

OPTIMAL GAUSSIAN APPROXIMATION FOR MULTIPLE TIME SERIES

BY SAYAR KARMAKAR^{†,*} AND WEI BIAO WU^{*}

[†]*University of Florida* and ^{*}*University of Chicago*

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 $n^{1/p}$.

Key Words and Phrases: Functional central limit theorem, Functional dependence measure, Gaussian approximation, Weak dependence.

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 Σ , and let $S_j = \sum_{i=1}^j X_i$. The FCLT asserts that

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

where $[t] = \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : i \leq t\}$ 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 Erdős 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 σ^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 $(S_i)_{i \leq n} \stackrel{D}{=} (S'_i)_{i \leq n}$, 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

$$X_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{id})^\top = H_i(\mathcal{F}_i) = H_i(\epsilon_i, \epsilon_{i-1}, \dots), \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $^\top$ denotes a matrix transpose, $\mathcal{F}_i = (\epsilon_i, \epsilon_{i-1}, \dots)$ and ϵ_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 $(\epsilon_i, \epsilon_{i-1}, \dots)$ 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 (Ω_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 $(S_i^c)_{1 \leq i \leq n} \stackrel{D}{=} (S_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ and

$$\max_{i \leq n} |S_i^c - G_i^c| = o_P(\tau_n) \quad \text{in } (\Omega_c, A_c, P_c), \quad (1.4)$$

where the approximation bound τ_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 τ_n in terms of p and the decay rate of the functional dependence measure. In particular, if the dependence decays sufficiently quickly, for τ_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 χ and A to formulate the temporal dependence of the process. In general, larger values of χ 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 χ 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 χ increases from

0 to a certain number χ_0 , we obtain the optimal τ_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 nonLipschitz 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 constants. 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 $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$ (resp. $a_n/b_n \rightarrow \infty$), 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 μ and covariance matrix Σ 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 $|A| = (\sum a_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$. For a positive semi-definite matrix A with spectral decomposition $A = QDQ^\top$, where Q is orthonormal and $D = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$, write the Grammian square root as $A^{1/2} = QD^{1/2}Q^\top$, 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 ϵ'_i, ϵ_j , for $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, be i.i.d. random variables. Assume $X_i \in \mathcal{L}_p, p > 0$. 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 ϵ_k in \mathcal{F}_i replaced by an i.i.d. copy ϵ'_k ,

$$\mathcal{F}_{i,(k)} = (\epsilon_i, \epsilon_{i-1}, \dots, \epsilon'_k, \epsilon_{k-1}, \dots) \text{ and } X_{i,(i-j)} = H_i(\mathcal{F}_{i,(i-j)}).$$

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 ϵ_{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 ϵ_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

$$\Theta_{i,p} = \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \delta_{j,p} = O(i^{-\chi}(\log i)^{-A}). \quad (2.3)$$

Larger χ or A implies weaker dependence. Our Gaussian approximation rate τ_n (cf., Theorems 2.1 and 2.2) depends on χ and A . Define functions $f_j(\cdot, \cdot)$ as follows

$$f_1 = f_1(p, \chi) = p^2\chi^2 + p^2\chi, \quad f_2 = 2p\chi^2 + 3p\chi - 2\chi, \quad (2.4)$$

$$f_3 = p^3(1 + \chi)^2 + 6f_1 + 4p\chi - 2, \quad f_4 = 2p(2p\chi^2 + 3p\chi + p - 2),$$

$$f_5 = p^2(p^2 + 4p - 12)\chi^2 + 2p(p^3 + p^2 - 4p - 4)\chi + (p^2 - p - 2)^2.$$

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: $\sup_{i \geq 1} E(|X_i|^p \mathbf{1}_{|X_i| \geq u}) \rightarrow 0$ as $u \rightarrow \infty$;

(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 $t \geq 1, l \geq l_*$,

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

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*

$$0 < \chi < \chi_0 = \frac{p^2 - 4 + (p - 2)\sqrt{p^2 + 20p + 4}}{8p}, \quad (2.5)$$

$$A > \frac{(2p + p^2)\chi + p^2 + 3p + 2 + f_5^{1/2}}{p(1 + p + 2\chi)}. \quad (2.6)$$

Then, (1.4) holds with the approximation bound $\tau_n = n^{1/r}$, where

$$\frac{1}{r} = \frac{f_1 + p^2\chi + p^2 - 2p + f_2 - \chi\sqrt{(p-2)(f_3-3p)}}{f_4}. \quad (2.7)$$

THEOREM 2.2. *Assume $E(X_i) = 0$, (2.A)—(2.B), and (2.3) hold. Recall (2.5) for χ_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 $\chi \rightarrow 0$, $r \rightarrow 2$ 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




FIG 1. *Optimal bound as a function of χ*

3.1. *Vector linear processes:* Assume that X_i is a vector linear process

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

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

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

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

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

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 $\Psi_* = I - \Psi_1 - \dots - \Psi_a$, $\Phi_* = I + \Phi_1 + \dots + \Phi_b$. Assume Ψ_* , Φ_* , and $\Sigma_e = E(e_1 e_1^\top)$ are nonsingular. Elementary calculation shows that, as $l \rightarrow \infty$,

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

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,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|X_{ir}X_{is} - X_{i,(i-j)r}X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_p \\
& \leq \|X_{ir}X_{is} - X_{ir}X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_p + \|X_{ir}X_{i,(i-j)s} - X_{i,(i-j)r}X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_p \\
& \leq \|X_{ir}\|_q \|X_{is} - X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_q + \|X_{ir} - X_{i,(i-j)r}\|_q \|X_{i,(i-j)s}\|_q \\
& = O(|B_j|),
\end{aligned}$$

because ϵ_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 Σ_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 τ_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 ϵ_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 $\max_{0 \leq u \leq 1} \|F(x_0, \epsilon_i, \theta(u))\|_p < \infty$, and

