge x_0^i\,, \quad i = 1, 2\,.$$

Choosing $y = x_0^i$, the latter relation implies that there exist constants $\Delta_i(\delta)$ such that

$$\overline{F}_i(x) \le \Delta_i(\delta) x^{-\delta}\,, \quad x \ge x_0^i\,, \quad i = 1, 2\,. \tag{2.7}$$

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ with positive Lebesgue densities on $(0,\infty)$ and that the following conditions hold:*

1. *The density f_1 has bounded increase with $\delta_{f_1} > 0$,*

2. *$\delta_{\overline{F}_1} < \delta_{\overline{F}_2}$ and $\liminf_{x\to\infty} x^{\delta}\,\overline{F}_1(x) > 0$ for some $\delta \in \left[\delta_{\overline{F}_1}, \delta_{\overline{F}_2}\right)$.*

Then $F_1 * F_2 \in \mathcal{E}$.

Proof. We start by proving $M_1^{(1,2)} > 0$. We have

$$x\, h_{F_1 * F_2}(x) = \frac{x f_1(x)}{\overline{F}_1(x)} \frac{\overline{F}_1(x)}{\overline{F_1 * F_2}(x)} \frac{f_1 \star f_2(x)}{f_1(x)} .$$

By assumption 1., inequality (1.2) applies for $\delta_0 < \delta_{f_1}$. Therefore for $x \geq x_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f_1 \star f_2(x)}{f_1(x)} &= \int_0^x \frac{f_1(y)}{f_1(x)} f_2(x-y)dy \geq \int_{x_0}^x \frac{1}{C(\delta_0)} \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^{-\delta_0} f_2(x-y)dy \\ &\geq F_2(x-x_0)/C(\delta_0) . \end{aligned}$$

Now, from (2.7) for every $\delta_i \in (0, \delta_{\overline{F}_i})$, $i = 1,2$, and sufficiently large x, some constant $\Delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{F_1 * F_2}(x) &\leq \overline{F}_1(x/2) + \overline{F}_2(x/2) \\ &\leq \Delta_1(\delta_1)(x/2)^{-\delta_1} + \Delta_2(\delta_2)(x/2)^{-\delta_2} \leq \Delta\left(x^{-\delta_1} + x^{-\delta_2}\right) . \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that there exist $\delta_2 \in \left[\delta_{\overline{F}_1}, \delta_{\overline{F}_2}\right)$ such that

$$M_1^{(1,2)} \geq \liminf_{x\to\infty} \frac{1}{\Delta\, C(\delta_0)} \frac{x f_1(x)}{\overline{F}_1(x)} x^{\delta_2} \overline{F}_1(x) \geq \frac{M_1^1}{\Delta\, C(\delta_0)} \liminf_{x\to\infty} x^{\delta_2}\overline{F}_1(x) > 0 .$$

In the last step we used Theorem 2.1 for $M_1^1 > 0$ and assumption 2. Another application of Theorem 2.1 yields the result.

To verify that the two conditions do not contradict each other we consider two Pareto distributions with tails $\overline{F}_i(x) = x^{-a_i}$, $i = 1,2$, $x \geq 1$. Choose $a_1 = 2$ and $a_2 = 3$. Then it is easy to see that $\delta_{\overline{F}_i} = a_i$, $i = 1,2$. Therefore $F_i \in \mathcal{E}$ and $f_i^{\star}(u) = u^{-(a_i+1)}$. Hence condition 1. holds with $\delta_{f_1} = 3$, f_1 has bounded increase and condition 2. is satisfied for $\delta = 2$. We conclude that the conditions of the theorem hold. The tail of the Pareto distribution F_i belongs to the class $\mathcal{R}_{-a_i}$ of regularly varying functions with index $-a_i$, i.e. $\overline{F_i}(ux) \sim u^{-a_i}\overline{F_i}(x)$ for each $u > 0$. From [5, Lemma 1.3.1] we know that if $\overline{F}_i \in \mathcal{R}_{-a_i}$, $i = 1,2$, then $\overline{F_1 * F_2} \in \mathcal{R}_{-\min(a_1,a_2)}$. This fact and the definition of regular variation immediately imply $F_1 * F_2 \in \mathcal{E}$.

