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#### Abstract

We adapt Stein's method to obtain Berry-Esseen type error bounds in the multivariate central limit theorem for non-stationary processes generated by timedependent compositions of uniformly expanding dynamical systems. In a particular case of random dynamical systems with a strongly mixing base transformation, we derive an error estimate of order $O\left(N^{-1 / 2}\right)$ in the quenched multivariate CLT, provided that the covariance matrix "grows linearly" with the number of summands $N$. The error in the normal approximation is estimated for the class of all convex sets.


## 1. Introduction

Consider a partial sum $W=\sum_{n=1}^{N} X^{n}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$-valued random vectors $X^{n}$ with $\mathbf{E}\left(X^{n}\right)=$ $0, \operatorname{Cov}(W)=\mathbf{I}_{d \times d}$, and $\beta_{3}=\sum_{n=1}^{N} \mathbf{E}\left[\left\|X^{n}\right\|^{3}\right]<\infty$. In the case of independent and identically distributed summands $X^{n}$, Bentkus [4] established the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)=O\left(d^{1 / 4} \beta_{3}\right) \quad \text { as } N \rightarrow \infty \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the non-smooth metric

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right):=\sup _{C \in \mathcal{C}}\left|\mathbf{P}(W \in C)-\mathcal{N}_{d}(C)\right|, \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{d}$ denotes the $d$-dimensional standard multivariate normal distribution, and $\mathcal{C}$ the class of all convex subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$. The result is a natural extension of the classical univariate Berry-Esseen theorem. In the literature of probability theory, various techniques have been employed to investigate such bounds, particularly focusing on their dependence on the dimension $d$, with (1) being the best known rate in terms of $d$ for general independent variables. Götze [15] used Stein's method combined with induction to derive $d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)=O\left(d \beta_{3}\right)$ for independent (not necessarily identically distributed) summands. More recently, building on the arguments of Bentkus and Götze, Raič [30] established a certain generalization of (1) in the case of independent summands.

Beyond the independent case, variants of (1) were derived for bounded locally dependent random vectors by Rinott and Rotar [31], Fang and Röllin [12], and Fang [11], with applications to normal approximation for certain graph related statistics. In particular, [11] established $d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)=O\left(d^{1 / 4} N \beta^{3}\right)$ in the case of decomposable random vectors with $\left\|X^{n}\right\|_{\infty} \leq \beta$, where the dependence structure is described in terms of certain dependency neighborhoods. In this bound the constant grows (polynomially) as the "size" of the dependency neighborhood increases.

[^0]Here, our main objective is to develop a version of Fang's approach [11] that is suitable for multivariate normal approximation with respect to non-smooth metrics such as (1) in the case of weakly dependent processes generated by dynamical systems with good mixing properties. We study the problem in a setting of non-stationary processes of the form $X^{n}=\varphi_{n} \circ T_{n} \cdots \circ T_{1}$, where $T_{n}: M \rightarrow M$ is a full-branch Gibbs-Markov map of a bounded metric space $M$, and $\varphi_{n}: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d}$ is a regular function. A distinctive feature of the approach described here is that it allows us to essentially reduce the problem of estimating $d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)$ to a set of correlation decay conditions (see Lemma 4.3). For the aforementioned model we verify these conditions by implementing the coupling technique due to Korepanov, Kosloff, and Melbourne [22].

We pause to highlight a couple of key steps in the general strategy of [11, 15, 30] for bounding $d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)$. After approximating $\mathbf{1}_{C} \approx h_{C, \varepsilon}$ by a suitable family of smooth functions $\left\{h_{C, \varepsilon}\right\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ with $\lim _{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} h_{C, \varepsilon}=\mathbf{1}_{C}$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}$, the Stein equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta f(w)-w^{T} \nabla f(w)=h_{C, \varepsilon}(w)-\mathcal{N}_{d}\left[h_{C, \varepsilon}\right] \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is solved to reduce the problem of bounding $d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)$ to controlling $\mathbf{E}[f(W)-$ $W^{T} \nabla f(W)$ ] for $f=f_{h_{C, \varepsilon}}$ in the class of solutions to (3), up to an error term resulting from the approximation step. Here, $\mathcal{N}_{d}[h]:=(2 \pi)^{-d / 2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} h(x) e^{-\|x\|^{2} / 2} d x$ for a function $h: \mathbb{R}^{d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In [11], the remaining term $\mathbf{E}\left[f(W)-W^{T} \nabla f(W)\right]$ is controlled through a carefully crafted decomposition that exploits the local dependence structure of $\left(X^{n}\right)$ and the explicit form of $f$. Starting from this decomposition, given a suitable choice of the parameter $\varepsilon$ that governs the regularity of $h_{C, \varepsilon}$, an estimate of the form $\left|\mathbf{E}\left[f(W)-W^{T} \nabla f(W)\right]\right| \leq 2^{-1} d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)+O\left(d^{1 / 4} N \beta^{3}\right)$ is derived. In the case of dynamical systems, the situation is more complicated due to the fact that the process is weakly dependent, prompting us to introduce a new type of decomposition for $\mathbf{E}\left[f(W)-W^{T} \nabla f(W)\right]$, which will be given in Section 4.3. In our setting, a direct application of the decomposition from [11] would only yield sub-optimal rates in terms of $N$, even in the case of a single measure-preserving transformation.

The problem of normal approximation in the context of chaotic dynamical systems has been previously addressed by several authors, using different metrics and techniques. Fourier analytic techniques [13, 16, 33] and martingale approximations [2, 6,27$]$ have been successfully adapted to establish (univariate) Berry-Esseen bounds and other refinements of the central limit theorem - including Edgeworth expansions, local limit theorems, and weak invariance principles with rates of convergence - for a wide range of stationary uniformly hyperbolic and non-uniformly hyperbolic systems. Recently, extensions of these techniques for non-stationary processes of dynamical systems have been under active investigation; see, for instance, $[5,8,10,26]$ and references therein.

Building on an approach due to Rio [32], certain weak-dependence conditions for a rate of convergence $d_{\mathcal{K}}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)=O\left(N^{-1 / 2}\right)$ in the multivariate central limit theorem with respect to the Kantorovich distance $d_{\mathcal{K}}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)=\sup _{\|h\|_{\text {Lip } \leq 1}}\left|\mathbf{E}[h(W)]-\mathcal{N}_{d}[h]\right|$ of Lipschitz continuous test functions were given in [29]. The result applies to Sinai billiards [29], Axiom A diffeomorphisms [35], and Pomeau-Manneville type interval maps [24], among others. The present work is partly based on [20,25], where an adaptation of Stein's method for smooth metrics such as $d_{\mathcal{K}}$ was developed in the context of chaotic dynamical systems. We emphasize that, due to the inductive step that is needed to treat non-smooth metrics such as (2) through Stein's method, the results of this paper are not a direct consequence of $[20,25]$ but require the development of new ideas. To conclude, we mention that in the different dynamical systems setting of Poisson approximation
related to hitting time statistics for shrinking sets, Stein's method has been implemented in $[7,14,18,19]$.

Organization and notation. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define the model to be studied in the rest of the paper and state our results. In Section 3, we review preliminaries related to Stein's method and decorrelation properties of the dynamical system under consideration. In Section 4, we prove our main result. Appendix A contains the proof of a decorrelation property mentioned in Section 3.

Throughout the paper, we denote by $\|x\|$ the Euclidean norm of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, and by $\|A\|_{s}=\sup \{\|A x\|:\|x\|=1\}$ the spectral norm of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$. Moreover, $\lambda_{\min }(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max }(A)$ denote respectively the minimum and maximum eigenvalue of $A$. For a function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on a measure space $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$, we write $\mu(f)=\int_{X} f d \mu$.

## 2. Setting and statement of main result

2.1. A time-dependent expanding dynamical system. Let $(M, d)$ be a metric space with $\operatorname{diam}(M) \leq 1$. We endow $M$ with its Borel sigma-algebra $\mathcal{B}$. Suppose that $\lambda$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the collection of all transformations $T: M \rightarrow M$ which admit a countable ${ }^{1}$ measurable partition $\mathcal{A}_{1}(T)$ of $M$, such that for each $a \in \mathcal{A}_{1}(T)$, the map $T: a \rightarrow M$ is a measurable bijection.

We consider sequences $\left(T_{n}\right)$ of maps in $\mathcal{M}$. Time-dependent compositions along the given sequence are denoted as follows:

$$
\mathcal{T}_{\ell, k}:=T_{k} \circ \cdots \circ T_{\ell}, \quad \mathcal{T}_{k}:=\mathcal{T}_{1, k},
$$

where the convention is that $\mathcal{T}_{\ell, k}=\operatorname{id}_{M}$ whenever $k<\ell$. For each $n \geq 1$, define

$$
\mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{n}\right)=\bigvee_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{T}_{i-1}^{-1} \mathcal{A}_{1}\left(T_{i}\right)
$$

That is, $\mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{n}\right)$ consists of "cylinder" sets of the form $A_{1} \cap \mathcal{T}_{1}^{-1} A_{2} \cap \cdots \cap \mathcal{T}_{n-1}^{-1} A_{n}$, where $A_{i} \in \mathcal{A}_{1}\left(T_{i}\right)$. For each $j, k \geq 1$, define

$$
\Lambda_{j, k}=\inf _{a \in \mathcal{A}_{1}\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, k}\right)} \inf _{\substack{x, y \in a \\ x \neq y}} \frac{d\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, k} x, \mathcal{T}_{j, k} y\right)}{d(x, y)}
$$

Given $\psi: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in(0,1]$, set

$$
|\psi|_{\alpha}=\sup _{x \neq y} \frac{|\psi(x)-\psi(y)|}{d(x, y)^{\alpha}}, \quad\|u\|_{\infty}=\|u\|_{\infty}+|u|_{\alpha},
$$

and if $\psi \geq 0$,

$$
|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell}=|\log \psi|_{\alpha}=\sup _{x \neq y} \frac{|\log \psi(x)-\log \psi(y)|}{d(x, y)^{\alpha}},
$$

where we adopt the conventions $\log 0=-\infty$ and $\log 0-\log 0=0$.
Remark 2.1. For any $\psi: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{+}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{-|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell}} \int_{M} \psi d \lambda \leq \psi \leq e^{|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell}} \int_{M} \psi d \lambda . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^1]Hence,

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\psi|_{\alpha} \leq|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell} e^{|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell}} \int_{M} \psi d \lambda . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the opposite direction, we have that

$$
|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq\left(\inf _{M} \psi\right)^{-1}|\psi|_{\alpha} .
$$

We assume that the sequential compositions $\mathcal{T}_{\ell, k}$ are uniformly expanding with bounded distortions in the following sense:
Assumptions (UE).
(UE:1) There exist $p \geq 1$ and $\Lambda>1$ such that

$$
\Lambda_{j, p+j-1} \geq \Lambda \quad \forall j \geq 1
$$

(UE:2) There exists $K^{\prime} \geq 1$ such that, for all $j \geq 1$, and all $1 \leq \ell<p$,

$$
d(x, y) \leq K^{\prime} d\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, j+\ell-1} x, \mathcal{T}_{j, j+\ell-1} y\right) \quad \forall x, y \in a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, j+\ell-1}\right)
$$

(UE:3) There exists $K>0$ such that

$$
\zeta_{a}^{(j, j+k)}=\frac{d\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, j+k}\right)_{*}\left(\left.\lambda\right|_{a}\right)}{d \lambda} \quad \text { satisfies } \quad\left|\zeta_{a}^{(j, j+k)}\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq K
$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, j+k}\right)$, and all $j \geq 1, k \geq 0$.
Basic examples of maps satisfying (UE:1-3) are given by "folklore" piecewise smooth expanding maps of the unit interval.

Example 2.1 (Piecewise expanding interval maps). Let $\lambda$ be the Lebesgue measure on $I:=[0,1]$. Denote by $\mathcal{E}_{a, B}$ the family of all maps $T: I \rightarrow I$ with the following properties:

- There exists a countable $(\bmod \lambda)$ partition $\mathcal{A}_{1}(T)=\left\{I_{j}\right\}$ of $I$ into open subintervals $I_{j}$ such that $T$ can be extended to a $C^{2}$ diffeomorphism $T_{j}: \bar{I}_{j} \rightarrow I$ on the closure $\bar{I}_{j}$ of each $I_{j}$;
- $\sup _{x \in I}\left|T^{\prime \prime}(x)\right| /\left(T^{\prime}(x)\right)^{2} \leq B<\infty$;
- $\inf _{x \in I}\left|T^{\prime}(x)\right| \geq a>0$.

Then, $\left(T_{k}\right), T_{k} \in \mathcal{E}_{a, B}$, satisfies (UE:1-3) provided that there exist $p \geq 1$ and $\Lambda>1$ such that

$$
\inf _{x \in I}\left|\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, p+j-1}\right)^{\prime}(x)\right| \geq \Lambda \quad \forall j \geq 1
$$

2.2. Main result. For $\alpha \in(0,1]$ and $A>0$, denote by $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$ the class of all densities $\rho$ such that $|\rho|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq A$. Let $\mu$ be a probability measure whose density $\rho$ lies in $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$, and let $\left(\varphi_{n}\right)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of functions $\varphi_{n}: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d}, d \geq 1$, such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu\left(\varphi_{n} \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}\right)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad\left\|\varphi_{n}\right\|_{\alpha} \leq L \quad \forall n \geq 1 \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that the first of these two properties can be always recovered by centering. Namely, if $\psi_{n}: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d}$ satisfies $\left\|\psi_{n}\right\|_{\alpha} \leq L$, then for $\bar{\psi}_{n}:=\psi_{n}-\mu\left(\psi \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}\right)$ we have that $\mu\left(\bar{\psi}_{n} \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}\right)=0$ and $\left\|\bar{\psi}_{n}\right\|_{\alpha} \leq 2 L$.

