

Maximal Inequalities for Empirical Processes under General Mixing Conditions with an Application to Strong Approximations

Demian Pouzo
UC Berkeley *

April 22, 2024

Abstract

This paper provides a bound for the supremum of sample averages over a class of functions for a general class of mixing stochastic processes with arbitrary mixing rates. Regardless of the speed of mixing, the bound is comprised of a concentration rate and a novel measure of complexity. The speed of mixing, however, affects the former quantity implying a phase transition. Fast mixing leads to the standard root- n concentration rate, while slow mixing leads to a slower concentration rate, its speed depends on the mixing structure. Our findings are applied to derive strong approximation results for a general class of mixing processes with arbitrary mixing rates.

1 Introduction

Maximal inequalities serve as a fundamental cornerstone in empirical processes theory, playing a pivotal role in deriving crucial results, including but not limited to the functional central limit theorem and robust approximations.

This paper provides a maximal inequality for $f \mapsto G_n[f] := n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - E_P[f(X_i)]$ of the form

$$\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \Gamma \quad (1)$$

where the data $(X_i)_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ is such that X_i belongs to some finite dimensional Euclidean space, is drawn from a stationary probability P , and satisfies some mixing conditions to be described below. The quantity Γ will be determined below and is related to the complexity of the class \mathcal{F} under a suitably chosen topology.

There is a large body of work deriving maximal inequalities and its derivatives such as the functional CLT for dependent data under mixing conditions; cf. [16, 3, 2, 29, 17, 6], and [10] and

*Dept. of Economics, UC Berkeley. email: dpouzo@berkeley.edu. I would like to thank Michael Jansson for comments. All errors are mine.

[22] for reviews. Closest to the present paper is the important work in [17] wherein the authors establish a functional invariance principle in the sense of Donsker for absolutely regular empirical processes. To the best of our knowledge, this and all other existing results in this literature are derived under assumptions implying that the mixing coefficients decay fast enough to zero, e.g. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta(k) < \infty$ (see [17]), or $k^{\frac{p}{p-2}} (\log k)^{2\frac{p-1}{p-2}} \beta(k) = o(1)$ for some $p > 2$ (see [3]) where β is the β -mixing coefficient defined in [28].

These results leave open the question of what type of maximal inequality one can obtain in contexts where the mixing coefficients do not satisfy these conditions. Many process do not satisfy them, either because the data exhibits long-range dependency or long-memory and this feature is modeled using slowly decaying dependence structure, e.g. see [4] in the context of Markov processes; or the data is described by a so-called infinite memory chain (see [18]); or simply because the β -mixing coefficients decay at a slow polynomial rate (see [8]). More generally, there is the open question of how do the mixing properties affect the concentration rate of the maximal inequality 1. This paper aims to provide insights into these questions.

Unfortunately, the approach utilized in [17] and related papers cannot be applied to establish maximal inequalities when the aforementioned restrictions on the mixing coefficients do not hold. One of the cornerstones of this approach relies on insights that can be traced back to Dudley in the 1960s ([19]) for Gaussian processes. Dudley’s work states that the “natural” topology to measure the complexity of the class of functions \mathcal{F} is related to the variation of the stochastic process. In [17], the authors use this insight to construct a “natural” norm, which turns out to depend on the β -mixing coefficients. Unfortunately, without restrictions on the mixing coefficients, this approach is not feasible, as this norm may not even be well-defined.

In view of this, the current paper proposes a new proof technique which employs a *family* of norms, rather than just one, to measure the complexity of the class \mathcal{F} . To accommodate this new feature, we introduce a measure of complexity inspired by Talagrand’s measure ([25, 26]) that allows for a family of norms.

The family of norms proposed in the proof is linked to the dependence structure, which is captured by suitably chosen mixing coefficients. Papers such as [3, 17] use β -mixing while some other papers use stronger concepts such as ϕ -mixing (see [20]). In this paper, however, we use the weaker notion of τ -mixing introduced by [13, 14]. These coefficients not only are typically weaker than the β -mixing ones, thereby encompassing a wider class of stochastic processes (see [13, 14] and Remark 1 below for a more thorough discussion), but they are also adaptive to the size of the class of functions \mathcal{F} — a property not enjoyed by standard mixing coefficients.

The main result in the paper shows that the L^1 norm of $\sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]|$ is bounded (up to constants) by the aforementioned complexity measure. Moreover, a corollary of this result establishes that when a summability condition, similar to the one in [17], holds, our bound replicates, and in some cases improves (up to constants) upon, the results in the literature. Conversely, when the summability restriction does not hold — i.e., the mixing coefficients do not decay quickly to zero — a bound of the form 1 remains valid. However, in this case, the quantity Γ is comprised not only of the complexity measure, as in the standard case, but also of a scaling factor that depends on the mixing properties and the sample size. This last result implies that, in this case, the concentration rate is not root-n, as in the standard case, but slower and is a function of the mixing rate.

We conclude by applying the maximal inequality to strong Gaussian approximations, which bound $\|\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f] - Z_n[f]|\|_{L^1(P)}$ for some Gaussian process $f \mapsto Z_n[f]$ to be defined below. We achieve this result without imposing restrictions on how fast the mixing coefficients decay to zero; to our knowledge, this result is new. Strong approximations are qualitatively different from

their weak analogs and have been thoroughly studied for the IID case since the seminal results by Kolmos, Major, and Tusnady ([21]). However, for the empirical processes with dependent data, results have been more sparse. [5] proved strong approximation results for empirical process for strongly mixing sequences satisfying $\alpha(n) = O(n^{-8})$, where α is the strong mixing coefficient as defined in [23]; more recently, [7] established results for Martingales, and [15] and [12] proved an almost sure strong approximation result for \mathcal{F} being the space of half-line functions under absolute regularity and a weaker mixing condition involving only indicators of half lines, respectively. In both cases the mixing coefficients are assumed to decay “fast enough” to zero.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the maximal L^1 -inequality result and Section 4 presents its proof. Sections 3 and 5 presents the application to strong approximations. Some technical lemmas and proofs are relegated to the Appendix.

2 Main Result: A Maximal $L^1(P)$ Inequality

This section aims to establish an upper bound for $\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)}$, where \mathcal{F} is a class of functions bounded in $L^2(P)$.¹ We now outline an informal roadmap for the proof to identify key components and motivate subsequent formal definitions.

The first step of the proof involves constructing a “chain” between f and f_0 denoted as $f - f_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f$, where each link, $\Delta_k f$, belongs to a class with finite cardinality.² As a consequence of this chain, the empirical process is decomposed as $G_n[f] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n[\Delta_k f]$.

For each link of the chain (indexed by $k \in \mathbb{N}$), the second step of the proof couples the empirical process $f \mapsto G_n[\Delta_k f]$ with $f \mapsto G_n^*[\Delta_k f] := n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_k f(X_i^*) - E_P[\Delta_k f(X^*)]$, where $(X_i)_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ and $(X_i^*)_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ have joint probability denoted by \mathbb{P} , and have the same marginal given by P ; the latter process is such that $(U_{2j}^*(q_k))_{j=0}^{\infty}$ form an independent sequence and $(U_{2j+1}^*(q_k))_{j=0}^{\infty}$ form another independent sequence where $U_i^*(q_k) := (X_{q_k i+1}^*, \dots, X_{q_k i+q_k}^*)$ and $q_k \in \mathbb{N}$ chosen below. Existence of such process is established by the results in [11] which are presented in Appendix A for completeness. Henceforth, we refer to $f \mapsto G_n^*[f]$ as a block-independent empirical process. This coupling yields

$$\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n^*[\Delta_k f]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n^*[\Delta_k f] - G_n[\Delta_k f]| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})},$$

where the second term on the right-hand side is controlled by our measure of dependence defined below.

The final step of the proof involves bounding the term $\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n^*[\Delta_k f]| \right\|_{L^1(P)}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. To achieve this, we employ Talagrand’s generic chaining insights (cf. [26]). However, it is crucial to adjust the measure of complexity to accommodate the link-specific length of the block, given by q_k . As mentioned in the introduction, the reason why the block length influences the topology employed to gauge complexity comes from the realization that the “natural” distance used in complexity computations stems from the stochastic process’s variability. Due to the dependence structure of

¹As per [26], this quantity is defined as $\sup\{\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{M}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} : \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \text{ finite}\}$ to sidestep measurability issues.

²For the actual construction of this chain, which is more intricate than the one presented here, we refer the reader to Lemma 4.1 in the Appendix C.

$f \mapsto G_n^*[f]$, the variability is measured by $\sigma_2(f, q_k) := \sqrt{E_P \left[\left(q_k^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{q_k} f(X_i) - E_P[f(X)] \right)^2 \right]}$,

where q_k is the parameter regulating the length of the blocks. Therefore, the “natural” notion of distance may differ for each link in the chain. To accommodate for this feature we introduce a measure of complexity.

From this brief description of the proof one can see the two key ingredients: First, a measure of dependence, which quantifies the error of approximating the original process with a block-independent one. Second, a measure of complexity that can accommodate a family of norms. Below we formally define these two quantities, we explain the need of working with a family of norms as opposed to just one as in the rest of the literature, and we then present the main result.

We conclude this introduction by pointing out that given the nature of the proof it is convenient for the sample size to be divisible by length of the blocks, i.e., n/q_k is an integer for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Otherwise, when decomposing $f \mapsto G_n^*[\Delta_k f]$ into the length- q_k blocks there will be a reminder. While such reminder can be dealt with (e.g., see [29]), it makes the derivations more cumbersome. Thus, we restrict n and q to be such that $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n := \{q \leq n : n/q \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and to ensure that \mathcal{Q}_n is “rich enough” in the sense that any consecutive elements q, q' of \mathcal{Q}_n are $0.5 \leq q'/q \leq 2$, we restrict n to take values in $\mathcal{N} := \{\prod_{i=1}^I p_i^{m_i} : (m_i)_{i=1}^I \in \mathbb{N}_0^I \text{ s.t. } m_1, m_2 \geq 1\}$ for some $I \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(p_i)_{i=1}^I$ consecutive primes — see Lemma B.1 in Appendix B for a formalization of these claims.³

Measure of Dependence. Let P be the probability distribution of the stationary process $(X_i)_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ and, with a slight abuse of notation, P also denotes the marginal probability of X_i , and $P(\cdot | \mathcal{M}_j)$ denotes the conditional probability of X_0 given \mathcal{M}_j for any $0 \leq j$, where \mathcal{M}_j is the σ -algebra generated by $(X_i)_{i=-\infty}^j$.

The measure that quantifies the dependence structure of the data is given by (cf. [13, 14, 11])

$$\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(q) := \left\| \sup_{f \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B})} \left| \int f(x) P(dx | \mathcal{M}_{-q}) - \int f(x) P(dx) \right| \right\|_{L^1(P)}, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$$

for any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \text{cone}\mathcal{F}$ where $\Lambda(\mathcal{B})$ is the class of Lipschitz (with constant 1) functions with respect to the distance $(x, y) \mapsto d_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y) := \sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}} |h(x) - h(y)|$; i.e., $\Lambda(\mathcal{B}) := \{g : |g(x) - g(y)| \leq d_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y)\}$.⁴ That is, $\tau_{\mathcal{B}}(q)$ quantifies the discrepancy between the marginal probability of X_0 and the conditional one given the information q periods ago; where the discrepancy is captured by the class of “test functions” given by $\Lambda(\mathcal{B})$. We refer the reader to [13, 14] for a thorough discussion of its properties and relation with other mixing coefficients such as β -mixing; here we simply mention that this notion of dependence — as opposed to, say, β -mixing — can be tailored to the particular class of functions one is working with, as we do next.

Let $q \mapsto \tau(q) := \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(q)$ with $\mathcal{B} := \{f \in \text{cone}\mathcal{F} : \|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq 1\}$ and

$$q \mapsto \theta(q) := \max\{\tau(q), \alpha(q)\},$$

³It is well-known that any integer admits a prime factorization $\prod_{i=1}^e p_i^{e_i}$ where $(p_i, e_i)_{i=1}^e$. Our restriction on \mathcal{N} imposes that e and $(p_i)_i$ do not depend on the particular integer. For instance, for $I = 3$, then $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, \dots, 2^{m_1} 3^{m_2}, \dots\}$. Note that once we fixed I certain values of n are not admissible, say, if $I = 3$ then neither $n = 7$ nor $n = 11$ (nor any prime larger than 3) are valid choices of n .

⁴For any set $A \subseteq L^2(P)$, $\text{cone}A := \{\lambda a : a \in A \text{ and } \lambda \geq 0\}$.

where α is a weaker version of the strong mixing coefficient (see [22] Ch. 1.3)

$$\alpha(q) := \sup_{s,t \in \mathbb{R}} |P(X_0 \geq t, X_{-q} \geq s) - P(X_0 \geq t)P(X_{-q} \geq s)|, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2)$$

The quantity θ is the relevant quantity for measuring dependence as both $\tau(q)$ and $\alpha(q)$ are used in the proof. The first one controls the error of coupling the original empirical process with a block-independent one; see Lemma A.1 in Appendix A. As shown in the proof of Lemma 4.3 in Appendix C, the second mixing coefficient, α , is used to control the variance of the block-independent empirical process given by $\sigma_2^2(f, q) = E_P \left[(q^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^q f(X_i) - E_P[f(X)])^2 \right]$.

We extend $\theta(\cdot)$ to the real line assuming its cadlag and non-increasing.⁵

Remark 1. In previous work (cf. [17]) these two quantities were subsumed by the β -mixing coefficient, $q \mapsto \beta(q)$. By Lemma 1 in [14] the β -mixing coefficient is equivalent τ if $\Lambda(\mathcal{F})$ is equivalent to BL, the class of bounded measurable functions. This will be the case if \mathcal{F} is sufficiently rich such that $d_{\mathcal{F}}(x, y) = 1_{\{x \neq y\}}$; for instance, if \mathcal{F} is the class of indicators over the half-line. For these cases, with a slight abuse of notation, the measure of dependence is denoted as τ_{BL} .

