

# CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM IN HIGH DIMENSIONS : THE OPTIMAL BOUND ON DIMENSION GROWTH RATE

DEBRAJ DAS AND SOUMENDRA LAHIRI

**ABSTRACT.** In this article, we try to give an answer to the simple question: “What is the critical growth rate of the dimension  $p$  as a function of the sample size  $n$  for which the Central Limit Theorem holds uniformly over the collection of  $p$ -dimensional hyper-rectangles?”. Specifically, we are interested in the normal approximation of suitably scaled versions of the sum  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  in  $\mathcal{R}^p$  uniformly over the class of hyper-rectangles  $\mathcal{A}^{re} = \{\prod_{j=1}^p [a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R} : -\infty \leq a_j \leq b_j \leq \infty, j = 1, \dots, p\}$ , where  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are independent  $p$ -dimensional random vectors with each having independent and identically distributed (iid) components. We investigate the critical cut-off rate of  $\log p$  below which the uniform central limit theorem (CLT) holds and above which it fails. According to some recent results of Chernozukov et al. (2017), it is well known that the CLT holds uniformly over  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$  if  $\log p = o(n^{1/7})$ . They also conjectured that for CLT to hold uniformly over  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$ , the optimal rate is  $\log p = o(n^{1/3})$ . We show instead that under some conditions, the CLT holds uniformly over  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$ , when  $\log p = o(n^{1/2})$ . More precisely, we show that if  $\log p = \epsilon\sqrt{n}$  for some sufficiently small  $\epsilon > 0$ , the normal approximation is valid with an error  $\epsilon$ , uniformly over  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$ . Further, we show by an example that the uniform CLT over  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$  fails if  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-(1/2+\delta)} \log p > 0$  for some  $\delta > 0$ . Hence the critical rate of the growth of  $p$  for the validity of the CLT is given by  $\log p = o(n^{1/2})$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Central Limit Theorem (CLT) is one of the oldest as well as remarkable results of classical probability theory. After initial works by de Moivre in the eighteenth century and by Laplace in the nineteenth century, it is the second half of the twentieth century which sees a boom in different forms as well as different applications of the CLT. In most simplest words, CLT is a statement about the convergence of properly centered and scaled sample mean of a sequence of random vectors to the Gaussian random vector in distribution. Although most of the theoretical developments centred around to establish CLT whenever the underlying dimension of the random vector is fixed, the recent interest, primarily driven by problems arising in statistical inference and machine learning, lies in establishing CLT when the dimension also grows with the sample size. Hence a natural but important question is “What is the critical growth rate of dimension  $p$  as a function of the sample size  $n$  for the validity of the CLT in the high dimensional set up where  $p \gg n$ ?” Let us consider a simple example to motivate the problem. Suppose that there are a

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60F05; Secondary 60B12, 62E20.

*Key words and phrases.* CLT, MGF, Non-uniform Berry-Esseen Theorem.

The first author was supported in part by DST fellowship DST/INSPIRE/04/2018/001290.

The second author was supported in part by NSF grant DMS 2006475.

collection of  $np$  independent and identically distributed (iid) Rademacher random variables, all defined on the same probability space. Now assume that we arrange those  $np$  random variables in  $n$  many vectors each of length  $p$ . Let us denote those  $n$  random vectors as  $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_n\}$  and let  $W_n = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ . Now if  $p$  is fixed, then classical CLT implies that  $W_n$  converges in distribution to  $Z$  where  $Z$  is random vector with the Gaussian distribution with mean zero and covariance matrix  $\mathbb{I}_p$ , the identity matrix of order  $p$ . When  $p$  grows with  $n$ , the question is how large  $p$  can be compared to  $n$  for the Gaussian approximation to hold and obviously what is the critical growth rate of  $p$  above which the Gaussian approximation fails. This paper centers around these two questions, but obviously under a more general framework which we will describe below.

Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be independent random vectors in  $\mathcal{R}^p$ ,  $p \in \mathbb{N} \equiv \{1, 2, \dots\}$  and let  $S_n = X_1 + \dots + X_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Suppose that  $EX_i = 0$  and  $E\|X_i\|^2 < \infty$  for all  $i$  where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm on  $\mathcal{R}^p$ . Lindeberg's Central Limit Theorem (CLT) (cf. Theorem 11.1.1, Athreya and Lahiri (2006)) asserts that for  $p$  fixed (i.e., not changing with  $n$ ), under a mild condition on the truncated second moments,

$$(1.1) \quad T_n \equiv \left( \sum_{i=1}^n EX_i X_i' \right)^{-1/2} S_n \Rightarrow Z$$

where  $\Rightarrow$  denotes convergence in distribution and  $Z$  is random vector with the Gaussian distribution with mean zero and covariance matrix  $\mathbb{I}_p$ , the identity matrix of order  $p$ . Here and in the following,  $B'$  denotes the transpose of a matrix  $B$ . This yields the Gaussian approximation

$$(1.2) \quad \rho_{n,\mathcal{A}} \equiv \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \left| P(T_n \in A) - P(Z \in A) \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a suitable collection of convex sets in  $\mathcal{R}^p$ . Typical choices of  $\mathcal{A}$  include

- (i)  $\mathcal{A}^{dist} = \left\{ (-\infty, a_1] \times \dots \times (-\infty, a_p] : a_1, \dots, a_p \in \mathcal{R} \right\}$ ,  
the collection of all left-infinite rectangles, leading to the Kolmogorov distance between the distributions of  $T_n$  and  $Z$ ,
- (ii)  $\mathcal{A}^{max} = \left\{ (-\infty, t] \times \dots \times (-\infty, t] : t \in \mathcal{R} \right\} = \left\{ \{ \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} T_{nj} \leq t \} : t \in \mathcal{R} \right\}$ ,  
and
- (iii)  $\mathcal{A}^{re} = \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^p [a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R} : -\infty \leq a_j \leq b_j \leq \infty \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, p \right\}$ ,  
the collection of all hyper rectangles,

among others. Clearly,  $\mathcal{A}^{max} \subset \mathcal{A}^{dist} \subset \mathcal{A}^{re}$ . For a fixed  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ , (1.1) implies that  $\rho_{n,\mathcal{A}^{re}} \rightarrow 0$ , so that the Gaussian approximation (GA) holds for each of the three classes. In recent years there has been a surge of interest in extending the GA results to the case where  $p = p_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In this paper, we investigate the range of validity of the approximation (1.2) for  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{re}$  for increasing  $p$  under some suitable regularity conditions.

To provide some perspective on the problem in relation to existing work on the CLT, we point out that when  $p \rightarrow \infty$  with  $n$ , the class of sets allowed in  $\mathcal{A}^{max}$  (and hence in  $\mathcal{A}^{dist}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$ ) in our framework does not necessarily allow the GA problem to be embedded in the paths of an empirical process or in some suitable Banach space and hence can not be directly derived from the well developed body of work establishing the CLT therein (cf. Ledoux and Talagrand (1991) and van der Vaart and Wellner (2000)). As a result, alternative theoretical tools are needed. We

first highlight some related work and associated approaches that have been applied to study the GA problem in our framework. Portnoy (1986) obtained some early results on the CLT in increasing dimensions using Fourier transform techniques allowing  $p$  to increase as a fractional power of  $n$ . Similar growth rates of  $p$  were also allowed in the works of Nagaev (1976), Asriev and Rotar (1989), and Götze (1991) in studying Berry-Esseen type bounds on the rate of convergence in the CLT for different classes of sets and functions under varying degree of generality. Tiro (1991) derived Edgeworth expansion results for expectations of functions of  $T_n$ , again using Fourier transformation based techniques, but under stronger conditions on  $p$ .