For $N \geq 1$ and $0 \leq \delta_{1} \leq \delta_{2} \leq 1$, define

$$
S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)=\sum_{\delta_{1} N \leq n<\delta_{2} N} \varphi_{n} \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}, \quad S_{N}=S_{N}(0,1) .
$$

We consider these quantities as random vectors on the probability space $(M, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$. Further, we set

$$
\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)=\mu\left(S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right) \otimes S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right), \quad \Sigma_{N}=\Sigma_{N}(0,1)
$$

and

$$
W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)=\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right) S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right), \quad W_{N}=W_{N}(0,1)
$$

provided that $\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)$ is invertible.
The following theorem, which is our main result, gives an estimate on the distance between the law of $W$ and $\mathcal{N}_{d}$ in the sense of the non-smooth metric $d_{c}$ defined in (2). The estimate holds under a condition which roughly stipulates that the eigenvalues of $\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)$ have the same order of growth as $N \rightarrow \infty$.
Theorem 2.2. Let $N \geq 1$, and let $\left(T_{n}\right)$ be a sequence of transformations satisfying (UE:1-3). Suppose that the density of $\mu$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$ with $A>K$, and that (6) holds. Moreover, suppose that $\Sigma_{N}$ is invertible, and that for some constants $C_{0}, C_{0}^{\prime} \geq 1$ and $K_{0} \geq 0$ the following conditions hold for all $0 \leq \delta_{1} \leq \delta \leq \delta_{2} \leq 1$ :
(C1) if $\left|\delta_{2}-\delta\right| \geq\left|\delta-\delta_{1}\right|$,

$$
\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \leq \max \left\{C_{0}^{\prime}\left|\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right|^{-K_{0}}, C_{0} \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta, \delta_{2}\right)\right)\right\}
$$

(C2) if $\left|\delta_{2}-\delta\right|<\left|\delta-\delta_{1}\right|$,

$$
\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \leq \max \left\{C_{0}^{\prime}\left|\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right|^{-K_{0}}, C_{0} \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right)\right\} .
$$

Then, there exists a constant $\mathbf{C}$ whose value is determined by $A, \alpha, K, K^{\prime}, \Lambda$, such that

$$
d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}\left(W_{N}\right), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right) \leq\left(d^{4} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}+2\left(C_{0}^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2}\right) \max \left\{N \lambda_{\min }^{-3 / 2}\left(\Sigma_{N}\right), \lambda_{\min }^{-1 / 2}\left(\Sigma_{N}\right)\right\}
$$

In particular, if $\lambda_{\min }^{-1}\left(\Sigma_{N}\right)=o\left(N^{-2 / 3}\right)$, then $\mathcal{L}\left(W_{N}\right) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}_{d}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where $\xrightarrow{D}$ denotes convergence in distribution.
Remark 2.3. The proof shows a slightly stronger conclusion. Namely that, under the assumptions of Theorem 2.2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}\left(W\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right) \\
& \leq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2}\left(d^{4} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}+2\left(C_{0}^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2}\right) \max \left\{N \lambda_{\min }^{-3 / 2}\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right), \lambda_{\min }^{-1}\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

holds for all $0 \leq \delta_{1} \leq \delta_{2} \leq 1$, whenever $\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)$ is invertible. Conditions (C1) and (C2) are related to the inductive method used to derive the upper bound on $d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)$, which involves controlling the ratio $\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) / \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta, \delta_{2}\right)\right)$ for varying $\delta \in\left[\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right]$; see the proof of Lemma 4.1 for details. The condition is not optimal, but rather a choice of convenience formulated with slowly transforming or randomly varying transformations in mind. An application of the latter type is given in Theorem 2.5 below.

Remark 2.4. In the proof of Theorem 2.2, we use the memory loss property

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|P_{n} \cdots P_{1}(\varphi-\psi)\right\|_{\infty}=O\left(q^{n}\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $q \in(0,1), \varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$, and $P_{i}$ denotes the transfer operator associated with $\lambda$ and $T_{i}$. It can be seen from the proof that the exponential rate in (7) is never needed, but instead we only require

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{2}\left\|P_{n} \cdots P_{1}(\varphi-\psi)\right\|_{\infty}<\infty \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

However, as part of the proof, specifically in (41), it is essential that (7) holds with respect to the strong norm $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ as opposed to, say, $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1}}$. This obstacle has prevented us from
extending our results to non-uniformly expanding systems such as Pomeau-Manneville type interval maps, for which polynomial rates of memory loss in $L^{1}$ have been obtained in $[1,23]$. It would be interesting to explore whether the techniques of [28] could be used to address this limitation.
2.3. Random dynamical systems. We combine [21, Theorem 4.1] with Theorem 2.2 to derive an error bound in the quenched multivariate central limit theorem for random expanding dynamical systems with a strongly mixing base transformation. To define the model, let $\left(\Omega_{0}, \mathcal{F}_{0}\right)$ be a measurable space, and let $\mathbf{P}$ be a probability measure on the product space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})=\left(\Omega_{0}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{F}_{0}^{\mathbb{N}}\right)$, where $\mathbb{N}=\{1,2, \ldots\}$. Expectation with respect to $\mathbf{P}$ is denoted by $\mathbf{E}$. We assume that the shift transformation $\tau: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega,(\tau \omega)_{k}=\omega_{k+1}$, preserves $\mathbf{P}$, and that, associated to each $\omega \in \Omega$ is a sequence of maps ( $T_{\omega_{n}}$ ) from the family $\mathcal{M}$. Given $\omega \in \Omega$, for any $n \geq 1$ we write $\mathcal{T}_{n}=T_{\omega_{n}} \circ \cdots \circ T_{\omega_{1}}$. We then consider a random dynamical system specified by the following assumptions.

## Assumptions (RDS).

(RDS:1) The map $(\omega, x) \mapsto T_{\omega_{n}} \circ \cdots \circ T_{\omega_{1}}(x)$ is measurable between $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ for any $n \geq 0$.
(RDS:2) The random selection process is strongly mixing with rate $O\left(n^{-\gamma}\right)$, where $\gamma>0$. That is, for some constant $C>0$,

$$
\sup _{i \geq 1} \alpha\left(\mathcal{F}_{1}^{i}, \mathcal{F}_{i+n}^{\infty}\right) \leq C n^{-\gamma} \quad \forall n \geq 1
$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{1}^{i}$ is the sigma-algebra on $\Omega$ generated by the projections $\pi_{1}, \ldots, \pi_{i}$, $\pi_{k}(\omega)=\omega_{k} ; \mathcal{F}_{i+n}^{\infty}$ is the sigma-algebra generated by $\pi_{i+n}, \pi_{i+n+1}, \ldots ;$ and

$$
\alpha\left(\mathcal{F}_{1}^{i}, \mathcal{F}_{j}^{\infty}\right)=\sup _{A \in \mathcal{F}_{1}^{i}, B \in \mathcal{F}_{j}^{\infty}}|\mathbf{P}(A \cap B)-\mathbf{P}(A) \mathbf{P}(B)|
$$

(RDS:3) There exist $p \geq 1$ and $\Lambda>1$, and $K^{\prime} \geq 1$, such that, for $\mathbf{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$
d\left(\mathcal{T}_{p}(x), \mathcal{T}_{p}(y)\right) \geq \Lambda d(x, y) \quad \forall x, y \in a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{p}\right)
$$

and if $1 \leq \ell<p$, then for $\mathbf{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$
d(x, y) \leq K^{\prime} d\left(\mathcal{T}_{\ell} x, \mathcal{T}_{\ell} y\right) \quad \forall x, y \in a, \forall a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{\ell}\right)
$$

(RDS:4) There exists $K>0$ such that for $\mathbf{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$
\zeta_{a}^{(k)}=\frac{d\left(\mathcal{T}_{k}\right)_{*}\left(\left.\lambda\right|_{a}\right)}{d \lambda} \quad \text { satisfies } \quad\left|\zeta_{a}^{(k)}\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq K
$$

whenever $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{k}\right)$.
Since $\tau$ preserves $\mathbf{P}$, assumptions (RDS:3-4) are equivalent to saying that (UE:1-3) hold for $\mathbf{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.

Given a probability measure $\mu$ on $\mathcal{B}$ together with a function $\varphi: M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d}, d \geq 1$, we set $\varphi_{n}=\varphi-\mu\left(\varphi \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}\right)$ for each $n \geq 1$, and define

$$
S_{N}=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \varphi_{n} \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}, \quad \Sigma_{N}=\mu\left(S_{N} \otimes S_{N}\right), \quad W_{N}=\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2} S_{N}
$$

provided that $\Sigma_{N}$ is invertible. Note that all of these quantities depend on $\omega$.
Theorem 2.5. Consider a random dynamical system satisfying (RDS:1-4). Suppose that the density of $\mu$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$ with $A>K$, and that $\|\varphi\|_{\alpha} \leq L<\infty$ together with the following condition holds.
(V) $\sup _{N \geq 1} \mathbf{E}\left[v^{T} \Sigma_{N} v\right]=\infty$ for each unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}$.

Then, for $\mathbf{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$
d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}\left(W_{N}\right), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)=O\left(d^{4} N^{-1 / 2}\right) \quad \text { as } N \rightarrow \infty
$$

Proof. Throughout this proof, $\mathbf{C}$ denotes a constant determined by $\Lambda, p, K, K^{\prime}, \alpha, A$. The value of $\mathbf{C}$ is allowed to change from one display to the next. Analogous to the notation introduced in Section 3.3, we denote by $P_{i}$ the transfer operator corresponding to $\lambda$ and $T_{\omega_{i}}$, and use the notation in (21) to represent time-dependent compositions along the sequence $\left(P_{i}\right)$.

First, we verify that $N^{-1} \Sigma_{N}$ converges to a positive definite limit $\Sigma_{\infty}$ almost surely with a polynomial rate of convergence as $N \rightarrow \infty$. To this end, we fix an arbitrary unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ and define the real-valued quantities

$$
\widetilde{\varphi}_{n}=v^{T} \varphi_{n}, \quad \widetilde{S}_{N}=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \widetilde{\varphi}_{n} \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}, \quad \widetilde{\sigma}_{N}^{2}=\mu\left(\widetilde{S}_{N}^{2}\right), \quad \widetilde{W}_{N}=\widetilde{\sigma}_{N}^{-1} \widetilde{S}_{N}
$$

Note that $\mu\left(\widetilde{S}_{N}^{2}\right)=v^{T} \Sigma_{N} v$. We will verify Assumptions (SA1), (SA3) and (SA5) in [21], Assumptions (SA2) and (SA4) in the same paper being automatically true by stationarity of $\mathbf{P}$ and the strong mixing assumption (RDS:2).
(SA1): Denoting $X_{n}=\widetilde{\varphi}_{n} \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}$, by Corollary 3.8 we have the upper bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mu\left(X_{i} X_{j}\right)\right| \leq \mathbf{C} L^{2} q^{|i-j|} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\mathbf{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$, where $q \in(0,1)$ is determined by $\Lambda, p, K, K^{\prime}, \alpha, A$. Hence, (SA1) in [21] holds with $\eta(j)=\mathbf{C} L^{2} q^{j}$.
(SA3): Let $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$ denote the density of $\mu$. By Lemma A.2, there exists $\tilde{A} \geq A$ determined by $\Lambda, p, K, K^{\prime}, \alpha, A$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{r}(\rho) \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, \tilde{A}}$ holds for all $r \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. Hence, by Theorem 3.6, for P-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$
\left\|\mathcal{P}_{k}(\rho)-\mathcal{P}_{r+1, k}(\rho)\right\|_{L^{1}(\lambda)}=\left\|\mathcal{P}_{r+1, k}\left(\mathcal{P}_{r}(\rho)-\rho\right)\right\|_{L^{1}(\lambda)} \leq \mathbf{C} q^{k-r}
$$

holds whenever $k \geq r$. It follows that (SA1) in [21] holds with $\eta(j)=\mathbf{C} q^{j}$.
(SA5:) Since $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$ is bounded by (4), we easily obtain $\left\|d\left(\mathcal{T}_{n}\right)_{*} \mu / d \mu\right\|_{L^{2}(\mu)} \leq \mathbf{C}$ for P-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$. Hence, (SA5') in [21] is satisfied.

Having verified Assumptions (SA1-5) in [21], it now follows by [21, Theorem 4.1] and [21, Lemma 4.4] that there exist non-random $\Sigma_{\infty} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\psi>0$, such that for $\mathbf{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\max _{r, s}\left|N^{-1}\left[\Sigma_{N}\right]_{r, s}-\left[\Sigma_{\infty}\right]_{r, s}\right|=O\left(N^{-\psi}\right) \quad \text { as } N \rightarrow \infty \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, under condition (V) it follows by [21, Lemma B.1] that $\lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right)>0$. In particular, $\lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}^{-1}\right)=O\left(N^{-1} \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right)^{-1}\right)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, for P-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$.