In many applications, however, it is common for \mathcal{F} to have smoothness restrictions of some sort. These restrictions imply that $\Lambda(\mathcal{F})$ will be much smaller than BL, and consequently, τ will be smaller than β , thus rendering the β -mixing coefficients unnecessarily restrictive in such cases. For instance, if \mathcal{F} belongs to a Lipschitz class with constant 1 with respect to some distance d (e.g. the euclidean distance), then it is easy to see that $\Lambda(\mathcal{F})$ will also belong to such class. So, if the data is such that $X_i = F(X_{i-1}) + U$ with F being Lipschitz with constant $l < 1$ and U being IID and integrable, it is well-known (see [1]) that τ_{BL} does not even converge to zero without further restrictions on the innovations U ; however $\tau(k) = O(e^{k \log l})$ (see [13]). \triangle

Measure of Complexity. We present a new measure of complexity which we dub Talagrand's complexity measure as it is inspired by Talagrand's Generic Chaining theory (see [24, 25, 26]).

Let $\mathcal{T}^\infty := (\mathcal{T}_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be an admissible partition sequence if \mathcal{T}^∞ is an increasing sequence of partitions with $\text{card} \mathcal{T}_l \leq 2^{2^l}$ and $\text{card} \mathcal{T}_0 = 1$.⁶ We denote the set of all admissible sequences as \mathbf{T} . For any $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let $T(f, \mathcal{T}_l)$ be the (only) set in \mathcal{T}_l containing f and let $x \mapsto D(f, \mathcal{T}_l)(x) := \sup_{f_1, f_2 \in T(f, \mathcal{T}_l)} |f_1(x) - f_2(x)|$ be the "diameter" of such set.

Talagrand's complexity measure is defined by

Definition 1 (Talagrand's complexity measure). For any set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and a family of quasi-norms, $\mathbf{d} := (d_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, let

$$\gamma(\mathcal{B}, \mathbf{d}) = \inf_{\mathcal{T}^\infty \in \mathbf{T}} \sqrt{2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} 2^{l/2} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} d_l(D(f, \mathcal{T}_l)) \quad (3)$$

be the Talagrand's complexity Measure of set \mathcal{B} under the family \mathbf{d} .

The difference between this definition and that of [26] is the supremum being inside the sum and the usage of a different (quasi)-norm, d_l , for each different partition \mathcal{T}_l . For reference, in the

⁵In cases where τ or α do not satisfy the monotonicity assumption, one can take the monotonic envelope, $\max_{q' \geq q} \theta(q')$.

⁶By increasing we mean that any set in \mathcal{T}_{l+1} is included in a set in \mathcal{T}_l .

case of one (quasi-)norm, this measure of complexity is no larger (up to constants) than standard complexity measures such as Dudley’s entropy and Ossiander’s bracketing entropy; we refer the reader to [26] and references therein for a proof of this claim, a more thorough exposition of the Generic chaining measure and how it compares to these other complexity measures.

We now introduce the notion of distance, captured by a family of norms. The “natural” notion of distance under which complexity is computed arises from the variability of the stochastic process. As argued above the relevant process is the block empirical process $f \mapsto G_n^*[f]$, and due to its dependence structure the variability is given by $\sigma_2(f, q)$, where q is the parameter regulating the length of the blocks. Therefore, it is convenient to bound $f \mapsto \sigma_2(f, q)$ with a norm. To this end, by [22] Theorem 1.1, $\sigma_2(f, q) \leq \|f\|_q$, where

$$\|f\|_q^2 = 2 \int_0^1 \mu_q(u) Q_f^2(u) du, \quad (4)$$

and

$$u \mapsto \mu_q(u) = \sum_{i=0}^q 1_{\{u \leq 0.5\theta(i)\}} \in \{0, \dots, 1 + q\}, \quad (5)$$

where $u \mapsto Q_f(u) := \inf\{s \mid H_f(s) \leq u\}$ is the quantile function of $|f|$ with $s \mapsto H_f(s) := P(|f(X)| > s)$.

Most of the literature derives maximal inequalities of the type studied here under the assumption that mixing coefficients decay “fast enough” to zero — e.g., $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \tau_{BL}(i) < \infty$ or stronger — which, in our setup, translates to $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta(i) < \infty$. Since, for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_q(u) \leq \theta^{-1}(2u) + 1$ where θ^{-1} is the generalized inverse of θ , it follows that $\|f\|_q$ is bounded by $\|f\|_{2,\theta} := \sqrt{2} \int_0^1 (\theta^{-1}(2u) + 1) Q_f^2(u) du$, which is a well-defined norm and can be combined with known metric entropies — to our knowledge, such approach was first proposed in [17] for constructing bracketing entropies using β -mixing coefficient in lieu of θ . If $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta(i)$ is not finite, however, the above proposal becomes infeasible since θ^{-1} is not integrable and thus $\|\cdot\|_{2,\theta}$ is not even be well-defined. Consequently, the strategy of proof proposed by [17] and related papers cannot be followed.

In order to sidestep this issue, we use a different strategy of proof which relies on directly using $\|\cdot\|_q$, as it is always well-defined for any finite q , and working with a sequence of block lengths, $(q_{n,k})_{k=0}^{\infty}$, given by

$$q_{n,k} = \min\{s \in \mathcal{Q}_n \mid 0.5\theta(s)n \leq s2^{k+1}\}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6)$$

This choice give raise to our measure of complexity, $\gamma_n(\mathcal{F}) := \gamma(\mathcal{F}, (\|\cdot\|_{q_{n,k}})_{k=0}^{\infty})$.

Main Result. We are now in position to state the maximal inequality result.

Theorem 1. *For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$,*

$$\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \mathbb{L} \gamma_n(\mathcal{F}), \quad (7)$$

for some universal constant \mathbb{L} .

The proof is relegated to Section 4. We now present a few remarks and discuss some implications for different dependence structures.

Remark 2 (Maximal Inequality under independence). *For IID data, $\theta(q) = 0$ and $\mu_q = 1$ for all $q \geq 1$. Thus, by setting $q_{n,k} = 1$ for all $k \geq 0$, it follows that $\|f\|_{q_{n,k}}^2 = \int Q_f^2(u) du = \|f\|_{L^2(P)}^2$, and by the bounds in expression 18 in Section 4,*

$$\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \mathbb{L} \inf_{\mathcal{T}^\infty \in \mathbf{T}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} 2^{l/2} \|D(f, \mathcal{T}_l)\|_{L^2(P)}, \quad (8)$$

which (up to constants) compares to classical results (e.g., [27]), and can actually improve them by virtue of Talagrand's complexity measure ([26]). \triangle

Remark 3 (Maximal Inequality under $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta(i) < \infty$). *As mentioned above, in this case, $\|f\|_q \leq \|f\|_{2,\theta}$ and hence a direct corollary of Theorem 1 implies*

$$\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \mathbb{L} \gamma(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{2,\theta}), \quad (9)$$

which extends the results in [17] by imposing weaker restrictions on the mixing properties of the data as we use θ as oppose to τ_{BL} . \triangle

Maximal Inequality for slowly decaying mixing. We now discuss the implications of $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \theta(i) = \infty$. To do this, it is useful to derive an upper bound on $\|\cdot\|_{q_{n,k}}$ that separates the dependence structure from the geometric one. By Lemma B.2 in the Appendix B for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $r > 2$,

$$\|\cdot\|_q \leq \sqrt{2} \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}. \quad (10)$$

Since $\|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}$ does not depend on the dependence structure, in order to understand how the dependence structure affects our maximal inequality, it suffices to study the sequence $\left\{ \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_{q_{n,k}}(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \right\}_k$.

To do this, we observe that $q \mapsto \mu_q(u)$ is non-decreasing and since, by expression 6, $q_{n,0} \geq q_{n,k}$ it follows that $\sqrt{2} \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_{q_{n,k}}(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \leq \sqrt{2} \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_{q_{n,0}}(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} =: \sqrt{\mathbf{n}(n)}$. The following corollary follows immediately from the previous argument and Theorem 1.

Corollary 1. *For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$,*

$$\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{n}(n)} \mathbb{L} \gamma(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}). \quad (11)$$

As mentioned above, $\gamma(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)})$ is no larger (up to constants) than standard complexity measures such as Dudley's entropy and Ossiander bracketing entropy with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}$. The term $\mathbf{n}(n)$, which depends on the mixing structure, acts as a correction of the standard IID case (under the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}$). Indeed $\sqrt{n/\mathbf{n}(n)}$ can be viewed as the proper scaling

factor for $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i) - E_P[f(X)]$ instead of \sqrt{n} . If $\sup_n \mathfrak{n}(n) < \infty$ — as in Remarks 2 and 3 — then the maximal inequality has the same order as the one for the IID case, but still might be fruitful to understand how the constants are affected by the dependence structure. On the other hand, if $\sup_n \mathfrak{n}(n) = \infty$ then the rate will be slower than the one in the IID case; thus in this case is even more crucial to understand the role played by the dependence structure. The next proposition sheds light on these issues by considering some special cases for the mixing coefficients.

Proposition 1. *Let $m > 0$. Then, for any $n \in \mathcal{N}$, $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ and $r > 2$,*⁷

1. *If $\theta(q) = 1\{q < m\}$, then $m \preccurlyeq \mathfrak{n}(n) \preccurlyeq m + 1$.*
2. *If $\theta(q) = (1 + q)^{-m}$ and*
 - (a) *$m > \frac{r}{r-2}$, then $\mathfrak{n}(n) \asymp 1$.*
 - (b) *$m = \frac{r}{r-2}$, then $\mathfrak{n}(n) \asymp (\log n)^{1/m}$.*
 - (c) *$m < \frac{r}{r-2}$, then $\mathfrak{n}(n) \asymp n^{\frac{r-m(r-2)}{r(m+1)}}$.*

Proof. See Appendix E. □

We conclude with some remarks about this proposition.

Remark 4. *In the m -dependent case (Case 1) the maximal inequality is asymptotically the same as the one for the IID case. The proposition, however, provides a more nuanced view by studying the finite sample behavior and shows that if observations are m -dependent, then is as if the sample size is (up to constants) n/m and not n . \triangle*

Remark 5. *Cases 3 and 4 are different, because $n \mapsto \mathfrak{n}(n)$ is not uniformly bounded. Roughly, for case 3, $\frac{n}{\mathfrak{n}(n)} \asymp \frac{n}{\log(n)^{1/m}}$ whereas for case 4 $\frac{n}{\mathfrak{n}(n)} \asymp n^{\frac{2m(r-1)}{r(m+1)}}$. Perhaps surprisingly, even in this last case $\frac{n}{\mathfrak{n}(n)} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for any allowed pair (r, m) . Hence, Theorem 1 still yields a maximal inequality but with a concentration rate given by $\sqrt{\frac{n}{\mathfrak{n}(n)}}$ as opposed to \sqrt{n} . This concentration rate, however, can be very slow (e.g., the case $m \approx 0$) thereby illustrating the important role of the dependence structure on this type of results. \triangle*

3 Application to Strong Approximations

The next theorem applies Theorem 1 to establish strong approximation results for empirical process without restrictions on how fast the mixing coefficients decay.

In order to state the theorem we introduce the following concepts. Let \mathcal{D} be a family of semi-norms under which \mathcal{F} is totally bounded — this family could be given by $(\|\cdot\|_{q_{n,k}})_k$ but not necessarily. Under this assumption, there exist finite open covers of \mathcal{F} comprised of open neighborhoods of the form $U(f, \delta) := \{f' \in \mathcal{F} : d(f', f) < \delta \forall d \in \mathcal{D}\}$ for some $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\delta > 0$. Let \mathbf{U} be the set of all such finite open covers and for each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbf{U}$ let $\delta[\mathcal{U}]$ denote the associated radius, $|\mathcal{U}|$ its cardinality, and let $f_1[\mathcal{U}], \dots, f_{|\mathcal{U}|}[\mathcal{U}]$ denote the associated centers of each neighborhood. Finally, let $H(\delta) := \{f', f \in \mathcal{F} : d(f', f) < \delta \forall d \in \mathcal{D}\}$ for any radius $\delta > 0$.

⁷Where $f(n) \preccurlyeq g(n)$ denotes $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n) \leq L \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(n)$ and $f(n) \asymp g(n)$ denotes $L^{-1} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(n) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(n) \leq L \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(n)$ for some universal constant L .

Theorem 2. For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$, any $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, and any $\gamma \in [2, \infty]$, there exists a Gaussian process $f \mapsto \mathbb{Z}_n[f]$ with $E[\mathbb{Z}_n[f]] = 0$ and $\text{Var}(\mathbb{Z}_n[f]) = \sigma_n^2(f, q)$ such that

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f] - \mathbb{Z}_n[f]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} \leq \mathbb{L}_\gamma \inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{U}} \left(\gamma_n(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])) + \left(\frac{q}{n}\right)^{\frac{\gamma-2}{2\gamma}} \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|} \sigma_\gamma(f_m[\mathcal{U}], q) + \sqrt{n} \tau_{\mathcal{F}}(q) + \gamma(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_q) \right)$$

for some universal constant \mathbb{L}_γ .⁸

In order to understand the bound in the theorem, it is convenient to understand the heuristics behind the proof — we relegate the formal arguments to Section 5. The proof follows standard practice and separate the problem into an “equi-continuity” part and a “finite dimensional” part by approximating the class \mathcal{F} with an open cover \mathcal{U} . By standard calculations,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f] - \mathbb{Z}_n[f]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} &\leq \left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])} |G_n[f] - G_n[f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} + \left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])} |Z_n[f] - Z_n[f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} \\ &\quad + \left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{U}|\}} |G_n[f_m[\mathcal{U}]] - Z_n[f_m[\mathcal{U}]]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)}. \end{aligned}$$

By invoking Theorem 1, with $H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])$ playing the role of \mathcal{F} , the first term in the RHS is majorized by $\gamma_n(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]))$. Similarly, the second term is majorized by $\gamma(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_q)$ (see Proposition 4 below for details). By coupling $G_n[f_m]$ with $G_n^*[f_m]$, which has a block length given by q , the third term of the RHS is bounded by

$$\left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{U}|\}} |G_n^*[f_m] - Z_n[f_m]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} + \left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{U}|\}} |G_n^*[f_m] - G_n[f_m]| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})}. \quad (12)$$

The quantity $G_n^*[f_m]$ can be decomposed as sums of IID random variables of the form $\sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} (q^{-1/2} \sum_{l=1}^q f_m(X_l))$. So, by employing the Yurinskii coupling theorem in [30], the first term in the previous display is bounded by $\sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \left(\frac{q}{n}\right)^{-1/\gamma} \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q)$ (see Proposition 5 below for details). By our definition of dependence measure the second term is bounded by $\sqrt{n} \tau_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$. Finally, since both the block length q and the open cover \mathcal{U} are arbitrary, one can optimize over them to obtain the desired bound.

