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Abstract. We obtain an optimal bound for a Gaussian approximation of a large class of vector-valued random processes. Our results provide a substantial generalization of earlier results that assume independence and/or stationarity. Based on the decay rate of the functional dependence measure, we quantify the error bound of the Gaussian approximation using the sample size $n$ and the moment condition. Under the assumption of $p$th finite moment, with $p > 2$, this can range from a worst case rate of $n^{1/2}$ to the best case rate of $n^{1/p}$.
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1. Introduction The functional central limit theorem (FCLT), or invariance principle plays an important role in statistics. Let $X_i$ for $i \geq 1$, be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with mean zero and covariance...
matrix $\Sigma$, and let $S_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j} X_i$. The FCLT asserts that

$$\{n^{-1/2}S_{\lfloor nu \rfloor}, \ 0 \leq u \leq 1\} \Rightarrow \{\Sigma^{1/2}IB(u), \ 0 \leq u \leq 1\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\lfloor t \rfloor = \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : i \leq t\}$ and $IB$ is the standard Brownian motion in $\mathbb{R}^d$; that is it has independent increments, and $IB(u + v) - IB(u) \sim N(0, vI_d)$ for $u, v \geq 0$. In this study, we generalize (1.1) by developing a convergence rate of (1.1) for multiple time series that can be dependent and nonidentically distributed.

The invariance principle was introduced by Erdös and Kac (1946, [9]), Doob (1949, [4]), Donsker (1952, [3]), and Prohorov (1956, [20]) furthered their ideas, which led to the theory of weak convergence of probability measures. There is an extensive body of literature on Gaussian approximations when the dimension $d = 1$. In this case, optimal rates for independent random variables were obtained by [11] and [21], among others. When $d = 1$ and $X_i$ is i.i.d. with mean zero and variance $\sigma^2$ and has a finite $p$th moment for $p > 2$, Komlós, Major, and Tusnády (1975, 76, [11, 12]) established the following result:

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S'_i - \sigma B(i)| = o_{\text{a.s.}}(\tau_n), \quad (1.2)$$

where $B(\cdot)$ is the standard Brownian motion and $S'_n$ is constructed on a richer space; such that $(S'_i)_{i \leq n} \overset{D}{=} (S'_i)_{i \leq n}$, and the approximation rate $\tau_n = n^{1/p}$ is optimal. Results of the type shown in (1.2) have many applications in statistics because we can use
functionals involving Gaussian processes to approximate statistics of \((X_i)_{i=1}^n\), and thus exploit the properties of Gaussian processes. Their result was generalized to independent random vectors by Einmahl (1987a, [6]; 1987b, [7]; 1989, [8]), Zaitsev (2001, [32]; 2002a, [33]; 2002b, [34]), and Götze and Zaitsev (2008, [10]), who optimal and nearly optimal results.

To generalize (1.2) to multiple time series, we consider the possibly nonstationary, \(d\)-dimensional, mean zero, vector-valued process

\[
X_i = (X_{i1}, \ldots, X_{id})^T = H_i(F_i) = H_i(\epsilon_i, \epsilon_{i-1}, \ldots), \quad i \in \mathbb{Z},
\]

where \(^T\) denotes a matrix transpose, \(F_i = (\epsilon_i, \epsilon_{i-1}, \ldots)\) and \(\epsilon_i\) for \(i \in \mathbb{Z}\) are i.i.d. random variables. Here, \(H_i(\cdot)\) is a measurable function such that \(X_i\) is well defined.

We allow \(H_i\) to be possibly nonlinear in its argument \((\epsilon_i, \epsilon_{i-1}, \ldots)\) in order to capture a much larger class of processes. If \(H_i(\cdot) \equiv H(\cdot)\) does not depend on \(i\), (1.3) defines a stationary causal process. The latter framework is very general; see [24, 26, 19], among others. When \(d = 1\), Wiener [25] considered representing stationary processes by functionals of i.i.d. random variables.

Lütkepohl [16] presented numerous applications of the functional central limit theorem for multiple time series analysis. Wu and Zhao (2007, [29]) and Zhou and Wu (2010, [35]) applied Gaussian approximation results with suboptimal approximation rates to trend estimations and functional regression models. For the class of weakly
dependent processes (1.3), we show that there exists a probability space \((\Omega_c, A_c, P_c)\)
on which we can define random vectors \(X_i^c\), with the partial sum process \(S_i^c = \sum_{t=1}^{i} X_t^c\) and a Gaussian process \(G_i^c = \sum_{t=1}^{i} Y_t^c\). Here \(Y_t^c\) is a mean zero independent Gaussian vector, such that \((S_i^c)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \overset{D}{=} (S_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}\) and

\[
\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i^c - G_i^c| = o_P(\tau_n) \quad \text{in } (\Omega_c, A_c, P_c),
\]

where the approximation bound \(\tau_n\) is related to the dependence decaying rates.

Our result is useful for asymptotic inferences involving multiple time series. As a primary contribution, we generalize and improve the existing results for Gaussian approximations in several ways. For some \(p > 2\), we assume uniform integrability of the \(p\)th moment and obtain an approximation bound \(\tau_n\) in terms of \(p\) and the decay rate of the functional dependence measure. In particular, if the dependence decays sufficiently quickly, for \(\tau_n\), we are able to achieve the optimal \(o_P(n^{1/p})\) bound. In the current literature, optimal results have been obtained for some special cases only.

We start with a brief overview of these.

For stationary processes with \(d = 1\), a suboptimal rate was derived by Wu (2007, [27]), where the martingale approximation is applied. Berkes, Liu, and Wu (2014, [2]) considered the causal stationary process given in (1.3) above obtaining the \(n^{1/p}\) bound for \(p > 2\). It is considerably more challenging to deal with vector-valued processes. Eberlein (1986, [5]) obtained a Gaussian approximation result for depen-
dent random vectors with an approximation error $O(n^{1/2-\kappa})$, for some small $\kappa > 0$. However, this bound can be too crude for many statistical applications. The martingale approximation approach in [27] cannot be applied to vector-valued processes because Strassen’s embedding fails for vector-valued martingales [17] in general. For a stationary multiple time series with additional constraints, Liu and Lin (2009, [13]) obtained an important result on strong invariance principles for stationary processes with bounds of the order $n^{1/p}$, with $2 < p < 4$. Wu and Zhou (2011, [31]) obtained suboptimal rates for multiple nonstationary time series. A critical limitation of the results in [31, 13] is the restriction $2 < p < 4$. Whether the bound $n^{1/p}$ can be achieved when $p \geq 4$ remains an open problem.

In this paper, we show that under proper decaying conditions on functional dependence measures for the process (1.3), we can indeed obtain the optimal bound $n^{1/p}$ for $p \geq 4$. Our condition is stated in the form of (2.3), which employs the two parameters $\chi$ and $A$ to formulate the temporal dependence of the process. In general, larger values of $\chi$ and $A$ mean the dependence decays more quickly. With proper conditions on $A$, we find optimal $\tau_n = \tau_n(\chi)$ for a general $\chi > 0$. In Corollary 2.1 in Berkes, Liu, and Wu (2014, [2]) the authors discussed univariate and stationary processes. However, their focus was on larger values of $\chi$ that allowed them to obtain $\tau_n = n^{1/p}$. In Theorem 2.1, we obtain a rate for any $\chi > 0$, and show that if $\chi$ increases from
0 to a certain number $\chi_0$, we obtain the optimal $\tau_n$, varying from the worst, $n^{1/2}$, to the optimal, $n^{1/p}$. This work is useful for processes in which dependence does not decay sufficiently quickly. For the borderline case $\chi = \chi_0$, we have a rate of $o_P(n^{1/p})$ for $2 < p < 4$, and for $p \geq 4$, we have a rate of $o_P(n^{1/p} \log n)$. However, if $\chi > \chi_0$, we obtain the optimal $o_P(n^{1/p})$ bound for all $p > 2$.

Our sharp Gaussian approximation result is quite useful for simultaneous inferences of curves where the unknown function is not even Lipschitz continuous. Although many studies have examined curve estimations by assuming smooth or regular behavior of a function few have focused on functions that are not differentiable or not Lipschitz continuous. Our Gaussian approximation can play a key role in weakening the smoothness assumption and thus enlarging the scope of statistical inferences. Moreover, the optimal $o_P(n^{1/p})$ bound for $2 < p < 4$ and the stationary processes obtained in [13] have remained popular choices over the past few years for multivariate Gaussian approximations. Therefore, we can apply our sharper invariance principle to generalize that of ([13]) one in multiple ways, thus yielding optimal rates when $p \geq 4$.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce the functional dependence measure and present our main result. Applications to linear processes and to locally stationary nonlinear non-Lipschitz processes are given in section
3. The proof of Theorem 2.1 is outlined in section 4. A detailed version is provided in the online Supplementary Material section 6. The goal of the sketched outline is to give the readers a basic idea of our long and involved derivation. Some useful results used throughout the proofs are presented in the online Supplementary Material section 7.

We now introduce some notation. For a random vector $Y$, write $Y \in \mathcal{L}_p$, for $p > 0$, if $\|Y\|_p := E(|Y|^p)^{1/p} < \infty$. If $Y \in \mathcal{L}_2$, $Var(Y)$ denotes the covariance matrix. For the $\mathcal{L}_2$ norm write $\| \cdot \| = \| \cdot \|_2$. Throughout the text, $c_p$ denotes a constant that depends only on $p$ and $c$ denotes a universal constant. These might take different values in different lines, unless otherwise specified. Then, $x^+ = \max(x, 0)$ and $x^- = -\min(x, 0)$. For two positive sequences $a_n$ and $b_n$, if $a_n/b_n \to 0$ (resp. $a_n/b_n \to \infty$), write $a_n \ll b_n$ (resp. $a_n \gg b_n$). Write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ if $a_n \leq cb_n$, for some $c < \infty$. The $d$-variate normal distribution with mean $\mu$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma$ is denoted by $N(\mu, \Sigma)$. Denote by $I_d$ the $d \times d$ identity matrix. For a matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, we define its Frobenius norm as $|A| = \left( \sum a_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2}$. For a positive semi-definite matrix $A$ with spectral decomposition $A = QDQ^T$, where $Q$ is orthonormal and $D = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d)$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \ldots \geq \lambda_d$, write the Grammian square root as $A^{1/2} = QD^{1/2}Q^T$, where $\rho_*(A) = \lambda_d$ and $\rho^*(A) = \lambda_1$. 
2. Main Results  We first introduce the uniform functional dependence measure on the underlying process using the idea of coupling. Let $\epsilon'_i, \epsilon_j$, for $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, be i.i.d. random variables. Assume $X_i \in L_p, p > 0$. For $j \geq 0, 0 < r \leq p$, define the functional dependence measure

$$\delta_{j,r} = \sup_i \| X_i - X_{i,(i-j)} \|^r = \sup_i \| H_i(\mathcal{F}_i) - H_i(\mathcal{F}_{i,(i-j)}) \|^r, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{i,(k)}$ is the coupled version of $\mathcal{F}_i$, with $\epsilon_k$ in $\mathcal{F}_i$ replaced by an i.i.d. copy $\epsilon'_k$, $\mathcal{F}_{i,(k)} = (\epsilon_i, \epsilon_{i-1}, \ldots, \epsilon'_k, \epsilon_{k-1}, \ldots)$ and $X_{i,(i-j)} = H_i(\mathcal{F}_{i,(i-j)})$.