It remains to verify (C1) and (C2) in Theorem 2.2. Fix $0 \leq \delta_{1} \leq \delta \leq \delta_{2} \leq 1$ with $\delta_{1}<\delta_{2}$ and an arbitrary unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$. Suppose that $\left|\delta_{2}-\delta\right|<\left|\delta-\bar{\delta}_{1}\right|$. Then,

$$
\begin{equation*}
v^{T} \Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right) v=v^{t} \Sigma_{N}(0, \delta) v-v^{t} \Sigma_{N}\left(0, \delta_{1}\right) v-2 v^{t} \mu\left(S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right) \otimes S_{N}\left(0, \delta_{1}\right)\right) v \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (9), for $\mathbf{P}$-a.e. $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|v^{t} \mu\left(S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right) \otimes S_{N}\left(0, \delta_{1}\right)\right) v\right| \leq \sum_{\delta_{1} N \leq i<\delta N} \sum_{0 \leq j<\delta_{1} N}\left|\mu\left(X_{i} X_{j}\right)\right| \leq L^{2} \mathbf{C} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (10), (11), and (12) it follows that for some constant $C>0$,

$$
v^{T} \Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right) v \geq \frac{1}{2} N\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right) v^{T} \Sigma_{\infty} v-d^{2} C \max \left\{1, N^{1-\psi}\right\}-L^{2} \mathbf{C}
$$

so that

$$
\lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right) \geq \frac{1}{2} N\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right) \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right)-d^{2} C \max \left\{1, N^{1-\psi}\right\}-L^{2} \mathbf{C}
$$

Similarly, we obtain

$$
\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \leq N\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right) \lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right)+d^{2} C \max \left\{1, N^{1-\psi}\right\}+L^{2} \mathbf{C}
$$

Consequently, for some constant $C_{1}>0$, whenever $N \geq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-1 / \max \{\psi, 1\}}\left(d^{2} C_{1} / \lambda_{\min }\right)^{1 / \max \{\psi, 1\}}$, we have

$$
\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \leq 4 \frac{\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right)}{\lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right)} \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right) \quad \text { for P-a.e. } \omega \in \Omega .
$$

For $N<\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-1 / \max \{\psi, 1\}}\left(d^{2} C_{1} / \lambda_{\min }\right)^{1 / \max \{\psi, 1\}}$, we have the trivial estimate

$$
\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \leq \mathbf{C} L^{2} N \leq \mathbf{C} L^{2}\left(d^{2} C_{1} / \lambda_{\min }\right)^{1 / \max \{\psi, 1\}}\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-1 / \max \{\psi, 1\}}
$$

Hence, (C1) follows with $K_{0}=1 / \max \{\psi, 1\}, C_{0}^{\prime}=\mathbf{C} L^{2}\left(d^{2} C_{1} / \lambda_{\min }\right)^{1 / \max \{\psi, 1\}}$, and $C_{0}=$ $4 \lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right) / \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right)$. The verification of Condition (C2) is almost verbatim the same. The desired estimate now follows by Theorem 2.2.

## 3. Preliminaries

3.1. Stein's method and smoothing. In this section, we present some preliminary definitions and results that are essential for deriving Berry-Esseen type bounds through Stein's method in the spirit of [11, 15, 30]. Our presentation follows [11].

We consider the Stein equation for the $d$-dimensional standard normal distribution:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta f(w)-w^{T} \nabla f(w)=h(w)-\mathbf{E}[h(Z)], \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Delta$ denotes the Laplacian operator, $h: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a given differentiable test function with bounded gradient, and $Z \sim \mathcal{N}_{d}$.

By a direct computation (see e.g. [15]) it can be verified that, defining

$$
g(w, \tau)=-\frac{1}{2(1-\tau)} \mathbf{E}[h(\sqrt{1-\tau} w-\sqrt{\tau} Z)-h(Z)]
$$

the function

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{h}(w)=\int_{0}^{1} g(w, \tau) d \tau \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a solution to (13). Given a function $f: \mathbb{R}^{d} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for brevity, we write $f_{r}(x)$ for the first order partial derivative $\partial f(x) / \partial x_{r}, f_{r s}(x)$ for the second order partial derivative $\partial^{2} f(x) / \partial x_{r} \partial x_{s}$, and so on. We denote by $\phi$ the density of $Z$. Then, the following relations can be verified using integration by parts:

$$
\begin{align*}
g_{r s}(w, \tau) & =-\frac{1}{2 \tau} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} h(\sqrt{1-\tau} w-\sqrt{\tau} z) \phi_{r s}(z) d z  \tag{15}\\
& =\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} h_{s}(\sqrt{1-\tau} w-\sqrt{\tau} z) \phi_{r}(z) d z  \tag{16}\\
g_{r s t}(w, \tau) & =\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} h(\sqrt{1-\tau} w-\sqrt{\tau} z) \phi_{r s t}(z) d z \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

If the test function $h$ in (13) is not smooth, as in the case of the metric (2), then the regularity of $f_{h}$ will not be sufficient in order to control the left hand side of (13) by Taylor expansion. For this reason, smoothing will be applied to the indicator $h=\mathbf{1}_{A}$ following Bentkus [4].

For each $\varepsilon>0$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}$, define

$$
h_{C, \varepsilon}(x)=\psi\left(\frac{\operatorname{dist}(x, C)}{\varepsilon}\right)
$$

where

$$
\psi(x)= \begin{cases}1, & x<0 \\ 1-2 x^{2}, & 0 \leq x<\frac{1}{2} \\ 2(1-x)^{2} & \frac{1}{2} \leq x<1 \\ 0, & x \geq 1\end{cases}
$$

For any $\varepsilon>0$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}=\left\{C \subset \mathbb{R}^{d}: C\right.$ convex $\}$, let

$$
C^{\varepsilon}=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: \operatorname{dist}(x, C) \leq \varepsilon\right\} \quad \text { and } \quad C^{-\varepsilon}=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: \operatorname{dist}\left(x, \mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash C\right)>\varepsilon\right\} .
$$

Lemma 3.1 (Lemma 2.3 in [4]). For each $\varepsilon>0$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}, h=h_{C, \varepsilon}$ satisfies the following properties:
(i) $h(x)=1$ for all $x \in C$,
(ii) $h(x)=0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \backslash C$,
(iii) $0 \leq h(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$,
(iv) $\|\nabla h(x)\| \leq 2 \varepsilon^{-1}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$,
(v) $\|\nabla h(x)-\nabla h(y)\| \leq 8 \varepsilon^{-2}\|x-y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$.

Building on Fang's approach [11], we will employ the following two results to control error terms that arise when passing from indicators $\mathbf{1}_{C}$ of sets $C \in \mathcal{C}$ to their smooth approximations $h_{C, \varepsilon}$ :

Lemma 3.2 (See $[3,4])$. For any $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
\sup _{C \in \mathcal{C}} \max \left\{\mathcal{N}_{d}\left(C^{\varepsilon} \backslash C\right), \mathcal{N}_{d}\left(C \backslash C^{-\varepsilon}\right)\right\} \leq 4 d^{\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon .
$$

Lemma 3.3 (See [12]). Let $Y$ be an arbitrary $\mathbb{R}^{d}$-valued random vector. For any $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(Y), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right) \leq 4 d^{\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon+\sup _{C \in \mathcal{C}}\left|\mathcal{N}_{d}\left(h_{C, \varepsilon}\right)-\mathbf{E}\left(h_{C, \varepsilon}(Y)\right)\right|
$$

where $h_{C, \varepsilon}$ is the function from Lemma 3.1.
3.2. A decomposition for $\mu\left[f(W)-W^{T} \nabla f(W)\right]$. For $N \geq 1$ and a sequence of bounded $\mathbb{R}^{d}$-valued random vectors $X^{n}$ on $(M, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ with $\mu\left(X_{n}\right)=0$, define

$$
S=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} X^{n} \quad \text { and } \quad W=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Y^{n}
$$

where $Y^{n}=\Sigma^{-1 / 2} X^{n}$ and the covariance matrix $\Sigma:=\mu(S \otimes S)$ is assumed to be invertible. By Lemma 3.3, for any $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right) \leq 4 d^{\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon+\sup _{C \in \mathcal{C}}\left|\mu\left(h_{C, \varepsilon}(W)\right)-\mathcal{N}_{d}\left(h_{C, \varepsilon}\right)\right| . \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $h=h_{C, \varepsilon}$ with $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\varepsilon>0$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{N}_{d}(h)-\mu(h(W))=\mu\left[f_{h}(W)-W^{T} \nabla f_{h}(W)\right], \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f_{h}$ is given by (14). Hence,

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right) \leq 4 d^{\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon+\sup _{f \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_{\varepsilon}}\left|\mathbf{E}\left[f(W)-W^{T} \nabla f(W)\right]\right|, \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathfrak{F}_{\varepsilon}=\left\{f: f=f_{h}, h=h_{A, \varepsilon}, C \in \mathcal{C}\right\}$. That is, for a bound on $d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)$ it suffices to control the right-hand side of (20). This task is facilitated by a decomposition from $[25,34]$, which will be recorded in the lemma below for the reader's convenience.

For $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, define the auxiliary random vectors

$$
\begin{aligned}
& W^{n, m}=W-\sum_{i \in[n]_{m}} Y^{i}, \quad[n]_{m}=\{0 \leq i<N:|i-n| \leq m\} \\
& Y^{n, m}=W^{n, m-1}-W^{n, m}=\sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\
0 \leq i<N}} Y^{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

and set $\bar{X}=X-\mu(X)$ for a random vector $X$ on $(M, \mu, \mathcal{B})$.
Lemma 3.4. (Proposition 5.3 in [25]) Suppose $f \in C^{2}\left(\mathbb{R}^{d}, \mathbb{R}\right)$. Denote

$$
\delta^{n, m}(u)=D^{2} f\left(W^{n, m}+u Y^{n, m}\right)-D^{2} f\left(W^{n, m}\right)
$$

and

$$
\delta^{n, m}=\delta^{n, m}(1)=D^{2} f\left(W^{n, m-1}\right)-D^{2} f\left(W^{n, m}\right)
$$

Then, $\mu\left[\Delta f(W)-W^{T} \nabla f(W)\right]=\sum_{i=1}^{7} E_{i}$, where $E_{i}=E_{i}(f)$ are defined as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E_{1}=-\int_{0}^{1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \mu\left[\left(Y^{n}\right)^{T} \delta^{n, m}(u) Y^{n, m}\right] d u, \quad E_{2}=-\int_{0}^{1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu\left[\left(Y^{n}\right)^{T} \delta^{n, 0}(u) Y^{n}\right] d u \\
& E_{3}=-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2 m} \mu\left[\left(Y^{n}\right)^{T} \overline{\delta^{n, k}} Y^{n, m}\right], \quad E_{4}=-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} \mu\left[\left(Y^{n}\right)^{T} \overline{\delta^{n, k}} Y^{n, m}\right], \\
& E_{5}=-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \mu\left[\left(Y^{n}\right)^{T} \overline{\delta^{n, k}} Y^{n}\right], \quad E_{6}=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \mu\left[\left(Y^{n}\right)^{T} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \mu\left(\delta^{n, k}\right) Y^{n, m}\right], \\
& E_{7}=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu\left[\left(Y^{n}\right)^{T} \mu\left(\delta^{n, 0}\right) Y^{n}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

The following preliminary estimate is an immediate consequence of (18), (19), and Lemma 3.4:

Lemma 3.5. For any $\varepsilon>0$,

$$
d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right) \leq 4 d^{\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon+\sup _{f \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\varepsilon}} \sum_{i=1}^{7}\left|E_{i}(f)\right|,
$$

where $E_{i}(f)$ are as in Lemma 3.4.
3.3. Decorrelation properties of time-dependent expanding maps. In this section, we consider a fixed sequence $\left(T_{n}\right)$ of maps $T_{n}: M \rightarrow M$ satisfying Assumptions (UE:1-3) in Section 2.1. Let $P_{n}: L^{1}(\lambda) \rightarrow L^{1}(\lambda)$ be the transfer operator associated to $T_{n}$ and $\lambda$, defined by the property

$$
\int_{M} P_{n}(f) \cdot g d \lambda=\int_{M} f \cdot g \circ T_{n} d \lambda \quad \forall f \in L^{1}(\lambda) \forall g \in L^{\infty}(\lambda) .
$$

Time-dependent compositions along the sequence $\left(P_{n}\right)$ will be denoted by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{P}_{\ell, k}=P_{k} \cdots P_{\ell}, \quad \mathcal{P}_{k}=\mathcal{P}_{1, k} . \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Theorem 3.6 (Exponential loss of memory). There exist $C_{\#}$ and $q \in(0,1)$ which depend continuously on $\Lambda, p, K, K^{\prime}$ and $\alpha$, such that for any $u \in C^{\eta}$ with $\lambda(u)=0$, and any $i \geq 1$,

$$
\left\|\mathcal{P}_{i, n+i-1} u\right\|_{\alpha} \leq C_{\#} q^{n}|u|_{\alpha} \quad \forall n \geq 0
$$

Proof. The result follows by applying the explicit coupling argument due to Korepanov, Kosloff, and Melbourne [22, Section 3], with further details provided in Appendix A for completeness.