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

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

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

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 θ . 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:

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

where e_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

$$(\hat{\theta}_1(t), \hat{\theta}_2(t))^T = \arg \min_{\eta_1, \eta_2} \sum_{i=2}^n (Y_i - \eta_1 Y_{i-1}^+ - \eta_2 Y_{i-1}^-)^2 K\left(\frac{i/n - t}{b_n}\right), \quad (3.8)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{nb_n}M(t)(\hat{\theta}(t) - \theta(t)) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{nb_n}} \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top \left(\theta\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \theta(t) \right) K\left(\frac{i/n - t}{b_n}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{nb_n}} \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbf{v}_i e_i K\left(\frac{i/n - t}{b_n}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where $\mathbf{v}_i = (Y_{i-1}^+, Y_{i-1}^-)^\top$ and $M(t) = (nb_n)^{-1} \sum_{i=2}^n \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top K((i/n - t)/b_n)$. Assuming some mild conditions on the innovation process e_i and the time-varying functions θ_1 and θ_2 , we can construct a simultaneous confidence interval for θ from (3.9). Assume for some $p > 2$, $\|e_1\|_p < \infty$, e_1 has a density with support $(-\infty, \infty)$, and

$$s = \sup_t (|\theta_1(t)| + |\theta_2(t)|) < 1. \quad (3.10)$$

We verify the conditions of Theorem 2.2 using the bivariate process $X_i = \mathbf{v}_i e_i$. 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 beacuse $x^+ x^- = 0$,

$$\text{Var}(S_{t+l} - S_t) = \sum_{i=t+1}^{t+l} \text{Var}(\mathbf{v}_i e_i) = \sum_{i=t+1}^{t+l} \text{diag}(E((Y_{i-1}^+)^2)E(e_i^2), E((Y_{i-1}^-)^2)E(e_i^2)).$$

With $D_i = \theta_1(i/n)Y_{i-1}^+ + \theta_2(i/n)Y_{i-1}^-$ and $c_0 = 2 \sup_i \|Y_i\|_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
E((Y_{i-1}^+)^2) &= E(((e_{i-1} + D_{i-2})^+)^2) \geq E(((e_{i-1} + D_{i-2})^+)^2 I(|D_{i-2}| \leq c_0)) \\
&\geq E(((e_{i-1} - c_0)^+)^2) P(|D_{i-2}| \leq c_0) \\
&> c_1 (1 - 2 \sup_i \|Y_i\|_2^2 / c_0^2), \tag{3.11}
\end{aligned}$$

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

$$n^{1/p} / \sqrt{nb_n} \rightarrow 0, \tag{3.12}$$

assuming bounded variation of K (cf., Zhao and Wu (2007, [30])). Now, assume $\theta_1(\cdot)$ and $\theta_2(\cdot)$ are Hölder- α continuous for some $\alpha < 1/2$. For the negligibility of the first term in (3.9) portraying we need $\sqrt{nb_n} b_n^\alpha \rightarrow 0$. 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 χ . 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 γ 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 γ and m_n in terms of χ 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 γ, m_n , 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 χ 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 $t_n \rightarrow 0$ very slowly, such as

$$t_n \log \log n \rightarrow \infty, \tag{4.1}$$

and use it at the truncation level $t_n n^{1/p}$. The truncation is defined through the operator

$$T_b(v) = (T_b(v_1), \dots, T_b(v_d))^T, \text{ where } T_b(w) = \min(\max(w, -b), b).$$

For the m -dependence approximation step and the blocking approximation, assume

$$m = \lfloor n^L t_n^k \rfloor, \quad 0 < k < (\gamma - p)/(\gamma/2 - 1), \quad 0 < L < 1, \quad (4.2)$$

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

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^\diamond , with the following summarized definition:

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

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

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

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

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^\diamond .

4.2. *Outline of conditional Gaussian approximation:* The blocks created in the preparation steps are not independent because two successive blocks share some ϵ_i in their shared border. In this second stage, we consider the partial sum process conditioned on these borderline ϵ_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 λ_* 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., $V_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) = \text{Var}(Y_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}))$) 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, γ , 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

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \delta_{j,p}^{p/\gamma} &\leq \sum_{i=\lfloor \log_2 m \rfloor}^{\infty} \sum_{j=2^i}^{2^{i+1}-1} \delta_{j,p}^{p/\gamma} \leq \sum_{i=\lfloor \log_2 m \rfloor}^{\infty} 2^{i(1-p/\gamma)} \Theta_{2^i,p}^{p/\gamma} \\ &= \sum_{i=\lfloor \log_2 m \rfloor}^{\infty} 2^{i(1-p/\gamma)} O(2^{-\chi i p/\gamma} i^{-Ap/\gamma}) = O(m^{1-p/\gamma-\chi p/\gamma} (\log m)^{-Ap/\gamma}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

By (4.1) and (6.15), $\log m \asymp \log n$. 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:

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma &= \frac{(2p + p^2)\chi + p^2 + 3p + 2 + f_5^{1/2}}{2 + 2p + 4\chi}, \\ L &= \frac{f_1 - f_2 + \chi\sqrt{(p-2)(f_3 - 3p)}}{\chi f_4},\end{aligned}$$

with f_1, \dots, 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 γ and L change with p and χ for $\chi < \chi_0$. Note that L , the power of n in the expression of m , is close to one if χ 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 γ and the optimal bound $1/r$ increase and decrease with χ , 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




