

# Asymptotics of Discrete Schrödinger Bridges via Chaos Decomposition

Zaid Harchaoui<sup>1</sup>, Lang Liu<sup>1</sup> and Soumik Pal<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Washington, e-mail: [\\*\\*liu16@uw.edu](mailto:liu16@uw.edu); [\\*zaid@uw.edu](mailto:zaid@uw.edu)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, e-mail: [soumik@uw.edu](mailto:soumik@uw.edu)

**Abstract:** Consider the problem of matching two independent i.i.d. samples of size  $N$  from two distributions  $P$  and  $Q$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . For an arbitrary continuous cost function, the optimal assignment problem looks for the matching that minimizes the total cost. We consider instead in this paper the problem where each matching is endowed with a Gibbs probability weight proportional to the exponential of the negative total cost of that matching. Viewing each matching as a joint distribution with  $N$  atoms, we then take a convex combination with respect to the above Gibbs probability measure. We show that this resulting random joint distribution converges, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , to the solution of a variational problem, introduced by Föllmer, called the Schrödinger problem. We also derive the first two error terms of orders  $N^{-1/2}$  and  $N^{-1}$ , respectively. This gives us central limit theorems for integrated test functions, including for the cost of transport, and second order Gaussian chaos limits when the limiting Gaussian variance is zero. The proofs are based on a novel chaos decomposition of the discrete Schrödinger bridge by polynomial functions of the pair of empirical distributions as a first and second order Taylor approximations in the space of measures. This is achieved by extending the Hoeffding decomposition from the classical theory of U-statistics.

**MSC2020 subject classifications:** Primary 46N10; secondary 60J35, 60F17, 62G20.

**Keywords and phrases:** Optimal transport, optimal matching, Schrödinger bridge, entropy regularization, chaos decomposition, Hoeffding decomposition, infinite-order U-statistics, contiguity.

## 1. Introduction

Consider two probability distributions  $P$  and  $Q$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \in [N]}$  and  $\{Y_i\}_{i \in [N]}$  be two independent i.i.d. samples from  $P$  and  $Q$ , respectively, where  $[N] := \{1, \dots, N\}$ . Consider a continuous *cost function*  $c : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  such that  $c(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x = y$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}_N$  be the set of permutations of the set  $[N] := \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ .

Every permutation can be viewed as a matching between the two sets of random variables. Choose an  $\epsilon > 0$  whose significance will be made clear shortly. Suppose we weigh every permutation  $\sigma$  by the (random) weight  $w(\sigma) := \exp(-\sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})/\epsilon)$ . That is, define a Gibbs measure on  $\mathcal{S}_N$ ,

$$q_\epsilon^*(\sigma) := \frac{w(\sigma)}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_N} w(\tau)} = \frac{\exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})/\epsilon\right)}{\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_N} \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\tau_i})/\epsilon\right)}, \quad \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N. \quad (1)$$

Now mix all possible matchings with probabilities given by  $q_\epsilon^*$  by defining

$$\hat{\mu}_\epsilon^N := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} q_\epsilon^*(\sigma) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})}. \quad (2)$$

The random measure  $\hat{\mu}_\epsilon^N$  is a joint distribution with marginals given by the two empirical distributions  $\hat{P}^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_i}$  and  $\hat{Q}^N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Y_i}$ . It is obtained by a convex combination of all possible matchings of atoms. A high cost for a matching results in an exponentially small weight. This paper deals with the limiting behavior of the sequence of random measures  $\hat{\mu}_\epsilon^N$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  while  $\epsilon > 0$  is fixed. Concretely, we show that, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\hat{\mu}_\epsilon^N$  converges weakly to, and has Gaussian fluctuations around, the solution  $\mu_\epsilon$  of the following variational problem

$$\mathbf{C}_\epsilon(P, Q) := \min_{\nu \in \Pi(P, Q)} \left[ \int c(x, y) d\nu(x, y) + \epsilon \text{KL}(\nu \mid P \otimes Q) \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $\Pi(P, Q)$  is the set of *couplings* of  $(P, Q)$ , i.e., all joint probability distributions over  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  with marginals given by  $P$  and  $Q$ , and  $\text{KL}(\nu|P \otimes Q) := \int \log \frac{d\nu}{d(P \otimes Q)} d\nu$  if  $\nu \ll P \otimes Q$  and infinity otherwise is the Kullback-Leibler divergence. Due to [13, 59], the solution  $\mu_\epsilon$  satisfies the following equation: There exist two measurable functions  $a_\epsilon$  and  $b_\epsilon$  such that

$$\frac{d\mu_\epsilon}{d(P \otimes Q)}(x, y) = \xi(x, y) := \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{\epsilon} (c(x, y) - a_\epsilon(x) - b_\epsilon(y)) \right]. \quad (4)$$

**Schrödinger bridges.** The measures  $\mu_\epsilon$  can be viewed as the (static) Schrödinger bridge [60, 24, 39, 12] connecting  $P$  to  $Q$  at temperature  $\epsilon$ . Assume that the following Markov transition kernel density is well-defined:

$$p_\epsilon(y | x) \propto \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{\epsilon} c(x, y) \right].$$

This defines a Markov chain. Suppose  $(W_0, W_1)$  is distributed according to this Markov chain, conditioned on “ $W_0 \sim P$  and  $W_1 \sim Q$ ”. The joint law of  $(W_0, W_1)$  is called the Schrödinger bridge connecting  $P$  to  $Q$  at temperature  $\epsilon$ . The quoted statement is not an event and is non-trivial to make precise. In continuum, when both  $P$  and  $Q$  are densities, the Schrödinger bridge can be made precise as the solution of the following problem called *the Schrödinger problem* [60, 24, 39]

$$\min_{\nu \in \Pi(P, Q)} \left[ \int c(x, y) d\nu(x, y) + \epsilon H(\nu) \right], \quad (5)$$

where  $H$  is the entropy defined as  $H(\nu) := \int \nu(x, y) \log \nu(x, y) dx dy$  if  $\nu$  is a density and infinity otherwise. We mention here two surveys [40, 12] on this problem. Since this problem and the problem (3) share the same solution, we call  $\mu_\epsilon$  the *Schrödinger bridge*.

In the same spirit, the random measure  $\hat{\mu}_\epsilon^N$  can also be interpreted as the Schrödinger bridge connecting two empirical measures  $\hat{P}^N$  and  $\hat{Q}^N$  at temperature  $\epsilon$ . In this interpretation  $\hat{\mu}_\epsilon^N$  first appeared in [50, Section 3.2] for a particular cost function. To see this, let  $X_i = x_i$  and  $Y_i = y_i$  for  $i \in [N]$ . Then  $\hat{P}^N$  and  $\hat{Q}^N$  are discrete distributions each supported on exactly  $N$  atoms. Imagine  $N$  independent Markov chains (or particles)  $W(1), \dots, W(N)$ , starting from positions  $\{W_0(i) = x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , make jumps according to the Markov kernel  $\{p_\epsilon(\cdot | x_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , respectively. Let  $L^N(1) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_1(i)$  denote the empirical distribution of their terminal values and let  $L^N(0, 1) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{(W_0(i), W_1(i))}$  denote the joint empirical distribution at two time points. The law of  $L^N(0, 1)$ , conditioned on  $L^N(1) = \hat{Q}^N$ , is given by the mixture formula  $\hat{\mu}_\epsilon^N$  in (2) (given  $X_i = x_i$  and  $Y_i = y_i$  for  $i \in [N]$ ), which solves Schrödinger’s problem in the discrete set-up. We refer to  $\hat{\mu}_\epsilon^N$  as the *discrete Schrödinger bridge*.

**Partition functions in quantum thermodynamics.** Although weighted averages of symmetrized empirical distributions (2) and its variations go way back to Feynman’s work [22], such quantities also appeared recently in several different contexts. Motivated by the quantum thermodynamics of  $N$  non-interacting Boson particles, a variation of (2) where  $Y_i = X_i$  for every  $i$  has been considered [1, 2, 3]. In this setting, the samples are obviously dependent and  $P = Q$ . One of the goals of these articles is to compute the trace of the exponential of an  $N$  particle Hamilton operator for Bose-Einstein statistics. In their language it can be described as the following limit

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \left[ \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \right) \right] = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \mathbf{C}_\epsilon(P, Q). \quad (6)$$

The term inside the log is called the partition function and is the denominator which appears in (1) scaled by  $N!$ . The marginal measure  $P$  comes from a Feynman-Kac representation of the trace operator and is taken to be either the uniform density over a compact box or the Lebesgue measure on the entire  $\mathbb{R}^d$  in which case it fails to be a probability measure. In a similar vein of work, Trashorras [65] considers the case where  $X_i = Y_i = x_i$ ,  $i \in [N]$ , are deterministic points such that its empirical measure  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i}$

converges weakly to  $P = Q$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . If a random permutation  $\sigma$  is chosen uniformly from  $\mathcal{S}_N$ , one gets a random measure  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(x_i, x_{\sigma_i})}$  which is referred to as the *symmetrized empirical measure*. In [65], a Large Deviation Principle for this sequence of random measures is derived, recovering the limit in (6). One of our key results (Corollary 3) establishes the limit in (6) in the case of independent i.i.d. samples. In fact, this result is obtained from a stronger result (Theorem 2) which gives the exact limit of a scaled version of  $(N!)^{-1} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \exp(-\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}))$  without conforming to large deviation. This result can be of independent interest to the literature mentioned above.

**Mallows models of random permutations.** The Gibbs measure  $q_\epsilon^*$  itself appears in a more recent work in an entirely different direction studying the limit of Mallows-type models of random permutations [44]. This is done in [48] where the interest is in statistical estimation on Mallows models and in a very recent paper [34] on scaling limits of large random permutations with fixed patterns. In [48, Theorem 1.5] the author obtained the limit (6) for  $P = Q = \text{Unif}(0, 1)$  in the setting when  $X_i = Y_i = i/N$ ,  $i \in [N]$ , are deterministic. In this case, the empirical measure  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{X_i}$  can be viewed as a deterministic approximation of  $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$ .

**Optimal transport and entropic regularization.** As shown in [39], when  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the Schrödinger problem recovers the Monge-Kantorovich optimal transport (OT) problem defined as

$$\mathbf{C}(P, Q) = \inf_{\nu \in \Pi(P, Q)} \int c(x, y) \nu(dx dy). \quad (7)$$

Since the data points are sampled from densities, they are all distinct almost surely. In this case, the empirical measures  $\hat{P}^N$  and  $\hat{Q}^N$  are discrete measures supported on  $N$  atoms. The plug-in estimator  $\mathbf{C}(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N)$  can then be formulated as the following linear program

$$\mathbf{C}(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N) = \min_{M \in \Pi(N^{-1}\mathbf{1}, N^{-1}\mathbf{1})} \langle M, C \rangle, \quad (8)$$

where  $\Pi(N^{-1}\mathbf{1}, N^{-1}\mathbf{1}) \subset \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  is the set of matrices such that  $M\mathbf{1} = M^\top \mathbf{1} = N^{-1}\mathbf{1}$ , i.e.,  $NM$  is doubly stochastic, and  $\langle M, C \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N c(X_i, Y_j) M_{ij}$ .

The limiting behavior of  $\mathbf{C}(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N)$  towards  $\mathbf{C}(P, Q)$  has been studied in combinatorics [4], probability and statistics [63, 25, 70, 38], and applied to economics [37, 26]. This problem also arises in nonparametric statistical hypothesis testing [52] where one tests for the null hypothesis  $P = Q$  by checking whether  $\mathbf{C}(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N) \approx 0$ . This, among other reasons, have spurred a recent interest in the study of asymptotic distributions of  $\mathbf{C}(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N)$ , properly scaled with respect to  $\mathbf{C}(P, Q)$ .

Early works on the large sample behavior of the OT cost were focused on the well-behaved quadratic cost  $c(x, y) = |x - y|^2$  ( $\sqrt{\mathbf{C}(P, Q)}$  is then called the Wasserstein-2 distance between  $P$  and  $Q$ ) on the real line  $\mathbb{R}$ ; see, e.g. [49, 15, 16]. These results were built upon the explicit characterization, given by quantile functions, of the Wasserstein distances on measures supported on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Beyond one dimension, similar results are rather challenging to obtain; see [4, 18] for almost sure convergence results. In [57], the authors obtained the limiting law of Wasserstein distances between Gaussian distributions with parameters estimated from data by utilizing the d-form representation in this special case. Recently, normal distributional results have been generalized to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for the quadratic cost [17] and for a general cost on compact domains [33]. Wasserstein distances between discrete probability measures supported on a finite [35, 62] and countable [64] metric space have also been investigated.

An entropy-regularized formulation of (8) is particularly attractive both from a computational viewpoint [14] and from a statistical viewpoint [56]. Cuturi [14] defined the following entropy-regularized optimal transport (EOT) problem:

$$\min_{M \in \Pi(N^{-1}\mathbf{1}, N^{-1}\mathbf{1})} [\langle M, C \rangle + \epsilon \text{Ent}(M)], \quad (9)$$

where  $\epsilon > 0$  is the regularization parameter and  $\text{Ent}(M) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N M_{ij} \log M_{ij}$  is the entropy of  $M$ ; see also [20]. The solution, although non-explicit, can be efficiently computed using the Sinkhorn algorithm [51, Section 4.2]. Let  $M_\epsilon^N$  denote the (unique) optimal solution to (9), then the limit behavior of  $M_\epsilon^N$  and in particular the *regularized* cost of transport  $\langle C, M_\epsilon^N \rangle$ , both as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\epsilon$  either fixed or decaying to

zero, becomes important. In fact,  $M_\epsilon^N$  can be viewed as the plug-in estimator of  $\mu_\epsilon$  since the minimizer of the problem (3) with  $P$  and  $Q$  replaced by  $\hat{P}^N$  and  $\hat{Q}^N$  is exactly, in its matrix form,  $M_\epsilon^N$ . For finite state spaces and  $c(x, y) = \|x - y\|^p$  with  $p \geq 1$ , this has been taken up in [36]. The slightly different but related concept of Sinkhorn divergence has been studied in [10] and later extended in [45] to Euclidean spaces for  $p = 2$ .

The discrete Schrödinger bridge  $\hat{\mu}_\epsilon^N$  is, in fact, the solution of a different discrete EOT problem which explains the surprising appearance of entropy in the limit (5). For a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ , let  $A_\sigma$  denote the permutation matrix corresponding to  $\sigma$ . By Birkhoff's Theorem [6, Theorem 5.2], every doubly stochastic matrix can be written as a convex combination of permutation matrices. Thus, every coupling  $M$  can be expressed as  $M = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} q_M(\sigma) \frac{1}{N} A_\sigma$ , where  $q_M(\sigma) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_N)$  is a probability distribution on  $\mathcal{S}_N$ . Such convex combinations are generally not unique. Nevertheless, for any  $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_N)$ , we can get an element in  $\Pi(N^{-1}\mathbf{1}, N^{-1}\mathbf{1})$  by defining  $M_q := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} q(\sigma) \frac{1}{N} A_\sigma$ . Moreover, it holds that  $\langle M_q, C \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} q(\sigma) \sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})$ . For  $q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_N)$  we define the entropy of  $q$  as  $\text{Ent}(q) := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} q(\sigma) \log(q(\sigma))$ . Consider the following problem

$$\min_{q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_N)} \left[ \langle M_q, C \rangle + \frac{\epsilon}{N} \text{Ent}(q) \right]. \quad (10)$$

This is a regularization of discrete OT with a different notion of entropy for a doubly stochastic matrix  $M$ . We show in the supplementary material that the solution to (10) is exactly  $q_\epsilon^*$  in (1).

The relationship between  $M_\epsilon^N$  that solves (9) and the matrix  $M_{q_\epsilon^*}$  where  $q_\epsilon^*$  solves (10) is not obvious. However, they are connected through the lens of matrix balancing; see [7] and references therein. To see this, we define an  $N \times N$  matrix  $K$  with  $(i, j)$ -th element being  $K_{ij} := \exp(-\frac{1}{\epsilon} c(X_i, Y_j))$ . Let  $|K|$  denote the permanent of  $K$ , i.e.,

$$|K| = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \prod_{i=1}^N K_{i\sigma_i} = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})\right),$$

which is exactly the denominator in (1). Notice that

$$(M_{q_\epsilon^*})_{i,j} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\sigma: \sigma_i=j} q_\epsilon^*(\sigma) = \frac{1}{N} \frac{\sum_{\sigma: \sigma_i=j} \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})/\epsilon\right)}{\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})/\epsilon\right)}.$$

The sum in the numerator is over all permutations  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$  such that  $\sigma_i = j$ . A little bit of algebra omitted here shows that it is exactly given by  $N \exp(-c(X_i, Y_j)/\epsilon) |K^{ij}|$ , where  $K^{ij}$  is the minor of  $K$  obtained by deleting the  $i$ th row and the  $j$ th column of the matrix  $K$ . Therefore, we get the neat formula  $(M_{q_\epsilon^*})_{i,j} = K_{ij} |K^{ij}| / |K|$ . The matrix  $M_{q_\epsilon^*}$  is referred to as the *matrix balance* of  $K$  [7, Section 3] while the matrix  $M_\epsilon^N$  is called the *Sinkhorn balance* [7, Section 4]. It is shown in [7, Section 4.1] that the Sinkhorn balance of a 0-1 matrix approximates the matrix balance of it. However, a more in-depth investigation on the relationship of these two objects is needed.

### 1.1. Main results

We now state our main results regarding the limiting behavior of the discrete Schrödinger bridge where both the dimension  $d$  and regularization parameter  $\epsilon$  are kept fixed. Given a probability measure  $\nu$  and integer  $p \geq 1$ , let  $\mathbf{L}^p(\nu)$  be the space of functions that have finite  $p$ -th norm under  $\nu$ . We shall keep the same notation for an absolutely continuous measure and its density.

We express our results in their full generality. Let  $\mu \in \Pi(P, Q)$  be absolutely continuous w.r.t.  $P \otimes Q$  with density  $\xi \in \mathbf{L}^1(P \otimes Q)$ . Define the random measure

$$\hat{\mu}^N := \frac{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})} \xi^\otimes(X, Y_\sigma)}{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^\otimes(X, Y_\sigma)}, \quad (11)$$

where  $\xi^\otimes(X, Y_\sigma) := \prod_{i=1}^N \xi(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})$ . As a special case, recall from (4) that, if  $\xi(x, y)$  is chosen to be  $\exp(-(c(x, y) - a_\epsilon(x) - b_\epsilon(y))/\epsilon)$ , then  $\mu = \mu_\epsilon$  is the Schrödinger bridge connecting  $P$  to  $Q$ . Moreover,  $\hat{\mu}^N$  recovers

the measure defined in (2). Our first result shows that the random measure  $\hat{\mu}^N$  converges weakly to its continuous counterpart  $\mu$ . Let us start by defining two operators on  $\mathbf{L}^2(P)$  and  $\mathbf{L}^2(Q)$  induced by  $\mu$ .

*Definition 1.* Define linear operators  $\mathcal{A} : \mathbf{L}^2(P) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(Q)$  and its adjoint  $\mathcal{A}^* : \mathbf{L}^2(Q) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(P)$  by

$$(\mathcal{A}f)(y) = \int f(x)\xi(x,y)dP(x) \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathcal{A}^*g)(x) = \int g(y)\xi(x,y)dQ(y). \quad (12)$$

Call  $A : (x, y) \mapsto \xi(x, y)$  the *kernel* of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $A^* : (y, x) \mapsto \xi(x, y)$  the kernel of  $\mathcal{A}^*$ .

We show in Lemma 11 that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a well-defined linear operator, and  $\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*$  are two Markov operators defined on  $\mathbf{L}^2(P)$  and  $\mathbf{L}^2(Q)$ , respectively. Moreover, they can be rewritten as two conditional expectations:  $(\mathcal{A}f)(y) = \mathbb{E}[f(X) \mid Y](y)$  and  $(\mathcal{A}^*g)(x) = \mathbb{E}[g(Y) \mid X](x)$  where  $(X, Y) \sim \mu$ .

**Consistency.** We first show that  $\hat{\mu}^N$  is a consistent estimator of  $\mu$ .

*Assumption 1.* All the results stated below hold under the following assumptions.

1.  $\xi \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . As a consequence [9, Appendix A.4], the operator  $\mathcal{A}$  is compact. Then the operators  $\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*$  admit eigenvalue decomposition  $\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}\alpha_k = s_k^2\alpha_k$  and  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*\beta_k = s_k^2\beta_k$  for all  $k \geq 0$  with  $s_0 = 1$ ,  $\alpha_0 = \beta_0 = \mathbf{1}$  and  $0 \leq s_k \leq 1$  for all  $k \geq 0$ . Moreover, it holds that  $\mathcal{A}\alpha_k = s_k\beta_k$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*\beta_k = s_k\alpha_k$ ; see [28, Chapter 6.1]. We call  $\{s_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  the singular values of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*$ , and call  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  and  $\{\beta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  the singular functions.
2. The operators  $\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*$  have positive eigenvalue gap, *i.e.*,  $s_k \leq s_1 < 1$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . By Jentzsch's Theorem [58, Theorem 7.2], a sufficient condition is that  $\xi$  is bounded.

**Theorem 1.** As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\hat{\mu}^N$  converges weakly to  $\mu$ , in probability.

Towards the proof of Theorem 1, a critical result is the limit law of the denominator in (11) which is denoted as  $D_N$ . We state it here since it is of independent interest.

**Theorem 2.** As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the denominator in (11) has the following limiting distribution:

$$D_N \rightarrow_d D := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - s_k^2)}} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[ -\frac{s_k^2}{1 - s_k^2} (U_k^2 + V_k^2) + \frac{2s_k}{1 - s_k^2} U_k V_k \right] \right\}, \quad (13)$$

where  $\{U_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  and  $\{V_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  are independent standard normal random variables.

It is noteworthy that  $D_N$  is a two-sample U-statistic of infinite order—a generalization of classical U-statistics introduced by Halmos [31] and Hoeffding [32], where the kernel of the U-statistic depends on the sample size. Infinite-order U-statistics were first considered in [30] as a special class of elementary symmetric polynomials of random variables; see also [46, 68, 67, 43] in this line of research. The limiting distribution of general infinite-order U-statistics was obtained in [19, Theorem 1] using randomization of the sample size and multiple Wiener integrals. Theorem 2 extends previous work on one-sample infinite-order U-statistics to *two-sample* infinite-order U-statistics.

Another closely related topic is the asymptotics of random permanents; see the monograph [53] for a review. An elementary symmetric polynomial is the permanent of a random matrix with identical rows [55, Page 2]. The limiting behavior of general random permanents has been studied in the case of i.i.d. entries [54] as well as independent columns [55], where the limit law is the exponential of a Gaussian distribution. The denominator  $D_N$  can be viewed as the permanent of the random matrix  $(\xi(X_i, Y_j))_{N \times N}$  scaled by  $N!$ . Hence, Theorem 2 characterizes the asymptotic behavior of the permanent of a random matrix induced by a bivariate function whose rows and columns are dependent—the limit law is given by the exponential of a weighted sum of products of Gaussians.

If we set  $\xi(x, y) := \exp(-(c(x, y) - a_\epsilon(x) - b_\epsilon(y))/\epsilon)$ , then Theorem 2 yields the limit in (6).

**Corollary 3.** As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the denominator in (1) has the following limit:

$$\frac{1}{N} \log \left[ \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \right) \right] \rightarrow_p -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \mathbf{C}_\epsilon(P, Q).$$

**First order chaos.** To conduct a more refined analysis of the convergence of  $\hat{\mu}^N$ , we let  $\eta$  be any function on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$  integrable under  $\mu$  and consider the convergence of  $T_N := T_N(\eta) := \int \eta(x, y) d\hat{\mu}^N$  towards  $\theta := \int \eta(x, y) d\mu$ . According to (11),

$$T_N = \frac{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})}{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})}, \quad (14)$$

A particularly important example is when  $\eta = c$  is the cost function and  $\mu$  is the Schrödinger bridge. In this case  $\theta$  is the optimal cost of transport for the regularized problem defined in (3), which is known as the *Sinkhorn distance* [14]. It can be viewed as an approximation to the unregularized optimal transport cost with a convergence rate decays exponentially in  $\epsilon$  [42]. On the other hand, most of the previous works consider the optimal value of the problem (3) since their analyses rely heavily on the duality. Moreover, as demonstrated in [41, Chapter 4], the statistic  $T_N$  can be used to statistically test for the equality of distributions of two independent samples.

The statistic  $T_N$  is a rather complicated function of the two empirical measures  $(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N)$ . Our next result shows that it can be well approximated by linear functions of the two measures in a way that is similar to the first order term in a Taylor expansion of smooth functions.

*Assumption 2.* All the results stated below hold under the following additional assumptions:  $\eta^2 \xi \in \mathbf{L}^1(P \otimes Q)$  and  $\eta \xi \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ .

We denote by  $I_{\nu} : \mathbf{L}^2(\nu) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(\nu)$  the identity operator on  $\mathbf{L}^2(\nu)$ , and, by convention, its kernel is given by the Dirac delta function. When the context is clear, we will write  $I$  for short. Define

$$\eta_{1,0}(x) := \int [\eta(x, y) - \theta] \xi(x, y) dQ(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{0,1}(y) := \int [\eta(x, y) - \theta] \xi(x, y) dP(x). \quad (15)$$

**Theorem 4.** As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , it holds that  $T_N - \theta = \mathcal{L}_1 + o_p(1/\sqrt{N})$ , where

$$\mathcal{L}_1 := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(X_i) + (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(Y_i)].$$

We call  $\mathcal{L}_1$  the first order chaos of  $T_N$ .

**Corollary 5.** As  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the sequence  $\sqrt{N}(T_N - \theta)$  converges in law to  $\mathcal{N}(0, \varsigma^2)$ , where  $\varsigma^2 = \varsigma^2(\eta)$ , as a function of  $\eta$ , is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma^2 := & \int ((I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(x))^2 dP(x) \\ & + \int ((I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(y))^2 dQ(y). \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 1.* In the arXiv version of this paper (arXiv:2011.08963) we conjectured that the same CLT holds for the solution of the EOT problem (9). This conjecture has been recently verified in [29].