In the proof of Theorem 2.2, the memory loss property of Theorem 3.6 will be applied after conditioning a measure on elements of $\mathcal{A}_{1}\left(\mathcal{T}_{n}\right)$. To prepare for this step, we make the following simple observation:
Corollary 3.7. Let $\mu$ be a probability measure with density $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$. For $m \geq 1$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}_{1}\left(\mathcal{T}_{m}\right)$, define $\psi_{a}=\mu(a)^{-1} \psi \mathbf{1}_{a}$, provided that $\mu(a) \neq 0$. Then, for any $i \geq 1$ and $n \geq 0$,

$$
\left\|\mathcal{P}_{i, n+m+i-1}\left(\psi-\psi_{a}\right)\right\|_{\alpha} \leq 2\left(K+A\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha}\right) e^{\left(K+A\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha}\right)} C_{\#} q^{n}
$$

where $C_{\#}$ and $q$ are as in Theorem 3.6.
Proof. By Lemma A.1, for $\varphi \in\left\{\psi, \psi_{a}\right\}$,

$$
\left|\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}(\varphi)\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq K+|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell}\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha} .
$$

Hence, by (5)

$$
|\varphi|_{\alpha} \leq\left(K+|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell}\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha}\right) e^{\left(K+|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell}\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha}\right)}
$$

The desired estimate now follows from Theorem 3.6.

Another easy consequence of Theorem 3.6 is the exponential decay of correlations for $L^{1}$ versus $C^{\alpha}$ observables.

Corollary 3.8. Suppose that $\psi \in C^{\alpha}$ and $\phi \in L^{1}(\lambda)$. Let $\mu$ be a probability measure with density $\rho \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$. Then, for any $n \geq 1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{M} \varphi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m+n} \psi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m} d \mu-\int_{M} \varphi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m+n} d \mu \int_{M} \psi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m} d \mu\right| \\
& \leq 4\|\varphi\|_{L^{1}(\lambda)}\|\psi\|_{\alpha}\left(K+A\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha}\right) e^{K+A\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha}} C_{\#} q^{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $C_{\#}$ and $q$ are as in Theorem 3.6.

Proof. By basic properties of the transfer operator, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|\int_{M} \varphi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m+n} \psi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m} d \mu-\int_{M} \varphi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m+n} d \mu \int_{M} \psi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m} d \mu\right| \\
& \leq\|\varphi\|_{L^{1}(\lambda)}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{m+n}\left(\rho \cdot \psi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m}\right)-\lambda\left(\psi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m}\right) \mathcal{P}_{m+n}(\rho)\right\|_{\alpha} \\
& =\|\varphi\|_{L^{1}(\lambda)}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{m+1, m+n}\left[\psi \mathcal{P}_{m}(\rho)-\lambda\left(\psi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m}\right) \mathcal{P}_{m}(\rho)\right]\right\|_{\alpha} .
\end{aligned}
$$

For $f \in\left\{\psi \mathcal{P}_{m}(\rho), \lambda\left(\psi \circ \mathcal{T}_{m}\right) \mathcal{P}_{m}(\rho)\right\}$, by applying (4) and (5) along with Lemma A.1, we obtain

$$
|f|_{\alpha} \leq\|\psi\|_{\infty}\left|\mathcal{P}_{m}(\rho)\right|_{\alpha, \ell} e^{\left|\mathcal{P}_{m}(\rho)\right|_{\alpha, \ell}}+|\psi|_{\alpha} e^{\left|\mathcal{P}_{m}(\rho)\right|_{\alpha, \ell}} \leq 2\|\psi\|_{\alpha}\left(K+A\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha}\right) e^{K+A\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha}}
$$

Hence, the desired upper bound follows by Theorem 3.6.

## 4. Proof of Theorem 2.2

Let $N \geq 1,\left(T_{n}\right), \mu$, and $\left(\varphi_{n}\right)$ be as in Theorem 2.2, and assume that Conditions (C1) and (C2) in the same theorem hold. Fix $\tilde{p} \geq 0$ and $\tilde{A} \geq A$ as in Lemma A.2. We then have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}\right) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, \tilde{A}} \quad \forall j \geq 1, \forall m \geq 0 \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Throughout the proof, we denote by $\mathbf{C} \geq 1$ a system constant whose value is determined by $\Lambda, p, K, K^{\prime}, \alpha, A$. The value of $\mathbf{C}$ is allowed to change from one display to the next. Moreover, given two functions $f, g: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on a set $S$, we express $f(x) \lesssim g(x)$ to signify that there exists an absolute constant $C$ such that $f(x) \leq C g(x)$ for all $x \in S$.
4.1. Induction. Recall that, for $0 \leq \delta_{1} \leq \delta_{2} \leq 1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right) & =\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right) S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right), \quad \Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)=\mu\left(S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right) \otimes S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \\
S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right) & =\sum_{\delta_{1} N \leq n<\delta_{2} N} \varphi_{n} \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

To prepare for the inductive argument in $[11,15,30]$, define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{D}=\mathfrak{D}(N)=\sup \left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{3 K_{0} / 2} \frac{d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}\left(W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)\right.}{\max \left\{N\left\|\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right\|_{s}^{3},\left\|\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right\|_{s}\right\}}, \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the supremum is taken over all $0 \leq \delta_{1} \leq \delta_{2} \leq 1$ such that and $\lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right)>0$. Note that $\mathfrak{D}(N)<\infty$ because there are only finitely many terms

$$
\frac{d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}\left(W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)\right.}{\max \left\{N\left\|\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right\|_{s}^{3},\left\|\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right\|_{s}\right\}}
$$

included in (23), one of them being $d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}\left(W_{N}\right), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right) / \max \left\{N\left\|\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\right\|_{s}^{3},\left\|\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\right\|_{s}\right\}$ by our assumption. The aim is to derive an upper bound on $\mathfrak{D}(N)$ independent of $N$. To this end, we fix $0 \leq \delta_{1}<\delta_{2} \leq 1$ such that $\lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right)>0$. In the sequel, we shall use the following notation for convenience:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& X^{n}=\varphi_{n} \circ \mathcal{T}_{n}, \quad Y^{n}=\mathbf{1}_{\delta_{1} N \leq n<\delta_{2} N} b_{N}^{-1}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right) X^{n}, \quad b_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)=\Sigma_{N}^{1 / 2}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right), \\
& \bar{b}=\max \left\{N\left\|\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right\|_{s}^{3},\left\|\Sigma_{N}^{-1 / 2}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right\|_{s}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)=\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} Y^{n}$. For brevity, we will omit the dependencies on $N$ and $\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}$ from our notation, writing $W$ in place of $W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right), \Sigma$ in place of $\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)$, etc.

First, suppose that $\lambda_{\max }(\Sigma) \leq C_{0}^{\prime}\left|\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right|^{-K_{0}}$. Then, we have the trivial estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right) \leq\left(C_{0}^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2}\left|\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right|^{-3 K_{0} / 2} N\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

From now on, we assume that

$$
\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right)>C_{0}^{\prime}\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-K_{0}}
$$

By Conditions (C1) and (C2) in Theorem 2.2, we then have that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \leq C_{0} \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \text { if }\left|\delta_{2}-\delta\right| \geq\left|\delta-\delta_{1}\right|,  \tag{25}\\
& \lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \leq C_{0} \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right) \text { if }\left|\delta_{2}-\delta\right|<\left|\delta-\delta_{1}\right| . \tag{26}
\end{align*}
$$

We will derive an upper bound on $d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)$ by controlling each term $E_{i}$ in Lemma 3.4. This constitutes the technical part of the proof.
4.2. Decomposition of $E_{i}$. Let $\varepsilon \in(0,1)$ and $f=f_{h} \in \mathfrak{F}_{\varepsilon}$, where $h=h_{C, \varepsilon}$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Drawing inspiration from [11], we start by decomposing $E_{1}+E_{2}$ in Lemma 3.4 as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_{1}+E_{2} & =-\int_{0}^{1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \mu\left[\left(Y^{n}\right)^{T} \delta^{n, m}(u) Y^{n, m}\right] d u-\int_{0}^{1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu\left[\left(Y^{n}\right)^{T} \delta^{n, 0}(u) Y^{n}\right] d u \\
& =-\int_{0}^{1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left\{\left(f_{r s}\left(W^{n, m}+u Y^{n, m}\right)-f_{r s}\left(W^{n, m}\right)\right) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} d u \\
& -\int_{0}^{1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left\{\left(f_{r s}\left(W^{n, 0}+u Y^{n, 0}\right)-f_{r s}\left(W^{n, 0}\right)\right) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n}\right\} d u \\
& =-\int_{0}^{1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{0}^{1} \mu\left\{\left(g_{r s}\left(W^{n, m}+u Y^{n, m}, \tau\right)-g_{r s}\left(W^{n, m}, \tau\right)\right) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} d \tau d u \\
& -\int_{0}^{1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{0}^{1} \mu\left\{\left(g_{r s}\left(W^{n, 0}+u Y^{n}, \tau\right)-g_{r s}\left(W^{n, 0}, \tau\right)\right) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n}\right\} d \tau d u \\
& =\int_{0}^{1}\left[\int_{0}^{\varepsilon^{2}} R_{1}(\tau, u) d \tau+\int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1} R_{1}(\tau, u) d \tau+\int_{0}^{\varepsilon^{2}} R_{2}(\tau, u) d \tau+\int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1} R_{2}(\tau, u) d \tau\right] d u
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_{1}=R_{1}(\tau, u)=-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left\{\gamma_{r, s}^{n, m}(u, \tau) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} \\
& R_{2}=R_{2}(\tau, u)=-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left\{\gamma_{r, s}^{n, 0}(u, \tau) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\gamma_{r, s}^{n, k}(u, \tau)=g_{r s}\left(W^{n, k}+u Y^{n, k}, \tau\right)-g_{r s}\left(W^{n, k}, \tau\right)
$$

Similarly, for $3 \leq i \leq 7$, we decompose $E_{i}=\int_{0}^{\varepsilon^{2}} R_{i}(\tau) d \tau+\int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1} R_{i}(\tau) d \tau$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{3} & =-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2 m} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left\{\overline{\gamma_{r, s}^{n, k}(1, \tau)} Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} \\
R_{4} & =-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left\{\overline{\gamma_{r, s}^{n, k}(1, \tau)} Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} \\
R_{5} & =-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left\{\overline{\gamma_{r, s}^{n, m}(1, \tau)} Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n}\right\} \\
R_{6} & =\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left(\gamma_{r, s}^{n, k}(1, \tau)\right) \mu\left(Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right) \\
R_{7} & =\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left(\gamma_{r, s}^{n, 0}(1, \tau)\right) \mu\left(Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

4.3. Decomposition of $R_{i}$. We will derive a decomposition for each $R_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq 7$, to facilitate controlling $E_{i}$ using Lemma 3.2 together with the decorrelation properties stated in Section 3.3. For convenience and brevity, we introduce the following notation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, k}=Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m} Y_{t}^{n, k}, \quad G_{r, s}^{n, k}=Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}, \\
& \eta^{n, m, k}(v, \tau, z)=h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)-h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, k}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right), \\
& \theta_{t}^{n, k, \ell}(\tau, z)=h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, k}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right) Y_{t}^{n, k}-h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, \ell}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right) Y_{t}^{n, \ell} .
\end{aligned}
$$

By employing (15) and subsequently applying the formula $f(x+a)-f(x)=\int_{0}^{1} a^{T} \nabla f(x+$ $v a) d v$, we can express

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{1} & =-\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \mu\left\{\gamma_{r, s}^{n, m}(u, \tau) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} \\
& =\frac{1}{2 \tau} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\left(h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.-h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, m}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\right) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r s}(z) d z \\
& =\int_{0}^{1} u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \mu\left\{\int _ { \mathbb { R } ^ { d } } h _ { t } \left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u v Y^{n, m}\right)\right.\right. \\
& \left.-\sqrt{\tau} z) \phi_{r s}(z) d z \cdot F_{r, s, t}^{n, m}\right\} d v .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let

$$
\mathfrak{C}_{r s t}=\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left[h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\right] \phi_{r s t}(z) d z}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z}
$$

so that

$$
\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mathfrak{C}_{r s t} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left[h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\right] \phi_{r s t} d z
$$

Using integration by parts, we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} h_{t}\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right) \phi_{r s}(z) d z \\
& =\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}\left(h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)-\mathfrak{C}_{r s t}\right) \phi_{r s t}(z) d z \\
& =\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}\left(h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\right. \\
& \left.-\mu\left[h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\right]\right) \phi_{r s t}(z) d z
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{1} & =\int_{0}^{1} u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)}\right. \\
& \left.\times F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v=S_{1,1}+S_{1,2}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{1,1} & =\int_{0}^{1} u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\left(\overline{h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)}\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.-\overline{h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, m}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)}\right) F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v \\
& =\int_{0}^{1} u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, m, m}(u v, \tau, z)} F_{r, s, t, t}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
S_{1,2}^{\prime}=u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, m}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z
$$