The next proposition sheds more light on the bound implied by the theorem and its behavior with respect to the mixing structure by analyzing a canonical example where $\theta(q) = (1+q)^{-m}$ for some $m \geq 0$. Henceforth, let $N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}, \epsilon)$ denote the covering number of \mathcal{F} under $\|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}$ and radius $\epsilon > 0$.

Proposition 2. Suppose $q \mapsto \theta(q) = (1+q)^{-m}$ for some $m \geq 0$ and the class \mathcal{F} is totally bounded with respect to $L^\infty(P)$ and $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} < \infty$. Then

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f] - \mathbb{Z}_n[f]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} \leq L \inf_{\delta > 0} \left(\int_0^\delta \sqrt{\log N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \epsilon)} d\epsilon (1 + \mathfrak{f}_m(n)) + N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \delta) \mathfrak{f}_m(n) \right),$$

for some universal constant L , where $\mathfrak{f}_m(n) := n^{\frac{1-m}{2(m+1)}}$ if $m \neq 1$ and $\mathfrak{f}_1(n) := (\log n)^{1/2}$ if $m = 1$.

Proof. In Theorem 2 we take the family \mathcal{D} to simply be given by $\|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}$ with $r = \infty$. By corollary

$$1, \gamma_n(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])) \leq L \sqrt{n(n)} \gamma(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}) \text{ and } \gamma(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_q) \leq L \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \gamma(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}).⁹$$

⁸Here, we define $\sigma_\infty(f_0, q) := \sqrt{q} \|f_0\|_{L^\infty(P)}$. The universal constant \mathbb{L}_γ depends on γ , we refer to the proof for details. Finally, Pr denotes the joint probability between the data and the Gaussian process.

⁹Throughout the proof the universal constant L can take different values in different instances.

By [25] p. 13, $\gamma(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}) \leq L \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\log N(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}, \epsilon)} d\epsilon$. And since $N(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}, \epsilon) \leq N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}, \epsilon/2)^2$, it follows that

$$\gamma(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}) \leq L \int_0^{\delta/2} \sqrt{\log N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}, \epsilon)} d\epsilon.$$

By assumption, $\|f_m\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq M$, then setting $\gamma = \infty$ it follows $\left(\frac{q}{n}\right)^{\frac{\gamma-2}{2\gamma}} \sigma_\gamma(f_m[\mathcal{U}], q) \leq L \frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}$ because $\sigma_\infty(f_m[\mathcal{U}], q) \leq \sqrt{q}M$. Therefore the bound implied by Theorem 2 simplifies (up to constants) to

$$\inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbf{U}} \left(\int_0^{\delta/2} \sqrt{\log N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^r(P)}, \epsilon)} d\epsilon (\sqrt{\mathfrak{n}(n)} + \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}) + |\mathcal{U}| \left(\frac{1+q}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{n}(1+q)^{-m} \right) \right)$$

By Lemma E.1 with $r = \infty$ in Appendix E, it follows that $\left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \leq L \max\{q^{\frac{1-m}{2}}, 1\} + o(q)$ for any $m \neq 1$, where $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} o(q) = 0$, and $\left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \leq L \max\{\sqrt{\log q}, 1\} + o(q)$ when $m = 1$. Moreover, by Proposition 1, $\sqrt{\mathfrak{n}(n)} \leq L(1 + \mathfrak{f}_m(n))$.

Therefore, the previous display is bounded by

$$\inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbf{U}} \left(\int_0^{\delta/2} \sqrt{\log N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \epsilon)} d\epsilon (\mathfrak{f}_m(n) + 1 + (1+q)^{\frac{1-m}{2}}) + |\mathcal{U}| \left(\frac{1+q}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{n}(1+q)^{-m} \right) \right),$$

if $m \neq 1$, and

$$\inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbf{U}} \left(\int_0^{\delta/2} \sqrt{\log N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \epsilon)} d\epsilon (\mathfrak{f}_m(n) + 1 + \sqrt{\log q}) + |\mathcal{U}| \left(\frac{1+q}{\sqrt{n}} + \sqrt{n}(1+q)^{-1} \right) \right),$$

if $m = 1$.

Hence, by choosing $1+q = n^{1/(m+1)}$, it follows that

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f] - Z_n[f]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} \leq L \inf_{\delta > 0} \left(\int_0^{\delta/2} \sqrt{\log N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \epsilon)} d\epsilon (1 + \mathfrak{f}(n)) + N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \delta) \mathfrak{f}(n) \right).$$

□

If $m \in (0, 1]$ the proposition implies that

$$(\mathfrak{f}(n))^{-1} \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f] - Z_n[f]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} = O(1).$$

This result yields a strong approximation for “slowly mixing” processes, but at a slower concentration rate than the standard root-n rate. On the other hand, for the “fast mixing” case of $m > 1$, $n^{\frac{1-m}{2(m+1)}} = o(1)$ and so

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f] - Z_n[f]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} \leq L \inf_{\delta > 0} \left(\int_0^{\delta/2} \sqrt{\log N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \epsilon)} d\epsilon + N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \delta) n^{\frac{1-m}{2(m+1)}} \right).$$

By choosing δ to vanish as n diverges but slowly — such that $N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}, \delta)n^{\frac{1-m}{2(m+1)}} = o(1)$ — it follows that the RHS is of order $o(1)$.

The rates implied by this result however are likely to be sub-optimal. One reason for this is our control of the term $\max_{m \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{U}|\}} |G_n^*[f_m] - Z_n[f_m]|$ wherein we basically bound the ℓ^∞ norm by the ℓ^1 one and apply the Yurinksii coupling in [30]. The loss of working with ℓ^1 as opposed to ℓ^∞ can be significant when the dimension is large — here given by $|\mathcal{U}|$. We conjecture an improvement can be made by replacing this step with the results of [9] who directly work with ℓ^∞ .

4 Proof of Theorem 1

We first construct a “chain” from f to f_0 based on an admissible partition sequence for \mathcal{F} given by $\mathcal{T}^\infty := (\mathcal{T}_k)_{k \geq 0}$. Recall that for any $k \geq 1$, let $T(f, \mathcal{T}_k)$ is the (unique) set in \mathcal{T}_k containing f . We measure the “diameter” of $T(f, \mathcal{T}_k)$ with $x \mapsto D(f, \mathcal{T}_k)(x) := \sup_{f_1, f_2 \in T(f, \mathcal{T}_k)} |f_1(x) - f_2(x)|$. Finally, let $\pi_k f$ be an element of $T(f, \mathcal{T}_k)$ and let $\Delta_k f := \pi_k f - \pi_{k-1} f$ and $\Xi_k f := -f + \pi_k f$. Observe that $\Delta_k f = \Xi_k f - \Xi_{k-1} f$ and

$$|\Xi_k f| = |\pi_k f - f| \leq D(f, \mathcal{T}_k), \quad \forall k \geq 1 \text{ and } \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \quad (13)$$

since both f and $\pi_k f$ are in $T(f, \mathcal{T}_k)$.

A simple chain would be given by $f - f_0 = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \Delta_k f$, but we need to control the $L^\infty(P)$ norm of the links of the chain. Thus, the next lemma uses a more sophisticated chaining argument taken from [27] Ch. 2.5.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}$, any admissible partition sequence of \mathcal{F} , $(\mathcal{T}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, any $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ with $a_k > 0$, and any sequence of operators $(D_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ each acting on \mathcal{F} , it follows that*

$$f - f_0 = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \Delta_k f 1_{\{m(f) \geq k \cap |D_k f| \leq a_k\}} - \sum_{k=1}^\infty \Xi_{k-1} f 1_{\{m(f) = k \cap |D_k f| > a_k\}} - \Xi_0 f 1_{\{m(f) = 0\}},$$

where $m(f) := \min\{j \mid |D_j f| > a_j\}$.

Proof. See Appendix C. □

In what follows, we use the previous lemma with the following choices for $(D_k f)_{k \geq 0}$ and $(a_k)_{k \geq 0}$: For all k, n ,

$$D_k f := D(f, \mathcal{T}_k), \text{ and } a_k(f) := a_{n,k}(f, \mathcal{T}_k) := \sqrt{n} \frac{2 \|D(f, \mathcal{T}_k)\|_{q_{n,k}}}{q_{n,k} \sqrt{2^{k+1}}}. \quad (14)$$

Given the previous lemma and these choices — the rationale for which will become apparent below (see Remark 6) — it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} &\leq \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[\sum_{k=1}^\infty g_k^1(f)]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} + \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty G_n[\Xi_{k-1} f 1_{\{m(f) = k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}] \right| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \\ &\quad + \left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[\Xi_0 f 1_{\{m(f) = 0\}}]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \end{aligned}$$

where $g_k^1(f) := \Delta_k f 1_{\{m(f) \geq k \cap |D_k f| \leq a_k(f)\}}$. Moreover, since by display 13 $|\Xi_{k-1} f| \leq D_{k-1} f$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n[\Xi_{k-1} f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}] \right| &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (g_k^2(f)(X_i)) \right| + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sqrt{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E_P[(g_k^2(f)(X))] \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n[g_k^2(f)] \right| + 2\sqrt{n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |E_P[g_k^2(f)(X)]|. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $g_k^2(f) := D_{k-1} f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f - f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} &\leq \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g_k^1(f)]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} + \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n[g_k^2(f)] \right| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |E_P[g_k^2(f)(X)]| + \left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[\Xi_0 f 1_{\{m(f)=0\}}]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} \\ &=: \mathbb{Q}_{21} + \mathbb{Q}_{22} + \mathbb{Q}_{23} + \mathbb{Q}_{24}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The term $\Xi_0 f 1_{\{m(f)=0\}}$ is bounded by $D_0 f 1_{\{m(f)=0 \cap |D_0 f| > a_0(f)\}}$ which does not depend on f because of the definition of $D(f, \mathcal{T}_0)$ and thus \mathbb{Q}_{24} will be less or equal than \mathbb{Q}_{23} and thus ignored. So, to prove Theorem 1 it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{Q}_{21}, \mathbb{Q}_{22} \leq \mathbb{L}_0 \gamma_n(\mathcal{F}), \text{ and } \mathbb{Q}_{23} \leq 2^{5/2} \gamma_n(\mathcal{F}) \quad (17)$$

where \mathbb{L}_0 is some universal constant to be determined below; the claim in Theorem 1 follows with $\mathbb{L} := 2\mathbb{L}_0 + 2^{5/2}$.

In fact, we establish a stronger result than this one. We show that, for $l \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\mathbb{Q}_{2l} \leq (\mathbb{L}_0 - 2) \xi_n(\mathcal{F}) + \sqrt{n} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}) \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}) \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \gamma_n(\mathcal{F}), \quad (18)$$

$$\text{and } \mathbb{Q}_{23} \leq 2^{5/2} \xi_n(\mathcal{F}) \quad (19)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{l,k} := \{g_k^l(f) : f \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \|g_k^l(f)\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq a_{k-(l-1)}(f)\}$ and

$$\xi_n(\mathcal{F}) := \inf_{\mathcal{T}^\infty \in \mathbf{T}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} 2^{l/2} \|D(f, \mathcal{T}_l)\|_{q_{l,n}}.$$

It is clear that $\xi_n(\mathcal{F}) \leq \gamma_n(\mathcal{F})$ and thus expression 17 (and in turn, Theorem 1) follows.¹⁰

The proof of expression 18 relies on a coupling scheme whereby the process $(X_i)_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ is coupled with a block-independent process given by $(X_i^*)_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ where blocks $U_j^*(q) := (X_{qi+1}^*, \dots, X_{qi+q}^*)$ are such that $(U_{2j}^*(q))_{j=0}^{\infty}$ form an independent sequence and $(U_{2j+1}^*(q))_{j=0}^{\infty}$ form another independent sequence. We refer the reader to Appendix A for the technical details of the construction of such process.

¹⁰In order to have a sense of $\xi_n(\mathcal{F})$ and $\gamma_n(\mathcal{F})$ we can compare them in the case where one norm is used (as opposed to the family $(\|\cdot\|_{q_{l,n}})_{l=0}^{\infty}$). In this case, $\xi_n(\mathcal{F})$ exactly coincides with Talagrand's generic chaining measure and $\gamma_n(\mathcal{F})$ coincides (up to constants) with Dudley's entropy; see [26] Section 2.5.

For any $l \in \{1, 2\}$, any $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$f \mapsto G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] := \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{g_k^l(f)(X_i^*) - E_P[g_k^l(f)(X_i^*)]\}$$

where $(X_i^*)_{i=-\infty}^\infty$ is constructed using $q_{k-(l-1)}$. Thus, the parameter k not only indexes the “link” of the chain constructed in Lemma 4.1, but it also indexes the dependence structure — the length of the blocks $(U_j^*(q_{k-(l-1)}))_{j=0}^\infty$.

By the triangle inequality, for any $l \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\mathbb{Q}_{2l} \leq \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] \right| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})} + \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty \{G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] - G_n[g_k^l(f)]\} \right| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})}, \quad (20)$$

where \mathbb{P} is the joint probability measure over the processes $(X_i^*)_{i=-\infty}^\infty$ and $(X_i)_{i=-\infty}^\infty$.