*Remark 2.* It has been shown in [39] that the Schrödinger bridge problem recovers the Monge-Kantorovich OT problem as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . It is of great interest to verify if the limiting variance  $\varsigma^2$  in Corollary 5 converges to the limiting variance of the OT plan.

*Remark 3.* When the limiting variance  $\varsigma^2 = 0$ , we can also establish the second order chaos of  $T_N$  and the limiting distribution of  $N(T_N - \theta)$ . We refer interested readers to [41, Appendix C.5].

The first order chaos  $\mathcal{L}_1$  admits a more compact expression using the notion of *tensor products*. Let  $\mathcal{A}_1 \in \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}^*, I_P, I_Q\}$  be an operator mapping from  $\mathbf{L}^2(\nu_1)$  to  $\mathbf{L}^2(\gamma_1)$  with kernel  $A_1$ . And define  $\mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_2$  similarly. The tensor product  $\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2 : \mathbf{L}^2(\nu_1 \otimes \nu_2) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(\gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_2)$  is defined by

$$(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2)f(v_1, v_2) := \iint f(v'_1, v'_2) A_1(v'_1, v_1) A_2(v'_2, v_2) d\nu_1(v'_1) d\nu_2(v'_2), \text{ for all } f \in \mathbf{L}^2(\nu_1 \otimes \nu_2).$$



For instance,  $I_P \otimes \mathcal{A} : \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})f(v_1, v_2) &:= \iint f(v'_1, v'_2) \delta_{v_1}(v'_1) \xi(v'_2, v_2) dP(v'_1) dP(v'_2) \\ &= \int f(v_1, v'_2) \xi(v'_2, v_2) dP(v'_2), \end{aligned}$$

or as a conditional expectation:  $(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})f(v_1, v_2) = \mathbb{E}[f(X', X) \mid X', Y](v_1, v_2)$  where  $(X, Y) \sim \mu$  is independent of  $X'$ . In particular, when  $f := f_1 \oplus f_2$ , we have  $(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2)(f_1 \oplus f_2)(v_1, v_2) = \mathcal{A}_1 f_1(v_1) + \mathcal{A}_2 f_2(v_2)$ . Finally, define the *swap* operator  $\mathcal{T}$  by  $\mathcal{T}f(u, v) = f(v, u)$  for any  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . It is clear that  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2) = (\mathcal{A}_2 \otimes \mathcal{A}_1)\mathcal{T}$  on  $\mathbf{L}^2(\nu_1 \otimes \nu_2)$ .

*Definition 2.* Define the operator  $\mathcal{B}$  on the space  $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ :

$$\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) = (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A})\mathcal{T}.$$

With this new operator  $\mathcal{B}$ , the first order chaos  $\mathcal{L}_1$  can be rewritten as (Corollary 14)

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} \oplus \eta_{0,1})(X_i, Y_i).$$

Both expressions of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  come from the following system of linear equations. Assume the first order chaos in Theorem 4 is given by  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [f(X_i) + g(Y_i)]$ , then  $f$  and  $g$  are (almost surely) solutions to:

$$\eta_{1,0} = f + \mathcal{A}^* g \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{0,1} = \mathcal{A} f + g.$$

**Second order chaos.** When  $\varsigma^2$  in Corollary 5 is zero for certain  $\eta$ , the Gaussian limit is trivial and we need to consider a higher order expansion. This is true, for example, when we subtract off from  $T_N - \theta$  its first order chaos. That is, consider

$$\tilde{\eta}(x, y) := \eta(x, y) - \theta - (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(x) - (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(y). \quad (16)$$

By linearity, the corresponding statistic follows from Theorem 4 by subtracting the first order chaos:

$$T_N(\tilde{\eta}) = T_N(\eta) - \theta - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(X_i) + (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(Y_i)], \quad (17)$$

In this case both  $T_N(\tilde{\eta}) \rightarrow 0$  in probability and  $\varsigma^2(\tilde{\eta}) = 0$ . Thus we need a higher order expansion.

*Definition 3.* Define the operator  $\mathcal{C}$  on the space  $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ :

$$\mathcal{C} := (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A}) \otimes (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*).$$

*Assumption 3.* The following results hold under the additional assumptions that  $\xi \in \mathbf{L}^{2\mathfrak{p}}(P \otimes Q)$  and  $\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi) \in \mathbf{L}^{2\mathfrak{p}/(\mathfrak{p}-2)}(P \otimes Q)$  for some<sup>1</sup>  $\mathfrak{p} \in [2, \infty]$ .

Let  $\eta_{2,0} := -(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$ ,  $\eta_{0,2} := -(\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q)\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$ , and  $\eta_{1,1'} := (I + \mathcal{B})\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$ .

**Theorem 6.** Assume, for some  $\eta \in \mathbf{L}^2(\mu)$ ,  $\varsigma^2 = 0$  in Corollary 5. Let  $\theta_{1,1'} := \iint \eta_{1,1'}(x, y) d\mu(x, y)$ . Then

$$T_N - \theta + \frac{\theta_{1,1'}}{N} = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} (\eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + \eta_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j)) + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) \right] + o_p(N^{-1}).$$

The term  $\theta_{1,1'}/N$  should be interpreted as an  $O(1/N)$  estimate of the bias since we show later in Proposition 9 that  $T_N$  may not be an unbiased estimator of  $\theta$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[T_N]$  may not be  $\theta$ .

<sup>1</sup>We will show in Lemma 15 that  $\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$  is a well-defined element in  $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . When  $\mathfrak{p} = 2$ , we assume  $\xi \in \mathbf{L}^4(P \otimes Q)$  and  $\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi) \in \mathbf{L}^\infty(P \otimes Q)$ ; when  $\mathfrak{p} = \infty$ , we only assume  $\xi \in \mathbf{L}^\infty(P \otimes Q)$ , i.e.,  $\xi$  is bounded.

**Corollary 7.** Assume, for some  $\eta \in \mathbf{L}^2(\mu)$ ,  $\varsigma^2 = 0$  in Corollary 5. Suppose that the function  $(\eta - \theta)\xi$  has a spectral expansion in  $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$  with respect to the orthonormal basis  $\{\alpha_k \otimes \beta_l\}_{k,l \geq 0}$  of  $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$  with coefficients  $(\gamma_{kl}, k, l \geq 0)$ , i.e.,  $(\eta - \theta)\xi = \sum_{k,l \geq 0} \gamma_{kl}(\alpha_k \otimes \beta_l)$ . Then, as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , the sequence of random variables  $N(T_N - \theta) + \theta_{1,1'}$  converges in law to mean-zero random variable

$$\sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{kl}}{(1 - s_k^2)(1 - s_l^2)} \{U_k V_l + s_k s_l U_l V_k - s_l(U_k U_l - \mathbb{1}\{k = l\}) - s_k(V_k V_l - \mathbb{1}\{k = l\})\},$$

where  $\{U_k, k \geq 1\}$  and  $\{V_l, l \geq 1\}$  are two independent sequences of i.i.d. standard normal random variables.

## 1.2. An abstract Taylor expansion and a conjectured universality

Consider the Schrödinger bridge  $\mu$  as a function of the input  $(P, Q)$  (and  $\epsilon$ , which is kept fixed). Hence, over a suitable space of pairs of probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  we get a function  $(P, Q) \mapsto \mu(P, Q)$ . This space of probability distributions is assumed to be convex in the usual sense. How can one define gradients or variations of this map?

It seems natural to take a class of test functions and consider the real-valued map  $(P, Q) \mapsto \theta(P, Q) := \int \eta d\mu$ . Suppose, *formally*, one can take the gradient  $\text{grad } \theta(P, Q)$  and the Hessian  $\text{Hess } \theta(P, Q)$  of this function at  $(P, Q)$ . Then, a formal Taylor approximation around  $(P, Q)$  would give us

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N) &= \theta(P, Q) + \text{grad } \theta(P, Q) \cdot (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \left\langle (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q), \text{Hess } \theta(P, Q) \cdot (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q) \right\rangle + o_p \left( \left\| (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q) \right\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\text{grad } \theta(P, Q)$  and  $\text{Hess } \theta(P, Q)$  are linear operators on the pair of measures  $(\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q)$ . Linear operators on measures can be identified with integrals of functions. Hence, one would expect a representation of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{grad } \theta(P, Q) \cdot (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q) &= \int f(x) (\hat{P}^N - P) (dx) + \int g(y) (\hat{Q}^N - Q) (dy) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{f}(X_i) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{g}(Y_j), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for some functions  $f$  and  $g$  and their centered versions  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  obtained by subtracting off their expectations. Similarly, one would expect a functional representation for the Hessian as a quadratic function:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q), \text{Hess } \theta(P, Q) \cdot (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q) \right\rangle &= \int f_{2,0}(x, u) (\hat{P}^N - P) (dx) (\hat{P}^N - P) (du) \\ &+ \int f_{1,1}(x, y) (\hat{P}^N - P) (dx) (\hat{Q}^N - Q) (dy) + \int f_{0,2}(v, y) (\hat{Q}^N - Q) (dv) (\hat{Q}^N - Q) (dy) \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{f}_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{f}_{1,1}(X_i, Y_j) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{f}_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j), \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

for some functions  $f_{2,0}, f_{1,1}, f_{0,2}$  and their suitably centered versions. For example,

$$\tilde{f}_{1,1}(x, y) = f_{1,1}(x, y) - \int f_{1,1}(x, y) dP(x) - \int f_{1,1}(x, y) dQ(y) + \iint f_{1,1}(x, y) dP(x) dQ(y).$$

Moreover, due to the Central Limit Theorem,  $\sqrt{N}(\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q)$  is a tight family of random measures and has a limiting Gaussian distribution. Thus, we would expect



1.  $\sqrt{N} \text{grad } \theta(P, Q) \cdot (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q)$  to converge to a mean zero Gaussian distribution with a variance given by a norm square of the gradient  $\text{grad } \theta(P, Q)$ .
2.  $N \left\langle (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q), \text{Hess } \theta(P, Q) \cdot (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q) \right\rangle$  converges to an element in the Gaussian second order chaos, which is comprised of linear combinations of central chi-squares and products of independent mean-zero Gaussians. The coefficients of the combinations will be given by the operator  $\text{Hess } \theta(P, Q)$ .
3.  $o_p \left( \left\| (\hat{P}^N - P, \hat{Q}^N - Q) \right\|^2 \right) = o_p(N^{-1})$ .

In fact, this method of Taylor expansion has been made rigorous for finite spaces and for  $c(x, y) = \|x - y\|^p$  in [10] who go on to derive similar distributional limits. The linear terms can also be related to mean elements in abstract spaces [47]. In [21], the authors show how the entropy-regularized transport as a divergence between probability distributions interpolates between Hilbertian kernel-based divergences and optimal transportation distances.

Our main results, Theorems 4 and 6 and the respective Corollaries 5 and 7, establish the representations (18) and (19) and the three limits without a differential structure by devising a chaos decomposition similar to the classical Hoeffding decomposition [66, Section 11.4] in the theory of U-statistics [66, Chapter 12]. Turning the tables around, the kernels appearing in Theorems 4 and 6 therefore suggest the linear operators  $\text{grad } \theta(P, Q)$  and  $\text{Hess } \theta(P, Q)$ . In a formal sense we have derived the first and second order variations of the map  $(P, Q) \mapsto \mu(P, Q)$  in terms of the Markov operators appearing in those theorems. Hence, we conjecture that the same limiting distributions (up to constant multiples) would appear for any other sequence of statistics of the form  $F(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N)$  that asymptotically converges in probability to  $\theta(P, Q)$ .

**Conjecture.** The distributional limits for fixed  $\epsilon$  of Corollaries 5 and 7 continue to hold (up to constant multiples) for the cost  $\langle C, M_\epsilon^N \rangle$ , where  $M_\epsilon^N$  is the solution to regularized OT problem (9) for i.i.d. data.

### 1.3. Outline of the paper

Section 2 is devoted to proving Theorem 1. We prove a novel *contiguity* result that allows us to change the model to  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mu$  based on the limiting distribution of the denominator in Theorem 2. This change of measure enables a more natural analysis for  $\hat{\mu}^N$  and Theorem 1 then follows from the reverse martingale convergence theorem.

Next in Section 3 we derive the first and (approximate) second order chaoses under the change of measure. We then prove Theorem 4 and 6 by variance bounds of remainders. Since  $T_N$  is a function of the pair of empirical distributions, it is invariant under permutations of  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N$  or  $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ , separately. Each terms in the chaos expansion is a polynomial function of the empirical distributions  $(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N)$ , so they are also symmetric under permutations. Thus, we obtain symmetric projections on subspaces of  $\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  when  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$ , under the change of measure  $\mu$ , are not independent. Essentially, we extend the classical Hoeffding projection to paired samples, which can be of independent interest.

In Section 4 we derive the asymptotic distribution of the denominator and the variance bounds of the remainders used in the previous two sections. The method here is based on a Hoeffding-like decomposition and new variance bounds for a type of U-statistic of increasing order under our original model when  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  are independent. The tools developed in this section can also be of independent interest.

Finally, Appendix is a collection of technical results used in the other proofs. For the readability, we give in Appendix D a table of notation.

## 2. Weak Convergence and Contiguity

In this section, we prove the weak convergence of  $\hat{\mu}^N$ . By definition, it suffices to show the convergence of  $T_N := \int \eta d\hat{\mu}^N$  to  $\theta := \int \eta d\mu$  for any continuous bounded function  $\eta$ . In fact, the convergence holds for every function  $\eta$  that is integrable under  $\mu$ .

Recall from (14) that  $T_N$  admits a complicated expression, i.e.,

$$T_N = \frac{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})}{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})}.$$

However, it has a rather simple structure under a change of measure—instead of assuming that  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  is an i.i.d. sample from the product measure  $P \otimes Q$ , we assume that  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  is an i.i.d. sample from  $\mu$ . As Proposition 9 below shows, under this change of measure,  $T_N$  is a simple conditional expectation and an unbiased estimator of  $\theta$ . Hence, it is natural to ask if there is a way to do analysis under the changed measure  $\mu$  and carry the results over to the original measure  $P \otimes Q$ . Contiguity [66, Chapter 6] is exactly a tool for such purposes. When  $\xi \neq 1$  a.s. under  $P \otimes Q$ , the laws of the entire i.i.d. sequence  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  under the two measures  $P \otimes Q$  and  $\mu$  are singular. But  $T_N$  is a function of only  $(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N)$ . Restricted to the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by these marginal empirical distributions, we show that the two measures are contiguous in Theorem 8 below.

We first set-up a measure-theoretic framework. We use the term “under the measure  $\gamma$ ” to indicate that the sample  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \gamma$  and use  $\mathbb{E}_{\gamma}$  to denote the expectation under this model. When  $\gamma = P \otimes Q$ , we write  $\mathbb{E}$  for short. Let  $\mathcal{F}_N$  denote the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}_N$  denote the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{F}_N$  generated by  $(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N)$ . Let  $R^N$  and  $S^N$  be the law of  $(\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N)$  under  $P \otimes Q$  and  $\mu$ , respectively. It is clear that  $R^N = (P \otimes Q)^N|_{\mathcal{G}_N}$  and  $S^N = \mu^N|_{\mathcal{G}_N}$ .

According to Le Cam’s first lemma [66, page 88], the contiguity holds true if the likelihood ratio  $dS^N/dR^N$  converges weakly, under  $R^N$ , to an a.s. positive random variable. Before we prove that, we give an explicit expression for the likelihood ratio—it is exactly  $D_N$ , i.e., the denominator of  $T_N$ .

*Fact 1.* The likelihood ratio  $dS^N/dR^N$  admits the following expression:

$$\frac{dS^N}{dR^N} = D_N := \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}). \quad (20)$$

*Proof.* Note that the likelihood ratio of  $\mu^N$  and  $(P \otimes Q)^N$  is given by

$$f_N := \frac{d\mu^N}{d(P \otimes Q)^N} = \prod_{i=1}^N \xi(X_i, Y_i), \quad \text{on } (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^N. \quad (21)$$

Hence, by the property of conditional expectation,

$$\frac{dS^N}{dR^N} = \frac{d\mu^N|_{\mathcal{G}_N}}{d(P \otimes Q)^N|_{\mathcal{G}_N}} = \mathbb{E}[f_N | \mathcal{G}_N],$$

where the conditional expectation is under  $P \otimes Q$ . It follows from exchangeability under  $P \otimes Q$  that  $\mathbb{E}[f_N | \mathcal{G}_N] = \mathbb{E}[\xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}) | \mathcal{G}_N]$  for each  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ . Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[f_N | \mathcal{G}_N] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}) \middle| \mathcal{G}_N\right] = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}), \quad (22)$$

where the last equality follows from  $\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})$  is  $\mathcal{G}_N$ -measurable.  $\square$

Recall from Theorem 2 that  $D_N$  has a limiting distribution given by the exponential of a weighted sum of products of Gaussians which is almost surely positive. Besides tools such as the Hoeffding decomposition from the U-statistics theory, the proof of Theorem 2 involves a novel approach to control the variance of  $D_N$ . We defer it to Section 4. Now we are ready to prove the contiguity result.

**Theorem 8.** *Under Assumption 1, the sequences  $(R^N, N \geq 1)$  and  $(S^N, N \geq 1)$  are mutually contiguous, i.e.,  $R^N \triangleleft \triangleright S^N$ . Explicitly, for a sequence of events  $(A_N \in \mathcal{G}_N, N \geq 1)$ , we have  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} S^N(A_N) = 0$  iff  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} R^N(A_N) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* According to Le Cam's first lemma [66, page 88],  $R^N \triangleleft S^N$ ,  $N \geq 1$ , if and only if the following statement holds true: if  $D_N$ , under  $P \otimes Q$ , converges weakly to  $D$ , along a sub-sequence, then  $P(D > 0) = 1$ . This statement follows directly from Theorem 2, so we have  $R^N \triangleleft S^N$ . By a standard computation, it can be shown that  $\mathbb{E}[D] = 1$ . Hence, it follows from Le Cam's first lemma again that  $S^N \triangleleft R^N$ , that is,  $R^N$  and  $S^N$  are mutually contiguous.  $\square$

With Theorem 8 at hand, we can work under the measure  $\mu$ . The next result rewrites  $T_N$  as a simple conditional expectation and verifies its consistency.

**Proposition 9.** *Assume that  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mu$ . It holds that  $T_N = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1) \mid \mathcal{G}_N]$  for every  $\eta \in \mathbf{L}^1(\mu)$ . Moreover,  $T_N$  is an unbiased and consistent estimator of  $\theta$ . That is,  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_N] = \theta$  for all  $N$  and  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} T_N = \theta$  almost surely.*

*Proof.* For simplicity of the notation, let  $\bar{\eta}(X, Y_\sigma) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})$  for each  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ . By exchangeability of  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , it holds that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_i, Y_i) \mid \mathcal{F}_N] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_j, Y_j) \mid \mathcal{F}_N]$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq N$  which implies that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1) \mid \mathcal{F}_N] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}}) \mid \mathcal{F}_N]$ . Since  $\bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}})$  is  $\mathcal{F}_N$ -measurable, it follows that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1) \mid \mathcal{F}_N] = \bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}})$ . By the tower property of conditional expectations,

$$h_N := \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1) \mid \mathcal{G}_N] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1) \mid \mathcal{F}_N] \mid \mathcal{G}_N] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}}) \mid \mathcal{G}_N].$$

By definition, the last expression is the a.s. unique  $\mathcal{G}_N$ -measurable function such that for any bounded  $\mathcal{G}_N$ -measurable  $\phi$ , it holds that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}})\phi] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[h_N\phi]$ . By (21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu[\bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}})\phi] &= \mathbb{E}[f_N \bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}})\phi] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[f_N \bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}}) \mid \mathcal{G}_N]\phi] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\mu\left[\frac{dR^N}{dS^N} \mathbb{E}[f_N \bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}}) \mid \mathcal{G}_N]\phi\right], \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $h_N = \frac{dR^N}{dS^N} \mathbb{E}[f_N \bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}}) \mid \mathcal{G}_N]$ . Similar to (22), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f_N \bar{\eta}(X, Y_{\text{id}}) \mid \mathcal{G}_N] = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \bar{\eta}(X, Y_\sigma) \xi^\otimes(X, Y_\sigma).$$

According to Fact 1,

$$h_N = \frac{1}{D_N} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \bar{\eta}(X, Y_\sigma) \xi^\otimes(X, Y_\sigma) = T_N.$$

Hence, the unbiasedness of  $T_N$  under  $\mu$  follows by the tower property of conditional expectations. Now consider the reverse  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_N = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_N, (X_i, Y_i), i \geq N+1)$ . Since  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i \geq N+1}$  are independent of  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , we have  $T_N = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1) \mid \bar{\mathcal{G}}_N]$ . Consequently,  $(T_N, \bar{\mathcal{G}}_N)_{N \geq 1}$  is a reverse martingale and  $T_N$  converges almost surely to  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1)] = \theta$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* As shown in Proposition 9, for any  $\eta \in \mathbf{L}^1(\mu)$ ,  $T_N = T_N(\eta) \rightarrow_{a.s.} \theta$  under  $\mu$ . In particular, Proposition 9 holds for any bounded continuous function  $\eta$ . Thus, except for a null set, the convergence in Proposition 9 holds for a countable collection of bounded continuous functions. By separability of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , almost sure weak convergence follows [69, Theorem 3.1] by choosing such a countable collection judiciously. This shows almost sure weak convergence under  $\mu$ . Weak convergence in probability under  $P \otimes Q$  now follows from Theorem 8.  $\square$

### 3. Limit Law and Chaos Decomposition

This section is devoted to the limit laws of  $T_N$  in (14). To obtain the Gaussian limit, our goal is to find the first order approximation  $\mathcal{L}_1$  of  $T_N$  in the form of a sum of i.i.d. terms. Now, provided that the remainder  $T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 = o_p(N^{-1/2})$ , it follows from the CLT that  $\sqrt{N}(T_N - \theta)$  converges weakly to a normal distribution. However, there are two main challenges. First, the statistic  $T_N$  has a rather complicated expression involving

a ratio of two infinite-order U-statistics. This prevents us from utilizing the Hoeffding decomposition to derive the first order approximation. Second, due to its complicated nature, it is extremely challenging to control the remainder—the variance computation for classical U-statistics does not apply here.

To address the first challenge, the key observation is that  $T_N$  admits a simple expression under  $\mu$  as shown in Proposition 9. This allows us to obtain a linear approximation of  $T_N$  under  $\mu$  which we call the first order chaos. Due to the contiguity result in Theorem 8, the first order chaos can be viewed as the first order approximation of  $T_N$  under  $P \otimes Q$ . As for the second challenge, we develop a novel approach to control the remainder using the spectral gap of the operators  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*$ . Since this approach is also used to establish the limit law of  $D_N$  in Theorem 2, we discuss the treatment of  $D_N$  and the remainder together in Section 4. Following a similar argument, we can also derive the second order chaos and the associated limit law.

In Section 3.1 we first give a formal derivation of the first order approximation  $\mathcal{L}_1$  and prove the asymptotic normality of  $T_N$ . We then derive  $\mathcal{L}_1$  rigorously as the first order chaos of  $T_N$  using orthogonal projections in  $\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$ . In Section 3.2 we obtain the second order chaos of  $T_N$ .

### 3.1. First order chaos

**A formal derivation.** Recall from Proposition 9 that  $T_N = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1) \mid \mathcal{G}_N]$ . Hence, in order to obtain the first order approximation of  $T_N$ , it is natural to approximate  $\eta(X, Y) - \theta$  by some linear term  $f(X) + g(Y)$  under  $(X, Y) \sim \mu$  and then use

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1) + g(Y_1) \mid \mathcal{G}_N] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [f(X_i) + g(Y_i)]$$

as the first order approximation of  $T_N$ . The above equality can be shown with an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 9. A good linear approximation  $f(X) + g(Y)$  should satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X, Y) - \theta \mid X] &= \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X) + g(Y) \mid X] \\ \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X, Y) - \theta \mid Y] &= \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X) + g(Y) \mid Y]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Recall  $\frac{d\mu}{d(P \otimes Q)}(x, y) = \xi(x, y)$  and  $\eta_{1,0}$  from (15). It holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X, Y) - \theta \mid X](x) = \int [\eta(x, y) - \theta] \xi(x, y) dQ(y) = \eta_{1,0}(x).$$

Similarly, we have  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X, Y) - \theta \mid Y](y) = \eta_{0,1}(y)$ . It then follows from the tower property that

$$\mathbb{E}_P[\eta_{1,0}(X)] = \mathbb{E}_P[\mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X, Y) - \theta \mid X]] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_Q[\eta_{0,1}(Y)] = 0. \quad (24)$$

Moreover, by Definition 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu[g(Y) \mid X](x) &= \int g(y) \xi(x, y) dQ(y) = (\mathcal{A}^* g)(x) \\ \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X) \mid Y](y) &= \int f(x) \xi(x, y) dP(x) = (\mathcal{A} f)(y). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

As a result, the condition (23) becomes

$$\eta_{1,0}(X) = f(X) + \mathcal{A}^* g(X) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_{0,1}(Y) = \mathcal{A} f(Y) + g(Y). \quad (26)$$

Formally, we can solve the linear system (26) to get

$$f = (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1}) \quad \text{and} \quad g = (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0}).$$

We will make this rigorous later. This suggests the following first order approximation of  $T_N$

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(X_i) + (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(Y_i)],$$

which is exactly the first order chaos  $\mathcal{L}_1$  in Theorem 4. In fact, the next result shows that, after subtracting  $\mathcal{L}_1$  from  $T_N - \theta$ , the variance of the numerator is of order  $O(N^{-2})$ .