Two other widely-used approaches for proving the CLT in high dimensions are based on Stein’s method (Stein (1986)) and on Lindeberg’s method (Lindeberg (1922)). CLTs in high dimensions using Stein’s method have been proved by Goldstein and Rinott (1996) by applying size bias couplings, by Chatterjee and Meckes (2008) and Reinert and Röllin (2009) using exchangeable pairs, and by Chen and Fang (2011) using the concentration inequality approach, among others. Lindeberg’s method was revived by Trotter (1959) in the context of proving multivariate CLTs and has been significantly generalized by Chatterjee (2006) for approximating expectations of smooth functions (not necessarily based on sums) of random vectors in high dimensions. Some variants of the argument also have been used by Bentkus (2003) and Zhilova (2019) to establish Berry-Esseen Theorems in high dimensions for the class of all convex sets and for the class of all Euclidean balls, respectively. Building on Chatterjee’s work and using techniques from spin-glass theory, in a seminal work, Chernozukov et al. (2013) (hereafter referred to as [CCK]) establish CLT for the class of sets  $\mathcal{A}^{max}$  in ultra-high dimensions. More precisely, they showed that  $\rho_{n,\mathcal{A}^{max}} \rightarrow 0$  allowing the dimension  $p$  to grow at a sub-exponential rate:

$$(1.3) \quad \rho_{n,\mathcal{A}^{max}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ provided } \log p = o(n^{1/7}) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Extensions of the GA results to the class  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$  has been later proved in Chernozukov et al. (2017). (Hereafter, we shall refer to both these papers as [CCK]). [CCK] also conjectured that the best growth rate of  $p$  is possibly faster, and hypothesized the best rate as  $\log p = o(n^{1/3})$ . A series of recent papers tried to settle this issue, and extend it in different directions. Chernozukov et al. (2019) and Koike (2019) improved the bound on the growth rate of  $p$  and proved validity of the CLT, respectively for the classes of sets  $\mathcal{A}^{max}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$ , allowing  $\log p = o(n^{1/5})$ . Their proofs are based on a randomized version of the Lindeberg’s method. Kuchibolta et al. (2020) used techniques from CLT on Banach Spaces to establish the CLT over  $\ell^\infty$ -balls in  $\mathcal{R}^p$  (which is a proper subset of  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$ ) and also obtained non-uniform large deviation bounds, allowing  $\log p = o(n^{1/4})$ . Under different sets of additional structural conditions on the  $X_i$ s (e.g., symmetry and/or existence of a common additive factor along all components), the papers by Chernozukov et al. (2019) and Koike (2019) also extend the CLT over the respective classes of sets, allowing  $\log p = o(n^{1/3})$ . In all these papers, a key assumption is that the component-wise variances of the  $X_i$ s remain bounded away from zero, which is a critical condition for anti-concentration of the approximating Gaussian measures in  $\mathcal{R}^p$ . In the case where this condition fails, it is possible to use the decay of the component-wise variances to reduce the effective dimension of the problem to a lower dimension. Indeed, Lopes et al (2020) consider a similar dimension

reduction setting assuming a polynomial rate of decay of the (ordered) component-wise variances and, among other interesting results, establish a uniform CLT over  $\mathcal{A}^{max}$  allowing  $\log p = o(n^{-\delta+1/2})$  for any  $\delta > 0$ . Since the maximum is not attained by the low-variance components, the assumed decay condition on the variances allowed Lopes et al (2020) to reduce the effective dimension of the problem to a logarithmic scale and apply the classical CLT results in low dimensions growing at a fractional polynomial rate with the sample size (cf. Bentkus (2003)). In this paper, we do not require any such dimension reduction conditions and show that, under some general regularity conditions,

$$(1.4) \quad \rho_{n, \mathcal{A}^{re}} \rightarrow 0, \text{ provided } \log p = o(n^{1/2}) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since  $\mathcal{A}^{max} \subset \mathcal{A}^{re}$ , it follows that the best growth rate of  $p$  for valid GA over both  $\mathcal{A}^{max}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$  is higher than the rate conjectured in [CCK]. It also improves upon all of the existing results listed above allowing a better growth rate of  $p$  and matches the rate bound in Lopes et al (2020) over a larger class of sets without the variance decay condition.

Once (1.4) is established, the CLT result also raises the natural question: *When does the GA over  $\mathcal{A}^{max}$  or  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$  fail in high dimensions?* In Theorem 2.3, we show by means of an example involving Rademacher random variables that

$$(1.5) \quad \rho_{n, \mathcal{A}^{re}} \not\rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ if } \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-(\delta+1/2)} \log p > 0,$$

for some  $\delta > 0$ . Thus, if  $\log p$  grows slightly faster than  $n^{1/2}$  even along a subsequence, the GA over  $\mathcal{A}^{max}$  or  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$  in  $\mathcal{R}^p$  fails. As a result, the best possible growth rate of  $p$  for a valid GA over the class  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$  is  $\log p = o(n^{1/2})$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . It can be shown that the conclusions of Theorem 2.3 remain unchanged if we consider  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{max}$ . Therefore, our main results settle the conjecture of [CCK] by providing a definite answer to the critical growth rate of  $p$  for a valid GA.

The proof of the main results here follows a very different approach compared to [CCK] and other related recent work in that we make use of the classical Fourier transformation based methods, albeit indirectly. The key tool is a set of non-uniform Berry-Esseen type bounds of Dasgupta (1989, 1992) in the one dimensional CLT for sums of independent random variables which, in turn, heavily make use of Fourier transformation based arguments (cf. Ghosh and Dasgupta (1978)). To derive the GA to  $P(T_n \in A)$  over  $A \in \mathcal{A}^{re}$ , we begin with the standard factorization of the probability  $P(T_n \in A)$  for rectangles  $A$  under the (assumed) independence of the components of  $X_i$  and do a careful analysis of the product of the  $p$  factors that define  $P(T_n \in A)$ . Note that each of the  $p$  factors must be very close to unity in order to yield a nontrivial value of  $P(T_n \in A)$ . As a result, one must control the errors in the component-wise normal approximations as well as the probabilities of the complementary events when the difference from unity is small. We accomplish this by regrouping the endpoints of the  $p$  intervals of  $A \in \mathcal{A}^{re}$  into a specific partition of the real line (depending on  $n$ ) and applying a set of suitable error estimates over each range. We also needed to make intricate choices of several tuning parameters to ensure that the final error estimates are close to the actual order of the GA error, yielding both a tight upper bound and a lower bound on the growth rate of  $p$ . See Section 3 for more details.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We state the assumptions and the main results in Section 2. Proofs of all the results are presented in Section 3.

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

Before moving to the main results, we state the assumptions needed to prove the main results. Suppose  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are independent random vectors in  $\mathcal{R}^p$ . Let  $X_{ij}$  be the  $j$ th component of  $X_i$ . Define  $s_n^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(X_{i1})$ . Consider the following assumptions:

- (A.1)  $X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip}$  are independent and identically distributed (iid) for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .
- (A.2)  $\mathbf{E}X_{i1}^{2m-1} = 0$  for all  $m \geq 1$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .
- (A.3)  $0 < \inf_{n \geq 1} n^{-1} s_n^2 \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} n^{-1} s_n^2 < \infty$ .
- (A.4)  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \left[ n^{m-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left( \frac{X_{i1}}{s_n} \right)^{2m} \right] \leq \frac{l^{-m} (2m)!}{m!}$  for all integer  $m \geq 1$ , for some  $l \in (1, 2]$ .

Let us discuss the assumptions briefly. Under assumption (A.1),  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  can be non-identically distributed (e.g., with a different component-wise variance  $\sigma_i^2$ ) but for each fixed  $i$ , all  $p$  components of  $X_i$  must have the same distribution. The independence of  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  and the iid nature among the components of each  $X_i$  ensure that  $T_1, \dots, T_p$  are iid where  $T_j \equiv T_{nj} = s_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij}$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ . This is essential to keep our proof of the main results simpler. Also note that under (A.1),  $T_n$  in (1.1) equals  $(T_{n1}, \dots, T_{np})'$ . Next, to gain some insight into assumptions (A.2)-(A.4), consider the case when  $X_i$ 's are iid, i.e. when  $X_{ij}$ 's are all iid. Note that in this case assumption (A.2) is satisfied if  $X_{11}$  has a symmetric distribution around 0 and all moments of  $X_{11}$  exist. (A.3) implies and is implied by the fact that  $X_{11}$  is non-degenerate and has a finite variance. Assumption (A.4) implies that  $\mathbf{E}e^{cX_{11}^2} < \infty$  for some  $c > 0$ , which in turn implies that  $X_{11}$  has an entire characteristic function.

Note that in our setup, the distributions of  $X_{11}, \dots, X_{n1}$  are enough to specify the distribution of  $T = s_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ . An immediate example of the sequence  $\{X_{11}, \dots, X_{n1}\}$  for which all the assumptions are satisfied is when  $X_{i1}$ 's are iid Rademacher random variables, i.e. when  $X_{i1} = 1$  or  $-1$  each with probability  $1/2$ . In this case, assumption (A.4) holds with  $l = 2$ . For other examples of  $\{X_{11}, \dots, X_{n1}\}$  which satisfy the above conditions, see section 5 in Dasgupta (1992).