In addition, $\mathcal{F}_{i,(k)} = \mathcal{F}_i$ if $k > i$. Note that, $\| H_i(\mathcal{F}_i) - H_i(\mathcal{F}_{i,(i-j)}) \|^r$ measures the dependence of $X_i$ on $\epsilon_{i-j}$. Because the physical mechanism function $H_i$ may differ for a nonstationary process, we choose to define the functional dependence measure in a uniform manner. The quantity $\delta_{j,r}$ measures the uniform $j$-lag dependence in terms of the $r$th moment. Assume throughout that

$$\Theta_{0,p} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta_{i,p} < \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

This condition implies short-range dependence in the sense that the cumulative dependence of $(X_j)_{j \geq k}$ on $\epsilon_k$ is finite. For clarity of presentation, in this paper we assume there exists $\chi > 0, A > 0$ such that the tail cumulative dependence measure

$$\Theta_{i,p} = \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \delta_{j,p} = O \left( i^{-\chi} (\log i)^{-A} \right). \quad (2.3)$$
Larger $\chi$ or $A$ implies weaker dependence. Our Gaussian approximation rate $\tau_n$ (cf., Theorems 2.1 and 2.2) depends on $\chi$ and $A$. Define functions $f_j(\cdot, \cdot)$ as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
    f_1 &= f_1(p, \chi) = p^2 \chi^2 + p^2 \chi, \\
    f_2 &= 2p \chi^2 + 3p \chi - 2 \chi, \\
    f_3 &= p^3(1 + \chi)^2 + 6f_1 + 4p \chi - 2, \\
    f_4 &= 2p(2p \chi^2 + 3p \chi + p - 2), \\
    f_5 &= p^2(p^2 + 4p - 12) \chi^2 + 2p(p^3 + p^2 - 4p - 4) \chi + (p^2 - p - 2)^2.
\end{align*}
\]

Assume that the process in (1.3) satisfies the uniform integrability and regularity conditions on the covariance structure:

(2.A) The series $(|X_i|^p)_{i \geq 1}$ is uniformly integrable: $\sup_{i \geq 1} E(|X_i|^p 1_{|X_i| \geq u}) \to 0$ as $u \to \infty$;

(2.B) (Lower bound on eigenvalues of covariance matrices of increment processes)

There exists $\lambda_* > 0$ and $l_* \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all $t \geq 1, l \geq l_*$,

\[\rho_*(Var(S_{t+l} - S_t)) \geq \lambda_* l.\]

The uniform integrability assumption is necessary owing to the nonstationarity of the process. The latter is frequently imposed in study of multiple time series.

**THEOREM 2.1.** Assume $E(X_i) = 0$, (2.A)—(2.B), and (2.3) holds with

\[
0 < \chi < \chi_0 = \frac{p^2 - 4 + (p - 2)\sqrt{p^2 + 20p + 4}}{8p},
\]

\[
A > \frac{(2p + p^2)\chi + p^2 + 3p + 2 + f_1^{1/2}}{p(1 + p + 2\chi)}.
\]
Then, (1.4) holds with the approximation bound \( \tau_n = n^{1/r} \), where

\[
\frac{1}{r} = \frac{f_1 + p^2 \chi + p^2 - 2p + f_2 - \chi \sqrt{(p - 2)(f_3 - 3p)}}{f_4}.
\]

(2.7)

Theorem 2.2. Assume \( E(X_i) = 0 \), (2.A)—(2.B), and (2.3) hold. Recall (2.5) for \( \chi_0 \): (i) if \( \chi > \chi_0 \) and \( A > 0 \), we can achieve (1.4) with \( \tau_n = n^{1/p} \) for all \( p > 2 \); for \( \chi = \chi_0 \), assume that \( A \) satisfies (2.6); (ii) if \( 2 < p < 4 \), we have \( \tau_n = n^{1/p} \); (iii) if \( p \geq 4 \), we have \( \tau_n = n^{1/p \log n} \).

Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 concern the two cases \( \chi < \chi_0 \) and \( \chi \geq \chi_0 \), respectively, and they are proved in sections 4 and 5 respectively. The proof of Theorem 2.2 requires a more refined treatment so that the optimal rate can be derived. For Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2(i) and (iii), we apply Götze and Zaitsev (2008, [10]); see Proposition 6.3. For Theorem 2.2(ii), Proposition 1 from Einmahl (1987, [6]) is applied. The expression of \( r \) is complicated. Figure 1 plots the power max\((1/r, 1/p)\). As \( \chi \to 0 \), \( r \to 2 \) and \( r = p \) if \( \chi > \chi_0 \).

Remark 2.3. The lower bound of \( A \) for the case \( \chi = \chi_0 \) can be further simplified to

\[
A > \frac{p^2 + 8p + 4 + (p - 2)\sqrt{p^2 + 20p + 4}}{6p}.
\]

3. Applications
3.1. Vector linear processes: Assume that $X_i$ is a vector linear process

$$X_i = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B_j \epsilon_{i-j}, \quad \text{(3.1)}$$

where $B_j$ is $d \times d$ coefficient matrix, and $\epsilon_i = (\epsilon_{i1}, \ldots, \epsilon_{id})^T$. Here $\epsilon_i$ is an i.i.d. random variable with mean zero and a finite $q$th moment, for some $q > 2$. Assume

$$\sum_{j=t}^{\infty} |B_j| = O(t^{-\chi} (\log t)^{-A}), \quad \text{(3.2)}$$

where $A$ satisfies (2.6), with $p$ therein replaced by $q$. The model in (3.1) covers a large class of popular multiple timeseries models including the vector AR, vector MA and vector ARMA models. under mild conditions on the coefficient matrices. Specifically,
for a zero-mean vector ARMA process with lags $a$ and $b$

$$X_i - \Psi_1 X_{i-1} - \ldots - \Psi_a X_{i-a} = \epsilon_i + \Phi_1 \epsilon_{i-1} + \ldots + \Phi_b \epsilon_{i-b}, \quad (3.3)$$

the stability condition (see [16] for a definition) ensures a pure vector MA representation (3.1). The stationarity of the $X_i$ process and the finite $q$th moment ensure condition (2.A), with $p$ replaced by $q$. Write $\Psi_* = I - \Psi_1 - \ldots - \Psi_a$, $\Phi_* = I + \Phi_1 + \ldots + \Phi_b$. Assume $\Psi_*$, $\Phi_*$, and $\Sigma_e = E(e_1 e_1^T)$ are nonsingular. Elementary calculation shows that, as $l \to \infty$,

$$\text{Var}(S_l/\sqrt{l}) \to \Psi_*^{-1} \Phi_* \Sigma_e \Phi_*^T \Psi_*^{-T},$$

which is also non-singular. Thus condition (2.B) holds. Note that $\|X_i - X_{i,(i-j)}\|_q = O(|B_j|)$. Therefore, condition (2.3) is satisfied for the $X_i$ process, from assumption (3.2). Thus, under a suitable moment assumption, we can apply Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 to generalize the central limit theory-type results to a stronger invariance principle.

Next, we discuss the covariance process for $X_i$ that admits a representation as (3.1). Assume $q > 4$. Let the $d(d + 1)/2$-dimensional vector $W_i = (X_{ir} X_{is})_{1 \leq r \leq s \leq d}$. Then, $\bar{W}_n := \sum_{i=1}^n W_i/n$ gives sample covariances of $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$. Write $p = q/2$. Fix two
coordinates \(1 \leq r \leq s \leq d\). Then,

\[
\|X_{ir}X_{is} - X_{i,(i-j)r}X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_p \\
\leq \|X_{ir}X_{is} - X_{ir}X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_p + \|X_{ir}X_{i,(i-j)s} - X_{i,(i-j)r}X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_p \\
\leq \|X_{ir}\|_q \|X_{is} - X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_q + \|X_{ir} - X_{i,(i-j)r}\|_q \|X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_q \\
= O(|B_j|),
\]

because \(\epsilon_i\) has a finite \(q\)th moment. Thus, condition (3.2) translates to condition (2.3) for the \(W\) process with \(p = q/2\). Condition (2.A) is trivially satisfied because the process \(W_i\) is stationary and has a finite \(p\)th moment. Let \(\Sigma_W = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \text{Cov}(W_0, W_k)\) be the long-run covariance matrix of \((W_i)\). We assume the minimum eigenvalue of \(\Sigma_W\) is positive. This ensures that condition (2.B) holds. By Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, we have

\[
\max_{i \leq n} |i\bar{W}_i - iE(W_1) - \Sigma_W^{1/2}IB(i)| = o_P(\tau_n), \quad (3.4)
\]

where \(\tau_n\) takes the values \(n^{1/r}\) (see (2.7)), and \(n^{1/p}\), based on \(\chi < \chi_0\) and \(\chi > \chi_0\), respectively and \(IB\) is a centered standard Brownian motion. Result (3.4) is helpful for change point inferences for multiple time series based on covariances; see [1, 23], among others.

3.2. Nonlinear nonstationary time series: Consider the process

\[
X_i = F(X_{i-1}, \epsilon_i, \theta(i/n)), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n,
\]
where $\epsilon_i$ is an i.i.d. random variable, $F$ is a measurable function, $\theta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a parametric function such that $\max_{0 \leq u \leq 1} \|F(x_0, \epsilon, \theta(u))\|_p < \infty$, and

$$
\sup_{0 \leq u \leq 1} \sup_{x \neq x'} \frac{\|F(x, \epsilon, \theta(u)) - F(x', \epsilon, \theta(u))\|_p}{|x - x'|} < 1. \tag{3.5}
$$

Then, the process $X_i$ satisfies the following geometric moment contraction: for some $0 < \beta < 1$,

$$
\delta_{i,p} = O(\beta^i). \tag{3.6}
$$

Thus, (2.3) holds for any $\chi > 0$, and Theorem 2.2 is applicable with rate $\tau_n = n^{1/p}$.