FIG 2. (a) γ as a function of χ , (b) L as a function of χ

before. We form a set of new equations:

$$1/2 + 1/p - 2/r' + L'(1 - (\chi + 1)p/r') = 0, \quad (5.1)$$

$$1/p - 1/\gamma' + L' - L'(\chi + 1)p/\gamma' = 0,$$

$$1 - \gamma'/r' + L'(\gamma'/2 - 1) = 0.$$

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

$$\gamma' < 2(1 + p + p\chi)/3, \quad (5.2)$$

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 $n^{L'} t_n^k$, following (6.15). We apply Nagaev-type inequality from Liu, Xiao, and Wu (2013, [15]) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P(|\tilde{S}_m| \geq \sqrt{lm}) &\lesssim \frac{m}{(lm)^{\gamma'/2}} \nu_R^{\gamma'+1} + \sum_{r=1}^R \exp\left(-c_{\gamma'} \frac{\lambda_r^2 l}{\tilde{\theta}_{r,2}^2}\right) + \frac{m^{\gamma'/2} \tilde{\Theta}_{m+1, \gamma'}^{\gamma'}}{(lm)^{\gamma'/2}} \quad (5.3) \\ &+ \frac{m \sup_i \|T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i)\|_{\gamma'}^{\gamma'}}{(lm)^{\gamma'/2}} + \exp\left(-\frac{c_{\gamma'} l}{\sup_i \|T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i)\|_2^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

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 $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_R = m$. For the choice $\tau_r = 2^{r-1}$ for $1 \leq r \leq R-1 = \lfloor \log_2 m \rfloor$, we obtain $\nu_R^{\gamma'+1} = O(n^{\gamma'/p-1} t_n^{\gamma'-p})$ 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 $P(|\tilde{S}_m| \geq \sqrt{lm}) = o(m/n)$, 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 χ 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 ∞ . 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

$$\begin{aligned} n^{1/2-1/p} m^{-\chi} (\log n)^{-A-\delta} &\rightarrow 0, \\ n^{1/p-1/\gamma} m^{1-(\chi+1)p/\gamma} (\log n)^{-Ap/\gamma} &\rightarrow 0, \\ n^{1-\gamma/p} (\log n)^{-\gamma\delta} m^{\gamma/2-1} &\rightarrow 0, \\ (\log n)^\gamma m^{1-\gamma/2} n^{\gamma/p-1} t_n^{\gamma-p} &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last is obtained using γ th moment in (5.3). Let $m = \lfloor n^L (\log n)^{2\gamma/(\gamma-2)} t_n^k \rfloor$, 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 , γ , 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. \square

Supplementary Material

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

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Associate Editor and an anonymous referee for their helpful feedback and comments. This study was partially supported by NSF/DMS 1405410.

References

- [1] AUE, A., HÖRMANN, S., HORVÁTH, L. and REIMHERR, M. (2009). Break detection in the covariance structure of multivariate time series models. *The Annals of Statistics* **37** 4046–4087.

- [2] BERKES, I., LIU, W. and WU, W. B. (2014). Komlós-Major-Tusnády approximation under dependence. *Ann. Probab.* **42** 794–817. [MR3178474](#)
- [3] DONSKEr, M. D. (1952). Justification and extension of Doob’s heuristic approach to the Komogorov-Smirnov theorems. *Ann. Math. Statistics* **23** 277–281. [MR0047288](#)
- [4] DOOB, J. L. (1949). Heuristic approach to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov theorems. *Ann. Math. Statistics* **20** 393–403. [MR0030732](#)
- [5] EBERLEIN, E. (1986). On strong invariance principles under dependence assumptions. *Ann. Probab.* **14** 260–270. [MR815969](#)
- [6] EINMAHL, U. (1987a). A useful estimate in the multidimensional invariance principle. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **76** 81–101. [MR899446](#)
- [7] EINMAHL, U. (1987b). Strong invariance principles for partial sums of independent random vectors. *Ann. Probab.* **15** 1419–1440. [MR905340](#)
- [8] EINMAHL, U. (1989). Extensions of results of Komlós, Major, and Tusnády to the multivariate case. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **28** 20–68. [MR996984](#)
- [9] ERDÖS, P. and KAC, M. (1946). On certain limit theorems of the theory of probability. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **52** 292–302. [MR0015705](#)
- [10] GÖTZE, F. and ZAITSEV, A. Y. (2008). Bounds for the rate of strong approximation in the multidimensional invariance principle. *Teor. Veroyatn. Primen.* **53** 100–123. [MR2760567](#)
- [11] KOMLÓS, J., MAJOR, P. and TUSNÁDY, G. (1975). An approximation of partial sums of independent RV’s and the sample DF. I. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete* **32** 111–131. [MR0375412](#)
- [12] KOMLÓS, J., MAJOR, P. and TUSNÁDY, G. (1976). An approximation of partial sums of independent RV’s, and the sample DF. II. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*

- 34** 33–58. [MR0402883](#)
- [13] LIU, W. and LIN, Z. (2009). Strong approximation for a class of stationary processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **119** 249–280. [MR2485027](#)
 - [14] LIU, W. and WU, W. B. (2010). Asymptotics of spectral density estimates. *Econometric Theory* **26** 1218–1245. [MR2660298](#)
 - [15] LIU, W., XIAO, H. and WU, W. B. (2013). Probability and moment inequalities under dependence. *Statist. Sinica* **23** 1257–1272. [MR3114713](#)
 - [16] LÜTKEPOHL, H. (2005). *New introduction to multiple time series analysis*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. [MR2172368](#)
 - [17] MONRAD, D. and PHILIPP, W. (1991). The problem of embedding vector-valued martingales in a Gaussian process. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **35** 374–377.
 - [18] NAGAEV, S. V. (1979). Large deviations of sums of independent random variables. *Ann. Probab.* **7** 745–789. [MR542129](#)
 - [19] PRIESTLEY, M. B. (1988). *Nonlinear and nonstationary time series analysis*. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London. [MR991969](#)
 - [20] PROHOROV, Y. V. (1956). Convergence of random processes and limit theorems in probability theory. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **1** 177–238. [MR0084896](#)
 - [21] SAKHANENKO, A. I. (2006). Estimates in the invariance principle in terms of truncated power moments. *Sibirsk. Mat. Zh.* **47** 1355–1371. [MR2302850](#)
 - [22] TONG, H. (1990). *Nonlinear time series. Oxford Statistical Science Series 6*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York A dynamical system approach, With an appendix by K. S. Chan, Oxford Science Publications. [MR1079320](#)
 - [23] TRAPANI, L., URGÀ, G. and KAO, C. (2017). Testing for instability in covariance structures.