We are now ready to state the first result.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be independent random vectors in  $\mathcal{R}^p$  such that the assumptions (A.1)-(A.4) hold. If  $\log p = o(n^{1/2})$  then*

$$\rho_{n, \mathcal{A}^{re}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Theorem 1 shows that under (A.1)-(A.4), the GA of (1.2) holds with  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{re}$  for  $p$  growing at the rate  $\exp(o(\sqrt{n}))$  with the sample size  $n$ . In particular, (1.2) holds with  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{max}$  beyond the range  $\log p \gg n^{1/3}$  hypothesized by [CCK]. Now a natural question is: *Does there exist an asymptotic upper bound on  $\rho_{n, \mathcal{A}^{re}}$  even when  $\log p$  is exactly of order  $\sqrt{n}$ ?* Next theorem gives an answer to this question.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  be independent random vectors in  $\mathcal{R}^p$  such that the conditions (A.1)-(A.4) hold. Recall that the constant  $l \in (1, 2]$  is defined in the condition (A.4). Then there exists a positive constant  $c \leq (1 - l^{-1})^3$  such that whenever  $\log p = \epsilon n^{1/2}$  with  $0 < \epsilon < c$ ,*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{n, \mathcal{A}^{re}} < \epsilon.$$

Theorem 2 is a refinement of Theorem 1 and shows that the uniform error of GA, namely,  $\rho_{n, \mathcal{A}^{re}}$ , decreases linearly with the multiplier  $\epsilon$  in the rate bound  $p \leq \exp(\epsilon\sqrt{n})$  for a nontrivial set of  $\epsilon$  depending on the tail parameter  $l$  of the distributions of  $X_{11}, \dots, X_{n1}$ . In particular, when all  $X_{ij}$ 's are iid with a subGaussian tail, the bound in Theorem 2 holds for all  $\epsilon \in (0, c)$  with some  $c \leq 1/8$ . The next result shows that for a valid GA over the class of sets  $\mathcal{A}^{re}$ , the  $o(\sqrt{n})$  upper bound on  $\log p$  can not be significantly improved upon.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $X_{ij}$ 's be iid Rademacher variables, i.e.  $X_{ij} = 1$  or  $-1$  each with probability  $1/2$  and be independent across  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ . If  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-(\delta+1/2)} \log p > 0$  for some  $\delta > 0$ , then*

$$\rho_{n, \mathcal{A}^{re}} \not\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

From the proof, it also follows that under the conditions of Theorem 3,

$$\rho_{n, \mathcal{A}^{max}} \not\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

As a result, the best possible growth rate of  $\log p$  for a valid GA over the smaller class of sets  $\mathcal{A}^{max}$  considered in [CCK] is also  $o(\sqrt{n})$ .

### 3. PROOFS OF THE RESULTS

Suppose,  $\Phi(\cdot)$  and  $\phi(\cdot)$  respectively denote the cdf and pdf of the standard normal random variable. Define  $N_i = (N_{i1}, \dots, N_{ip})'$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  where  $N_{ij}$ 's are iid  $N(0, 1)$  random variables for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ . For any vector  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_p) \in \mathcal{R}$ , let  $t_{(j)}$  and  $t^{(j)}$  respectively denote the  $j$ th element after sorting the components of  $\mathbf{t}$  in increasing order and in decreasing order. (We use boldface font only for  $\mathbf{t}$  to avoid some notational conflict later on. All other vectors are denoted using regular font). For any random variable  $H$ ,  $P(H \leq x)$  is assumed to be 1 if  $x = \infty$ . We will need to use some lemmas which are stated and proved next. Proofs of the theorems are given in Section 3.2 below.

#### 3.1. Auxiliary Lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\{Z_{ni} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$  be a triangular array of random variables which are independent within each row with  $\sigma_n^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} Z_{ni}^2$  and satisfies*

- (1)  $\mathbf{E} Z_{ni}^{2m+1} = 0$  for all  $m \geq 1$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .
- (2)  $0 < \inf_{n \geq 1} \sigma_n^2 \leq \sup_{n \geq 1} \sigma_n^2 < \infty$ .
- (3)  $\sup_{n \geq 1} \left[ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} \left( \frac{Z_{ni}}{\sigma_n} \right)^{2m} \right] \leq \frac{q^{-m} (2m)!}{m!}$  for all  $m \geq 1$ , for some  $q \in (1, 2]$ .

Then we have for some constant  $b_1 > 0$ ,

$$\left| \mathbf{P} \left( \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni} \leq t \right) - \Phi(t) \right| \leq b_1 \exp(-t^2(1-q^{-1})); \quad -\infty < t < \infty.$$

**Proof of Lemma 1:** This lemma is stated as Theorem 1 in Dasgupta (1992).

**Lemma 2.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1,*

$$\left| \mathbf{P} \left( \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni} \leq t \right) - \Phi(t) \right| \leq b_2 r_n \exp(-t^2/2) \text{ for all } |t| < M_n,$$

where  $M_n = O(n^{1/4})$ ,  $r_n = \max\{n^{-1} M_n^3, n^{-1/2}\}$  and  $b_2 > 0$  is a constant independent of  $n$  and  $t$ .

**Proof of Lemma 2:** Let us split  $|t| < M_n$  into two parts: when  $|t| \leq 1$  and when  $1 < |t| < M_n$ . If  $|t| \leq 1$  then by Berry-Esseen theorem (cf. Bhattacharya and Rao (1986)) and assumption (3) of Lemma 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \mathbf{P}\left(\sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni} \leq t\right) - \Phi(t) \right| &\leq (2.75) \left[ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}\left(\frac{|Z_{ni}|}{\sigma_n}\right)^3 \right] n^{-1/2} \\
 &\leq (2.75) \left[ 1 + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}\left(\frac{|Z_{ni}|}{\sigma_n}\right)^4 \right] n^{-1/2} \\
 &\leq \left[ (2.75) \left( 1 + \frac{q^{-2}(4!)}{2!} \right) e^{1/2} \right] \left( e^{-t^2/2} n^{-1/2} \right) \\
 &\leq b_2 r_n \exp(-t^2/2)
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Now consider the region  $1 < |t| < M_n$ . Here we are going to use Theorem 2.2 of Dasgupta (1989). Note that under the conditions (2) & (3) of Lemma 1, using monotone convergence theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{E}(Z_{ni}^2 \exp(|Z_{ni}|)) &\leq \mathbf{E}\left(Z_{ni}^2 (\exp(|Z_{ni}|) + \exp(-|Z_{ni}|))\right) = 2 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}|Z_{ni}|^{2m+2}}{(2m)!} \\
 \Rightarrow \sup_{n \geq 1} \left[ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}(Z_{ni}^2 \exp(|Z_{ni}|)) \right] &\leq 2 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\sup_{n \geq 1} [n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}|Z_{ni}|^{2m+2}]}{(2m)!} \\
 \Rightarrow \sup_{n \geq 1} \left[ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}(Z_{ni}^2 \exp(|Z_{ni}|)) \right] &\leq 2 \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{q^{-(m+1)} (2m+2)! M^{m+1}}{(m+1)!(2m)!} < \infty,
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where  $M = \sup_{n \geq 1} \sigma_n^2$ . Hence in view of (1.3) of Dasgupta (1989), we can consider  $g(x) = e^{|x|}$  in applying Theorem 2.2 of Dasgupta (1989). As a consequence, we have for any  $1 < |t| < M_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left| \mathbf{P}\left(\sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni} \leq t\right) - \Phi(t) \right| &\leq b \exp(-t^2/2) |t|^{-1} \exp(kn^{-1}t^4) - 1 \\
 &\quad + b \exp(-t^2/2 + kn^{-1}t^4) n^{-1/2} \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{P}(|Z_{ni}| > r\sqrt{n}\sigma_n|t|) \\
 &= J_{1n} + J_{2n} + J_{3n} \quad (\text{say}),
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

for some  $0 < r < 1/2$  and constants  $b, k > 0$  depend on only  $r$ . Since  $n^{-1}t^4 = O(1)$ ,  $|\exp(kn^{-1}t^4) - 1| |t|^{-1} \leq k_1 n^{-1} |t|^3 \leq k_1 r_n$  for some constant  $k_1 > 0$ , and  $\exp(kn^{-1}t^4) = O(1)$ . Hence  $J_{1n} + J_{2n} \leq b k_2 r_n \exp(-t^2/2)$  for some constant  $k_2 > 0$ . Again by Markov's inequality and using (3.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{P}(|Z_{ni}| > r\sqrt{n}\sigma_n|t|) &\leq r^{-2} \sigma_n^{-2} \left[ n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}(Z_{ni}^2 \exp(|Z_{ni}|)) \right] \exp(-r\sqrt{n}\sigma_n|t|) \\
 &\leq k_3 r_n \exp(-t^2/2)
 \end{aligned}$$

whenever  $1 < |t| < M_n$ , for some constant  $k_3 > 0$ . Therefore when  $1 < |t| < M_n$ , taking  $b_2 = (bk_2 + k_3)$  we have

$$(3.4) \quad \left| \mathbf{P} \left( \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ni} \leq t \right) - \Phi(t) \right| \leq b_2 r_n \exp(-t^2/2).$$