The following lemma bounds the second term of the RHS

Lemma 4.2. *For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $l \in \{1, 2\}$,*

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty \{G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] - G_n[g_k^l(f)]\} \right| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})} \leq \sqrt{n} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}),$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{l,k} := \{g_k^l(f) : f \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \|g_k^l(f)\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq a_{k-(l-1)}(f)\}$.

Proof. First, observe that for $l \in \{1, 2\}$

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty \{G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] - G_n[g_k^l(f)]\} \right| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})} \leq \sum_{k=1}^\infty \left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] - G_n[g_k^l(f)]| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})}.$$

Second, since $m(f) = k$ implies $|D_{k-1}f| \leq a_{k-1}$, then $\|D_{k-1}f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq a_{k-1}(f)$. Hence, in Lemma A.1 in Appendix A we set \mathcal{B} equal to $\mathcal{B}_{2,k} := \{g_k^2(f) : f \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \|g_k^2(f)\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq a_{k-1}(f)\}$, and we obtain,

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty \{G_n^*[g_k^2(f)] - G_n[g_k^2(f)]\} \right| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})} \leq \sqrt{n} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{2,k}}(q_{k-1}).$$

By analogous arguments,

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty \{G_n^*[g_k^1(f)] - G_n[g_k^1(f)]\} \right| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})} \leq \sqrt{n} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{1,k}}(q_k).$$

with $\mathcal{B}_{1,k} := \{g_k^1(f) : f \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \|g_k^1(f)\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq a_k(f)\}$. \square

In order to bound the first term of the RHS in expression 20 we first show that for any $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $u \geq 2$,

$$P \left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] \right| \geq u \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F}) \right) \leq \mathbb{C}_0 e^{-2u} \quad (21)$$

for $l \in \{1, 2\}$ where $\mathbb{C}_0 := 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^{2^{j-1}}$. We employ an extension of the generic chaining approach proposed by Talagrand (cf. see [26]) to prove this expression. One condition needed for this approach (cf. see [26] expression 1.4) is a Berenstein-type inequality for $|\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^l(f)]|$ which is verified in the following lemma

Lemma 4.3. *For any $g \in \mathcal{F}$, any $n \in \mathcal{N}$, any $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\mathbf{b} > 0$ such that $\|g\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq 2\frac{\sqrt{n}}{q\sqrt{2^k}}\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{b} \geq \|g\|_q$, it follows that*

$$P\left(|G_n^*[g]| \geq u\sqrt{2^k}\mathbf{b}\frac{16}{3}\right) \leq 2\exp\{-u2^k\}$$

for any $u \geq 1$.

Proof. See Appendix C. □

Remark 6. *The condition on the norms $\|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(P)}$ and $\|\cdot\|_q$ stems from the fact that Bernstein inequality demands a balance between the variance of $|G_n^*(f)|$ and an uniform bound on f . Given that the $|G_n^*(f)|$ is comprised of independent blocks of length q , the variance term is bounded by $\frac{n}{q}\|f\|_q^2$ — i.e., the number of blocks, n/q , times a bound of the within block variance, $\|f\|_q^2$. On the other hand, the uniform bound is of order $\sqrt{n}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}$. Our choices of $D_k f$ and $a_k(f)$ in expression 14 are chosen precisely to satisfy this condition, because $\|g_k^l(f)\|_q \leq \|D_k f\|_q$ and $\|g_k^l(f)\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq a_{k-(l-1)}(f)$ for $l \in \{1, 2\}$. \triangle*

With Lemma 4.3 at hand, we can now bound $P(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^l(f)]| \geq u\frac{16}{3}\xi_n(\mathcal{F}))$.

Lemma 4.4. *For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $u \geq 2$,*

$$P\left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left|\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^l(f)]\right| \geq u\frac{16}{3}\xi_n(\mathcal{F})\right) \leq \mathbb{C}_0 e^{-2u}$$

for $l \in \{1, 2\}$.

Proof. STEP 1. Recall that $\xi_n(\mathcal{F}) = \inf_{\mathcal{T}^\infty \in \mathcal{T}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{2^j} \|D_{j-1}f\|_{q_{j-1}}$ and let

$$\Omega_n(u) = \left\{ \omega^* \in \Omega \mid \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \forall j \in \mathbb{N}, G_n^*[g_j^2(f)] \leq u\frac{16}{3}\sqrt{2^j}\|D_{j-1}f\|_{q_{j-1}} \right\}.$$

Hence, $P(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^2(f)]| \geq u\frac{16}{3}\xi_n(\mathcal{F})) \leq P(\Omega \setminus \Omega_n(u))$.

Since $P(\Omega \setminus \Omega_n(u)) = P(\exists f \exists j, G_n^*[g_j^2(f)] \geq u\frac{16}{3}\sqrt{2^j}\|D_{j-1}f\|_{q_{j-1}})$, we now bound this term. To do this, we employ Lemma 4.3 with $q = q_{k-1}$, $g = g_k^2(f)$, and $\mathbf{b} = \|D_{k-1}f\|_{q_{k-1}}$. For these choices is true that $\|g_k^2(f)\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq a_{k-1}(f) = \sqrt{n}\frac{2\|D_{k-1}f\|_{q_{k-1}}}{q_{k-1}\sqrt{2^k}}$ and $\|g_k^2(f)\|_{q_{k-1}} \leq \mathbf{b} = \|D_{k-1}f\|_{q_{k-1}}$ and thus the conditions in the lemma are satisfied. Hence, for all f and all j ,

$$P\left(|G_n^*[g_j^2(f)]| \geq u\frac{16}{3}\sqrt{2^j}\|D_{j-1}f\|_{q_{j-1}}\right) \leq 2e^{-u2^j}.$$

We also note that $\text{card}(\{g_k^2(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}) = \text{card}(\{D_{k-1}f : f \in \mathcal{F}\})$. Since $D_{k-1}f = D_{k-1}f'$ for all f, f' in the same set of \mathcal{T}_{k-1} , $\text{card}(\{D_{k-1}f : f \in \mathcal{F}\}) = \text{card}(\mathcal{T}_{k-1}) \leq 2^{2^{k-1}}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^2(f)] \right| \geq u \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F})\right) \leq P(\Omega \setminus \Omega_n(u)) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\text{card}(\mathcal{T}_{j-1})} P\left(|G_n^*[g_j^2(f)]| \geq u \sqrt{2^j} \|D_{j-1}f\|_{q_{j-1}} \frac{16}{3}\right) \\ & \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \text{card}(\mathcal{T}_{j-1}) e^{-u2^j}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $u2^j = u(2 + 2^{j-1}) \geq 2u + 2^{j-1}$ for $u \geq 1$, it follows that

$$P\left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^2(f)] \right| \geq u \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F})\right) \leq 2e^{-2u} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \text{card}(\mathcal{T}_{j-1}) e^{-2^{j-1}} \leq 2e^{-2u} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^{2^{j-1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$P\left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^2(f)] \right| \geq u \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F})\right) \leq \mathbb{C}_0 e^{-2u},$$

as desired.

STEP 2. We now show that

$$P\left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^1(f)] \right| \geq u \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F})\right) \leq 2e^{-2u} \left(\frac{2}{e^{15}}\right)^2 \mathbb{C}_0 \leq \mathbb{C}_0 e^{-2u}$$

In order to do this we proceed as in Step 1 and obtain

$$P\left(|G_n^*[g_j^1(f)]| \geq u \frac{16}{3} \sqrt{2^j} \|D_j f\|_{q_j}\right) \leq 2e^{-u2^{j+1}}$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, by analogous calculations to those in step 1,

$$P\left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^1(f)] \right| \geq u \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F})\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=1}^{\text{card}(\{g_j^1(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}\})} e^{-u2^{j+1}}.$$

The cardinality of $\{g_j^1(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is no larger than $\text{card}(\{\pi_j f : f \in \mathcal{F}\}) \times \text{card}(\{\pi_{j-1} f : f \in \mathcal{F}\}) \leq 2^{2^j + 2^{j-1}}$, thus — since $u \geq 2$ and $2^j \geq 2$ for all $j \geq 1$, $u2^j \geq u2 + 2^j$ —

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} G_n^*[g_k^1(f)] \right| \geq u \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F})\right) & \leq 2e^{-2u} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{2^j + 2^{j-1}} e^{-2^{j+1}} \\ & \leq 2e^{-2u} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^{2^{j+1}} \leq 2e^{-2u} \left(\frac{2}{e}\right)^2 \mathbb{C}_0, \end{aligned}$$

because $2^{j-1} + 2^j \leq 2^{j+1}$. □

The following proposition uses all the results to establish the claims in expressions 18-19.

Proposition 3. For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\mathbb{Q}_{2l} \leq \left(\frac{16}{3} \mathbb{C}_0 \int_0^\infty 2e^{-2t} dt \right) \xi_n(\mathcal{F}) + \sqrt{n} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}) \quad \forall l \in \{1, 2\}, \quad (22)$$

$$\max_{l \in \{1, 2\}} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}) \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \gamma_n(\mathcal{F}), \quad (23)$$

$$\mathbb{Q}_{23} \leq 2^{5/2} \xi_n(\mathcal{F}). \quad (24)$$

So \mathbb{L}_0 in expression 17 is given by $\frac{16}{3} \mathbb{C}_0 \int_0^\infty 2e^{-2t} dt + 2$.

Proof of Proposition 3. Let $l \in \{1, 2\}$. Given the results in the Lemma 4.4, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(E_P \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] \right| \right] \right) &= \left(\int_0^\infty P \left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] \right| \geq u \right) du \right) \\ &= \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F}) \left(\int_0^\infty P \left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty G_n^*[g_k^l(f)] \right| \geq \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F}) t \right) dt \right) \\ &= \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F}) \mathbb{C}_0 \left(\int_0^\infty 2e^{-2t} dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

So, by this result and Lemma 4.2

$$\mathbb{Q}_{2l} \leq \frac{16}{3} \xi_n(\mathcal{F}) \mathbb{C}_0 \left(\int_0^\infty 2e^{-2t} dt \right) + \sqrt{n} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}).$$

Therefore, to obtain the desired result it suffices to verify that the choice of $(q_k)_{k \geq 0}$ in expression 6 yields $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}) \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \gamma_n(\mathcal{F})$. To do this, observe that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and any $f \in \mathcal{B}_{l,k}$, $a_{k-(l-1)}(f) \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}_{l,k}} a_{k-(l-1)}(f) \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} a_{k-(l-1)}(f) := \bar{a}_{k-(l-1)}$. Hence, by Lemmas A.1-A.2 in Appendix A, $\tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}) \leq \bar{a}_{k-(l-1)} \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)})$ with $\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{l,k} := \{f \in \text{cone} \mathcal{B}_{l,k} : \|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq 1\}$, so

$$\sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}) \leq \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{\sqrt{n} 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|D(f, \mathcal{T}_{k-(l-1)})\|_{q_{k-(l-1)}} \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)})}{\sqrt{2^{k+2-l}} q_{k-(l-1)}}.$$

By our choice of $(q_k)_{k \geq 0}$ in expression 6, $\frac{\tau_{\bar{\mathcal{B}}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)})}{q_{k-(l-1)}} \leq \frac{2^{k+2-l}}{n}$ for $l \in \{1, 2\}$. Hence,

$$\sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}) \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^\infty \sqrt{2^{k+2-l}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|D(f, \mathcal{T}_{k-(l-1)})\|_{q_{k-(l-1)}}.$$

Since the partition implied by the term $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \sqrt{2^{k+2-l}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|D(f, \mathcal{T}_{k-(l-1)})\|_{q_{k-(l-1)}}$ is arbitrary, we can bound the term by $\gamma_n(\mathcal{F})$. Thereby obtaining the desired result of

$$\sum_{k=1}^\infty \tau_{\mathcal{B}_{l,k}}(q_{k-(l-1)}) \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \gamma_n(\mathcal{F}).$$

We now show that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |E_P[g_k^2(f)(X)]| = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |E_P[D_{k-1}f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}]| \leq 2^{3/2} \frac{\xi_n(\mathcal{F})}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Given $m(f) = k$, it follows that $|D_{k-1}f| \leq a_{k-1}(f)$ and in turn, by expression 14, it follows that

$$q_{k-1}D_{k-1}f \leq \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} b_k \leq \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} q_k D_k f \leq \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} q_{k-1} D_k f.$$

where $b_k := 2\sqrt{n} \|D_k f\|_{q_k} / \sqrt{2^k}$ for all $k \geq 1$; the second inequality follows because under $m(f) = k$, $D_k f > a_k(f) = b_k/q_k$; the last inequality follows because $q_{k-1} \geq q_k$. Therefore, $D_{k-1}f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}} \leq \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} D_k f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap D_k f > a_k(f)\}}$, and thus

$$E_P[D_{k-1}f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}] \leq \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} \|D_k f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} \|D_k f 1_{\{|D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}\|_{L^1(P)}.$$

For any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, by Lemma C.1 in Appendix C ($a_k(f) = b_k/q_{n,k}$ with b_k defined as in the lemma)

$$\|D_k f 1_{\{|D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{2^{k+1}}{n}} \|D_k f\|_{q_k}. \text{ Hence, the previous display implies}$$

$$E_P[D_{k-1}f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}] \leq \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} \sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{2^{k+1}}{n}} \|D_k f\|_{q_k}.$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |E_P[D_{k-1}f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}]| \leq \sqrt{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{2^{k+1}} \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} \|D_k f\|_{q_k}.$$

Note that $\frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} = \sqrt{\frac{2^{k+1}}{2^k} \frac{\|D_{k-1}f\|_{q_{k-1}}}{\|D_k f\|_{q_k}}}$, so $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{2^{k+1}} \frac{b_{k-1}}{b_k} \|D_k f\|_{q_k} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{k+1}}{\sqrt{2^k}} \|D_{k-1}f\|_{q_{k-1}}$. Finally, since the implied partition defining $D_{k-1}f$ is arbitrary, it follows that

$$\sqrt{2} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{k+1}}{\sqrt{2^k}} \|D_{k-1}f\|_{q_{k-1}} = 2^{3/2} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{2^k} \|D_{k-1}f\|_{q_{k-1}} = 2^{3/2} \xi_n(\mathcal{F}),$$

thereby implying the desired result of

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |E_P[D_{k-1}f 1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k(f)\}}]| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2^3}{n}} \xi_n(\mathcal{F}).$$

□

5 Proof of Theorem 2

As stated in the text, for any open cover \mathcal{U} it suffices to bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])} |G_n[f] - G_n[f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P)} + \left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])} |Z_n[f] - Z_n[f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P}_T)} \\ & + \left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{U}|\}} |G_n[f_m[\mathcal{U}]] - Z_n[f_m[\mathcal{U}]]| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P}_T)}. \end{aligned}$$

The first term in the RHS is less than $\mathbb{L}_{\gamma_n}(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]))$ by applying Theorem 1 with $\mathcal{F} = H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])$. In order to bound the other two terms in the RHS we need to be specific about the Gaussian process, $f \mapsto Z_n[f]$. For any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, let $Z_n[f] := \sigma_2(f, q)\mathcal{Z}$ where $\mathcal{Z} \sim N(0, 1)$ and

$$\sigma_m(f, q) := \left(E_P \left[\left| q^{-1/2} \sum_{l=1}^q f(X_l) - E_P[f(X)] \right|^m \right] \right)^{1/m} \quad \forall m \geq 0, \quad (25)$$

and some parameter q in \mathcal{Q}_n to be determined below.