It can be shown that the remainder  $T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 = U_N/D_N$ , where  $D_N$  is defined in (20) and

$$U_N := \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\eta}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}) \quad (27)$$

with  $\tilde{\eta}$  defined as

$$\tilde{\eta}(x, y) := \eta(x, y) - \theta - (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(x) - (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(y). \quad (28)$$

In fact, for all  $f$  and  $g$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_N - \theta - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [f(X_i) + g(Y_i)] \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) - \theta - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [f(X_i) + g(Y_i)] \right] \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})}{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})} \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) - \theta - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [f(X_i) + g(Y_{\sigma_i})] \right] \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})}{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})} \\ &= \frac{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\eta(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) - \theta - f(X_i) - g(Y_{\sigma_i})] \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})}{\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})}. \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 10.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, we have  $\mathbb{E}[U_N^2] = O(N^{-2})$ .*

Similar to  $D_N$ , the numerator  $U_N$  is also a two-sample U-statistic of infinite order. We defer the proof of Proposition 10 to Section 4. Let us prove the main results.

*Proof of Theorem 4.* According to Theorem 2 and Proposition 10, we have  $D_N = O_p(1)$  and  $U_N = o_p(N^{-1/2})$ . By Slutsky's Lemma, it holds that  $T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 = U_N/D_N = o_p(N^{-1/2})$ . Now, Corollary 5 follows from the standard Lindeberg CLT [11, Section 27].  $\square$

**First order chaos.** We derive the first order chaos  $\mathcal{L}_1$  using orthogonal projections in  $\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$ . We change in this section the measure so that  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mu$ .

*Definition 4.* Let  $x_{[N]}$  and  $y_{[N]}$  be two sets of (random) vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $T := T(x_{[N]}, y_{[N]})$ . We say  $T$  is *permutation symmetric in  $x$*  if  $T(x_{\sigma_{[N]}}, y_{[N]}) = T(x_{[N]}, y_{[N]})$  for every  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ , where  $x_{\sigma_{[N]}} := (x_{\sigma_i})_{i \in [N]}$ . We define permutation symmetry in  $y$  similarly. We say  $T$  is permutation symmetric if it is permutation symmetric in both  $x$  and  $y$ .

Let  $H_0 \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  be the subspace of constant functions and  $H_1 \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  be the subspace spanned by functions of the type

$$\sum_{i=1}^N [f(X_i) + g(Y_i)] \quad (29)$$

that is orthogonal to  $H_0$ . By Proposition 9, the (orthogonal) projection of  $T_N$  onto  $H_0$  is  $\text{Proj}_{H_0}(T_N) = \theta$ . Moreover, we show in Appendix B that  $H_1$  is closed so that the projection of  $T_N$  onto  $H_1$  uniquely exists. We will compute this projection, which we refer to as the *first order chaos*. Note that the elements in  $\mathbf{L}^2$

spaces are only defined up to zero-measure sets (or equivalent classes). For two elements  $f, g \in \mathbf{L}^2$ ,  $f = g$  means  $f$  equals  $g$  up to equivalent classes.

Given a probability measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(\nu)$  be the subspace of  $\mathbf{L}^2(\nu)$  consisting of mean-zero functions. Recall  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*$  in Definition 1. We first argue that  $(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}$  and  $(I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}$  are well-defined on  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$ , respectively. The proof is deferred to the supplementary material.

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $(X, Y) \sim \mu$ . Under Assumption 1, the following statements hold true:*

- (a) *For any  $f \in \mathbf{L}^2(P)$  and  $g \in \mathbf{L}^2(Q)$ , it holds  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X) | Y](y) = \mathcal{A}f(y)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[g(Y) | X](x) = \mathcal{A}^*g(x)$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{A}f \in \mathbf{L}^2(Q)$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*g \in \mathbf{L}^2(P)$ .*
- (b) *The largest eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*$  is 1, and  $\mathcal{A}\mathbf{1} = \mathcal{A}^*\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$ .*
- (c) *The operator  $\mathcal{A}$  maps  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  to  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$ , and  $\mathcal{A}^*$  maps  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$  to  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$ .*
- (d) *The operators  $(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1} : \mathbf{L}_0^2(P) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $(I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1} : \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$  are well-defined.*
- (e) *It holds that  $\mathcal{A}(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1} = (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*(I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1} = (I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}\mathcal{A}^*$  on their domains defined above. Moreover, for any  $f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $g \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu [(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^*g)(X) + (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(g - \mathcal{A}f)(Y) | X] &= f(X) \\ \mathbb{E}_\mu [(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^*g)(X) + (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(g - \mathcal{A}f)(Y) | Y] &= g(Y). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Now we are ready to give the first order chaos of  $T_N$ , i.e.,  $\text{Proj}_{H_1}(T_N)$ .

**Proposition 12.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the first order chaos of the statistic  $T_N$  is given by*

$$\mathcal{L}_1 := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^*\eta_{0,1})(X_i) + (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A}\eta_{1,0})(Y_i)]. \quad (31)$$

*Proof.* By the definition of orthogonal projection, it suffices to show that, for any  $i \in [N]$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 | X_i] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_\mu[T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 | Y_i] = 0$$

almost surely. We will prove it for  $X_1$ , and the rest of them can be proved similarly. Recall from (24) that  $\eta_{1,0} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $\eta_{0,1} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$ . By (c) in Lemma 11, we know  $\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^*\eta_{0,1} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A}\eta_{1,0} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$ . It then follows from (d) in Lemma 11 that, for every  $i \in [N]$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu [(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^*\eta_{0,1})(X_i) + (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A}\eta_{1,0})(Y_i)] = 0.$$

As a result,  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathcal{L}_1 | X_1]$  is equal to

$$\frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}_\mu [(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^*\eta_{0,1})(X_1) + (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A}\eta_{1,0})(Y_1) | X_1] = \frac{\eta_{1,0}(X_1)}{N},$$

where the last equality follows from (30). We only need to show  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_N - \theta | X_1] = \frac{1}{N}\eta_{1,0}(X_1)$ . Let  $h(x) := \mathbb{E}_\mu[T_N - \theta | X_1](x)$ . We will prove that  $\mathbb{E}_P[h(X_1)\phi(X_1)] = \mathbb{E}_P[\eta_{1,0}(X_1)\phi(X_1)]/N$  for all  $\sigma(X_1)$ -measurable  $\phi$ . Fix an arbitrary  $\sigma(X_1)$ -measurable  $\phi$ . Since  $T_N - \theta$  is permutation symmetric in  $X$  (see Definition 4), we get  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[T_N - \theta | X_i](x) \equiv h(x)$  for all  $i \in [N]$ . As a result, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ (T_N - \theta) \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(X_i) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_\mu [(T_N - \theta)\phi(X_i)] = N \mathbb{E}_P[h(X_1)\phi(X_1)].$$

Recall from Proposition 9 that  $T_N = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1) | \mathcal{G}_N]$ . Since  $\sum_{i=1}^N \phi(X_i)$  is  $\mathcal{G}_N$ -measurable, by the tower property of conditional expectation, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ (T_N - \theta) \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(X_i) \right] = \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ (\eta(X_1, Y_1) - \theta) \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(X_i) \right] = \mathbb{E}_P[\eta_{1,0}(X_1)\phi(X_1)],$$

where the last equality follows from the independence of  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  and  $\eta_{1,0} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$ . Hence, we have  $\mathbb{E}_P[\eta_{1,0}(X_1)\phi(X_1)] = N\mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X_1)\phi(X_1)]$  which completes the proof.  $\square$



We then derive a more compact expression of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  using  $\mathcal{B}$  in Definition 2. We start by providing some properties of  $\mathcal{B}$  in the following lemma. The proof is deferred to the supplementary material.

**Lemma 13.** *Under Assumption 1, the following statements hold true:*

- (a) Let  $(X_1, Y_1), (X_2, Y_2) \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mu$ . It holds that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, Y_2) \mid X_2, Y_1](x, y) = \mathcal{B}f(x, y)$  for any  $f \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{B}f \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ .
- (b) The operator  $\mathcal{B}$  maps  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$  to  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$ .
- (c) For any  $f \oplus g \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , we have  $\mathcal{B}(f \oplus g) = \mathcal{A}^*g \oplus \mathcal{A}f$ .
- (d) The operator  $(I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}$  is well-defined on  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$ .
- (e) For any  $f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $g \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$ , it holds that

$$(I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(f \oplus g) = [(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^*g)] \oplus [(I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(g - \mathcal{A}f)]. \quad (32)$$

According to (32), the first order chaos  $\mathcal{L}_1$  admits a more compact representation.

**Corollary 14.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the first order chaos of  $T_N$  admits an alternative expression  $\mathcal{L}_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} \oplus \eta_{0,1})(X_i, Y_i)$ .*

*Remark 4.* Note that the above expression of  $\mathcal{L}_1$  is permutation symmetric, i.e.,  $\sum_{i=1}^N (I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} \oplus \eta_{0,1})(X_i, Y_i) = \sum_{i=1}^N (I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} \oplus \eta_{0,1})(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})$  for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ .

*Remark 5.* Another way to see this is: due to (26),  $\eta_{1,0} \oplus \eta_{0,1} = f \oplus g + \mathcal{A}^*g \oplus \mathcal{A}f = (I + \mathcal{B})(f \oplus g)$ .

### 3.2. Second order chaos

Recall that we have defined the operator  $\mathcal{C} := (I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}) \otimes (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)$ . Again, let us prove its inverse is well-defined. Given a measure  $\nu$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , let

$$\mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\nu) := \{f \in \mathbf{L}^2(\nu) : \mathbb{E}[f(X, Y) \mid Y] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbb{E}[f(X, Y) \mid X] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0 \text{ for all } (X, Y) \sim \nu\}. \quad (33)$$

For  $f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\nu)$ , we say  $f$  is degenerate with respect to  $\nu$ . For example, we will show in the next lemma that the function  $\tilde{\eta}$  defined in (28) belongs to  $\mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ , and then, by Assumption 2,  $\tilde{\eta}\xi \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ .

**Lemma 15.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the inverse operator  $\mathcal{C}^{-1} : \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  is well-defined. Moreover, it is equal to  $(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1} \otimes (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}$ . In particular,  $\tilde{\eta}\xi \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  so that  $\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$  is well-defined.*

From Lemma 15 we know  $\mathcal{C}$  preserves the degeneracy with respect to  $P \otimes Q$ . The following lemma verifies similar properties for other operators under consideration.

**Lemma 16.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}_k \in \{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}^*, I_P, I_Q\}$  be an operator mapping from  $\mathbf{L}^2(\nu_k)$  to  $\mathbf{L}^2(\nu'_k)$  for  $k \in \{1, 2\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$  maps  $\mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\nu_1 \otimes \nu_2)$  to  $\mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\nu'_1 \otimes \nu'_2)$ . In particular, the operator  $\mathcal{B}$  maps  $\mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  to  $\mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ .*

Unlike the first order chaos, we will give an approximation to the second order chaos, i.e., the projection onto  $H_2$ , of  $T_N$ . Here  $H_2 \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  is the subspace spanned by functions of the type

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} [f(X_i, X_j) + g(Y_i, Y_j)] + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq N} h(X_i, Y_j)$$

that is orthogonal to  $H_0 \oplus H_1$ . According to Lemma 15, we know  $\tilde{\eta}\xi \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  and  $\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$  is well-defined. Let

$$\eta_{2,0} := -(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi), \quad \eta_{0,2} := -(\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q)\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi), \quad \text{and } \eta_{1,1'} := (I + \mathcal{B})\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi). \quad (34)$$

We define

$$\mathcal{L}_2 := \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \left\{ \sum_{i \neq j} [\eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + \eta_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j)] + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) - \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) \right\}, \quad (35)$$

where  $\ell_{1,1'}(X_1, Y_1)$  is an affine function such that  $\eta_{1,1'} - \ell_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ . We will show in the next lemma that  $\eta_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}^2(\mu)$ , so  $\ell_{1,1'}$  can be derived the same way we obtain  $\tilde{\eta}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is permutation symmetric due to affineness of  $\ell_{1,1'}$ .

**Lemma 17.** *The functions  $\eta_{2,0}$ ,  $\eta_{0,2}$  and  $\eta_{1,1'}$  are degenerate, i.e.,  $\eta_{2,0} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ ,  $\eta_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$  and  $\eta_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . Under Assumption 3, the function  $\eta_{1,1'}$  also belongs to  $\mathbf{L}^2(\mu)$ , and thus  $\mathcal{L}_2 \in H_2$ . Moreover, the following identities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} (I + \mathcal{T})[\eta_{2,0} + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{0,2} + (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{1,1'}] &\equiv 0 \\ (I + \mathcal{T})[(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A})\eta_{2,0} + \eta_{0,2} + (\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q)\eta_{1,1'}] &\equiv 0 \\ (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})(I + \mathcal{T})\eta_{2,0} + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)(I + \mathcal{T})\eta_{0,2} + (I + \mathcal{B})\eta_{1,1'} &\equiv \tilde{\eta}\xi. \end{aligned}$$

The next proposition shows that  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is equal to the second order chaos of  $T_N$  up to an  $o_p(N^{-1})$  term.

**Proposition 18.** *Suppose Assumption 3 holds. Let the second order chaos of  $T_N$  be<sup>2</sup>  $\text{Proj}_{H_2}(T_N)$ . Then we have  $\text{Proj}_{H_2}(T_N) = \mathcal{L}_2 + o_p(N^{-1})$  under the measure  $\mu^N$ .*

*Proof.* Define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 := \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} [\eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + \eta_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j) + \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j)]. \quad (36)$$

It follows from LLN that  $\mathcal{L}_2 - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 = o_p(N^{-1})$ . It then suffices to show  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 - \text{Proj}_{H_2}(T_N) = o_p(N^{-1})$ . According to the degeneracy in Lemma 17, we know  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid X_i] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid Y_i] = 0$  for all  $i \in [N]$ , which implies  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \in H_0^\perp \cap H_1^\perp$ . Note that  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2$  is not permutation symmetric since it lacks the diagonal terms  $\eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i)$ , so it is not in  $H_2$ . Moreover, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathcal{L}_2 \mid X_i, Y_i] = 0, \quad \text{for all } i \in [N]. \quad (37)$$

*Step 1.* We show  $\text{Proj}_{H_2}(T_N) = \text{Proj}_{H_2}(\tilde{T}_N)$ , where

$$\tilde{T}_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\eta(X_i, Y_i) - \theta] - \mathcal{L}_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\eta}(X_i, Y_i). \quad (38)$$

In fact, since  $\theta \perp H_2$  and  $\mathcal{L}_1 \perp H_2$ , we have, for any  $U \in H_2$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[(\tilde{T}_N - T_N)U] = \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(X_i, Y_i) - T_N \right) U \right].$$

By the exchangeability of  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$ , it holds that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta(X_i, Y_i) U \right] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1)U]$ , and thus

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[(\tilde{T}_N - T_N)U] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1)U] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[T_N U] \stackrel{(i)}{=} \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1)U] - \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta(X_1, Y_1)U \mid \mathcal{G}_N]] = 0,$$

where (i) follows from the tower property. Hence,  $\tilde{T}_N - T_N \in H_2^\perp$  and thus the claim follows. Moreover, since  $\tilde{\eta} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ , we have  $\tilde{T}_N \in H_0^\perp \cap H_1^\perp$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{T}_N \mid X_i, Y_i] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{\eta}(X_k, Y_k) \mid X_i, Y_i] = \frac{1}{N} \tilde{\eta}(X_i, Y_i), \quad \text{for all } i \in [N], \quad (39)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{T}_N \mid X_i, X_j] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{T}_N \mid Y_i, Y_j] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{T}_N \mid X_i, Y_j] = 0, \quad \text{for all } i \neq j. \quad (40)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>We show in Proposition 41 in Appendix C that the subspace  $H_2$  is closed, so the second order chaos exists.

*Step 2.* We show  $\text{Proj}_{H_2}(T_N) = \text{Proj}_{H_2}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2)$ . By Step 1, it suffices to prove  $\tilde{T}_N - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \in H_2^\perp$ . We will prove  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[(\tilde{T}_N - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2)U] = 0$  for every

$$U := \sum_{i < j} [f_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + f_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j)] + \sum_{i,j=1}^N f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_j) \in \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N).$$

We first compute  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{T}_N - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid X_1, X_2]$ . Since  $\eta_{2,0} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ , so it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) \mid X_1, X_2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \sum_{\{i,j\}=\{1,2\}} \eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) \mid X_1, X_2 \right] = (I + \mathcal{T})\eta_{2,0}(X_1, X_2). \quad (41)$$

Since  $\eta_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(Y_1, Y_2) \mid X_1, X_2] = (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_1, X_2)$  for any  $f \in \mathbf{L}^2(Q \otimes Q)$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j) \mid X_1, X_2 \right] = (I + \mathcal{T})(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{0,2}(X_1, X_2). \quad (42)$$

Furthermore, since  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, Y_2) \mid X_1, X_2] = (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_1, X_2)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) \mid X_1, X_2 \right] = (I + \mathcal{T})(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{1,1'}(X_1, X_2). \quad (43)$$

Putting (41), (42) and (43) together, we get  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid X_1, X_2] = 0$  by the first identity in Lemma 17. Consequently, by (40),

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{T}_N - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid X_1, X_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{T}_N \mid X_1, X_2] = 0.$$

By the exchangeability of  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , we obtain  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{T}_N - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid X_i, X_j] = 0$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Similarly,  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{T}_N - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid Y_i, Y_j] = 0$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Hence, we only need to prove

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ (\tilde{T}_N - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2) \sum_{i,j} f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_j) \right] = 0.$$

For that purpose, we will compute  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid X_i, Y_j]$ . We have shown in (37) that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid X_i, Y_i] = 0$  for all  $i \in [N]$ . For  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) \mid X_1, Y_2 \right] &= (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})(I + \mathcal{T})\eta_{2,0}(X_1, Y_2) \\ \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j) \mid X_1, Y_2 \right] &= (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)(I + \mathcal{T})\eta_{0,2}(X_1, Y_2) \\ \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) \mid X_1, Y_2 \right] &= (I + \mathcal{B})\eta_{1,1'}(X_1, X_2). \end{aligned}$$

It then follows from the third identity in Lemma 17 that

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \mid X_1, Y_2] = \frac{1}{N(N-1)}\tilde{\eta}(X_1, Y_2)\xi(X_1, Y_2).$$

By the exchangeability of  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  again, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \sum_{i,j=1}^N f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_j) \right] &= \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}_\mu [\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_j)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu [\tilde{\eta}(X_1, Y_2) \xi(X_1, Y_2) f_{1,1}(X_1, Y_2)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\mu [\tilde{\eta}(X_1, Y_1) f_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1)],\end{aligned}$$

since  $\xi$  is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $\mu$  with respect to  $P \otimes Q$  under  $\mathbb{E}_\mu$ . On the other hand, we also have, by (39) and (40),

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \tilde{T}_N \sum_{i,j=1}^N f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_j) \right] = N \mathbb{E}_\mu [\tilde{T}_N f_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu [\tilde{\eta}(X_1, Y_1) f_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1)].$$

Hence,  $\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ (\tilde{T}_N - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2) \sum_{i,j=1}^N f(X_i, Y_j) \right] = 0$  and the claim follows.

*Step 3.* We control the variance of  $\text{Proj}_{H_2}(T_N) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2$ . From Step 2 we know  $\text{Proj}_{H_2}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2) = \text{Proj}_{H_2}(T_N)$ . By the definition of  $\mathbf{L}^2$  projection, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu [(\text{Proj}_{H_2}(T_N) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2)^2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu [(\text{Proj}_{H_2}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2)^2] = \min_{V \in H_2} \mathbb{E}_\mu [(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 - V)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu [(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 - \mathcal{L}_2)^2],$$

since  $\mathcal{L}_2 \in H_2$ . Note that

$$\mathcal{L}_2 - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^N [\eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) - \ell_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i)].$$

By independence, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu [(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 - \mathcal{L}_2)^2] = \frac{1}{N^2(N-1)^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}_\mu [(\eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) - \ell_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i))^2] = O(N^{-3}).$$

It follows that  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 = \text{Proj}_{H_2}(T_N) + o_p(N^{-1})$ .  $\square$

Note that the second order remainder is  $T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2 = (U_N - \mathcal{L}_2 D_N)/D_N$  where  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is defined in (35). It can be shown that the variance of  $U_N - \mathcal{L}_2 D_N$  is of order  $O(N^{-4})$ .

**Proposition 19.** *Under Assumptions 1-3, we have  $\mathbb{E}[(U_N - \mathcal{L}_2 D_N)^2] = O(N^{-4})$ .*

The proof of Proposition 19 is similar to the one of Proposition 25. We defer it to Section 4. Now we are ready to prove Theorem 6 and Corollary 7.

*Proof of Theorem 6.* Since  $\ell_{1,1'}$  is affine and  $\eta_{1,1'} - \ell_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_{1,1'}(X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\ell_{1,1'}(X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\eta_{1,1'}(X, Y)] = \theta_{1,1'}.$$

It then follows from LLN that  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) \rightarrow_p \theta_{1,1'}$ . As a result,

$$T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2 = T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 + \frac{\theta_{1,1'}}{N} + o_p(N^{-1}).$$

By Theorem 2 and Proposition 19, we have  $T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 - \mathcal{L}_2 = O_p(N^{-2})$  which completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 7.* Recall from (17) that  $\eta_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , so it holds that  $\frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{i=1}^N \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) = o_p(N^{-1})$  by LLN. Hence, we will ignore this term in the following derivation.

To begin with, we show the limiting distribution is well-defined. Since  $\varsigma^2 = 0$  in Corollary 5, we know

$$(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(x) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(y) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0,$$

which implies

$$\tilde{\eta}(x, y) := \eta(x, y) - \theta - (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(x) - (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(y) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \eta(x, y) - \theta.$$

Consequently,  $(\eta - \theta)\xi \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . According to [8, Page 90],  $\{\alpha_i \otimes \beta_j\}_{i,j \geq 0}$  forms an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . Thus, we have the expansion

$$(\eta - \theta)\xi = \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \gamma_{kl}(\alpha_k \otimes \beta_l), \quad \text{in } \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q), \quad (44)$$

where  $\sum_{k,l \geq 1} \gamma_{kl}^2 < \infty$ . Recall from Assumption 1 that  $0 \leq s_k \leq s_1 < 1$  for all  $k \geq 1$ , we have

$$\sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{kl}^2}{(1-s_k^2)^2(1-s_l^2)^2} \leq \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{kl}^2}{(1-s_1^2)^4} < \infty. \quad (45)$$

Let  $\{U_k\}, \{V_l\}$  be independent sequences of *i.i.d.* standard normal random variables. We define

$$\begin{aligned} Z &:= \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{kl}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \{U_k V_l + s_k s_l U_l V_k - s_l(U_k U_l - \mathbf{1}\{k=l\}) - s_k(V_k V_l - \mathbf{1}\{k=l\})\} \\ &= \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{1}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \{(\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk})U_k V_l - s_l \gamma_{kl}(U_k U_l - \mathbf{1}\{k=l\}) - s_k \gamma_{kl}(V_k V_l - \mathbf{1}\{k=l\})\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the sum converges in  $\mathbf{L}^2$ . We will show  $Z_N := N\mathcal{L}_2 \rightarrow_d Z$  by using characteristic functions, *i.e.*, by showing that, for each  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(itZ_N)] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\exp(itZ)], \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty.$$

The following proof is inspired by [61, Chapter 5.5.2].

*Step 1.* We expand  $Z_N$  on  $\{\alpha_k \otimes \beta_l\}_{k,l \geq 0}$ . For  $k \geq 1$ , we denote

$$\tilde{\alpha}_k := (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} \alpha_k = (1 - s_k^2)^{-1} \alpha_k \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta}_k := (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1} \beta_k = (1 - s_k^2)^{-1} \beta_k.$$

By Lemma 15 it holds that  $\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\alpha_k \otimes \beta_l) = \tilde{\alpha}_k \otimes \tilde{\beta}_l$ , and then we get

$$\mathcal{C}^{-1}[(\eta - \theta)\xi] = \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \gamma_{kl}(\tilde{\alpha}_k \otimes \tilde{\beta}_l) = \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{kl}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)}(\alpha_k \otimes \beta_l).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) &:= (I + \mathcal{B})\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)(X_i, Y_j) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{kl}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} [\alpha_k(X_i)\beta_l(Y_j) + s_k s_l \alpha_l(X_i)\beta_k(Y_j)] \\ \eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) &:= (I_{\rho_0} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)(X_i, X_j) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{kl}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} s_l \alpha_k(X_i) \alpha_l(X_j) \\ \eta_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j) &:= (\mathcal{A} \otimes I_{\rho_1})\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)(Y_i, Y_j) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{kl}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} s_k \beta_k(Y_i) \beta_l(Y_j). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $Z_N$  admits the following expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_N &= \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{kl}[\alpha_k(X_i)\beta_l(Y_j) + s_k s_l \alpha_l(X_i)\beta_k(Y_j) - s_l \alpha_k(X_i)\alpha_l(X_j) - s_k \beta_k(Y_i)\beta_l(Y_j)]}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k,l \geq 1} \frac{(\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk})\alpha_k(X_i)\beta_l(Y_j) - s_l \gamma_{kl}\alpha_k(X_i)\alpha_l(X_j) - s_k \gamma_{kl}\beta_k(Y_i)\beta_l(Y_j)}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)}. \end{aligned}$$

*Step 2.* We truncate the inner infinite sum. Fix an arbitrary integer  $K > 0$ . Let

$$Z_N^K := \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{(\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk}) \alpha_k(X_i) \beta_l(Y_j) - s_l \gamma_{kl} \alpha_k(X_i) \alpha_l(X_j) - s_k \gamma_{kl} \beta_k(Y_i) \beta_l(Y_j)}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)}$$

$$Z^K := \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{[(\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk}) U_k V_l - s_l \gamma_{kl} (U_k U_l - \mathbb{1}\{k=l\}) - s_k \gamma_{kl} (V_k V_l - \mathbb{1}\{k=l\})]}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)}.$$

By triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ}]| &\leq |\mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N^K}]| + |\mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N^K}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ^K}]| + |\mathbb{E}[e^{itZ^K}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ}]| \\ &=: A + B + C \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Fix arbitrary  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , it now suffices to show that  $A, B, C \leq \epsilon$  for all sufficiently large  $N$  with an appropriate choice of  $K$ .