3. The case of subexponential distributions

In this section we present some results on the characterization of the classes $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$ through hazard rates. In the following result we provide an inequality for the hazard rate which is useful for characterizing membership in the class $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that F has a positive Lebesgue density on $(0,\infty)$ and $\gamma_f < \infty$. Then $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$, and for any $\gamma > \gamma_f$ there are positive constants x_0', $C'(\gamma)$, defined in* (1.1)*, such that for all $x \geq x_0'$ and $\lambda > 1$:*

$$xh(x) \leq C'(\gamma)\, V(\lambda,\gamma)\,, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$V(\lambda,\gamma) = \begin{cases} (\lambda^{-\gamma+1}-1)/(-\gamma+1), & \text{if } \gamma \neq 1, \\ \log\lambda, & \text{if } \gamma = 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since $\gamma_f < \infty$, (1.1) yields

$$\int_x^\infty f(y)/f(x)dy \quad \geq \quad \int_x^{\lambda x} f(y)/f(x)dy \geq C'(\gamma)\, x^\gamma \int_x^{\lambda x} y^{-\gamma} dy\,.$$

Then (3.1) holds, $M_2 < \infty$ and from [7, Theorem 3.3] we obtain $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$.

In the next theorem we generalize the statement from [7, Corollary 3.4] by substituting the condition of an eventually non-increasing density f by the assumption that f has bounded increase. This allows one to avoid the verification of the monotonicity property of f, and restricts one to the calculation of δ_f through $f^\star(u)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that F is supported on $(0,\,\infty)$ with a positive Lebesgue density f which has bounded increase. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. $F \in \mathcal{D}$ 2. $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$ and 3. $M_2 < \infty$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3). We start by observing that

$$\overline{F}(x/2)/\overline{F}(x) = 1 + \int_{x/2}^x f(y)/\overline{F}(x)\,dy\,. \tag{3.2}$$

Since f has bounded increase (1.2) applies for $x \geq y \geq x/2$ and sufficiently large x. Hence exists a constant $\Lambda(\delta)$ such that for large x,

$$\int_{x/2}^x f(y)dy \geq (x^\delta f(x)/C(\delta)) \int_{x/2}^x y^{-\delta} dy = xf(x)\Lambda(\delta)\,. \tag{3.3}$$

The inequalities (3.2) and (3.3) imply

$$xh(x) \leq [\Lambda(\delta)]^{-1}(\overline{F}(x/2))/\overline{F}(x) - 1)\,.$$

Now, from the assumption $F \in \mathcal{D}$ we obtain $M_2 < \infty$.
(3) $\Rightarrow$ (2) follows from [7, Theorem 3.3] and (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is trivial.

In [9, Theorem 2] necessary and sufficient conditions for membership in $\mathcal{S}$ were presented. In [7, Theorem 3.6] a corresponnding result for a the important subclass $\mathcal{S}^*$ of $\mathcal{S}$ was given; see also [7, Corollary 3.8]. The previously mentioned results require that the hazard rate be eventually monotone (such that $h(y) \leq h(x)$ for all $y \geq x \geq x_0$). However, a verification of this monotonicity condition is in general not straightforward.

In the next result we prove the statement of [9, Theorem 2] under the assumption $\delta_h > 0$ which might be checked easier.

Recall the notion of hazard function $H(x) := -\ln \overline{F}(x)$ with the convention $H(\infty) = \infty$. An application of [1, Proposition 2.2.1] yields a Potter-type inequality for $g(x) = (h(x))^{-1}$: if $\delta_h > 0$ then for $0 < \delta < \delta_h$ there exist constants $C(\delta)$, x_0 such that

$$h(y)/h(x) \le C(\delta)(y/x)^{-\delta}, \quad y \ge x \ge x_0\,. \tag{3.4}$$

If $\delta_h > 0$ we say that the hazard rate h has positive decrease; see [1, Definition, page 71].