The term $\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])} |Z_n[f] - Z_n[f_0]| \right\|_{L^v(P_r)}$ is bounded by employing the Generic chaining results by Talagrand (cf. [25]) and presented here mostly for completeness.

Proposition 4. *For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$, any $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ and any $\delta > 0$,*

$$\left\| \sup_{f, f_0 \in H(\delta)} |Z_n[f] - Z_n[f_0]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} \leq \sqrt{2}L \inf_{\mathcal{T}^\infty \in \mathbf{T}} \sup_{h \in H(\delta)} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} 2^{l/2} \|D_l(h, \mathcal{T}_l)\|_q$$

where L is some universal constant.

As the RHS of the previous display is majorized by $\gamma(H(\delta), \|\cdot\|_q)$ the desired result follows.

Proof. See Section 5.1. □

Finally, the term $\left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{U}|\}} |G_n[f_m[\mathcal{U}]] - Z_n[f_m[\mathcal{U}]] \right\|_{L^1(P_r)}$ is bounded by the following proposition

Proposition 5. *For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$, any $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, any open cover $(U(f_1, \delta), \dots, U(f_M, \delta))$, and any $\gamma \in [2, \infty]$,*

$$\left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, M\}} |G_n[f_m] - Z_n[f_m]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} \leq L_\gamma \sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \left(\frac{q}{n}\right)^{-1/\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q) + \sqrt{n} \tau_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$$

for some universal constant L_γ that only depends on γ .

Proof. See Section 5.2. □

By putting all these results together we obtain that for any open cover $(U(f_1, \delta), \dots, U(f_M, \delta))$ with radius $\delta > 0$ and any $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$,

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f] - Z_n[f]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} \leq \mathbb{L}_\gamma \left(\gamma_n(H(\delta)) + \gamma(H(\delta), \|\cdot\|_q) + \sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \left(\frac{q}{n}\right)^{-1/\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q) + \sqrt{n} \tau_{\mathcal{F}}(q) \right)$$

for some universal constant \mathbb{L}_γ . Since the open cover is arbitrary we can optimize over it and obtain

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |G_n[f] - Z_n[f]| \right\|_{L^1(P_r)} \leq \mathbb{L}_\gamma \inf_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathbf{U}} \left(\gamma_n(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}])) + \left(\frac{q}{n}\right)^{\frac{\gamma-2}{2\gamma}} \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{U}|} \sigma_\gamma(f_m[\mathcal{U}], q) + \sqrt{n} \tau_{\mathcal{F}}(q) + \gamma_2(H(\delta[\mathcal{U}]), \|\cdot\|_q) \right)$$

5.1 Proof of Proposition 4

$f \mapsto Z_n[f]$ is a Gaussian process. Hence, letting $d(f', f)^2 := E[(Z_n[f] - Z_n[f'])^2]$ it follows that

$$\Pr(|Z_n[f] - Z_n[f']| \geq u) \leq 2e^{-\frac{u^2}{d(f, f')}}.$$

Hence, by Theorem 2.2.22 and expression 2.47 in [26], for any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$,

$$\Pr\left(\sup_{f, f_0 \in \mathcal{B}} |Z_n[f] - Z_n[f_0]| \geq Lu\xi(\mathcal{B}, d)\right) \leq 2e^{-u^2},$$

where L is some universal constant and $\xi(\mathcal{B}, d) := \inf_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbf{T}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} \sqrt{2} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} 2^{l/2} d(D(f, \mathcal{T}_l))$.

We now provide a bound for d . Since $Z_n[f_0] = \sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \sigma_2(f_0, q) \mathcal{Z}$ with $\mathcal{Z} \sim N(0, n/q)$,

$$d(f', f) := \sqrt{E[(Z_n[f] - Z_n[f'])^2]} = |\sigma_2(f, q) - \sigma_2(f', q)| \leq \|\delta_0(\omega^*)(f - f')\|_{L^2(P)}.$$

where $f \mapsto \delta_j(\omega^*)f := q^{-1/2} \sum_{i=qj+1}^{qj+q} \{f(X_i^*) - E_P[f(X^*)]\}$ for any $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and the last inequality follows because $\sigma_2(f, q) = \|\delta_0(\omega^*)f\|_{L^2(P)}$ and thus $|\|\delta_0(\omega^*)f\|_{L^2(P)} - \|\delta_0(\omega^*)f'\|_{L^2(P)}| \leq \|\delta_0(\omega^*)(f - f')\|_{L^2(P)}$ by triangle inequality. Thus, by the same calculations as in the proof of Lemma 4.3, $\|\delta_0(\omega^*)(f - f')\|_{L^2(P)} \leq \|f - f'\|_q$. Hence $d(f, f') \leq \sqrt{2}\|f - f'\|_q$ and $\xi(\mathcal{B}, d) \leq \sqrt{2}\xi(\mathcal{B}, \|\cdot\|_q)$.

5.2 Proof of Proposition 5

We employ a combination of the coupling technique used in the proof of Theorem 1 and the Yurinskii coupling.

By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, M\}} |G_n[f_m] - Z_n[f_m]| \right\|_{L^1(\text{Pr})} &\leq \left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, M\}} |G_n^*[f_m] - Z_n[f_m]| \right\|_{L^1(\text{Pr})} \\ &\quad + \left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, M\}} |G_n^*[f_m] - G_n[f_m]| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})} \\ &=: \mathbb{Q}_{31} + \mathbb{Q}_{32}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas A.1-A.2 in the Appendix A, $\mathbb{Q}_{32} \leq \sqrt{n} \tau_{\{f_1, \dots, f_M\}}(q) \leq \sqrt{n} \tau_{\mathcal{F}}(q)$. We now bound the term \mathbb{Q}_{31} . To do this note that

$$\left\| \max_{m \in \{1, \dots, M\}} |G_n^*[f_m] - G_n[f_m]| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})} \leq \sum_{m=1}^M \|G_n^*[f_m] - G_n[f_m]\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})} \quad (26)$$

and suppose that (it is proved below)

$$P\left(|G_n^*(f_m) - Z_n[f_m]| \geq u 0.5 \sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \left(\frac{q}{n}\right)^{-1/\gamma} \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q)\right) \leq 2L\gamma^{2\gamma} u^{-\gamma}, \quad (27)$$

for some universal constant L and for any $u > 0$ (with the RHS being equal to $2Le^{-Lu}$ if $\gamma = \infty$). Then, it readily follows that

$$\mathbb{Q}_{31} \leq 2L\gamma^{2\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \left(\frac{q}{n}\right)^{-1/\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q) \int_1^\infty u^{-\gamma} du = 2L \frac{\gamma^{2\gamma}}{\gamma-1} \sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \left(\frac{q}{n}\right)^{-1/\gamma} \sum_{m=1}^M \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q)$$

and thus the statement in Proposition 5 follows.

Proof of expression 27. Since $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, the following decomposition holds with $J := n/q - 1$

$$G_n^*[f_m] = \sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} \delta_{2j}(\omega^*) f_m + \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} \delta_{2j+1}(\omega^*) f_m \right).$$

Hence, since $Z_n[f_m] = \sigma_2(f_m, q) (\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} Z_{2j} + \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} Z_{2j+1})$ with $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |G_n^*[f_m] - Z_n[f_m]| &\leq \left| \sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} \delta_{2j}(\omega^*) f_m - \sigma_2(f_m, q) \sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} Z_{2j} \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} \delta_{2j+1}(\omega^*) f_m - \sigma_2(f_m, q) \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} Z_{2j+1} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Both $\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} \delta_{2j}(\omega^*) f_m$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} \delta_{2j+1}(\omega^*) f_m$ are sums of IID random variables with mean 0 and variance given by $\sigma_2^2(f_m, q) := E_P[(\delta_0(\omega^*) f_m)^2]$ so we can invoke Lemma D.1 in Appendix D to bound each term. To apply this lemma, let Y_i be defined as $\delta_{2i}(\omega^*) f_m$ and $\delta_{2i+1}(\omega^*) f_m$ and K as $[J/2]$ and $[(J+1)/2] - 1$ respectively; also let $\|\cdot\|$ be the ℓ^1 norm. In both cases, $L_\gamma \leq \frac{n}{q} \sigma_\gamma^\gamma(f_m, q)$. Therefore, by Lemma D.1 in Appendix D, for any $t > 0$

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} \delta_{2j}(\omega^*) f_m - \sigma_2(f_m, q) \sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} Z_{2j} \right| \geq t \right) \leq L\gamma^{2\gamma} \frac{n}{q} \sigma_\gamma^\gamma(f_m, q) t^{-\gamma}$$

and

$$\Pr \left(\left| \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} \delta_{2j+1}(\omega^*) f_m - \sigma_2(f_m, q) \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} Z_{2j+1} \right| \geq t \right) \leq L\gamma^{2\gamma} \frac{n}{q} \sigma_\gamma^\gamma(f_m, q) t^{-\gamma}$$

for some universal constants L .

Therefore, letting $t = u \left(\frac{n}{q} \sigma_\gamma^\gamma(f_m, q)\right)^{1/\gamma} = u \left(\frac{n}{q}\right)^{1/\gamma} \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q)$, and $Z_n[f_m] = \sqrt{\frac{n}{q}} \sigma_2(f_m, q) \mathcal{Z}$ where $\mathcal{Z} = N(0, n/q)$ and decomposing $Z_n[f_m]$ as $\sigma_2(f_m, q) \sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} Z_{2j} + \sigma_2(f_m, q) \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} Z_{2j+1}$

with $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| G_n^*(f_m) - Z_n[f_m] \right| \geq u 2 \sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \left(\frac{n}{q} \right)^{1/\gamma} \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q) \right) \\
& \leq P \left(\left| \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor J/2 \rfloor} \delta_{2j}(\omega^*) f_m - \sigma_2(f_m, q) \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor J/2 \rfloor} Z_{2j} \right| \geq u \left(\frac{n}{q} \right)^{1/\gamma} \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q) \right) \\
& + P \left(\left| \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (J+1)/2 \rfloor - 1} \delta_{2j+1}(\omega^*) f_m - \sigma_2(f_m, q) \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (J+1)/2 \rfloor - 1} Z_{2j+1} \right| \geq u \left(\frac{n}{q} \right)^{1/\gamma} \sigma_\gamma(f_m, q) \right) \\
& \leq 2L\gamma^{2\gamma} u^{-\gamma},
\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

References

- [1] Donald W. K. Andrews. Non-strong mixing autoregressive processes. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 21(4):930–934, 1984.
- [2] Donald W. K. Andrews and David Pollard. An introduction to functional central limit theorems for dependent stochastic processes. *International Statistical Review/Revue Internationale de Statistique*, pages 119–132, 1994.
- [3] Miguel A. Arcones and Bin Yu. Central limit theorems for empirical and u-processes of stationary mixing sequences. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 7:47–71, 1994.
- [4] Meysam Asadi, Ramezan Paravi Torghabeh, and Narayana P Santhanam. Stationary and transition probabilities in slow mixing, long memory markov processes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(9):5682–5701, 2014.
- [5] István Berkes and Walter Philipp. An almost sure invariance principle for the empirical distribution function of mixing random variables. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 41(2):115–137, 1977.
- [6] Patrick Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [7] Matias D. Cattaneo, Ricardo P. Masini, and William G. Underwood. Yurinskii’s coupling for martingales, 2022.
- [8] Xiaohong Chen, Lars P. Hansen, and Marine Carrasco. Nonlinearity and temporal dependence. *Journal of Econometrics*, 155:155–169, 2010.
- [9] Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, and Kengo Kato. Gaussian approximation of suprema of empirical processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(4):1564 – 1597, 2014.
- [10] Jérôme Dedecker and Sana Louhichi. Maximal inequalities and empirical central limit theorems. In *Empirical process techniques for dependent data*, pages 137–159. Springer, 2002.
- [11] Jérôme Dedecker and Florence Merlevède. Inequalities for partial sums of hilbert-valued dependent sequences and applications. *Mathematical methods of Statistics*, 15(2):176–206, 2006.
- [12] Jérôme Dedecker, Florence Merlevède, and Emmanuel Rio. On strong approximation results for the empirical process of stationary sequences. *Annals of Probability*, 41:3658–3696, 2013.
- [13] Jérôme Dedecker and Clémentine Prieur. Coupling for τ -dependent sequences and applications. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 17(4):861–885, 2004.