*Step 3.* We bound  $A$  and  $C$ . Using the inequality  $|e^{iz} - 1| \leq |z|$ , we get

$$A \leq \mathbb{E} |e^{itZ_N} - e^{itZ_N^K}| \leq |t| \mathbb{E} |Z_N - Z_N^K| \leq |t| [\mathbb{E}(Z_N - Z_N^K)^2]^{1/2}. \quad (47)$$

We rewrite  $Z_N - Z_N^K$  as  $\frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i \neq j} [g_K^{\alpha\beta}(X_i, Y_j) - g_K^{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, X_j) - g_K^{\beta\beta}(Y_i, Y_j)]$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} g_K^{\alpha\beta}(x, y) &:= \sum_{k,l > K} \frac{\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \alpha_k(x) \beta_l(y) \\ g_K^{\alpha\alpha}(x, x') &:= \sum_{k,l > K} \frac{\gamma_{kl} s_l}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \alpha_k(x) \alpha_l(x') \\ g_K^{\beta\beta}(y, y') &:= \sum_{k,l > K} \frac{\gamma_{kl} s_k}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \beta_k(y) \beta_l(y'). \end{aligned}$$

By the orthogonality of  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$  and  $\{\beta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ , we know  $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_k(X_i) \beta_l(Y_j) \alpha_{k'}(X_i) \beta_{l'}(Y_j)] = 0$  for all  $k, l \geq 1$  and  $i \neq j$ . This implies  $g_K^{\alpha\beta}(X_i, Y_j)$  and  $g_K^{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, X_j)$  are uncorrelated. Analogously, we have  $g_K^{\alpha\beta}(X_i, Y_j)$ ,  $g_K^{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, X_j)$  and  $g_K^{\beta\beta}(Y_i, Y_j)$  are mutually uncorrelated for all  $i \neq j$ . As a result,  $\mathbb{E}[(Z_N - Z_N^K)^2]$  reads

$$\mathbb{E}[(Z_N - Z_N^K)^2] = \frac{1}{(N-1)^2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} g_K^{\alpha\beta}(X_i, Y_j) \right]^2 + \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} g_K^{\alpha\alpha}(X_i, X_j) \right]^2 + \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} g_K^{\beta\beta}(Y_i, Y_j) \right]^2 \right\}. \quad (48)$$

Notice that  $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_k(X_1) \beta_l(Y_2) | X_1] = \mathbb{E}[\alpha_k(X_1) \beta_l(Y_2) | Y_2] = 0$  for all  $k, l \geq 1$ , then

$$\mathbb{E}[g_K^{\alpha\beta}(X_1, Y_2) | X_1] = \mathbb{E}[g_K^{\alpha\beta}(X_1, Y_2) | Y_2] = 0.$$

As a result,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} g_K^{\alpha\beta}(X_i, Y_j) \right]^2 = N(N-1) \mathbb{E}[g_K^{\alpha\beta}(X_1, Y_2)^2] = N(N-1) \sum_{k,l > K} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \right]^2.$$

Let  $\delta > 0$  be such that  $|t| \delta < \epsilon$ . It then follows from (45) that, for all sufficiently large  $K$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{(N-1)^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j} g_K^{\alpha\beta}(X_i, Y_j) \right]^2 \leq \frac{N}{N-1} \sum_{k,l > K} \left[ \frac{\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \right]^2 \leq \frac{N}{6(N-1)} \delta^2.$$



The same bound for the rest of the two terms in (48) can be shown using similar arguments. Therefore, by (47),

$$A \leq |t| [\mathbb{E}(Z_N - Z_N^K)^2]^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{N}{2(N-1)}} |t| \delta < \epsilon, \quad \text{for all } N \geq 2.$$

Repeating the above argument for  $Z_N^K$  and  $Z$  gives  $C < \epsilon$  for all  $N \geq 2$ .

*Step 4.* We bound  $B$  by proving  $Z_N^K \rightarrow_d Z^K$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Consider  $W_N := (W_\alpha^\top, W_\beta^\top)$  with

$$W_\alpha := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_k(X_i) \right)_{k=1}^K \quad \text{and} \quad W_\beta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_k(Y_i) \right)_{k=1}^K.$$

According to the multivariate CLT [11, Section 29], it holds  $W_N \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}_{2K}(0, I_{2K})$ , where the covariance matrix  $I_{2K}$  follows from the orthonormality of  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  and  $\{\beta_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ . We then rewrite  $Z_N^K$  as a quadratic form of  $W_N$ . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{1}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} (\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk}) \alpha_k(X_i) \beta_l(Y_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{(\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk})}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \left\{ \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_k(X_i) \right] \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_l(Y_i) \right] - \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_k(X_i) \beta_l(Y_i) \right\} \\ &= 2W_\alpha^\top \Sigma^{\alpha\beta} W_\beta - \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{(\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk})}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_k(X_i) \beta_l(Y_i), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Sigma_{kl}^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{(\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk})}{2(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)}$  is the  $(k, l)$ -element in the matrix  $\Sigma$ . Similarly, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{\gamma_{kl}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} s_l \alpha_k(X_i) \alpha_l(X_j) = W_\alpha^\top \Sigma^{\alpha\alpha} W_\alpha - \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{\gamma_{kl} s_l}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_k(X_i) \alpha_l(X_i) \\ & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{\gamma_{kl}}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} s_k \beta_k(Y_i) \beta_l(Y_j) = W_\beta^\top \Sigma^{\beta\beta} W_\beta - \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{\gamma_{kl} s_k}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_k(Y_i) \beta_l(Y_i), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Sigma_{kl}^{\alpha\alpha} = \frac{\gamma_{kl} s_l}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)}$  and  $\Sigma_{kl}^{\beta\beta} = \frac{\gamma_{kl} s_k}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)}$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_N^K &:= \frac{N}{N-1} W_N^\top \begin{pmatrix} -\Sigma^{\alpha\alpha} & \Sigma^{\alpha\beta} \\ [\Sigma^{\alpha\beta}]^\top & -\Sigma^{\beta\beta} \end{pmatrix} W_N - \frac{N}{N-1} \\ & \quad \sum_{k,l=1}^K \frac{1}{(1-s_k^2)(1-s_l^2)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [(\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk}) \alpha_k(X_i) \beta_l(Y_i) - s_l \gamma_{kl} \alpha_k(X_i) \alpha_l(X_i) - s_k \gamma_{kl} \beta_k(Y_i) \beta_l(Y_i)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_k(X_i) \beta_l(Y_i)] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\alpha_k(X_i) \alpha_l(X_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\beta_k(Y_i) \beta_l(Y_i)] = \mathbf{1}\{k = l\}$  for all  $k, l \geq 1$  and  $i \in [N]$ , we know from LLN that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [(\gamma_{kl} + s_k s_l \gamma_{lk}) \alpha_k(X_i) \beta_l(Y_i) - s_l \alpha_k(X_i) \alpha_l(X_i) - s_k \beta_k(Y_i) \beta_l(Y_i)] \rightarrow_p -s_l \mathbf{1}\{k = l\} - s_k \mathbf{1}\{k = l\}.$$

By Slutsky's lemma, it holds  $Z_N^K \rightarrow_d Z^K$ , and thus we have  $B < \epsilon$  for all sufficiently large  $N$ . Now, by (46), we get  $|\mathbb{E}[e^{itZ_N}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itZ}]| \leq 3\epsilon$  for all sufficiently large  $N$ . Since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary, this completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. Analysis of the Denominator and the Remainder

Recall from (27) that the first order remainder  $R_1 := T_N - \theta - \mathcal{L}_1 = U_N/D_N$ , where

$$U_N := \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\eta}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}) \quad \text{and} \quad D_N := \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}), \quad (49)$$

with  $\tilde{\eta}$  defined in (28). We prove in this section the limit law of  $D_N$  in Theorem 2 and the variance bound of  $U_N$  in Proposition 10. The strategy is to decompose  $D_N$  and  $U_N$  into orthogonal pieces using the Hoeffding decomposition (Section 4.1), and then bound the higher order terms using the spectral gap of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*$  (Section 4.2). Note that both  $D_N$  and  $U_N$  are *two-sample* U-statistics of infinite order. Techniques for U-statistics of fixed order and *one-sample* U-statistics of infinite order do not apply here. Hence, this section develops new tools to handle two-sample U-statistics of infinite order. Using similar techniques, we also prove the bound for the second order remainder in Proposition 25. We work throughout this section with the original model assuming that  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P \otimes Q$  and use  $\mathbb{E}$  to denote the expectation.

##### 4.1. Hoeffding decomposition under the product measure

*Definition 5.* Given  $A, B \subset [N]$ , we denote by  $H_{AB}$  the subspace of  $\mathbf{L}^2((P \otimes Q)^N)$  spanned by functions of the form  $f(X_A, Y_B)$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_A, Y_B) \mid X_C, Y_D] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0, \quad \text{for all } C \subset A, D \subset B \text{ and } |C| + |D| < |A| + |B|. \quad (50)$$

We say such an  $f(X_A, Y_B)$  is completely degenerate. In particular, when  $|A| = |B| = 1$ , we write  $f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . By definition, for distinct choices of the pair  $(A, B)$ , the subspaces  $H_{AB}$  are orthogonal. Take an arbitrary mean-zero statistic  $T \in \mathbf{L}_0^2((P \otimes Q)^N)$ . If  $T$  can be decomposed as

$$T = \sum_{A, B \subset [N]} T_{AB}, \quad \text{with } T_{AB} \in H_{AB}, \quad (51)$$

then we call it the *Hoeffding decomposition* of  $T$  [66, Chapter 11]. Its variance can then be computed as  $\mathbb{E}[T^2] = \sum_{A, B \subset [N]} \mathbb{E}[T_{AB}^2]$ .

For example, both  $\tilde{\xi}(X_1, Y_1) := \xi(X_1, Y_1) - 1$  and  $h(X_1, Y_1) := \tilde{\eta}(X_1, Y_1)\xi(X_1, Y_1)$  are completely degenerate according to the following lemma.

**Lemma 20.** *Assume that  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , then  $\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\eta} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ .*

*Proof.* The claim  $\tilde{\xi} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  follows from  $\mathbb{E}[\xi(X_i, Y_j) \mid X_i] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \mathbb{E}[\xi(X_i, Y_j) \mid Y_j] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1$  for all  $i, j \in [N]$  since  $\mu \in \Pi(P, Q)$  and  $d\mu/d(P \otimes Q) = \xi$ . To prove the other claim, note that, by (30),

$$\eta_{1,0}(x) = \int [(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(x) + (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(y)] \xi(x, y) dQ(y).$$

By definition,  $\eta_{1,0}(x) = \int [\eta(x, y) - \theta] \xi(x, y) dQ(y)$ . This yields  $\int \tilde{\eta}(x, y) \xi(x, y) dQ(y) = 0$ . Similarly, we obtain that  $\int \tilde{\eta}(x, y) \xi(x, y) dP(x) = 0$  and thus  $\tilde{\eta} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ .  $\square$

We then derive the Hoeffding decompositions of  $D_N$  and  $U_N$  as defined in (49). The proof is deferred to the supplementary material.

**Proposition 21.** *Assume that  $\xi, \eta \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , then the following Hoeffding decompositions hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} D_N &= 1 + \sum_{\substack{A, B \subset [N] \\ |A|=|B|>0}} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N: \sigma_A=B} \prod_{i \in A} \tilde{\xi}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \\ U_N &= \sum_{\substack{A, B \subset [N] \\ |A|=|B|>0}} \frac{1}{N \cdot N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N: \sigma_A=B} \sum_{i \in A} h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in A \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}), \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where  $\sigma_A := \{\sigma_i : i \in A\}$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[D_N^2] &= 1 + \sum_{r=1}^N \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_j) \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right] \\ \mathbb{E}[U_N^2] &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{r}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{i=1}^r \mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_1, Y_1) \prod_{j=2}^r \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_j) h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right].\end{aligned}$$

#### 4.2. Variance bounds

We then bound the variances of  $D_N$  and  $U_N$  using the spectral gap of operators  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*$ . Assumption 1 guarantees that such spectral gap does exist. We first prove a contraction property.

**Lemma 22.** *Recall  $s_1$  from Assumption 1. For any  $f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ , we have  $(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  and  $\|(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)} \leq s_1 \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P)}$ . Similar results hold for  $I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q$  and  $\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ . By definition,  $(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})f(x, y) = \int f(x, x') \xi(x', y) dP(x')$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})f(X_1, Y_1) \mid X_1] &= \int f(X_1, x') dP(x') \left[ \int \xi(x', y) dQ(y) \right] \\ &= \int f(X_1, x') dP(x') \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,  $\mathbb{E}[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})f(X_1, Y_1) \mid Y_1] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0$ . Consequently,  $(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . Now, by [8, Page 90],  $\{\alpha_i \otimes \alpha_j\}_{i,j \geq 0}$  forms an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P)$ , and thus  $f$  admits the following expansion  $f = \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \gamma_{ij} \alpha_i \otimes \alpha_j$  where  $\sum_{i,j \geq 1} \gamma_{ij}^2 < \infty$ . It then follows that

$$\|(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}^2 = \left\| \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \gamma_{ij} s_j \alpha_i \otimes \beta_j \right\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}^2 = \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \gamma_{ij}^2 s_j^2 \leq s_1^2 \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P)}^2.$$

□

According to Proposition 21, the key quantity in the variances of  $D_N$  and  $U_N$  is

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ f(X_1, Y_1) \prod_{j=2}^N \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_j) f(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [N] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right] \quad (53)$$

for some  $f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , where  $f = \tilde{\xi} = \xi - 1$  for  $D_N$  and  $f = h = \tilde{\eta}\xi$  for  $U_N$ . In order to control it, we decompose a permutation into disjoint cycles. By independence, the expectation then equals the product of expectations with respect to each cycle. We first give a simple example to illustrate the idea.

*Example 1.* Consider the case when  $r = 3$ ,  $i = 3$ , and  $\sigma$  is given by  $\sigma_1 = 2$ ,  $\sigma_2 = 1$  and  $\sigma_3 = 3$ . We are interested in bounding the following expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_1, Y_1) \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_2) \tilde{\xi}(X_3, Y_3) f(X_3, Y_3) \tilde{\xi}(X_1, Y_2) \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_1)]. \quad (54)$$

By construction,  $\sigma$  contains two cycles,  $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1$  and  $3 \rightarrow 3$ , and the above expectation reads

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X_1, Y_1) \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_2) \tilde{\xi}(X_1, Y_2) \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_1)] \cdot \mathbb{E}[f(X_3, Y_3) \tilde{\xi}(X_3, Y_3)].$$

The second expectation is upper bounded by  $\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)} \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}$  by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. It then suffices to bound the first expectation. We simplify this expectation by iteratively integrating with

respect to a single variable, while keeping the rest being fixed. We first integrate with respect to  $X_1$  given  $X_2, Y_1, Y_2$ . This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[f(X_1, Y_1) \tilde{\xi}(X_1, Y_2) \mid X_2, Y_1, Y_2] \cdot \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_2) \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_1) \\ &= (\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) f(Y_2, Y_1) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_2) \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_1), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $\mathbb{E}[f(X_1, Y_1) \tilde{\xi}(X_1, Y_2) \mid X_2, Y_1, Y_2] = \mathbb{E}[f(X_1, Y_1) \xi(X_1, Y_2) \mid Y_1, Y_2] = (\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) f(Y_2, Y_1)$  since  $f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  and  $\tilde{\xi} = \xi - 1$ . We then integrate with respect to  $Y_2$  given  $X_2$  and  $Y_1$ . This yields

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) f(Y_2, Y_1) \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_2) \mid X_2, Y_1] \cdot \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_1) = (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)(\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) f(X_2, Y_1) \cdot \tilde{\xi}(X_2, Y_1).$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma 22, its expectation is upper bounded by

$$\|(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)(\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)} \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)} \leq s_1^2 \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)} \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}.$$

Hence, the expectation in (54) is upper bounded by  $s_1^2 \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}^2 \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}^2$ .

The following lemma generalizes this example to an arbitrary cycle  $k_1 \rightarrow k_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow k_l \rightarrow k_1$ . The proof is deferred to the supplementary material.

**Lemma 23.** *Suppose Assumption 1 holds and  $f, g \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . Define  $\varsigma_f := \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}$  and  $\varsigma_g := \|g\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}$ . For any  $l > 0$  and  $l$  distinct indices  $\{k_1, \dots, k_l\} \subset [N]$ , we have, for all  $t, t' \in [l]$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ f(X_{k_t}, Y_{k_t}) g(X_{k_{t'}}, Y_{k_{t'+1}}) \prod_{i \neq t} \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_i}) \prod_{j \neq t'} \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_{j+1}}) \right] \leq s_1^{2(l-1)} \varsigma_f \varsigma_g. \quad (55)$$

Now we are ready to control the quantity in (53).

**Lemma 24.** *Suppose the same assumptions in Lemma 23 hold true. Let  $\varsigma_0 := \|\tilde{\xi}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}$  and  $\varsigma_h := \|h\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}$ . For any  $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$ ,  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$  and  $i \in [N]$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_1, Y_1) \prod_{j=2}^N \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_j) h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [N] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right] \leq s_1^{2(N-\#\sigma)} \varsigma_h^2 \varsigma_0^{2(\#\sigma-1)},$$

where  $\#\sigma$  is the number of cycles of the permutation  $\sigma$ .

*Proof.* We first consider the case when  $i \neq 1$ . It is well-known that every permutation can be decomposed as disjoint cycles. Take a cycle  $k_1 \rightarrow k_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow k_l \rightarrow k_1$  of  $\sigma$ . If it contains both 1 and  $i$ , then we assume, w.l.o.g.,  $k_1 = 1$  and  $k_2 = i$ . Consequently, all the terms that involve  $X_{k_{[l]}}$  and  $Y_{k_{[l]}}$  are

$$h(X_1, Y_1) h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j=2}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_j}) \prod_{j \in [l] \setminus \{2\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_{j+1}}).$$

Using Lemma 23 with  $f = h$  and  $g = h$ , it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_1, Y_1) h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j=2}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_j}) \prod_{j \in [l] \setminus \{2\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_{j+1}}) \right] \leq s_1^{2(l-1)} \varsigma_h^2.$$

If this cycle only contains 1, then a similar argument gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_1, Y_1) \prod_{j=2}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_j}) \prod_{j=1}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_{j+1}}) \right] \leq s_1^{2(l-1)} \varsigma_h \varsigma_0.$$

If this cycle only contains  $i$ , with  $k_1 = i$ , then we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j=1}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_j}) \prod_{j=2}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_{j+1}}) \right] \leq s_1^{2(l-1)} \varsigma_h \varsigma_0.$$

Finally, if this cycle does not contain either 1 or  $i$ , then it holds

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_j}) \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_j}, Y_{k_{j+1}}) \right] \leq s_1^{2(l-1)} \varsigma_0^2.$$

Here we are invoking Lemma 23 with  $f = g = \tilde{\xi}$ . Putting all together, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_1, Y_1) \prod_{j=2}^N \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_j) h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [N] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right] \leq s_1^{2(N-\#\sigma)} \varsigma_h^2 \varsigma_0^{2(\#\sigma-1)}.$$

When  $i = 1$ , we can invoke Lemma 23 to get the same bound, since we allow  $t = t'$  in this lemma.  $\square$

Now we are ready to give an upper bound for the variance of  $U_N$  and prove Proposition 10.

*Proof of Proposition 10.* Recall from Proposition 21 that  $\mathbb{E}[U_N^2]$  is equal to

$$\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{r}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{i=1}^r \mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_1, Y_1) \prod_{j=2}^r \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_j) h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [N] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right]. \quad (56)$$

By Lemma 24, we know

$$\mathbb{E}[U_N^2] \leq \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{r}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} r s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma)} \varsigma_0^{2(\#\sigma-1)} \varsigma_h^2. \quad (57)$$

If  $s_1 = 0$  or  $\varsigma_0 = 0$ , then  $\xi = 1$   $P \otimes Q$ -a.s. It follows from (56) that  $\mathbb{E}[U_N^2] = 0$  which completes the proof. Hence, we assume in the following that  $s_1 > 0$  and  $\varsigma_0 > 0$ .

Now, let  $\sigma^*$  be a random permutation uniformly sampled from  $\mathcal{S}_r$ . It is known [5, Chapter 1] that the moment generating function of  $\#\sigma^*$  is given by  $\mathbb{E}[u^{\#\sigma^*}] = \prod_{i=1}^r (1 - \frac{1}{i} + \frac{u}{i})$ . Thus,

$$\frac{r}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} r s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma)} \varsigma_0^{2(\#\sigma-1)} = r^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma^*)} \varsigma_0^{2(\#\sigma^*-1)} \right] = r^2 s_1^{2r} \varsigma_0^{-2} \prod_{i=1}^r \left( 1 - \frac{1}{i} + \frac{\varsigma_0^2}{s_1^2 i} \right).$$

Let  $m := \lceil \varsigma_0^2 / s_1^2 - 1 \rceil$ . Then, for every  $r \geq m$ ,

$$\prod_{i=1}^r \left( 1 - \frac{1}{i} + \frac{\varsigma_0^2}{s_1^2 i} \right) \leq \prod_{i=1}^r \left( 1 + \frac{m}{i} \right) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^r (i+m)}{r!} = \frac{\prod_{i=r-m+1}^r (i+m)}{m!} \leq \frac{(r+m)^m}{m!},$$

and thus  $\sum_{r=m}^N \frac{r}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} r s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma)} \varsigma_0^{2(\#\sigma-1)} \leq \sum_{r=m}^N r^2 s_1^{2r} \varsigma_0^{-2} \frac{(r+m)^m}{m!}$  converges as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  since  $s_1 < 1$ . It follows from (57) that  $\mathbb{E}[U_N^2] = O(N^{-2})$ .  $\square$

With the same proof technique, a similar result holds for  $D_N$ . Recall from Proposition 21 that  $D_N = 1 + \sum_{r=1}^N D_{N,r}$  where

$$D_{N,r} := \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{|A|=|B|=r} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N : \sigma_A = B} \prod_{i \in A} \tilde{\xi}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}). \quad (58)$$

**Proposition 25.** *Under Assumption 1, we have, for any integer  $R \in [0, N]$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( D_N - 1 - \sum_{r=1}^R D_{N,r} \right)^2 \right] \leq \sum_{r=R+1}^N \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma)} \varsigma_0^{2\#\sigma}$$

which can be arbitrarily small for sufficiently large  $R$ .

### 4.3. Limit Law of the Denominator

Finally, we prove Theorem 2 regarding the limiting distribution of  $D_N$ . According to the singular value decomposition in Assumption 1, it holds that

$$\xi(x, y) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} s_k \alpha_k(x) \beta_k(y), \quad \text{in } \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q),$$

where  $0 \leq s_k < 1$  is decreasing in  $k$ . Hence, we start by considering a truncated version of  $\xi$ , i.e.,  $\xi^K(x, y) := 1 + \sum_{k=1}^K s_k \alpha_k(x) \beta_k(y)$  for some integer  $K$  and derive the limit law of

$$D_N^K := \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \prod_{i=1}^N \xi^K(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}).$$

Note that all the results for  $D_N$  in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 hold for  $D_N^K$  with  $\xi$  being replaced by  $\xi^K$ .

**Proposition 26.** *Under Assumption 1, it holds that*

$$D_N^K \rightarrow_d D^K := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\prod_{k=1}^K (1 - s_k^2)}} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[ -\frac{s_k^2}{1 - s_k^2} (U_k^2 + V_k^2) + \frac{2s_k}{1 - s_k^2} U_k V_k \right] \right\}, \quad (59)$$

where  $\{U_k\}_{k=1}^K$  and  $\{V_k\}_{k=1}^K$  are independent standard normal random variables.

*Proof.* We will prove the convergence using characteristic functions, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[e^{itD_N^K}] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[e^{itD^K}]$ .

*Step 1. Truncation.* Recall from (58) that  $D_N = 1 + \sum_{r=1}^N D_{N,r}$ . Applying it to  $D_N^K$  yields  $D_N^K = 1 + \sum_{r=1}^N D_{N,r}^K$  where  $D_{N,r}^K$  is  $D_{N,r}$  with  $\xi$  being replaced by  $\xi^K$ . We further truncate  $D_N^K$  so that it becomes a two-sample U-statistic of fixed order  $R > 0$ , that is, we consider  $D_N^{K,R} := 1 + \sum_{r=1}^R D_{N,r}^K$ . We then truncate the limit  $D^K$ . By the multi-linear Mehler formula (see, e.g., [23]), we have

$$D^K = \sum_{p_1, \dots, p_K \geq 0} \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{s_k^{p_k}}{p_k!} H_{p_k}(U_k) H_{p_k}(V_k), \quad (60)$$

where  $\{H_p\}_{p \geq 0}$  are the Hermite polynomials satisfying

$$\int H_p(x) H_q(x) e^{-x^2/2} dx = \sqrt{2\pi} p! \mathbf{1}\{p = q\}. \quad (61)$$

Therefore, it is natural to define

$$D^{K,R} := 1 + \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_{p_1 + \dots + p_K = r} \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{s_k^{p_k}}{p_k!} H_{p_k}(U_k) H_{p_k}(V_k).$$

By the triangle inequality,  $|\mathbb{E}[e^{itD_N^K}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itD^K}]| \leq C_1 + C_2 + C_3$  where

$$C_1 := |\mathbb{E}[e^{itD_N^K} - e^{itD_N^{K,R}}]|, \quad C_2 := |\mathbb{E}[e^{itD_N^{K,R}} - e^{itD^{K,R}}]|, \quad C_3 := |\mathbb{E}[e^{itD^{K,R}} - e^{itD^K}]|.$$

We fix some arbitrary  $\delta > 0$  and show that  $C_1, C_2, C_3 \leq \delta$  for sufficiently large  $N$  and  $R$ .

