Distribution-uniform strong laws of large numbers

Ian Waudby-Smith, Martin Larsson, and Aaditya Ramdas

Carnegie Mellon University {ianws,larsson,aramdas}@cmu.edu

Abstract

We revisit the question of whether the strong law of large numbers (SLLN) holds uniformly in a rich family of distributions, culminating in a distribution-uniform generalization of the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund SLLN. These results can be viewed as extensions of Chung's distribution-uniform SLLN to random variables with uniformly integrable $q^{\rm th}$ absolute central moments for 0 < q < 2; $q \neq 1$. Furthermore, we show that uniform integrability of the $q^{\rm th}$ moment is both sufficient and necessary for the SLLN to hold uniformly at the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund rate of $n^{1/q-1}$. These proofs centrally rely on distribution-uniform analogues of some familiar almost sure convergence results including the Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem, Kolmogorov's three-series theorem, a stochastic generalization of Kronecker's lemma, and the Borel-Cantelli lemmas. The non-identically distributed case is also considered.

1	Introduction	1
	1.1 Notation and conventions	3
	1.2 Outline and summary of contributions	4
2	Distribution-uniform strong laws of large numbers	4
3	Other distribution-uniform strong laws	8
	3.1 A distribution-uniform Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem	8
	3.2 A distribution-uniform Kolmogorov three-series theorem	
	3.3 A distribution-uniform stochastic generalization of Kronecker's lemma	
	3.4 Distribution-uniform Borel-Cantelli lemmas	14
4	Proof details for Theorems 1 and 2	14
	4.1 Proof of Theorem 1	15
	4.2 Proof of Theorem 2	31
5	Summary	34

1 Introduction

In his 1951 Berkeley Symposium paper titled "The strong law of large numbers" [5], Kai Lai Chung writes "For use in certain statistical applications Professor Wald raised the question of the uniformity of the strong [law of large numbers] with respect to a family of [distributions]". Chung's paper proceeds to provide a concrete answer to that question, yielding a generalization of Kolmogorov's strong law of large numbers (SLLN) that holds uniformly in a rich family of distributions having a uniformly integrable first absolute moment. Let us formally recall (a minor refinement of) Chung's distribution-uniform SLLN here.

Theorem (Chung's \mathcal{P} -uniform strong law of large numbers [5, 14]). Let \mathcal{P} be a collection of probability distributions and $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be independent and identically distributed random variables defined on the probability spaces $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}) := (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})_{P \in \mathcal{P}}$ satisfying the \mathcal{P} -uniform integrability (\mathcal{P} -UI) condition

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X - \mathbb{E}_P(X)| \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|X - \mathbb{E}_P(X)| > m\} \right) = 0. \tag{1}$$

Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k X_i - \mathbb{E}_P(X) \right| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0. \tag{2}$$

Notice that Chung's SLLN recovers Kolmogorov's as a special case when the class of distributions $\dot{\mathcal{P}} = \{P\}$ is taken to be a singleton such that $\mathbb{E}_P|X| < \infty$ since for any sequence of random variables $(Y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_P\left(\lim_{n\to\infty}Y_n=0\right)=1\quad\text{if and only if}\quad\forall\varepsilon>0,\ \lim_{m\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_P\left(\sup_{k\geqslant m}|Y_k|\geqslant\varepsilon\right)=0.\tag{3}$$

The equivalence in (3) highlights why Chung's original characterization of the SLLN holding " \mathcal{P} -uniformly" in (2) is a natural one. Despite Chung's advance, there are four open questions that we aim to address in this paper:

(i) Can the convergence rate in (2) be improved in the presence of higher moments in the sense of Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund [11]? That is, can it be shown that for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{k^{1/q}} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(X_i - \mathbb{E}_P(X) \right) \right| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0 \tag{4}$$

under certain \mathcal{P} -UI conditions on the q^{th} moment for 1 < q < 2?

(ii) Is it possible to restrict the *divergence* rate when X has fewer than 1 but more than 0 finite absolute moments, again in the sense of Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund [11]? That is, can it be shown that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{k^{1/q}} \sum_{i=1}^k X_i \right| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0, \tag{5}$$

under similar \mathcal{P} -UI conditions but for 0 < q < 1 even when $\mathbb{E}_P|X| = \infty$ for some $P \in \mathcal{P}$?

(iii) Are \mathcal{P} -UI conditions necessary for \mathcal{P} -uniform SLLNs to hold (in addition to being sufficient)? That is, if the condition in (1) does not hold, can it be shown that for some positive constant C > 0,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \left(X_i - \mathbb{E}_P(X) \right) \right| \ge C \right) > 0, \tag{6}$$

with analogous questions in the case of higher or lower P-UI moments as in (i) and (ii)?

(iv) Does an analogue of Chung's SLLN exist for independent but non-identically distributed random variables, such as in the sense of Petrov [12, §IX, Theorem 12]? That is, can it be shown that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{a_k} \sum_{i=1}^k (X_i - \mathbb{E}_P(X_i)) \right| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0 \tag{7}$$

for some appropriately chosen sequence $a_n \nearrow \infty$, and if so, under what conditions on $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$? We provide positive answers to (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) in Theorems 1(i), 1(ii), 1(iii), and 2, respectively. **Remark 1** (On centered versus uncentered uniform integrability). As outlined by Ruf et al. [14, Remark 4.5], the assumption displayed in (1) is a minor refinement of Chung [5] whose original result made the (stronger) uncentered P-UI assumption,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|X| \mathbb{1}\{|X| > m\}\right) = 0 \tag{8}$$

in place of (1) but yielding the same conclusion in (2). While the difference between (1) and (8) may seem minor — indeed, for a single $P \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathbb{E}_P|X| < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}_P|X - \mathbb{E}_P(X)| < \infty$ are equivalent — we highlight in Theorem 1(iii) how (1) is both sufficient and necessary for the SLLN to hold, while the same cannot be said for (8), drawing an important distinction between the two.

Remark 2 (On the phrase "uniform integrability"). Note that the phrase "uniform integrability" is commonly used to refer to an analogue of (1) holding for a family of random variables $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ on the same probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) (as in Chung [6, §4.5], Chong [3], Chandra and Goswami [2], Hu and Rosalsky [7], and Hu and Zhou [8] among others) in the sense that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X_k)| \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X_k)| > m\}\right) = 0,\tag{9}$$

while the presentation in (1) is a statement about a single random variable on a collection of probability spaces $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ (as also seen in Chow and Teicher [4, pp. 93–94] and Ruf et al. [14, Section 4.2]). Clearly, these two presentations communicate a similar underlying property, but they are used in conceptually different contexts and for this reason, we deliberately write " \mathcal{P} -UI" to emphasize adherence to (1) and avoid ambiguity.

1.1 Notation and conventions

Let us now make explicit some notation and conventions that will be used throughout the paper. First, the discussion surrounding (3) motivates the following definition which summarizes, extends, and makes succinct Chung's notion of sequences that vanish both \mathcal{P} -uniformly and almost surely.

Definition 1 (Distribution-uniformly and almost surely vanishing sequences). Let \mathcal{P} be a collection of distributions and $(Y_n(P))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be random variables defined on (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$. We say that $(Y_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \equiv (Y_n(P))_{n=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{\mathcal{P}\text{-uniformly vanishes almost surely}}_{\mathcal{P}\text{-uniformly vanishes almost surely}}$ if for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geqslant m} |Y_k(P)| \geqslant \varepsilon \right) = 0, \tag{10}$$

and as a shorthand for (10), we write

$$Y_n = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1). \tag{11}$$

Moreover, for a nondecreasing sequence $r_n \nearrow \infty$, we say that $Y_n = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(r_n)$ if $Y_n/r_n = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$.

Clearly, if a sequence satisfies Definition 1, then it is both \mathcal{P} -uniformly vanishing in probability for the same class \mathcal{P} as well as vanishing P-almost surely for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Furthermore, we make use of the following conventions.

- Individual distributions are denoted by the capital letter P and collections of distributions are denoted by calligraphic capital letters (typically P).
- We write " \mathcal{P} -UI" (or simply "UI") for " \mathcal{P} -uniformly integrable" when it is clear from context that the phrase is used as an adjective and " \mathcal{P} -uniform integrability" when used as a noun.
- Collections of probability spaces are written as $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$.
- If the q^{th} absolute central moment of X is \mathcal{P} -UI, i.e.

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X - \mathbb{E}_P(X)|^q \mathbb{1} \left\{ |X - \mathbb{E}_P(X)|^q > m \right\} \right) = 0, \tag{12}$$

we condense this to "the q^{th} moment of X is \mathcal{P} -UI" and omit the qualifiers "absolute" and "central".

- The phrase "independent and identically distributed" is abbreviated to "i.i.d.".
- For real numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we use $a \wedge b$ to denote $\min\{a, b\}$ and $a \vee b$ to denote $\max\{a, b\}$.
- We write $b_n \nearrow \infty$ for a real sequence $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ if it is nondecreasing and diverging to ∞ .
- We omit the subscript P from $\mathbb{E}_P(X)$ when using the shorthand notation in (11). For example, we write $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \mathbb{E}(X) = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$ if in fact

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geqslant m} |X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X)| \geqslant \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$
 (13)

• If $\mathbb{E}_P|X_n|$ is finite for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that "the SLLN holds at a rate of $\bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(a_n/n)$ " to mean that $a_n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n(X_i-\mathbb{E}(X_i))=\bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$ for the sequence $a_n \nearrow \infty$. Similarly, if $\mathbb{E}_P|X_n|=\infty$ for some $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then we use the same phrase "the SLLN holds at a rate of $\bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(a_n/n)$ " if $a_n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i=\bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$. For example, Chung [5] gives conditions under which the SLLN holds at a rate of $\bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$.

1.2 Outline and summary of contributions

Below we outline how the paper will proceed, summarizing our main contributions.

- Section 2 contains our main results Theorems 1(i), 1(ii), 1(ii), and 2 which provide answers to the questions posed in (4), (5), (6), and (7), respectively. In short, these theorems show that the SLLN holds at a rate of $\bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{1/q-1})$ in the i.i.d. case if and only if they have a \mathcal{P} -UI q^{th} moment, and that it holds at a rate of $\bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(a_n/n)$ in the non-i.i.d. case if $\sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}|X_k \mathbb{E}X_k|^q/a_k^q$ vanishes \mathcal{P} -uniformly as $m \to \infty$.
- Section 3 contains distribution-uniform analogues of several almost sure convergence results that are commonly used in the proofs of SLLNs. These include analogues of the Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem (Section 3.1), the Kolmogorov three-series theorem (Section 3.2), Kronecker's lemma (Section 3.3), and the Borel-Cantelli lemmas (Section 3.4). These results rely on the notion of a distribution-uniform Cauchy sequence, whose definition is provided in Definition 2 and which serves as a \mathcal{P} -uniform generalization of a sequence that is P-almost surely convergent.
- Section 4 contains complete proofs to Theorems 1 and 2. After considering the "right" generalizations of distribution-uniform convergence (in Definitions 1 and 2), the high-level structure of the proofs to Theorems 1(i), 1(ii), and 2 largely mirror those of their P-pointwise counterparts due to Kolmogorov, Marcinkiewicz, and Zygmund in the sense that they use analogous technical theorems and lemmas from Section 3 in similar succession. One exception to this is the combination of Kolmogorov's three-series theorem and Kronecker's lemma certain subtleties surrounding uniform boundedness in probability of P-uniform Cauchy sequences requires the introduction of another three-series theorem provided in Theorem 5. Furthermore, our proofs noticeably deviate from their P-pointwise counterparts in satisfying the conditions of our P-uniform three series theorems (Theorems 4 and 5). These require additional care in both cases, relying for example on a delicate application of the de la Vallée Poussin criterion of uniform integrability; details can be found in Lemmas 3-8.

2 Distribution-uniform strong laws of large numbers

We begin by presenting our first main result which gives both necessary and sufficient conditions for the SLLN to hold at a rate of $\bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{1/q-1})$ in the i.i.d. setting, providing answers to the questions posed in (4), (5), and (6).

Theorem 1 (\mathcal{P} -uniform Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund strong law of large numbers). Let $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be independent and identically distributed random variables and consider the following \mathcal{P} -UI condition for some 0 < q < 2:

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X - \mu(P; q)|^q \mathbb{1}\{ |X - \mu(P; q)|^q > m \} \right) = 0, \tag{14}$$

where $\mu(P;q) = \mathbb{E}_P(X)$ if $1 \leq q < 2$ and $\mu(P;q) = 0$ if 0 < q < 1.