- [14] Jérôme Dedecker and Clémentine Prieur. New dependence coefficients. examples and applications to statistics. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 132:203–236, 2005.
- [15] Jérôme Dedecker, Emmanuel Rio, and Florence Merlevède. Strong approximation of the empirical distribution function for absolutely regular sequences in \mathbb{R}^d . *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 19:1–56, 2014.
- [16] Paul Doukhan, JR Leon, and F Portal. Principes d’invariance faible pour la mesure empirique d’une suite de variables aléatoires mélangeante. *Probability theory and related fields*, 76(1):51–70, 1987.
- [17] Paul Doukhan, Pascal Massart, and Emmanuel Rio. Invariance principles for absolutely regular empirical processes. *Annales de l’institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et Statistiques*, 31(2):393–427, 1995.
- [18] Paul Doukhan and Olivier Wintenberger. Weakly dependent chains with infinite memory. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 118(11):1997–2013, 2008.
- [19] Richard M. Dudley. The sizes of compact subsets of hilbert space and continuity of gaussian processes. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 1(3):290–330, 1967.
- [20] Ildar A. Ibragimov and Yurii A. Rozanov. *Gaussian random processes*, volume 9. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [21] 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*, 32:111–131, 1975.
- [22] Emmanuel Rio. *Asymptotic theory of weakly dependent random processes*, volume 80. Springer, 2017.
- [23] Murray Rosenblatt. A central limit theorem and a strong mixing condition. *Proceedings of the national Academy of Sciences*, 42(1):43–47, 1956.
- [24] Michel Talagrand. Majorizing measures: the generic chaining. *The Annals of Probability*, 24(3):1049–1103, 07 1996.
- [25] Michel Talagrand. *The Generic Chaining*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 2005.
- [26] Michel Talagrand. *Upper and Lower Bounds for Stochastic Processes*. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics. springer-Verlag, 2014.
- [27] Aad W. van der Vaart and Jon Wellner. *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes with Applications to Statistics*. Springer-Verlag New York, 1996.
- [28] VA Volkonskii and Yu A Rozanov. Some limit theorems for random functions. i. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 4(2):178–197, 1959.
- [29] Bin Yu. Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 94–116, 1994.
- [30] A Yu Zaitsev. The accuracy of strong gaussian approximation for sums of independent random vectors. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 68(4):721, 2013.

Appendix

A Coupling Technique

In this section we formally construct the sequence $(X_i^*)_{i=-\infty}^\infty$ using the results in [11]; we do this here for completeness, there are no conceptual innovations in this section.

Throughout, $\sigma(X)$ denotes the σ -algebra generated by the random variable X . Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, Pr)$ be a probability space of a random variable Z satisfying the conditions of Lemma 1 in [11]. Let \mathcal{H} be a class of functions, $z \mapsto h(z)$, in $L^1(Pr)$ and let $\Lambda(\mathcal{H})$ be the class of functions, $z \mapsto g(z)$, that are Lipschitz continuous with constant 1 with respect to the distance $(x, y) \mapsto d_{\mathcal{H}}(x, y) := \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |h(x) - h(y)|$.

Let \mathcal{S}' be a σ -algebra on \mathcal{S} . Let $\zeta \sim U(0, 1)$ independent of $\sigma(X) \vee \mathcal{M}$. By Lemma 1 in [11], there exists a random variable Z^* measurable with respect to $\sigma(Z) \vee \mathcal{S}' \vee \sigma(\zeta)$, distributed as Z and independent of \mathcal{S}' such that

$$E_{\mathbb{P}}[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |h(Z) - h(Z^*)|] = E_{Pr} \left[\sup_{g \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H})} \left| \int g(z) Pr(dz | \mathcal{S}') - \int g(z) Pr(dz) \right| \right]$$

where \mathbb{P} is the joint probability of (Z^*, Z) . Observe that $d_{\mathcal{H}}$ plays the role of the distance d in Lemma 1 in [11] and by construction it satisfies their condition 2.1.

We now apply this coupling lemma to construct $(X_i^*)_{i=-\infty}^\infty$. For this, let $(\mathbb{E}^\infty, \mathcal{S}, P)$ be the probability space of $(X_i)_{i=-\infty}^\infty$, where \mathbb{E} is some finite dimensional Euclidean space. For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, let $U_j^*(q) := (X_{qj+1}^*, \dots, X_{qj+q}^*)$ for any $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n/q - 1\}$ which is constructed by employing the coupling argument above recursively. Take any $j \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$, let $\zeta_j \sim IID - U(0, 1)$, let $U_j(q) := (X_{qj+1}, \dots, X_{qj+q})$ play the role of Z and let $\sigma((U_m(q))_{m \leq j-2}) = \sigma((X_i)_{i \leq qj-q}) = \mathcal{M}_{qj-q}$ play the role of \mathcal{S}' . Then, by the previous argument there exists a Z^* , which we denote as $U_j^*(q)$ such that has the same distribution of $U_j(q)$, is measurable with respect to $\sigma(U_j(q)) \vee \sigma((U_m(q))_{m \leq j-2}) \vee \sigma(\zeta_j)$ and is independent of $(U_m(q))_{m \leq j-2}$. Hence $(X_i^*)_{i=-\infty}^\infty$ has the same distribution as $(X_i)_{i=-\infty}^\infty$ and $(U_{2j}^*)_j$ are independent and $(U_{2j+1}^*)_j$ are also independent. Finally, for any class of functions \mathcal{H} , from \mathbb{E}^r to \mathbb{R} , with $r \leq q$, with finite first moments, it follows

$$E_{\mathbb{P}}[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |h(X_{1:r}) - h(X_{1:r}^*)|] = E_P \left[\sup_{g \in \Lambda(\mathcal{H})} \left| \int g(x_{1:r}) P(dx_{1:r} | \mathcal{M}_{-q}) - \int g(x_{1:r}) P(dx_{1:r}) \right| \right],$$

where $X_{1:r} := (X_1, \dots, X_r)$.

An implication of this coupling result is the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. *Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \text{cone}\mathcal{F}$. For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$*

$$\left\| \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} |G_n[f] - G_n^*[f]| \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{P})} \leq \sqrt{n} \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(q),$$

for any $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$.

Proof of Lemma A.1. For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$,

$$G_n[f] - G_n^*[f] = n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=0}^{n/q} \sum_{l=1}^q (f(X_{qj+l}) - f(X_{qj+l}^*)).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbb{P}}[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} |G_n[f] - G_n^*[f]|] &\leq n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=0}^{n/q-1} \sum_{l=1}^q E_{\mathbb{P}}[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} |f(X_{qj+l}) - f(X_{qj+l}^*)|] \\ &= \sqrt{n} E_{\mathbb{P}}[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} |f(X_1) - f(X_1^*)|] \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows by stationarity. By the results above with $r = 1$ and $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{B}$, it follows that

$$E_{\mathbb{P}}[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} |f(X_1) - f(X_1^*)|] \leq E_P \left[\sup_{f \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B})} \left| \int f(x) P(dx | \mathcal{M}_{-q}) - \int f(x) P(dx) \right| \right] = \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(q),$$

and hence $E_{\mathbb{P}}[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} |G_n[f] - G_n^*[f]|] \leq \sqrt{n} \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(q)$, as desired. \square

The following lemma contains some useful properties of the measure of dependence.

Lemma A.2. *The following are true*

1. For any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, $\tau_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \tau_{\mathcal{B}'}$.
2. For any $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, $\tau_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} \|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{B}}}$ where $\bar{\mathcal{B}} := \{f \in \text{cone}\mathcal{B} : \|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq 1\}$.

Proof of Lemma A.2. (1) It suffices to show that $\Lambda(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq \Lambda(\mathcal{B}')$. Take any $g \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B})$, by definition of $\Lambda(\mathcal{B})$, for any x, y , $|g(x) - g(y)| \leq d_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y)$. Since $d_{\mathcal{B}}(x, y) := \sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}} |h(x) - h(y)| \leq \sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}'} |h(x) - h(y)| =: d_{\mathcal{B}'}(x, y)$ it follows that $|g(x) - g(y)| \leq d_{\mathcal{B}'}(x, y)$, and thus $g \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B}')$.

(2) If $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} \|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} = \infty$ the inequality is trivial, so we proceed under the assumption that $B := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{B}} \|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} < \infty$. Take any $g \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B})$, since for any x, y , $|g(x) - g(y)| \leq \sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}} |h(x) - h(y)|$, and $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}} |h(x) - h(y)| = B \sup_{h \in \mathcal{B}} |h(x)/B - h(y)/B| \leq B \sup_{h' \in \bar{\mathcal{B}}} |h'(x) - h'(y)|$, where the last inequality follows from the fact that $h/B \in \text{cone}\mathcal{B}$ and $\|h/B\|_{L^\infty(P)} = B^{-1} \|h\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq 1$, it follows that $g/B \in \Lambda(\bar{\mathcal{B}})$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\mathcal{B}}(q) &= E_P \left[\sup_{g \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B})} \left| \int g(x) P(dx | \mathcal{M}_{-q}) - \int g(x) P(dx) \right| \right] \\ &= B E_P \left[\sup_{g \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B})} \left| \int B^{-1} g(x) P(dx | \mathcal{M}_{-q}) - \int B^{-1} g(x) P(dx) \right| \right] \\ &= B E_P \left[\sup_{g' = g/B : g \in \Lambda(\mathcal{B})} \left| \int g'(x) P(dx | \mathcal{M}_{-q}) - \int g'(x) P(dx) \right| \right] \\ &\leq B E_P \left[\sup_{g' \in \Lambda(\bar{\mathcal{B}})} \left| \int g'(x) P(dx | \mathcal{M}_{-q}) - \int g'(x) P(dx) \right| \right] \\ &= B \tau_{\bar{\mathcal{B}}}(q) \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

B Supplementary Lemmas

The following results shows that consecutive elements of \mathcal{Q}_n are not “too far apart”.

Lemma B.1. *For any $n \in \mathcal{N}$ and $a \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, $a > 1$. Then there exists $a' \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ such that $a' < a$ and $2a' \geq a$.*

Proof. If $a \in \mathcal{Q}_n$, then it must be that $a = \prod_{i=1}^I p_i^{f_i}$ for some integers $(f_i)_i$. By assumption, $f_2 \geq 1$ — the associated number to $p_2 = 2$. So consider $a' = p_2^{f_2-1} \prod_{i=3}^I p_i^{f_i}$. Clearly $a' < a$ and $2a' = a$. Moreover, $\frac{n}{a'} = p_2 \frac{n}{a}$ which is an integer because $a \in \mathcal{Q}_n$. Therefore $a' \in \mathcal{Q}_n$. \square

$$\text{Let } \mathbb{B}_r(q) := \sqrt{2} \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} \right)^{(r-2)/(2r)}.$$

Lemma B.2. For any $r > 2$, any $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and any $q \in \mathbb{N}$, it follows that $\|f\|_q \leq \mathbb{B}_r(q) \|f\|_{L^r(P)}$ with ¹¹

$$\left(\int_0^{1/2} (\min\{\theta^{-1}(2u), (q+1)\})^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \leq \frac{\mathbb{B}_r(q)}{\sqrt{2}} \leq \left(\int_0^{1/2} (\min\{\theta^{-1}(2u) + 1, (q+1)\})^{\frac{r}{r-2}} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}.$$

Proof of Lemma B.2. By definition $\|f\|_q^2 = 2 \int_0^1 \mu_q(u) Q_f(u)^2 du$. By Cauchy-Swarchz inequality

$$\int_0^1 \mu_q(u) Q_f^2(u) du \leq \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^q \right)^{1/q} \left(\int_0^1 |Q_f(u)|^{2p} \right)^{1/p}$$

with $1/q + 1/p = 1$. Letting $p = r/2$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_0^1 \mu_q(u) Q_f^2(u) du &\leq 2 \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} \right)^{(r-2)/r} \left(\int_0^1 |Q_f(u)|^r \right)^{2/r} \\ &= 2 \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} \right)^{(r-2)/r} \|f\|_{L^r(P)}^2 \\ &= \mathbb{B}_r(q)^2 \|f\|_{L^r(P)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

We now show the upper and lower bound for $\mathbb{B}_r(q)$. To do this, we observe that for any $u \in [0, 1/2]$,

$$\mu_q(u) \leq \min\{\theta^{-1}(2u) + 1, q + 1\},$$

where $\theta^{-1}(u) = \min\{s \mid \theta(s) \leq u\}$ for $u \in [0, 1]$ and $\theta^{-1}(u) = 0$ for $u > 1/2$ (the inverse is well-defined because $t \mapsto \theta(t) \in [0, 1]$ is cadlag and non-increasing).

To show the previous display, observe that $u \mapsto \mu_q(u) = \sum_{l=0}^q 1\{u \leq 0.5\theta(l)\}$, and so, for any $u \in [0, 1]$, $\mu_q(u) = \min\{j(2u), 1 + q\}$ where $j(u) = \min\{s \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid u > \theta(s)\}$. Hence, it suffices to show that $\theta^{-1}(u) \geq j(u) - 1$. By definition of $j(\cdot)$, $u \leq \theta(j(u) - 1)$ and by definition of $\theta^{-1}(u)$, $\theta(\theta^{-1}(u)) \leq u$; thus $\theta(\theta^{-1}(u)) \leq \theta(j(u) - 1)$. Since $\theta(\cdot)$ is non-increasing, this implies that $\theta^{-1}(u) \geq j(u) - 1$. Thus, the desired results holds.

Therefore, for any $a \geq 0$

$$\int_0^1 (\mu_q(u))^a du \leq \int_0^{1/2} \min\{(\theta^{-1}(2u) + 1)^a, (q + 1)^a\} du,$$

and from this inequality and by choosing $a = \frac{r}{r-2}$, it readily follows that

$$2^{-1/2} \mathbb{B}_r(q) \leq \left(\int_0^{1/2} \min\{(\theta^{-1}(2u) + 1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q + 1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}.$$

To show the lower bound for $\mathbb{B}_r(q)$ observe that for any $u \in [0, 1]$

$$\mu_q(u) \geq \min\{\theta^{-1}(2u), q + 1\}.$$

¹¹Recall that the function $\beta^{-1} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined as $\beta^{-1}(u) = \min\{s \mid \beta(s) \leq u\}$ — since β is right-continuous, the min exists.