Bernoulli To Appear.

- [24] TSAY, R. S. (2010). *Analysis of financial time series*, third ed. *Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ. [MR2778591](#)
- [25] WIENER, N. (1958). *Nonlinear Problems in Random Theory*. Wiley, New York.
- [26] WU, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: another look at dependence. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **102** 14150–14154 (electronic). [MR2172215](#)
- [27] WU, W. B. (2007). Strong invariance principles for dependent random variables. *Ann. Probab.* **35** 2294–2320. [MR2353389](#)
- [28] WU, W. B. and WU, Y. N. (2016). Performance bounds for parameter estimates of high-dimensional linear models with correlated errors. *Electron. J. Stat.* **10** 352–379. [MR3466186](#)
- [29] WU, W. B. and ZHAO, Z. (2007a). Inference of trends in time series. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **69** 391–410. [MR2323759](#)
- [30] WU, W. B. and ZHAO, Z. (2007b). Inference of trends in time series. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **69** 391–410. [MR2323759](#)
- [31] WU, W. B. and ZHOU, Z. (2011). Gaussian approximations for non-stationary multiple time series. *Statist. Sinica* **21** 1397–1413. [MR2827528](#)
- [32] ZAITSEV, A. Y. (2000). Multidimensional version of a result of Sakhanenko in the invariance principle for vectors with finite exponential moments. I. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **45** 718–738. [MR1968723](#)
- [33] ZAITSEV, A. Y. (2001a). Multidimensional version of a result of Sakhanenko in the invariance principle for vectors with finite exponential moments. III. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **46** 744–769. [MR1971831](#)
- [34] ZAITSEV, A. Y. (2001b). Multidimensional version of a result of Sakhanenko in the invariance

- principle for vectors with finite exponential moments. II. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.* **46** 535–561. [MR1978667](#)
- [35] ZHOU, Z. and WU, W. B. (2010). Simultaneous inference of linear models with time varying coefficients. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **72** 513–531. [MR2758526](#)

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Online Supplementary:

(doi: [COMPLETED BY THE TYPESETTER](#); .pdf). The online supplementary material contains the detailed proofs of Theorem 2.1 and some useful lemmas. The long detailed steps are in section 6 and the lemmas are postponed to section 7.

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 $v = (v_1, \dots, v_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define

$$T_b(v) = (T_b(v_1), \dots, T_b(v_d))^\top, \text{ where } T_b(w) = \min(\max(w, -b), b). \quad (6.1)$$

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

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i - S_i^\oplus| = o_P(n^{1/p}), \text{ where } S_l^\oplus = \sum_{i=1}^l [T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i) - ET_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i)]. \quad (6.2)$$

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

$$\sup_i \frac{1}{t^p} E(|X_i|^p \mathbf{1}_{|X_i| > t n^{1/p}}) = 0 \text{ and } n \sup_i E \min\left(\frac{|X_i|^\gamma}{t^\gamma n^{\gamma/p}}, 1\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (6.3)$$

where $\gamma > p$. The second relation follows from Lemma 7.1. Clearly (6.3) implies that

$$\sup_i \frac{1}{t_n^p} E(|X_i|^p \mathbf{1}_{|X_i| > t_n n^{1/p}}) + n \sup_i E \min\left(\frac{|X_i|^\gamma}{t_n^\gamma n^{\gamma/p}}, 1\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (6.4)$$

holds for a sequence $t_n \rightarrow 0$ very slowly. Without loss of generality we can let

$$t_n \log \log n \rightarrow \infty \quad (6.5)$$

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

$$R_{c,l} = \sum_{i=1+c}^{l+c} X_i^\oplus = \sum_{i=1+c}^{l+c} [T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i) - E T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i)]. \quad (6.6)$$

By (6.4), we have $P(\max_{i \leq n} |S_i - \sum_{j=1}^i T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_j)| = 0) \rightarrow 1$ in view of

$$\sup_j P(|X_j| > t_n n^{1/p}) \leq \sup_j \frac{1}{n t_n^p} E(|X_j|^p \mathbf{1}_{|X_j| > t_n n^{1/p}}) = o(1/n).$$

Also by (6.4), $\max_{j \leq n} |E(X_j - T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_j))| = o(n^{1/p-1})$. Hence (6.2) follows. \square

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 $E(X_i | \epsilon_i, \dots, \epsilon_{i-m})$. This gives a very simple yet effective way to handle the original process in terms of a collection of ϵ_i 's. Define the partial sum process

$$\tilde{R}_{c,l} = \sum_{i=1+c}^{l+c} \tilde{X}_j, \text{ where } \tilde{X}_j = E(T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_j) | \epsilon_j, \dots, \epsilon_{j-m}) - E(T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_j)). \quad (6.7)$$

Write $\tilde{R}_{0,i} = \tilde{S}_i$. From Lemma A1 in Liu and Lin (2009, [13]), we have

$$\| \max_{1 \leq l \leq n} |S_l^\oplus - \tilde{S}_l| \|_r \leq c_r n^{1/2} \Theta_{1+m,r}. \quad (6.8)$$

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

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

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

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

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 $\gamma > p$,

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

$$n^{1/p-1/\gamma} \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \delta_{j,p}^{p/\gamma} \rightarrow 0. \quad (6.13)$$