Finally, exploiting the trivial identity $\overline{h(-\sqrt{\tau} z)}=0$, we express $S_{1,2}^{\prime}$ as another telescopic sum, repeatedly subtracting blocks of size $m: S_{1,2}^{\prime}=S_{1,2}+S_{1,3}$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{1,2} & =u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\left(\overline{h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, m}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)}-\overline{h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, m 2}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)}\right)\right. \\
& \left.\times F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\right\} \cdot \phi_{r s t}(z) d z \\
& =u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, m, m 2}(0, \tau, z)} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m}\right\} \cdot \phi_{r s t}(z) d z,
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{1,3} & =u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=2}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\left(\overline{h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, m \ell}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)}\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.-\overline{h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, m(\ell+1)}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)}\right) \times F_{r, s, t}^{n, m}\right\} \cdot \phi_{r s t}(z) d z \\
& =u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=2}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, m \ell, m(\ell+1)}(0, \tau, z)} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z .
\end{aligned}
$$

By repeating essentially the same steps for each remaining term $R_{i}, 2 \leq i \leq 7$, we derive decompositions analogous to the one established for $R_{1}$. The resulting formulas are as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_{2}=S_{2,1}+S_{2,2}+S_{2,3}, \\
& S_{2,1}=\int_{0}^{1} u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, 0,0}(u v, \tau, z)} F_{r, s, t}^{n, 0,0}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v, \\
& S_{2,3}=u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, 0,1}(0, \tau, z)} F_{r, s, t}^{n, 0,0}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z, \\
& S_{2,4}=u \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, \ell, \ell+1}(0, \tau, z)} F_{r, s, t}^{n, 0,0}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z ; \\
& R_{3}=S_{3,1}+S_{3,2}+S_{3,3}, \\
& S_{3,1}=\int_{0}^{1} \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2 m} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, k, k}(v, \tau, z) Y_{t}^{n, k}} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v, \\
& S_{3,2}=\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2 m} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\theta_{t}^{n, k, k 2}(\tau, z)} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z, \\
& S_{3,3}=\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2 m} \sum_{\ell=2}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\theta_{t}^{n, k \ell, k(\ell+1)}(\tau, z)} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z ; \\
& R_{4}=S_{4,1}+S_{4,2}, \\
& S_{4,1}=\int_{0}^{1} \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, k, k}(v, \tau, z) Y_{t}^{n, k}} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v, \\
& S_{4,2}=\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\theta_{t}^{n, k \ell, k(\ell+1)}(\tau, z)} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z ; \\
& R_{5}=S_{5,1}+S_{5,2}, \\
& S_{5,1}=\int_{0}^{1} \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\left.\eta^{n, m, m}(v, \tau, z) Y_{t}^{n, m} G_{r, s}^{n, 0}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v, ~}\right. \\
& S_{5,2}=\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\theta_{t}^{n, m \ell, m(\ell+1)}(\tau, z)} G_{r, s}^{n, 0}\right\} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z ;
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_{6}=S_{6,1}+S_{6,2}+S_{6,3} \\
& S_{6,1}=-\int_{0}^{1} \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, k, k}(v, \tau, z)} Y_{t}^{n, k}\right\} \mu\left(G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right) \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v \\
& S_{6,2}=-\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, 0,1}(0, \tau, z)} Y_{t}^{n}\right\} \mu\left(G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right) \phi_{r s t}(z) d z \\
& S_{6,3}=-\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, k \ell, k(\ell+1)}(0, \tau, z)} Y_{t}^{n, k}\right\} \mu\left(G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right) \phi_{r s t}(z) d z
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_{7}=S_{7,1}+S_{7,2}+S_{7,3} \\
& S_{7,1}=-\int_{0}^{1} \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, 0,0}(v, \tau, z)} Y_{t}^{n}\right\} \mu\left(G_{r, s}^{n, 0}\right) \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v, \\
& S_{7,2}=-\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, 0,1}(0, \tau, z)} Y_{t}^{n}\right\} \mu\left(G_{r, s}^{n, 0}\right) \phi_{r s t}(z) d z \\
& S_{7,3}=-\frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, \ell, \ell+1}(0, \tau, z)} Y_{t}^{n}\right\} \mu\left(G_{r, s}^{n, 0}\right) \phi_{r s t}(z) d z
\end{aligned}
$$

4.4. Decorrelation bounds on $\eta^{n, m, k}$ and $\theta_{t}^{n, m, k}$. In this section, we establish decorrelation bounds on $\eta^{n, m, k}$ and $\beta_{t}^{n, m, k}$, which will be used to control the terms $\int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1} S_{i, j} d \tau$ derived in the previous section.

Given $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we decompose $W^{n, m}=W_{-}^{n, m}+W_{+}^{n, m}$ and $Y^{n, m}=Y_{-}^{n, m}+Y_{+}^{n, m}$, where

$$
W_{-}^{n, m}=\sum_{\substack{0 \leq i<N \\ i<n-m}} Y_{i}, \quad W_{+}^{n, m}=\sum_{\substack{0 \leq i<N \\ i>n+m}} Y_{i}, \quad Y_{-}^{n, m}=\mathbf{1}_{n-m \geq 0} Y^{n-m}, \quad Y_{+}^{n, m}=\mathbf{1}_{n+m<N} Y^{n+m}
$$

Slightly abusing notation, for fixed $v \in[0,1], \tau \in[0,1], z \in \mathbb{R}^{d}$, we write

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta^{n, m, k}(x, y) & =h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W_{-}^{n, m}(x)+W_{+}^{n, m}(y)+v\left(Y_{-}^{n, m}(x)+Y_{+}^{n, m}(y)\right)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right) \\
& -h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W_{-}^{n, k}(x)+W_{+}^{n, k}(y)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

First, we verify the following simple estimates that will be used frequently in the sequel.
Lemma 4.1. Assume (25) and (26). Let $0 \leq n<N, m, k, \ell \geq 0, \varepsilon>0, \tau \in[0,1]$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, v \in[0,1]$. Then,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{M}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)\right| d \mu(x) \\
& \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} L^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\left[d^{1 / 4}\left(\varepsilon+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\right)+\bar{b} \mathfrak{D}\right] \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \iint_{M^{2}}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)\right| d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \\
& \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} C_{0}^{3} L^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\left[d^{1 / 4}\left(\varepsilon+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\right)+\bar{b} \mathfrak{D}\right] \tag{28}
\end{align*}
$$

Remark 4.2. Conditions (C1) and (C2) have been devised for the purpose of obtaining (28).

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Recall that $h=h_{C, \varepsilon}$ is the function from Lemma 3.1. Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\|\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m+k}+v Y^{n, m+k}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z-\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, m+k+\ell}-\sqrt{\tau}\right)\right\| \\
& \leq(2 \ell+2) \sqrt{1-\tau} L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}
\end{aligned}
$$

we have the following relations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) \neq 0 \\
& \Longrightarrow \sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m+k}+v Y^{n, m+k}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z \in C^{\varepsilon+(2 \ell+2) \sqrt{1-\tau} L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}} \backslash C^{-(2 \ell+2) \sqrt{1-\tau} L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}} \\
& \Longrightarrow W^{n, m+k}+v Y^{n, m+k} \in D^{\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1-\tau}}+(2 \ell+2) L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}} \backslash D^{-(2 \ell+2) L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}},
\end{aligned}
$$

for some $D=D(\tau, z) \in \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, since

$$
\left\|W-\left(W^{n, m+k}+v Y^{n, m+k}\right)\right\| \leq(2(m+k)+3) L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}
$$

it follows that

$$
A_{1}:=\left\{x \in M: \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) \neq 0\right\} \subset\left\{W \in D^{a_{1}} \backslash D^{-a_{2}}\right\},
$$

where

$$
a_{1}:=\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1-\tau}}+2(k+m+\ell+3) L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}, a_{2}:=2(k+m+\ell+3) L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} .
$$

By Lemma 3.1-(iv), for all $x, y \in M$,

$$
\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)\right| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}(\ell+1) L \sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} .
$$

Hence, by employing Lemma 3.2, we now obtain (27):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{M}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)\right| d \mu(x) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}(\ell+1) L \sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \mu\left(A_{1}\right) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}(\ell+1) L \sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\left[d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)+\mathcal{N}_{d}\left(D^{a_{1}} \backslash D\right)+\mathcal{N}_{d}\left(D \backslash D^{-a_{2}}\right)\right] \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}(\ell+1) L \sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\left[\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \bar{b} \mathfrak{D}+d^{1 / 4}\left(a_{1}+a_{2}\right)\right] \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2} L^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\left[\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \bar{b} \mathfrak{D}+d^{1 / 4}\left(\varepsilon+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

To establish (28), we define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{W}^{n}(x, y) & =b^{-1} S\left(\delta_{1},(n / N)\right)(x)+b^{-1} S\left((n / N), \delta_{2}\right)(y) \\
& =\sum_{\delta_{1} N \leq i<n} Y^{i}(x)+\sum_{n \leq i<\delta_{2} N} Y^{i}(y) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, as above, we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{2} & :=\left\{(x, y) \in M \times M: \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) \neq 0\right\} \\
& \subset\left\{(x, y) \in M \times M: \widetilde{W}^{n}(x, y) \in D^{a_{1}} \backslash D^{-a_{2}}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Set $\delta=n / N$. We suppose that $\delta \in\left[\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right]$. Otherwise, we either have $\widetilde{W^{n}}(x, y)=$ $b^{-1} S\left(\delta_{1},(n / N)\right)(x)$ or $\widetilde{W}^{n}(x, y)=b^{-1} S\left((n / N), \delta_{2}\right)(y)$, and (28) reduces to (27).

Case $1^{\circ}$ : Suppose $\left|\delta_{2}-\delta\right|<\left|\delta-\delta_{1}\right|$. Then, $\left|\delta-\delta_{1}\right| \geq\left|\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right| / 2$ and, by (26), $\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)$ is invertible since $\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right)>0$. In this case we "discard" the part $b^{-1} S_{N}\left(\delta, \delta_{2}\right)(y)$ from $\widetilde{W}^{n}(x, y)$. We have

$$
\widetilde{W}^{n}(x, y) \in D^{a_{1}} \backslash D^{-a_{2}} \Longleftrightarrow b^{-1} S_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)(x) \in D_{1}^{a_{1}} \backslash D_{1}^{-a_{2}}
$$

where $D_{1}=D_{1}(\tau, z, y) \in \mathcal{C}$ is obtained by shifting $D$. Hence, recalling that

$$
W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)=\sum_{\delta_{1} N \leq i<\delta N} b_{N}^{-1}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right) X^{i}
$$

we have the relation

$$
(x, y) \in A_{2} \Longrightarrow W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)(x) \in D_{2}^{a_{1}^{\prime}} \backslash D_{2}^{-a_{2}^{\prime}}
$$

where $D_{2}=D_{2}\left(\tau, z, y, b_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right), b_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \in \mathcal{C}$ and, by (26),

$$
a_{1}^{\prime}=\frac{\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right)}{\lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right)} a_{1} \leq C_{0} a_{1}, \quad a_{2}^{\prime}=\frac{\lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right)}{\lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right)} a_{2} \leq C_{0} a_{2} .
$$

With this, we are in a position to apply Lemma 3.2:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{M^{2}}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)\right| d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}(\ell+1) L \sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}(\mu \otimes \mu)\left(A_{2}\right) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}(\ell+1) L \sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \int_{M} \mu\left(W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right) \in D_{2}^{a_{1}^{\prime}} \backslash D_{2}^{a_{2}^{\prime}}\right) d \mu(y) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}(\ell+1) L \sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\left(d^{1 / 4} C_{0}\left(a_{1}+a_{2}\right)+d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}\left(W_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)\right) \\
& \lesssim C_{0} \varepsilon^{-1}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2} L^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\left(d^{1 / 4}\left(\varepsilon+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+\left(\delta_{1}-\delta\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \max \left\{N\left\|b^{-1}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right\|_{s}^{3},\left\|b^{-1}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right\|_{s}\right\} \mathfrak{D}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Using $\delta-\delta_{1} \geq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right) / 2$ along with $\left\|b^{-1}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right\|_{s}^{-2}=\lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta\right)\right) \geq C_{0}^{-1} \lambda_{\max }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right) \geq$ $C_{0}^{-1} \lambda_{\min }\left(\Sigma_{N}\left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)\right)=C_{0}^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{-2}$, we thus obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{M^{2}}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)\right| d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \\
& \lesssim\left(\delta_{1}-\delta\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} C_{0}^{3} \varepsilon^{-1}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2} L^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\left(d^{1 / 4}\left(\varepsilon+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\right)+\bar{b} \mathfrak{D}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Case $2^{\circ}:\left|\delta_{2}-\delta\right| \geq\left|\delta-\delta_{1}\right|$. We can derive (28) as in Case $1^{\circ}$, but applying (25) instead of (26).