Now combining (3.1) and (3.4), the proof of Lemma 2 is complete.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  be a sequence of mean zero independent random vectors in  $\mathcal{R}^p$  with  $Y_i = (Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{ip})$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and let  $\{Y_{i1}, \dots, Y_{ip}\}$  be iid for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $d_n^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} Y_{i1}^2 < \infty$ . Define,  $l_1(x) = \max \left\{ \mathbf{P} \left( d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (-Y_{i1}) \leq x \right), \Phi(x) \right\}$ ,  $d_1(x) = \left| \mathbf{P} \left( d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (-Y_{i1}) \leq x \right) - \Phi(x) \right|$ ,  $l_2(x) = \max \left\{ \mathbf{P} \left( d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_{i1} \leq x \right), \Phi(x) \right\}$  and  $d_2(x) = \left| \mathbf{P} \left( d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_{i1} \leq x \right) - \Phi(x) \right|$ . Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{P} \left( d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \in \prod_{j=1}^p \{[a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R}\} \right) - \mathbf{P} \left( n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_i \in \prod_{j=1}^p \{[a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R}\} \right) \right| \\ & \leq L_1(\mathbf{a}) + L_2(\mathbf{b}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_p)'$ ,  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_p)'$ ,

$$L_1(\mathbf{a}) = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^p \left( \prod_{j \neq k} l_1(-a_j) \right) d_1(-a_k) \right], \quad L_2(\mathbf{b}) = \left[ \sum_{k=1}^p \left( \prod_{j \neq k} l_2(b_j) \right) d_2(b_k) \right].$$

**Proof of Lemma 3:** Note that  $d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i = (W_1, \dots, W_p)'$  where  $W_j = d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_{ij}$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ . Then, using the conditions on  $Y_{ij}$ 's, it is easy to check that  $\{W_1, \dots, W_p\}$  are identically distributed. Therefore the components of  $d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ , are iid. Similarly, since  $N_{ij} \sim N(0, 1)$  are iid, the  $p$ -variables  $(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_{i1}), \dots, (n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_{ip})$  are also iid. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{P} \left( d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \in \prod_{j=1}^p \{[a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R}\} \right) - \mathbf{P} \left( n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_i \in \prod_{j=1}^p \{[a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R}\} \right) \right| \\ & = \left| \prod_{j=1}^p P(W_j \in [a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R}) - \prod_{j=1}^p P(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_{ij} \in [a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R}) \right| \\ & \leq \left[ \sum_{k=1}^p \left( \prod_{j \neq k} \left( \min \{l_1(-a_j), l_2(b_j)\} \right) \right) [d_1(-a_k) + d_2(b_k)] \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^p \left( \prod_{j \neq k} l_1(-a_j) \right) [d_1(-a_k)] + \sum_{k=1}^p \left( \prod_{j \neq k} l_2(b_j) \right) [d_2(b_k)] \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^p \left( \prod_{j \neq k} l_1(-a_j) \right) [d_1(-a_k)] + \sum_{k=1}^p \left( \prod_{j \neq k} l_2(b_j) \right) [d_2(b_k)] \end{aligned}$$



The last equality is due to the following fact:

If  $(G_1, H_1), \dots, (G_p, H_p)$  are iid random vectors in  $\mathcal{R}^2$ , then for any  $t_1, \dots, t_p \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^p \left[ \left( \prod_{j \neq k} \left( \max \left\{ P(G_j \leq t_j), P(H_j \leq t_j) \right\} \right) \right) \left| P(G_k \leq t_k) - P(H_k \leq t_k) \right| \right] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^p \left[ \left( \prod_{j \neq k} \left( \max \left\{ P(G_1 \leq t_{(j)}), P(H_1 \leq t_{(j)}) \right\} \right) \right) \left| P(G_1 \leq t_{(k)}) - P(H_1 \leq t_{(k)}) \right| \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\{t_{(1)}, t_{(2)}, \dots, t_{(p)}\}$  are obtained after sorting  $\{t_1, \dots, t_p\}$  in increasing order. Therefore we are done.

**Lemma 4.** For any  $t > 0$ ,  $\frac{1 - \Phi(t)}{\phi(t)} \geq \frac{2}{\sqrt{t^2 + 4} + t}$ .

**Proof of Lemma 4:** This inequality is proved in Birnbaum (1942).

**Lemma 5.** For any positive integer  $m$ ,

$$\sqrt{2\pi} m^{m+1/2} e^{-m} \leq m! \leq m^{m+1/2} e^{-m+1}.$$

This is the well-known Stirling's formula. See for example Robbins (1955).

**3.2. Proofs of the main results. Proof of Theorem 1:** Suppose  $T_n = s_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  and  $S_n = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_i$ . Let  $T = (T_{n1}, \dots, T_{np})'$  and  $S_n = (S_{n1}, \dots, S_{np})'$ . Clearly  $T_{nj}$ 's are iid and  $S_{nj}$ 's are iid for  $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ . We can use Lemma 3 with  $Y_i = X_i$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{P} \left( d_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \in \prod_{j=1}^p \{[a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R}\} \right) - \mathbf{P} \left( n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_i \in \prod_{j=1}^p \{[a_j, b_j] \cap \mathcal{R}\} \right) \right| \\ & \leq L_1(\mathbf{a}) + L_2(\mathbf{b}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $L_1(\mathbf{a})$  and  $L_2(\mathbf{b})$  are as defined in Lemma 3. Since all the assumptions are also satisfied if we replace  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  by  $\{-X_1, \dots, -X_n\}$ , it is enough to show

(3.5)

$$\sup_{t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_p} L((t_1, \dots, t_p)') = \sup_{t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_p} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^p \left( \prod_{j \neq k} l(t_j) \right) d(t_k) \right] = o(1), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Here,  $l(x) = \max \left\{ \mathbf{P}(T_{n1} \leq x), \mathbf{P}(S_{n1} \leq x) \right\}$  and  $d(x) = \left| \mathbf{P}(T_{n1} \leq x) - \mathbf{P}(S_{n1} \leq x) \right|$ . Note that we are done if we can show  $L(\mathbf{t}) = L((t_1, \dots, t_p)') \leq A_n$  for sufficiently large  $n$ , where  $A_n$  does not depend on  $\mathbf{t}$ , and  $A_n = o(1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Since  $\log p = o(n^{1/2})$ , there exists a sequence of positive numbers  $a_n$  increasing to  $\infty$  such that  $\log p = O(a_n^{-3} n^{1/2})$ . Without loss of generality assume  $a_n^3 = o(n^{1/2})$ . Now fix  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_p)'$  in  $\mathcal{R}^p$  such that  $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_p$ . Then there exist

integers  $l_1, l_2, l_3$ , depending on  $n$ , such that  $0 \leq l_1, l_2, l_3 \leq p$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_1 &\leq t_2 \leq \cdots \leq t_{l_1} < -a_n^{-1}n^{1/4} \\
 -a_n^{-1}n^{1/4} &\leq t_{l_1+1} \leq t_{l_1+2} \leq \cdots \leq t_{l_2} < 1 \\
 1 &\leq t_{l_2+1} \leq t_{l_2+2} \leq \cdots \leq t_{l_3} \leq a_n^{-1}n^{1/4} \\
 (3.6) \quad a_n^{-1}n^{1/4} &< t_{l_3+1} \leq t_{l_3+2} \leq \cdots \leq t_p
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $a_n^3 = o(n^{1/2})$  and  $a_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , hence due to Lemma 2 and Lemma 4, we have for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 l(x) &\leq I\left(x > a_n^{-1}n^{1/4}\right) + \left[1 - \frac{2\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} + b_2e^{-1/2}n^{-1/4}\right]I\left(x < 1\right) \\
 &\quad + \left[1 - \frac{2\phi(x)}{\sqrt{x^2+4}+x} + b_2e^{-x^2/2}n^{-1/4}\right]I\left(x \in [1, a_n^{-1}n^{1/4}]\right) \\
 &\leq I\left(x > a_n^{-1}n^{1/4}\right) + \left[1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1}\right]I\left(x < 1\right) \\
 (3.7) \quad &\quad + \left[1 - (4\pi)^{-1/2}a_n n^{-1/4}e^{-x^2/2}\right]I\left(x \in [1, a_n^{-1}n^{1/4}]\right),
 \end{aligned}$$

for any  $x \in \mathcal{R}$ .  $I(\cdot)$  is the indicator function. Again due to Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 we have for any  $x \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

$$(3.8) \quad d(x) \leq \left[b_1e^{-x^2(1-l^{-1})}\right]I\left(|x| > a_n^{-1}n^{1/4}\right) + \left[b_2e^{-x^2/2}n^{-1/4}\right]I\left(|x| \leq a_n^{-1}n^{1/4}\right)$$