This follows because $\mu_q(u) = \min\{j(2u), 1 + q\}$, and $\theta^{-1}(u) \leq j(u)$. To prove the latter we proceed by contradiction, i.e., suppose $\theta^{-1}(u) > j(u)$. By definition of $j(u)$, $u > \theta(j(u))$. But this violates the property that $\theta^{-1}(u)$ is the minimum over all s such that $\theta(s) \leq u$. Therefore, $\mu_q(u) \geq \min\{\theta^{-1}(2u), q + 1\}$ and thus for any $a > 0$.

$$\int_0^1 (\mu_q(u))^a du \geq \int_0^{1/2} (\min\{\theta^{-1}(2u), q + 1\})^a du.$$

By choosing $a = \frac{r}{r-2}$, it readily follows that

$$2^{-1/2} \mathbb{B}_r(q) \geq \left(\int_0^{1/2} \min\{(\theta^{-1}(2u))^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\} du \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}.$$

□

C Supplementary Lemmas for the Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Recall that $\Delta_k f := \pi_k f - \pi_{k-1} f = \Xi_k f - \Xi_{k-1} f$, with $\Xi_k f = -f + \pi_k f$. Hence, for any $f, f_0 \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$f - f_0 = f - \pi_1 f + \pi_1 f - f_0 = \dots = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f$$

setting $\pi_0 f = f_0$. Because, $m(f) = \min\{k \mid |D_k f| > a_k\}$, it follows,

$$\begin{aligned} f - f_0 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f \mathbf{1}_{m(f) \geq k} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f \mathbf{1}_{m(f) < k} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f \mathbf{1}_{m(f) \geq k} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\Xi_k f - \Xi_{k-1} f) \mathbf{1}_{m(f) < k} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f \mathbf{1}_{m(f) \geq k} - \Xi_0 f \{\mathbf{1}_{m(f) < 1}\} - \Xi_1 f \{\mathbf{1}_{m(f) < 2} - \mathbf{1}_{m(f) < 1}\} - \Xi_2 f \{\mathbf{1}_{m(f) < 3} - \mathbf{1}_{m(f) < 2}\} - \dots \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f \mathbf{1}_{m(f) \geq k} - \Xi_0 f \{\mathbf{1}_{m(f) < 1}\} - \Xi_1 f \{\mathbf{1}_{m(f)=1}\} - \Xi_2 f \{\mathbf{1}_{m(f)=2}\} - \dots \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f \mathbf{1}_{m(f) \geq k} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Xi_k f \mathbf{1}_{m(f)=k} - \Xi_0 f \mathbf{1}_{m(f)=0}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third line follows because $\mathbf{1}_{m(f) < k+1} - \mathbf{1}_{m(f) < k} = \mathbf{1}_{m(f)=k}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{m(f) < 1} = \mathbf{1}_{m(f)=0}$.

Moreover, since $\Delta_k f = \Xi_k f - \Xi_{k-1} f$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\{m(f) \geq k \cap |D_k f| > a_k\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k\}}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f - f_0 &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f) \geq k \cap |D_k f| \leq a_k\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f) \geq k \cap |D_k f| > a_k\}} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Xi_k f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k\}} - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Xi_k f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| \leq a_k\}} - \Xi_0 f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f)=0\}}. \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Delta_k f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f) \geq k \cap |D_k f| \leq a_k\}} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Xi_{k-1} f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| > a_k\}} - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Xi_k f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| \leq a_k\}} - \Xi_0 f \mathbf{1}_{\{m(f)=0\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, $m(f) = k$ implies that $|D_k f| > a_k$ and thus $1_{\{m(f)=k \cap |D_k f| \leq a_k\}} = 0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Throughout, we use $J = J(q, n) = n/q - 1$, which is an integer since $q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$. Let $f \mapsto \delta_j(\omega^*)f := q^{-1/2} \sum_{i=qj+1}^{qj+q} \{f(Z_i^*) - E_P[f(Z^*)]\}$ for any $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Then, it follows that for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$G_n^*(f) = n^{-1/2} \sqrt{q} \sum_{j=0}^J \delta_j(\omega^*)f$$

where $\delta_j(\omega^*)f$ is measurable with respect to $U_j^*(q) = (X_{qj+1}^*, \dots, X_{qj+q}^*)$.

Note that, for any sequence $(a_j)_j$, $\sum_{j=0}^J a_j = \sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} a_{2j} + \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} a_{2j+1}$, then ¹²

$$G_n^*(f) = n^{-1/2} \sqrt{q} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} \delta_{2j}(\omega^*)f + \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} \delta_{2j+1}(\omega^*)f \right). \quad (28)$$

Hence, for any $t > 0$,

$$P(G_n^*(f) \geq t) \leq P\left(n^{-1/2} \sqrt{q} \sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]} \delta_{2j}(\omega^*)f \geq 0.5t\right) + P\left(n^{-1/2} \sqrt{q} \sum_{j=0}^{[(J+1)/2]-1} \delta_{2j+1}(\omega^*)f \geq 0.5t\right). \quad (29)$$

Thus, it suffices to bound each term in the right hand side (RHS) separately. By the results in Appendix A, $(U_{2j}^*(q))_{j \geq 0}$ are independent (so are $(U_{2j+1}^*(q))_{j \geq 0}$). Moreover, they have the same distribution as $(U_{2j}(q))_{j \geq 0}$ (also $(U_{2j+1}^*(q))_{j \geq 0}$ has the same distribution as $(U_{2j+1}(q))_{j \geq 0}$).

It is easy to see that for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $\|\delta_j(\omega^*)f\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq \sqrt{q} 2 \|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}$. Moreover, by [22] Theorem 1.1, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_P[(\delta_0(\omega^*)f)^2] &= \text{Var}_P(f(X_0)) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^q (1 - k/q) \text{Cov}_P(f(X_0), f(X_k)) \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{k=0}^q (1 - k/q) \int_0^{\alpha(k)} Q_f^2(u) du \\ &\leq 4 \int_0^1 \left(\sum_{k=0}^q 1_{\{u \leq \alpha(k)\}} \right) Q_f^2(u) du \\ &\leq 4 \int_0^1 \mu_q(u) Q_f^2(u) du = 2 \|f\|_q^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $(\alpha(k))_k$ are the mixing coefficients defined in expression 2.

¹²Here, $[a] = \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \leq a\}$.

By Bernstein inequality (see [27] Lemma 2.2.9), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{n}}\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]}\delta_{2j}(\omega^*)f \geq u\right) &\leq \exp\left\{-\frac{0.5q^{-1}nu^2}{\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]}E_P[(\delta_{2j}(\omega^*)f)^2] + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{nu}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}}\right\} \\
&\leq \exp\left\{-\frac{0.5nq^{-1}u^2}{(0.5J+1)2\|f\|_q^2 + \frac{2}{3}\sqrt{nu}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}}\right\} \\
&\leq \exp\left\{-\frac{0.5u^2}{2\|f\|_q^2 + \frac{2}{3}u\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}}\right\} \\
&\leq \exp\left\{-\frac{u^2}{4\left(\mathbf{b}^2 + \frac{1}{3}u\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}\right)}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from the fact that $E_P[(\delta_{2j}(\omega^*)f)^2] = E_P[(\delta_0(\omega^*)f)^2]$ (stationarity) and our previous observations; the third line follows from simple algebra and the fact that $J-1 = \frac{n}{q}$ and $n/q \geq 1$; the last one from $\|f\|_q \leq \mathbf{b}$.

If $\mathbf{b}^2 \geq \frac{1}{3}u\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}$, then

$$P\left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{n}}\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]}\{\delta_{2j}(\omega^*)f\} \geq u\right) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{u^2}{8\mathbf{b}^2}\right\}$$

so

$$P\left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{n}}\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]}\{\delta_{2j}(\omega^*)f\} \geq t\sqrt{8}\mathbf{b}\right) \leq \exp\{-t^2\}$$

Otherwise, if $\mathbf{b}^2 < \frac{1}{3}u\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}$, then

$$P\left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{n}}\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]}\{\delta_{2j}(\omega^*)f\} \geq u\right) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{u}{\frac{8}{3}\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}}\right\}$$

so

$$P\left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{n}}\sum_{j=0}^{[J/2]}\{\delta_{2j}(\omega^*)f\} \geq t^2\frac{8}{3}\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}\right) \leq \exp\{-t^2\}.$$

We are interested in $t = u2^{k/2}$ for any $u \geq 1$. Note also that $\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} \leq 2q^{-1}\sqrt{n}\mathbf{b}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^k}}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&t^2\frac{8}{3}\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)}\mathbf{1}\{t\frac{1}{3}\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} > \mathbf{b}^2\} + \sqrt{8}t\mathbf{b}\mathbf{1}\{t\frac{1}{3}\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} < \mathbf{b}^2\} \\
&\leq u^2\frac{16}{3}2^{k/2}\mathbf{b}\mathbf{1}\{t\frac{1}{3}\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} > \mathbf{b}^2\} + \sqrt{8}u2^{k/2}\mathbf{b}\mathbf{1}\{t\frac{1}{3}\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} < \mathbf{b}^2\} \\
&\leq u^2\mathbf{b}2^{k/2}\left(\frac{16}{3}\mathbf{1}\{t\frac{1}{3}\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} > \mathbf{b}^2\} + \sqrt{8}\mathbf{1}\{t\frac{1}{3}\frac{q}{\sqrt{n}}\|f\|_{L^\infty(P)} < \mathbf{b}^2\}\right) \\
&\leq u^2\mathbf{b}2^{k/2}\frac{16}{3},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third line follows since $u \geq 1$ and since $16/3 \geq \sqrt{8}$. Therefore,

$$P\left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{n}} \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor J/2 \rfloor} \{\delta_{2^j}(\omega^*)f\} \geq u^2 2^{k/2} \mathbf{b} \frac{16}{3}\right) \leq \exp\{-u^2 2^k\}.$$

The same result holds for $\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor (J+1)/2 \rfloor - 1} \{\delta_{2^{j+1}}(\omega^*)f\}$. Thus, by equation 29, the desired result follows. \square

The following result provides an useful bound of $\|\cdot\|_{L^1(P)}$ over bounded functions in terms of $\|\cdot\|_q$.

Lemma C.1. *For all n, k and $f \in \mathcal{F}$, let $b_k = 2\sqrt{n}\|f\|_{q_{n,k}}/\sqrt{2^{k+2}}$ and $q_{n,k}$ as defined in equation 6. Then*

$$\|f1_{\{f > b_k/q_{n,k}\}}\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \sqrt{2}\|f\|_{q_{n,k}} \sqrt{\frac{2^{k+1}}{n}}.$$

Proof of Lemma C.1. We divide the proof into several steps.

STEP 1. We first show that, for any $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$,

$$\|f1_{\{f > Q_f(\epsilon)\}}\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \sqrt{2}\|f\|_q \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{\mu_q(\epsilon)}}.$$

To do this, observe that $\|f1_{\{f > Q_f(\epsilon)\}}\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \int_0^\epsilon Q_f(t)dt$ for any $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ because, $\|f1_{\{f > Q_f(\epsilon)\}}\|_{L^1(P)} = \int_0^1 |Q_{f_\epsilon}(u)|du$ with $f_\epsilon := f1_{\{f > Q_f(\epsilon)\}}$. Observe that $H_{f_\epsilon}(0) = P(|f(X)|1_{\{f(X) > Q_f(\epsilon)\}} > 0) = P(|f(X)| > Q_f(\epsilon)) \leq H_f(Q_f(\epsilon)) \leq \epsilon$, so, for any $u \geq \epsilon$, $Q_{f_\epsilon}(u) = 0$. Hence, $\|f1_{\{f > Q_f(\epsilon)\}}\|_{L^1(P)} = \int_0^\epsilon |Q_{f_\epsilon}(u)|du$. Since $|Q_{f_\epsilon}| \leq |Q_f|$ the desired result follows.

For any $q \in \mathbb{N}$, since $u \mapsto Q_f(u)$ is non-increasing, it follows that

$$\|f\|_q^2 = 2 \int_0^1 \mu_q(u) Q_f^2(u) du \geq 2 Q_f^2(t) \int_0^t \mu_q(u) du$$

for all $t \in [0, 1]$, therefore $Q_f(t) \leq \frac{\|f\|_q}{\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\int_0^t \mu_q(v) dv}}$. Moreover, since $u \mapsto \mu_q(u)$ is non-increasing, $\sqrt{\int_0^t \mu_q(v) dv} \geq \sqrt{\mu_q(t)t}$. So,

$$Q_f(t) \leq \frac{\|f\|_q}{\sqrt{2} \sqrt{\mu_q(t)t}}. \quad (30)$$

Hence, for any $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$,

$$\|f1_{\{f > Q_f(\epsilon)\}}\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \frac{\|f\|_q}{\sqrt{2}} \int_0^\epsilon \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_q(t)t}} dt.$$

Since $u \mapsto \mu_q(u)$ is non-increasing, $\int_0^\epsilon \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu_q(t)t}} dt \leq \mu_q(\epsilon)^{-1/2} \int_0^\epsilon \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} dt = 2\sqrt{\epsilon} \mu_q(\epsilon)^{-1/2}$. Therefore,

$$\|f1_{\{f > Q_f(\epsilon)\}}\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \sqrt{2}\|f\|_q \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{\mu_q(\epsilon)}}.$$

STEP 2. We show that

$$\|f1_{\{f > b_k/q_{n,k}\}}\|_{L^1(P)} \leq \sqrt{2}\|f\|_{q_{n,k}} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_{n,k}}{\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k})}},$$

where $\epsilon_{n,k} := n^{-1} \underline{q}_{n,k} 2^{k+1}$ where $\underline{q}_{n,k}$ is maximal element of \mathcal{Q}_n lower than $q_{n,k}$. By Step 1, it suffices to show that (a) $\epsilon_{n,k} \in [0, 1]$ and (b) $\frac{b_k}{q_{n,k}} \geq Q_f(\epsilon_k)$.