(i) If (14) holds with $q \in [1, 2)$, then

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/q}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \mathbb{E}(X)) = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1). \tag{15}$$

(ii) If (14) holds with $q \in (0,1)$, then

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/q}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1). \tag{16}$$

(iii) If (14) does not hold, then

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/q}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \mu(P;q)) \neq \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1).$$
(17)

In other words, the \mathcal{P} -uniform SLLN holds for the average $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_{i}$ with a rate of $o(n^{1/q-1})$ if and only if the q^{th} moment of X is \mathcal{P} -UI.

In the same way that Chung's \mathcal{P} -uniform SLLN for UI first moments generalizes Kolmogorov's P-pointwise SLLN for finite first moments, Theorems 1(i) and 1(ii) generalize the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund [11] P-pointwise SLLN for finite q^{th} moments when 0 < q < 2; $q \neq 1$, painting a fuller picture of sufficiency for \mathcal{P} -uniform SLLNs in the i.i.d. case.

Turning to Theorem 1(iii), the necessity of \mathcal{P} -UI appears to be new to the literature even in the case of q=1. In fact, Chung's original paper [5] studied necessary conditions for the \mathcal{P} -uniform SLLN but only considered uncentered UI as in (8) which turns out not to be necessary in general. Concretely, he showed that if the SLLN in (15) holds for q=1 and the median of X is uniformly bounded, then the uncentered \mathcal{P} -UI condition in (8) holds; in other words, if $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}|\mathrm{med}_P(X)|<\infty$ where $\mathrm{med}_P(X):=\sup\{x:\mathbb{P}_P(X\leqslant x)\leqslant 1/2\}$, then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \mathbb{E}(X)) = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1) \implies \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P(|X| \mathbb{1}\{|X| > m\}) = 0.$$
 (18)

Chung [5, Remark 2] uses a simple counterexample to point out that without uniform boundedness of the medians, uncentered \mathcal{P} -UI is not necessary. Indeed, letting $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{N}} := \{P_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ where P_n is the distribution of X with a point mass at x = n, we obviously have that the uniform SLLN holds (since the centered sample average is always 0 with P-probability one for all $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{N}}$) and yet X does not satisfy uncentered $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{N}}$ -uniform integrability. Clearly, this counterexample does not apply to the centered uniform integrability condition we are considering in (14).

Theorem 1(iii) also highlights that uniform boundedness of the q^{th} moment is not sufficient for the SLLN to hold \mathcal{P} -uniformly at a rate of $o(n^{1/q-1})$. Going further, by the de la Vallée Poussin criterion for uniform integrability [3], the SLLN holding uniformly at this rate is equivalent to the uniform boundedness of $\mathbb{E}_P \varphi(|X|^q)$ for some positive and nondecreasing function φ growing faster than $x \mapsto x$, i.e. $\lim_{x\to\infty} \varphi(x)/x = \infty$. Let us now give rough outlines of the proofs of Theorems 1(i), 1(ii), and 1(iii) (with a diagrammatic overview of the former displayed in Figure 1), leaving most technical details for Section 4.1.

Proof outline of Theorem 1(i). Since q = 1 corresponds to the SLLN of Chung [5], we focus on 1 < q < 2. Similar to classical SLLN proofs, we focus our attention on the weighted random variables $(Z_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ given




Figure 1: A diagrammatic summary of the theorems and lemmas required to prove Theorem 1(i). Note that when $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$ is a singleton, the proof due to Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund [11] only involves the left branch (Lemma 3 \rightarrow Theorem 4 \rightarrow Lemma 1) since the right one is trivially satisfied in that case (more discussion can be found in Section 4.1.2). The above structure similarly applies to the proof of Theorem 1(ii) but we replace Lemmas 3 and 7 with Lemmas 4 and 8 for the sake of satisfying the conditions of Theorems 4 and 5, respectively.

by $Z_n := (X_n - \mathbb{E}_P(X_n))/n^{1/q}$. First, in Theorem 4 we develop a \mathcal{P} -uniform analogue of the Kolmogorov three-series theorem which states that if for some c > 0,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_n^{\leqslant c} \right| = 0, \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_P Z_n^{\leqslant c} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(|Z_n| > c) = 0, \quad (19)$$

where $Z_n^{\leqslant c}:=Z_n\mathbb{1}\{Z_n\leqslant c\}$, then $S_n:=\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$ is a \mathcal{P} -uniform Cauchy sequence (a notion that we define and discuss more thoroughly in Definition 2), meaning that for any $\varepsilon>0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{n,k \ge m} |S_n - S_k| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$
 (20)

Indeed, Lemma 3 focuses on exploiting \mathcal{P} -UI of the q^{th} moment to show that (19) holds with c=1.

We then introduce the \mathcal{P} -uniform stochastic Kronecker lemma (Lemma 1) which states that if S_n is \mathcal{P} -uniformly Cauchy as in (20) and \mathcal{P} -uniformly bounded in probability — meaning that for any $\delta > 0$, there exist N, B > 0 so that for any $n \geq N$, we have $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P(|S_n| \geq B) < \delta$ — then for any $b_n \nearrow \infty$, we have

$$\frac{1}{b_n} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i Z_i = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1). \tag{21}$$

To apply Lemma 1 to our setting, we show that S_n is \mathcal{P} -uniformly Cauchy as a consequence of the threeseries theorem discussed above combined with Lemma 3, and to show that S_n is \mathcal{P} -uniformly bounded in probability, we introduce another three-series-type theorem in Theorem 5 which states that if

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}_P \left[(Z_n/B) \, \mathbb{1}\{ |Z_n/B| \leqslant 1 \} \right]| = 0, \tag{22}$$

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} \left[(Z_{n}/B) \mathbb{1}\{ |Z_{n}/B| \leqslant 1 \} \right] = 0, \text{ and}$$
 (23)

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(|Z_n/B| > 1) = 0, \tag{24}$$

then $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$ is \mathcal{P} -uniformly bounded in probability. Lemma 7 indeed shows that the above three series conditions are satisfied as long as X has a \mathcal{P} -UI q^{th} moment. Taking the sequence $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ to be given by $b_n = n^{1/q}$ and invoking the \mathcal{P} -uniform Kronecker lemma yields the desired result:

$$\frac{1}{n^{1/q}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \mathbb{E}(X)) = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1), \tag{25}$$

which completes the proof outline of Theorem 1(i).

Proof outline of Theorem 1(ii). The proof in the case of 0 < q < 1 proceeds in the same manner as that of 1 < q < 2 but instead of Lemma 3 showing that the three-series conditions in (19) are satisfied for $(X_n - \mathbb{E}_P(X_n))/n^{1/q}$, it is Lemma 4 that shows that these conditions are satisfied for $X_n/n^{1/q}$, thereby demonstrating that $\sum_{k=1}^n X_k/k^{1/q}$ is \mathcal{P} -uniformly Cauchy. Similarly, rather than using Lemma 7 to satisfy the \mathcal{P} -uniform boundedness three series above, we use Lemma 8. Again, invoking the \mathcal{P} -uniform stochastic Kronecker lemma yields the desired result.

Proof outline of Theorem 1(iii). We will describe the proof outline for the case where $1 \leq q < 2$ but a similar argument goes through for 0 < q < 1 (with all details provided in Section 4.1). The proof relies on a \mathcal{P} -uniform generalization of the second Borel-Cantelli lemma (Lemma 2) which states that for independent events $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in \mathcal{F} , if the tails of the sums of $(\mathbb{P}_P(E_n))_{n=1}^{\infty}$ do not uniformly vanish, then the probability of the tails of the unions of $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ do not uniformly vanish; more succinctly:

$$0 < \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P}(E_{k}) \leqslant \infty \implies \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_{P}\left(\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} E_{k}\right) > 0.$$
 (26)

To make use of this lemma, we highlight that for any $P \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_P\left(\sup_{k\geqslant m-1}\frac{1}{k^{1/q}}|S_k|\geqslant 1/2\right)\geqslant \mathbb{P}_P\left(\sup_{k\geqslant m}\frac{1}{k^{1/q}}|X-\mathbb{E}_P(X)|\geqslant 1\right)$$
(27)

where $S_k := \sum_{i=1}^k (X_i - \mathbb{E}_P(X_i))$ are the centered partial sums, and hence once paired with (26), it suffices to show that

$$0 < \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X_k)|^q > k\right) \le \infty.$$
 (28)

Indeed by Hu and Zhou [8, Theorem 2.1], (28) is equivalent to the \mathcal{P} -UI condition in (14) being violated, i.e. (28) holds if and only if

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X - \mathbb{E}_P(X)|^q \mathbb{1}\{|X - \mathbb{E}_P(X)|^q > m\} \right) > 0, \tag{29}$$

which completes the proof outline of Theorem 1(iii).

Let us now consider the setting of independent but *non-identically distributed* random variables. The following theorem serves as a distribution-uniform generalization of the well-known strong law of large numbers for independent random variables (see Petrov [12, §IX, Theorem 12]).

Theorem 2 (\mathcal{P} -uniform strong law for non-identically distributed random variables). Let $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be independent random variables and suppose that for some $q \in [1,2]$, they each have a finite absolute q^{th} central moment. Suppose that for some $a_n \nearrow \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P |X_k - \mathbb{E}_P X_k|^q}{a_k^q} = 0.$$
 (30)

Then the strong law of large numbers holds \mathcal{P} -uniformly at a rate of $o(a_n/n)$, meaning for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geqslant m} \left| \frac{1}{a_k} \sum_{i=1}^k (X_i - \mathbb{E}_P(X_i)) \right| \geqslant \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$
 (31)

Before giving the proof outline, we make some brief remarks about Theorem 2. After some inspection, the reader will notice that when instantiated in the identically distributed setting, Theorem 2 does not recover Theorem 1, meaning that it cannot attain an SLLN rate as fast as $o(n^{1/q-1})$ in the presence of only $q \in (1,2)$ UI moments. This is not surprising, and directly mirrors the relationship between the P-pointwise non-i.i.d. SLLNs [12, §IX, Theorem 12] and the strong laws of Kolmogorov, Marcinkiewicz, and Zygmund in the i.i.d. case. The latter proofs in the P-pointwise case (and now ours provided in Section 4.1 for the P-uniform case) all crucially exploit the fact that $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are identically distributed.

Proof outline of Theorem 2. The proof of Theorem 2 is identical to that of Theorem 1(i) but instead of using Lemma 3 and Lemma 7 to satisfy the conditions of the \mathcal{P} -uniform Kolmogorov and boundedness three-series theorems (Theorems 4 and 5), we use different arguments found in Lemmas 10 and 11, respectively. (In fact, the latter two lemmas are simpler and require much softer arguments.) This completes the proof outline of Theorem 2.

The full proof can be found in Section 4. As alluded to in the proof outlines of Theorems 1 and 2, our results rely on so-called " \mathcal{P} -uniform Cauchy sequences" as well as \mathcal{P} -uniform analogues of several familiar almost sure convergence results. We present all of these in the next section.

3 Other distribution-uniform strong laws

In this section, we provide \mathcal{P} -uniform analogues of various almost sure convergence results including the Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem, the Kolmogorov three-series theorem, and a stochastic generalization of Kronecker's lemma. These are instrumental to the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. However, note that the classical (P-pointwise) forms of these results are stated (either in their assumptions or in their conclusions) in terms of a sequence of random variables converging P-almost surely. While Definition 1 provides a natural distribution-uniform generalization of sequences that almost surely vanish (i.e. converge to 0), it does not immediately yield a sensible definition of a sequence that \mathcal{P} -uniformly almost surely converges to a potentially random quantity. The definition of a Cauchy sequence however is agnostic to the limiting value of the sequence, motivating the following definition of a \mathcal{P} -uniform Cauchy sequence which generalizes the notion of P-almost sure convergence to a family of distributions \mathcal{P} .