This facilitates an inference for the unknown parametric function $\theta$. Time-varying analogues of ARCH-, GARCH-, AR-, ARMA-type models are prominent examples in this large class of nonstationary models. We discuss the following example of a threshold AR(1) model (see Tong (1990, [22])) with time-varying coefficients:

$$
Y_i = \theta_1(i/n)Y_{i-1}^+ + \theta_2(i/n)Y_{i-1}^- + \epsilon_i, \tag{3.7}
$$

where $\epsilon_i$ is an i.i.d. mean-zero innovation. Assuming $\theta(\cdot) = (\theta_1(\cdot), \theta_2(\cdot))^T$ is continuous, we can estimate $\theta(t)$, for $t \in [0, 1]$, by

$$
(\hat{\theta}_1(t), \hat{\theta}_2(t))^T = \arg \min_{\eta_1, \eta_2} \sum_{i=2}^{n} (Y_i - \eta_1 Y_{i-1}^+ - \eta_2 Y_{i-1}^-)^2 K \left( \frac{i/n - t}{b_n} \right), \tag{3.8}
$$
where $K$ is a symmetric kernel with bounded variation and compact support, and $b_n$ is an appropriately chosen bandwidth. For such an estimation choice one has

$$
\sqrt{nb_n} M(t)(\hat{\theta}(t) - \theta(t)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nb_n}} \sum_{i=2}^{n} v_i v_i^T \left( \theta \left( \frac{i}{n} \right) - \theta(t) \right) K \left( \frac{i/n - t}{b_n} \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{nb_n}} \sum_{i=2}^{n} v_i e_i K \left( \frac{i/n - t}{b_n} \right),
$$

(3.9)

where $v_i = (Y_{i-1}^+, Y_{i-1}^-)^T$ and $M(t) = (nb_n)^{-1} \sum_{i=2}^{n} v_i v_i^T K((i/n - t)/b_n)$. Assuming some mild conditions on the innovation process $e_i$ and the time-varying functions $\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$, we can construct a simultaneous confidence interval for $\theta$ from (3.9). Assume for some $p > 2, ||e_1||_p < \infty$, $e_1$ has a density with support $(-\infty, \infty)$, and

$$
s = \sup_t (||\theta_1(t)|| + ||\theta_2(t)||) < 1.
$$

(3.10)

We verify the conditions of Theorem 2.2 using the bivariate process $X_i = v_i e_i$. To prove (2.A), it suffices to show uniform integrability for $(|Y_i|^p)_{i \geq 1}$ for the model (3.7). It easily follows because $e_i$ is an i.i.d. innovation process with a finite $p$th moment, and

$$
|Y_i| \leq |e_i| + s|Y_{i-1}| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} s^j |e_{i-j}|.
$$

Thus, (2.A) holds. As a result of the independence of $e_i$, and because $x^+ x^- = 0$,

$$
Var(S_{t+l} - S_t) = \sum_{i=t+1}^{t+l} Var(v_i e_i) = \sum_{i=t+1}^{t+l} \text{diag}(E((Y_{i-1}^+)^2)E(e_i^2), E((Y_{i-1}^-)^2)E(e_i^2)).
$$
With $D_i = \theta_1(i/n)Y_{i-1}^+ + \theta_2(i/n)Y_{i-1}^-$ and $c_0 = 2 \sup_i \|Y_i\|_2$, 

$$E((Y_{i-1}^+)^2) = E(((e_{i-1} + D_{i-2})^+)^2) \geq E(((e_{i-1} + D_{i-2})^+)^2 I(|D_{i-2}| \leq c_0))$$

$$\geq E(((e_{i-1} - c_0)^+)^2) P(|D_{i-2}| \leq c_0)$$

$$\geq c_1 (1 - 2 \sup_i \|Y_i\|_2^2 / c_0^2), \quad (3.11)$$

where $c_1$ is a constant that does not depend on $i$. We have a similar calculation for $E((Y_{i-1}^-)^2)$, and thus, (2.B) is satisfied. Under assumption (3.10), because $X_i$ satisfies the geometric moment contraction property (3.5), (2.3) holds for any $\chi > 0$.

For the second term in (3.9), we apply the Gaussian approximation from Theorem 2.2 with rate $\tau_n = n^{1/p}$. Using summation-by-parts, the negligibility criterion for the term with the approximation rate requires

$$n^{1/p} / \sqrt{nb_n} \to 0, \quad (3.12)$$

assuming bounded variation of $K$ (cf., Zhao and Wu (2007,[30])). Now, assume $\theta_1(\cdot)$ and $\theta_2(\cdot)$ are Hölder-$\alpha$ continuous for some $\alpha < 1/2$. For the negligibility of the first term in (3.9) portraying we need $\sqrt{nb_n} b_n^\alpha \to 0$. This, along with (3.12) and $\alpha < 1/2$, requires $p > 4$. This portrays one scenario among many that demands a sharper Gaussian approximation than $n^{1/4}$. One such is obtained in Theorem 2.2.

In the regime of curve estimation, our result provides a strong tool by relaxing the smoothness assumption on the coefficient curves/functions. This example shows how
to overcome the unavailability of a Taylor series expansion using the minimal Hölder-continuity property and a sharper Gaussian approximation.

4. Key ideas of the proof of Theorem 2.1  The proof of Theorem 2.1 is quite involved. Here, we provide a brief outline of the major components of the proof. In particular, we emphasize the difficulties that arise as a result of the nonstationarity and the vector-valued process, as well as the techniques we use to circumvent these problems. Because these techniques allow us to solve this problem in such a general manner, we believe it might be of interest to the reader to at least have an overview of the major steps. A detailed proof is provided in the online Supplementary Material.

The first part of our proof consists of a series of approximations to create almost independent blocks. The first of them, the truncation approximation, ensures the optimal $n^{1/p}$ bound. This step differs from the treatment of [2] because of the choice of the truncation level; we included the term $t_n$, exploiting the uniform integrability assumption. This is necessary because of the nonstationarity. Second, we use the $m$-dependence approximation for a suitably chosen sequence $m_n$ in terms of the decay rate $\chi$. This generalizes the treatment in [2] because it also allows for processes where dependence decays slowly. Lastly, the blocking approximation requires some sharp Rosenthal-type inequality that needs a $\gamma$th moment of the block-sums in the numerator with $\gamma > p$. It is essential to use a power higher than $p$ to obtain a better
rate. This step needs a $k$-dic decomposition, where $k$ is possibly greater than or equal to three, to allow for nonstationarity.

To maintain clarity, we defer the exact choice of $\gamma$ and $m_n$ in terms of $\chi$ and $A$ to subsection 4.4. Instead, in this subsection, we derive conditions (4.3) (see (6.9), (6.12), and (6.13) in the online supplement A) to ensure an $n^{1/r}$ rate and to solve $\gamma, m_n, \text{and } r$ later to obtain the best possible choices for this sequence. Henceforth, we drop the suffix of $m_n$ for convenience.

4.1. Outline of preparation step: The importance of the preparation step is two-fold. It creates a platform for the conditional Gaussian approximation and regrouping by creating almost independent blocks. Moreover, these steps allow us to build a system of equations to solve for the approximation rate $\tau_n = n^{1/r}$ as a function of the decay rate $\chi$ in (2.3). These equations are key in our generic approach deriving the optimal rate for slowly decaying dependence, and show how it possibly affects (see Figure 1) the optimal Gaussian approximation rate.

For the truncating approximation, we exploit the uniform integrability to introduce a sequence $t_n \to 0$ very slowly, such as

$$t_n \log \log n \to \infty,$$

and use it at the truncation level $t_n n^{1/p}$. The truncation is defined through the operator
\[ T_b(v) = (T_b(v_1), \ldots, T_b(v_d))^\top, \text{ where } T_b(w) = \min(\max(w, -b), b). \]

For the \( m \)-dependence approximation step and the blocking approximation, assume

\[
m = \lfloor n^L t_n^k \rfloor, \quad 0 < k < (\gamma - p)/(\gamma/2 - 1), \quad 0 < L < 1, \tag{4.2}
\]

\[ n^{1/2-1/r} \Theta_{m,r} \rightarrow 0, \quad n^{1-\gamma/r} m^{\gamma/2-1} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad n^{1/p-1/\gamma} \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \delta_{j,p}^{p/\gamma} \rightarrow 0, \tag{4.3}
\]

where the first term in (4.3) is required for the \( m \)-dependence step, and the other two are for the blocking approximation. After these approximations, we have a partial sum process \( S_n^\circ \), with the following summarized definition:

\[
S_i^\circ = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} A_j \quad \text{with} \quad A_j = \sum_{i=(2jk_0-2k_0)m+1}^{2k_0jm} \tilde{X}_i,
\]

where \( \tilde{X}_j = E(T_{l_n^{1/p}}(X_j)|\epsilon_j, \ldots, \epsilon_{j-m}) - E(T_{l_n^{1/p}}(X_j)) \),

and \( k_0 = \lfloor \Theta_{0,2}/\lambda_\ast \rfloor + 2, q_i = \lfloor i/(2k_0m) \rfloor \). For this truncated, \( m \)-dependent and blocked process \( S_n^\circ \), we have the approximation

\[
\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i - S_i^\circ| = o_P(n^{1/r}).
\]

See section 6.1 in the online Supplementary Material. Next, in subsections 4.2 and 4.3, we discuss how to obtain a Gaussian approximation for \( S_n^\circ \).
4.2. *Outline of conditional Gaussian approximation:* The blocks created in the preparation steps are not independent because two successive blocks share some $\epsilon_i$ in their shared border. In this second stage, we consider the partial sum process conditioned on these borderline $\epsilon_i$, which implies conditional independence. Berkes, Liu, and Wu (2014, [2]) performed a similar treatment with a triadic decomposition for stationary scalar processes, and applied Sakhanenko’s (2006, [21]) Gaussian approximation result to the conditioned process.

Because the result of Sakhanenko (2006, [21]) is only valid for $d = 1$, we need to use the Gaussian approximation result from Götze and Zaitsev (2008, [10]) (see Proposition 6.3) for $d \geq 2$. This incurs a cost of verifying a very technical sufficient condition on the covariance matrices of the independent vectors. This verification is particularly complicated in our case because we are dealing with a conditional process. We opt for a $k$-dic decomposition instead of the triadic decomposition in [2]. This is necessary to accommodate the nonstationarity of the process. We need $k_0 > \Theta_{0.2}^2/\lambda_*$ (cf., (6.11)), where $\lambda_*$ is mentioned in Condition 2.B.

4.3. *Outline of regrouping and unconditional Gaussian approximation:* In the last part of our proof, we obtain the Gaussian approximation for the unconditional process by applying Proposition 6.3 one more time. In the second part of our proof, we consider the conditional variance (cf., $V_j(a_{2k_0j}, a_{2k_0j+2k_0}) = Var(Y_j(a_{2k_0j}, a_{2k_0j+2k_0}))$ in
(6.20) of subsection 6.2) of the blocks. These conditional variances are one-dependent. In order to apply Götze and Zaitsev’s (2008, [10]) result, we rearrange the sums of these variances into sums of independent blocks (cf., 6.22 in subsection 6.2). Owing to the nonstationarity, this regrouping is different and more complex than that of Berkes, Liu, and Wu (2014, [2]). In particular, the regrouping procedure leads to matrices that may not be positive-definite and, hence, cannot be used directly as possible covariance matrices of Gaussian processes. We overcome this obstacle by introducing a novel positive-definitization that does not affect the optimal rate.