Lemma 4.3. Assume (25) and (26). Suppose that $0 \leq \tau \leq 1, \varepsilon>0, z \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, v \in[0,1]$, and $r, s, t \in\{1, \ldots, d\}$. Set

$$
A_{*}(m, k, \ell)=C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E}(m+k+\ell+1)^{2}, \quad q_{*}=\max \left\{q, \Lambda^{-\alpha / p}\right\}
$$

where

$$
\mathcal{E}=d^{1 / 4}\left(\varepsilon+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\right)+\bar{b} \mathfrak{D} .
$$

Then, the following upper bounds hold for all $0 \leq n<N, m, k, \ell \geq 0$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(v, \tau, z)} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\right\}\right| \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} A_{*}(m, k, \ell) q_{*}^{k / 2},  \tag{29}\\
& \left|\mu\left\{\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(v, \tau, z) F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\right\}\right| \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} A_{*}(m, k, \ell) q_{*}^{m / 2},  \tag{30}\\
& \left|\mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(v, \tau, z)} Y_{t}^{n, m}\right\}\right| \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} A_{*}(m, k, \ell) q_{*}^{k / 2},  \tag{31}\\
& \left|\mu\left\{\overline{\theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(\tau, z)} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\}\right| \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} A_{*}(m, k, \ell) q_{*}^{k / 2},  \tag{32}\\
& \left|\mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, m+k, m+k}(v, \tau, z) Y_{t}^{n, m+k}} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\}\right| \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} A_{*}(m, k, 0) q_{*}^{k / 2} . \tag{33}
\end{align*}
$$

4.4.1. Proof of (29). Let $0 \leq n<N, m, k, \ell \geq 0,0 \leq \tau \leq 1, \varepsilon>0, z \in \mathbb{R}^{d}, v \in[0,1]$, and $r, s, t \in\{1, \ldots, d\}$. Recall that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta^{n, m, k}(x, y) & =h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W_{-}^{n, m}(x)+W_{+}^{n, m}(y)+v\left(Y_{-}^{n, m}(x)+Y_{+}^{n, m}(y)\right)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right) \\
& -h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W_{-}^{n, k}(x)+W_{+}^{n, k}(y)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We aim to control

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I} & :=\mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(v, \tau, z)} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\right\} \\
& =\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) d \mu(x)-\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(y, y) d \mu(y) \int_{M} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) d \mu(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

To exploit the gap between the indices appearing in $\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}$ and $F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}$, we decompose

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{I}=\mathcal{I}_{1}+\mathcal{I}_{2}+\mathcal{I}_{3}, \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{1} & =\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) F_{r, s, t}^{n, m}(x) d \mu(x) \\
& -\iint_{M^{2}} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y) F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) d \mu(x), \\
\mathcal{I}_{2} & =\iint_{M^{2}} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y) F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) d \mu(x) \\
& -\iint_{M^{2}} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \int_{M} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu\left(x^{\prime}\right), \\
\mathcal{I}_{3} & =\iint_{M^{2}} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \int_{M} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu\left(x^{\prime}\right) \\
& -\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(y, y) d \mu(y) \int_{M} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu\left(x^{\prime}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Each of these three terms can be controlled through a similar procedure, which we carry out in detail for $\mathcal{I}_{1}$ in what follows.
$\mathcal{I}_{1}$ - Step 0. We decompose the integral $\int_{M}$ using the partition $\mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$ induced by a suitable iterate $\mathcal{T}_{i}$. After that we replace $F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}$ in $\mathcal{I}_{1}$ by a constant on each $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$ and control the error. Without loss of generality, we will assume that $\mu(a)>0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$. Otherwise we can replace $\mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$ with $\mathcal{A}_{*}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)=\left\{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right): \mu(a)>0\right\}$.

In the case of $\mathcal{I}_{1}$, we set $i=i(n, m, k)=\lceil n+m+k / 2\rceil$, and decompose

$$
\mathcal{I}_{1}=\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a}\left[\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)-\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y)\right] F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) d \mu_{a}(x)
$$

where $\mu_{a}$ denotes the probability measure with density $\rho_{a}=\mathbf{1}_{a} \rho / \mu(a)$.
By (UE:1), for any $x, y \in a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$, any $0 \leq j \leq n+m$, and any $r \in\{1, \ldots, d\}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|X_{r}^{j}(x)-X_{r}^{j}(y)\right| \leq L \Lambda \Lambda_{1}^{-k / 2} \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Lambda_{1}=\Lambda^{\alpha / p}>1$. Fix $c_{a} \in a$ for each $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$. Combining (27), (28) and (35), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_{1} & =\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a}\left[\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)-\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y)\right] F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) d \mu_{a}(x) \\
& =\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\left(c_{a}\right) \mu(a) \int_{a}\left[\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)-\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y)\right] d \mu_{a}(x) \\
& +O\left(\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \Lambda \Lambda_{1}^{-k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathcal{E}=d^{1 / 4}\left(\varepsilon+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\right)+\bar{b} \mathfrak{D}$ and the constant in the error term is absolute.
$\mathcal{I}_{1}-$ Step 1. By essentially repeating the argument from Lemma 4.1, we approximate

$$
\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) \approx \int_{a} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right)
$$

for $x \in a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$. More precisely, we have the following estimates.
Claim 4.4. Set

$$
B_{1}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right)=h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(\left(W_{-}^{n, m+k}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+W_{+}^{n, m+k}(x)\right)+v\left(Y_{-}^{n, m+k}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+Y_{+}^{n, m+k}(x)\right)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)
$$

and

$$
B_{2}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right)=h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W_{-}^{n, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+W_{+}^{n, m+k+\ell}(x)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right) .
$$

Then,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a}\left|B_{1}(x, x)-\int_{a} B_{1}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right| d \mu_{a}(x) \\
& \leq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} L^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m}(k+m+1) \mathcal{E} \tag{36}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a}\left|B_{2}(x, x)-\int_{a} B_{2}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right| d \mu_{a}(x) \\
& \leq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} L^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m}(k+m+\ell+1) \mathcal{E} . \tag{37}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof of Claim 4.4. Note that, if $x, x^{\prime} \in a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right), y \in M$, it follows by (UE:1) that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \| \sqrt{1-\tau}\left(\left(W_{-}^{n, m+k}(x)+W_{+}^{n, m+k}(y)\right)+v\left(Y_{-}^{n, m+k}(x)+Y_{+}^{n, m+k}(y)\right)\right) \\
& \left.-\sqrt{\tau} z-\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(\left(W_{-}^{n, m+k}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+W_{+}^{n, m+k}(y)\right)+v\left(Y_{-}^{n, m+k}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+Y_{+}^{n, m+k}(y)\right)\right)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right) \| \\
& \leq \sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|Y_{-}^{n, m+k}(x)-Y_{-}^{n, m+k}(x)\right\|+\sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|W_{-}^{n, m+k}(x)-W_{-}^{n, m+k}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right\| \\
& \leq\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \sqrt{1-\tau} L \Lambda \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m}+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \sqrt{1-\tau} L \mathbf{1}_{n-m-k>0} \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor(n-m-k) / p\rfloor} \sum_{j p \leq q<(j+1) p} d\left(\mathcal{T}_{q} x, \mathcal{T}_{q} x^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha} \\
& \leq\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \sqrt{1-\tau} L \Lambda \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m}+\mathbf{1}_{n-m-k>0}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \sqrt{1-\tau} L \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor(n-m-k) / p\rfloor} p \Lambda^{-\alpha\lfloor(n+m+k / 2) / p\rfloor+\alpha j} \\
& \leq 2 \sqrt{1-\tau}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \frac{\Lambda L p}{1-\Lambda_{1}^{-1}} \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m} \tag{38}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence, using (38) and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A:=\left\{x \in a: a(x, x)-\int_{a} B_{1}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) \neq 0\right\} \subset a \cap\left\{W \in D^{c_{1}} \backslash D^{-c_{2}}\right\} \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $D=D(\tau, z) \in \mathcal{C}$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_{1} & =\frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{1-\tau}}+2\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \frac{L \Lambda p}{1-\Lambda_{1}^{-1}}+2(k+m+3) L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \\
c_{2} & =2\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \frac{\Lambda L p}{1-\Lambda_{1}^{-1}}+2(k+m+3) L\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}
\end{aligned}
$$

In combination with Lemma 3.2, (38), and Lemma 3.1-(iv), (39) yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{a} \mu(a) \int_{a}\left|B_{1}(x, x)-\int_{Z} B_{1}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right| d \mu_{a}(x) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \frac{\Lambda L p}{1-\Lambda_{1}^{-1}} \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m} \sqrt{1-\tau} \mu\left(W \in D^{c_{1}} \backslash D^{-c_{2}}\right) \\
& \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \frac{\Lambda L p}{1-\Lambda_{1}^{-1}} \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m}\left\{d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)+\sqrt{1-\tau} d^{1 / 4}\left(c_{1}+c_{2}\right)\right\} \\
& \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \mathbf{C} L^{2}(k+m+1) \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m}\left\{\bar{b} \mathfrak{D}+d^{1 / 4}\left(\varepsilon+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\right)\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This establishes (36). To obtain (37), it suffices to replace $k+m$ with $k+m+\ell$ in the preceding proof.

By Claim 4.4 and the estimate established in Step 0,

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{I}_{1} & =\sum_{a} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\left(c_{a}\right) \mu(a) \int_{a}\left[\int_{a} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
& \left.-\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y)\right] d \mu_{a}(x)  \tag{40}\\
& +O\left(\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C} \Lambda_{1}^{-k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

$\mathcal{I}_{1}$ - Step 2. We replace the conditional measure $\mu_{a}, a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$, with the measure $\mu$ in (40), and estimate the resulting error term using Lemma 3.7.

Let $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$, and denote by $\tilde{\eta}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)$ the function that satisfies

$$
\widetilde{\eta}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x, \mathcal{T}_{n+m+k} y\right)=\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) .
$$

Recall that $\rho_{a}=\mathbf{1}_{a} \rho / \mu(a)$, where $\rho$ is the density of $\mu$. If $n+m+k \geq N$, then (40) $=0$. Otherwise, by Corollary 3.7,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\int_{M}\left[\int_{a} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right)-\int_{M} \int_{a} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, y\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu(y)\right]\left(\rho_{a}-\rho\right) d \lambda(x)\right| \\
& =\mid \int_{M}\left[\int_{a} \widetilde{\eta}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
& \left.-\int_{M} \int_{a} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, y\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu(y)\right] \circ \mathcal{T}_{n+m+k}\left(\rho_{a}-\rho\right) d \lambda(x) \mid \\
& \leq\left[\int_{M} \int_{a}\left|\widetilde{\eta}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right)\right| d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \lambda(x)\right. \\
& \left.+\int_{M} \int_{a}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, y\right)\right| d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu(y)\right]\left\|\mathcal{P}_{n+m+k-i+i}\left(\rho_{a}-\rho\right)\right\|_{\infty} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\inf _{M} \mathcal{P}_{n+m+k}(\rho)} \int_{M} \int_{a}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)\right| d \mu_{a}(x) d \mu(y) \mathbf{C} q^{k / 2} \\
& \leq \mathbf{C} \int_{M} \int_{a}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)\right| d \mu_{a}(x) d \mu(y) q^{k / 2} \tag{41}
\end{align*}
$$

where (22) was used in the last inequality. Combining (41) and (28), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
|(40)| & \leq \mathbf{C} L^{3}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3} \sum_{a} \mu(a) \int_{M} \int_{a}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)\right| d \mu_{a}(x) d \mu(y) q^{k / 2} \\
& \leq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C} q^{k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E}
\end{aligned}
$$

We have established the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mathcal{I}_{1}\right| \leq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C} q_{*}^{k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E}, \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
q_{*}=\max \left\{q, \Lambda^{-\alpha / p}\right\} .
$$

Estimates on $\mathcal{I}_{2}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{3}$. Since the remaining terms $\mathcal{I}_{2}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{3}$ can be treated in a manner similar to $\mathcal{I}_{1}$, we provide only an outline of the approach to deriving (42) for these two terms.

In the case of $\mathcal{I}_{2}$, we have $\mathcal{I}_{2}=0$ if $n-m-k<0$. Otherwise, we set $i=\lceil n-m-k / 2\rceil$, and decompose

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \iint_{M^{2}} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y) F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) d \mu(x) \\
& =\int_{M} \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) \int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y) d \mu_{a}(x) .
\end{aligned}
$$

As in the case of $\mathcal{I}_{1}$, we approximate

$$
\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y) \approx \int_{M} \int_{a} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, y\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu(y)
$$

on each $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$. For this, we use the following counterpart of Claim 4.4.

Claim 4.5. Set
$B_{1}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right)=h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(\left(W_{-}^{n, m+k}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+W_{+}^{n, m+k}(x)\right)+v\left(Y_{-}^{n, m+k}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+Y_{+}^{n, m+k}(x)\right)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)$
and

$$
B_{2}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right)=h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W_{-}^{n, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}\right)+W_{+}^{n, m+k+\ell}(x)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)
$$

Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a}\left|\int_{M} B_{1}(x, y) d \mu(y)-\int_{M} \int_{a} B_{1}\left(x^{\prime}, y\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu(y)\right| d \mu_{a}(x) \\
& \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} L^{2} C_{0}^{3}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}(k+m+1) \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E},
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a}\left|\int_{M} B_{2}(x, y) d \mu(y)-\int_{M} \int_{a} B_{2}\left(x^{\prime}, y\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu(y)\right| d \mu_{a}(x) \\
& \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} L^{2} C_{0}^{3}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}(k+m+\ell+1) \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m-\ell} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof of Claim 4.5. The result can be established by estimating as in the proof of Claim 4.4 , and then conducting a case-by-case analysis depending on the value of $\delta=n / N$, as in the proof of (28). The multiplicative factor $C_{0}^{3}$ arises as a consequence of the latter step. Details are left to the reader.