Therefore from equations (3.5)-(3.8), we have

$$(3.9) \quad L(\mathbf{t}) \leq I_1(\mathbf{t}) + I_2(\mathbf{t}) + I_3(\mathbf{t}) + I_4(\mathbf{t}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_1(\mathbf{t}) &= \left(\left[1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1}\right]^{l_2-1}\right) * \left(\prod_{j=l_2+1}^{l_3} \left[1 - (4\pi)^{-1/2}a_n n^{-1/4}e^{-t_j^2/2}\right]\right) \\
 &\quad * \left(\sum_{k=1}^{l_1} b_1e^{-t_k^2(1-l^{-1})}\right) * I\left(l_1 \geq 1\right), \\
 I_2(\mathbf{t}) &= \left(\left[1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1}\right]^{l_2-1}\right) * \left(\prod_{j=l_2+1}^{l_3} \left[1 - (4\pi)^{-1/2}a_n n^{-1/4}e^{-t_j^2/2}\right]\right) \\
 &\quad * \left(\sum_{k=l_1+1}^{l_2} b_2n^{-1/4}e^{-t_k^2/2}\right) * I\left((l_2 - l_1) \geq 1\right), \\
 I_3(\mathbf{t}) &= \left(\left[1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1}\right]^{l_2}\right) * I\left((l_3 - l_2) \geq 1\right) \\
 &\quad * \left(\sum_{k=l_2+1}^{l_3} b_2n^{-1/4}e^{-t_k^2/2} \left(\prod_{\substack{j=l_2+1 \\ j \neq k}}^{l_3} \left[1 - (4\pi)^{-1/2}a_n n^{-1/4}e^{-t_j^2/2}\right]\right)\right),
 \end{aligned}$$

$$I_4(\mathbf{t}) = \left( \left[ 1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} \right]^{l_2} \right) * \left( \prod_{j=l_2+1}^{l_3} \left[ 1 - (4\pi)^{-1/2} a_n n^{-1/4} e^{-t_j^2/2} \right] \right) \\ * \left( \sum_{k=l_3+1}^p b_1 e^{-t_k^2(1-l^{-1})} \right) * I((p-l_3) \geq 1).$$

Bound on  $I_1(\mathbf{t}) + I_4(\mathbf{t})$ : Note that since  $\log p = O(a_n^{-3} n^{1/2})$ , by looking into (3.6) we have for some  $0 < M < \infty$ ,

$$I_1(\mathbf{t}) + I_4(\mathbf{t}) \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^{l_1} b_1 e^{-t_k^2(1-l^{-1})} \right) I(l_1 \geq 1) + \left( \sum_{k=l_3+1}^p b_1 e^{-t_k^2(1-l^{-1})} \right) I((p-l_3) \geq 1) \\ \leq (l_1 + p - l_3) \left( b_1 e^{-a_n^{-2} n^{1/2} (1-l^{-1})} \right) \\ \leq p \left( b_1 e^{-a_n^{-2} n^{1/2} (1-l^{-1})} \right) \\ \leq b_1 e^{M a_n^{-3} n^{1/2} - a_n^{-2} n^{1/2} (1-l^{-1})} \\ \leq b_1 e^{-a_n^{-3} n^{1/2} (a_n (1-l^{-1}) - M)} \\ (3.10) \\ = A_{1n} \quad (\text{say})$$

Bound on  $I_2(\mathbf{t})$ : Let  $d^{-1} = \left[ 1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} \right]$ . Then

$$I_2(\mathbf{t}) \leq \left( \left[ 1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} \right]^{l_2-1} \right) \left( \sum_{k=l_1+1}^{l_2} b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-t_k^2/2} \right) I((l_2-l_1) \geq 1) \\ \leq b_2 l_2 d^{-(l_2-1)} n^{-1/4} \\ \leq b_2 d n^{-1/4} \sup_{x>0} (x d^{-x}).$$

Now,  $\sup_{x>0} (x c^{-x}) = (\log c)^{-1} c^{-(\log c)^{-1}}$  for any  $c > 1$ . Therefore we have

$$(3.11) \quad I_2(\mathbf{t}) \leq \left( b_2 d (\log d)^{-1} d^{-(\log d)^{-1}} \right) n^{-1/4} = A_{2n} \quad (\text{say})$$

Bound on  $I_3(\mathbf{t})$ : Note that if  $(l_3 - l_2) = 0$  then  $I_3(\mathbf{t}) = 0$  and there is nothing more to do. Hence assume  $(l_3 - l_2) \geq 1$ . Then we have

$$(3.12) \\ I_3(\mathbf{t}) \leq \left( \sum_{k=l_2+1}^{l_3} b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-t_k^2/2} \left( \prod_{\substack{j=l_2+1 \\ j \neq k}}^{l_3} \left[ 1 - (4\pi)^{-1/2} a_n n^{-1/4} e^{-t_j^2/2} \right] \right) \right) = I_{31}(\mathbf{t}) \quad (\text{say}).$$

We are going to check the monotonicity of  $I_{31}(\mathbf{t})$  with respect to  $t_{l_2+1}, \dots, t_{l_3}$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial I_{31}(\mathbf{t})}{\partial t_l} = & \left[ b_2 t_l e^{-t_l^2/2} n^{-1/4} \prod_{\substack{j=l_2+1 \\ j \neq l}}^{l_3} \left[ 1 - (4\pi)^{-1/2} a_n n^{-1/4} e^{-t_j^2/2} \right] \right] \times \\ & \left[ \sum_{\substack{k=l_2+1 \\ k \neq l}}^{l_3} \left( \left[ 1 - (4\pi)^{-1/2} a_n n^{-1/4} e^{-t_k^2/2} \right]^{-1} (4\pi)^{-1/2} a_n n^{-1/4} e^{-t_k^2/2} \right) - 1 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Hence for any  $l = l_2 + 1, \dots, l_3$ ,  $\frac{\partial I_{31}(\mathbf{t})}{\partial t_l} \gtrless 0$  if and only if

$$(3.13) \quad \sum_{\substack{j=l_2+1 \\ j \neq l}}^{l_3} \frac{z_j}{1 - z_j} \gtrless 1,$$

where  $z_j = (4\pi)^{-1/2} a_n n^{-1/4} e^{-t_j^2/2}$  for  $j \in \{l_2 + 1, \dots, l_3\}$ . Note that since  $1 \leq t_{l_2+1} \leq \dots \leq t_{l_3}$ ,  $1 > z_{l_2+1} \geq \dots \geq z_{l_3} > 0$  for sufficiently large  $n$ . Hence for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\frac{z_{l_2+1}}{1 - z_{l_2+1}} \geq \dots \geq \frac{z_{l_3}}{1 - z_{l_3}},$$

due to the fact that  $z/(1 - z)$  is increasing for  $z \in (0, 1)$ . Therefore from (3.13) we can say that  $I_{31}(\mathbf{t})$  is non-increasing in  $\{t_{l_2+1}, \dots, t_m\}$  and non-decreasing in  $\{t_{m+1}, \dots, t_{l_3}\}$  where  $(m - l_2)$  is a non-negative integer not more than  $(l_3 - l_2)$ . Again note that  $1 \leq t_{l_2+1} \leq \dots \leq t_m \leq t_{m+1} \leq \dots \leq t_{l_3} \leq a_n^{-1} n^{1/4}$ . Hence from (3.12) we have