4.4. Conclusion of the proof: This subsection discusses the choice of the sequence $m, \gamma$, and the rate $\tau_n = n^{1/r}$, starting from the conditions in (4.3) (see equations (6.9), (6.12), and (6.13) in the detailed version of the proof). Elementary calculations show that $r < p$ for $\chi < \chi_0$. Provided $1 - (\chi + 1)p/\gamma < 0$, we have

$$\sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \delta_{j,p}^{p/\gamma} \leq \sum_{i=[\log_2 m]}^{\infty} \sum_{j=2^i}^{2i+1-1} \delta_{j,p}^{p/\gamma} \leq \sum_{i=[\log_2 m]}^{\infty} 2^{i(1-p/\gamma)} \Theta_{2^i,p}^{p/\gamma} \leq \sum_{i=[\log_2 m]}^{\infty} 2^{i(1-p/\gamma)} O(2^{-\chi p/\gamma} (\log m)^{-A p/\gamma}) = O(m^{1-p/\gamma} (\log m)^{-A p/\gamma}).$$

By (4.1) and (6.15), $\log m \approx \log n$. Assume that

$$1/2 - 1/r - \chi L = 0, \quad A > \gamma/p, \quad (4.5)$$

$$1 - \gamma/r + L(\gamma/2 - 1) = 0, \quad 0 < k < (\gamma/2 - 1)^{-1}(\gamma - p) \quad (4.6)$$

$$1/p - 1/\gamma + (1 - (\chi + 1)p/\gamma)L = 0. \quad (4.7)$$
Then, the conditions in (4.3) hold. Solving the equations in (4.5), (4.6), and (4.7), we obtain $r$ in (2.7), as follows:

$$\gamma = \frac{(2p + p^2)\chi + p^2 + 3p + 2 + f_5^{1/2}}{2 + 2p + 4\chi},$$

$$L = \frac{f_1 - f_2 + \chi \sqrt{(p - 2)(f_3 - 3p)}}{\chi f_4},$$

with $f_1, \ldots, f_5$ given in (2.4). Moreover, we specifically choose $A > 2\gamma/p$ for a crucial step in the proof of our Gaussian approximation; see (6.40).

**Remark 4.1.** Figure 2 depicts how $\gamma$ and $L$ change with $p$ and $\chi$ for $\chi < \chi_0$. Note that $L$, the power of $n$ in the expression of $m$, is close to one if $\chi$ is small. This makes intuitive sense, because if the dependence decays very slowly, to make blocks of size $m$ (or a multiple of $m$) behave almost independently, we need a larger $L$.

5. Proof of Theorem 2.2

**Proof.** Case 1 ($\chi > \chi_0$): Note that the optimal power $\gamma$ and the optimal bound $1/r$ increase and decrease with $\chi$, respectively (see also Figures 1 and 2). This is a motivation behind tweaking our proof for the verification of (6.24) to handle the $(\log n)$ term in the choice of $l$ in (6.26). When using the Nagaev inequality to show (6.43), we use a power $\gamma' > \gamma$, while keeping the choice of $l$ (cf., 6.26) the same as
before. We form a set of new equations:

\[
\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{r'} + L'(1 - (\chi + 1)p/r') = 0, \quad (5.1)
\]

\[
\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{\gamma'} + L' - L'(\chi + 1)p/\gamma' = 0,
\]

\[
1 - \frac{\gamma' / r'}{r'} + L'(\gamma' / 2 - 1) = 0.
\]

The intuition behind the first of these equations is to use a higher power than \( p \) in the \( m \)-dependence approximation. However, we have only defined moments up to \( p \). Therefore, we use Lemma 7.2 to obtain a new equation corresponding to the \( m \)-dependence approximation using a power \( r' \) that is little higher than \( p \). The solution
of (5.1) has the property
\[ \gamma' < 2(1 + p + p\chi)/3, \] (5.2)
for \( \chi > \chi_0 \). In addition, \( L' < L(\chi_0) \) (cf., Figure 2) and, hence, \( m^{1-\gamma'/2} \ll m'^{1-\gamma'/2} \), where \( m' \) is taken as \( n^{l'k} \), following (6.15). We apply Nagaev-type inequality from Liu, Xiao, and Wu (2013, [15]) to obtain
\[ P(\|S_m\| \geq \sqrt{lm}) \lesssim \frac{m}{(lm)^{\gamma'/2}} Nu^{\gamma'/2} + \sum_{r=1}^{R} \exp \left( -c_{\gamma'}/(\tilde{\Theta}_{m+1.\gamma'}^{\gamma'}) (lm)^{\gamma'/2} \right) \] (5.3)
\[ + \frac{ m \sup_{i} \|T_{tn^{1/p}}(X_i)\|_{\gamma'}^{\gamma'}}{(lm)^{\gamma'/2}} + \exp \left( -\frac{c_{\gamma'}l}{\sup_{i} \|T_{tn^{1/p}}(X_i)\|_{2}^{2}} \right), \]
where \( \nu_R = \sum_{r=1}^{R} \mu_r, \mu_r = (\tau_r^{\gamma'/2-1}\tilde{\Theta}_{r,\gamma'}^{\gamma'})^{1/(\gamma'+1)}, \lambda_r = \mu_r/\nu_R, \) and \( \tilde{\Theta}_{r,t} = \sum_{i=1+\tau_{r-1}}^{\tau_r} \tilde{\delta}_{i,t}, \) for some sequence \( 0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \ldots < \tau_R = m. \) For the choice \( \tau_r = 2^{r-1} \) for \( 1 \leq r \leq R - 1 = \lfloor \log_2 m \rfloor, \) we obtain \( \nu_R^{\gamma'/2+1} = O(n^{\gamma'/p-1}t^{1-p}_n) \) using (5.2), or (6.4) under the decay condition on \( \Theta_{i,p} \) in (2.3). The third term and the exponential terms are straightforward to deal with. The fourth term is handled similarly to (7.4). Combining these as in our new set of equations in (5.1), we get \( P(\|S_m\| \geq \sqrt{lm}) = o(m/n), \) which is sufficient to conclude the proof, as proposed in (6.43).

The positive-definitization technique introduced in (6.31) is validated in Proposition 6.9. This step requires \( \gamma > 4\chi \) for \( \chi > \max(1/2, \chi_0) \). We observe that \( \gamma' - 4\chi = 0 \) has a root \( \chi_1 > \chi_0 \). This allows us to replace \( \chi \) in the decay condition of \( \Theta_{i,p} \) with \( \min(\chi, \chi_1) \), and thus completes the proof. The arguments for the rest of the proof of
Theorem 2.1 remain valid.

Case 2 ($\chi = \chi_0, 2 < p < 4$): We apply Proposition 1 from Einmahl (1987, [6]). He proved a Gaussian approximation result for independent, but not necessarily identical vectors with a diagonal covariance matrix. The two remarks following the proposition mention that the diagonal nature of every covariance matrix can be relaxed if these matrices have bounded eigenvalues. A careful check of his proof reveals that it can be further relaxed to the assumption of bounded eigenvalues of the covariance matrix of a normalized block sum only. This allows us to replace $l$ (see (6.26)) in the conclusion of Proposition 6.3 with $l'$ without the logarithm term $(\log n)$ in the denominator and without the condition (6.25). Thus, we obtain a rate of $o_P(n^{1/p})$ for all $2 < p < 4$.

Case 3 ($\chi = \chi_0, p \geq 4$): In this case, we do not have a similar optimal Gaussian approximation result for independent, but not identically distributed random vectors. Instead we apply Proposition 6.3 again. The sufficient conditions in that result lead to an unavoidable $(\log n)$ term in the choice of $l$ (see 6.26). This, in turn, leads to a rate of $o_P(n^{1/p} \log n)$. Note that $\chi_0 > 1/2 - 1/p$ for all $p > 2$. From the proof of the case $0 < \chi < \chi_0$, consider (6.45). Then, observe that if $\chi = \chi_0$,

$$\frac{n}{m} P(|\tilde{S}_m| \geq \sqrt{lm}) = O((\log n) p t_n^{k(p/\gamma - p/2)}),$$

which may diverge to $\infty$. To deal with this difficulty in this special case, we choose
a different $m$ sequence. Our new set of conditions with $\tau_n = n^{1/p}(\log n)^{\delta}$ are

\begin{align*}
n^{1/2-1/p}m^{-\gamma}(\log n)^{-A-\delta} & \to 0, \\
n^{1/p-1/\gamma}m^{1-(x+1)p/\gamma}(\log n)^{-A_p/\gamma} & \to 0, \\
n^{1-\gamma/p}(\log n)^{-\gamma \delta}m^{\gamma/2-1} & \to 0, \\
(\log n)^{\gamma}m^{1-\gamma/2n^{\gamma/p-1}t_n^{\gamma-p}} & \to 0,
\end{align*}

where the last is obtained using $\gamma$th moment in (5.3). Let $m = \lfloor n^L(log n)^{2/(\gamma - 2)k_k} \rfloor$, with $0 < k < (\gamma/2 - 1)^{-1}(\gamma - p)$. Then, we can achieve $\delta = 1$. We still have the same set of equations for $L, \gamma,$ and $r$ shown in (4.5), (4.6), and (4.7), respectively. A careful check reveals that the rest of the proof follows with this modified $m$ sequence.

\section*{Supplementary Material}

The online Supplementary Material contains detailed proofs of Theorem 2.1 (section 6) and some useful lemmas (section 7).
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6. Detailed Steps of the Proof of Theorem 2.1

6.1. Preparation stage: The preparation stage consists of truncation approximation, $m$-dependence approximation and blocking approximation.

6.1.1. Truncation approximation: Truncation approximation is necessary to allow higher moments manipulations. For $b > 0$ and $v = (v_1, \ldots, v_d)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define

$$T_b(v) = (T_b(v_1), \ldots, T_b(v_d))^T,$$ where $T_b(w) = \min(\max(w, -b), b).$ \hfill (6.1)

Proposition 6.1. Assume Condition (2.A). It is possible to choose a sequence $t_n \to 0$ slow enough such that we have

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i - S_i^{\oplus}| = O_p(n^{1/p}),$$ where $S_i^{\oplus} = \sum_{i=1}^l \left[ T_{t_{n^{1/p}}}(X_i) - ET_{t_{n^{1/p}}}(X_i) \right].$ \hfill (6.2)

Proof. of Proposition 6.1. We introduce a very slowly converging sequence $t_n \to 0$ based on the uniform integrability condition (2.A). For every $t > 0$, we have

$$\sup_i \frac{1}{t^p} E(|X_i|^p 1_{|X_i| > t_{n^{1/p}}}) = 0$$ and $n \sup_i E \min\left( \frac{|X_i|^\gamma}{t^{\gamma n^{1/p}}} \right) \to 0 as n \to \infty.$ \hfill (6.3)
where $\gamma > p$. The second relation follows from Lemma 7.1. Clearly (6.3) implies that
\[
\sup_i \frac{1}{t_n} E(|X_i|^p \mathbb{1}_{|X_i| > t_n^{1/p}}) + n \sup_i E\left(\frac{|X_i|^{\gamma}}{t_n^{\gamma/p}}\right) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{6.4}
\]
holds for a sequence $t_n \to 0$ very slowly. Without loss of generality we can let
\[
t_n \log \log n \to \infty \tag{6.5}
\]
since otherwise we can replace $t_n$ by $\max(t_n, (\log \log n)^{-1/2})$ (say). The truncation operator $T_b$ in (6.1) is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant 1. Let
\[
R_{c,l} = \sum_{i=1+c}^{l+c} X_i \equiv \sum_{i=1+c}^{l+c} [T_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_i) - ET_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_i)]. \tag{6.6}
\]
By (6.4), we have $P(\max_{i \leq n} |S_i - \sum_{j=1}^i T_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_j)| = 0) \to 1$ in view of
\[
\sup_j P\left(|X_j| > t_n^{1/p}\right) \leq \sup_j \frac{1}{nt_n^{1/p}} E\left(|X_j|^p I\left(|X_j| > t_n^{1/p}\right)\right) = o(1/n).
\]
Also by (6.4), $\max_{j \leq n} |E(X_j - T_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_j))| = o(n^{1/p-1})$. Hence (6.2) follows. \hfill $\Box$