Theorem 3.2. *Let F be a distribution on $(0,\infty)$ with positive Lebesgue density f. Assume that the hazard rate h has positive decrease. Then $F \in \mathcal{S}$ if and only if*

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \int_0^x \exp\{\kappa y h(x) - H(y)\} h(y) dy = 1 \quad \textit{for every } \kappa > 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. If F has a positive Lebesgue density the hazard function H is differentiable and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{F^{2*}}(x)/\,\overline{F}(x) - 1 &= \int_0^x \exp\left\{H(x) - H(x-y) - H(y)\right\} h(y) dy \\ &= \int_0^{x/2} \exp\left\{H(x) - H(x-y) - H(y)\right\} h(y) dy \\ &\quad + \int_0^{x/2} \exp\left\{H(x) - H(x-y) - H(y)\right\} h(x-y) dy \\ &= I_1(x) + I_2(x)\,, \end{aligned}$$

We start by showing the converse implication: (3.5) implies that $I_1(x) \to 1$ and $I_2(x) \to 0$, hence F is subexponential. For $y \le x/2$ there exists $\xi \in (x-y\,, x)$ such that $yh(\xi) = H(x) - H(x-y)$. Then

$$x > \xi > x - y \ge x/2 \ge y. \tag{3.6}$$

An application of (3.4) yields for large x and $\delta < \delta_h$

$$\max(h(\xi)/h(x/2), h(x)/h(\xi)) \le C(\delta)\,. \tag{3.7}$$

Hence for any x, y satisfying (3.6),

$$y\, h(x)/C(\delta) \le H(x) - H(x-y) \le C(\delta)\, y\, h(x/2)\,, \tag{3.8}$$

Since $H(x) - H(x-y) \ge 0$ we have the trivial bound $I_1(x) \ge F(x/2)$ and from the right inequality in (3.8) we conclude that

$$F(x/2) \le I_1(x) \le \int_0^{x/2} \exp\{C(\delta)\, yh(x/2) - H(y)\} h(y)\, dy\,. \tag{3.9}$$

Together with (3.5) this implies the desired relation $I_1(x) \to 1$.

It remains to show $I_2(x) \to 0$. From (3.8) we obtain

$$I_2(x) \le \Big(\int_0^{x_0} + \int_{x_0}^{x/2}\Big) \exp\{C(\delta)\, yh(x/2) - H(y)\} h(x-y)\, dy\,.$$

The first integral converges to zero as $x \to \infty$ since $h(x) \to 0$. By (3.6) and (3.4) there exists some x_0 such that $h(x-y)/h(y) \le C(\delta)$, $x_0 \le y \le x/2$, and therefore, up to a constant multiple, the second integral is bounded by the right-hand expression in (3.9) which converges to 1. Moreover, the integrand in the right-hand expression of (3.9) converges for every y as $x \to \infty$. The integrand in the second integral above converges to zero for every y. An application of Pratt's lemma [10, Theorem 1] shows that the second integral converges to zero as $x \to \infty$. Hence $I_2(x) \to 0$ and the converse implication of the result is proved.

For the direct part, assuming that F is subexponential, we obtain from (3.6) and (3.7) that

$$\overline{F^{2*}}(x)/\,\overline{F}(x) - 1 \ge I_1(x) \ge \int_0^{x/2} \exp\{-H(y)\}\, h(y)dy = \int_0^{x/2} f(y)dy\,.$$

Since the left-and right-hand sides converge to 1 as $x \to \infty$ the proof of (3.5) is complete.

We introduce the class $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{E}$ of heavy tailed distributions on $(0,\infty)$. In what follows, we will frequently use the relation $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{E}$, which is a consequence of [6, Theorem 1] and the definition of the class $\mathcal{A}$. Also notice that the inclusion $\mathcal{D}\cap\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{D}\cap\mathcal{L}$ is strict since the distributions with slowly varying tail are not contained in $\mathcal{E}$, but belong to $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$. Next we show that $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{A}$ is closed under convolution.

Proposition 3.2. *Assume $F_i \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{A}$, $i = 1, 2$. Then $F_1 * F_2 \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{A}$ and*

$$\overline{F_1 * F_2}(x) \sim \overline{F}_1(x) + \overline{F}_2(x)\,, \quad x \to \infty\,. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. Relation (3.10) follows from $F_i \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$, $i = 1, 2$, and [2, Theorem 2.1]. Furthermore from [4, Proposition 2] (or [2, Theorem 2.1]) we conclude $F_1 * F_2 \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$. Let us use relation (3.10) to show that $F_1 * F_2 \in \mathcal{E}$. Then for some $u > 1$ we have

$$\limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{\overline{F_1 * F_2}(ux)}{\overline{F_1 * F_2}(x)} = \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{\overline{F}_1(ux) + \overline{F}_2(ux)}{\overline{F}_1(x) + \overline{F}_2(x)} \le \max\left\{\overline{F}_1^{\star}(u)\,,\ \overline{F}_2^{\star}(u)\right\}.$$

Taking into account that $F_i \in \mathcal{E}$, $i = 1,\, 2$ we obtain the result. This finishes the proof.