Definition 2 (Distribution-uniform Cauchy sequence). Let \mathcal{P} be a collection of distributions and $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ a sequence of random variables defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$. We say that $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a $\underline{\mathcal{P}}$ -uniform Cauchy sequence if for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k, n \ge m} |X_k - X_n| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$
 (32)

It is easy to check that a \mathcal{P} -uniform Cauchy sequence is P-almost surely a Cauchy sequence for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and that if $(X_n - C)_{n=1}^{\infty} = \bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$ for any fixed $C \in \mathbb{R}$, then $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is \mathcal{P} -uniformly Cauchy. Definition 2 can be viewed as a \mathcal{P} -uniform generalization of the notion of a sequence that converges with P-probability one. Indeed, the following section makes use of Definition 2 to provide a \mathcal{P} -uniform generalization of the Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem.

3.1 A distribution-uniform Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem

In the classical P-pointwise case, the Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem states that for a sequence of independent random variables $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, if the sum of their variances is finite, i.e.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P}(X_{k}) < \infty, \tag{33}$$

then $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} X_k$ is P-almost surely finite. With Definition 2 in mind, we are ready to state and prove a P-uniform generalization of the Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem, establishing that the sum $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} X_k$ is P-uniformly Cauchy whenever the series in (33) has P-uniformly vanishing tails.

Theorem 3 (\mathcal{P} -uniform Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem). Let $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be independent random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$. If

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} X_{k} = 0 \tag{34}$$

then $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mathbb{E}_P(X_i))$ is \mathcal{P} -uniformly Cauchy (Definition 2), meaning for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k, n \ge m} |S_k - S_n| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$
 (35)

Proof. First note that for any $m \ge 1$, we have that

$$\left\{ \sup_{k,n \geqslant m} |S_k - S_n| \geqslant \varepsilon \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \sup_{k \geqslant m} |S_k - S_m| \geqslant \varepsilon/2 \right\} \cup \left\{ \sup_{n \geqslant m} |S_n - S_m| \geqslant \varepsilon/2 \right\}$$
 (36)

and hence for any $P \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{P}\left(\sup_{k,n\geqslant m}|S_{k}-S_{n}|\geqslant\varepsilon\right)\leqslant\mathbb{P}_{P}\left(\sup_{k\geqslant m}|S_{k}-S_{m}|\geqslant\varepsilon/2\right)+\mathbb{P}_{P}\left(\sup_{n\geqslant m}|S_{n}-S_{m}|\geqslant\varepsilon/2\right)\tag{37}$$

$$=2\lim_{M\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_P\left(\max_{m\leqslant k\leqslant M}|S_k-S_m|\geqslant \varepsilon/2\right)$$
(38)

$$\leq \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \lim_{M \to \infty} \sum_{k=m+1}^{M} \operatorname{Var}_P(X_k)$$
 (39)

$$= \frac{8}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \sum_{k=m+1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_P(X_k), \tag{40}$$

where (38) follows from monotonicity and (39) from Kolmogorov's inequality. Taking suprema over $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and limits as $m \to \infty$ and noting the condition in (34) yields the desired result, completing the proof.

3.2 A distribution-uniform Kolmogorov three-series theorem

Now that we have a \mathcal{P} -uniform Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence theorem, we will use it to prove a \mathcal{P} -uniform analogue of Kolmogorov's three-series theorem. To begin, define the truncated version $X^{\leqslant c}$ of a random variable X at a constant c as

$$X^{\leqslant c} := X \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|X| \leqslant c\}. \tag{41}$$

In the P-pointwise case, recall that Kolmogorov's three-series theorem states that if the following three series are finite for some c > 0:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P X_n^{\leqslant c} < \infty, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_P X_n^{\leqslant c} < \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(|X_n| > c) < \infty, \tag{42}$$

then $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} X_k$ is P-almost surely finite. Similarly to Theorem 3 in the previous section, our \mathcal{P} -uniform analogue of Kolmogorov's three series theorem will conclude that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} X_k$ is \mathcal{P} -uniformly Cauchy as long as the tails of a certain three series are \mathcal{P} -uniformly vanishing.

Theorem 4 (\mathcal{P} -uniform Kolmogorov three-series theorem). Let $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of independent random variables. Suppose that the following three summation tails decay \mathcal{P} -uniformly for some c > 0:

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P X_n^{\leqslant c} \right| = 0, \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_P X_n^{\leqslant c} = 0, \quad and \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(|X_n| > c) = 0.$$

Then $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ is a \mathcal{P} -uniform Cauchy sequence, meaning for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{n,k \ge m} |S_n - S_k| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0. \tag{43}$$

Notice that the first series in (42) does not have an exact analogue in Theorem 4 since the former is not a sum of absolute values of $(\mathbb{E}_P X_n^{\leqslant c})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ while that of the latter is. In particular, Theorem 4 is not a strict generalization of Kolmogorov's three-series theorem in general, but this distinction is inconsequential for the sake of proving (\mathcal{P} -uniform or P-pointwise) SLLNs, at least in the i.i.d. and independent but non-i.i.d. settings considered by Kolmogorov, Marcinkiewicz, and Zygmund, as well as Petrov [13, §IX, Theorem 12]. Indeed, all of their (and our) proofs ultimately upper bound $\mathbb{E}_P X_n^{\leqslant c}$ for a mean-zero X_n by $\mathbb{E}_P(|X_n|\cdot 1\{|X_n|\leqslant c\})$ or by $\mathbb{E}_P(|X_n|\cdot 1\{|X_n|>c\})$, and hence one can simply analyze $|\mathbb{E}_P X_n^{\leqslant c}|$ from the outset. Detailed discussions and proofs can be found in Section 4.1.1. Let us now return to and prove Theorem 4.

Proof. Abusing notation slightly, let $S_n^{\leqslant c} := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^{\leqslant c}$. Note that for any $m \geqslant 1$, we have

$$\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P\left(\sup_{n,k\geqslant m} |S_n - S_k| \geqslant \varepsilon\right) \tag{44}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{n \ge k \ge m} |S_n - S_k| \ge \varepsilon \right) \tag{45}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{n \geq k \geq m} \left| S_n^{\leq c} - S_k^{\leq c} \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\exists k \geq m : X_k \neq X_k^{\leq c} \right)$$

$$\tag{46}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{n \geq k \geq m} \left| S_n^{\leq c} - S_k^{\leq c} \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P \left(|X_k| > c \right). \tag{47}$$

The second term above vanishes asymptotically by the third series, so it suffices to show that the first term goes to 0 as $m \to \infty$. Indeed,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{n \ge k \ge m} \left| S_n^{\le c} - S_k^{\le c} \right| \ge \varepsilon \right) \tag{48}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{n \ge k \ge m} \left| S_n^{\le c} - \mathbb{E}_P S_n^{\le c} + \mathbb{E}_P S_n^{\le c} - \mathbb{E}_P S_k^{\le c} + \mathbb{E}_P S_k^{\le c} - S_k^{\le c} \right| \ge \varepsilon \right)$$
(49)

$$\leq \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{n \geq k \geq m} \left| S_n^{\leq c} - \mathbb{E}_P S_n^{\leq c} - \left(S_k^{\leq c} - \mathbb{E}_P \left(S_k^{\leq c} \right) \right) \right| \geq \varepsilon/2}_{(\star)} \right) + \tag{50}$$

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sup_{k \geqslant n \geqslant m} |\mathbb{E}_P S_n^{\leqslant c} - \mathbb{E}_P S_k^{\leqslant c}| \geqslant \varepsilon/2 \right\}. \tag{51}$$

Now, $(\star) \to 0$ by the second series combined with the \mathcal{P} -uniform Khintchine-Kolmogorov convergence

theorem (Theorem 3). Turning to (†), we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sup_{k \ge n \ge m} \left| \mathbb{E}_P S_n^{\le c} - \mathbb{E}_P S_k^{\le c} \right| \ge \varepsilon/2 \right\}$$
 (52)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sup_{k \geq m} \sum_{i=m}^{k} \left| \mathbb{E}_{P} X_{i}^{\leq c} \right| \geq \varepsilon/4 \right\} + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sup_{n \geq m} \sum_{i=m}^{n} \left| \mathbb{E}_{P} X_{i}^{\leq c} \right| \geq \varepsilon/4 \right\}$$
 (53)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sup_{k \ge m} \left| \sum_{i=m}^{k} \mathbb{E}_{P} X_{i}^{\leqslant c} \right| \ge \varepsilon/4 \right\} + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sup_{n \ge m} \sum_{i=m}^{n} \left| \mathbb{E}_{P} X_{i}^{\leqslant c} \right| \ge \varepsilon/4 \right\}$$
 (54)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{i=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P X_i^{\leqslant c} \right| \geqslant \varepsilon/4 \right\} + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{i=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P X_i^{\leqslant c} \right| \geqslant \varepsilon/4 \right\}$$
 (55)

which vanishes as $m \to \infty$ by the first of the three series, completing the proof.

3.3 A distribution-uniform stochastic generalization of Kronecker's lemma

In the classical P-pointwise setting, proofs of strong laws of large numbers rely on a (non-stochastic) convergence result known as Kronecker's lemma which states that if $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of real numbers so that $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i = \ell \in \mathbb{R}$, then for any positive sequence $b_n \nearrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{b_n} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i = 0. \tag{56}$$

This lemma is typically used as follows (consider the Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund SLLN with 1 < q < 2 for the sake of example). One first shows via the P-pointwise Kolmogorov three-series theorem that the sum

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X)}{k^{1/q}} \tag{57}$$

is P-almost surely convergent as $n \to \infty$, at which point one applies Kronecker's lemma (on the same set of P-probability 1) to justify that

$$\mathbb{P}_{P}\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/q}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_{i} - \mathbb{E}_{P}(X)) = 0\right) = 1.$$
 (58)

However, it is not clear how Kronecker's lemma can be used to derive a \mathcal{P} -uniform analogue of (58) if (57) is only shown to be \mathcal{P} -uniformly Cauchy and especially if the limiting value $\ell \equiv \ell(P)$ of (57) is a potentially random quantity whose behavior depends on the distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}$ itself. Indeed, for the \mathcal{P} -uniform case, we introduce an additional uniform stochastic boundedness condition given in (60). Satisfying (60) in pursuit of proving Theorems 1(i), 1(ii), and 2 requires additional care (the details of which can be found in Section 4.1.2), while this subtlety is easily sidestepped in the P-pointwise setting. Nevertheless, the following lemma serves as a stochastic and \mathcal{P} -uniform generalization of Kronecker's lemma that lends itself naturally to our goals and reduces to the usual P-almost sure application of Kronecker's lemma when $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$ is a singleton.

Lemma 1 (A \mathcal{P} -uniform stochastic generalization of Kronecker's lemma). Let $(Z_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of random variables so that their partial sums $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$ form a \mathcal{P} -uniform Cauchy sequence, meaning for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k, n \ge m} |S_k - S_n| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$
 (59)

Moreover, assume that $S_n = \dot{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$, meaning for any $\delta > 0$, there exists N, B > 0 so that for any $n \ge N$,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|S_n| > B\right) < \delta. \tag{60}$$

Let $b_n \nearrow \infty$ be a positive, nondecreasing, and diverging sequence. Then, $b_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i Z_i$ vanishes \mathcal{P} -uniformly: for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=1}^k b_i Z_i \right| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$
 (61)

Proof. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any $\delta > 0$. Our goal is to show that for all m sufficiently large,

Goal:
$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=1}^k b_i Z_i \right| \ge \varepsilon \right) < 4\delta, \tag{62}$$

where the factor of 4 is only included for mathematical convenience later on. Using the assumptions of the theorem in (59) and (60), let B > 0 and choose N sufficiently large so that for any $m \ge N$,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k, n \ge m} |S_n - S_k| \ge \varepsilon/6 \right) < \delta, \tag{63}$$

and so that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|S_m| \geqslant B\right) < \delta. \tag{64}$$

Again using (60) and the assumption that $b_n \nearrow \infty$, let $N^* \equiv N^*(\varepsilon, B, N) \geqslant N$ be sufficiently large so that

$$\frac{\varepsilon b_{N^*}}{6b_N} \geqslant B,\tag{65}$$

and so that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P\left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} S_i \right| \geqslant \frac{\varepsilon b_{N^*}}{6b_N} \right) < \delta, \tag{66}$$

where we can impose the latter condition since $\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} S_i = \dot{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$ for any fixed N and we can take $\varepsilon b_{N^*}/6b_N$ to be arbitrarily large for any fixed N and ε . Then for all $m \ge N^*$,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=1}^k b_i Z_i \right| \ge \varepsilon \right) \tag{67}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| S_k - \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i) S_i \right| \ge \varepsilon \right)$$
 (68)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| S_k - \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i) S_i - \frac{b_k - b_N}{b_k} \cdot S_m - \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=N}^{k-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i) (S_i - S_m) \right| \ge \varepsilon \right)$$
(69)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq m} \left| S_k - \frac{b_k - b_N}{b_k} S_m \right| \geqslant \varepsilon/3 \right) + \tag{70}$$

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i) S_i \right| \ge \varepsilon/3 \right) + \tag{71}$$

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=N}^{k-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i)(S_i - S_m) \right| \ge \varepsilon/3 \right), \tag{72}$$

where (68) follows from summation by parts, (69) follows from breaking the sum up into i = 1, ..., N-1 and i = N, ..., k-1 and simplifying the telescoping sum, and (70) follows from the triangle inequality. We will now bound the terms in (70), (71), and (72) separately.