$$I_3(\mathbf{t}) \leq I_{31}((\mathbf{t}^{(1)'}, \mathbf{t}^{(2)'})')$$

where  $\mathbf{t}^{(1)}$  is an  $(m - l_2) \times 1$  vector with each component being 1 and  $\mathbf{t}^{(2)}$  is an  $(l_3 - m) \times 1$  vector with each component being  $a_n^{-1} n^{1/4}$ . Therefore using the fact that  $\log p = O(a_n^{-3} n^{1/2})$  we can say that there exists  $M \in (0, \infty)$  such that for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(\mathbf{t}) & \leq (m - l_2) \left[ 1 - (4\pi)^{-1/2} a_n n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2} \right]^{m-l_2-1} (b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2}) \\ & \quad + (l_3 - m) (b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-(2^{-1} a_n^{-2} n^{1/2})}) \\ & \leq 2 \left[ \exp \left( \log(m - l_2) - (m - l_2) ((4\pi)^{-1/2} a_n n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2}) \right) \right] (b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2}) \\ & \quad + p (b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-(2^{-1} a_n^{-2} n^{1/2})}) \\ & \leq 2 \left[ \exp \left( \sup_{x>0} [\log x - x ((4\pi)^{-1/2} a_n n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2})] \right) \right] (b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2}) \\ & \quad + \left( b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-((a_n^{-3} n^{1/2})(a_n/2 - M))} \right) \\ & \leq ((4\pi)^{1/2} a_n^{-1} n^{1/4} e^{1/2}) (b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2}) + \left( b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-((a_n^{-3} n^{1/2})(a_n/2 - M))} \right) \\ (3.14) \quad & = A_{3n} \quad (\text{say}) \end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.10), (3.11) and (3.14), we have for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$I(\mathbf{t}) \leq A_{1n} + A_{2n} + A_{3n} = A_n \quad (\text{say}).$$

Note that  $A_n$  does not depend on the choice of  $\mathbf{t}$  and also  $A_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, the proof of Theorem 1 is now complete.

**Proof of Theorem 2:** We are going to follow the same steps as in the proof of Theorem 1. Note that we are done if in (3.5) we can show  $L_n(\mathbf{t}) \leq \epsilon/2$  for sufficiently large  $n$ , irrespective of the choice of  $\mathbf{t}$ .

Now take  $c = \min \left\{ [8b_2\sqrt{2\pi}(\sqrt{2}+1)]^{-3}, (1-l^{-1})^3 \right\}$  where the constant  $b_2$  is as defined in Lemma 2 but with  $\{Z_{ni} : 1 \leq i \leq n\} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  and the constant  $l$  is defined in the condition (A.4). Fix  $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_p)'$  in  $\mathcal{R}^p$  such that  $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_p$ . Then there exist integers  $l_4, l_5, l_6$ , depending on  $n$ , such that  $0 \leq l_4, l_5, l_6 \leq p$  and

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_{l_4} &< -\epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4} \\ -\epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4} \leq t_{l_4+1} \leq t_{l_4+1} \leq \dots \leq t_{l_5} &< 1 \\ 1 \leq t_{l_5+1} \leq t_{l_5+1} \leq \dots \leq t_{l_6} &\leq \epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4} \\ \epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4} < t_{l_6+1} \leq t_{l_6+1} \leq \dots \leq t_p \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Now use the same definitions of  $l(x)$  and  $u(x)$ , as in the proof of Theorem 1. Then due to Lemma 1 & 2 and the fact that  $\epsilon \leq c < 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} l(x) &\leq I\left(x > \epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4}\right) + \left[1 - \frac{2\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} + \epsilon b_2 e^{-1/2}n^{-1/4}\right] I\left(x < 1\right) \\ &\quad + \left[1 - \frac{2\phi(x)}{\sqrt{x^2+4}+x} + \epsilon b_2 e^{-x^2/2}n^{-1/4}\right] I\left(x \in [1, \epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4}]\right) \\ &\leq I\left(x > \epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4}\right) + \left[1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1}\right] I\left(x < 1\right) \\ &\quad + \left[1 - \frac{n^{-1/4}e^{-x^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(\sqrt{\epsilon^{2/3}+4n^{-1/2}}+\epsilon^{1/3})}\right] I\left(x \in [1, \epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4}]\right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

and

$$u(x) \leq \left[b_1 e^{-x^2(1-l^{-1})}\right] I\left(|x| > \epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4}\right) + \left[b_2 \epsilon n^{-1/4} e^{-x^2/2}n^{-1/4}\right] I\left(|x| \leq \epsilon^{1/3}n^{1/4}\right) \quad (3.17)$$

for any  $x \in \mathcal{R}$ , for sufficiently large  $n$ . Therefore from equations (3.5)-(3.8) we have for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$L(\mathbf{t}) \leq J_1(\mathbf{t}) + J_2(\mathbf{t}) + J_3(\mathbf{t}) + J_4(\mathbf{t}), \quad (3.18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_1(\mathbf{t}) &= \left(\left[1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1}\right]^{l_5-1}\right) * \left(\prod_{j=l_5+1}^{l_6} \left[1 - \frac{n^{-1/4}e^{-t_j^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(\sqrt{\epsilon^{2/3}+4n^{-1/2}}+\epsilon^{1/3})}\right]\right) \\ &\quad * \left(\sum_{k=1}^{l_4} b_1 e^{-t_k^2(1-l^{-1})}\right) * I\left(l_4 \geq 1\right), \end{aligned}$$

$$J_2(\mathbf{t}) = \left( \left[ 1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} \right]^{l_5-1} \right) * \left( \prod_{j=l_5+1}^{l_6} \left[ 1 - \frac{n^{-1/4}e^{-t_j^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(\sqrt{\epsilon^{2/3}+4n^{-1/2}}+\epsilon^{1/3})} \right] \right) \\ * \left( \sum_{k=l_3+1}^{l_4} \epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-t_k^2/2} \right) I((l_2 - l_1) \geq 1),$$

$$J_3(\mathbf{t}) = \left( \left[ 1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} \right]^{l_5} \right) * I((l_6 - l_5) \geq 1) \\ * \left( \sum_{k=l_5+1}^{l_6} \epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-t_k^2/2} \left( \prod_{\substack{j=l_5+1 \\ j \neq k}}^{l_6} \left[ 1 - \frac{n^{-1/4}e^{-t_j^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(\sqrt{\epsilon^{2/3}+4n^{-1/2}}+\epsilon^{1/3})} \right] \right) \right),$$

$$J_4(\mathbf{t}) = \left( \left[ 1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} \right]^{l_5} \right) * \left( \prod_{j=l_5+1}^{l_6} \left[ 1 - \frac{n^{-1/4}e^{-t_j^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(\sqrt{\epsilon^{2/3}+4n^{-1/2}}+\epsilon^{1/3})} \right] \right) \\ * \left( \sum_{k=l_6+1}^p b_1 e^{-t_k^2(1-l^{-1})} \right) I((p - l_6) \geq 1).$$

Bound on  $J_1(\mathbf{t}) + J_4(\mathbf{t})$ : Since  $\log p = \epsilon n^{1/2}$ , from (3.18) we have

$$J_1(\mathbf{t}) + J_4(\mathbf{t}) \leq \left( \sum_{k=1}^{l_4} b_1 e^{-t_k^2(1-l^{-1})} \right) I(l_4 \geq 1) + \left( \sum_{k=l_6+1}^p b_1 e^{-t_k^2(1-l^{-1})} \right) I((p - l_6) \geq 1) \\ \leq p \left( b_1 e^{-\epsilon^{2/3} n^{1/2} (1-l^{-1})} \right) \\ = b_1 \exp(\epsilon n^{1/2} - \epsilon^{2/3} n^{1/2} (1-l^{-1})) \\ \leq b_1 \exp(-\epsilon^{2/3} n^{1/2} ((1-l^{-1}) - \epsilon^{1/3})) \\ (3.19) \quad < \epsilon/12,$$

for large enough  $n$ , since  $\epsilon < c \leq (1-l^{-1})^3$ .