6.1.2. $m$-dependence approximation: The $m$-dependence approximation is a very important tool that is extensively used in literature; see for example the Gaussian approximation in Liu and Lin (2009, [13]) and Berkes, Liu and Wu (2014, [2]). For a suitably chosen sequence $m$, we look at the conditional mean $E(X_i|\epsilon_i, \ldots, \epsilon_{i-m})$. This gives a very simple yet effective way to handle the original process in terms of a collection of $\epsilon_i$'s. Define the partial sum process
\[
\tilde{R}_{c,l} = \sum_{i=1+c}^{l+c} \tilde{X}_j, \text{ where } \tilde{X}_j = E\left(T_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_j)|\epsilon_j, \ldots, \epsilon_{j-m}\right) - E(T_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_j)). \tag{6.7}
\]
Write $\tilde{R}_{0,i} = \tilde{S}_i$. From Lemma A1 in Liu and Lin (2009, [13]), we have

$$\| \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i^{\otimes} - \tilde{S}_i| \|_r \leq c_r n^{1/2} \Theta_{1+m,r}. \quad (6.8)$$

The proofs in [13] are for stationary processes. Since our $\delta_{j,r}$ in (2.1) is defined in an uniform manner, the proof goes through for the non-stationary case as well. Assume

$$n^{1/2 - 1/r} \Theta_{m,r} \to 0. \quad (6.9)$$

By (6.8) and (6.9), we have $n^{1/r}$ convergence in the $m$-dependence approximation step

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i^{\otimes} - \tilde{S}_i| = o_P(n^{1/r}). \quad (6.10)$$

6.1.3. Blocking approximation: Towards the blocking approximation, we approximate the partial sum process $\tilde{S}_i$ by sums of $A_j$ where, for $j \geq 0$,

$$A_{j+1} = \sum_{i=2jk_0m+1}^{(2k_0j+2k_0)m} \tilde{X}_i, \text{ where } k_0 = \lfloor \Theta_{0,2}^2/\lambda_* \rfloor + 2. \quad (6.11)$$

To this end, we will need the following two conditions, for some $\gamma > p$,

$$n^{1-\gamma/r} m^{\gamma/2-1} \to 0, \quad (6.12)$$

$$n^{1/p - 1/\gamma} \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \delta_{j,p}^{p/\gamma} \to 0. \quad (6.13)$$
We now define functional dependence measure for the truncated process \((T_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_i))_{i \leq n}\) as
\[
\delta_{j,l}^\oplus = \sup_i \| T_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_i) - T_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_{i,(i-j)}) \|_l, \quad \text{where } l \geq 2.
\]

Similarly, define the functional dependence measure for the \(m\)-dependent process \((\tilde{X}_i)\) as
\[
\tilde{\delta}_{j,l} = \sup_i \| \tilde{X}_i - \tilde{X}_{i,(i-j)} \|_l.
\]

For these dependence measures, the following inequality holds for all \(l \geq 2\):
\[
\tilde{\delta}_{j,l} \leq \delta_{j,l}^\oplus \leq \delta_{j,l}.
\] (6.14)

We now proceed to proving Proposition 6.2, the blocking approximation result. As mentioned in the main text, we need to assume conditions (6.12) and (6.13) for this step. The almost-polynomial rate of \(m\) sequence as mentioned in (6.15) is also assumed.

Remark: We need another condition for the blocking approximation (see (7.2) in the proof of Lemma 7.3). However, we skip it here and choose \(m\) and \(\gamma\) such that conditions (6.9), (6.12) and (6.13) are met. These will automatically imply this fourth one in view of (2.3).

We assume an almost polynomial rate for \(m\) sequence: for some \(0 < L < 1\),
\[
m = [n^{Lk_n}], \quad 0 < k < (\gamma - p)/(\gamma/2 - 1).
\] (6.15)
Proposition 6.2. Assume (6.12) and (6.13) for some $\gamma > p$. Moreover, assume (6.15) for the $m$ sequence and (2.3) for the decay rate of $\Theta_{i,p}$ with some $A > \gamma / p$. Then

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\tilde{S}_i - S_i^\circ| = o_P(n^{1/r}), \text{ where } S_i^\circ = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} A_j, \; q_i = \lfloor i/(2k_0m) \rfloor.$$  

(6.16)

Proof. of Proposition 6.2: Let $\mathcal{S} = \{2ik_0m, 0 \leq i \leq q_n\}$, $\phi_n = (n^{1-\gamma / r} m^{\gamma / 2 - 1})^{1/(2r)}$. Then

$$P \left( \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\bar{R}_{0,l} - \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor l/(2k_0m) \rfloor} A_j| \geq \phi_n n^{1/r} \right) \leq \frac{n}{2k_0m} \max_{c \in \mathcal{S}} P( \max_{1 \leq l \leq 2k_0m} |\bar{R}_{c,l}| \geq \phi_n n^{1/r} )$$

$$\leq n \max_{c \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{E(\max_{1 \leq l \leq 2k_0m} |\bar{R}_{c,l}|^r)}{2k_0m \phi_n^{\gamma / r} n^{\gamma / r}} = O(\phi_n^r),$$

from the assumption (6.12) and Lemma 7.3. Since $\phi_n \to 0$, (6.16) follows. \(\square\)

Summarizing (6.2), (6.10) and (6.16), we can work on $S_i^\circ$ in view of

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i - S_i^\circ| = o_P(n^{1/r}).$$  

(6.17)

In the next two subsections we shall provide details of the arguments for steps mentioned in sections 4.2 and 4.3. section 6.2 presents the conditional Gaussian approximation, where we shall apply Proposition 6.3 stated in section 7. section 6.3 deals with unconditional Gaussian approximation and regrouping.
6.2. *Conditional Gaussian approximation*: The blocks $A_j$ created in (6.11) after the blocking approximation are weakly independent; except they share some dependence on the border. In this subsection, we look at the conditional process given the $\epsilon_i$ the blocks share in their borders. Demeaning the conditional process, we apply the Proposition 6.3 for the Gaussian approximation. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $\tilde{H}_i$ be a measurable function such that

$$
\tilde{X}_i = \tilde{H}_i(\epsilon_i, \ldots, \epsilon_{i-m}).
$$

(6.18)

Recall Proposition 6.2 for the definition of $q_i$. Let $q = q_n$. For $j = 1, \ldots, q$, define

$$
\bar{a}_{2k_0j} = \{a_{(2k_0j-1)m+1}, \ldots, a_{2k_0jm}\} \text{ and } a = \{\ldots, \bar{a}_{0}, \bar{a}_{2k_0}, \bar{a}_{4k_0}, \ldots\}.
$$

Given $a$, define, for $2k_0jm + 1 \leq i \leq (2k_0j + 1)m$,

$$
\tilde{X}_i(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) = \tilde{H}_i(\epsilon_i, \ldots, \epsilon_{2k_0jm+1}, a_{2k_0jm}, \ldots, a_{i-m})
$$

and for $(2k_0j + 2k_0 - 1)m + 1 \leq i \leq (2k_0j + 2k_0)m$,

$$
\tilde{X}_i(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) = \tilde{H}_i(a_i, \ldots, a_{(2k_0j+2k_0-1)m+1}, \epsilon_{(2k_0j+2k_0-1)m}, \ldots, \epsilon_{i-m}).
$$
Further, define the blocks as following,

\[
F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) = \sum_{i=2k_0jm+1}^{(2k_0j+1)m} \tilde{X}_i(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}), \quad (6.19)
\]

\[
F_{4j+2} = \sum_{i=(2k_0j+1)m+1}^{(2k_0j+k_0)m} \tilde{X}_i, \quad F_{4j+3} = \sum_{i=(2k_0j+k_0)m+1}^{(2k_0j+2k_0)m} \tilde{X}_i,
\]

\[
F_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) = \sum_{i=(2k_0j+2k_0-1)m+1}^{(2k_0j+2k_0)m} \tilde{X}_i(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}).
\]

Similarly, for \( j = 1, \ldots, q \), define

\[
\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j} = \{\epsilon(2k_0j-1)m+1, \ldots, \epsilon 2k_0jm\} \text{ and } \vartheta = \{\ldots, \bar{\vartheta}_0, \bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0}, \bar{\vartheta}_{4k_0}, \ldots\}.
\]

Recall \( A_j \) from (6.11). We have

\[
A_{j+1} = F_{4j+1}(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j}) + F_{4j+2} + F_{4j+3} + F_{4j+4}(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j+2k_0}).
\]

Define the mean functions

\[
\Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) = E^*(F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})) \text{ and } \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) = E^*(F_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0})),
\]

where \( E^* \) refers to the conditional moment given \( a \). In the sequel, with slight abuse of notation, we will simply use the usual \( E \) to denote moments of random variables conditioned on \( a \). Introduce the centered process

\[
Y_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) = F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) + F_{4j+2}
\]

\[
F_{4j+3} + F_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) - \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}). \quad (6.20)
\]
Following the definition of $S_n^\circ$, we let
\[ S_i(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{q_i-1} Y_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}). \]

The mean and variance function of $S_i(a)$ are respectively denoted by
\[ M_i(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{q_i-1} [\Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) + \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0})], \]
\[ Q_i(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{q_i-1} V_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}), \]
where $V_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0})$ is the dispersion matrix of $Y_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0})$. Define
\[ V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) = E(F_{4j-2}F_{4j-1}^T + F_{4j-1}F_{4j-2}^T) + Var(F_{4j-1} + F_{4j}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})) + Var(F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) + F_{4j+2}). \quad (6.21) \]
Note that, the following identity holds for all $t$:
\[ \sum_{j=0}^{t} V_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) = L(\bar{a}_0) + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) + U_t(\bar{a}_{2k_0t+2k_0}), \quad (6.22) \]
where $L(\bar{a}_0) = Var(F_1(\bar{a}_0) + F_2)$ and
\[ U_{t-1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0t}) = E(F_{4t-2}F_{4t-1}^T + F_{4t-1}F_{4t-2}^T) + Var(F_{4t-1} + F_{4t}(\bar{a}_{2k_0t}) - \Lambda_{4t}(\bar{a}_{2k_0t})). \quad (6.23) \]
Define
\[ L^a_{\gamma} = \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} E(|Y_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0})|^\gamma). \]
In the sequel, we suppress \( Y_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}), Y_j(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j}, \bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j+2k_0}), V_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}), V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}), V_j(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j}, \bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) \) and \( V_{j0}(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j}) \) as just \( Y_j^a, Y_j^\vartheta, V_j^a, V_j^\vartheta \) and \( V_{j0}^\vartheta \) respectively. We apply Proposition 6.3 to the independent mean zero random vectors \( Y_j^a \).