Bounding (70) by 2δ . For any $m \ge N^*$, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| S_k - \frac{b_k - b_N}{b_k} S_m \right| \ge \varepsilon/3 \right) \tag{73}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq m} |S_k - S_m| \geq \varepsilon/6 \right) + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq m} \left| \frac{b_N}{b_k} S_m \right| \geq \varepsilon/6 \right)$$
 (74)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq m} |S_k - S_m| \geq \varepsilon/6 \right) + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(|S_m| \geq \frac{\varepsilon b_m}{6b_N} \right)$$
 (75)

$$<2\delta,$$
 (76)

where the last inequality follows from the conditions imposed on $N^* \ge N$ in (63) and (64) combined with the fact that $\varepsilon b_m/6b_N \ge B$ for all $m \ge N^*$ as in (65).

Bounding (71) by δ . For any $m \ge N^*$, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geqslant m} \left| \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i) S_i \right| \geqslant \varepsilon/3 \right)$$
 (77)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i) S_i \right| \ge \varepsilon b_m / 3 \right)$$
 (78)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} S_i \right| \geq \frac{\varepsilon b_m}{3b_N} \right) \tag{79}$$

$$<\delta,$$
 (80)

where the last inequality follows from the condition imposed on N^* in (66).

Bounding (72) by δ . For any $m \ge N$, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geqslant m} \left| \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=N}^{k-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i)(S_i - S_m) \right| \geqslant \varepsilon/3 \right)$$
(81)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq m} \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=N}^{k-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i) |S_i - S_m| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right)$$
(82)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq m} \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=N}^{k-1} (b_{i+1} - b_i) \varepsilon / 6 \geq \varepsilon / 3 \right) + \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq N} |S_k - S_m| \geq \varepsilon / 6 \right)}_{\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{E}}}$$
(83)

$$< \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sup_{k \geqslant m} \frac{b_k - b_N}{b_k} \geqslant 2 \right\}}_{} + \delta$$
 (84)

$$=\delta,$$
 (85)

which follows from the conditions imposed on N in (63) and the fact that $\sup_{k \ge m} (b_k - b_N)/b_k \le 1$. Putting the bounds in (70), (71), and (72) together, we have that for any $m \ge N^*$,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geqslant m} \left| \frac{1}{b_k} \sum_{i=1}^k b_i Z_i \right| \geqslant \varepsilon \right) < 4\delta, \tag{86}$$

which yields the desired result, completing the proof.

3.4 Distribution-uniform Borel-Cantelli lemmas

In order to show that \mathcal{P} -UI of certain finite absolute moments is in fact necessary for the \mathcal{P} -uniform SLLN to hold — i.e. the result of Theorem 1(iii) — we rely on a \mathcal{P} -uniform generalization of the second Borel-Cantelli lemma. Before discussing the second Borel-Cantelli lemma, let us briefly discuss the first. A natural desideratum for a \mathcal{P} -uniform first Borel-Cantelli lemma would be to say that for events $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in \mathcal{F} , if $\lim_m \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(E_n) = 0$, then $\lim_m \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P\left(\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} E_k\right) = 0$. Indeed, this is trivially satisfied since

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} E_k \right) \leq \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P \left(E_k \right). \tag{87}$$

For this reason, we do not dwell on the first Borel-Cantelli lemma, but instead shift our attention to the second since its \mathcal{P} -uniform generalization (and the proof thereof) is nontrivial in comparison and is central to the proof of Theorem 1(iii).

Lemma 2 (The second \mathcal{P} -uniform Borel-Cantelli lemma). Let $(E_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be independent events such that

$$0 < \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(E_k) \le \infty.$$
 (88)

Then the probability of infinitely many of them occurring does not P-uniformly vanish, i.e.

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} E_k \right) > 0. \tag{89}$$

Proof. The proof proceeds by a direct calculation. Writing out the limit in (89), we have

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} E_k \right) = \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ 1 - \mathbb{P}_P \left(\bigcap_{k=m}^{\infty} E_k^c \right) \right\}$$
(90)

$$=1-\lim_{m\to\infty}\inf_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\lim_{t\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_P\left(\bigcap_{k=m}^t E_k^c\right) \tag{91}$$

$$=1-\lim_{m\to\infty}\inf_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\lim_{t\to\infty}\prod_{k=m}^{t}(1-\mathbb{P}_{P}(E_{k}))$$
(92)

$$\geqslant 1 - \lim_{m \to \infty} \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \lim_{t \to \infty} \exp\left\{ -\sum_{k=m}^{t} \mathbb{P}_{P}(E_{k}) \right\}$$
 (93)

$$=1-\exp\left\{-\lim_{m\to\infty}\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{k=m}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}_{P}(E_{k})\right\} > 0, \tag{94}$$

where (91) follows from the fact that the intersections $(\bigcap_{k}^{t} E_{k})_{t=1}^{\infty}$ are nested, (92) exploits independence of $(E_{n})_{n=1}^{\infty}$, and (94) follows from the assumption in (88). This completes the proof.

4 Proof details for Theorems 1 and 2

Given the distribution-uniform analogues of Kolmogorov's three-series theorem (Theorem 4), Kronecker's lemma (Lemma 1), and the second Borel-Cantelli lemma (Lemma 2), we are ready to provide complete and detailed proofs for our main results in Theorems 1 and 2.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1(i). As mentioned in the proof outline, we focus on the case of 1 < q < 2 since q = 1 corresponds to the SLLN of Chung [5]. By Lemma 3 (the proof of which we defer to Section 4.1.1), we have that the \mathcal{P} -UI condition

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X - \mathbb{E}_P(X)|^q \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|X - \mathbb{E}_P(X)|^q > m\} \right) = 0 \tag{95}$$

implies that the three series in Theorem 4 vanish \mathcal{P} -uniformly with c=1 as follows:

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P Z_k^{\leqslant 1} = 0, \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_P Z_k^{\leqslant 1} = 0, \text{ and } \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P \left(|Z_k| > 1 \right) = 0, \quad (96)$$

where $Z_k^{\leq 1}$ is the scaled and truncated version of X_k given by

$$Z_k^{\leq 1} := \frac{X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X)}{k^{1/q}} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X)| \leq k^{1/q}\}. \tag{97}$$

Therefore, by the \mathcal{P} -uniform three series theorem (Theorem 4) we have that $S_n \equiv S_n(P) := \sum_{k=1}^n (X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X))/k^{1/q}$ forms a \mathcal{P} -uniform Cauchy sequence, meaning that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k, n \ge m} |S_k - S_n| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$
 (98)

Moreover, by Lemma 7 combined with Theorem 5, we have that the \mathcal{P} -UI condition (95) implies that S_n is \mathcal{P} -uniformly bounded in probability, meaning for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $N, B \geq 1$ so that for any $n \geq N$,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|S_n| \geqslant B\right) < \delta. \tag{99}$$

Combining (98) and (99), we invoke the \mathcal{P} -uniform Kronecker lemma (Lemma 1) with the sequence $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ given by $b_n := n^{1/q}$ to yield that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \ge m} \left| \frac{1}{k^{1/q}} \sum_{i=1}^k (X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X)) \right| \ge \varepsilon \right) = 0, \tag{100}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1(i).

Proof of Theorem 1(ii). By Lemma 4, the \mathcal{P} -UI condition

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X|^q \mathbb{1}\{|X|^q > m\} \right) = 0 \tag{101}$$

implies that the three series in Theorem 4 vanish \mathcal{P} -uniformly with c=1 and with the random variables $(Z_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ given by

$$Z_k^{\leq 1} := \frac{X_k}{k^{1/q}} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|X| \leqslant k^{1/q}\},\tag{102}$$

and thus the partial sums $S_n := \sum_{k=1}^n X_k/k^{1/q}$ are \mathcal{P} -uniformly Cauchy. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1(i), we have by Lemma 8 combined with Theorem 5 that $S_n := \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$ is \mathcal{P} -uniformly bounded in probability. Instantiating the \mathcal{P} -uniform Kronecker lemma (Lemma 1) with the sequence $(b_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ given by $n^{1/q}$, we have the desired result.

Proof of Theorem 1(iii). Suppose that \mathcal{P} is a class of distributions for which the \mathcal{P} -UI condition in (14) does not hold. Then we aim to show that

Goal:
$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geqslant m} \left| \frac{1}{k^{1/q}} \sum_{i=1}^k (X_i - \mu(P; q)) \right| \geqslant \frac{1}{2} \right) > 0, \tag{103}$$

recalling that $\mu(P;q) = \mathbb{E}_P(X)$ when $1 \leq q < 2$ and $\mu(P;q) = 0$ when 0 < q < 1. Consider the partial sums $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu(P;q))$ and note that for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{P}\left(\sup_{k\geqslant m}\frac{1}{k^{1/q}}\left|X-\mu(P;q)\right|\geqslant 1\right) \tag{104}$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq m} \frac{1}{k^{1/q}} (|S_k| + |S_{k-1}|) \geqslant 1 \right) \tag{105}$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq m-1} \frac{1}{k^{1/q}} |S_k| \geq 1/2 \right) + \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geq m-1} \frac{1}{k^{1/q}} |S_k| \geq 1/2 \right)$$
 (106)

$$=2\mathbb{P}_{P}\left(\sup_{k\geqslant m-1}\left|\frac{1}{k^{1/q}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}(X_{i}-\mu(P;q))\right|\geqslant 1/2\right),\tag{107}$$

and hence by the \mathcal{P} -uniform second Borel-Cantelli lemma (Lemma 2), it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|X - \mu(P; q)| > k^{1/q} \right) > 0, \tag{108}$$

from which we will obtain (103). Indeed, by Hu and Zhou [8, Theorem 2.1] — or as shown directly in Lemma 9 — we have that for any random variable Y,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y| > k\right) = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|Y| \mathbb{1}\{|Y| > m\}\right) = 0, \tag{109}$$

and hence if the q^{th} moment is not \mathcal{P} -UI, we must have that (108) holds. This completes the proof. \square

4.1.1 Sufficient conditions for the \mathcal{P} -uniform Kolmogorov three-series theorem

In what follows, we verify that the tails of the three series of Theorem 4 vanish \mathcal{P} -uniformly when X has a \mathcal{P} -UI q^{th} moment, thereby enabling the application of the \mathcal{P} -uniform Kolmogorov three-series theorem. Lemmas 3 and 4 consider the cases of 1 < q < 2 and 0 < q < 1, respectively.

Lemma 3 (Sufficient conditions in the identically distributed case when 1 < q < 2). Let $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be i.i.d. random variables on the probability spaces $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ and let $Y_n := X_n - \mathbb{E}_P X$ be their centered versions for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$. Suppose that the q^{th} moment is UI for some 1 < q < 2:

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > m\} \right) = 0.$$
 (110)

Then, the three conditions of the P-uniform Kolmogorov three-series theorem are satisfied for

$$Z_n := \frac{Y_n}{n^{1/q}} \tag{111}$$

with c = 1, meaning that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_n^{\leqslant 1} \right| = 0, \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_P(Z_n^{\leqslant 1}) = 0, \quad and \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Z_n^{\leqslant 1}| > 1 \right) = 0,$$

where $Z_n^{\leq 1} := Z_n \mathbb{1}\{Y_n \leq n^{1/q}\}.$

Proof. Consider the truncated random variables Y_n^{\leqslant} and $Z_n^{\leqslant 1}$ given by

$$Y_n^{\leqslant} := \begin{cases} Y_n & \text{if } |Y_n| \leqslant n^{1/q} \\ 0 & \text{if } |Y_n| > n^{1/q}. \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_n^{\leqslant 1} := \begin{cases} Z_n & \text{if } |Z_n| \leqslant 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } |Z_n| > 1, \end{cases}$$
 (112)

respectively. Let us now separately show that the tails of the three series vanish P-uniformly.