Bound on  $J_2(\mathbf{t})$ : Noting that  $d^{-1} = \left[ 1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} \right]$  and  $\epsilon < 1$ , we have for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$J_2(\mathbf{t}) \leq I_2(\mathbf{t}) \leq \left( \left[ 1 - \frac{\phi(1)}{\sqrt{5}+1} \right]^{l_2-1} \right) \left( \sum_{k=l_1+1}^{l_2} b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-t_k^2/2} \right) I((l_2 - l_1) \geq 1) \\ (3.20) \quad \leq \left( b_2 d^{-1} (\log d)^{-1} d^{-(\log d)^{-1}} \right) n^{-1/4} < \epsilon/12.$$

Bound on  $J_3(\mathbf{t})$ : Write  $z_n = n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2} \left[ \sqrt{2\pi}(\sqrt{\epsilon^{2/3}+4n^{-1/2}}+\epsilon^{1/3}) \right]^{-1}$ . Through the same line of arguments as in bounding  $I_3(\mathbf{t})$ , we have for some non-negative

integer  $q \in [l_5, l_6]$  and for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_3(\mathbf{t}) &\leq (q - l_5) \left[ 1 - z_n \right]^{q-l_5-1} (\epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2}) \\
&\quad + (l_6 - q) (\epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-(2^{-1} \epsilon^{2/3} n^{1/2})}) \\
&\leq 2 \left[ \exp \left( \log(q - l_5) - (q - l_5) z_n \right) \right] (\epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2}) \\
&\quad + p (\epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-(2^{-1} \epsilon^{2/3} n^{1/2})}) \\
&\leq 2 \left[ \exp \left( \sup_{x>0} [\log x - x z_n] \right) \right] (\epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2}) \\
&\quad + \left( \epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} \exp \left( -\epsilon^{2/3} n^{1/2} (1/2 - \epsilon^{1/3}) \right) \right) \\
&\leq 2 z_n^{-1} (\epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} e^{-1/2}) + \left( \epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} \exp \left( -\epsilon^{2/3} n^{1/2} (1/2 - \epsilon^{1/3}) \right) \right) \\
&\leq \left[ \sqrt{2\pi} (\sqrt{\epsilon^{2/3} + 4n^{-1/2}} + \epsilon^{1/3}) \right] 2\epsilon b_2 \\
&\quad + \left( \epsilon b_2 n^{-1/4} \exp \left( -\epsilon^{2/3} n^{1/2} (1/2 - \epsilon^{1/3}) \right) \right) \\
(3.21) \quad &< \epsilon/4 + \epsilon/12,
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\epsilon^{1/3} < c^{1/3} \leq [8b_2 \sqrt{2\pi}(\sqrt{2} + 1)]^{-1}$ . Now combining (3.15)-(3.21), the proof of Theorem 2 is complete.

**Proof of Theorem 3:** Suppose  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-(\delta+1/2)} \log p > 0$  for some  $\delta > 0$ . Then, there exists a subsequence  $\{n_k\}$  such that  $\log p_{n_k} > n_k^{\delta+1/2}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We will consider two cases depending on the values of  $p$ :

(I)  $p_{n_k} \geq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} (\sqrt{n_k + 4} + \sqrt{n_k}) e^{n_k/2}$  for infinitely many  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ;

(II)  $n_k^{\delta+1/2} < \log p_{n_k} \leq \log \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} (\sqrt{n_k + 4} + \sqrt{n_k}) e^{n_k/2} \right]$  for all but finitely many  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Next, strictly for the sake of notational simplicity, without loss of generality, we shall suppose that the respective inequalities under Cases (I) and (II) hold for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . (Otherwise, one needs to extract a further subsequence  $\{n_{k_i}\}$  of  $\{n_k\}$  for Case (I) and rewrite all the steps below for Case(I) with  $n$  replaced by  $n_{k_i}$ , and do similarly for Case (II)).

Case (I): Suppose that  $p \geq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} (\sqrt{n + 4} + \sqrt{n}) e^{n/2}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We will show that  $\rho_{n, \mathcal{A}^{re}} \rightarrow 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that here  $s_n^2 = n$ . Consider the set  $A = (-\infty, \sqrt{n}]^p$ . Then clearly  $A \in \mathcal{A}^{re}$  and

$$(3.22) \quad P \left( s_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \in A \right) = \left[ P \left( \sum_{i=1}^n X_{i1} \leq n \right) \right]^p = 1.$$

However using Lemma 4 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 P\left(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_i \in A\right) &= \left[P\left(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_{i1} \leq \sqrt{n}\right)\right]^p \\
 &= \left[\Phi(\sqrt{n})\right]^p \\
 &\leq \left[1 - \frac{2\phi(\sqrt{n})}{\sqrt{n+4} + \sqrt{n}}\right]^p \\
 &= \left[1 - \frac{2e^{-n/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(\sqrt{n+4} + \sqrt{n})}\right]^p.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.23}$$

Therefore if  $p \geq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}(\sqrt{n+4} + \sqrt{n})e^{n/2}$  then  $P(s_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n N_i \in A) \leq 2/e$  for large enough  $n$  and hence from (3.22) it is clear that  $\rho_{n, A^{re}} \rightarrow 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , when  $p \geq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}(\sqrt{n+4} + \sqrt{n})e^{n/2}$ .

Case (II): Now suppose that  $n^{1/2+\delta} \leq \log p \leq \log \left[\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}(\sqrt{n+4} + \sqrt{n})e^{n/2}\right]$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note that here  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ . We will show that  $\rho_{n, A^{re}} \rightarrow 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Consider the set  $B = (-\infty, n^{1/4}f(n)]^p$ . Here  $\{f(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a sequence such that  $n^{3/4}f(n)$  is an even integer and  $n^{\delta/4} \leq f(n) \leq \frac{n^{1/4}}{1+\eta}$  with some constant  $0 < \eta < 1$ .  $\eta$  is going to be specified later. For rest of the proof, we will only consider  $n$  to be even. (The proof is similar for the odd integer subsequence, with the lower limit of the summation in (3.24) changed to  $[n_1 + 1]/2$ ). Then writing  $n_1 = n^{3/4}f(n)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 L_{1n} &= P\left(s_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \in B\right) = \left[P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_{i1} \leq n^{3/4}f(n)\right)\right]^p \\
 &= \left[1 - \sum_{\substack{k=n_1+2 \\ k \text{ is an even integer}}}^n \binom{n}{\frac{(n-k)}{2}} 2^{-n}\right]^p \\
 &= \left[1 - \sum_{k=\frac{n_1}{2}+1}^{\frac{n}{2}} \binom{n}{\frac{n}{2}-k} 2^{-n}\right]^p \\
 &\geq \left[1 - \left(\frac{n-n_1}{2}\right) \binom{n}{\frac{n-n_1}{2}} 2^{-n}\right]^p \\
 &= \left[1 - g(n)\right]^p \quad (\text{say}),
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{3.24}$$

where the last inequality follows due to the fact that

$$\binom{n}{1} \leq \binom{n}{2} \leq \dots \leq \binom{n}{l+1}, \quad \text{for any positive integer } l < \frac{n-1}{2}.$$



Now applying Lemma 5 we have

$$g(n) \leq \frac{(n - n_1)e(2\pi)^{-1}n^{-1/2}}{\left(1 - \frac{n_1}{n}\right)^{\frac{n-n_1+1}{2}}\left(1 + \frac{n_1}{n}\right)^{\frac{n+n_1+1}{2}}},$$

where writing  $t_1 = \left(\frac{n-n_1+1}{2}\right) \log\left(1 - \frac{n_1}{n}\right)$  and  $t_2 = \left(\frac{n+n_1+1}{2}\right) \log\left(1 + \frac{n_1}{n}\right)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} (t_1 + t_2) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{n_1^{2k}}{n^{2k-1}} \left( \frac{1}{2k-1} - \frac{1}{2k} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \log\left(1 - \frac{n_1^2}{n^2}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{n_1^2}{2n} + \frac{n_1^4}{14n^3} + \frac{1}{2} \log\left(1 - \frac{1}{(1+\eta)^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ . Therefore we have for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{1n} &\geq \left[ 1 - \left[ e(2\pi)^{-1} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(1+\eta)^2} \right)^{1/2} \right] \left( \frac{n - n_1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) e^{-\frac{n_1^2}{2n} - \frac{n_1^4}{14n^3}} \right]^p \\ (3.25) \quad &= [1 - E_{1n}]^p \quad (\text{say}). \end{aligned}$$