In the next statement a characterization of the class $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{A}$ with respect to the hazard rate and the limits $\overline{F}_{\star}(u)$ and $\overline{F}^{\star}(u)$ for all $u > 1$ is presented and in this way a generalization of [8, Theorems 3.3 and 3.7] is provided. The generalization is achieved by substituting the condition of an eventually non-increasing density f by the assumption that f is of bounded increase. This allows one to avoid the verification of the monotonicity property of f, and restricts one to the calculation of δ_f through $f^{\star}(u)$.

Corollary 3.1. *Assume F is a distribution supported on $(0,\,\infty)$ with positive Lebesgue density f such that f has bounded increase. Then $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{A}$ if and only if one of the following statements holds*

1. $0 < M_1 \le M_2 < \infty\,,$
2. $0 < \overline{F}_{\star}(u) \le \overline{F}^{\star}(u) < 1\,.$

Proof. 1. Let us begin with the direct implication. From the assumption $F \in \mathcal{D}$ and Theorem 3.1 we obtain $M_2 < \infty$. From the assumption $F \in \mathcal{E}$ and from Theorem 2.1 we find $M_1 > 0$. Next, for the inverse part we apply directly Theorems 2.1 and 3.1.

2. The condition $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{A}$ is equivalent to $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{E}$. Because of $F \in \mathcal{D}$ from Theorem 3.1 we obtain $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{L}$. Hence $F \in \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{A}$. This completes the proof.

Corollary 3.2. *Let F be a distribution on $(0, \infty)$ with positive Lebesgue density f. Assume that the hazard rate h has positive decrease. Then $F \in \mathcal{A}$ if and only if $M_1 > 0$ and*

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} \int_0^x \exp\{\kappa y h(x) - H(y)\} h(y) dy = 1 \quad \textit{for every } \kappa > 0 \,, \tag{3.11}$$

Proof. From the decreasing property of the tail $\overline{F}$ we obtain $f(ux)/f(x) \leq h(ux)/h(x)$ for every $u > 1$. Hence $\delta_f \geq \delta_h > 0$. From the last inequality and Theorems 2.1 and 3.2 we conclude the result. This finishes the proof.

Acknowledgments. The authors would like to thank Thomas Mikosch for his comments that improved significantly the material of the paper and Søren Asmussen for his advice to work on this topic.

References

[1] Bingham N.H., Goldie C.M., Teugels J.L. (1987) *Regular Variation.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[2] Cai J., Tang Q.H. (2004) On max-sum equivalence and convolution closure of heavy-tailed distributions and their applications. *J. Appl. Probab.* **41**, 117-130.

[3] Cline D.B.H., Samorodnitsky G. (1994) Subexponentiality of the product of independent random variables. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* **49**, 75–98.

[4] Embrechts P., Goldie C.M. (1980) On closure and factorization properties of subexponential and related distributions. *J. Austral. Math. Soc., Ser. A* **29**, 243–256.

[5] Embrechts P., Klüppelberg C., Mikosch T. (1997) Modeling Extremal Events for Insurance and Finance. Springer, Berlin.

[6] Goldie C.M. (1978) Subexponential distributions and dominated-variation tails. *J. Appl. Probab.* **15**, 440–442.

[7] Klüppelberg C. (1988) Subexponential distributions and integrated tail.s *J. Appl. Probab.* **25**, 132–141.

[8] Konstantinides D.G. (2008) A class of heavy tailed distributions. *J. Numer. Appl. Math.* **96**, 127-138.

[9] Pitman E.J.G. (1980) Subexponential distribution functions. *J. Austral. Math. Soc., Ser. A* **29**, 337–347.

[10] Pratt J.W. (1960) On interchanging limits and integrals *Ann. Math. Statist.* **31**, 74–77.