By Claim 4.5, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \iint_{M^{2}} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y) F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) d \mu(x) \\
& =\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) \int_{M} \int_{Z} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu_{a}(x) d \mu(y)  \tag{43}\\
& +O\left(\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} L^{5} C_{0}^{3}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4}(k+m+\ell+1) \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Moreover, by Corollary 3.7,

$$
\left|\int_{a} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m} d \mu_{a}-\int_{M} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m} d \mu\right| \lesssim L^{3}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3}\left\|\mathcal{P}_{n-m-i+i}\left(\rho_{a}-\rho\right)\right\|_{L^{1}(\lambda)} \lesssim L^{3}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3} \mathbf{C} q^{k / 2} .
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
(43) & =\int_{M} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu\left(x^{\prime}\right) \iint_{M^{2}} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \\
& +O\left(\mathbf{C} L^{3}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3} q^{k / 2} \iint_{M^{2}}\left|\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)\right| d \mu(x) d \mu(y)\right) \\
& =\int_{M} F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu\left(x^{\prime}\right) \iint_{M^{2}} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \\
& +O\left(\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} q^{k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \mathcal{E}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where (28) was used to obtain the last equality. Consequently, $\mathcal{I}_{2}$ is of order

$$
\begin{equation*}
O\left(\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} q_{*}^{k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \mathcal{E}\right) \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the constant in the error term is absolute.

Finally, for $\mathcal{I}_{3}$, we set $i=n$, and once more decompose

$$
\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) d \mu(x)=\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \int_{a} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) d \mu_{a}(x) .
$$

As in the proof of Claim 4.4, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a}\right|^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)-\int_{a} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) \mid d \mu_{a}(x) \\
& \leq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} L^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m}(k+m+\ell+1) \mathcal{E} \tag{45}
\end{align*}
$$

so that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) d \mu(x) \\
& =\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a} \int_{a} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, x\right) d \mu_{a}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu_{a}(x)  \tag{46}\\
& +O\left(\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} L^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \Lambda_{1}^{-k-m}(k+m+\ell+1) \mathcal{E}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Building upon (41) and (28), we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(46) & =\iint_{M^{2}} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \\
& +O\left(\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} C_{0}^{3} L^{2} \mathbf{C} q^{k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that $\mathcal{I}_{3}$ is also of order (44). This completes the proof of (29).
4.4.2. Proofs of (30), (31) and (33). The proofs of (30), (31) and (33) are similar to the proof of (29), the only notable difference being the way in which the iterated integrals appearing in the decomposition (34) are factored. For example, in the case of (30), we exploit the gap between the indices in $Y_{r}^{n}$ and $\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell} Y_{s}^{n, m} Y_{t}^{n, m}$ by decomposing

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) F_{r, s, t}^{n, m, m}(x) d \mu(x) \\
& =\int_{M} Y_{r}^{n}(x) \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) Y_{s}^{n, m}(x) Y_{t}^{n, m}(x) d \mu(x)=\mathcal{K}_{1}+\mathcal{K}_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{K}_{1} & =\int_{M} Y_{r}^{n}(x) \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) H_{s, t}^{n, m}(x, x) d \mu(x) \\
& -\iint_{M^{2}} Y_{r}^{n}(x) \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) H_{s, t}^{n, m}(x, y) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \\
\mathcal{K}_{2} & =\iint_{M^{2}} Y_{r}^{n}(x) \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) H_{s, t}^{n, m}(x, y) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \\
& -\int_{M} Y_{r}^{n}(x) d \mu(x) \iint Y_{r}^{n}(x) \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}\left(x^{\prime}, y\right) H_{s, t}^{n, m}\left(x^{\prime}, y\right) d \mu\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu(y),
\end{aligned}
$$

and we have used the notation

$$
H_{s, t}^{n, m}(x, y)=\left[Y_{-}^{n, m}(x)+Y_{+}^{n, m}(x)\right]_{s}\left[Y_{-}^{n, m}(x)+Y_{+}^{n, m}(y)\right]_{t} .
$$

Note that, since $\mu\left(Y^{n}\right)=0$, the last term in the expression of $\mathcal{K}_{2}$ vanishes. With only minor modifications, we can carry out the procedure described in the proof of (29) for the terms $\mathcal{K}_{1}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{2}$ to obtain (30). We omit the details.
4.4.3. Proof of (32). Similar to the proof of (29), the first step toward obtaining (32) is to decompose the integral

$$
\mathcal{J}:=\mu\left\{\overline{\theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(\tau, z)} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\}
$$

into three parts $\mathcal{J}=\mathcal{J}_{1}+\mathcal{J}_{2}+\mathcal{J}_{3}$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{1} & =\int_{M} \theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) G_{r, s}^{n, m}(x) d \mu(x)-\iint_{M^{2}} \theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y) G_{r, s}^{n, m}(x) d \mu(x), \\
\mathcal{J}_{2} & =\iint_{M^{2}} \theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y) G_{r, s}^{n, m}(x) d \mu(x) \\
& -\iint_{M^{2}} \theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \int_{M} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu\left(x^{\prime}\right) \\
\mathcal{J}_{3} & =\iint_{M^{2}} \theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \int_{M} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu\left(x^{\prime}\right) \\
& -\int_{M} \theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x) d \mu(x) d \mu(y) \int_{M} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\left(x^{\prime}\right) d \mu\left(x^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and, as with $\eta^{n, m, k}$, we have denoted

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \theta_{t}^{n, m, k}(x, y) \\
& =h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W_{-}^{n, m}(x)+W_{+}^{n, m}(y)+v\left(Y_{-}^{n, m}(x)+Y_{+}^{n, m}(y)\right)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\left[Y_{-}^{n, m}(x)+Y_{+}^{n, m}(y)\right]_{t} \\
& -h\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W_{-}^{n, k}(x)+W_{+}^{n, k}(y)\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\left[Y_{-}^{n, k}(x)+Y_{+}^{n, k}(y)\right]_{t} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Consider $\mathcal{J}_{1}$. Exactly as in Step 0 of the proof of (29) we set $i=\lceil n+m+k / 2\rceil$ and decompose

$$
\mathcal{J}_{1}=\sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)} \mu(a) \int_{a}\left[\theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)-\int_{M} \theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y)\right] G_{r, s}^{n, m}(x) d \mu_{a}(x)
$$

Fixing $c_{a} \in a$ for each $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{i}\right)$, it follows by combining (27), (28) and (35) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{1} & =\sum_{a} \mu(a) G_{r, s}^{n, m}\left(c_{a}\right) \int_{a}\left[\theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)-\int_{M} \theta_{t}^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y)\right] d \mu_{a}(x) \\
& +O\left(\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \Lambda_{1}^{k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \mathcal{E}\right) \\
& =\mathcal{J}_{1,1}+\mathcal{J}_{1,2}+O\left(\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \Lambda_{1}^{k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \mathcal{E}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{1,1} & =\sum_{a} \mu(a) G_{r, s}^{n, m}\left(c_{a}\right) Y_{-}^{n, m+k}\left(c_{a}\right) \int_{a}\left[\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)\right. \\
& \left.-\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y) d \mu(y)\right] d \mu_{a}(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_{1,2} & =\sum_{a} \mu(a) G_{r, s}^{n, m}\left(c_{a}\right) \int_{a}\left[\eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, x)\left[Y_{+}^{n, m+k}(x)\right]_{t}\right. \\
& \left.-\int_{M} \eta^{n, m+k, m+k+\ell}(x, y)\left[Y_{+}^{n, m+k}(y)\right]_{t} d \mu(y)\right] d \mu_{a}(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

From the proof of (29), we already know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mathcal{J}_{1, i}\right| \leq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \mathbf{C} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} q_{*}^{k / 2}(k+m+\ell+1)^{2} \varepsilon^{-1}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \mathcal{E} \tag{47}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for $i=1$. For $i=2$, we can repeat Steps 1 and 2 almost verbatim from the proof of (29) to obtain (47).

The remaining terms $\mathcal{J}_{i}, i=2,3$, can be handled by applying similar modifications as those discussed in the case of $\mathcal{J}_{1}$ to the procedures used for estimating $\mathcal{I}_{i}, i=2,3$, in the proof of (29).
4.5. Estimates on $\int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1} R_{i}(\tau) d \tau$. Starting from the decompositions established in Section 4.3, by invoking the upper bounds in Lemmas 4.1 and Lemma 4.3, it is now straightforward to verify that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1}\left|R_{i}\right| d \tau \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{1-3 K_{0} / 2} d^{3} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C} N\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \varepsilon^{-2} \mathcal{E} \tag{48}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds for all $1 \leq i \leq 7$. For instance, in the case of $R_{4}$, the desired inequality follows by applying (32) and (33):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1}\left|R_{4}\right| d \tau \leq \sum_{i=1}^{2} \int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1}\left|S_{4, i}\right| d \tau \\
& \leq \int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1} \int_{0}^{1} \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{\delta_{1}} \sum_{N \leq n<\delta_{2} N}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}, s, t=1}^{d}\left|\mu\left\{\overline{\eta^{n, k, k}(v, \tau, z) Y_{t}^{n, k}} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\}\right| \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d v d \tau \\
& +\int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1} \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} \sum_{\delta_{1} N \leq n<\delta_{2} N} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}\left|\mu\left\{\overline{\theta_{t}^{n, k \ell, k(\ell+1)}(\tau, z)} G_{r, s}^{n, m}\right\}\right| \phi_{r s t}(z) d z d \tau \\
& \lesssim \int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1} \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} d \tau \sum_{\delta_{1} N \leq n<\delta_{2} N} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} A_{*}(m, k-m, 0) q_{*}^{(k-m) 2} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z \\
& +\int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1} \frac{\sqrt{1-\tau}}{2 \tau^{3 / 2}} d \tau \sum_{\delta_{1} N \leq n<\delta_{2} N} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s, t=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}}\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} \\
& \times A_{*}(m, k \ell-m, \ell) q_{*}^{(k \ell-m) / 2} \phi_{r s t}(z) d z \\
& \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{1-3 K_{0} / 2} d^{3} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \varepsilon^{-2} \mathcal{E} N \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} k^{2} q_{*}^{(k-m) / 2} \\
& +\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{1-3 K_{0} / 2} d^{3} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \varepsilon^{-2} \mathcal{E} N \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-1}(k \ell)^{2} q_{*}^{(k \ell-m) / 2} \\
& \lesssim\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{1-3 K_{0} / 2} d^{3} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{4} \varepsilon^{-2} \mathcal{E} N .
\end{aligned}
$$

4.6. Estimate on $\int_{0}^{\varepsilon^{2}} R_{i}(\tau) d \tau$. Let us denote

$$
\eta_{s}^{n, m, k}(v, \tau, z)=h_{s}\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+v Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)-h_{s}\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, k}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right),
$$

where we recall that $h_{s}(x)=\partial_{s} h(x)$ is a partial derivative of $h$. Using (16), we express

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{1} & =-\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\left(h_{s}\left(\sqrt{1-\tau}\left(W^{n, m}+u Y^{n, m}\right)-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.-h_{s}\left(\sqrt{1-\tau} W^{n, m}-\sqrt{\tau} z\right)\right) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r}(z) d z \\
& =-\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\eta_{s}^{n, m, m}(u, \tau, z) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r}(z) d z .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similar representations can be derived for the remaining six terms:

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{2} & =-\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\eta_{s}^{n, 0,0}(u, \tau, z) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n}\right\} \phi_{r}(z) d z \\
R_{3} & =-\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2 m} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta_{s}^{n, k, k}(1, \tau, z)} Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r}(z) d z \\
R_{4} & =-\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2 m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\overline{\eta_{s}^{n, k, k}(1, \tau, z)} Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\} \phi_{r}(z) d z \\
R_{5} & =-\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\frac{\eta_{s}^{n, m, m}(1, \tau, z)}{\eta_{r}^{n}} Y_{s}^{n}\right\} \phi_{r}(z) d z \\
R_{6} & =\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{m} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\eta_{s}^{n, k, k}(1, \tau, z)\right\} \mu\left(Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right) \phi_{r}(z) d z \\
R_{7} & =\frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{r, s=1}^{d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d}} \mu\left\{\eta_{s}^{n, 0,0}(1, \tau, z)\right\} \mu\left(Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n}\right) \phi_{r}(z) d z
\end{aligned}
$$

Considering the properties of $h=h_{C, \varepsilon}$ from Lemma 3.1, we observe that by simply replacing $h$ with its partial derivative $h_{s}$ in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we can derive the following upper bounds:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mu\left\{\left|\eta_{s}^{n, m, m}(u, \tau, z)\right|\right\} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} \cdot\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} L^{2}(m+1)^{2}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E}  \tag{49}\\
& \left|\mu\left\{\eta_{s}^{n, m, m}(u, \tau, z) Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\}\right| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} \cdot\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} B_{*}(m, 0) q_{*}^{m / 2}  \tag{50}\\
& \left|\mu\left\{\overline{\eta_{s}^{n, m+k, m+k}(1, \tau, z)} Y_{r}^{n} Y_{s}^{n, m}\right\}\right| \lesssim \varepsilon^{-1} \cdot\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{-3 K_{0} / 2} B_{*}(m, k) q_{*}^{k / 2} \tag{51}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
B_{*}(m, k)=C_{0}^{3} L^{4} \mathbf{C}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E}(m+k+1)^{2} .
$$

The multiplicative factor $\varepsilon^{-1}$ appears due to the fact that the Lipschitz constant of $h_{s}$ is of order $\varepsilon^{-2}$, whereas the Lipschitz constant of $h$ is of order $\varepsilon^{-1}$.