The first series. Writing out the first series $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty}|\mathbb{E}_{P}Z_{n}^{\leq 1}|$ for any $m\geqslant 1$ and performing a direct calculation, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_n^{\leqslant 1} \right| = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{Y \mathbb{1}(|Y| \leqslant n^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right) \right|$$
(113)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{-Y \mathbb{1}(|Y| > n^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right) \right| \tag{114}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{|Y| \mathbb{1}(|Y| > n^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right) \tag{115}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(\frac{|Y| \mathbb{1}(k^{1/q} < |Y| \leq (k+1)^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right)$$
 (116)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}(k \ge n \ge m) \cdot \mathbb{E}_P\left(\frac{|Y| \mathbb{1}(k^{1/q} < |Y| \le (k+1)^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}}\right)$$
(117)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \sum_{n=m}^{k} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(\frac{|Y| \mathbb{1}(k^{1/q} < |Y| \le (k+1)^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right)$$
(118)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(|Y| \mathbb{1}(k^{1/q} < |Y| \leq (k+1)^{1/q}) \right) \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{k} \frac{1}{n^{1/q}}.$$
 (119)

Now, there exists some constant $C_q > 0$ depending only on q so that $\sum_{n=1}^k 1/n^{1/q} \leqslant C_q k/(k+1)^{1/q}$ and thus

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_{P} Z_{n}^{\leq 1} \right| \leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(|Y| \mathbb{1}(k^{1/q} < |Y| \leq (k+1)^{1/q}) \right) \cdot C_{q} \frac{k}{(k+1)^{1/q}}$$
(120)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} (k+1)^{1/q} \mathbb{P}_P \left(k^{1/q} < |Y| \leq (k+1)^{1/q} \right) \cdot C_q \frac{k}{(k+1)^{1/q}}$$
 (121)

$$= C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=-m}^{\infty} k \mathbb{P}_P \left(k^{1/q} < |Y| \le (k+1)^{1/q} \right). \tag{122}$$

Through another direct calculation, we have that

$$C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=-m}^{\infty} k \mathbb{P}_P \left(k^{1/q} < |Y| \le (k+1)^{1/q} \right)$$
 (123)

$$= C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{k} \mathbb{1}(k \ge m \lor n) \cdot \mathbb{P}_P\left(k^{1/q} < |Y| \le (k+1)^{1/q}\right)$$
 (124)

$$= C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=m \le n}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P \left(k^{1/q} < |Y| \le (k+1)^{1/q} \right)$$
 (125)

$$= C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P \left(|Y|^q > (m \vee n) \right). \tag{126}$$

Noticing that $|Y|^q > (m \vee n)$ if and only if $|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > m \vee n\} > (m \vee n)$, we have that

$$C_{q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P} (|Y|^{q} > (m \vee n)) = C_{q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P} (|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > m \vee n\} > (m \vee n))$$
 (127)

$$\leq C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > m\} > n\right) \tag{128}$$

$$\leqslant C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > m\}\right),\tag{129}$$

and hence by the \mathcal{P} -UI of the q^{th} moment as in (14), we have that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_n^{\leqslant 1} \right| = 0, \tag{130}$$

which completes the proof for the first of the three series.

The second series. Writing out the second series $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty}\operatorname{Var}_P(Z_n^{\leq 1})$ for any $m\geqslant 1$ and performing a direct calculation, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1} = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{P} \left[(Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1})^{2} \right] - \left[\mathbb{E}_{P} Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1} \right]^{2} \right\}$$
(131)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P}[(Z_{n}^{\leq 1})^{2}] \tag{132}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}\{n \geq m\} \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left[\frac{Y^2}{n^{2/q}} \mathbb{1}\{|Y| \leq n^{1/q}\} \right]$$
 (133)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}\{n \ge m\} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{P} \left[\frac{Y^{2}}{n^{2/q}} \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \le k^{1/q}\} \right]$$
 (134)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}\{n \ge k \vee m\} \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left[\frac{Y^2}{n^{2/q}} \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \le k^{1/q}\} \right]$$
(135)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left[Y^2 \mathbb{1}\{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \le k^{1/q} \} \right] \sum_{n=k \vee m}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2/q}}.$$
 (136)

Now, notice that there exists a constant $C_q > 0$ depending only on q so that $\sum_{n=k \vee m}^{\infty} 1/n^{2/q} \leq (k \vee m)/(k \vee m)^{2/q}$, and hence we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1} \leqslant C_{q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(k \vee m)}{(k \vee m)^{2/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{P} \left[Y^{2} \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \leqslant k^{1/q} \} \right]$$
(137)

$$\leqslant C_q \left\{ \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{m}{m^{2/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left[Y^2 \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \leqslant k^{1/q} \} \right]}_{(\star \leqslant)} + \right. \tag{138}$$

$$\underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{2/q}} \mathbb{E}_P \left[Y^2 \mathbb{1}\{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \leqslant k^{1/q} \} \right]}_{(\star, \star)} \right\}, \tag{139}$$

and we will now separately show that $(\star_{\leq}) \to 0$ and $(\star_{\geq}) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. By Lemma 5, let $\varphi(x) \equiv xh(x)$; $x \geq 0$ be a function where $h(x) \geq 1$ is nondecreasing and diverging to ∞ no faster than $x \mapsto \log x$ so that

$$\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \varphi(|Y|^q) < \infty. \tag{140}$$

Then, writing out (\star_{\leq}) , we have that

$$(\star_{\leq}) := \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{m}{m^{2/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{P} \left[Y^{2} \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \leq k^{1/q} \} \right]$$
 (141)

$$= m \cdot \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left[\frac{Y^2}{m^{2/q}} \mathbb{1}\{|Y| \leqslant m^{1/q}\} \right]$$
 (142)

$$\leq m \cdot \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left[\frac{\varphi(|Y|^q)}{\varphi(m)} \mathbb{1}\{|Y| \leq m^{1/q}\} \right]$$
(143)

$$\leq \mathcal{M} \cdot \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left[\frac{\varphi(|Y|^q)}{\mathcal{M} \cdot h(m)} \right]$$
 (144)

$$= \underbrace{\frac{1}{h(m)}}_{\to 0} \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{P} \varphi(|Y|^{q})}_{<\infty},\tag{145}$$

where (143) follows from Lemma 6. Therefore, $\lim_{m\to\infty}(\star_{\leq})=0$. Now, let us show that $\lim_{m\to\infty}(\star_{\geq})=0$. Indeed, writing out (\star_{\geq}) ,

$$(\star_{\geqslant}) := \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{2/q}} \mathbb{E}_P \left[Y^2 \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \leqslant k^{1/q} \} \right]$$
 (146)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{2/q}} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left[k^{2/q} \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \leq k^{1/q} \} \right]$$
 (147)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} k \mathbb{P}_P \left((k-1)^{1/q} < |Y| \leq k^{1/q} \right), \tag{148}$$

and the above vanishes as $m \to \infty$ by the proof for the first series. Putting both the analysis for (\star_{\leq}) and (\star_{\geq}) together, we have that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1} = 0, \tag{149}$$

completing the proof for the second series.

The third series. Writing out the third series $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{k=m}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y/k^{1/q}|>1\right)$ for any $m\geqslant 1$, we have that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(\left| \frac{Y}{k^{1/q}} \right| > 1 \right) \tag{150}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}(k \ge m) \mathbb{P}_P(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > k\} > k), \tag{151}$$

where the equality follows from the fact that $|Y|^q > k$ if and only if $|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > k\} > k$. Continuing from the above, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}(k \geqslant m) \mathbb{P}_P(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > k\} > k)$$
(152)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}(k \geq m) \mathbb{P}_{P}(|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > m\} > k),$$
 (153)

since $\mathbb{P}(|Y|^q\mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q>k\}>k)\leq \mathbb{P}(|Y|^q\mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q>m\}>k)$ whenever $k\geqslant m$. Finally, we use the expectation-tail sum identity:

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}(k \ge m) \mathbb{P}_{P}(|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > m\} > k)$$
 (154)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P}(|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > m\} > k)$$
 (155)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > m\}\right),\tag{156}$$

and thus using the \mathcal{P} -UI q^{th} moment of Y, we have that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y| > k^{1/q}\right) = 0,\tag{157}$$

completing the proof of the third series, and hence the entire lemma.

Lemma 4 (Sufficient conditions for the three series with 0 < q < 1). Given the same setup as Lemma 3, suppose that X has a \mathcal{P} -UI (uncentered) q^{th} moment for some 0 < q < 1:

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|X|^q \mathbb{1}\{|X|^q > m\}\right) = 0. \tag{158}$$

Then, the three conditions of the P-uniform Kolmogorov three-series theorem are satisfied for

$$Z_n := \frac{X_n}{n^{1/q}} \tag{159}$$

with c = 1, meaning that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_n^{\leqslant 1} \right| = 0, \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_P(Z_n^{\leqslant 1}) = 0, \quad and \quad \lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Z_n^{\leqslant 1}| > 1 \right) = 0,$$

where $Z_n^{\leq 1} := Z_n \mathbb{1}\{X_n \leq n^{1/q}\}$

Proof. The proofs for the second and third series are identical to those when 1 < q < 2 as in Lemma 3 and thus we focus solely on the first series here. Writing out $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X| \mathbb{1}(|X| \leq n^{1/q})/n^{1/q} \right)$, we have that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_n^{\leqslant 1} \right| \leqslant \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{|X| \mathbb{1}(|X| \leqslant n^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right) \tag{160}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}\{n \geq k \vee m\} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(\frac{|X| \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \leq k^{1/q}\}}{n^{1/q}} \right)$$
 (161)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}\{n \ge k \vee m\} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{|X| \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \le k^{1/q}\}}{n^{1/q}} \right)$$
(162)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X| \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \le k^{1/q}\} \right) \sum_{n=k \vee m}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/q}}, \tag{163}$$

and thus there exists $C_q > 0$ depending only on q so that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P} Z_{n}^{\leq 1} \leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(|X| \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \leq k^{1/q} \} \right) \cdot C_{q} \frac{k \vee m}{(k \vee m)^{1/q}}$$
(164)

$$\leqslant C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{m}{m^{1/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X| \mathbb{1} \left\{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \leqslant k^{1/q} \right\} \right) + \underbrace{\left(\star_{\leqslant} \right)}$$

$$\tag{165}$$

$$C_{q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{1/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(|X| \mathbb{1} \left\{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \leqslant k^{1/q} \right\} \right), \tag{166}$$

and thus similarly to the proof for the second series in Lemma 3, it suffices to show that $(\star_{\leq}) \to 0$ and $(\star_{\geq}) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. Turning to (\star_{\leq}) first, we have

$$(\star_{\leq}) = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{m}{m^{1/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(|X| \mathbb{1} \left\{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \leq k^{1/q} \right\} \right)$$
 (167)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} m \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{|X|}{m^{1/q}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ |X| \leqslant m^{1/q} \right\} \right). \tag{168}$$

By Lemma 5, there exists a function $\varphi(x) = xh(x)$; $x \ge 0$ where $h(x) \ge 1$ is nondecreasing and diverges to ∞ no faster than $x \mapsto \log x$ so that

$$\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \varphi(|X|^q) < \infty. \tag{169}$$

Moreover, instantiating Lemma 6 with u=1, we have that $|X|/m^{1/q} \leq \varphi(|X|^q)/\varphi(m)$ whenever $|X| \leq m^{1/q}$ and thus

$$(\star_{\leq}) \leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} m \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{|X|}{m^{1/q}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ |X| \leq m^{1/q} \right\} \right)$$
 (170)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} m \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{\varphi(|X|^q)}{\varphi(m)} \right)$$
 (171)

$$= \frac{\mathscr{M}}{\mathscr{M}h(m)} \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \varphi(|X|^q)}_{\in \mathcal{O}}, \tag{172}$$

and since $\lim_{m\to\infty} h(m) = \infty$, we have that $\lim_{m\to\infty} (\star_{\leq}) = 0$. Moving to (\star_{\geq}) , we have that

$$(\star_{\geqslant}) = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{1/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X| \mathbb{1} \left\{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \leqslant k^{1/q} \right\} \right)$$
 (173)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{1/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left(k^{1/q} \mathbb{1} \left\{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \leq k^{1/q} \right\} \right) \tag{174}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} k \cdot \mathbb{P}_P \left((k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \le k^{1/q} \right)$$
 (175)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{k} \mathbb{1}(k \ge m) \cdot \mathbb{P}_{P}\left((k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \le k^{1/q} \right)$$
 (176)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n \vee m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left((k-1)^{1/q} < |X| \leqslant k^{1/q} \right)$$

$$\tag{177}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|X|^q > n \vee m\right) \tag{178}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|X|^q \mathbb{1}\left\{|X|^q > n \vee m\right\} > n \vee m\right)$$

$$\tag{179}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_{P}\left(|X|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|X|^{q} > m\} > m\right) + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P}\left(|X|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|X|^{q} > n \vee m\} > n \vee m\right)$$
(180)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P(|X|^q > m) + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(|X|^q \mathbb{1}\{|X|^q > m\} > n)$$

$$\tag{181}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P |X|^q / m + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X|^q \mathbb{1} \left\{ |X|^q > m \right\} \right), \tag{182}$$

and thus by the \mathcal{P} -UI condition, we have that $\lim_{m\to\infty}(\star_{\geq})=0$, completing the proof of Lemma 4.