*Step 2. Control  $C_1$  and  $C_3$ .* Using the inequality  $|e^{iz} - 1| \leq |z|$ , we get

$$C_1 \leq \mathbb{E} |e^{itD_N^K} - e^{itD_N^{K,R}}| \leq |t| \mathbb{E} |D_N^K - D_N^{K,R}| \leq |t| \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(D_N^K - D_N^{K,R})^2}.$$



Invoking Proposition 25 for  $D_N^K$  implies that, for sufficiently large  $R$ , we have  $C_1 \leq \delta$ . Similarly, it holds that  $C_3 \leq |t| \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(D^{K,R} - D^K)^2}$  where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(D^{K,R} - D^K)^2 &= \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{r=R+1}^{\infty} \sum_{p_1+\dots+p_K=r} \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{s_k^{p_k}}{p_k!} H_{p_k}(U_k) H_{p_k}(V_k) \right|^2 \\ &= \sum_{r=R+1}^{\infty} \sum_{p_1+\dots+p_K=r} \prod_{k=1}^K s_k^{2p_k} \leq \sum_{r=R+1}^{\infty} s_1^{2r}, \quad \text{since } s_k \leq s_1. \end{aligned}$$

Here the two equations follow from (60) and (61), respectively. Since  $s_1 < 1$ , we have  $C_3 \leq \delta$  for sufficiently large  $R$ .

*Step 3. Control  $C_2$ .* It suffices to show that  $D_N^{K,R} \rightarrow_d D^{K,R}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  for any  $R > 0$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} D_{N,r}^K &= \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{|A|=|B|=r} \sum_{\sigma_A=B} \prod_{i \in A} \tilde{\xi}^K(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) = \frac{(N-r)!}{N!} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq N \\ 1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_r \leq N}} \sum_{\sigma \in S_r} \prod_{t=1}^r \tilde{\xi}^K(X_{i_t}, Y_{j_{\sigma_t}}) \\ &= \frac{(N-r)!}{N!} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq N \\ j_1 \neq \dots \neq j_r}} \prod_{t=1}^r \tilde{\xi}^K(X_{i_t}, Y_{j_t}) = \frac{(N-r)!}{r!N!} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_r \\ j_1 \neq \dots \neq j_r}} \prod_{t=1}^r \tilde{\xi}^K(X_{i_t}, Y_{j_t}) \\ &= \frac{(N-r)!}{r!N!} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_r \\ j_1 \neq \dots \neq j_r}} \prod_{t=1}^r \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K s_k \alpha_k(X_{i_t}) \beta_k(Y_{j_t}) \right] \\ &= \frac{(N-r)!}{r!N!} \sum_{\substack{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_r \\ j_1 \neq \dots \neq j_r}} \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_r=1}^K \prod_{t=1}^r s_{k_t} \alpha_{k_t}(X_{i_t}) \beta_{k_t}(Y_{j_t}) \\ &= \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_r=1}^K \left( \prod_{t=1}^r s_{k_t} \right) \frac{(N-r)!}{N!} \left[ \sum_{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_r} \prod_{t=1}^r \alpha_{k_t}(X_{i_t}) \right] \left[ \sum_{j_1 \neq \dots \neq j_r} \prod_{t=1}^r \beta_{k_t}(Y_{j_t}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The last term above can be rewritten as follows. Take an arbitrary sequence  $\mathbf{k} := (k_t)_{t=1}^r \subset [K]^r$ . For each  $k \in [K]$ , let  $p_k(\mathbf{k})$  be the number of times  $k$  appears among  $(k_t)_{t=1}^r$ . Then it follows from [66, Theorem 12.10] that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{(N-r)!}{N!}} \sum_{i_1 \neq \dots \neq i_r} \prod_{t=1}^r \alpha_{k_t}(X_{i_t}) &= \prod_{k=1}^K H_{p_k(\mathbf{k})}(\mathbb{G}_N^{(X)} \alpha_k) + o_p(1) \\ \sqrt{\frac{(N-r)!}{N!}} \sum_{j_1 \neq \dots \neq j_r} \prod_{t=1}^r \beta_{k_t}(Y_{j_t}) &= \prod_{k=1}^K H_{p_k(\mathbf{k})}(\mathbb{G}_N^{(Y)} \beta_k) + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{G}_N^{(X)} \alpha := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha(X_i)$  and  $\mathbb{G}_N^{(Y)} \beta$  is defined similarly.

$$D_{N,r}^K = \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_r=1}^K \prod_{k=1}^K s_k^{p_k(\mathbf{k})} H_{p_k(\mathbf{k})}(\mathbb{G}_N^{(X)} \alpha_k) H_{p_k(\mathbf{k})}(\mathbb{G}_N^{(Y)} \beta_k) + o_p(1),$$

Moreover, for any permutation symmetric  $f : [K]^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{r!} \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_r=1}^K f(k_1, \dots, k_r) = \sum_{p_1+\dots+p_K=r} \frac{1}{p_1! \dots p_K!} f(l_1, \dots, l_r),$$

where  $l_1, \dots, l_r$  is an arbitrary sequence such that  $k$  appears exactly  $p_k$  times for all  $k \in [K]$ . As a result,

$$D_{N,r}^K = \sum_{p_1 + \dots + p_K = r} \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{s_k^{p_k}}{p_k!} H_{p_k}(\mathbb{G}_N^{(X)} \alpha_k) H_{p_k}(\mathbb{G}_N^{(Y)} \beta_k) + o_p(1),$$

and thus  $D_N^{K,R} = 1 + \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_{p_1 + \dots + p_K = r} \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{s_k^{p_k}}{p_k!} H_{p_k}(\mathbb{G}_N^{(X)} \alpha_k) H_{p_k}(\mathbb{G}_N^{(Y)} \beta_k) + o_p(1)$ . According to the multivariate CLT [11, Section 29], the random vector  $(\mathbb{G}_N^{(X)} \alpha_k, \mathbb{G}_N^{(Y)} \beta_k)_{k=1}^K$  converges in distribution to  $\mathcal{N}_{2K}(0, I_{2K})$  by the orthonormality of  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^K$  and  $\{\beta_k\}_{k=1}^K$ . It then follows from the continuous mapping theorem that

$$D_N^{K,R} \rightarrow_d 1 + \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_{p_1 + \dots + p_K = r} \prod_{k=1}^K \frac{s_k^{p_k}}{p_k!} H_{p_k}(U_k) H_{p_k}(V_k) = D^{K,R},$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* We again prove the convergence using the characteristic functions. *Step 0. Verify the validity of the limit.* We first show  $1/\prod_{k=1}^\infty (1 - s_k^2) < \infty$ . In fact,

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^\infty (1 - s_k^2)} = \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^\infty \log \frac{1}{1 - s_k^2} \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{s_k^2}{1 - s_k^2} \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{\sum_{k=1}^\infty s_k^2}{1 - s_1^2} \right\} < \infty, \quad (62)$$

where the first inequality follows from  $\log(1+x) \geq \frac{x}{1+x}$  for all  $x > -1$  and the last inequality follows from the square summability of  $\{s_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ . It suffices to show that  $D \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . For any  $k \geq 1$ , let

$$Z_k := \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - s_k^2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{s_k^2}{2(1 - s_k^2)} (U_k^2 + V_k^2) + \frac{s_k}{1 - s_k^2} U_k V_k \right\}. \quad (63)$$

Then  $\{Z_k\}_{k \geq 1}$  are mutually independent and  $D = \prod_{k=1}^\infty Z_k$ . By a standard computation, we get  $\mathbb{E}[Z_k^2] = 1/(1 - s_k^2)$ . Therefore, by (62),  $\mathbb{E}[D^2] = \prod_{k=1}^\infty \mathbb{E}[Z_k^2] = 1/\prod_{k=1}^\infty (1 - s_k^2) < \infty$ .

*Step 1. Control the difference between the characteristic functions.* Recall  $D_N^K$  and  $D^K$  from Proposition 26. By the triangle inequality, we have  $|\mathbb{E}[e^{itD_N}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itD}]| \leq C_1 + C_2 + C_3$  where

$$C_1 := |\mathbb{E}[e^{itD_N}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itD_N^K}]|, \quad C_2 := |\mathbb{E}[e^{itD_N^K}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itD^K}]|, \quad C_3 := |\mathbb{E}[e^{itD^K}] - \mathbb{E}[e^{itD}]|.$$

Fix  $\delta > 0$ . By Proposition 26,  $C_2 \leq \delta$  for sufficiently large  $N$ . It then remains to control  $C_1$  and  $C_3$ .

*Step 2. Control  $C_1$ .* By construction, it holds that

$$D_N - D_N^K = \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{|A|=|B|=r} \sum_{\sigma_A=B} \prod_{i \in A} \xi^{-K}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}),$$

where  $\xi^{-K} := \xi - \xi^K \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  and  $\varsigma_K^2 := \mathbb{E}_{P \otimes Q}[(\xi^{-K}(X, Y))^2] = \sum_{k \geq K+1} s_k^2$ . Invoking Proposition 25 for  $\xi^{-K}$ , we obtain  $\mathbb{E}[(D_N - D_N^K)^2] \leq \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma)} \varsigma_K^{2\#\sigma}$ . As shown in the proof of Proposition 10, the sum  $\sum_{r=1}^N \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma)}$  converges. Moreover, for sufficiently large  $K$ , since  $\varsigma_K^2$  can be arbitrarily small, we have  $C_1 \leq |t| \mathbb{E}[(D_N - D_N^K)^2] \leq \delta$ .

*Step 3. Control  $C_3$ .* Again, it suffices to control  $\mathbb{E}[(D^K - D)^2]$ . Recall  $Z_k$  in (63). By independence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(D^K - D)^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \prod_{k=1}^K Z_k - \prod_{k=1}^\infty Z_k \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{k=1}^K Z_k^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( 1 - \prod_{k \geq K+1} Z_k \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^K (1 - s_k^2)} \left[ \frac{1}{\prod_{k \geq K+1} (1 - s_k^2)} - 1 \right], \quad \text{since } \mathbb{E}[Z_k] = 1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (62) that  $\prod_{k=1}^K (1 - s_k^2)^{-1} < \infty$  and

$$1 \leq \frac{1}{\prod_{k \geq K+1} (1 - s_k^2)} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{1 - s_1^2} \sum_{k \geq K+1} s_k^2 \right\} \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{as } K \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, we have  $\mathbb{E}[(D^K - D)^2] \rightarrow 0$  as  $K \rightarrow \infty$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 3.* Recall from (4) that the Schrödinger bridge  $\mu_\epsilon$  which solves (3) is given by  $\mu_\epsilon(x, y) = \xi(x, y)P(x)Q(y)$  where  $\xi(x, y) = \exp(-(c(x, y) - a_\epsilon(x) - b_\epsilon(y))/\epsilon)$ . Moreover, it follows from the strong duality that [27, Proposition 2.1]  $(a_\epsilon, b_\epsilon)$  solve the dual problem

$$\max_{a, b \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left[ \int a(x) dP(x) + \int b(y) dQ(y) + \epsilon - \epsilon \int \exp \left( -\frac{c(x, y) - a(x) - b(y)}{\epsilon} \right) dP(x) dQ(y) \right]$$

where  $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is the set of continuous functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Consequently,  $\mathbf{C}_\epsilon(P, Q) = \int a_\epsilon(x) dP(x) + \int b_\epsilon(y) dQ(y)$ . By some algebra, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \log \left[ \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \exp \left( -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N c(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})}{\epsilon} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \log \left[ \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^N \xi(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})}{\exp \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (a_\epsilon(X_i) + b_\epsilon(Y_{\sigma_i}))/\epsilon \right)} \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{\epsilon N} \sum_{i=1}^N [a_\epsilon(X_i) + b_\epsilon(Y_i)] + \frac{1}{N} \log D_N. \end{aligned}$$

Now the claim follows from the facts that  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [a_\epsilon(X_i) + b_\epsilon(Y_i)] \rightarrow_p \mathbf{C}_\epsilon(P, Q)$  (by LLN) and  $\frac{1}{N} \log D_N = o_p(1)$  (by Theorem 2) as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

#### 4.4. Second order remainder

We control in this subsection  $\mathbb{E}[(U_N - \mathcal{L}_2 D_N)^2]$  in Proposition 19. We will decompose  $\mathcal{L}_2 D_N$  into manageable pieces. Let  $K_{2,0}(x, x', y, y') := \eta_{2,0}(x, x')\xi(x, y)\xi(x', y')$  and  $K_{0,2}(x, x', y, y') := \eta_{0,2}(y, y')\xi(x, y)\xi(x', y')$ . Then we have

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) D_N = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} K_{2,0}(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \quad (64)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \neq j} \eta_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j) D_N &= \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \eta_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j) \xi(X_{\sigma_i^{-1}}, Y_i) \xi(X_{\sigma_j^{-1}}, Y_j) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{\sigma_i^{-1}, \sigma_j^{-1}\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} K_{0,2}(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}). \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Furthermore, let  $K_{1,1'}(x, x', y, y') := \eta_{1,1'}(x, y')\xi(x, y)\xi(x', y')$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i, j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i \neq j} \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) \xi^\otimes(X, Y_\sigma) &= \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i, j=1}^N \sum_{j' \in [N] \setminus \{i\}} \sum_{\sigma_{j'}=j} K_{1,1'}(X_i, X_{j'}, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_{j'}}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, j'\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i \neq j'} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} K_{1,1'}(X_i, X_{j'}, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_{j'}}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, j'\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}). \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Note that  $\sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) = \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})$  by affineness, and

$$\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i=j} \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}) = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}).$$

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i=j} \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}) - \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) D_N = \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\eta_{1,1'} - \ell_{1,1'}](X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}).$$

Repeating the argument in Proposition 10 for  $\tilde{\eta}$  replaced by  $\eta_{1,1'} - \ell_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$  gives

$$\frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i=j} \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) \xi^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma}) - \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) D_N = O(N^{-2}). \quad (67)$$

Here we say a random variable  $\phi_N = O(N^{-2})$  if  $\text{Var}(\phi_N) = O(N^{-4})$ . Putting (64), (65), (66) and (67) together, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_2 D_N = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i \neq j} (K_{2,0} + K_{0,2} + K_{1,1'})(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) + O(N^{-2}).$$

*Definition 6.* Let  $r > 0$  be an integer. We say a statistic  $T := T(X_{[N]}, Y_{[N]})$  is  $r$ -degenerate if

$$\mathbb{E}[T \mid X_A, Y_B] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0, \quad \text{for all } A, B \subset [N] \text{ such that } |A| + |B| = r.$$

If  $T$  is  $(r-1)$ -degenerate, and  $L \in \oplus_{|A|+|B|=r} H_{AB}$  such that  $T - L$  is  $r$ -degenerate, then we call  $L$  the  $r$ -th order term of  $T$ .

In the following, we further decompose  $K_{2,0} + K_{0,2} + K_{1,1'}$  into second, third and fourth order terms using Hoeffding decomposition, and show that the second order terms cancel out  $U_N$  and the rest of the terms are negligible.

The following lemma gives the second order terms of  $K_{2,0}$ ,  $K_{0,2}$  and  $K_{1,1'}$ .

**Lemma 27.** *Let*

$$\begin{aligned} k_{2,0}(x, x', y, y') &:= \eta_{2,0}(x, x') + (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A})\eta_{2,0}(y, y') + (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})\eta_{2,0}(x, y') + (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})\mathcal{T}\eta_{2,0}(x', y) \\ k_{0,2}(x, x', y, y') &:= (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{0,2}(x, x') + \eta_{0,2}(y, y') + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)\eta_{0,2}(x, y') + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)\mathcal{T}\eta_{0,2}(x', y) \\ k_{1,1'}(x, x', y, y') &:= (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{1,1'}(x, x') + \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q)\eta_{1,1'}(y, y') + \eta_{1,1'}(x, y') + \mathcal{B}\eta_{1,1'}(x', y). \end{aligned}$$

For any  $i \neq i'$  and  $j \neq j'$ , the function  $\bar{K}_I(X_i, X_{i'}, Y_j, Y_{j'}) := (K_I - k_I)(X_i, X_{i'}, Y_j, Y_{j'})$  is 2-degenerate for every  $I = \{2, 0\}, \{0, 2\}, \{1, 1'\}$ .

*Proof.* We only prove the claim for  $I = \{2, 0\}$ . Recall that  $K_{2,0}(x, x', y, y') := \eta_{2,0}(x, x')\xi(x, y)\xi(x', y')$ . Conditioning on  $X_i, X_{i'}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[K_{2,0}(X_i, X_{i'}, Y_j, Y_{j'}) \mid X_i, X_{i'}] = \eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_{i'}) \mathbb{E}[\xi(X_i, Y_j) \mid X_i] \mathbb{E}[\xi(X_{i'}, Y_{j'}) \mid X_{i'}] = \eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_{i'}).$$

It then follows from degeneracy that  $\mathbb{E}[(K_{2,0} - k_{2,0})(X_i, X_{i'}, Y_j, Y_{j'}) \mid X_i, X_{i'}] = 0$ . Conditioning on  $X_i, Y_j$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[K_{2,0}(X_i, X_{i'}, Y_j, Y_{j'}) \mid X_i, Y_j] = \xi(X_i, Y_j) \mathbb{E}[\eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_{i'}) \mid X_i, Y_j] = 0 = \mathbb{E}[k_{2,0}(X_i, X_{i'}, Y_j, Y_{j'}) \mid X_i, Y_j].$$

Conditioning on  $X_i, Y_{j'}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[K_{2,0}(X_i, X_{i'}, Y_j, Y_{j'}) \mid X_i, Y_{j'}] &= \mathbb{E}[\eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_{i'})\xi(X_{i'}, Y_{j'}) \mid X_i, Y_{j'}] = (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})\eta_{2,0}(X_i, Y_{j'}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[k_{2,0}(X_i, X_{i'}, Y_j, Y_{j'}) \mid X_i, Y_{j'}]. \end{aligned}$$

The rest follows analogously.  $\square$

Now, we get

$$\mathcal{L}_2 D_N = W_N + V_N + O(N^{-2}), \quad (68)$$

where

$$W_N := \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i \neq j} (\bar{K}_{2,0} + \bar{K}_{0,2} + \bar{K}_{1,1'}) (X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \quad (69)$$

$$V_N := \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i \neq j} (k_{2,0} + k_{0,2} + k_{1,1'}) (X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}). \quad (70)$$

We will show that  $\mathbb{E}[(U_N - V_N)^2] = O(N^{-4})$  and  $\mathbb{E}[W_N^2] = O(N^{-4})$ . As a result,  $\mathbb{E}[(U_N - \mathcal{L}_2 D_N)^2] = O(N^{-4})$ .

**Lemma 28.** *The following algebraic identity holds:*

$$V_N = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i \neq j} \tilde{\eta}(X_i, Y_j) \xi(X_i, Y_j) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, \sigma_j^{-1}\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}). \quad (71)$$

Moreover, under Assumptions 1 and 2,  $\mathbb{E}[(U_N - V_N)^2] = O(N^{-4})$ .

*Proof.* We consider the terms involving  $(X_i, X_j)$  and  $(Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j})$  in  $\sum_{i \neq j} (k_{2,0} + k_{0,2} + k_{1,1'}) (X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j})$ . By Lemma 17, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \neq j} [\eta_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) \eta_{0,2}(X_i, X_j) + (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, X_j)] &= 0 \\ \sum_{i \neq j} [(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}) \eta_{2,0}(Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) + \eta_{0,2}(Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) + (\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) \eta_{1,1'}(Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j})] &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We then consider the terms involving  $(X_i, Y_{\sigma_j})$  and  $(X_j, Y_{\sigma_i})$ . Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) \eta_{2,0}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \\ &= \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{j'=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_j = j'} (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) \eta_{2,0}(X_i, Y_{j'}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \\ &= \sum_{i,j'=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i \neq j'} (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) \eta_{2,0}(X_i, Y_{j'}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, \sigma_{j'}^{-1}\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}). \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) \mathcal{T} \eta_{2,0}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \\ &= \sum_{i',j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_j \neq i'} (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) \mathcal{T} \eta_{2,0}(X_j, Y_{i'}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{j, \sigma_{i'}^{-1}\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} [(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) \eta_{2,0}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_j}) + (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) \mathcal{T} \eta_{2,0}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_i})] \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i \neq j} (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) (I + \mathcal{T}) \eta_{2,0}(X_i, Y_j) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, \sigma_j^{-1}\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}). \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Analogously,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} [(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q) \eta_{0,2}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_j}) + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q) \mathcal{T} \eta_{0,2}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_i})] \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \\ &= \sum_{i, j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i \neq j} (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q) (I + \mathcal{T}) \eta_{0,2}(X_i, Y_j) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, \sigma_j^{-1}\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}), \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} [\eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_j}) + \mathcal{B} \eta_{1,1'}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_i})] \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \\ &= \sum_{i, j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i \neq j} (I + \mathcal{B}) \eta_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, \sigma_j^{-1}\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}). \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Hence, the identity (71) follows from the third identity in Lemma 17.

Let us compute  $\mathbb{E}[(U_N - V_N)^2]$ . Denote  $h := \tilde{\eta} \xi$ . Recall from (49) that

$$U_N := \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\eta}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \xi(X, Y_{\sigma}) = \frac{1}{N \cdot N!} \sum_{i, j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i = j} h(X_i, Y_j) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}).$$

By Lemma 32, we get

$$U_N = \frac{1}{N \cdot N!} \sum_{i, j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i = j} h(X_i, Y_j) \sum_{A \subset [N] \setminus \{i\}} \prod_{k \in A} [\xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) - 1]. \quad (75)$$

Similarly,

$$V_N = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{i, j=1}^N \sum_{\sigma_i \neq j} h(X_i, Y_j) \sum_{A \subset [N] \setminus \{i, \sigma_j^{-1}\}} \prod_{k \in A} [\xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) - 1]. \quad (76)$$

Define the set of sequences of length  $r$  to be

$$\mathcal{S}_{N,r} := \{(k_i)_{i=1}^r : k_i \in [N], |\{k_1, \dots, k_r\}| = r\}, \quad \text{for } r \in [N].$$

Take  $r \in [N]$  and  $(k_i)_{i=1}^r, (k'_i)_{i=1}^r \in \mathcal{S}_{N,r}$ . Let us count the number of times the term

$$h(X_{k_1}, Y_{k'_1}) \prod_{s=2}^r [\xi(X_{k_s}, Y_{k'_s}) - 1] \quad (77)$$

appears in (75) and (76), respectively. In order to get this term, we must have  $i = k_1, j = k'_1, A = \{k_2, \dots, k_r\}$  and  $\sigma_{k_s} = k'_s$  for all  $s \in \{2, \dots, r\}$ . Note that  $\sigma_i = j$  in (75), so there are  $(N-r)!$  such terms in (75). Similarly, there are  $(N-r)(N-r)!$  such terms in (76). Hence, the coefficient of this term in  $U_N - V_N$  is

$$C_{N,r} = \frac{(N-r)!}{N \cdot N!} - \frac{(N-r)(N-r)!}{N(N-1) \cdot N!} = \frac{r-1}{N-1} \frac{(N-r)!}{N \cdot N!}.$$

We claim that

$$U_N - V_N = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{r=1}^N (r-1) \sum_{|A|=|B|=r} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N : \sigma_A = B} \sum_{i \in A} h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in A \setminus \{i\}} [\xi(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) - 1]. \quad (78)$$



To see this, we only need to prove that the coefficient of the term (77) on the right hand side of (78) is exactly  $C_{N,r}$ . In other words, it appears  $(N-r)!$  times in the following sum:

$$\sum_{|A|=|B|=r} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N: \sigma_A=B} \sum_{i \in A} h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in A \setminus \{i\}} [\xi(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) - 1].$$

To get this term, we must have  $A = \{k_1, \dots, k_r\}$ ,  $B = \{k'_1, \dots, k'_r\}$ ,  $i = k_1$  and  $\sigma_{k_s} = k'_s$  for all  $s \in [r]$ . There are  $(N-r)!$  permutations satisfy this condition, and thus it appears  $(N-r)!$  times.

A derivation analogous to the one for Proposition 21 implies that  $\mathbb{E}[(U_N - V_N)^2]$  is equal to

$$\frac{1}{N^2(N-1)^2} \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{r(r-1)^2}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{i=1}^r \mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_1, Y_1) \prod_{j=2}^r [\xi(X_j, Y_j) - 1] h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [N] \setminus \{i\}} [\xi(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) - 1] \right].$$

Repeating the argument in Proposition 10, we know  $\mathbb{E}[(U_N - V_N)^2] = O(N^{-4})$ .  $\square$

Before we bound  $\mathbb{E}[W_N^2]$ , let us give a result similar to Lemma 23 for functions with 3 and 4 arguments. Let  $\phi \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q \otimes Q)$  and  $\psi \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q)$  such that  $\phi(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2)$  and  $\psi(X_1, X_2, Y_1)$  are completely degenerate under the measure  $(P \otimes Q)^N$ .

**Lemma 29.** *Assume  $\|\phi\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q \otimes Q)} < \infty$  and  $\|\psi\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q)} < \infty$ . Under Assumptions 1-3, there exists a constant  $C$  such that, for any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$  and  $i \neq j \in [N]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \phi(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) \prod_{k=3}^N [\xi(X_k, Y_k) - 1] \phi(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, j\}} [\xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) - 1] \right] &\leq s_1^{2(N-\#\sigma-2)} C^{\#\sigma} \\ \mathbb{E} \left[ \psi(X_1, X_2, Y_1) \prod_{k=3}^N [\xi(X_k, Y_k) - 1] \psi(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i, j\}} [\xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) - 1] \right] &\leq s_1^{2(N-\#\sigma-2)} C^{\#\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\#\sigma$  is the number of cycles of  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ .

The proof of Lemma 29 is similar to Lemma 23—we iteratively take expectation with respect to a single variable, while keeping the rest being fixed. In consideration of the space, we only give an example here.