Proposition 6.3 concerns Gaussian approximation for independent vectors. There are several types of Gaussian approximations in literature for independent vectors. We find the following result by Götze and Zaitsev (2008, [10]) particularly useful since it provides an explicit and good approximation bound for the partial sums. This has been used several times in our proof.

**Proposition 6.3.** Let \( \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n \) be independent \( \mathbb{R}^d \)-valued mean zero random vectors. Assume that there exist \( s \in \mathbb{N} \) and a strictly increasing sequence of non-negative integers \( \eta_0 = 0 < \eta_1 < \ldots < \eta_s = n \) satisfying the following conditions.

Let

\[
\zeta_k = \xi_{\eta_k-1+1} + \ldots + \xi_{\eta_k}, \quad \text{Var}(\zeta_k) = B_k, \quad k = 1, \ldots, s
\]

and \( L_\gamma = \sum_{j=1}^n E(|\xi_j|^\gamma), \gamma \geq 2 \), and assume that, for all \( k = 1, \ldots, s, \)

\[
C_1w^2 \leq \rho_s(B_k) \leq \rho^*(B_k) \leq C_2w^2, \quad (6.24)
\]

where \( w = (L_\gamma)^{1/\gamma}/\log^* s \), with some positive constants \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \). Suppose the
quantities

\[ \lambda_{k,\gamma} = \sum_{j=\eta_{k-1}+1}^{\eta_k} E \| \xi_j \|^{\gamma}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, s, \]

satisfy, for some \( 0 < \epsilon < 1 \) and constant \( C_3 \),

\[ C_3 d^{r/2} s^s (\log^* s)^{\gamma+3} \max_{1 \leq k \leq s} \lambda_{k,\gamma} \leq L_\gamma. \tag{6.25} \]

Then one can construct on a probability space independent random vectors \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) and a corresponding set of independent Gaussian vectors \( Y_1, \ldots, Y_n \) so that \( (X_j)_{j=1}^n \overset{D}{=} (\xi_j)_{j=1}^n, \ E(Y_j) = 0, \ Var(Y_j) = Var(X_j), \ 1 \leq j \leq n, \) and for any \( z > 0, \)

\[ P \left( \max_{t \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^t X_i - \sum_{i=1}^t Y_i \right| \geq z \right) \leq C_* L_\gamma z^{-\gamma}. \]

where \( C_* \) is a constant that depends on \( d, \gamma, C_1, C_2 \) and \( C_3 \).

We need to find a suitable sequence \( \eta_k \) that allows us to get constants \( C_1, C_2 \) in (6.24) and \( C_3 \) in (6.25). There are roughly \( q = n/(2k_0 m) \) many \( Y_j^a \) random variables. Define

\[ l = \lfloor q^{2/\gamma} / \log^2 q \rfloor. \tag{6.26} \]

To apply Proposition 6.3, we choose the sequence \( \eta_k = kl \) and \( s \approx q/l \). This choice is justified by proving the following series of propositions.
Proposition 6.4. Recall $\lambda_*$ and $A_j$ from (2.5) and (6.11) respectively. There exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$2(\lambda_* + \delta)k_0m \leq \rho_* (\text{Var}(A_j)) \leq \rho^* (\text{Var}(A_j)) \leq \|A_j\|^2 \leq 2k_0m \Theta_{0.2}^2.$$ 

Proposition 6.5. We can get positive constants $c_1$ and $c_2$ such that for all $j$,

$$c_1m \leq \rho_* (\text{Var}(Y_j^{\theta})) \leq \rho^* (\text{Var}(Y_j^{\theta})) \leq E(|Y_j^{\theta}|^2) \leq c_2 m. \quad (6.27)$$

Proposition 6.6. For $l$ in (6.26), there exists constant $c_3$ such that,

$$P \left( \max_{1 \leq t \leq q/l} \left| \text{Var} \left( \sum_{j=(t-1)l}^{t-1} Y_j^a \right) - E \left( \text{Var} \left( \sum_{j=(t-1)l}^{t-1} Y_j^a \right) \right) \right| \geq c_3 lm \right) \to 0.$$ 

Proposition 6.7. We can get constants $c_4$ and $c_5$ such that

$$P(c_4q^{2/\gamma}m \leq (L_j^a)^{2/\gamma} \leq c_5q^{2/\gamma}m) \to 1.$$ 

Proposition 6.8. Choose $\eta_k = kl$ with $l$ being defined in (6.26). Then we can get $C_1$ and $C_2$ such that (6.24) is satisfied. Moreover, with $l$ in (6.26), we can get $C_3$ such that (6.25) holds.

Thus, we use Proposition 6.3 to construct $d$-variate mean zero normal random vectors $N_j^a$ and random vectors $E_j^a$ such that

$$E_j^a \overset{D}{=} Y_j^a \text{ and } \text{Var}(N_j^a) = \text{Var}(Y_j^a), \quad 0 \leq j \leq q - 1,$$
\[ P_a \left( \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\Pi_a^i - D_a^i| \geq c_0 z \right) \leq C \frac{L_a}{z^\gamma}, \quad \text{where} \quad \Pi_a^i = \sum_{j=0}^{q_i-1} E_a^j, \quad D_a^i = \sum_{j=0}^{q_i-1} N_a^j \] (6.28)

and \( C \) is a constant depending on \( \gamma, c_1, \ldots, c_5 \) and \( C_3 \). These constants are free of \( a \). We can create a set \( \mathcal{A} \) with \( P(\mathcal{A}) \to 1 \) so that \( a \in \mathcal{A} \) implies the statements in Proposition 6.7 and Proposition 6.6 hold. Putting \( z = n^{1/r} \) above in (6.28), by Lemma 7.3 and the restriction (4.6), we have, as \( n \to \infty \),

\[ E(L_a^\gamma n^{-\gamma/r}) \leq \frac{q}{n^{\gamma/r}} c_\gamma \max_e E(|\bar{R}_{c,2km}|^\gamma) = O(n^{1-\gamma/r}m^{\gamma/2-1}) \to 0, \] (6.29)

using

\[ E(|Y_j(\bar{\varphi}_{2koj}, \bar{\varphi}_{2koj+2ko})|^\gamma) \leq c_\gamma \max_e E(|\bar{R}_{c,2km}|^\gamma) = O(m^{\gamma/2}). \]

Hence, conditioning on whether \( a \) lies in \( \mathcal{A} \) or not, from (6.29) we obtain,

\[ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\Pi_a^i - D_a^i| = o_P(n^{1/r}). \] (6.30)

6.3. Unconditional Gaussian approximation and Regrouping: Here we shall work with the processes \( \Pi_a^i, \mu_a^i \) and \( D_a^i \). Note that, \( V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2koj}) \) defined in (6.21) is a function of \( \varphi \) and might not be positive definite in an uniform fashion. For a constant \( 0 < \delta_* < \lambda_* \), let

\[ V_{j1}(\bar{a}_{2koj}) = \begin{cases} V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2koj}) & \text{if } \rho_*(V_{j0}^\varphi) \geq \delta_* m, \\ (\delta_* m)I_d & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases} \] (6.31)
which is a positive-definitized version of $V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k0j})$. The following proposition shows that partial sums of $V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k0j})$ and $V_{j1}(\bar{a}_{2k0j})$ are close to each other.

**Proposition 6.9.** For some $\iota > 0$, we have

$$\max_{i \leq n} E \left( \left| \sum_{j=1}^{\max(1, q_i - 1)} (V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k0j}) - V_{j1}(\bar{a}_{2k0j})) \right| \right) = o_P(n^{2/\gamma - \iota}).$$

Henceforth in the sequel we will slightly abuse $\max(1, q_i - 1) = \max(1, \lfloor i/(2k0m) \rfloor) - 1$ and simply use $q_i - 1 = \lfloor i/(2k0m) \rfloor - 1$ for presentational clarity.

**Proof.** of Proposition 6.9. Recall (6.19) for the definition of $F_{4j+1}(.)$, $F_{4j+2}$ etc.

Define

$$F_{21} = \sum_{i=m+1}^{2m} \tilde{X}_i.$$

Define the projection operator $P_i$ by

$$P_i Y = E(Y|\mathcal{F}_i) - E(Y|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}), \quad Y \in \mathcal{L}_1.$$

For $1 \leq j \leq m$, $\|P_j F_{21}\| \leq \sum_{i=m+1-j}^{m} \delta_{i,2}$. Since $\|E(F_{21}^T|\mathcal{F}_m)\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \|P_j F_{21}\|^2$, we have

$$|E(F_1(\bar{a}_0)F_2^T)| = |E(F_1(\bar{a}_0)F_{21}^T)| = |E(F_1(\bar{a}_0)E(F_{21}^T|\mathcal{F}_m))|$$

$$\leq \|F_1(\bar{a}_0)\| \left( \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left( \sum_{i=m+1-j}^{m} \delta_{i,2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (6.32)$$

Under the decay condition on $\Theta_{i,p}$ in (2.3), we have

$$E(|E(F_1(\bar{a}_0)F_{21}^T)|^\gamma) = O(m^{\max(\gamma/2, \gamma-\chi)}).$$
We expand the last term of $V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})$ (see (6.21)). Also note that,

$$|E(F_{4j-2}F_{4j-1}^T) + E(F_{4j-1}F_{4j-2}^T)| \ll m$$

and $\rho_*(\text{Var}(F_{4j+2})) \geq (k_0 - 1)\lambda_* m$. 

Then Proposition 6.9 follows from the fact that our solution of $\gamma$ from (4.5), (4.6), and (4.7) satisfy $\gamma > \max(2, 4\chi)$ for $\chi \leq \chi_0$ and

$$n \max_j P \left( \rho_*(V_{j0}^n) < \delta_* m \right) \leq 2n \max_j P \left( |E(F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})F_{4j+2}^T)| \geq -\theta m/2 \right) = O(n^{2/r-\epsilon}),$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$ since we can choose $\delta_*$ such that $\theta = (k_0 - 1)\lambda_* - \delta_* > 0$. \hfill $\square$

Recall (6.23) for the definition of $U_j$. By Lemma 7.3 and Jensen’s inequality, we obtain $\max_j \|U_j(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j+2k_0})\|_{\gamma/2} = O(m^{1/2})$. By (4.6), $\phi_n := q^{1/\gamma} m^{1/2} n^{-1/r} \to 0$. Then

$$P \left( \max_{0 \leq j \leq q-1} |U_j(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j+2k_0})| \geq \phi_n n^{2/r} \right) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} P \left( |U_j(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j+2k_0})| \geq \phi_n n^{2/r} \right) = O(\phi_n^{-\gamma/2} n^{1-\gamma/r} m^{\gamma/2-1}) = O(\phi_n^{\gamma/2}) \to 0.$$

Similarly, $|L(\bar{\vartheta}_0)| = o_P(n^{2/r})$. Thus, by (6.22) and Proposition 6.9, since $\text{Var}(Y_j^a) = \text{Var}(N_j^a)$, one can construct i.i.d. $N(0, I_d)$ normal vectors $Z_i^a, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that

$$\max_{i \leq n} |D_i^\vartheta - \varsigma_i(\vartheta)| = o_P(n^{1/r}),$$

where $\varsigma_i(a) = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i-1} V_{j1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})^{1/2} Z_j^a$. By (6.30), we have

$$\max_{i \leq n} |\Pi_i^\vartheta - \varsigma_i(\vartheta)| = o_P(n^{1/r}).$$
Let $Z_{l}^{*}, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, independent of $(\epsilon_{j})_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$, be i.i.d. $N(0, I_{d})$ and define

$$ \Psi_{i} = \sum_{j=1}^{q_{i}-1} V_{j1}(\bar{\theta}_{2k_{0}j})^{1/2} Z_{j}^{*}. $$