Again note that by Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{2n} &= P\left(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_i \in B\right) = \left[ P\left(n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n N_{i1} \leq n^{-1/2} n_1\right) \right]^p \\ &\leq \left[ 1 - \frac{2\phi\left(\frac{n_1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{n_1^2}{n} + 4} + \frac{n_1}{\sqrt{n}}} \right]^p \\ &= \left[ 1 - \frac{(\pi/2)^{-1/2} e^{-\frac{n_1^2}{2n}}}{\sqrt{\frac{n_1^2}{n} + 4} + \frac{n_1}{\sqrt{n}}} \right]^p \\ (3.26) \quad &= [1 - E_{2n}]^p \quad (\text{say}). \end{aligned}$$

Now observe that  $\frac{n^\delta}{14} \leq \frac{n_1^4}{14n^3} \leq \frac{n}{(1+\eta)^4}$ , due to the assumed condition  $n^{\delta/4} \leq f(n) \leq \frac{n^{1/4}}{1+\eta}$ . Again for the choice of  $f(n)$ ,  $\log 3n_1 < n^{\delta/2}$  for large enough  $n$ . Therefore

$$E_{1n} \ll E_{2n}.$$

We shall choose  $f(n)$  suitably depending on the growth rate of  $p$  to show that  $\rho_{n, A^{re}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . When  $n^{\delta+1/2} < \log p < \left[ \frac{3 \log n}{4} + \frac{n}{2(1+\eta)^2} \right]$ , it easy to choose a sequence  $f(n)$  in the given range such that  $pE_{2n} \rightarrow \infty$  and  $pE_{1n} \rightarrow 0$ , so that  $L_{1n} \rightarrow 1$  but  $L_{2n} \rightarrow 0$  and  $\rho_{n, A^{re}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In particular take  $\sqrt{n}[f(n)]^2 \approx 2[\log p - \log n]$ .

The case when  $\log p$  is of comparable order to  $n$ , or more precisely when  $\left[ \frac{3 \log n}{4} + \frac{n}{2(1+\eta)^2} \right] \leq \log p \leq \log \left[ \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} (\sqrt{n+4} + \sqrt{n}) e^{n/2} \right]$ , the choice of  $f(n)$  is a little tricky. We take  $f(n) = \frac{n^{1/4}}{1+\eta}$  where  $\eta > 0$  is to be specified below. Then, it is easy to check that  $pE_{2n} \rightarrow \infty$ . Next we show that for large enough  $n$ ,  $E_{1n}^{-1} \gg$

$\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}(\sqrt{n+4} + \sqrt{n})e^{n/2}$  for some  $\eta > 0$ . This is true if  $\frac{(1+\eta)n}{2} \leq \frac{n}{2(1+\eta)^2} + \frac{n}{14(1+\eta)^4}$ , that is if

$$(3.27) \quad \left[ \frac{1}{(1+\eta)^3} + \frac{1}{7(1+\eta)^5} - 1 \right] \geq 0.$$

Fix an  $\eta > 0$  such that this condition holds. Then it follows that  $pE_{1n} \rightarrow 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  as before and hence  $\rho_{n, A^{re}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

## REFERENCES

1. ASRIEV, A.V. and ROTAR, V.I. (1989). On the convergence rate in the infinite dimensional central limit theorem for probabilities of hitting parallelepipeds. *Theory of Probability and Its Applications* **30** 691-701.
2. ATHREYA, K.B. and LAHIRI, S.N. (2006). *Measure Theory and Probability Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
3. BENTKUS, V. (2003). On the dependence of the Berry-Esseen bound on dimension. *J. Statist. Plann. Infer.* **113** 385-402.
4. BIRNBAUM, Z. W. (1942). An Inequality for Mill's Ratio. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **13**(2) 245-246.
5. BHATTACHARYA, R. N. and RANGA RAO, R. (1986). *Normal approximation and asymptotic expansions*. John Wiley & Sons.
6. CHATTERJEE, S. (2006). A generalization of Lindebergs principle. *Ann. Probab.* **34** 2061-2076.
7. CHATTERJEE, S. and MECKES, E. (2008). Multivariate normal approximation using exchangeable pairs. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **4** 257-283.
8. CHEN, L. AND FANG, X. (2011). Multivariate normal approximation by Steins method: the concentration inequality approach. *arXiv:1111.4073*.
9. CHERNOZHUKOV, V., CHETVERIKOV, D. and KATO, K. (2013). Gaussian approximations and multiplier Bootstrap for maxima of sums of high-dimensional random vectors. *Annals of Statistics* **41** 2786-2819.
10. CHERNOZHUKOV, V., CHETVERIKOV, D. and KATO, K. (2017). Central limit theorems and bootstrap in high dimensions. *Ann. Prob.* **45**(4) 2309-2352.
11. CHERNOZHUKOV, V., CHETVERIKOV, D., KATO, K. and KOIKE, Y. (2019). Improved central limit theorem and bootstrap approximations in high dimensions. *Working paper; arXiv:1912.10529*
12. DASGUPTA, R. (1989). Some further results on nonuniform rates of convergence to normality. *Sankhya Ser. A.* **51**(2) 144-167.
13. DASGUPTA, R. (1992). Rates of convergence to normality for some variables with entire characteristic function. *Sankhya Ser. A.* **54** 198-214.
14. GHOSH, M. and DASGUPTA, R. (1978). On Some Nonuniform Rates of Convergence to Normality. *Sankhya Series A* **40** 347-368.
15. GOLDSTEIN, L. and RINOTT, Y. (1996). Multivariate normal approximations by Steins method and size bias couplings. *J. Appl. Probab.* **33** 1-17.
16. GÖTZE, F. (1991). On the rate of convergence in the multivariate CLT. *Ann. Probab.* **19** 724-739.
17. KOIKE, Y (2019). Notes on the dimension dependence in high-dimensional central limit theorems for hyperrectangles. *Working paper; arXiv: arXiv:1911.00160v2*
18. KUCHIBHOTLA, A.K., MUKHERJEE, S. and BANERJEE, D. (2020). High-dimensional CLT: Improvements, non-uniform extensions and large deviations. *Working paper; arXiv: 1806.06153v3*
19. LEDOUX, M. and TALAGRAND, M. (1991). *Probability in Banach Spaces*, Springer-Verlag.
20. LINDBERG, J. W. (1922). Eine neue Herleitung des Exponentialgesetzes in der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung. *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **15** 211-225.
21. LOPES, M. E., LIN, Z. and MÜLLER, H.-G. (2020). Bootstrapping max statistics in high dimensions: Near-parametric rates under weak variance decay and application to functional and multinomial data. *Ann. Statist.* **48** (2) 1214-1229.

22. NAGAEV, S. (1976). An estimate of the remainder term in the multidimensional central limit theorem. *Proc. Third Japan-USSR Symp. Probab. Theory*. Lecture Notes in Math. pp. 419-438.
23. PORTNOY, S. (1986). On the central limit theorem in  $\mathcal{R}^p$  when  $p \rightarrow \infty$ . *Prob. Th. Rel. Fields* **73** 571-583.
24. REINERT, G. and RÖLLIN, A. (2009). Multivariate normal approximation with Steins method of exchangeable pairs under a general linearity condition. *Ann. Probab.* **37** 2150-2173.
25. ROBBINS, H. (1955). A Remark on Stirling's Formula. *The American Mathematical Monthly*. **62**(1) 26-29.
26. STEIN, C. (1986). *Approximate Computation of Expectations*. IMS Lecture Notes-Monograph Series, Vol 7, Hayward, CA, USA.
27. TIRO, A.M. (1991). Edgeworth expansion and bootstrap approximation for M-estimators of linear regression parameters with increasing dimensions. *Ph.D. Thesis* Iowa State University, Ames, IA, USA. DOI <https://doi.org/10.31274/rtd-180813-11340>.
28. TROTTER, H. F. (1959). Elementary proof of the central limit theorem. *Archiv der Mathem.* **10** 226234.
29. VAN DER VAART, A. and WELLNER, J. (2000). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes With Applications to Statistics*. Springer Verlag.
30. ZHILOVA, M. (2020). Non-classical Berry-Esseen inequality and accuracy of the weighted bootstrap. *Annals of Statistics* (To appear).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KANPUR,  
UTTAR PRADESH 208016, INDIA

*E-mail address:* `rajdas@iitk.ac.in`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS, MO  
63130, UNITED STATES

*E-mail address:* `s.lahiri@wustl.edu`