We now define functional dependence measure for the truncated process $(T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i))_{i \leq n}$ as

$$\delta_{j,l}^{\oplus} = \sup_i \|T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i) - T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_{i,(i-j)})\|_l, \text{ where } l \geq 2.$$

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 $l \geq 2$:

$$\tilde{\delta}_{j,l} \leq \delta_{j,l}^{\oplus} \leq \delta_{j,l}. \quad (6.14)$$

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 γ 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 $0 < L < 1$,

$$m = \lfloor n^L t_n^k \rfloor, \quad 0 < k < (\gamma - p)/(\gamma/2 - 1). \quad (6.15)$$

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

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\tilde{S}_i - S_i^\diamond| = o_P(n^{1/r}), \text{ where } S_i^\diamond = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} A_j, \quad q_i = \lfloor i/(2k_0m) \rfloor. \quad (6.16)$$

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

Then

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(\max_{1 \leq l \leq n} |\tilde{R}_{0,l} - \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor l/(2k_0m) \rfloor} A_j| \geq \phi_n n^{1/r} \right) &\leq \frac{n}{2k_0m} \max_{c \in \mathcal{S}} P \left(\max_{1 \leq l \leq 2k_0m} |\tilde{R}_{c,l}| \geq \phi_n n^{1/r} \right) \\ &\leq n \max_{c \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{E(\max_{1 \leq l \leq 2k_0m} |\tilde{R}_{c,l}|^\gamma)}{2k_0m \phi_n^\gamma n^{\gamma/r}} = O(\phi_n^\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

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

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

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |S_i - S_i^\diamond| = o_P(n^{1/r}). \quad (6.17)$$

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 ϵ_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

$$\tilde{X}_i = \tilde{H}_i(\epsilon_i, \dots, \epsilon_{i-m}). \quad (6.18)$$

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

$$\bar{a}_{2k_0j} = \{a_{(2k_0j-1)m+1}, \dots, a_{2k_0jm}\} \text{ and } a = \{\dots, \bar{a}_0, \bar{a}_{2k_0}, \bar{a}_{4k_0}, \dots\}.$$

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

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

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

$$\tilde{X}_i(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) = \tilde{H}_i(a_i, \dots, a_{(2k_0j+2k_0-1)m+1}, \epsilon_{(2k_0j+2k_0-1)m}, \dots, \epsilon_{i-m}).$$

Further, define the blocks as following,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) &= \sum_{i=2k_0jm+1}^{(2k_0j+1)m} \tilde{X}_i(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}), \\
F_{4j+2} &= \sum_{i=(2k_0j+1)m+1}^{(2k_0j+k_0)m} \tilde{X}_i, \quad F_{4j+3} = \sum_{i=(2k_0j+k_0)m+1}^{(2k_0j+2k_0-1)m} \tilde{X}_i, \\
F_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) &= \sum_{i=(2k_0j+2k_0-1)m+1}^{(2k_0j+2k_0)m} \tilde{X}_i(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.19}$$

Similarly, for $j = 1, \dots, q$, define

$$\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j} = \{\epsilon_{(2k_0j-1)m+1}, \dots, \epsilon_{2k_0jm}\} \text{ and } \vartheta = \{\dots, \bar{\vartheta}_0, \bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0}, \bar{\vartheta}_{4k_0}, \dots\}.$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) &= F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) + F_{4j+2} \\
&\quad + F_{4j+3} + F_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) - \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

Following the definition of S_n° , 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

$$\begin{aligned} M_i(a) &= \sum_{j=0}^{q_i-1} [\Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) + \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0})], \\ Q_i(a) &= \sum_{j=0}^{q_i-1} V_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}), \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) &= E(F_{4j-2}F_{4j-1}^\top + F_{4j-1}F_{4j-2}^\top) + Var(F_{4j-1} + F_{4j}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})) \\ &\quad + Var(F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) + F_{4j+2}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

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

$$U_{t-1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0t}) = E(F_{4t-2}F_{4t-1}^\top + F_{4t-1}F_{4t-2}^\top) + Var(F_{4t-1} + F_{4t}(\bar{a}_{2k_0t}) - \Lambda_{4t}(\bar{a}_{2k_0t})). \quad (6.23)$$

Define

$$L_\gamma^a = \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} E(|Y_j(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0})|^\gamma).$$

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^ϑ , V_j^a , V_{j0}^a , V_j^ϑ and V_{j0}^ϑ 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 ξ_1, \dots, ξ_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 $\eta_0 = 0 < \eta_1 < \dots < \eta_s = n$ satisfying the following conditions. Let*

$$\zeta_k = \xi_{\eta_{k-1}+1} + \dots + \xi_{\eta_k}, \quad \text{Var}(\zeta_k) = B_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, s$$

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

$$C_1 w^2 \leq \rho_*(B_k) \leq \rho^*(B_k) \leq C_2 w^2, \quad (6.24)$$

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

quantities

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

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

$$C_3 d^{\gamma/2} s^\epsilon (\log^* s)^{\gamma+3} \max_{1 \leq k \leq s} \lambda_{k,\gamma} \leq L_\gamma. \quad (6.25)$$

Then one can construct on a probability space independent random vectors X_1, \dots, X_n and a corresponding set of independent Gaussian vectors Y_1, \dots, Y_n so that $(X_j)_{j=1}^n \stackrel{D}{=} (\xi_j)_{j=1}^n$, $E(Y_j) = 0$, $\text{Var}(Y_j) = \text{Var}(X_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, 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, γ, C_1, C_2 and C_3 .

We need to find a suitable sequence η_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

$$l = \lfloor q^{2/\gamma} / \log^2 q \rfloor. \quad (6.26)$$

To apply Proposition 6.3, we choose the sequence $\eta_k = kl$ and $s \asymp q/l$. This choice is justified by proving the following series of propositions.