From the distributional equality,

$$ (\Pi_{i}^{\vartheta} + M_{i}(\vartheta))_{1 \leq i \leq n} \overset{D}{=} (S_{i}^{\circ})_{1 \leq i \leq n}, $$

we need to prove Gaussian approximation for the process $\Psi_{i} + M_{i}(\vartheta)$. Define

$$ B_{j} = V_{j1}(\bar{\theta}_{2k_{0}j})^{1/2} Z_{j}^{*} + \Lambda_{4j}(\bar{\theta}_{2k_{0}j}) + \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{\theta}_{2k_{0}j}), $$

which are independent random vectors for $j = 1, \ldots, q$ and let

$$ S_{i}^{\sharp} = \sum_{j=1}^{q_{i}-1} B_{j} \text{ and } W_{i}^{\sharp} = \Psi_{i} + M_{i}(\vartheta) - S_{i}^{\sharp}. $$

Note that,

$$ \max_{i \leq n} |W_{i}^{\sharp}| = \max_{i \leq n} |\Lambda_{4q_{i}}(\bar{\theta}_{2k_{0}q_{i}}) + \Lambda_{1}(\bar{\theta}_{0})| = o_{P}(n^{1/r}). $$

Conditions (6.24) and (6.25) can be verified easily with this unconditional process $(S)_{i}^{\sharp}$ to use the Proposition 6.3. Thus, there exists $B_{j}^{new}$ and Gaussian random variable $B_{j}^{gau}$, such that $(B_{j}^{new})_{j \leq q-1} \overset{D}{=} (B_{j})_{j \leq q-1}$ and corresponding $B_{j}^{gau} \sim N(0, Var(B_{j}))$, such that

$$ \max_{i \leq n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{[i/2k_{0}m]-1} B_{j}^{new} - \sum_{j=1}^{[i/2k_{0}m]-1} B_{j}^{gau} \right| = o_{P}(n^{1/r}). $$
By (6.16), (6.33), (6.34) and (6.35), we can construct a process $S^c_i$ and $B^c_j$ such that

$$(S^c_i)_{i \leq n} \overset{D}{=} (S_i)_{i \leq n} \quad \text{and} \quad (B^c_j)_{j \leq q-1} \overset{D}{=} (B^gau_j)_{j \leq q-1}$$

and

$$\max_{i \leq n} |S^c_i - \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor i/(2k_0m) \rfloor} B^c_j| = o_p(n^{1/r}). \quad (6.36)$$

Relabel this final Gaussian process as

$$G^c_i = \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor i/(2k_0m) \rfloor} (Var(B_j))^{1/2} Y^c_j,$$

where $Y^c_j$ are i.i.d. $N(0, I_d)$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.1. \qed

**Proof.** of Proposition 6.4. Without loss of generality, we prove it for $j = 1$. Note that

$$2k_0m\lambda_* \leq \rho_*(Var(S_{2k_0m})) \leq \rho^*(Var(S_{2k_0m})) \leq \| \sum_{i=1}^{2k_0m} X_i \|^2 \leq 2k_0m\Theta_{2,0}^2. \quad (6.37)$$

Recall $X^\oplus_i$ and $\tilde{X}_i$ from (6.6) and (6.7). The same upper bound works for $S^\oplus_i$ and $\tilde{S}_i$. Note that, $\| S^\oplus_{2k_0m} - S_{2k_0m} \| = o(m)$ and from [14], we have

$$\| A_1 - S^\oplus_{2k_0m} \| = O(\sqrt{2k_0m}\Theta_{m,2}) = o(\sqrt{2k_0m}).$$

This concludes the proof using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. \qed

**Proof.** of Proposition 6.5. As $A_j$ is the block sum of the $m$-dependent processes with length $2k_0m$, we have, using (6.37), for all $j$,

$$2k_0m(\lambda_* + \delta) \leq E(|A_j|^2) \leq 2k_0m\Theta_{0,2}^2.$$
for some small $\delta > 0$. We conclude the proof by using

$$|E(|Y_j^g|^2) - E(|A_{j+1}|^2)| = |\Lambda_{4j+1}(\tilde{\varphi}_{2k_0j})|^2 + |\Lambda_{4j+4}(\tilde{\varphi}_{2k_0j+2k_0})|^2 \leq 2m\Theta_{0,2}^2$$

and $k_0 > \Theta_{0,2}^2/\lambda_* + 1$. Using similar arguments, (6.27) follows.

**Proof.** of Proposition 6.6. Note that, without loss of generality, we can assume $V_j^a$ to be independent for different $j$ since otherwise we can always break the probability statement in even and odd blocks and prove the statement separately. We use Corollary 1.6 and Corollary 1.7 from Nagaev (1979, [18]) respectively for the case $\gamma < 4$ and $\gamma \geq 4$ on $|V_j^a - E(V_j^a)|$ to deduce that it suffices to show the following

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq q/l} \max_{t(l-1)+1 \leq j \leq t} P(|V_j^a - E(V_j^a)| \geq lm) \to 0. \quad (6.38)$$

We expand and write $V_j^a$ as follows:

$$V_j^a = Var(F_{4j+1}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j})) + Var(F_{4j+2} + F_{4j+3}) \quad (6.39)$$

$$+ E((F_{4j+1}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j}))F_{4j+2}^T) + E(F_{4j+2}(F_{4j+1}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j})))^T$$

$$+ E(F_{4j+3}(F_{4j+4}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) - \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j+2k_0})))^T$$

$$+ E((F_{4j+4}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) - \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j+2k_0}))F_{4j+3}^T)$$

$$+ Var(F_{4j+4}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) - \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{\alpha}_{2k_0j+2k_0})).$$

Using derivation similar to (6.32), it suffices to show (6.38) for only the first and last term in (6.39). Moreover, we assume $d = 1$ and $j = 1$ to simplify notations.
The proofs and the theorems used can be easily extended to vector-valued processes. Denote by $\tilde{S}_m, \{j\}$ for the sum $\tilde{S}_m$ with $\epsilon_j$ replaced by an i.i.d. copy $\epsilon_j'$. For the first term, by Burkholder’s inequality,

$$E(\|Var(F_1(\bar{a}_0)) - E(Var(F_1(\bar{a}_0)))\|^{\gamma/2}) = E(\|E(\tilde{S}_m^2|a_{1-m}, \ldots, a_0) - E(\tilde{S}_m^2)\|^{\gamma/2})$$

$$= \|\sum_{j=-m}^{0} P_j \tilde{S}_m^2\|^{\gamma/2} / \gamma/2 \leq c_{\gamma} (\sum_{j=-m}^{0} \|P_j \tilde{S}_m^2\|^{2 \gamma/2})^{\gamma/4}$$

For $-m \leq j \leq 0$, $\|P_j \tilde{S}_m^2\|^{\gamma/2} \leq \|\tilde{S}_m - \tilde{S}_{m,j}\|^{\gamma/2} \leq \|\tilde{S}_m - \tilde{S}_{m,j}\|^{\gamma} \|\tilde{S}_m + \tilde{S}_{m,j}\|^{\gamma}$. Note that $\|\tilde{S}_m\|^{\gamma} = O(m^{1/2})$ and $\|\tilde{S}_m - \tilde{S}_{m,j}\|^{\gamma} \leq \sum_{r=1}^{m} \tilde{\delta}_{r,j,\gamma}$. By Lemma 7.2,

$$\tilde{\delta}_{k,\gamma} \leq 2n^{1/p-1/\gamma}t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \delta_{k,p}^{\gamma/\gamma}$$

Then since $3 > 2(\chi + 1)p/\gamma$ for $\chi \leq \chi_0$, we have

$$\sum_{j=-m}^{0} \|P_j \tilde{S}_m\|^{\gamma/2} = O(m) \sum_{j=-m}^{0} \sum_{r=1}^{m} (\tilde{\delta}_{r,j,\gamma})^{2}$$

(6.40)

$$= O(m)n^{2/p-2/\gamma}t_n^{2-2p/\gamma} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \sum_{r=1}^{m} (\delta_{r+j,p}^{\gamma/\gamma})^{2}$$

$$= O(m)n^{2/p-2/\gamma}t_n^{2-2p/\gamma}m^{3-2(\chi+1)p/\gamma}(\log m)^{-2A_p/\gamma}$$

by (2.3) and the Hölder inequality. Then, since $A > 2\gamma/p$ and $\log m \asymp \log q \asymp \log n$,

$$qE(\|Var(F_1(\bar{a}_0)) - E(Var(F_1(\bar{a}_0)))\|^{\gamma/2}) \lesssim qm^{\gamma-(\chi+1)p/2}n^{\gamma/2-1/2}t_n^{\gamma/2-p/2}(\log n)^{-A_p/2} = o((lm)^{\gamma/2}),$$

using (6.5), (4.7) and the choice of $l$ in (6.26). For the last term in (6.39), we view $E(F_4(\bar{a}_{2k_0})^2)$ as

$$E(F_4(\bar{a}_{2k_0})^2) = E((\tilde{S}_{2k_0} - \tilde{S}_{(2k_0-1)m})^2|a_{(2k_0-1)m+1}, \ldots, a_{2k_0m})$$
and show that it is close to $(\tilde{S}_{2k_0m} - \tilde{S}_{(2k_0-1)m})^2$. Let $\mathcal{F}_j^m = (\epsilon_j, \ldots, \epsilon_m)$. Note that,

$$\|\tilde{S}_m^2 - E(\tilde{S}_m^2 | a_m, \ldots, a_1)\|_{\gamma/2}^{\gamma/2} \lesssim \left( \sum_{j=-m}^{0} \| E(\tilde{S}_m^2 | \mathcal{F}_j^m) - E(\tilde{S}_m^2 | \mathcal{F}_{j+1}^m) \|_{\gamma/2}^{\gamma/4} \right) \leq c m^{\gamma-(\chi+1)p/2} n^{\gamma/2p-1/2} \ell_n^{\gamma/2-p/2} (\log m)^{-Ap/2}$$