Lemma 5. Let 0 < q < 2 and suppose that the (potentially uncentered) q^{th} moment of Y is UI, meaning that

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}(|Y|^q > m)\right) = 0. \tag{183}$$

Then there exists a nondecreasing function φ that can be written as $\varphi(x) = xh(x)$ for any $x \ge 0$ where $h(x) \ge 1$ is nondecreasing and diverges to ∞ no faster than $\log(x)$ so that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P\left[\varphi(|Y|^q)\right] < \infty. \tag{184}$$

Proof. By the criterion of uniform integrability due to Charles de la Vallée Poussin (see Chong [3], Hu and Rosalsky [7], or Chandra [1]), we have that there exists a function $\varphi^* : \mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0}$ growing faster than $x \mapsto x$ — meaning that $\lim_{x \to \infty} \varphi^*(x)/x = \infty$ — so that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left[\varphi^*(|Y|^q) \right] < \infty. \tag{185}$$

Define $h^{\star}(x) := x^{-1} \varphi^{\star}(x) \mathbbm{1}(x > 0)$, noting that h^{\star} diverges to ∞ . From this, define $h : \mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0}$ as

$$h(x) := \inf_{y \ge x} \{ (h^{\star}(y) \lor 1) \land \log(e + y) \}.$$
 (186)

Clearly, $1 \le h(x) \le \log(e+x)$ for every $x \ge 0$ and the infimum over $y \ge x$ of $h^*(y)$ forces h(x) to be nondecreasing. Define $\varphi(x) := xh(x)$ and note that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \varphi(|Y|^q) = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_P |Y|^q h(|Y|^q) \right\} \tag{187}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \{ \mathbb{E}_P \left(|Y|^q \left[2 + h^*(|Y|^q) \right] \right) \}$$
 (188)

$$\leq 2 \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P |Y|^q + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|Y|^q h^{\star}(|Y|^q) \right)$$

$$\leq 2 \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P |Y|^q + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\varphi^{\star}(|Y|^q) \right)$$
(189)

$$\leq 2 \sup_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_P |Y|^q + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\varphi^{\star}(|Y|^q) \right) \tag{190}$$

$$<\infty,$$
 (191)

which completes the proof.

Lemma 6. Consider the setup of Lemma 5. We have that for any $a \ge 0$ and b > 0 such that $a \le b$,

$$\frac{a^u}{b^u} \leqslant \frac{\varphi(a^q)}{\varphi(b^q)},\tag{192}$$

whenever $0 < q \le u \le 2$.

Proof. Clearly the result holds when a=0 since $\varphi(0)=0$ and $\varphi(x)>0$ when x>0, so let us consider the case where $0 < a \le b$. Then without loss of generality, we can write b = ac for some $c \ge 1$. Showing (192) amounts to showing that

$$\frac{1}{c^u} \leqslant \frac{\varphi(a^q)}{\varphi(a^q c^q)}. (193)$$

Indeed, we have that

$$\frac{\varphi(a^q)}{\varphi(a^q c^q)} = \frac{\mathscr{A} \cdot h(a^q)}{\mathscr{A} \cdot c^q \cdot h(a^q c^q)} \tag{194}$$

$$\geqslant \frac{1}{c^q} \tag{195}$$

$$\geqslant \frac{1}{c^u}, \tag{196}$$

$$\geqslant \frac{1}{c^u},$$
 (196)

where the first line follows from the fact that $\varphi(x)$ can be written as xh(x), the second follows from the fact that $h(a^q) \leq h(a^q c^q)$ since h is nondecreasing and $c \geq 1$, and the last line follows from the fact that $c^q \leq c^u$ whenever $c \geq 1$ and $0 < q \leq u$, completing the proof of Lemma 6.

4.1.2 Distribution-uniform boundedness in probability

In order to apply our \mathcal{P} -uniform stochastic Kronecker lemma (Lemma 1) in the proof of Theorems 1(i)and 1(ii), we ultimately need to show that

$$S_n := \sum_{k=1}^n Y_k / k^{1/q} \tag{197}$$

is \mathcal{P} -uniformly bounded in probability — or more succinctly, $\sum_{k=1}^{n} Y_k/k^{1/q} = \bar{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$ — where $Y_k = X_k - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}(X)$ when 1 < q < 2 and $Y_k = X_k$ when 0 < q < 1. In order to achieve this, we introduce a particular three series theorem for \mathcal{P} -uniform boundedness in probability (Theorem 5) that is similar in spirit but distinct from Theorem 4 and then show in Lemmas 7 and 8 that \mathcal{P} -UI is sufficient to satisfy the conditions of Theorem 5. Let us now state and prove Theorem 5.

Theorem 5 (A three-series theorem for \mathcal{P} -uniform boundedness in probability). Let $(Z_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be independent random variables on the probability spaces $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Suppose that the following three series uniformly vanish as $B \to \infty$:

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}_P \left[(Z_n/B) \, \mathbb{1}\{ |Z_n/B| \le 1 \} \right]| = 0, \tag{198}$$

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} \left[(Z_{n}/B) \mathbb{1}\{|Z_{n}/B| \le 1\} \right] = 0, \quad and \tag{199}$$

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(|Z_n/B| > 1) = 0. \tag{200}$$

Then, $S_n := \sum_{k=1}^n Z_k$ is \mathcal{P} -uniformly bounded in probability, meaning that for any δ , there exists N_{δ} and B_{δ} so that for all $n \geq N_{\delta}$,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|S_n| \geqslant B_\delta\right) < \delta. \tag{201}$$

Conceptually, the \mathcal{P} -uniform Kolmogorov three-series theorem derived in Section 3.2 can be thought of as imposing \mathcal{P} -uniform structure on whether $(S_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges almost surely, while Theorem 5 imposes \mathcal{P} -uniform structure on what $(S_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to with high probability. This subtlety is sidestepped in the P-pointwise case since if S_n is P-almost surely convergent, then it is bounded in probability (its limit point is a well-defined random variable). As such, it is perhaps unsurprising that when $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$ is a singleton, the conditions (198)–(200) reduce to those of the Kolmogorov three-series theorem displayed in (42) but with absolute values surrounding the summands of the first series (which, as discussed in Section 3.2, is a distinction that is virtually inconsequential for the purposes of proving SLLNs).

Let us now prove Theorem 5 below, and later (in Lemmas 7 and 8) show that the three series conditions are satisfied under \mathcal{P} -UI conditions. In what follows, we use $Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1}$ to denote

$$Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1} := (Z_n/B)\mathbb{1}\{|Z_n/B| \leq 1\}$$
(202)

and $S_{n,B}^{\leq 1} := \sum_{k=1}^{n} Z_{k,B}^{\leq 1}$ to denote their partial sums.

Proof of Theorem 5. Let $\delta > 0$ be arbitrary. Our goal is to show that there exists N_{δ} and B_{δ} large enough so that for all $n \ge N_{\delta}$, (201) holds. Notice that for any B > 0, we have that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|S_n| > B\right) \tag{203}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\left| \sum_{k=1}^n Z_k \right| > B \right) \tag{204}$$

$$\leq \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\left| \sum_{k=1}^n (Z_k/B) \mathbb{1}\{|Z_k/B| \leq 1\} \right| > 1 \right)}_{(\star)} + \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{P}_P \left(|Z_k/B| > 1\right)}_{(\dagger)}. \tag{205}$$

Now, notice that we can write (\star) as

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\left| \sum_{k=1}^n (Z_k/B) \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|Z_k/B| \le 1\} \right| > 1 \right)$$
 (206)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\left| S_{n,B}^{\leqslant} - \mathbb{E}_P S_{n,B}^{\leqslant} + \mathbb{E}_P S_{n,B}^{\leqslant} \right| > 1 \right)$$
 (207)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\left| S_{n,B}^{\leq} - \mathbb{E}_P S_{n,B}^{\leq} \right| > 1/2 \right) + \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\left| \mathbb{E}_P S_{n,B}^{\leq} \right| > 1/2 \right)$$
 (208)

$$= \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\left| S_{n,B}^{\leqslant} - \mathbb{E}_P S_{n,B}^{\leqslant} \right| > 1/2 \right)}_{(\star i)} + \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| \mathbb{E}_P S_{n,B}^{\leqslant} \right| > 1/2 \right\}}_{(\star ii)}. \tag{209}$$

By Kolmogorov's inequality, we have that

$$(\star i) \leq 4 \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \operatorname{Var}_{P} \left((Z_{k}/B) \cdot \{ |Z_{k}/B| \leq 1 \} \right)$$
 (210)

$$\leq 4 \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} \left((Z_{k}/B) \cdot \{ |Z_{k}/B| \leq 1 \} \right). \tag{211}$$

Furthermore, by the triangle inequality and upper bounding the finite sum by an infinite one, we have

$$(\star ii) \leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{1} \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}_P[(Z_n/B)\mathbb{1}\{|Z_n/B| \leq 1\}]| > 1/2 \right\}.$$
 (212)

Once again upper bounding a finite sum by an infinite one, we have

$$(\dagger) \leqslant \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Z_k/B| > 1\right). \tag{213}$$

Therefore, using the first, second, and third series conditions, we can find $B_{\delta} > 0$ so that for all $n \ge 1$, we have $(\star i) \le \delta/2$, $(\star ii) = 0$, and $(\dagger) \le \delta/2$, respectively, and thus

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|S_n| > B_\delta\right) \leqslant \delta,\tag{214}$$

completing the proof.

Lemma 7 (Satisfying the three series for uniform boundedness when 1 < q < 2). Suppose that $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ are i.i.d. and have a \mathcal{P} -UI q^{th} moment for 1 < q < 2. Then the three series for uniform stochastic boundedness in Theorem 5 are satisfied for the random variable $Z_n := (X_n - \mathbb{E}_P(X))/n^{1/q}$.

Proof. We will handle the three series separately below. Throughout, let $Y_n := X_n - \mathbb{E}_P(X)$ and $Z_{n,B}^{\leq} := (Y/B)\mathbb{1}\{(Y/B)| \leq n^{1/q}\}/n^{1/q}$.