PROPOSITION 6.4. Recall λ_* and A_j from (2.B) 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 ,

$$c_1m \leq \rho_*(\text{Var}(Y_j^\vartheta)) \leq \rho^*(\text{Var}(Y_j^\vartheta)) \leq E(|Y_j^\vartheta|^2) \leq c_2m. \quad (6.27)$$

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

$$P \left(\max_{1 \leq t \leq q/l} \left| \text{Var} \left(\sum_{j=(t-1)l}^{tl-1} Y_j^a \right) - E \left(\text{Var} \left(\sum_{j=(t-1)l}^{tl-1} Y_j^a \right) \right) \right| \geq c_3lm \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

PROPOSITION 6.7. We can get constants c_4 and c_5 such that

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

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

$$E_j^a \stackrel{D}{=} Y_j^a \text{ and } \text{Var}(N_j^a) = \text{Var}(Y_j^a), \quad 0 \leq j \leq q-1,$$

$$P_a \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\Pi_i^a - D_i^a| \geq c_0 z \right) \leq C \frac{L_\gamma^a}{z^\gamma}, \text{ where } \Pi_i^a = \sum_{j=0}^{q_i-1} E_j^a, \quad D_i^a = \sum_{j=0}^{q_i-1} N_j^a \quad (6.28)$$

and C is a constant depending on γ, c_1, \dots, c_5 and C_3 . These constants are free of a . We can create a set \mathcal{A} with $P(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow 1$ 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 $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$E(L_\gamma^a n^{-\gamma/r}) \leq \frac{q}{n^{\gamma/r}} c_\gamma \max_c E(|\tilde{R}_{c,2k_0 m}|^\gamma) = O(n^{1-\gamma/r} m^{\gamma/2-1}) \rightarrow 0, \quad (6.29)$$

using

$$E(|Y_j(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0 j}, \bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0 j+2k_0})|^\gamma) \leq c_\gamma \max_c E(|\tilde{R}_{c,2k_0 m}|^\gamma) = O(m^{\gamma/2}).$$

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

$$\max_{i \leq n} |\Pi_i^\vartheta - D_i^\vartheta| = o_P(n^{1/r}). \quad (6.30)$$

6.3. Unconditional Gaussian approximation and Regrouping: Here we shall work with the processes $\Pi_i^\vartheta, \mu_i^\vartheta$ and D_i^ϑ . Note that, $V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0 j})$ defined in (6.21) is a function of ϑ and might not be positive definite in an uniform fashion. For a constant $0 < \delta_* < \lambda_*$, let

$$V_{j1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0 j}) = \begin{cases} V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0 j}) & \text{if } \rho_*(V_{j0}^a) \geq \delta_* m, \\ (\delta_* m) I_d & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6.31)$$

which is a positive-definitized version of $V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})$. The following proposition shows that partial sums of $V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})$ and $V_{j1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})$ are close to each other.

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

$$\max_{i \leq n} E \left(\left| \sum_{j=1}^{\max(1, q_i - 1)} (V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - V_{j1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})) \right| \right) = o_P(n^{2/r-\iota}).$$

Henceforth in the sequel we will slightly abuse $\max(1, q_i - 1) = \max(1, \lfloor i/(2k_0m) \rfloor - 1)$ and simply use $q_i - 1 = \lfloor i/(2k_0m) \rfloor - 1$ for presentational clarity.

PROOF. of Proposition 6.9. Recall (6.19) for the definition of $F_{4j+1}(\cdot), F_{4j+2}$ 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 $\|E(F_{21}^\top|\mathcal{F}_m)\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m \|P_j F_{21}\|^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |E(F_1(\bar{a}_0)F_2^\top)| &= |E(F_1(\bar{a}_0)F_{21}^\top)| = |E(F_1(\bar{a}_0)E(F_{21}^\top|\mathcal{F}_m))| \\ &\leq \|F_1(\bar{a}_0)\| \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \left(\sum_{i=m+1-j}^m \delta_{i,2} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

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

$$E(|E(F_1(\bar{a}_0)F_{21}^\top)|^\gamma) = O(m^{\max(\gamma/2, \gamma-\chi\gamma)}).$$

We expand the last term of $V_{j0}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})$ (see (6.21)). Also note that,

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} n \max_j P(\rho_*(V_{j0}^a) < \delta_*m) &\leq 2n \max_j P(|E(F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})F_{4j+2}^\top)| \geq -\theta m/2) \\ &= O(n) \frac{m^{\max(\gamma/2, \gamma-\chi\gamma)}}{m^\gamma} = o(n^{2/r-\iota}), \end{aligned}$$

for some $\iota > 0$ since we can choose δ_* such that $\theta = (k_0 - 1)\lambda_* - \delta_* > 0$. \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), $\phi_n := q^{1/\gamma}m^{1/2}n^{-1/r} \rightarrow 0$. Then

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

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 $Z_l^a, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that

$$\max_{i \leq n} |D_i^\vartheta - \varsigma_i(\vartheta)| = o_P(n^{1/r}), \text{ where } \varsigma_i(a) = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i-1} V_{j1}^0(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})^{1/2} Z_j^a.$$

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

$$\Psi_i = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i-1} V_{j1}(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j})^{1/2} Z_j^*.$$

From the distributional equality,

$$(\Pi_i^\vartheta + M_i(\vartheta))_{1 \leq i \leq n} \stackrel{D}{=} (S_i^\diamond)_{1 \leq i \leq n}, \quad (6.33)$$

we need to prove Gaussian approximation for the process $\Psi_i + M_i(\vartheta)$. Define

$$B_j = V_{j1}(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j})^{1/2} Z_j^* + \Lambda_{4j}(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j}) + \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{\vartheta}_{2k_0j}),$$

which are independent random vectors for $j = 1, \dots, q$ 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,

$$\max_{i \leq n} |W_i^\sharp| = \max_{i \leq n} |\Lambda_{4q_i}(\vartheta_{2k_0q_i}) + \Lambda_1(\vartheta_0)| = o_P(n^{1/r}). \quad (6.34)$$