Item (a) follows from the definition $\epsilon_{n,k} := n^{-1} \underline{q}_{n,k} 2^{k+1} \leq 0.5\theta(\underline{q}_{n,k})$ and $\theta(q) \leq 1$. We now show (b). By expression 30, it suffices to show $\frac{b_k}{q_{n,k}} \geq \frac{\|f\|_{q_{n,k}}}{\sqrt{2\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k})\epsilon_{n,k}}}$, or equivalently, $\frac{b_k}{q_{n,k}} \sqrt{2\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k})\epsilon_{n,k}} \geq \|f\|_{q_{n,k}}$. Since $\epsilon_{n,k} := n^{-1} \underline{q}_{n,k} 2^{k+1}$,

$$\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k}) = \mu_{q_{n,k}}(n^{-1}(\underline{q}_{n,k})2^{k+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{q_{n,k}} 1_{\{n^{-1}(\underline{q}_{n,k})2^{k+1} \leq 0.5\theta(i)\}}.$$

By definition of $q_{n,k}$, $n^{-1} \underline{q}_{n,k} 2^{k+1} < 0.5\theta(\underline{q}_{n,k})$. Since $\theta(\cdot)$ is non-increasing, this implies that $n^{-1} \underline{q}_{n,k} 2^{k+1} < 0.5\theta(i)$ for all $i = 0, \dots, \underline{q}_{n,k}$ and thus

$$\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k}) = \sum_{i=0}^{q_{n,k}} 1_{\{n^{-1} \underline{q}_{n,k} 2^{k+1} \leq 0.5\theta(i)\}} \geq \underline{q}_{n,k}. \quad (31)$$

This implies that $\sqrt{\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k})\epsilon_{n,k}} \geq \underline{q}_{n,k} n^{-1/2} \sqrt{2^{k+1}} = \epsilon_{n,k} \sqrt{\frac{n}{2^{k+1}}}$ where the last equality follows from the definition of $\epsilon_{n,k}$. Since $q_{n,k} \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ and n is restricted to be of the form $\prod_{i=1}^I p_i^{m_i}$ for some integers $(m_i)_i$, it follows by Lemma B.1 in Appendix B, that $q_{n,k} \leq 2\underline{q}_{n,k}$. This inequality and the definition of $\epsilon_{n,k}$ imply that $q_{n,k} \leq 2n\epsilon_{n,k}/2^{k+1}$, and thus, from the previous display it follows that

$$\frac{1}{q_{n,k}} \sqrt{\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k})\epsilon_{n,k}} \geq \frac{2^{k+1}}{2n\epsilon_{n,k}} \epsilon_{n,k} \sqrt{\frac{n}{2^{k+1}}} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2^{k+1}}{n}}.$$

Since $b_k = 2\sqrt{n}\|f\|_{q_{n,k}}/\sqrt{2^{k+2}}$, this display implies that

$$\frac{b_k}{q_{n,k}} \sqrt{2\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k})\epsilon_{n,k}} \geq \frac{b_k}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2^{k+2}}{n}} = \|f\|_{q_{n,k}}$$

as desired.

STEP 3. In view of step 2, the proof concludes if $\frac{\epsilon_{n,k}}{\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k})} \leq \frac{2^{k+1}}{n}$. By expression 31, $\frac{\epsilon_{n,k}}{\mu_{q_{n,k}}(\epsilon_{n,k})} \leq \frac{\epsilon_{n,k}}{\underline{q}_{n,k}}$ and thus the desired inequality follows from the definition of $\epsilon_{n,k}$. \square

D Supplementary Lemmas for the Proof of Theorem 2

The next Lemma is a Yurkinskii coupling result for IID random variables taken from [30], it is here just for completeness.

Lemma D.1. *Let Y_1, \dots, Y_K be independent mean zero and variance σ^2 random variables such that*

$$L_\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^K E[\|Y_i\|^\gamma] < \infty, \quad (32)$$

for some $\gamma \geq 2$. Then there exists a IID- $N(0, \sigma)$ sequence, Z_1, \dots, Z_K , such that for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\Pr\left(\left\|\sum_{i=1}^K Y_i - Z_i\right\| \geq \delta\right) \leq L_\gamma^{2\gamma} L_\gamma \delta^{-\gamma}$$

for some universal constant L .

Proof. See Theorem 6 in [30]. \square

E Proof of Proposition 1

Let $\mathbb{B}_r(q) := \sqrt{2} \left(\int_0^1 |\mu_q(u)|^{\frac{r}{r-2}} \right)^{(r-2)/(2r)}$, for any $r > 2$. The following lemma is used in the proof of the proposition and its proof is relegated to the end of this section.

Lemma E.1. *Let $m > 0$. For any $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $r > 2$, the following hold:*

1. *If $\theta(q) = 1\{q < m\}$, then*

$$2^{\frac{1}{r}} \sqrt{\min\{1+q, 1+m\}} \geq \mathbb{B}_r(q) \geq 2^{\frac{1}{r}} \sqrt{\min\{1+q, m\}}.$$

2. *If $\theta(q) = (1+q)^{-m}$ with $m > \frac{r}{r-2}$, then*

$$\left(2^{1+\frac{r}{r-2}-m} + \frac{0.5}{1-\frac{r}{m(r-2)}} \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \geq \mathbb{B}_r(q) \geq \left(\frac{0.5}{1-\frac{r}{m(r-2)}} (1-2^{-m+\frac{r}{r-2}}) - 0.5 \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}$$

3. *If $\theta(q) = (1+q)^{-m}$ with $m = \frac{r}{r-2}$, then*

$$\sqrt{2} (0.5 + 0.5m \log(1+q))^{\frac{1}{2m}} \geq \mathbb{B}_r(q) \geq \sqrt{2} (0.5m \log(2+q) - 0.5)^{\frac{1}{2m}}$$

4. *If $\theta(q) = (1+q)^{-m}$ with $m < \frac{r}{r-2}$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{2} \left(0.5(1+q)^{-m+\frac{r}{r-2}} + \frac{0.5}{\frac{r}{m(r-2)} - 1} (1+q)^{-m+\frac{r}{r-2}} \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} &\geq \mathbb{B}_r(q) \\ &\geq \sqrt{2} \left(\frac{0.5}{\frac{r}{m(r-2)} - 1} ((2+q)^{-m+\frac{r}{r-2}}) - 0.5 \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 1. Given our definition of $\mathbf{n}(n)$ and our notation, $\mathbb{B}_r(q_{n,0}) = \mathbf{n}(n)$. Thus, it suffices to provide upper and lower bounds on $\mathbb{B}_r(q)$. Throughout the proof, r is fixed to an arbitrary value greater than two.

(1) Note that $q_{n,0}$ is such that $\theta(q_{n,0})/q_{n,0} \leq \frac{4}{n}$. Recall that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $[x]$ is the smallest element, s in \mathcal{Q}_n such that $s \geq x$. Since $\theta(q_{n,0})/q_{n,0} \leq 1/q_{n,0}$, any value $q_{n,0} \geq 0.25n$ will satisfy the restriction $\theta(q_{n,0})/q_{n,0} \leq \frac{4}{n}$. Thus, $q_{n,0} = [0.25n]$. Therefore, by Lemma E.1(1), $\sqrt{m} \preceq \sqrt{\mathbf{n}(n)} \preceq \sqrt{m+1}$.

(2) By Lemma E.1(2), a bound for $\mathbb{B}_r(q)$ does not depend on q and thus the desired result follows.

(3) We first establish that $q_{n,0} \leq \left[\left(\frac{n}{4} \right)^{1/(m+1)} \right]$ and also that $q_{n,0} \geq \left(\frac{n}{4} \right)^{1/(m+1)} - 1$. To show this note that $\theta(q)/q \leq q^{-(m+1)}$. If $q_{n,0} > \left[\left(\frac{n}{4} \right)^{1/(m+1)} \right]$, then by definition of the operator $[.]$ there exists a $s \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ such that $q_{n,0} > s \geq \left(\frac{n}{4} \right)^{1/(m+1)}$. Thus $\frac{4}{n} > s^{-(1+m)} \geq \theta(s)/s$. But this contradicts the fact that $q_{n,0}$ is minimal in \mathcal{Q}_n such that $\theta(s)/s \leq \frac{4}{n}$. Clearly, $(q_{n,0})^{-(m+1)} \leq \frac{4}{n}$ and thus $q_{n,0} \geq \left(\frac{n}{4} \right)^{1/(m+1)} - 1$.

Thus, by Lemma E.1(3),

$$\sqrt{2} \left(2 + 0.5m \log \left(1 + \left[\left(\frac{n}{4} \right)^{1/(m+1)} \right] \right) \right)^{\frac{1}{2m}} \geq \mathbb{B}_r(q) \geq \sqrt{2} \left(0.5m \log \left(\left(\frac{n}{4} \right)^{1/(m+1)} + 1 \right) - 0.5 \right)^{\frac{1}{2m}}$$

These inequalities imply that $\mathbf{n}(n) \asymp (\log n)^{1/(2m)}$.

(4) By Lemma E.1(4), for some constant L which depends on r and m ,

$$L^{-1} q_{n,0}^{-\frac{-m(r-2)+r}{2r}} + o(1) \geq \mathbf{n}(n) \geq L q_{n,0}^{-\frac{-m(r-2)+r}{2r}} - o(1).$$

So using the same bounds for $q_{n,0}$ as in point (3), the desired result follows. \square

E.1 Proof of Lemma E.1

Proof of Lemma E.1. We use the upper and lower bounds of $\mathbb{B}_r(q)$ provided by Lemma B.2.

(1) In this case $u \mapsto \theta^{-1}(u) = m$. Therefore,

$$\int_0^{1/2} \min\{(\theta^{-1}(2u))^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\} du = 0.5 \min\{m^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\}$$

and

$$\int_0^{1/2} \min\{(\theta^{-1}(2u) + 1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\} du = 0.5 \min\{(1+m)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\}.$$

(2)-(4) Lower bound. Take $\theta(q) = (1+q)^{-m}$ so $\theta^{-1}(2u) = (2u)^{-1/m} - 1$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{1/2} \min\{(\theta^{-1}(2u))^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\} du &= (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}} a(q) + 0.5 \int_{2a(q)}^1 (t^{-\frac{1}{m}} - 1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}} dt \\ &\geq (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}} a(q) + 0.5 \int_{2a(q)}^1 t^{-\frac{r}{m(r-2)}} dt - 0.5(1 - 2a(q)) \end{aligned}$$

where $a(q) = 0.5(2+q)^{-m}$. Therefore,

$$\int_0^{1/2} \min\{(\theta^{-1}(2u))^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\} du \geq \frac{(q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}}{2(q+2)^m} + \frac{0.5(1 - (2+q)^{-m + \frac{r}{r-2}})}{1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)}} - 0.5(1 - (2+q)^{-m})$$

where the second term in the RHS is $0.5m \log(2+q)$ if $1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)} = 0$. Hence:

If $1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)} > 0$,

$$\mathbb{B}_r(q) \geq \left(\frac{0.5}{1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)}} (1 - 2^{-m + \frac{r}{r-2}}) - 0.5 \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}$$

If $1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)} = 0$,

$$\mathbb{B}_r(q) \geq \left(0.5 \frac{(q+1)^m}{(q+2)^m} + 0.5m \log(2+q) - 0.5 \right)^{\frac{1}{2m}} \geq (0.5m \log(2+q) - 0.5)^{\frac{1}{2m}}$$

If $1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)} < 0$,

$$\mathbb{B}_r(q) \geq \left(0.5 \frac{(q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}}{(q+2)^m} + \frac{0.5}{\frac{r}{m(r-2)} - 1} ((2+q)^{-m + \frac{r}{r-2}}) - 0.5 \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \geq \left(\frac{0.5}{\frac{r}{m(r-2)} - 1} ((2+q)^{-m + \frac{r}{r-2}}) - 0.5 \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}$$

(2)-(4) Upper bound. It follows that

$$\int_0^{1/2} \min\{(\theta^{-1}(2u) + 1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\} du = 0.5(q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}} b(q) + 0.5 \int_{2b(q)}^1 t^{-\frac{r}{m(r-2)}} dt$$

where $b(q) = 0.5(1+q)^{-m}$. Therefore,

$$\int_0^{1/2} \min\{(\theta^{-1}(2u) + 1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}, (q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}\} du = \frac{(q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}}{(q+1)^m} + \frac{0.5}{1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)}} (1 - (1+q)^{-m + \frac{r}{r-2}})$$

where the second term in the RHS is $0.5m \log(1+q)$ if $1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)} = 0$. Hence:

If $1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)} > 0$,

$$\mathbb{B}_r(q) \leq \left(2 \frac{(q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2}}}{(q+1)^m} + \frac{0.5}{1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)}} \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}} \leq \left(2^{1 + \frac{r}{r-2} - m} + \frac{0.5}{1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)}} \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}$$

where the second inequality follows because $(q+1)^{\frac{r}{r-2} - m} \leq 2$

If $1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)} = 0$,

$$\mathbb{B}_r(q) \leq \left(0.5 \frac{(q+1)^m}{(q+1)^m} + 0.5m \log(1+q) \right)^{\frac{1}{2m}} \leq (0.5 + 0.5m \log(1+q))^{\frac{1}{2m}}$$

If $1 - \frac{r}{m(r-2)} < 0$,

$$\mathbb{B}_r(q) \leq \left(0.5(1+q)^{-m + \frac{r}{r-2}} + \frac{0.5}{\frac{r}{m(r-2)} - 1} (1+q)^{-m + \frac{r}{r-2}} \right)^{\frac{r-2}{2r}}$$

□