The first uniform boundedness series. Writing out the first series $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}_P(Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1})|$ and performing a direct calculation, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}_P Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1}| = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{(Y/B)\mathbb{1}(|(Y/B)| \leqslant n^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right) \right|$$
(215)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{-(Y/B)\mathbb{1}(|Y/B| > n^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right) \right|$$
 (216)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{|Y/B| \mathbb{1}(|Y/B| > n^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right) \tag{217}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(\frac{|Y/B| \mathbb{1}(k^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le (k+1)^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right)$$
(218)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{k} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(\frac{|Y/B| \mathbb{1}(k^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le (k+1)^{1/q})}{n^{1/q}} \right)$$
(219)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|Y/B| \mathbb{1}(k^{1/q} < |Y/B| \leq (k+1)^{1/q}) \right) \cdot \sum_{n=1}^k \frac{1}{n^{1/q}}. \tag{220}$$

Now, there exists some constant $C_q > 0$ depending only on q so that $\sum_{n=1}^k 1/n^{1/q} \leqslant C_q k/(k+1)^{1/q}$ and thus

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P} Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1} \leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(|Y/B| \mathbb{1} (k^{1/q} < |Y/B| \leq (k+1)^{1/q}) \right) \cdot C_{q} \frac{k}{(k+1)^{1/q}}$$
(221)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \underbrace{(k+1)^{1/q}} \mathbb{P}_P \left(k^{1/q} < |Y/B| \leq (k+1)^{1/q} \right) \cdot C_q \frac{k}{(k+1)^{1/q}}$$
 (222)

$$= C_q \cdot \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \mathbb{P}_P \left(k^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le (k+1)^{1/q} \right). \tag{223}$$

Through another direct calculation, we have that

$$C_q \cdot \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \mathbb{P}_P \left(k^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le (k+1)^{1/q} \right)$$
 (224)

$$= C_q \cdot \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}_P \left(k^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le (k+1)^{1/q} \right)$$
 (225)

$$= C_q \cdot \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P \left(k^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le (k+1)^{1/q} \right)$$
 (226)

$$= C_q \cdot \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y/B|^q > n\right) \tag{227}$$

$$\leq C_q \cdot \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|Y/B|^q\right)$$
 (228)

$$\leqslant C_q \cdot B^{-q} \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|Y|^q \right),}_{<\infty} \tag{229}$$

and thus

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} = 0, \tag{230}$$

completing the proof for the first uniform boundedness series.

The second uniform boundedness series. Writing out the second series $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_P(Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1})$ for any B > 0 and performing a direct calculation, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1} = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{P} [(Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1})^{2}] - [\mathbb{E}_{P} Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1}]^{2} \right\}$$
(231)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P}[(Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1})^{2}] \tag{232}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left[\frac{(Y/B)^2}{n^{2/q}} \mathbb{1}\{|Y/B| \leq n^{1/q}\} \right]$$
 (233)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left[\frac{(Y/B)^{2}}{n^{2/q}} \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le k^{1/q}\} \right]$$
(234)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left[\frac{(Y/B)^{2}}{n^{2/q}} \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le k^{1/q}\} \right]$$
(235)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left[(Y/B)^2 \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le k^{1/q} \} \right] \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2/q}}.$$
 (236)

Now, notice that there exists a constant $C_q > 0$ depending only on q so that $\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 1/n^{2/q} \leqslant C_q k/k^{2/q}$, and hence we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1} \leq C_{q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{2/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{P} \left[(Y/B)^{2} \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \leq k^{1/q} \} \right]. \tag{237}$$

Separating the first term from this sum, notice that we have

$$C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{2/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left[(Y/B)^2 \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le k^{1/q}\} \right]$$
 (238)

$$\leq \underbrace{C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left[(Y/B)^2 \mathbb{1}\{|Y/B| \leq 1\} \right]}_{(\star)} + \tag{239}$$

$$\underbrace{C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{2/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left[(Y/B)^2 \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} \leqslant |Y/B| \leqslant k^{1/q} \} \right]}_{(\dagger)}.$$
 (240)

Notice that $(Y/B)^2 \mathbb{1}\{|Y/B| \le 1\} \le |Y/B|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y/B| \le 1\}$ with P-probability one for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ since 0 < q < 2. Therefore,

$$(\star) = C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left[(Y/B)^2 \mathbb{1}\{|Y/B| \leqslant 1\} \right] \leqslant \frac{C_q}{B^q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P |Y|^q. \tag{241}$$

Turning now to (†), we have

$$(\dagger) = C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{2/q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_P \left[(Y/B)^2 \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le k^{1/q} \} \right]$$
 (242)

$$\leq C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^{2/q}} \mathbb{E}_P \left[k^{2/q} \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le k^{1/q} \} \right]$$
 (243)

$$= C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k \mathbb{P}_P \left((k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le k^{1/q} \right)$$
 (244)

$$= C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{k} \mathbb{P}_P \left((k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le k^{1/q} \right)$$
 (245)

$$= C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}\{k \ge 2\} \mathbb{P}_P \left((k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \le k^{1/q} \right)$$
 (246)

$$\leq C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left[2 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P \left((k-1)^{1/q} < |Y/B| \leq k^{1/q} \right) \right]$$
 (247)

$$\leq 2C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y/B| > (n-1)^{1/q}\right) \tag{248}$$

$$\leq \frac{2C_q}{B^q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|Y|^q\right). \tag{249}$$

Putting the bounds on (\star) and (\dagger) together, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} \leqslant (\star) + (\dagger) \leqslant \frac{3C_{q}}{B^{q}} \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{P} |Y|^{q}}_{<\infty}, \tag{250}$$

and hence we have that

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} = 0, \tag{251}$$

which completes the proof for the second series.

The third uniform boundedness series. Writing out the series $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y/k^{1/q}| > B\right)$ for any B > 0 and using the expectation-tail sum identity, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y/k^{1/q}| > B\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{B^q} \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|Y|^q\right)}_{\leq \infty},\tag{252}$$

and we note that $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P(|Y|^q) < \infty$ above since uniform integrability implies uniform boundedness. Consequently, we have that

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y/k^{1/q}| > B\right) = 0, \tag{253}$$

completing the proof for the third series and hence the entire lemma.

Lemma 8 (Satisfying the three series for uniform boundedness when 0 < q < 1). Suppose that X has a \mathcal{P} -UI (uncentered) q^{th} moment for 0 < q < 1. Then the three series for uniform stochastic boundedness in Theorem 5 are satisfied for the random variable $Z_n := X_n/n^{1/q}$.

Proof. Similar to satisfying the conditions of the \mathcal{P} -uniform Kolmogorov three-series theorem as in Lemma 4, satisfying the conditions of the \mathcal{P} -uniform boundedness three-series theorem proceeds identically for the second and third series, and thus we focus solely on the first series here.

cally for the second and third series, and thus we focus solely on the first series here. Throughout, let $Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant} := (X/B)\mathbb{1}\{(X/B)| \leqslant n^{1/q}\}/n^{1/q}$. Writing out $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}_P(Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1})|$ for any B > 0, we have via a direct calculation that

$$\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left|\mathbb{E}_{P}Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1}\right|\tag{254}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{|X/B| \mathbb{1}\{|X/B| \leq n^{1/q}\}}{n^{1/q}} \right) \tag{255}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}_{P} \left(\frac{|X/B| \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |X/B| \leqslant k^{1/q}\}}{n^{1/q}} \right)$$
 (256)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X/B| \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |X/B| \le k^{1/q}\} \right) \cdot \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1/q}}.$$
 (257)

Now, following techniques from earlier proofs, notice that since 0 < q < 1, there exists a constant C_q depending only on q so that $\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 1/n^{1/q} \leqslant C_q k/k^{1/q}$. Breaking up the sum similarly to how we did for the second series of uniform boundedness in Lemma 7, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} \right| \leqslant \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X/B| \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |X/B| \leqslant k^{1/q}\} \right) \cdot C_q \frac{k}{k^{1/q}}$$
 (258)

$$\leq \underbrace{C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X/B| \mathbb{1}\{|X/B| \leq 1 \right) + \underbrace{\left(\times \right)}_{(\star)} } \tag{259}$$

$$\underbrace{C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X/B| \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |X/B| \leqslant k^{1/q}\} \right) \frac{k}{k^{1/q}}}_{(\dagger)}.$$
 (260)

First looking at (\star) , we notice that $|X/B|\mathbb{1}\{|X/B| \le 1\} \le |X/B|^q\mathbb{1}\{|X/B| \le 1\}$ with P-probability one for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$ since 0 < q < 1, and thus

$$(\star) \leqslant \frac{C_q}{B^q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P |X|^q. \tag{261}$$

Turning to (†), we have that

$$(\dagger) = C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(|X/B| \mathbb{1}\{(k-1)^{1/q} < |X/B| \le k^{1/q}\} \right) \frac{k}{k^{1/q}}$$
 (262)

$$\leq C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(k^{1/q} \mathbb{1} \{ (k-1)^{1/q} < |X/B| \leq k^{1/q} \} \right) \frac{k}{k^{1/q}}$$

$$\tag{263}$$

$$= C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{k} \mathbb{1}\{k \ge 2\} \mathbb{P}_P \left((k-1)^{1/q} < |X/B| \le k^{1/q} \right)$$
 (264)

$$= C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}\{k \ge 2\} \mathbb{P}_P \left((k-1)^{1/q} < |X/B| \le k^{1/q} \right)$$
 (265)

$$\leq 2C_q \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|X/B| > n^{1/q}\right) \tag{266}$$

$$\leq \frac{2C_q}{B^q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{E}_P |X|^q. \tag{267}$$

Combining the upper bounds on (\star) and (\dagger) , we have that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} \right| \leqslant \frac{3C_q}{B^q} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P |X|^q, \tag{268}$$

and thus we have that

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} \right| = 0, \tag{269}$$

completing the proof of Lemma 8.

4.1.3 An equivalent criterion of uniform integrability

Lemma 9 (Uniform integrability is equivalent to uniformly vanishing sums of tail probabilities). Let Y be a random variable on the probability spaces $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$. Then Y has a \mathcal{P} -UI q^{th} moment if and only if the tail sum of its tail probability is \mathcal{P} -uniformly vanishing, meaning

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}(|Y|^q > m)\right) = 0 \tag{270}$$

if and only if

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(|Y|^q > k) = 0.$$
 (271)

The above lemma gives an equivalent criterion of \mathcal{P} -UI and was shown in Hu and Zhou [8, Theorem 2.1] where they refer to the property in (271) as " W^* uniform integrability" [8, Definition 1.6]. Since Hu and Zhou [8, Theorem 2.1] is written in the context of uniform integrability for a family of random variables $(X_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ defined on a single probability space (as contrasted with \mathcal{P} -UI in Section 1), we provide a self-contained proof for completeness.

Proof. The forward implication is obvious since for any $P \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P}(|Y|^{q} > k) = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P}(|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > m\} > k)$$
(272)

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}(|Y|^q > m) > k) \tag{273}$$

$$\leq \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}_P(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}(|Y|^q > m) > k) dk \tag{274}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_P(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}(|Y|^q > m)). \tag{275}$$

The reverse implication is more involved. Suppose that there exists a collection of distributions \mathcal{P} so that (271) holds but (270) does not. First, note that we can write the supremum over expectations in (270) as

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{P} (|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > m\}) = \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P} (|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > m\} > k) dk$$
 (276)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}(|Y|^q > m) > k\right) \tag{277}$$

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P} \left(|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > m\} > k \right) + \tag{278}$$

$$\underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > m\} > k\right)}_{(\dagger)},\tag{279}$$

and since $(\star) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$, we must have that $(\dagger) \to 0$, and hence

$$\limsup_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > m\} > k\right) > \varepsilon \tag{280}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$, or in other words, no matter how large we take M to be, we can always find some $M^* \geq M$ and $P^* \in \mathcal{P}$ so that $\sum_{k=0}^{M^*-1} \mathbb{P}_{P^*}(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > M^*\} > k) > \varepsilon$. Writing out the above sum, we have for any m, P,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > m\} > k\right) = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y|^q > m\right)$$
 (281)

since $|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > m\} > k$ if and only if $|Y|^q > m$ whenever $k \leq m$. Carrying on with the above calculation, we have as a consequence of (280) that

$$\limsup_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} m \mathbb{P}_P(|Y|^q > m) > \varepsilon. \tag{282}$$

Simultaneously, by the assumed uniform tail vanishing property in (271), we can choose an M sufficiently large so that

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > M\} > k\right) < \varepsilon/2. \tag{283}$$

By (282), find some $M^* > 3M$ and $P^* \in \mathcal{P}$ so that

$$M^{\star} \cdot \mathbb{P}_{P^{\star}} (|Y|^q > M^{\star}) > \varepsilon.$$
 (284)