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 $(B_j^{new})_{j \leq q-1} \stackrel{D}{=} (B_j)_{j \leq q-1}$ and corresponding $B_j^{gau} \sim N(0, Var(B_j))$,

such that

$$\max_{i \leq n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor i/2k_0m \rfloor - 1} B_j^{new} - \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor i/2k_0m \rfloor - 1} B_j^{gau} \right| = o_P(n^{1/r}). \quad (6.35)$$

By (6.16), (6.33), (6.34) and (6.35), we can construct a process S_i^c and B_j^c such that

$$(S_i^c)_{i \leq n} \stackrel{D}{=} (S_i)_{i \leq n} \text{ and } (B_j^c)_{j \leq q-1} \stackrel{D}{=} (B_j^{gau})_{j \leq q-1} \text{ and}$$

$$\max_{i \leq n} |S_i^c - \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor i/(2k_0m) \rfloor - 1} B_j^c| = o_P(n^{1/r}). \quad (6.36)$$

Relabel this final Gaussian process as

$$G_i^c = \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor i/(2k_0m) \rfloor - 1} (\text{Var}(B_j))^{1/2} Y_j^c,$$

where Y_j^c are i.i.d. $N(0, I_d)$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.1. \square

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We expand and write V_j^a as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} V_j^a &= \text{Var}(F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j})) + \text{Var}(F_{4j+2} + F_{4j+3}) \\ &+ E((F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}))F_{4j+2}^\top) + E(F_{4j+2}(F_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}) - \Lambda_{4j+1}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j}))^\top) \\ &+ E(F_{4j+3}(F_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) - \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}))^\top) \\ &+ E((F_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) - \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}))F_{4j+3}^\top) \\ &+ \text{Var}(F_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0}) - \Lambda_{4j+4}(\bar{a}_{2k_0j+2k_0})). \end{aligned} \quad (6.39)$$

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 ϵ_j replaced by an i.i.d. copy ϵ'_j . For the first term, by Burkholder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E(|\text{Var}(F_1(\bar{a}_0)) - E(\text{Var}(F_1(\bar{a}_0)))|)^{\gamma/2} &= E(|E(\tilde{S}_m^2|a_{1-m}, \dots, a_0) - E(\tilde{S}_m^2)|)^{\gamma/2} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{j=-m}^0 P_j \tilde{S}_m^2 \right\|_{\gamma/2}^{\gamma/2} \leq c_\gamma \left(\sum_{j=-m}^0 \|P_j \tilde{S}_m^2\|_{\gamma/2}^2 \right)^{\gamma/4} \end{aligned}$$

For $-m \leq j \leq 0$, $\|P_j \tilde{S}_m^2\|_{\gamma/2} \leq \|\tilde{S}_m^2 - \tilde{S}_{m,\{j\}}^2\|_{\gamma/2} \leq \|\tilde{S}_m - \tilde{S}_{m,\{j\}}\|_\gamma \|\tilde{S}_m + \tilde{S}_{m,\{j\}}\|_\gamma$.

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,

$\tilde{\delta}_{k,\gamma} \leq 2n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \delta_{k,p}^{p/\gamma}$. Then since $3 > 2(\chi + 1)p/\gamma$ for $\chi \leq \chi_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=-m}^0 \|P_j \tilde{S}_m^2\|_{\gamma/2}^2 &= O(m) \sum_{j=-m}^0 \sum_{r=1}^m (\tilde{\delta}_{r-j,\gamma})^2 \\ &= O(m) n^{2/p-2/\gamma} t_n^{2-2p/\gamma} \sum_{j=0}^m \left(\sum_{r=1}^m \delta_{r+j,p}^{p/\gamma} \right)^2 \\ &= O(m) n^{2/p-2/\gamma} t_n^{2-2p/\gamma} m^{3-2(\chi+1)p/\gamma} (\log m)^{-2Ap/\gamma}, \end{aligned} \tag{6.40}$$

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

$$qE(|\text{Var}(F_1(\bar{a}_0)) - E(\text{Var}(F_1(\bar{a}_0)))|)^{\gamma/2} \tag{6.41}$$

$$\lesssim qm^{\gamma-(\chi+1)p/2} n^{\gamma/2p-1/2} t_n^{\gamma/2-p/2} (\log n)^{-Ap/2} = o((lm)^{\gamma/2}),$$

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

$$E(F_4(\bar{a}_{2k_0})^2) = E((\tilde{S}_{2k_0 m} - \tilde{S}_{(2k_0-1)m})^2 | a_{(2k_0-1)m+1}, \dots, a_{2k_0 m})$$

and show that it is close to $(\tilde{S}_{2k_0m} - \tilde{S}_{(2k_0-1)m})^2$. Let $\mathcal{F}_j^m = (\epsilon_j, \dots, \epsilon_m)$. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{S}_m^2 - E(\tilde{S}_m^2 | a_m, \dots, a_1)\|_{\gamma/2}^{\gamma/2} &\lesssim \left(\sum_{j=-m-1}^0 \|E(\tilde{S}_m^2 | \mathcal{F}_j^m) - E(\tilde{S}_m^2 | \mathcal{F}_{j+1}^m)\|_{\gamma/2}^2 \right)^{\gamma/4} \quad (6.42) \\ &\leq cm^{\gamma-(\chi+1)p/2} n^{\gamma/2p-1/2} t_n^{\gamma/2-p/2} (\log m)^{-Ap/2} \\ &= o(q^{-1}(lm)^{\gamma/2}), \end{aligned}$$

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

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

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

$$P(|\tilde{S}_m| \geq \sqrt{lm}) \leq C_1 \frac{m^{\max\{1, p(1/2-\chi)\}}}{(lm)^{p/2}} + C_2 \exp(-C_3 l), \quad (6.44)$$