*Example 2.* Consider  $N = 4$ ,  $i = 2$ ,  $j = 3$  and  $\sigma$  given by  $\sigma_i = i + 1$  for  $i \in [3]$ . By construction,  $\sigma$  only has one cycle  $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 1$ . The expectation of interest then reads

$$\mathbb{E} [\phi(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) [\xi(X_3, Y_3) - 1] [\xi(X_4, Y_4) - 1] \phi(X_2, X_3, Y_3, Y_4) [\xi(X_1, Y_2) - 1] [\xi(X_4, Y_1) - 1]].$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}_4$  be a shorthand notation for  $I_P \otimes I_P \otimes I_Q \otimes \mathcal{A}$ , and  $\mathcal{A}_4^*$  similarly. Taking expectation with respect to  $Y_4$ , while keeping others being fixed, we get

$$\mathbb{E} [\phi(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) [\xi(X_3, Y_3) - 1] (\mathcal{A}_4^* \phi)(X_2, X_3, Y_3, X_4) [\xi(X_1, Y_2) - 1] [\xi(X_4, Y_1) - 1]],$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\phi(X_2, X_3, Y_3, Y_4) [\xi(X_4, Y_4) - 1] \mid X_2, X_3, X_4, Y_3] &= \mathbb{E} [\phi(X_2, X_3, Y_3, Y_4) \xi(X_4, Y_4) \mid X_2, X_3, X_4, Y_3] \\ &= \mathcal{A}_4^* \phi(X_2, X_3, Y_3, X_4). \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

Now taking expectation with respect to  $X_4$ , while keeping others being fixed, we get

$$\mathbb{E} [\phi(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) [\xi(X_3, Y_3) - 1] (\mathcal{A}_4 \mathcal{A}_4^* \phi)(X_2, X_3, Y_3, Y_1) [\xi(X_1, Y_2) - 1]]$$

Now, both  $X_1$  and  $Y_2$  in  $\xi(X_1, Y_2) - 1$  appears in  $\phi(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2)$ , and both  $X_3$  and  $Y_3$  in  $\xi(X_3, Y_3) - 1$  appears in  $\phi(X_2, X_3, Y_3, Y_4)$ , so we stop here and use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to get an upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{A}_4 \mathcal{A}_4^* \phi)^2(X_2, X_3, Y_3, Y_1) [\xi(X_1, Y_2) - 1]^2] \times \mathbb{E}[\phi^2(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) [\xi(X_3, Y_3) - 1]^2]} \\ &= \|(\mathcal{A}_4 \mathcal{A}_4^* \phi)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q \otimes Q)} \|\phi\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q \otimes Q)} \|\xi - 1\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}^2, \quad \text{by independence.} \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Hence, (80) can be further bounded above by  $Cs_1^2$ , where  $C := \|\phi\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q \otimes Q)}^2 \|\xi - 1\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}^2$ .

For the expectation associated with  $\psi$ , we view  $\psi$  as a function with four arguments such that it is constant in its fourth argument and then repeat the argument for  $\phi$ . It only makes a difference at places where we apply  $\mathcal{A}_4$  or  $\mathcal{A}_4^*$  to  $\phi$ —instead of applying this operator, the expectation is exactly zero, and thus the bound holds trivially. To be more specific, in the first step of the above example, where we take expectation with respect to  $Y_4$ , we should have, in (79), that

$$\mathbb{E}[\psi(X_2, X_3, Y_3)[\xi(X_4, Y_4) - 1] \mid X_2, X_3, X_4, Y_3] = \psi(X_2, X_3, Y_3) \mathbb{E}[\xi(X_4, Y_4) - 1 \mid X_4] \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 0.$$

Recall from (69) that

$$W_N := \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i \neq j} (\bar{K}_{2,0} + \bar{K}_{0,2} + \bar{K}_{1,1'}) (X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}).$$

To prove  $\mathbb{E}[W_N^2] = O(N^{-4})$ , we again use Hoeffding decomposition. From Lemma 27 we know  $(\bar{K}_{2,0} + \bar{K}_{0,2} + \bar{K}_{1,1'}) (X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j})$  is 2-degenerate, so each term in its Hoeffding decomposition should contain at least 3 variables. We assume it is given by the following form:

$$\phi(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) + \psi_0(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}) + \psi_1(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) + \psi_2(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) + \psi_3(X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}).$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} W_N^\phi &:= \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i \neq j} \phi(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) \\ W_N^{\psi_0} &:= \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i \neq j} \psi_0(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}), \end{aligned}$$

and  $W_N^{\psi_1}$ ,  $W_N^{\psi_2}$  and  $W_N^{\psi_3}$ , similarly. Consequently,  $W_N = W_N^\phi + W_N^{\psi_0} + W_N^{\psi_1} + W_N^{\psi_2} + W_N^{\psi_3}$ . It then suffices to show  $\mathbb{E}[(W_N^\phi)^2] = O(N^{-4})$  and  $\mathbb{E}[(W_N^{\psi_i})^2] = O(N^{-4})$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ . The strategy here is the same as Proposition 10.

**Corollary 30.** *Suppose the same assumptions in Lemma 29 hold. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(W_N^\phi)^2] &\leq \frac{1}{N^2(N-1)^2} \sum_{r=2}^N \frac{r^2(r-1)^2}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma-2)} C^{\#\sigma} \\ \mathbb{E}[(W_N^{\psi_i})^2] &\leq \frac{1}{N^2(N-1)^2} \sum_{r=2}^N \frac{r^2(r-1)^2}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma-2)} C^{\#\sigma}, \quad \text{for } i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $\mathbb{E}[(W_N^\phi)^2] = O(N^{-4})$  and  $\mathbb{E}[(W_N^{\psi_i})^2] = O(N^{-4})$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ .

*Proof.* We only prove the bound for  $\mathbb{E}[(W_N^\phi)^2]$ . Notice that, using Lemma 32 for  $A = [N] \setminus \{i, j\}$ , we have  $\prod_{k \in [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) = \sum_{C \subset [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \prod_{k \in C} [\xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) - 1]$  for every pair  $i \neq j$ . As a result,

$$W_N^\phi = \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i \neq j} \phi(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \sum_{C \subset [N] \setminus \{i,j\}} \prod_{k \in C} [\xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) - 1]. \quad (81)$$

Because  $\phi(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j})$  is completely degenerate, an argument similar to the one in Proposition 21 shows that the Hoeffding decomposition of  $W_N^\phi$  is given by

$$W_N^\phi := \frac{1}{N(N-1)} \frac{1}{N!} \sum_{|A|=|B|>1} W_{AB}^\phi,$$

where

$$W_{AB}^\phi := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N: \sigma_A = B} \sum_{i \neq j \in A} \phi(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in A \setminus \{i, j\}} [\xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) - 1].$$

Consequently,

$$\mathbb{E}[(W_N^\phi)^2] = \frac{1}{N^2(N-1)^2(N!)^2} \sum_{r=2}^N \sum_{|A|=|B|=r} \mathbb{E}[(W_{AB}^\phi)^2] = \frac{1}{N^2(N-1)^2(N!)^2} \sum_{r=2}^N \binom{N}{r}^2 \mathbb{E}[(W_{[r][r]}^\phi)^2], \quad (82)$$

where the last equality follows from exchangeability. Using a derivation similar to the one for Proposition 21,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(W_{[r][r]}^\phi)^2] &= ((N-r)!)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} \phi(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [r] \setminus \{i, j\}} [\xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) - 1] \right]^2 \\ &= ((N-r)!)^2 r! r(r-1) \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} \\ &\quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \phi(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) \prod_{k=3}^r [\xi(X_k, Y_k) - 1] \phi(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j}) \prod_{k \in [r] \setminus \{i, j\}} [\xi(X_k, Y_{\sigma_k}) - 1] \right] \\ &\leq ((N-r)!)^2 r! r(r-1) \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma-2)} C^{\#\sigma}, \quad \text{by Lemma 29.} \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Now, putting (82) and (83) together, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(W_N^\phi)^2] &\leq \frac{1}{N^2(N-1)^2(N!)^2} \sum_{r=2}^N \binom{N}{r}^2 ((N-r)!)^2 r! r(r-1) \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq r} s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma-2)} C^{\#\sigma} \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2(N-1)^2} \sum_{r=2}^N \frac{r^2(r-1)^2}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} s_1^{2(r-\#\sigma-2)} C^{\#\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Proposition 19.* Let  $f := \mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$ . Recall  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{q}$  from Assumption 3. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\eta_{2,0}^{2\mathfrak{q}}(X_1, X_2)] &= \int [(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(x, x')]^{2\mathfrak{q}} dP(x) dP(x') \\ &= \int \left[ \int f(x, y') \xi(x', y') dQ(y') \right]^{2\mathfrak{q}} dP(x) dP(x') \\ &\stackrel{\text{Jensen}}{\leq} \iint f^{2\mathfrak{q}}(x, y') \xi(x', y') dQ(y') dP(x) dP(x'). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\int \xi(x', y') dP(x') \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1$ , integrating with respect to  $x'$  in the above upper bound gives

$$\int f^{2\mathfrak{q}}(x, y') dQ(y') dP(x) = \mathbb{E}[f^{2\mathfrak{q}}(X_1, Y_1)] < \infty.$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \|K_{2,0}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q \otimes Q)}^2 &= \mathbb{E} [\eta_{2,0}^2(X_1, X_2) \xi^2(X_1, Y_1) \xi^2(X_2, Y_2)] \\ &\stackrel{\text{H\"older}}{\leq} \mathbb{E}[\eta_{2,0}^{2\mathfrak{q}}(X_1, X_2)]^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{q}}} \mathbb{E}[\xi^{2\mathfrak{p}}(X_1, Y_1) \xi^{2\mathfrak{p}}(X_2, Y_2)]^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{p}}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\eta_{2,0}^{2\mathfrak{q}}(X_1, X_2)]^{\frac{1}{\mathfrak{q}}} \mathbb{E}[\xi^{2\mathfrak{p}}(X_1, Y_1)]^{\frac{2}{\mathfrak{p}}} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, we have  $\|K_{0,2}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q \otimes Q)} < \infty$  and  $\|K_{1,1'}\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes P \otimes Q \otimes Q)} < \infty$ . As discussed before Corollary 30, we can then decompose  $(\bar{K}_{2,0} + \bar{K}_{0,2} + \bar{K}_{1,1'})(X_i, X_j, Y_{\sigma_i}, Y_{\sigma_j})$  into third and fourth order terms using Hoeffding decomposition and invoke Corollary 30 to show  $\mathbb{E}[W_N^2] = O(N^{-4})$ . Recall from (68) that  $\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{L}_2 D_N - W_N - V_N)^2] = O(N^{-4})$ . Hence, by Lemma 28,

$$\mathbb{E}[(U_N - \mathcal{L}_2 D_N)^2] \leq 3 \{ \mathbb{E}[(U_N - V_N)^2] + \mathbb{E}[W_N^2] + \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{L}_2 D_N - V_N - W_N)^2] \} = O(N^{-4}).$$

□

## Acknowledgements

Z.H. acknowledges support from NSF grant DMS-1810975 and CCF-1740551. L.L. acknowledges support from NSF grant DMS-1612483 and CCF-1740551. S.P. acknowledges support from NSF grant DMS-1612483 and DMS-2052239. Part of this work was done while Z.H. was visiting the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing.

## References

- [1] ADAMS, S., BRU, J. B. and KÖNIG, W. (2006). Large deviations for trapped interacting Brownian particles and paths. *Annals of Probability* **34**.
- [2] ADAMS, S. and DORLAS, T. (2008). Asymptotic Feynman–Kac formulae for large symmetrised systems of random walks. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré Probabilités and Statistique* **44**.
- [3] ADAMS, S. and KÖNIG, W. (2008). Large deviations for many Brownian bridges with symmetrised initial-terminal conditions. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **142**.
- [4] AJTAI, M., KOMLÓS, J. and TUSNÁDY, G. (1984). On optimal matchings. *Combinatorica* **4**.
- [5] ARRATIA, R., BARBOUR, A. D. and TAVARÉ, S. (2003). *Logarithmic combinatorial structures: A probabilistic approach* **1**. European Mathematical Society.
- [6] BARVINOK, A. (2002). *A Course in Convexity*. American Mathematical Society.
- [7] BEICHL, I. and SULLIVAN, F. (1999). Approximating the permanent via importance sampling with application to the dimer covering problem. *Journal of Computational Physics* **149**.
- [8] BEREZANSKY, Y. M. and KONDRATIEV, Y. G. (2013). *Spectral Methods in Infinite-Dimensional Analysis*, 1 ed. Springer.
- [9] BICKEL, P. J., KLAASSEN, C. A., RITOV, Y. and WELLNER, J. A. (1998). *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models* **1**. Springer-Verlag New York.
- [10] BIGOT, J., CAZELLES, E. and PAPADAKIS, N. (2019). Central limit theorems for entropy-regularized optimal transport on finite spaces and statistical applications. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **13**.
- [11] BILLINGSLEY, P. (1995). *Probability and Measure*, Third ed. John Wiley & Sons.
- [12] CHEN, Y., GEORGIOU, T. T. and PAVON, M. (2021). Stochastic control liaisons: Richard Sinkhorn meets Gaspard Monge on a Schrodinger bridge. *SIAM Review* **63**.
- [13] CSISZAR, I. (1975). I-divergence geometry of probability distributions and minimization problems. *Annals of Probability* **3**.
- [14] CUTURI, M. (2013). Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [15] DEL BARRIO, E., GINÉ, E. and MATRAN, C. (1999). Central limit theorems for the Wasserstein distance between the empirical and the true distributions. *The Annals of Probability* **27**.
- [16] DEL BARRIO, E., GINÉ, E. and UTZET, F. (2005). Asymptotics for  $L_2$  functionals of the empirical quantile process, with applications to tests of fit based on weighted Wasserstein distances. *Bernoulli* **11**.
- [17] DEL BARRIO, E. and LOUBES, J.-M. (2019). Central limit theorems for empirical transportation cost in general dimension. *Annals of Probability* **47**.
- [18] DOBRIĆ, V. and YUKICH, J. E. (1995). Asymptotics for transportation cost in high dimensions. *Journal of Theoretical Probability* **8**.

- [19] DYNKIN, E. B. and MANDELBAUM, A. (1983). Symmetric Statistics, Poisson Point Processes, and Multiple Wiener Integrals. *The Annals of Statistics* **11**.
- [20] FERRADANS, S., PAPADAKIS, N., PEYRÉ, G. and AUJOL, J.-F. (2014). Regularized discrete optimal transport. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences* **7**.
- [21] FEYDY, J., SÉJOURNÉ, T., VIALARD, F., AMARI, S., TROUVÉ, A. and PEYRÉ, G. (2019). Interpolating between optimal transport and MMD using Sinkhorn divergences. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*.
- [22] FEYNMAN, R. P. (1953). Atomic theory of the  $\lambda$  transition in Helium. *Physical Review* **91**.
- [23] FOATA, D. (1981). Some Hermite polynomial identities and their combinatorics. *Advances in Applied Mathematics* **2**.
- [24] FÖLLMER, H. (1988). Random Fields and Diffusion Processes. In *École d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XV-XVII-1985-87* Springer, Berlin.
- [25] FOURNIER, N. and GUILLIN, A. (2015). On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **162**.
- [26] GALICHON, A. and SALANIÉ, B. (2010). Matching with trade-offs: Revealed preferences over competing characteristics. *CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP7858*.
- [27] GENEVAY, A., CUTURI, M., PEYRÉ, G. and BACH, F. (2016). Stochastic optimization for large-scale optimal transport. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [28] GOHBERG, I., GOLDBERG, S. and KAASHOEK, M. A. (1990). *Classes of Linear Operators Vol. 1*. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- [29] GONZÁLEZ-SANZ, A., LOUBES, J.-M. and NILES-WEED, J. (2022). Weak limits of entropy regularized optimal transport; potentials, plans and divergences. *arXiv preprint*.
- [30] HALÁSZ, G. and SZÉKELY, G. J. (1976). On the elementary symmetric polynomials of independent random variables. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* **28**.
- [31] HALMOS, P. R. (1946). The theory of unbiased estimation. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **17**.
- [32] Hoeffding, W. (1948). A class of statistics with asymptotically normal distribution. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **19**.
- [33] HUNDRIESER, S., KLATT, M., STAUDT, T. and MUNK, A. (2022). A unifying approach to distributional limits for empirical optimal transport. *arXiv preprint*.
- [34] KENYON, R., KRÁL', D., RADIN, C. and WINKLER, P. (2020). Permutations with fixed pattern densities. *Random Structures & Algorithms* **56**.
- [35] KLATT, M., MUNK, A. and ZEMEL, Y. (2020). Limit laws for empirical optimal solutions in random linear programs. *Annals of Operations Research* **315**.
- [36] KLATT, M., TAMELING, C. and MUNK, A. (2020). Empirical regularized optimal transport: Statistical theory and applications. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* **2**.
- [37] KOSOWSKY, J. J. and YUILLE, A. L. (1994). The invisible hand algorithm: Solving the assignment problem with statistical physics. *Neural Networks* **7**.
- [38] LEI, J. (2020). Convergence and concentration of empirical measures under Wasserstein distance in unbounded functional spaces. *Bernoulli* **26**.
- [39] LÉONARD, C. (2012). From the Schrödinger problem to the Monge-Kantorovich problem. *Journal of Functional Analysis* **262**.
- [40] LÉONARD, C. (2014). A survey of the Schrödinger problem and some of its connections with optimal transport. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series A* **34**.
- [41] LIU, L. (2022). Statistical Divergences for Learning and Inference: Limit Laws and Non-Asymptotic Bounds, PhD thesis, University of Washington.
- [42] LUISE, G., RUDI, A., PONTIL, M. and CILIBERTO, C. (2018). Differential Properties of Sinkhorn Approximation for Learning with Wasserstein Distance. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- [43] MAJOR, P. (1999). The limit behavior of elementary symmetric polynomials of i.i.d. random variables when their order tends to infinity. *The Annals of Probability* **27**.
- [44] MALLOWS, C. L. (1957). Non-null ranking models. I. *Biometrika* **44**.
- [45] MENA, G. and NILES-WEED, J. (2019). Statistical bounds for entropic optimal transport: Sample complexity and the central limit theorem. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

- [46] MÓRI, T. F. and SZÉKELY, G. J. (1982). Asymptotic behaviour of symmetric polynomial statistics. *The Annals of Probability* **10**.
- [47] MOURIER, E. (1953). Éléments aléatoires dans un espace de Banach. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré* **13** 161-244.
- [48] MUKHERJEE, S. (2016). Estimation in exponential families on permutations. *The Annals of Statistics* **44** 853–875.
- [49] MUNK, A. and CZADO, C. (1998). Nonparametric validation of similar distributions and assessment of goodness of fit. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **60** 223–241.
- [50] PAL, S. and WONG, T.-K. L. (2020). Multiplicative Schrödinger problem and the Dirichlet transport. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **178** 613–654.
- [51] PEYRÉ, G. and CUTURI, M. (2019). Computational Optimal Transport. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning* **11** 355–607.
- [52] RAMDAS, A., GARCÍA TRILLOS, N. and CUTURI, M. (2017). On Wasserstein two-sample testing and related families of nonparametric tests. *Entropy* **19**.
- [53] REMPALA, G. and WESOŁOWSKI, J. (2007). *Symmetric functionals on random matrices and random matchings problems. The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications* **147**. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [54] REMPALA, G. A. and WESOŁOWSKI, J. (1999). Limiting behavior of random permanents. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **45**.
- [55] REMPALA, G. A. and WESOŁOWSKI, J. (2005). Approximation theorems for random permanents and associated stochastic processes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **131**.
- [56] RIGOLLET, P. and WEED, J. (2018). Entropic optimal transport is maximum-likelihood deconvolution. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique* **356** 1228 - 1235.
- [57] RIPPL, T., MUNK, A. and STURM, A. (2016). Limit laws of the empirical Wasserstein distance: Gaussian distributions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **151** 90–109.
- [58] RUGH, H. H. (2010). Cones and gauges in complex spaces: Spectral gaps and complex Perron-Frobenius theory. *Annals of Mathematics* **171** 1707–1752.
- [59] RÜSCHENDORF, L. and THOMSEN, W. (1993). Note on the Schrödinger equation and I-projections. *Statistics & Probability Letters* **17** 369–375.
- [60] SCHRÖDINGER, E. (1932). Sur la théorie relativiste de l'électron et l'interprétation de la mécanique quantique. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré* **2** 269–310.
- [61] SERFLING, R. J. (1980). *Approximation theorems of mathematical statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.
- [62] SOMMERFELD, M. and MUNK, A. (2018). Inference for empirical Wasserstein distances on finite spaces. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **80** 219–238.
- [63] TALAGRAND, M. (1992). Matching random samples in many dimensions. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **2** 846–856.
- [64] TAMELING, C., SOMMERFELD, M. and MUNK, A. (2019). Empirical optimal transport on countable metric spaces: Distributional limits and statistical applications. *Annals of Applied Probability* **29** 2744–2781.
- [65] TRASHORRAS, J. (2008). Large deviations for symmetrised empirical measures. *Journal of Theoretical Probability* **21** 397–412.
- [66] VAN DER VAART, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- [67] VAN ES, A. J. and HELMERS, R. (1988). Elementary symmetric polynomials of increasing order. *Probability theory and related fields* **80**.
- [68] VAN ES, B. (1986). On the weak limits of elementary symmetric polynomials. *The Annals of Probability* **14**.
- [69] VARADARAJAN, V. S. (1958). Weak convergence of measures on separable metric spaces. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics (1933-1960)* **19** 15–22.
- [70] WEED, J. and BACH, F. (2019). Sharp asymptotic and finite-sample rates of convergence of empirical measures in Wasserstein distance. *Bernoulli* **25** 2620–2648.



## Appendix A: Additional Proofs

*Proof of the optimality of  $q_\epsilon^*$ .* Recall that the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between probability distributions is defined as

$$\text{KL}(\nu' \parallel \nu) := \int \log \frac{d\nu'}{d\nu} d\nu', \quad \text{for } \nu' \ll \nu.$$

It is zero iff  $\nu' = \nu$ . We claim that minimizing (10) is equivalent to minimizing  $\text{KL}(q \parallel q_\epsilon^*)$  which is uniquely minimized at  $q = q_\epsilon^*$ . In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{KL}(q \parallel q_\epsilon^*) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} q(\sigma) \log \frac{q(\sigma)}{q_\epsilon^*(\sigma)} = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} q(\sigma) \log \left( \frac{q(\sigma) \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_N} w(\tau)}{w(\sigma)} \right) \\ &= \text{Ent}(q) + \log \left[ \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_N} w(\tau) \right] \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} q(\sigma) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} c(X, Y_\sigma) q(\sigma) \\ &= \frac{N}{\epsilon} \langle M_q, C \rangle + \text{Ent}(q) + \log \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_N} w(\tau), \end{aligned}$$

and thus the claim follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 11.* (a) According to (25), it holds that  $\mathcal{A}f(y) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X) \mid Y](y)$  and thus, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\|\mathcal{A}f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q)}^2 = \mathbb{E}_\mu[(\mathcal{A}f)^2(Y)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X) \mid Y]^2] \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2(X)] = \|f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P)}^2 < \infty, \quad (84)$$

which implies  $\mathcal{A}f \in \mathbf{L}^2(Q)$ . A similar argument holds for  $\mathcal{A}^*g$ .

(b) Since  $\mu \in \Pi(P, Q)$ , we get, for any  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}\mathbf{1}(y) = \int \mathbf{1}(x) \xi(x, y) dP(x) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1.$$

This implies  $(1, \mathbf{1})$  is a (eigenvalue, eigenvector) pair of  $\mathcal{A}$ . It then follows from (84) that 1 is the largest eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

(c) For any  $f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$ , it holds

$$\int \mathcal{A}f(y) dQ(y) = \iint f(x) \xi(x, y) dP(x) dQ(y) = \int f(x) dP(x) = 0.$$

It then follows that  $\mathcal{A}f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$ .

(d) From (b) and (c) we know  $\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}$  maps from  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  to  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  with the largest eigenvalue being 1. Recall that we assume  $\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}$  has positive eigenvalue gap, in other words,  $\mathbf{1}$  is the only eigenfunction corresponds to the eigenvalue 1. Given  $f, g \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$ , if  $(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})f = (I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})g$ , then  $f - g = c\mathbf{1}$  for some constant  $c$ . Since  $f - g \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  is orthogonal to  $\mathbf{1}$ , it holds that  $f = g$  and thus  $I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}$  is injective on  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$ . Moreover, for every  $f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$ ,

$$\tilde{f} := \left[ I + \sum_{k \geq 1} (\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^k \right] f$$

converges in  $\mathbf{L}^2(P)$  and  $(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})\tilde{f} = f$ . It follows that  $I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A}$  is also surjective. Therefore,  $(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}f$  is well-defined and is equal to  $\tilde{f}$ .

(e) From (d) we get, for any  $f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$ ,

$$\mathcal{A}(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}f = \mathcal{A} \left[ I + \sum_{k \geq 1} (\mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^k \right] f = \left[ I + \sum_{k \geq 1} (\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^k \right] \mathcal{A}f = (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1} \mathcal{A}f.$$



This implies  $\mathcal{A}(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1} = (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ . The other identity can be proved analogously. Finally, we prove the first equation in (30). In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\mu [(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^*g)(X) + (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(g - \mathcal{A}f)(Y) \mid X] \\ &= (I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^*g)(X) + \mathcal{A}^*(I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(g - \mathcal{A}f)(X) \\ &= (I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^*g)(X) + (I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}\mathcal{A}^*(g - \mathcal{A}f)(X) = f(X), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from a simple algebra.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 13.* (a) Let  $f \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . By the definition of conditional expectation, it suffices to show that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathcal{B}f(X_2, Y_1)\phi(X_2, Y_1)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, Y_2)\phi(X_2, Y_1)]$  for all  $\sigma(X_2, Y_1)$ -measurable  $\phi$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{B}$ , we have

$$\mathcal{B}f(x, y) = \iint f(x', y')\xi(x', y)\xi(x, y')dP(x')dQ(y').$$

As a result, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, Y_2)\phi(X_2, Y_1)] &= \iint dP(x)dQ(y) \iint f(x', y')\phi(x, y)\xi(x', y)\xi(x, y')dP(x')dQ(y') \\ &= \iint \mathcal{B}f(x, y)\phi(x, y)dP(x)dQ(y) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathcal{B}f(X_2, Y_1)\phi(X_2, Y_1)], \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. By Jensen's inequality,

$$\|\mathcal{B}f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)}^2 = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, Y_2) \mid X_2, Y_1]^2] \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu[f^2(X_1, Y_2)] < \infty,$$

and thus  $\mathcal{B}f \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ .

(b) Take any  $f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$ , we have, by (a),

$$\mathbb{E}_{P \otimes Q}[\mathcal{B}f(X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathcal{B}f(X_2, Y_1)] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, Y_2) \mid X_2, Y_1]] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, Y_2)] = 0,$$

and thus  $\mathcal{B}f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$ .

(c) Recall  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)$ . Take any  $f \oplus g \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , we have

$$\mathcal{B}(f \oplus g)(x, y) = (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)(f \oplus g)(y, x) = \mathcal{A}f(y) + \mathcal{A}^*g(x) = (\mathcal{A}^*g \oplus \mathcal{A}f)(x, y).$$

(d) Recall from Assumption 2 that  $\mathcal{A}$  admits a singular value decomposition:  $\mathcal{A}\alpha_k = s_k\beta_k$  and  $\mathcal{A}^*\beta_k = s_k\alpha_k$  for all  $k \geq 0$  with  $s_0 = 1$  and  $\alpha_0 = \beta_0 = \mathbf{1}$ , where  $\{\alpha_k\}$  and  $\{\beta_k\}$  are orthonormal bases of  $\mathbf{L}^2(P)$  and  $\mathbf{L}^2(Q)$ , respectively. Take any  $f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$ . According to [8, Page 90],  $\{\alpha_i \otimes \beta_j\}_{i,j \geq 0}$  forms an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . As a result, we get that  $f$  has an expansion

$$f = \sum_{i,j \geq 0, i+j > 0} \gamma_{ij}(\alpha_i \otimes \beta_j),$$

where  $\sum_{i,j \geq 0, i+j > 0} \gamma_{ij}^2 < \infty$ . Define a function

$$\tilde{f} := \sum_{i,j \geq 0, i+j > 0} \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{1 + s_i s_j} (\alpha_i \otimes \beta_j).$$

Since  $s_k \geq 0$  for all  $k \geq 0$ , it holds that  $\tilde{f} \in \mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . Furthermore, we have  $\mathbb{E}_{P \otimes Q}[\tilde{f}(X, Y)] = 0$  as  $\alpha_i \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $\beta_i \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$  for all  $i > 0$ . This implies  $\tilde{f} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$ . Moreover, we have

$$(I + \mathcal{B})\tilde{f} = \sum_{i,j \geq 0, i+j > 0} \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{1 + s_i s_j} (\alpha_i \otimes \beta_j) + \sum_{i,j \geq 0, i+j > 0} \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{1 + s_i s_j} s_i s_j (\alpha_i \otimes \beta_j) = f, \quad (85)$$

and thus  $I + \mathcal{B} : \mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$  is surjective. On the other hand, if  $(I + \mathcal{B})f = 0$  for some  $f \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$ , then we must have  $\langle \mathcal{B}f, f \rangle_{\mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)} = -\|f\|_{\mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)}^2$ . However, we also know  $\langle \mathcal{B}f, f \rangle_{\mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)} =$

$\sum_{i,j \geq 0, i+j > 0} s_i s_j \gamma_{ij}^2 \geq 0$ . Consequently, it holds  $f \equiv 0$  and thus  $I + \mathcal{B}$  is also injective. Hence, the inverse operator  $(I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}$  is well-defined on  $\mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$ .

(e) Take any  $f \oplus g \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P \otimes Q)$ , it follows from (d) that  $(I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(f \oplus g)$  exists. It then suffices to verify

$$(I + \mathcal{B}) [(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^* g) \oplus (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(g - \mathcal{A} f)] = f \oplus g.$$

By (c), we know

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{B} [(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^* g) \oplus (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(g - \mathcal{A} f)] \\ &= \mathcal{A}^* (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(g - \mathcal{A} f) \oplus \mathcal{A} (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^* g) \\ &= (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} \mathcal{A}^* (g - \mathcal{A} f) \oplus (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1} \mathcal{A} (f - \mathcal{A}^* g), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (e) in Lemma 11. Consequently,

$$(I + \mathcal{B}) [(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(f - \mathcal{A}^* g) \oplus (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(g - \mathcal{A} f)] = f \oplus g.$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 15.* We will prove that  $\mathcal{C} : \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  is bijective. On the one hand, take any  $f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , since  $\{\alpha_i \otimes \beta_j\}_{i,j \geq 0}$  forms an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , we know  $f$  must admit the following expansion:

$$f = \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \gamma_{ij} \alpha_i \otimes \beta_j, \quad \text{where} \quad \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \gamma_{ij}^2 < \infty.$$

Note that we have assumed  $s_k < 1$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Define

$$\tilde{f} := \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \frac{\gamma_{ij}}{(1 - s_i^2)(1 - s_j^2)} \alpha_i \otimes \beta_j,$$

then, similar to (85), we have  $\mathcal{C}\tilde{f} = f$  and  $\tilde{f} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{C}$  is surjective. On the other hand, if  $\mathcal{C}f = 0$ , then  $\mathcal{C}f = \sum_{i,j \geq 1} (1 - s_i^2)(1 - s_j^2) \gamma_{ij} (\alpha_i \otimes \beta_j) = 0$ . It follows that  $\gamma_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i, j \geq 1$ , and thus  $\mathcal{C}$  is injective.

By (30) we get

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu [(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}(\eta_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^* \eta_{0,1})(X_1) + (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(\eta_{0,1} - \mathcal{A} \eta_{1,0})(Y_1) \mid X_1] = \eta_{1,0}(X_1).$$

By definition,  $\eta_{1,0}(X_1) = \int [\eta(X_1, y) - \theta] \xi(X_1, y) dQ(y) = \mathbb{E}_\mu [\eta(X_1, Y_1) - \theta \mid X_1]$ . This yields  $\mathbb{E}_\mu [\tilde{\eta}(X_1, Y_1) \mid X_1] = 0$ . Similarly,  $\mathbb{E}_\mu [\tilde{\eta}(X_1, Y_1) \mid Y_1] = 0$ . We obtain  $\tilde{\eta} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ , and then, by Assumption 2,  $\tilde{\eta} \xi \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  since

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbb{E}_\mu [\tilde{\eta}(X_1, Y_1) \mid X_1](x) = \int \tilde{\eta}(x, y) \xi(x, y) dQ(y) \\ 0 &= \mathbb{E}_\mu [\tilde{\eta}(X_1, Y_1) \mid Y_1](y) = \int \tilde{\eta}(x, y) \xi(x, y) dP(x). \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 16.* We prove the claim for  $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A} : \mathbf{L}^2(P) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(Q)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}^* : \mathbf{L}^2(Q) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}^2(P)$ . The rest follows similarly. Take any  $f \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , we know  $(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(Y_1, X_2) = \mathbb{E}_\mu [f(X_1, Y_2) \mid X_2, Y_1]$ . Hence, by the tower property, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu [(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(Y_1, X_2) \mid X_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu [f(X_1, Y_2) \mid X_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu [\mathbb{E}_\mu [f(X_1, Y_2) \mid X_2, Y_2] \mid X_2] = 0.$$

Analogously,  $\mathbb{E}_\mu [(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(Y_1, X_2) \mid Y_1] = 0$ . This implies  $(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(Y_1, X_2) \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes P)$ , and the claim follows. Now, observe that  $(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(Y_1, X_2) \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes P)$  yields  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_2, Y_1) \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)$ , we get  $\mathcal{B}$  maps  $\mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  to  $\mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . □

*Proof of Lemma 17.* Since  $\tilde{\eta}\xi \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , we know from Lemma 15 and Lemma 16 that  $\eta_{2,0} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ ,  $\eta_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$  and  $\eta_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ . Let  $f := \mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$ . Recall from Assumption 3 that  $\xi \in \mathbf{L}^{2p}(P \otimes Q)$  and  $f \in \mathbf{L}^{2q}(P \otimes Q)$ . As a result,

$$\mu[f^2]^{\text{H\"older}} \leq \left[ \int f^{2q}(x, y) dP(x) dQ(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[ \int \xi^p(x, y) dP(x) dQ(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty. \quad (86)$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int (\mathcal{B}f)^{2q}(x, y) dP(x) dQ(y) &= \int \left[ \int f(x', y') \xi(x', y) \xi(x, y') dP(x') dQ(y') \right]^{2q} dP(x) dQ(y) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Jensen}}{\leq} \int \int f^{2q}(x', y') \xi(x', y) \xi(x, y') dP(x') dQ(y') dP(x) dQ(y) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \int f^{2q}(x', y') dP(x') dQ(y') < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from  $\int \xi(x', y) dQ(y) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} \int \xi(x, y') dP(x) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{=} 1$ . Similar to (86), it then holds that

$$\mu[(\mathcal{B}f)^2] \leq \left[ \int (\mathcal{B}f)^{2q}(x, y) dP(x) dQ(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} \left[ \int \xi^p(x, y) dP(x) dQ(y) \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty.$$

This yields that  $\eta_{1,1'} := (I + \mathcal{B})f \in \mathbf{L}^2(\mu)$ . Now, by the degeneracy (33) of  $\eta_{2,0}$ ,  $\eta_{0,2}$  and  $\eta_{1,1'}$ , we obtain  $\mathcal{L}_2 \in H_0^\perp \cap H_1^\perp$ . It then follows from the permutation symmetry of  $\mathcal{L}_2$  that  $\mathcal{L}_2 \in H_2$ .

Notice that  $(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{0,2} = -(\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{1,1'} &= ((I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) + (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{B})\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi) \stackrel{(i)}{=} -\eta_{2,0} + \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_P)(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi) \\ &= -\eta_{2,0} + \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)$  in (i). It then follows that

$$(I + \mathcal{T})[\eta_{2,0} + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{0,2} + (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\eta_{1,1'}] = (I + \mathcal{T})(\mathcal{T} - I)(\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi) \equiv 0,$$

since  $(I + \mathcal{T})(\mathcal{T} - I) = \mathcal{T} - I + \mathcal{T}\mathcal{T} - \mathcal{T} = 0$ . Similarly,  $(I + \mathcal{T})[(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A})\eta_{2,0} + \eta_{0,2} + (\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q)\eta_{1,1'}] \equiv 0$ .

Let us verify the last identity in the statement of Lemma 17. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})(I + \mathcal{T})\eta_{2,0} &= [(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) + \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes I_P)]\eta_{2,0} = -[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*) + \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)]\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi) \\ &= -[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*) + \mathcal{B}]\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Analogously,  $(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)(I + \mathcal{T})\eta_{0,2} = -[(\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) + \mathcal{B}]\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi)$  and

$$(I + \mathcal{B})\eta_{1,1'} = (I + \mathcal{B})(I + \mathcal{B})\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi) = [I + 2\mathcal{B} + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A})\mathcal{T}\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)]\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})(I + \mathcal{T})\eta_{2,0} + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)(I + \mathcal{T})\eta_{0,2} + (I + \mathcal{B})\eta_{1,1'} \\ &= [I - (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*) - (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) + (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)]\mathcal{C}^{-1}(\tilde{\eta}\xi) = \tilde{\eta}\xi, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from  $\mathcal{C} := (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A}) \otimes (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*) = I - I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^* - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q + \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*$ .  $\square$

We then prove the Hoeffding decomposition of  $D_N$  and  $U_N$  in Proposition 21. We start with two useful lemmas.

**Lemma 31.** *Let  $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \subset [N]$  be such that  $A_1 \cap A_2 = B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ . Assume  $T_1 := f_1(X_{A_1}, Y_{B_1}) \in \mathbf{L}^2((P \otimes Q)^N)$  and  $T_2 := f_2(X_{A_2}, Y_{B_2}) \in \mathbf{L}^2((P \otimes Q)^N)$  are completely degenerate. Then  $T_1 T_2 \in \mathbf{L}^2((P \otimes Q)^N)$  is also completely degenerate.*

*Proof.* Take any  $A' \subset A_1 \cup A_2$  and  $B' \subset B_1 \cup B_2$  such that  $|A'| + |B'| < |A_1| + |A_2| + |B_1| + |B_2|$ . Let  $A'_1 := A' \cap A_1$ ,  $A'_2 := A' \cap A_2$ ,  $B'_1 := B' \cap B_1$  and  $B'_2 := B' \cap B_2$ . Then  $A' = A'_1 \cup A'_2$  and  $B' = B'_1 \cup B'_2$ . Furthermore, without loss of generality, we may assume  $|A'_1| + |B'_1| < |A_1| + |B_1|$ . By independence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[T_1 T_2 \mid X_{A'}, Y_{B'}] = \mathbb{E}[T_1 \mid X_{A'_1}, Y_{B'_1}] \mathbb{E}[T_2 \mid X_{A'_2}, Y_{B'_2}] = 0,$$

since  $\mathbb{E}[T_1 \mid X_{A'_1}, Y_{B'_1}] = 0$ . □

**Lemma 32.** *Let  $A \subset [N]$  be a subset. For any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ , the following identity holds:*

$$\prod_{i \in A} \xi(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) = \sum_{C \subset A} \prod_{i \in C} \tilde{\xi}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}), \quad (87)$$

where  $\prod_{i \in \emptyset} \tilde{\xi}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) := 1$ . Moreover, (87) gives the Hoeffding decomposition of  $\prod_{i \in A} \xi(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 31,  $\prod_{i \in C} \tilde{\xi}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})$  is completely degenerate for each  $C \subset A$ . It then suffices to prove the identity (87). If  $|A| = m$ , then it is enough to prove (87) for  $A = [m]$  and  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_m$ . We will prove it by induction. For  $m = 1$ , the identity reduces to  $\xi(X_1, Y_1) = 1 + \tilde{\xi}(X_1, Y_1)$ , which is true by definition. Assume the identity holds for  $m - 1$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^m \xi(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) &= \sum_{C \subset [m-1]} \prod_{i \in C} \tilde{\xi}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \times \xi(X_m, Y_{\sigma_m}) \\ &= \sum_{C \subset [m], m \in C} \prod_{i \in C} \tilde{\xi}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) + \sum_{C \subset [m-1]} \prod_{i \in C} \tilde{\xi}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) = \sum_{C \subset [m]} \prod_{i \in C} \tilde{\xi}(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the identity holds for  $m$ . □

*Proof of Proposition 21.* We only prove the results for  $U_N$ . The proof for  $D_N$  is similar. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} U_N &:= \frac{1}{N \cdot N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [N] \setminus \{i\}} \xi(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \\ &= \frac{1}{N \cdot N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i=1}^N h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \sum_{C \subset [N] \setminus \{i\}} \prod_{j \in C} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}), \quad \text{by Lemma 32.} \end{aligned}$$

Take  $A, B \subset [N]$  such that  $|A| = |B| > 0$ . We will write  $U_N$  as a sum of terms that contain exactly  $X_A := (X_i)_{i \in A}$  and  $Y_B := (Y_i)_{i \in B}$ . The terms that contain exactly  $X_A$  among  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N$  in the above decomposition are

$$\frac{1}{N \cdot N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N} \sum_{i \in A} h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in A \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}).$$

Consequently, the terms that contain exactly  $(X_A, Y_B)$  are

$$\frac{1}{N \cdot N!} U_{AB} := \frac{1}{N \cdot N!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N: \sigma_A = B} \sum_{i \in A} h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in A \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}).$$

Hence, the identity (52) follows. Moreover, since  $h \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , we get, by Lemma 31, that

$$h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in A \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \in H_{AB}, \quad \text{for any } i \in A \text{ and } \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N \text{ such that } \sigma_A = B.$$

This implies  $U_{AB} \in H_{AB}$ , and thus (52) is the Hoeffding decomposition of  $U_N$ .

Let us compute  $\mathbb{E}[U_N^2]$ . For any  $A, B \subset [N]$  such that  $|A| = |B| = r > 0$ , we get, by the exchangeability of  $X_{[N]}$  and  $Y_{[N]}$  under  $P \otimes Q$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[U_{AB}^2] = \mathbb{E}[U_{[r][r]}^2]$ . Furthermore, since there are  $(N-r)!$  permutations that map  $[r]$  to  $[r]$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{[r][r]}^2] = (N-r)!^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{i=1}^r h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right]^2.$$

As a result,  $\mathbb{E}[U_{[r][r]}^2]$  is equal to

$$(N-r)!^2 \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{l=1}^r \mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_l, Y_{\tau_l}) \prod_{k \in [r] \setminus \{l\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_k, Y_{\tau_k}) \times \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{i=1}^r h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right].$$

By symmetry, the contribution from every  $\tau$  is the same, so  $\mathbb{E}[U_{[r][r]}^2]$  is equal to

$$(N-r)!^2 r! \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{l=1}^r h(X_l, Y_l) \prod_{k \in [r] \setminus \{l\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_k, Y_k) \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{i=1}^r h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right].$$

It then follows from the exchangeability of  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i \in [N]}$  that

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{[r][r]}^2] = (N-r)!^2 r! \mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_1, Y_1) \prod_{k=2}^r \tilde{\xi}(X_k, Y_k) \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{i=1}^r h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right].$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[U_N^2] &= \frac{1}{N^2(N!)^2} \sum_{r=1}^N \sum_{|A|=|B|=r} \mathbb{E}[U_{AB}^2] = \frac{1}{N^2(N!)^2} \sum_{r=1}^N \binom{N}{r}^2 \mathbb{E}[U_{[r][r]}^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{r}{r!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_r} \sum_{i=1}^r \mathbb{E} \left[ h(X_1, Y_1) \prod_{j=2}^r \tilde{\xi}(X_k, Y_k) h(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i}) \prod_{j \in [r] \setminus \{i\}} \tilde{\xi}(X_j, Y_{\sigma_j}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 23.* There are two cases to consider:  $t = t'$  and  $t \neq t'$ . The proofs are similar so we only prove it for  $t = t'$ . By exchangeability, it suffices to consider  $t = t' = 1$ . The strategy is again to iteratively take expectation with respect to one variable, while keeping the rest being fixed. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[f(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_1}) \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_l}, Y_{k_l}) \mid X_{k_1}, X_{k_l}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[f(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_1}) \xi(X_{k_l}, Y_{k_l}) \mid X_{k_1}, X_{k_l}] = (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_{k_1}, X_{k_l}). \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation with respect to  $Y_{k_l}$  in (55), while keeping others being fixed, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[f(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_1}) \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_l}, Y_{k_l}) \mid X_{k_1}, X_{k_l}] g(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_2}) \prod_{i=2}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_i}) \prod_{i=2}^{l-1} \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_{i+1}}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_{k_1}, X_{k_l}) g(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_2}) \prod_{i=2}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_i}) \prod_{i=2}^{l-1} \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_{i+1}}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now taking expectation with respect to  $X_{k_l}$ , while keeping others being fixed, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_{k_1}, X_{k_l}) \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_l}, Y_{k_l}) \mid X_{k_1}, Y_{k_l}] g(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_2}) \prod_{i=2}^{l-1} \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_i}) \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_{i+1}}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_l}) g(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_2}) \prod_{i=2}^{l-1} \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_i}) \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_{i+1}}) \right], \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_{k_1}, X_{k_l})\tilde{\xi}(X_{k_l}, Y_{k_l}) \mid X_{k_1}, Y_{k_l}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_{k_1}, X_{k_l})\xi(X_{k_l}, Y_{k_l}) \mid X_{k_1}, Y_{k_l}] - \mathbb{E}[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)f(X_{k_1}, X_{k_l}) \mid X_{k_1}] \\
&= (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)f(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_l}).
\end{aligned}$$

Keep repeating this argument, we ultimately get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[ f(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_1})g(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_2}) \prod_{i=2}^l \tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_i})\tilde{\xi}(X_{k_i}, Y_{k_{i+1}}) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{l-1} f(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_2})g(X_{k_1}, Y_{k_2}) \right] \\
&\leq \|(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{l-1} f\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)} \|g\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)} \leq s_1^{2(l-1)} \varsigma_f \varsigma_g, \quad \text{by Lemma 22.}
\end{aligned}$$

□

## Appendix B: Closedness of $H_1$

Let  $\nu$  be a probability measure. Given a subspace (not necessarily closed)  $H \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\nu)$  and a statistic  $T \in \mathbf{L}^2(\nu)$ , the  $\mathbf{L}^2$  projection of  $T$  onto  $H$ , if exists, is defined as

$$\text{Proj}_H(T) := \arg \min_{U \in H} \|T - U\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\nu)}^2.$$

The next lemma gives an equivalent definition using orthogonality. The proof is omitted.

**Lemma 33.** *Let  $U \in H$ , then  $U = \text{Proj}_H(T)$  iff  $T - U \in H^\perp$ .*

In the following, we assume  $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_N, Y_N) \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mu$ , with  $\mathbb{E}_\mu$  denoting the expectation under this model, as before. Recall the subspace  $H_1 \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  defined in Section 3. We will prove that it is closed.

**Lemma 34.** *The subspace  $H_1 \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  admits the following alternative expression:*

$$H_1 = \text{Span} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N (f_{1,0}(X_i) + f_{0,1}(Y_i)) : f_{1,0} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P), f_{0,1} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q) \right\}. \quad (88)$$

*Proof of Lemma 34.* For any  $\sum_{i=1}^N (f_{1,0}(X_i) + f_{0,1}(Y_i)) \in H_1$ , we get  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[f_{1,0}(X_1) + f_{0,1}(Y_1)] = 0$  since  $H_0 \perp H_1$  and  $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$  are i.i.d. Let  $\theta_{1,0} := \mathbb{E}_\mu[f_{1,0}(X_1)]$  and  $\theta_{0,1} := \mathbb{E}_\mu[f_{0,1}(Y_1)]$ , then it holds that  $\theta_{1,0} + \theta_{0,1} = 0$ . Hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N f_{1,0}(X_i) + f_{0,1}(Y_i) = \sum_{i=1}^N \bar{f}_{1,0}(X_i) + \bar{f}_{0,1}(Y_i),$$

where  $\bar{f}_{1,0} := f_{1,0} - \theta_{1,0} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $\bar{f}_{0,1} := f_{0,1} - \theta_{0,1} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$ , and the claim follows. □

**Proposition 35.** *Under Assumptions 1, the subspace  $H_1 \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  is closed.*

*Proof of Proposition 35.* We use the representation of  $H_1$  given in (88). Take an arbitrary Cauchy sequence  $\{\sum_{i=1}^N f_{1,0}^n(X_i) + f_{0,1}^n(Y_i)\} \subset H_1$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m)(X_i) + (f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m)(Y_i) \right] \right]^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } m, n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Since  $f_{1,0}^n, f_{1,0}^m \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $f_{0,1}^n, f_{0,1}^m \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$  for all  $n, m \geq 1$ , we get, as  $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N \left[ (f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m)(X_i) + (f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m)(Y_i) \right] \right]^2 \\ &= N \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ (f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m)(X_1) + (f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m)(Y_1) \right]^2 \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}_\mu[(f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m)(X_1)(f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m)(Y_1)]| &= |\mathbb{E}_\mu[\mathcal{A}(f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m)(Y_1)(f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m)(Y_1)]| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{A}(f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q)} \|f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q)} \\ &\leq s_1 \|f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P)} \|f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q)} \\ &\leq \frac{s_1}{2} \left[ \|f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P)}^2 + \|f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q)}^2 \right], \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption 1 and  $f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - s_1) \left[ \|f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(P)}^2 + \|f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q)}^2 \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ (f_{1,0}^n - f_{1,0}^m)(X_1) + (f_{0,1}^n - f_{0,1}^m)(Y_1) \right]^2 \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies  $\{f_{1,0}^n\} \subset \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $\{f_{0,1}^n\} \subset \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$  are two Cauchy sequences, *i.e.*, there exist  $f_{1,0} \in \mathbf{L}^2(P)$  and  $f_{0,1} \in \mathbf{L}^2(Q)$  such that  $f_{1,0}^n \rightarrow_{\mathbf{L}^2(P)} f_{1,0}$  and  $f_{0,1}^n \rightarrow_{\mathbf{L}^2(Q)} f_{0,1}$ . Moreover,  $P[f_{1,0}^n] = Q[f_{0,1}^n] = 0$  yields  $f_{1,0} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(P)$  and  $f_{0,1} \in \mathbf{L}_0^2(Q)$ . Therefore,  $H_1$  is closed.  $\square$

## Appendix C: Closedness of $H_2$

We start with two useful results.

**Lemma 36.** *The subspace  $H_2 \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  is spanned by functions of the form*

$$\sum_{i < j} [f_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + f_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j)] + \sum_{i=1}^N f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_i) + \sum_{i \neq j} f_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j), \tag{90}$$

where  $f_{2,0} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ ,  $f_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$  are symmetric and  $f_{1,1} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ ,  $f_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  are the same up to an affine term, that is,  $f_{1,1}(x, y) = f_{1,1'}(x, y) + g_1(x) + g_2(y) + a$ .