(6.42)

$$= o(q^{-1}(lm)^{\gamma/2}),$$

similar to the derivation in (6.40). By (6.41) and (6.42), it suffices to show that

$$\frac{n}{m} P(|\tilde{S}_m| \geq \sqrt{lm}) \to 0. \quad (6.43)$$

Using the Nagaev-type inequality from Wu and Wu (2016, [28]) we obtain

$$P(|\tilde{S}_m| \geq \sqrt{lm}) \leq C_1 \frac{m^{\max\{1,p(1/2-\chi)\}}}{(lm)^{p/2}} + C_2 \exp(-C_3l), \quad (6.44)$$

where $C_1, C_2$ and $C_3$ depend on $\chi$ and $p$. The second term in (6.44) is $o(m/n)$ since $e^{-l} \to 0$ very fast. For the first term in (6.44), if $\chi < 1/2 - 1/p$, then

$$\frac{n}{m} m^{p(1/2-\chi)} = (\log n)^p n^{1-p/\gamma+L(p/\gamma-p\chi-1)} \ell_n^{k(p/\gamma-p\chi-1)} = o(1),$$

as from (4.7) we have $1 - p/\gamma + L(p/\gamma - p\chi - 1) = L(p/\gamma - 1)(\chi p + p + 1) < 0$. If $1/2 - 1/p \leq \chi < \chi_0$ and consequently $r < p$, then we have, for the first term in (6.44),

$$\frac{n}{m} m^{p(1/2-\chi)} = (\log n)^p n^{1-p/\gamma+L(1/\gamma-1/2)} \ell_n^{k(p/\gamma-p/2)} = o(1), \quad (6.45)$$

using (6.5), $r < p$ and the fact that $r$ satisfy $1/r - 1/\gamma + L(1/\gamma - 1/2) = 0$. \hfill \Box
Proof. of Proposition 6.7. By Lemma 7.3, \( E(L_\gamma^a) \approx qm^{\gamma/2} \). Then it suffices to prove

\[
P(|L_\gamma^a - E(L_\gamma^a)| \geq cqm^{\gamma/2}/\log q) \to 0,
\]

holds for some constant \( c > 0 \). Note that \( E(|Y_j^a|^\gamma) \) are even indices \( j \) (also for odd indices \( j \)). Thus we can prove the statement separately by breaking \( L_\gamma^a \) in sum of even and odd \( E(|Y_j^a|^\gamma) \). Without loss of generality, we assume all \( E(|Y_j^a|^\gamma) \) are independent and proceed. Define \( J_j = (2k_0m)^{-\gamma/2}E(|\tilde{S}_{2k_0m(j-1)} - \tilde{S}_{2k_0m(j-1)}^2|\bar{a}_{2k_0(j-1)}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j}) \) and \( \theta = l^{\gamma/2} = q/\log q \). Recall the truncation operator \( T \) from (6.1). Noting \( E(J_j) = O(1) \) from Lemma 7.3, we have

\[
P(\sum_{j=1}^{q} T_\theta(J_j) - E(T_\theta(J_j)) \geq \phi) \leq \frac{q}{\phi^2} \max_j E(T_\theta(J_j)^2) = O(\theta q/\phi^2) = o(1),
\]

where \( \phi = q/\log q \), and

\[
\max_j P(J_j \geq \theta) \leq \max_j P(E(|\tilde{S}_{2k_0m(j-1)} - \tilde{S}_{2k_0m(j-1)}^2|\bar{a}_{2k_0(j-1)}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j}) \geq 2k_0lm) = o(q^{-1}),
\]

from (6.41), (6.42) and (6.43). Thus \( P(|\sum_{j=1}^{q} J_j - \sum_{j=1}^{q} E(J_j)| \geq \phi) \to 0 \) which is a restatement of (6.46).

Proof. of Proposition 6.8. We showed in Proposition 6.7 that

\[
P(cqm^{\gamma/2} \leq L_\gamma \leq Cqm^{\gamma/2}) \to 1,
\]
for some constants $c$ and $C$. Let $l$ be as given in (6.26). Let $S = \{0, l, 2l, \cdots\}$. Proposition 6.5 and Proposition 6.6 show that, for some constants $c$ and $C$,

$$P(clk_0 m \leq \min_{i \in S} \rho_\ast \left( Var \left( \sum_{j=l}^{i+l-1} Y_j^a \right) \right) \leq \max_{i \in S} \rho_\ast \left( Var \left( \sum_{j=l}^{i+l-1} Y_j^a \right) \right) \leq Clk_0 m) \to 1.$$ 

We choose $\eta_k = kl$ and $s \approx q/l$. Starting with the conditional block sum process $Y_j^a$ for $0 \leq j \leq q - 1$, this choice of $\eta_k$ satisfies (6.24) for a given $a$ with probability going to 1. The other condition, (6.25) can be easily verified for such a choice of $\eta$-sequence using ideas similar to the proof of Proposition 6.7. We skip the details of that derivation. $\square$

### 7. Some Useful Results

**Lemma 7.1.** Let $p < \gamma$. Assume (2.A). Then $\sup_i E \min\{|X_i|^{\gamma} n^{-\gamma/p}, 1\} = o(n^{-1})$.

**Proof.** Choose $k_n = \lfloor 2(\log n)/((p+\gamma) \log 2) \rfloor$. Then $n = o(2^{\gamma k_n})$ and $2^{p k_n} = o(n^p)$. Let $Z = |X_i| n^{-1/p}$. The lemma follows from

$$E(\min\{Z^{\gamma}, 1\}) \leq P(Z \geq 1) + \sum_{k=0}^{k_n} 2^{-k\gamma} P(2^{-1-k} \leq Z < 2^{-k}) + 2^{-\gamma(k_n+1)}$$

$$\leq E(Z^p 1_{Z \geq 1}) + \sum_{k=0}^{k_n} 2^{p(k+1)-k\gamma} E(Z^p 1_{Z \geq 2^{-1-k}}) + 2^{-\gamma(k_n+1)} = o(n^{-1}),$$

in view of the uniform integrability condition (2.A) and $n^{1/2}/2^{k_n} \to \infty$. $\square$

**Lemma 7.2.** The functional dependence measures defined on the truncated process $(X_i^{\oplus})$ and the $m$-dependent process $(\bar{X}_i)$, satisfy $\delta_{j,\gamma} \leq \bar{\delta}_{j,\gamma} \leq 2n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \delta_{j,\gamma}^{p/\gamma}$. 

Proof. Since the truncation operator $T$ is Lipschitz continuous,

\[
(\delta_{j,\gamma}^\oplus)^\gamma = \sup_i E(\lvert T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i) - T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i, (i-j)) \rvert)^\gamma
\]

\[
= n^{\gamma/p} t_n^\gamma \sup_i E \left( \min \left( 2, \frac{\lvert X_i - X_i, (i-j) \rvert}{t_n n^{1/p}} \right)^\gamma \right) \leq 2 n^{\gamma/p - 1} t_n^{\gamma - p} \delta_{j,\gamma}^p.
\]

The first inequality $\tilde{\delta}_{j,\gamma} \leq \delta_{j,\gamma}^\oplus$ follows from (6.14). \hfill \Box

Lemma 7.3. Rosenthal Type Moment Bound Recall (6.4) and (6.5) for $t_n$. Assume (6.9), (6.12), (6.13) along with (2.6) on $A$ related to the restriction on $\Theta_{i,p}$ as mentioned in (2.3). Moreover, assume $m = \lfloor n^{1/k} \rfloor$ with $k$ satisfying $k < (\gamma/2 - 1)^{-1}(\gamma - p)$. Then, we have

\[
\max_i E(\max_{1 \leq l \leq m} |\tilde{R}_{t,l}|^\gamma) = O(m^{\gamma/2}). \tag{7.1}
\]

Proof. Since the functional dependence measure is defined in an uniform manner, we can ignore the $\max_i$ in (7.1) and use the Rosenthal-type inequality for stationary processes in Liu, Xiao and Wu (2013, [15]). By [15], there is a constant $c$, depending only on $\gamma$, such that

\[
\| \max_{1 \leq l \leq m} |\tilde{R}_{t,l}| \|_\gamma \leq c m^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \tilde{\delta}_{j,2} + \sum_{j=1+m}^{\infty} \tilde{\delta}_{j,\gamma} + \sup_i \| T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i) \|_\gamma \\
+ c m^{1/\gamma} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{m} j^{1/2 - 1/\gamma} \tilde{\delta}_{j,\gamma} + \sup_i \| T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i) \|_\gamma \right) \\
\leq c(I + II + III + IV),
\]
where

\[ I = m^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \tilde{\delta}_{j,2} + m^{1/2} \|X_1\|_2, \]

\[ II = m^{1/2} \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \tilde{\delta}_{j,\gamma}, \quad III = m^{1/\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{1/2-1/\gamma} \tilde{\delta}_{j,\gamma}, \]

\[ IV = m^{1/\gamma} \sup_i \|T_{t_n^{1/p}}(X_i)\|_{\gamma}. \]

For the first term \( I \), since \( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta_{j,2} + \sup_i \|X_i\|_2 \leq 2\Theta_{0,2} \) and \( \tilde{\delta}_{j,2} \leq \delta_{j,2} \), we have \( I = O(m^{1/2}) \). Starting with \( II \), we apply Lemma 7.2 to obtain

\[ II = m^{1/2} \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \tilde{\delta}_{j,\gamma} \lesssim m^{1/2} n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \tilde{\delta}_{j,p/\gamma}. \]

The rest follows from the derivation in (4.4) and (4.7). For the third term, we have

\[ III \lesssim m^{1/\gamma} n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m} j^{1/2-1/\gamma} \tilde{\delta}_{j,p/\gamma} \]

\begin{align*}
&\leq m^{1/\gamma} n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \sum_{l=1}^{[\log_2 m]+1} 2^{l-1} \sum_{j=2^l-1}^{2^{l-1}} j^{1/2-1/\gamma} \tilde{\delta}_{j,p/\gamma} \\
&\leq m^{1/\gamma} n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \sum_{l=1}^{[\log_2 m]+1} 2^{(3/2-1/\gamma-p/\gamma)} O(2^{-l \chi p/\gamma} t_n^{1-A p/\gamma}).
\end{align*}

Recall the definition of \( \chi_0 \) from (2.5). If \( \chi \leq \chi_0 \), then our solution for \( \gamma \) satisfies

\[ 3/2 - 1/\gamma - (\chi + 1)p/\gamma \geq 0, \]

with equality holding only for \( \chi = \chi_0 \). Hence, if \( \chi < \chi_0 \), we have

\[ m^{-1/2} III = m^{-(\chi+1)p/\gamma} n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} (\log n)^{-A p/\gamma} O(1) = o(1), \]
from (4.7), (6.15) and (6.5). If $\chi = \chi_0$, since $A > \gamma/p$ from (2.6) [The lower bound for $A$ there is just $2\gamma/p$ as mentioned in (4.5)], we have

$$m^{-1/2}III = m^{1/\gamma - 1/2}n^{1/p - 1/\gamma}t_n^{-p/\gamma}O(1) = o(1),$$

(7.3)
since (4.6) is true. Also for the case of $\chi > \chi_0$ in the proof of Theorem 2.2, the way we define our three conditions in (5.1) the new solution also satisfy $\gamma' = 2(1 + p + p\chi)/3$ and thus (7.3) holds. For the fourth term $IV$, we use (6.4) to derive

$$m^{-\gamma/2}IV^\gamma = m^{1-\gamma/2} \sup_i \|T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i)\|^\gamma$$

(7.4)
$$\leq m^{1-\gamma/2}t_n^{\gamma/p} \sup_i E \left( \min\left\{ \frac{|X_i|^\gamma}{t_n^{\gamma/p}}, 1 \right\} \right)$$
$$= m^{1-\gamma/2}t_n^{\gamma/p - 1}o(1) = o(1),$$
in the light of (4.6).