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

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

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),

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

using (6.5), $r < p$ and the fact that r satisfy $1/r - 1/\gamma + L(1/\gamma - 1/2) = 0$. \square

PROOF. of Proposition 6.7. By Lemma 7.3, $E(L_\gamma^a) \asymp qm^{\gamma/2}$. Then it suffices to prove

$$P(|L_\gamma^a - E(L_\gamma^a)| \geq cqm^{\gamma/2}/\log q) \rightarrow 0, \quad (6.46)$$

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_γ^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 $J_j = (2k_0m)^{-\gamma/2}E(|\tilde{S}_{2k_0mj} - \tilde{S}_{2k_0m(j-1)}|^\gamma | \bar{a}_{2k_0(j-1)}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j})$ and $\theta = l^{\gamma/2} = q/(\log q)^\gamma$. 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

$$\max_j P(J_j \geq \theta) \leq \max_j P(E(|\tilde{S}_{2k_0mj} - \tilde{S}_{2k_0m(j-1)}|^2 | \bar{a}_{2k_0(j-1)}, \bar{a}_{2k_0j}) \geq 2k_0lm) = o(q^{-1}),$$

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

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

$$P(cqm^{\gamma/2} \leq L_\gamma \leq Cqm^{\gamma/2}) \rightarrow 1,$$

for some constants c and C . Let l be as given in (6.26). Let $S = \{0, l, 2l, \dots\}$.

Proposition 6.5 and Proposition 6.6 show that, for some constants c and C ,

$$P(\text{clk}_0 m \leq \min_{i \in S} \rho_* \left(\text{Var} \left(\sum_{j=i}^{i+l-1} Y_j^a \right) \right) \leq \max_{i \in S} \rho^* \left(\text{Var} \left(\sum_{j=i}^{i+l-1} Y_j^a \right) \right) \leq C \text{clk}_0 m) \rightarrow 1.$$

We choose $\eta_k = kl$ and $s \asymp q/l$. Starting with the conditional block sum process Y_j^a for $0 \leq j \leq q-1$, this choice of η_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 η -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 $2^{p k_n} = o(n)$.

Let $Z = |X_i| n^{-1/p}$. The lemma follows from

$$\begin{aligned} E(\min\{Z^\gamma, 1\}) &\leq P(Z \geq 1) + \sum_{k=0}^{k_n} 2^{-k\gamma} P(2^{-1-k} \leq Z < 2^{-k}) + 2^{-\gamma(k_n+1)} \\ &\leq E(Z^p \mathbf{1}_{Z \geq 1}) + \sum_{k=0}^{k_n} 2^{p(k+1)-k\gamma} E(Z^p \mathbf{1}_{Z \geq 2^{-1-k}}) + 2^{-\gamma(k_n+1)} = o(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

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

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

PROOF. Since the truncation operator T is Lipschitz continuous,

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_{j,\gamma}^\oplus)^\gamma &= \sup_i E(|T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i) - T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_{i,(i-j)})|^\gamma) \\ &= n^{\gamma/p} t_n^\gamma \sup_i E\left(\left|\min\left(2, \left|\frac{X_i - X_{i,(i-j)}}{t_n n^{1/p}}\right|\right)\right|^\gamma\right) \leq 2^\gamma n^{\gamma/p-1} t_n^{\gamma-p} \delta_{j,p}^p. \end{aligned}$$

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

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 $m = \lfloor n^L t_n^k \rfloor$ with k satisfying $k < (\gamma/2 - 1)^{-1}(\gamma - p)$. Then, we have

$$\max_t E(\max_{1 \leq l \leq m} |\tilde{R}_{t,l}|^\gamma) = O(m^{\gamma/2}). \quad (7.1)$$

PROOF. Since the functional dependence measure is defined in an uniform manner, we can ignore the \max_t 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 γ , such that

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

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= m^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\delta}_{j,2} + m^{1/2} \|X_1\|_2, \\
II &= m^{1/2} \sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} \tilde{\delta}_{j,\gamma}, \quad III = m^{1/\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{1/2-1/\gamma} \tilde{\delta}_{j,\gamma}, \\
IV &= m^{1/\gamma} \sup_i \|T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i)\|_{\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

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

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}
III &\lesssim m^{1/\gamma} n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^m j^{1/2-1/\gamma} \delta_{j,p}^{p/\gamma} \\
&\leq m^{1/\gamma} n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor \log_2 m \rfloor + 1} \sum_{j=2^{l-1}}^{2^l-1} j^{1/2-1/\gamma} \delta_{j,p}^{p/\gamma} \\
&\leq m^{1/\gamma} n^{1/p-1/\gamma} t_n^{1-p/\gamma} \sum_{l=1}^{\lfloor \log_2 m \rfloor + 1} 2^{l(3/2-1/\gamma-p/\gamma)} O(2^{-l\chi p/\gamma} l^{-Ap/\gamma}).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

Recall the definition of χ_0 from (2.5). If $\chi \leq \chi_0$, then our solution for γ 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

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

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

$$m^{-1/2}III = m^{1/\gamma-1/2}n^{1/p-1/\gamma}t_n^{1-p/\gamma}O(1) = o(1), \quad (7.3)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} m^{-\gamma/2}IV^\gamma &= m^{1-\gamma/2} \sup_i \|T_{t_n n^{1/p}}(X_i)\|^\gamma \\ &\leq m^{1-\gamma/2} t_n^\gamma n^{\gamma/p} \sup_i E \left(\min \left\{ \frac{|X_i|^\gamma}{t_n^\gamma n^{\gamma/p}}, 1 \right\} \right) \\ &= m^{1-\gamma/2} t_n^\gamma n^{\gamma/p-1} o(1) = o(1), \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

in the light of (4.6). □