By (49), (50), and (51), it follows that

$$
\left|R_{i}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2 \sqrt{\tau}}\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{1-3 K_{0} / 2} d^{2} \mathbf{C} L^{4} C_{0}^{3} N\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3} \varepsilon^{-2} \mathcal{E}
$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq 7$. Integrating over $\tau$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{0}^{\varepsilon^{2}}\left|R_{i}\right| d \tau \leq\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{1-3 K_{0} / 2} d^{2} \mathbf{C} L^{4} C_{0}^{3} N\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E} \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

4.7. Completing the proof of Theorem 2.2. By Lemma 3.5,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& d_{c}(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{L}(Z)) \leq 4 d^{\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon+\sup _{f \in \widetilde{\mho}_{\varepsilon}} \sum_{i=1}^{7}\left|E_{i}(f)\right| \\
& \leq 4 d^{\frac{1}{4}} \varepsilon+\sup _{f \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{F}} \varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^{7} \int_{0}^{\varepsilon^{2}}\left|R_{i}(\tau)\right| d \tau+\sum_{i=1}^{7} \int_{\varepsilon^{2}}^{1}\left|R_{i}(\tau)\right| d \tau .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\bar{b}=\max \left\{N\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3},\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}\right\} \geq N\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}^{3}$, assembling (24), (48) and (52), we now obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{3 K_{0} / 2} \frac{d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}_{d}\right)}{\bar{b}} \\
& \leq \frac{4 d^{1 / 4} \varepsilon}{\bar{b}}+\left(C_{0}^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2}+d^{3} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \varepsilon^{-2} \mathcal{E}+d^{2} \mathbf{C} C_{0}^{3} L^{4} \varepsilon^{-1} \mathcal{E} \\
& \leq \frac{4 d^{1 / 4} \varepsilon}{\bar{b}}+\left(C_{0}^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2}+d^{13 / 4} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}\left\{\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s} \varepsilon^{-2}+\varepsilon^{-1}\right\}\left[\varepsilon+\left\|b^{-1}\right\|_{s}+\bar{b} \mathfrak{D}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

for arbitrary $\varepsilon>0$. Choosing $\varepsilon=4 d^{13 / 4} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C} \bar{b}$, it follows that

$$
\left(\delta_{2}-\delta_{1}\right)^{3 K_{0} / 2} \frac{d_{c}\left(\mathcal{L}(W), c N_{d}\right)}{\bar{b}} \leq d^{4} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}+\left(C_{0}^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2}+\frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{D} .
$$

Now, recalling the definition of $\mathfrak{D}$ from (23), we arrive at the estimate

$$
\mathfrak{D} \leq d^{4} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}+\left(C_{0}^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2}+\frac{1}{2} \mathfrak{D}
$$

i.e.

$$
\mathfrak{D} \leq d^{4} C_{0}^{3} L^{5} \mathbf{C}+2\left(C_{0}^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2}
$$

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is complete.

## Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 3.6

In this section, we present the proof of the memory loss estimate in Theorem 3.6. The proof follows closely the strategy of [22] and is included here for completeness. We remark that, for the model under consideration, alternative methods exist for deriving similar bounds, such as those described in [9,17, 36].
Lemma A.1. Let $\psi: M \rightarrow(0,+\infty)$. Suppose that $m=k p+\ell$, where $0 \leq \ell<p$. Then, for any $j \geq 1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}\left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{a}\right)\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq K+|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell}\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\eta} \Lambda^{-k} . \tag{53}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, j+m-1}\right)$. In particular, if $m \geq\left(\left\lceil\log \left(K^{\prime}\right) / \log (\Lambda)\right\rceil+1\right) p$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}\left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{a}\right)\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq K+|\psi|_{\eta, \ell} \Lambda^{-\alpha} . \tag{54}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, (54) holds with $\psi$ in place of $\psi \mathbf{1}_{a}$.

Proof. The last statement follows by the fact that $\left|\sum_{n} \psi_{n}\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq \sup _{n}\left|\psi_{n}\right|_{\alpha, \ell}$ for any countable collection $\left\{\psi_{n}\right\}$ of maps $\psi_{n}: M \rightarrow(0,+\infty)$.

Let $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, j+m-1}\right)$. Then,

$$
\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}\left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{a}\right)(y)=\zeta_{a}^{(j, j+m-1)}(y) \psi\left(y_{a}\right),
$$

where $y_{a}$ denotes the unique preimage under $\mathcal{T}_{j, j+m-1}$ lying in $a$. Hence,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\log \mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}\left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{a}\right)(x)-\log \mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}\left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{a}\right)(y)\right| \\
& \leq\left|\log \zeta_{a}^{(j, j+m-1)}(x)-\log \zeta_{a}^{(j, j+m-1)}(y)\right|+\left|\log \psi\left(x_{a}\right)-\log \psi\left(y_{a}\right)\right| \\
& \leq K d(x, y)^{\alpha}+|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell} d\left(x_{a}, y_{a}\right)^{\alpha} \\
& \leq K d(x, y)^{\alpha}+|\psi|_{\alpha, \ell}\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\eta} \Lambda^{-\alpha k} d(x, y)^{\alpha}, \tag{55}
\end{align*}
$$

where (UE:2-3) were used in the last inequality.
Lemma A.2. Let $\psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$ with $A>K$. Then, for any $j \geq 1, \mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1} \psi \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}$ holds if

$$
m \geq p \frac{\log \left(\left(K^{\prime}\right)^{\alpha} \Lambda^{\alpha} \frac{A}{A-K}\right)}{\alpha \log (\Lambda)}
$$

In particular, there exists $\tilde{A}=\tilde{A}\left(A, K^{\prime}, K, \alpha, \Lambda, p\right) \geq A$ such that $\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}\left(\mathcal{D}_{\alpha, A}\right) \subset \mathcal{D}_{\alpha, \tilde{A}}$ holds for all $j \geq 1$ and all $m \geq 0$.

Proof. The result follows as a consequence of (55).

Fix constants $R>0$ and $\xi \in\left(0, e^{-R}\right)$ such that

$$
R\left(1-\xi e^{R}\right) \geq K+\Lambda^{-\alpha} R
$$

for example, $R=2 K /\left(1-\Lambda^{-\eta}\right)$ and $\xi=e^{-R}\left(1-\Lambda^{-\alpha}\right) / 2$. Set

$$
\tilde{p}=\left(\left\lceil\log \left(K^{\prime}\right) / \log (\Lambda)\right\rceil+1\right) p .
$$

Lemma A.3. Let $\psi: M \rightarrow(0,+\infty)$ satisfy $|\psi|_{\eta, \ell} \leq R$. Then, for any $j \geq 1$ and $m \geq \tilde{p}$,

$$
\left|\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}\left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{a}\right)\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq R,
$$

whenever $a \in \mathcal{A}\left(\mathcal{T}_{j, j+m-1}\right)$. The inequality continues to hold if $\psi \mathbf{1}_{a}$ is replaced with $\psi$.
Proof. By Lemma A.1,

$$
\left|\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1}\left(\psi \mathbf{1}_{a}\right)\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq K+\Lambda^{-\alpha} R \leq R .
$$

Lemma A.4. Let $\psi^{(1)}, \psi^{(2)}: M \rightarrow(0, \infty)$ with $\left|\psi^{(i)}\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq R$ and $\int_{M} \psi^{(1)} d \lambda=\int_{M} \psi^{(2)} d \lambda$. Set

$$
\psi_{j, m}^{(i)}=\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1} \psi^{(i)}-\xi \int_{M} \psi^{(i)} d \lambda, \quad i=1,2
$$

Then, for any $j \geq 1$ and $m \geq \tilde{p}$ :
(i) $\left|\psi_{j, m}^{(i)}\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq R$,
(ii) $\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1} \psi^{(1)}-\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1} \psi^{(2)}=\psi_{j, m}^{(1)}-\psi_{j, m}^{(2)}$,
(iii) $\int_{M} \psi_{j, m}^{(1)} d \lambda=\int_{M} \psi_{j, m}^{(2)} d \lambda=(1-\xi) \int_{M} \psi^{(1)} d \lambda$.

Proof. (ii) and (iii) are trivial. By [22, Proposition 3.2]

$$
\left|\psi_{j}^{(i)}\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq \frac{\left|\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1} \psi^{(i)}\right|_{\alpha, \ell}}{1-\xi e^{\left.\mathcal{P}_{j, j+m-1} \psi^{(i)}\right|_{\alpha, \ell}}} \leq \frac{K+\Lambda^{-\alpha} R}{1-\xi e^{R}} \leq R .
$$

Completing the proof of Theorem 3.6. Without loss of generality, we shall assume that $i=1$. Write $n=\tilde{p} k+\ell$, where $0 \leq \ell<\tilde{p}$.

First assume $|u|_{\alpha} \leq R$ so that $\|u\|_{\infty} \leq R$, since $\int_{M} u d \lambda=0$. Decompose $u=\psi_{0}^{+}-\psi_{0}^{-}$, where

$$
\psi_{0}^{+}=1+\max \{0, u\} \quad \text { and } \quad \psi_{0}^{-}=1-\min \{0, u\} .
$$

Then, $\psi_{0}^{ \pm} \geq 1$,

$$
\int_{M} \psi_{0}^{+} d \lambda=\int_{M} \psi_{0}^{-} d \lambda \leq 1+\|u\|_{\infty} \leq 1+R
$$

and, for all $x, y \in M$,

$$
\left|\log \psi_{0}^{ \pm}(x)-\log \psi_{0}^{ \pm}(y)\right| \leq\left|\psi_{0}^{ \pm}(x)-\psi_{0}^{ \pm}(y)\right| \leq|u(x)-u(y)| \leq R d(x, y)^{\eta}
$$

Hence, $\left|\psi_{0}^{ \pm}\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq R$.
Recursively define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\psi_{1}^{ \pm} & =\mathcal{P}_{1, \tilde{p}+\ell} \psi_{0}^{ \pm}-\xi \int_{M} \psi_{0}^{ \pm} d \lambda, \\
\psi_{j+1}^{ \pm} & =\mathcal{P}_{\ell+j \tilde{p}+1, \ell+(j+1) \tilde{p}} \psi_{j}^{ \pm}-\xi \int_{M} \psi_{j}^{ \pm}, \quad j=1, \ldots, k-1 .
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma A.4-(i), $\left|\psi_{j}^{ \pm}\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq R$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{P}_{n}(u)=\psi_{k}^{+}-\psi_{k}^{-}, \tag{56}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{M} \psi_{k}^{ \pm} d \lambda & =\int_{M} \psi_{k-1}^{ \pm} d \lambda-\xi \int_{M} \psi_{k-1}^{ \pm} d \lambda=(1-\xi) \int_{M} \psi_{k-1}^{ \pm} d \lambda \\
& =\cdots=(1-\xi)^{k} \int_{M} \psi_{0}^{ \pm} d \lambda \leq(1-\xi)^{k}(1+R)
\end{aligned}
$$

Set $q=1-\xi$. By (4), we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{k}^{+} \leq e^{R} \int_{M} \psi_{k}^{ \pm} d \lambda \leq e^{R}(1+R) q^{k} \tag{57}
\end{equation*}
$$

The inequality

$$
|a-b| \leq \max \{a, b\}|\log a-\log b| \quad \forall a, b>0,
$$

combined with $\left|\psi_{j}^{ \pm}\right|_{\alpha, \ell} \leq R$ and (57) yields

$$
\left|\psi_{k}^{ \pm}(x)-\psi_{k}^{ \pm}(y)\right| \leq e^{R} R(1+R) q^{k} d(x, y)^{\eta}
$$

Hence, by (56),

$$
\left|\mathcal{P}_{n}(u)\right|_{\alpha} \leq 2 e^{R} R(1+R) q^{k} .
$$

Finally, to remove the restriction $|u|_{\alpha} \leq R$, it is observed that $v=R|u|_{\alpha}^{-1} u$ satisfies $|v|_{\alpha} \leq R$ and therefore

$$
\left|\mathcal{P}_{n}(u)\right|_{\alpha}=R^{-1}|u|_{\alpha}\left|\mathcal{P}_{n}(v)\right|_{\eta} \leq 2 e^{R}(1+R) q^{k}|u|_{\alpha} .
$$

Moreover, $\int_{M} \mathcal{P}^{n} u d \lambda=0$, so that $\left\|\mathcal{P}^{n} u\right\|_{\infty} \leq\left|\mathcal{P}^{n} u\right|_{\alpha}$. Hence,

$$
\left\|\mathcal{P}_{n}(u)\right\|_{\alpha} \leq 4 e^{R}(1+R) q^{k}|u|_{\alpha} \leq 4 e^{R}(1+R) q^{-1} q^{n / \tilde{p}}|u|_{\alpha} .
$$
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