We will now show that (283) and (284) are incompatible, leading to a contradiction. Indeed,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > M\} > k\right) \tag{285}$$

$$\geqslant \sum_{k=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_{P^{\star}} (|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > M\} > k)$$
 (286)

$$\geqslant \sum_{k=M}^{M^{\star}} \mathbb{P}_{P^{\star}} (|Y|^{q} \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^{q} > M\} > k)$$
 (287)

$$= \sum_{k=M}^{M^{\star}} \mathbb{P}_{P^{\star}} \left(|Y|^q > k \right), \tag{288}$$

where the first inequality follows by definition of a supremum, the second since we are taking only a smaller sum over finitely many elements, and the last equality follows from the fact that whenever $k \ge M$, $|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > M\} > k$ if and only if $|Y|^q > k$. Carrying on with the above calculation, we finally have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y|^q \mathbb{1}\{|Y|^q > M\} > k\right) \tag{289}$$

$$\geqslant \sum_{k=M}^{M^{\star}} \mathbb{P}_{P^{\star}} \left(|Y|^{q} > k \right) \tag{290}$$

$$\geqslant \sum_{k=M}^{M^{\star}} \mathbb{P}_{P^{\star}} \left(|Y|^q > M^{\star} \right) \tag{291}$$

$$= (M^{\star} - M)\mathbb{P}_{P^{\star}}(|Y|^q > M^{\star}) \tag{292}$$

$$\geqslant (M^{\star} - M^{\star}/3) \mathbb{P}_{P^{\star}} (|Y|^q > M^{\star}) \tag{293}$$

$$> 2\varepsilon/3,$$
 (294)

which contradicts the fact that the same sum was assumed to be less than $\varepsilon/2$ in (283), completing the proof.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof of Theorem 2. By Lemma 10, we have that the following \mathcal{P} -uniform moment regularity condition

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P |X_k - \mathbb{E}_P X_k|^q}{a_k^q} = 0$$
 (295)

implies that the three series in Theorem 4 vanish \mathcal{P} -uniformly with c=1 for the random variables $Z_k^{\leq 1}$ which are scaled and truncated versions of X_k given by

$$Z_k^{\leqslant 1} := \frac{X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X_k)}{a_k} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{|X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X)| \leqslant a_k\}. \tag{296}$$

Therefore, by the \mathcal{P} -uniform three series theorem (Theorem 4) we have that $S_n \equiv S_n(P) := \sum_{k=1}^n (X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X))/a_k$ forms a \mathcal{P} -uniform Cauchy sequence. Moreover, by Theorem 5 and Lemma 11, we have that the \mathcal{P} -uniform moment regularity condition (295) implies that S_n is \mathcal{P} -uniformly bounded in probability. Combining the facts that $(S_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is \mathcal{P} -uniformly Cauchy and bounded in probability, we invoke the \mathcal{P} -uniform Kronecker lemma (Lemma 1) similar to the proof of Theorem 1(i) but now with the sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ to yield that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \mathbb{P}_P \left(\sup_{k \geqslant m} \left| \frac{1}{a_k} \sum_{i=1}^k (X_k - \mathbb{E}_P(X_k)) \right| \geqslant \varepsilon \right) = 0, \tag{297}$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma 10 (Satisfying the three series for independent random variables). Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be independent random variables and let $Y_n := X_n - \mathbb{E}X_n$ be their centered versions. Suppose that for some increasing sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ that diverges to ∞ ,

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=t}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P |Y_n|^q}{a_n^q} = 0.$$
 (298)

Then the three series conditions of Theorem 4 are satisfied for

$$Z_k := \frac{Y_k}{a_k} \tag{299}$$

with c = 1.

Proof. First, define the truncated random variables Y_n^{\leq} as

$$Y_n^{\leqslant} := \begin{cases} Y_n & \text{if } |Y_n| \leqslant a_n \\ 0 & \text{if } |Y_n| > a_n. \end{cases}$$
 (300)

and $Z_n^{\leq 1}$ as

$$Z_n^{\leqslant 1} := \begin{cases} Z_n & \text{if } |Z_n| \leqslant 1\\ 0 & \text{if } |Z_n| > 1 \end{cases}$$

$$(301)$$

for any n. We will satisfy the three series separately.

The first series. Writing out $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty}|\mathbb{E}_{P}Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1}|$, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} |\mathbb{E}_P Z_n^{\leqslant 1}| = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{Y_n \mathbb{1}(|Y_n| \leqslant a_n)}{a_n} \right) \right|$$
(302)

$$\leqslant \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{|Y_n| \mathbb{1}(|Y_n| > a_n)}{a_n} \right)$$
 (303)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P |Y_n|^q}{a_n^q} \to 0 \tag{304}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $(|Y_n|/a_n)\mathbb{1}\{|Y_n|>a_n\} \leq (|Y_n|^q/a_n^q)\mathbb{1}\{|Y_n|>a_n\}$ since $q\geqslant 1$.

The second series. Writing out $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty}\mathrm{Var}_{P}Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1}$, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1} = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{P} \left[(Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1})^{2} \right] - \left[\mathbb{E}_{P} Z_{n}^{\leqslant 1} \right]^{2} \right\}$$
(305)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P}[(Z_{n}^{\leq 1})^{2}]$$
(306)

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{Y_n^2 \mathbb{1}(|Y_n| \leqslant a_n)}{a_n^2} \right)$$
 (307)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P |Y_n|^q}{a_n^q} \to 0, \tag{308}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $(Y_n^2/a_n^2)\mathbb{1}\{|Y_n| \leq a_n\} \leq (|Y_n|^q/a_n^q)\mathbb{1}\{|Y_n| \leq a_n\}$ with P-probability one for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$ since $q \leq 2$.

The third series. Finally, writing out the third series $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty}\mathbb{P}_P(|Y_n/a_n|>1)$, we have by Markov's inequality,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(\left| \frac{Y_n}{a_n} \right| > 1 \right) \leqslant \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}|Y_n|^q}{a_n^q} \to 0, \tag{309}$$

which completes the proof.

Lemma 11 (Satisfying the three series of \mathcal{P} -uniform boundedness for independent random variables). Let X_1, \ldots, X_n be independent random variables and let $Y_n := X_n - \mathbb{E}X_n$ be their centered versions. Suppose that for some increasing sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ that diverges to ∞ ,

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=m}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P |Y_n|^q}{a_n^q} = 0.$$
 (310)

Then the three series conditions of Theorem 5 are satisfied for

$$Z_k := \frac{Y_k}{a_k}. (311)$$

Proof. First, define the truncated random variables $Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1}$ as

$$Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1} := \frac{(Y_n/B)\mathbb{1}\{|Y_n/B| \leq a_n\}}{a_n}.$$
(312)

We will satisfy the three series separately.

The first uniform boundedness series. Writing out $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left|\mathbb{E}_{P}Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1}\right|$ for any B>0, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} \right| = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{(Y_n/B)\mathbb{1}(|Y_n/B| \leqslant a_n)}{a_n} \right) \right|$$
(313)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{|Y_n/B| \mathbb{1}(|Y_n/B| > a_n)}{a_n} \right)$$
 (314)

$$\leq \frac{1}{B^q} \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P |Y_n|^q}{a_n^q}}_{(315)},$$

and we note that $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}_P|Y_n|^q/a_n^q<\infty$ since $\lim_m\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=m}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}_P|Y_n|^q/a_n^q=0$. Therefore, we have

$$\lim_{B \to \infty} \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| \mathbb{E}_P Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} \right| = 0, \tag{316}$$

completing the proof of the first series.

The second uniform boundedness series. Writing out $\sup_{P\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathrm{Var}_{P}Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1}$, we have

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_{P} Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{P} [(Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1})^{2}] - [\mathbb{E}_{P} Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1}]^{2} \right\}$$
(317)

$$\leq \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{P}[(Z_{n,B}^{\leq 1})^{2}] \tag{318}$$

$$= \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_P \left(\frac{(Y_n/B)^2 \mathbb{1}(|Y_n/B| \leqslant a_n)}{a_n^2} \right)$$
(319)

$$\leqslant \frac{1}{B^q} \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}_P |Y_n|^q}{a_n^q}}_{<\infty}. \tag{320}$$

Therefore, $\lim_B \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{Var}_P Z_{n,B}^{\leqslant 1} = 0$, completing the proof for the second series.

The third uniform boundedness series. Finally, writing out the third series $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P(|Y_n/B| > a_n)$, we have by Markov's inequality,

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}_P\left(|Y_n/B| > a_n\right) \leqslant \frac{1}{B^q} \underbrace{\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}|Y_n|^q}{a_n^q}}_{\leq \infty} \to 0$$
 (321)

as $B \to \infty$ which completes the proof.

5 Summary

In this paper, we introduced a set of tools and techniques to derive distribution-uniform strong laws of large numbers, culminating in extensions of Chung's i.i.d. strong law to uniformly integrable q^{th} moments for 0 < q < 2; $q \neq 1$ in the sense of Marcinkiewicz and Zygmund [11] as well as to independent but non-identically distributed random variables. Furthermore, we showed that \mathcal{P} -uniform integrability of the q^{th} moment is both sufficient and necessary for the strong law to hold at the Kolmogorov-Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund rates of $\bar{o}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{1/q-1})$, shedding new light on uniform strong laws even in Chung's case when q = 1.

As alluded to in the introduction, Ruf et al. [14] were able to prove Chung's strong law using an argument not resembling those typically found in almost sure convergence theorems. In short, they derive a novel high-probability line-crossing inequality for sums of i.i.d. random variables whose first moments are finite and show how this inequality can be uniformly controlled in a family with a uniformly integrable first moment. It is not obvious to us whether their proof techniques can be adapted to higher (or lower) finite moments or to non-identically distributed settings, but this would be interesting to see.

Zooming out, we anticipate that the proof techniques found in Sections 3 and 4 may open vistas for understanding other distribution-uniform almost sure behavior. In particular, we plan to explore their use in the development of distribution-uniform analogues of strong invariance principles such as the Komlós-Major-Tusnády embeddings [9, 10] in the presence of q^{th} uniformly integrable moments when q > 2.

References

[1] Tapas Kumar Chandra. de la Vallée Poussin's theorem, uniform integrability, tightness and moments. Statistics & Probability Letters, 107:136–141, 2015. 22

- [2] Tapas Kumar Chandra and A Goswami. Cesaro uniform integrability and the strong law of large numbers. Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A, pages 215–231, 1992. 3
- [3] Kong-Ming Chong. On a theorem concerning uniform integrability. Publ Inst Math (Beograd)(NS), 25(39):8–10, 1979. 3, 5, 22
- [4] Yuan Shih Chow and Henry Teicher. Integration in a Probability Space. In Probability Theory: Independence, Interchangeability, Martingales, pages 84–112. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1997. ISBN 978-1-4612-1950-7. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4612-1950-7.4. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1950-7_4. 3
- [5] Kai Lai Chung. The strong law of large numbers. In *Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, volume 2, pages 341–353. University of California Press, January 1951. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 15
- [6] Kai Lai Chung. A course in probability theory. Academic press, 2001. 3
- [7] Tien-Chung Hu and Andrew Rosalsky. A note on the de la Vallée Poussin criterion for uniform integrability. Statistics & probability letters, 81(1):169–174, 2011. 3, 22
- [8] Ze-Chun Hu and Qian-Qian Zhou. A note on uniform integrability of random variables in a probability space and sublinear expectation space. *Chinese Journal of Applied Probability and Statistics*, 34(6):577-586, 2017. URL https://arxiv.org/abs/1705.08333. 3, 7, 16, 29
- [9] János Komlós, Péter Major, and Gábor Tusnády. An approximation of partial sums of independent rv'-s, and the sample df. i. Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete, 32 (1-2):111-131, 1975. 34
- [10] János Komlós, Péter Major, and Gábor Tusnády. An approximation of partial sums of independent rv's, and the sample df. ii. Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete, 34(1): 33–58, 1976. 34
- [11] J Marcinkiewicz and A Zygmund. Sur les fonctions indépendantes. Fundamenta Mathematicae, 29: 60-90, 1937. 2, 5, 6, 34
- [12] Valentin V. Petrov. Laws of Large Numbers, pages 256-291. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1975. ISBN 978-3-642-65809-9. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-65809-9_9. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-65809-9_9. 2, 7, 8
- [13] Valentin V Petrov. Sums of independent random variables, volume 82. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012. 10
- [14] Johannes Ruf, Martin Larsson, Wouter M Koolen, and Aaditya Ramdas. A composite generalization of Ville's martingale theorem. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 2023. 2, 3, 34