*Proof of Lemma 36.* Take any

$$T := \sum_{i < j} [f(X_i, X_j) + g(Y_i, Y_j)] + \sum_{i,j=1}^N h(X_i, Y_j) \in H_2.$$

Define  $\tilde{f}(x, x') := f(x, x') - f_0(x) - f_0(x') - \theta_f$  and  $\tilde{g}(y, y')$  analogously, where  $\theta_f := \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, X_2)]$  and  $f_0(x) := \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, X_2) - \theta_f \mid X_1](x) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f(X_1, X_2) - \theta_f \mid X_2](x)$ . By definition, we know  $\tilde{f} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$  and  $\tilde{g} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$  are symmetric. Also, let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{h}(x, y) &:= h(x, y) - (I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(h_{1,0} \oplus h_{0,1})(x, y) - \theta_h \\ \tilde{h}'(x, y) &:= h(x, y) - h'_{1,0}(x) - h'_{0,1}(y) - \theta'_h, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_h &:= \mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X_1, Y_1)], & h_{1,0}(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X_1, Y_1) - \theta_h \mid X_1](x), & h_{0,1}(y) &:= \mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X_1, Y_1) - \theta_h \mid Y_1](y) \\ \theta'_h &:= \mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X_1, Y_2)], & h'_{1,0}(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X_1, Y_2) - \theta'_h \mid X_1](x), & h'_{0,1}(y) &:= \mathbb{E}_\mu[h(X_1, Y_2) - \theta'_h \mid Y_2](y). \end{aligned}$$



By construction,  $\tilde{h}' \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ , and  $\tilde{h}$  and  $\tilde{h}'$  are the same up to an affine term. Furthermore, it follows from (30) and (32) that  $\tilde{h} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ . Hence, to prove (90), we just need to show that  $T$  is equal to

$$\tilde{T} := \sum_{i < j} [\tilde{f}(X_i, X_j) + \tilde{g}(Y_i, Y_j)] + \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{h}(X_i, Y_i) + \sum_{i \neq j} \tilde{h}'(X_i, Y_j). \quad (91)$$

Note that  $T \in H_0^\perp \cap H_1^\perp$ , it holds that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[T] = \frac{N(N-1)}{2}(\theta_f + \theta_g) + N\theta_h + N(N-1)\theta'_h = 0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu[T - \mathbb{E}_\mu[T] \mid X_i] &= (N-1)[f_0(X_i) + \mathcal{A}^*g_0(X_i) + h'_{1,0}(X_i) + \mathcal{A}^*h'_{0,1}(X_i)] + h_{1,0}(X_i) = 0 \\ \mathbb{E}_\mu[T - \mathbb{E}_\mu[T] \mid Y_i] &= (N-1)[\mathcal{A}f_0(Y_i) + g_0(Y_i) + \mathcal{A}h'_{1,0}(Y_i) + h'_{0,1}(Y_i)] + h_{0,1}(Y_i) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} (N-1)(I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})(f_0 + h'_{1,0})(X_i) + (h_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^*h_{0,1})(X_i) &= 0 \\ (N-1)(I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)(g_0 + h'_{0,1})(Y_i) + (h_{0,1} - \mathcal{A}h_{1,0})(Y_i) &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

and thus, using (32),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (N-1)[f_0(X_i) + g_0(Y_i) + h'_{1,0}(X_i) + h'_{0,1}(Y_i)] \\ &\quad + (I - \mathcal{A}^*\mathcal{A})^{-1}(h_{1,0} - \mathcal{A}^*h_{0,1})(X_i) + (I - \mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}(h_{0,1} - \mathcal{A}h_{1,0})(Y_i) \\ &= (N-1)[f_0(X_i) + g_0(Y_i) + h'_{1,0}(X_i) + h'_{0,1}(Y_i)] + (I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(h_{1,0} \oplus h_{0,1})(X_i, Y_i). \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Putting all together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{T} &= T - \sum_{i < j} [f_0(X_i) + f_0(X_j) + g_0(Y_i) + g_0(Y_j) + \theta_f + \theta_g] - \sum_{i=1}^N [(I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(h_{1,0} \oplus h_{0,1})(X_i, Y_i) + \theta_h] \\ &\quad - \sum_{i \neq j} [h'_{1,0}(X_i) + h'_{0,1}(Y_j) + \theta'_h] \\ &= T - (N-1) \sum_{i=1}^N [f_0(X_i) + g_0(Y_i) + h'_{1,0}(X_i) + h'_{0,1}(Y_i)] - \sum_{i=1}^N (I + \mathcal{B})^{-1}(h_{1,0} \oplus h_{0,1})(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_\mu[T], \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly equal to  $T$  by (92) and the claim follows.  $\square$

Let  $T^n := T^n(X_{[N]}, Y_{[N]}) \in \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  be permutation symmetric for each  $n \geq 1$ . Assume  $T^n$  converges in  $\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  to some  $T$ . We show that  $T$  is also permutation symmetric, even though the underlying measure is not.

**Lemma 37.** *Under Assumption 2,  $T$  is also permutation symmetric.*

*Proof of Lemma 37.* Since  $T^n \rightarrow_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)} T$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , there exists a sub-sequence  $T^{n_k} \rightarrow_{a.s.} T$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . In other words, there exists a subset  $A \subset (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)^N$  such that  $\mu^N(A) = 0$  and  $T^{n_k} \rightarrow T$  on  $A^c$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . For all permutations  $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{S}_N$ , define

$$A_{\sigma, \tau} := \{(x_{\sigma_{[N]}}, y_{\tau_{[N]}}) : (x_{[N]}, y_{[N]}) \in A\}.$$

Since  $\mu^N$  is a probability density, we get  $\mu^N(A_{\sigma, \tau}) = 0$ , and thus  $\mu^N(A_{\mathcal{S}_N}) = 0$  where  $A_{\mathcal{S}_N} := \cup_{\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{S}_N} A_{\sigma, \tau}$ .

Now, take any  $(x_{[N]}, y_{[N]}) \in A_{\mathcal{S}_N}^c$ , it holds that  $T^{n_k}(x_{[N]}, y_{[N]}) \rightarrow T(x_{[N]}, y_{[N]})$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . For any  $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_N$ , we know, by construction, that  $(x_{[N]}, y_{\sigma_{[N]}}) \in A_{\mathcal{S}_N}^c$ . Consequently,  $T^{n_k}(x_{[N]}, y_{\sigma_{[N]}}) \rightarrow T(x_{[N]}, y_{\sigma_{[N]}})$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . It then follows from the permutation symmetry of  $T^n$  that  $T(x_{[N]}, y_{[N]}) = T(x_{[N]}, y_{\sigma_{[N]}})$ . This implies, almost surely,  $T$  is permutation symmetric. Since every element in  $\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  is only defined up to a zero-measure set, we can conclude that  $T$  is permutation symmetric.  $\square$

Before we prove the closedness of  $H_2$ , let us consider the subspace  $H_2^{i,j}$  spanned by functions of the type

$$g(X_i, X_j, Y_i, Y_j) := f_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + f_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j) + f_{1,1'}(X_j, Y_i) + f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_i) + f_{1,1}(X_j, Y_j), \quad (93)$$

where  $f_{2,0} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ ,  $f_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$  are symmetric, and  $f_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$ ,  $f_{1,1} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$  are the same up to an affine term. We will show that  $H_2^{i,j}$  is closed. The next lemma shows that every elements in this subspace is permutation symmetric.

**Lemma 38.** *Let  $f_{2,0} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ ,  $f_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$ ,  $f_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  and  $f_{1,1} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ . Then  $g(X_i, X_j, Y_i, Y_j)$  defined in (93) is permutation symmetric iff  $f_{2,0}, f_{0,2}$  are symmetric and  $f_{1,1'}, f_{1,1}$  are the same up to an affine term.*

*Proof of Lemma 38.* Define  $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}$  to be the operator that swaps  $X_i$  and  $X_j$ . If  $g(X_i, X_j, Y_i, Y_j)$  is permutation symmetric, then  $\mathcal{T}_{i,j}g(X_i, X_j, Y_i, Y_j) = g(X_i, X_j, Y_i, Y_j)$ , that is,

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + f_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) + f_{1,1'}(X_j, Y_i) + f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_i) + f_{1,1}(X_j, Y_j) \\ &= f_{2,0}(X_j, X_i) + f_{1,1'}(X_j, Y_j) + f_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) + f_{1,1}(X_j, Y_i) + f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_j). \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Taking the conditional expectation given  $X_i, Y_i$  yields

$$f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_i) = f_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_i) + g_1(X_i) + g_2(Y_i) + a, \quad (95)$$

where  $a = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f_{1,1'}(X_j, Y_j)]$ ,

$$g_1(X_i) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_j) \mid X_i] \quad \text{and} \quad g_2(Y_i) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[f_{1,1}(X_j, Y_i) \mid Y_i].$$

Now, plugging (95) into (94) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + \sum_{k,l \in \{i,j\}} f_{1,1'}(X_k, Y_l) + g_1(X_i) + g_2(Y_i) + g_1(X_j) + g_2(Y_j) + 2a \\ &= f_{2,0}(X_j, X_i) + \sum_{k,l \in \{i,j\}} f_{1,1'}(X_k, Y_l) + g_1(X_j) + g_2(Y_i) + g_1(X_i) + g_2(Y_j) + 2a, \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

and thus  $f_{2,0}$  is symmetric. The symmetry of  $f_{0,2}$  can be derived similarly. Conversely, when  $f_{2,0}, f_{0,2}$  are symmetric and  $f_{1,1'}, f_{1,1}$  are the same up to an affine term, the identity (96) is true. As a result,  $g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2)$  is permutation symmetric.  $\square$

To prove the closedness of  $H_2^{i,j}$ , we introduce two operators using again the notation of tensor product:  $\mathcal{C}_{2,0} := (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A}) \otimes (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{0,2} := (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*) \otimes (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)$ . Following an argument similar to the one for Lemma 15, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 39.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the inverse operators  $\mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1} : \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{0,2}^{-1} : \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q) \rightarrow \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$  are well-defined. Moreover, it holds  $\mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1} = (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} \otimes (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{0,2}^{-1} = (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1} \otimes (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1}$ .*

**Proposition 40.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true. Let  $T \in H_0^\perp \cap H_1^\perp$  be permutation symmetric in  $X_{i,j}$  and in  $Y_{i,j}$  for  $i \neq j$ . Define  $k_{2,0}^{i,j}(x, x') := \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_i, X_j](x, x')$ ,  $k_{0,2}^{i,j}(y, y') := \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid Y_i, Y_j](y, y')$ ,  $k_{1,1'}^{i,j}(x, y) := \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_i, Y_j](x, y)$  and  $k_{1,1}^{i,i} := \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_i, Y_i]$ , then the projection  $\text{Proj}_{H_2^{i,j}}(T)$  is given by*

$$U := g_{2,0}(X_i, X_j) + g_{0,2}(Y_i, Y_j) + g_{1,1'}(X_i, Y_j) + g_{1,1'}(X_j, Y_i) + k_{1,1}^{i,i}(X_i, Y_i) + k_{1,1}^{j,j}(X_j, Y_j), \quad (97)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_{2,0} &:= \mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1}[k_{2,0}^{i,j} + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{0,2}^{i,j} - (I + \mathcal{T})(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{1,1'}^{i,j}] \\ g_{0,2} &:= \mathcal{C}_{0,2}^{-1}[k_{0,2}^{i,j} + (\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A})k_{2,0}^{i,j} - (I + \mathcal{T})(\mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q)k_{1,1'}^{i,j}] \\ g_{1,1'} &:= \mathcal{C}^{-1}[(I + \mathcal{B})k_{1,1'}^{i,j} - (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})k_{2,0}^{i,j} - (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)k_{0,2}^{i,j}]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the subspace  $H_2^{i,j}$  is closed.

*Proof of Proposition 40.* We consider  $(i, j) = (1, 2)$  and omit the dependency on  $(i, j)$  in  $k$  for simplicity. By the permutation symmetry of  $T$ , we know  $k_{1,1'}(x, y) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_1, Y_2](x, y) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_2, Y_1](x, y)$  and  $k_{1,1}(x, y) := \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_1, Y_1](x, y) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_2, Y_2](x, y)$ . According to Lemma 33, it suffices to show  $T - U \in (H_2^{1,2})^\perp$ , or

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[T - U \mid X_1, X_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T - U \mid Y_1, Y_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T - U \mid X_1, Y_1] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T - U \mid X_1, Y_2] = 0. \quad (98)$$

*Step 1.* We show  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[T - U \mid X_1, Y_1] = 0$ . We start by showing the statistic  $U$  is well-defined. Since  $T \in H_0^\perp \cap H_1^\perp$ , we know  $k_{2,0} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ ,  $k_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$ ,  $k_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  and  $k_{1,1} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ . According to Lemma 16, it holds that  $(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$  and  $(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ . This implies

$$k_{2,0}^{i,j} + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{0,2}^{i,j} - (I + \mathcal{T})(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{1,1'}^{i,j} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P). \quad (99)$$

Hence, by Lemma 39,  $g_{2,0} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$  is well-defined. Similarly,  $g_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$  and  $g_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  are well-defined. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[g_{2,0}(X_1, X_2) \mid X_1, Y_1] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[g_{1,1'}(X_2, Y_1) \mid X_1, Y_1] = 0.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[U \mid X_1, Y_1] = k_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) + \mathbb{E}_\mu[k_{1,1}(X_2, Y_2)] \stackrel{(i)}{=} k_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_1, Y_1], \quad (100)$$

where (i) follows from  $k_{1,1} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ . Then the claim follows.

*Step 2.* We prove that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[T - U \mid X_1, X_2] = 0$ , that is,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[U \mid X_1, X_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_1, X_2] = k_{2,0}(X_1, X_2). \quad (101)$$

Recall that  $k_{1,1} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ , we then have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[k_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) \mid X_1, X_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[k_{1,1}(X_2, Y_2) \mid X_1, X_2] = 0. \quad (102)$$

Furthermore, according to Lemma 39, it holds that

$$(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{C}_{0,2}^{-1} \stackrel{(ii)}{=} (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} \mathcal{A}^* \otimes (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} \mathcal{A}^* = \mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*),$$

where we have used Lemma 11 in (ii). This implies that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[g_{0,2}(Y_1, Y_2) \mid X_1, X_2]$  is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)g_{0,2}(X_1, X_2) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1}[(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{0,2} + (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})k_{2,0} - (I + \mathcal{T})(\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{1,1'}](X_1, X_2). \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Similarly, it follows from Lemma 15 that

$$(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{C}^{-1} = (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} \otimes (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} \mathcal{A}^* = \mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1}(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*),$$

and thus  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[g_{1,1'}(X_1, Y_2) + g_{1,1'}(X_2, Y_1) \mid X_1, X_2] = (I + \mathcal{T})(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)g_{1,1'}(X_1, X_2)$  reads

$$\begin{aligned} & (I + \mathcal{T})\mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1}[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)(I + \mathcal{B})k_{1,1'} - (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})k_{2,0} - (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{0,2}](X_1, X_2) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1}(I + \mathcal{T})[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^* + \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*))k_{1,1'} - (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})k_{2,0} - (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{0,2}](X_1, X_2), \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

where the equality follows from  $(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{B} = (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)$ . Putting (102), (103) and (104) together, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[U \mid X_1, X_2] = \mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1}[\mathcal{D}_{2,0}k_{2,0} + \mathcal{D}_{0,2}k_{0,2} + \mathcal{D}_{1,1'}k_{1,1'}](X_1, X_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{2,0} &= I + (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A}) - (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A}) - (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes I_P) \mathcal{T} \\ \mathcal{D}_{0,2} &= 2(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) - (I + \mathcal{T})(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) = (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) - (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) \mathcal{T} \\ \mathcal{D}_{1,1'} &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since  $T$  is permutation symmetric in  $X_{1,2}$ , we know  $k_{2,0}$  is symmetric. As a result,  $\mathcal{T}k_{2,0} = k_{2,0}$ , which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{2,0}k_{2,0} &= [(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A}) \otimes (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})]k_{2,0} = \mathcal{C}_{2,0}k_{2,0} \\ \mathcal{D}_{0,2}k_{0,2} &= [(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*) - (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)]k_{0,2} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the claim (101) follows. A similar argument yields  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[U \mid Y_1, Y_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid Y_1, Y_2] = k_{2,0}(Y_1, Y_2)$ .

*Step 3.* We verify

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[U \mid X_1, Y_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_1, Y_2] = k_{1,1'}(X_1, Y_2).$$

Again, we prove it by direct computations. Analogous to (102), it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[k_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) \mid X_1, Y_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[k_{1,1}(X_2, Y_2) \mid X_1, Y_2] = 0. \quad (105)$$

Note that

$$(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})\mathcal{C}_{2,0}^{-1} = (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{A}(I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} = (I - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A})^{-1} \otimes (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)^{-1} \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C}^{-1}(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}),$$

it follows that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[g_{2,0}(X_1, X_2) \mid X_1, Y_2] = (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})g_{2,0}(X_1, Y_2)$  is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^{-1}[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})k_{2,0} + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)k_{0,2} - (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)k_{1,1'} - \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)k_{1,1'}](X_1, Y_2) \\ = \mathcal{C}^{-1}[(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A})k_{2,0} + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)k_{0,2} - (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*)k_{1,1'} - \mathcal{B}k_{1,1'}](X_1, Y_2),\end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

and, analogously,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_\mu[g_{0,2}(Y_1, Y_2) \mid X_1, Y_2] \\ = \mathcal{C}^{-1}[(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q)k_{0,2} + (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A})k_{2,0} - (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q)k_{1,1'} - \mathcal{B}k_{1,1'}](X_1, Y_2).\end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[g_{1,1'}(X_2, Y_1) \mid X_1, Y_2] = \mathcal{B}g_{1,1'}(X_1, Y_2)$ , we get

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu[U \mid X_1, Y_2] = \mathcal{C}^{-1}[\mathcal{D}'_{2,0}k_{2,0} + \mathcal{D}'_{0,2}k_{0,2} + \mathcal{D}'_{1,1'}k_{1,1'}](X_1, Y_2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}'_{2,0} &= (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) + (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}) - (I + \mathcal{B})(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A}) = (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}) - (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}) \mathcal{T} \\ \mathcal{D}'_{0,2} &= (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q) + (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*) - (I + \mathcal{B})(\mathcal{A}^* \otimes I_Q) = (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*) - (\mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*) \mathcal{T}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}'_{1,1'} &= -(I_P \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*) - \mathcal{B} - (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) - \mathcal{B} + (I + \mathcal{B})(I + \mathcal{B}) \\ &= I + (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*) - (I_P \otimes \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*) - (\mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A} \otimes I_Q) \\ &= (I_P - \mathcal{A}^* \mathcal{A}) \otimes (I_Q - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^*) = \mathcal{C}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[U \mid X_1, Y_2] = \mathbb{E}_\mu[T \mid X_1, Y_2] = k_{1,1'}(X_1, Y_2)$ .

*Step 4.* We prove  $H_2^{1,2}$  is closed. Recall that  $H_2^{1,2}$  is spanned by  $g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2)$  given in (93). Take any Cauchy sequence  $\{g^n(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2)\} \subset H_2^{1,2} \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^2)$ , there exists  $g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) \in \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^2)$  such that  $g^n(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^2)} g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2)$ . In the following, we will write  $g^n$  and  $g$  for short. Since  $g^n$  is permutation symmetric for each  $n \geq 1$ , we know, by Lemma 37,  $g$  is also permutation symmetric. As a result, the projection  $\text{Proj}_{H_2^{1,2}}(g)$  exists, and thus

$$\|g^n - g\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^2)}^2 = \|g^n - \text{Proj}_{H_2^{1,2}}(g)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^2)}^2 + \|g - \text{Proj}_{H_2^{1,2}}(g)\|_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^2)}^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (108)$$

It then follows that  $g^n \rightarrow_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^2)} \text{Proj}_{H_2^{1,2}}(g)$ , so  $H_2^{1,2}$  is closed.  $\square$

Now we are ready to show the closedness of  $H_2$ .

**Proposition 41.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the subspace  $H_2 \subset \mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$  is closed.*

*Proof of Proposition 41.* We use the representation of  $H_2$  given in Lemma 36. Take any Cauchy sequence

$$T^n := \sum_{i < j} [f_{2,0}^n(X_i, X_j) + f_{0,2}^n(Y_i, Y_j)] + \sum_{i=1}^N f_{1,1}^n(X_i, Y_i) + \sum_{i \neq j} f_{1,1'}^n(X_i, Y_j),$$

we must have  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[(T^n - T^m)^2] \rightarrow 0$  as  $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $g^n(x, x', y, y') := f_{2,0}^n(x, x') + f_{0,2}^n(y, y') + f_{1,1'}^n(x, y') + f_{1,1'}^n(x', y)$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu[(T^n - T^m)^2] &= \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \left( \sum_{i < j} (g^n - g^m)(X_i, X_j, Y_i, Y_j) \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^N (f_{1,1}^n - f_{1,1}^m)(X_i, Y_i) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{N(N-1)}{2} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ ((g^n - g^m)(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2))^2 \right] + N \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ ((f_{1,1}^n - f_{1,1}^m)(X_1, Y_1))^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

so we get, as  $n, m \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ ((g^n - g^m)(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2))^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_\mu \left[ ((f_{1,1}^n - f_{1,1}^m)(X_1, Y_1))^2 \right] \rightarrow 0. \quad (109)$$

Furthermore, since  $g^n(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2), f_{1,1}^n(X_1, Y_1) \in H_0^\perp \cap H_1^\perp$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[g^n(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) \mid X_1, Y_1] = 0$ , there exist  $g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2), f_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) \in H_0^\perp \cap H_1^\perp$  such that  $\mathbb{E}_\mu[g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) \mid X_1, Y_1] = 0$ ,

$$g^n(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)} g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) \quad \text{and} \quad f_{1,1}^n(X_1, Y_1) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)} f_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1). \quad (110)$$

Consequently,  $T^n$  admits the limit

$$T^n \rightarrow_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)} \sum_{i < j} g(X_i, X_j, Y_i, Y_j) + \sum_{i=1}^N f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_i).$$

It then suffices to show the limit lives in  $H_2$ . According to (110), it holds that

$$g^n(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) + f_{1,1}^n(X_1, Y_1) + f_{1,1}^n(X_2, Y_2) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^2)} g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) + f_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) + f_{1,1}(X_2, Y_2).$$

Since  $g^n(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) + f_{1,1}^n(X_1, Y_1) + f_{1,1}^n(X_2, Y_2) \in H_2^{i,j}$  and  $H_2^{i,j}$  is closed as shown in Proposition 40, we get that  $g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) + f_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) + f_{1,1}(X_2, Y_2) \in H_2^{i,j}$  and thus has the form

$$f_{2,0}(X_1, X_2) + f_{0,2}(Y_1, Y_2) + f_{1,1'}(X_1, Y_2) + f_{1,1'}(X_2, Y_1) + \hat{f}_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) + \hat{f}_{1,1}(X_2, Y_2),$$

where  $f_{2,0} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes P)$ ,  $f_{0,2} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(Q \otimes Q)$  are symmetric and  $\hat{f}_{1,1} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(\mu)$ ,  $f_{1,1'} \in \mathbf{L}_{0,0}^2(P \otimes Q)$  are the same up to an affine term. Taking conditional expectation given  $(X_1, Y_1)$  leads to  $f_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1) = \hat{f}_{1,1}(X_1, Y_1)$ , and thus  $g(X_1, X_2, Y_1, Y_2) = f_{2,0}(X_1, X_2) + f_{0,2}(Y_1, Y_2) + f_{1,1'}(X_1, Y_2) + f_{1,1'}(X_2, Y_1)$ . Hence, the limit  $\sum_{i < j} g(X_i, X_j, Y_i, Y_j) + \sum_{i=1}^N f_{1,1}(X_i, Y_i) \in H_2$ , and the closedness of  $H_2$  follows.  $\square$

## Appendix D: Notation

We give a table of notation in Table 1.

TABLE 1  
Notation.

---

<u>Sets and Functions:</u>	
$[N]$	set of integers from 1 to $N$ .
$\mathcal{S}_N$	set of permutations of $[N]$ .
$\#\sigma$	number of cycles in the permutation $\sigma$ .
$\mathbf{1}$	constant function with value 1.
$f \oplus g$	direct sum of $f$ and $g$ , i.e., $(f \oplus g)(x, y) = f(x) + g(y)$ .
$c$	cost function.
$\eta$	general test function.
$\tilde{\eta}$	degenerate test function defined in (28).
$f^{\otimes}(X, Y_{\sigma})$	product $\prod_{i=1}^N f(X_i, Y_{\sigma_i})$ .
<u>Probability and Statistics:</u>	
$P, Q$	probability distributions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ .
$\hat{P}^N, \hat{Q}^N$	empirical measures of samples $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ from $P$ and $Q$ , respectively.
$P \otimes Q$	product measure of $P$ and $Q$ .
$\mathbb{E}$	expectation under the product measure $(P \otimes Q)^N$ .
$\mathbb{E}_{\mu}$	expectation under the measure $\mu^N$ .
$\mathbf{L}^p(\nu)$	space of functions whose $p$ th power is integrable with respect to the measure $\nu$ .
Proj	$\mathbf{L}^2$ projection.
$H_0$	subspace of $\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$ spanned by constant functions.
$H_1$	subspace of $\mathbf{L}^2(\mu^N)$ spanned by mean-zero linear functions; defined in (29).
$\mathcal{L}_1$	first order chaos, also the projection of $T_N$ on $H_1$ .
<u>Operators:</u>	
$I_{\nu}$	identity operator on $\mathbf{L}^2(\nu)$ .
$\mathcal{T}$	swap operator, i.e., $\mathcal{T}f(x, y) = f(y, x)$ .
$\mathcal{A}$	integral operator mapping from $\mathbf{L}^2(P)$ to $\mathbf{L}^2(Q)$ with kernel $\xi : (x, y) \mapsto \xi(x, y)$ .
$\mathcal{A}^*$	integral operator mapping from $\mathbf{L}^2(Q)$ to $\mathbf{L}^2(P)$ with kernel $\xi : (y, x) \mapsto \xi(x, y)$ .
$\{s_k\}_{k \geq 0}$	singular values of $\mathcal{A}$ .
$\{\alpha_k\}_{k \geq 0}$	singular functions of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^*$ .
$\{\beta_k\}_{k \geq 0}$	singular functions of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^*$ .
$\mathcal{A}_1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_2$	tensor product of operators $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ .
$\mathcal{B}$	operator $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}^*)$ defined on $\mathbf{L}^2(P \otimes Q)$ .
<u>Optimal transport:</u>	
$\mathbf{C}(P, Q)$	optimal cost of transporting $P$ to $Q$ with cost function $c$ .
$\Pi(P, Q)$	space of probabilities defined on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with marginals $P$ and $Q$ .
$\mu_{\epsilon}$	(static) Schrödinger bridge connecting $P$ to $Q$ at temperature $\epsilon$ .
$\hat{\mu}_{\epsilon}^N$	discrete Schrödinger bridge connecting $\hat{P}^N$ to $\hat{Q}^N$ at temperature $\epsilon$ .
$T_N$	see (14).
$\xi$	nonnegative function on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $d\mu/(d(P \otimes Q))(x, y) = \xi(x, y)$ .
$\theta$	mean of $\eta(X, Y)$ under the measure $\mu$ , i.e., $\int \eta(x, y)\mu(x, y)dxdy$ .
$\eta_{1,0}, \eta_{0,1}$	see (15).

---