

A central limit theorem for a sequence of conditionally centered random fields

ABDOLLAH JALILIAN^{1,a}, ARNAUD POINAS^{2,b}, GANGGANG XU^{3,c} and RASMUS WAAGEPETERSEN^{4,d}

¹Department of Statistics, Razi University, Baq-e Abrisham, Kermanshah, 67144-15111, Iran and Lancaster Ecology and Epidemiology Group, Lancaster University, United Kingdom, ^ajalilian@razi.ac.ir

²Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Applications, University of Poitiers, Poitiers, France, ^barnaud.poinas@univ-poitiers.fr

³Department of Management Science, University of Miami, Coral Gables, FL 33124, Florida, United States of America, ^cgangxu@bus.miami.edu

⁴Department of Mathematical Sciences, Aalborg University, Skjernvej 4A, Aalborg, DK-9220, Denmark, ^drw@math.aau.dk

A central limit theorem is established for a sum of random variables belonging to a sequence of random fields. The fields are assumed to have zero mean conditional on the past history and to satisfy certain conditional α -mixing conditions in space or time. Exploiting conditional centering and the space-time structure, the limiting normal distribution is obtained for increasing spatial domain, **increasing length of the sequence, or both of these**. The theorem is very well suited for establishing asymptotic normality in the context of unbiased estimating function inference for a wide range of space-time processes. This is pertinent given the abundance of space-time data. Two examples demonstrate the applicability of the theorem.

Keywords: Central limit theorem; conditional α -mixing; conditional centering; estimating function; random field; space-time; spatio-temporal

1. Introduction

While the literature on central limit theorems for spatial stochastic processes is extensive ([Biscio and Waagepetersen, 2019](#), [Bolthausen, 1982](#), [Comets and Janžura, 1998](#), [Guyon, 1995](#), [Jensen and Künsch, 1994](#), [Karácsny, 2006](#), to mention a few), the literature on central limit theorems for spatio-temporal processes seems much less developed. The theoretical foundation for statistical analysis of space-time data is thus incomplete which is unfortunate since such data are increasingly common. The objective of this paper is to derive a central limit theorem for a sequence of random fields that satisfy a certain conditional centering condition. This condition is motivated by applications of estimating functions in space-time statistics (see [Section 2](#)) where the estimating function based on a random field at one time point is unbiased (has zero mean expectation at the true parameter value) conditional on the past.

Our central limit theorem is based on increasing spatial domain or increasing time horizon asymptotics (**or a combination**) but does not require stationarity in space nor in time. To prove the theorem we use a unified framework that more specifically covers both a fixed length sequence of random fields each with increasing spatial domain, **a sequence of random fields with unconstrained time horizon and fixed spatial domain, and a combination of these asymptotic settings**. The proof requires to bound a large variety of covariances. In the case of spatial random fields, this is typically done by imposing appropriate weak spatial dependence conditions like m -dependence (e.g. [Heinrich, 2013](#), [Leonenko, 1975](#)) or α -mixing ([Bolthausen, 1982](#)). [Leonenko \(1975\)](#) considers a central limit theorem for a sequence of statistics each obtained as a sum of variables for a random field in a sequence of increasing domain

m -dependent random fields. Instead of using mixing conditions as an intermediate step to bound covariances, Doukhan and Lang (2016) propose a notion of weak dependence where they impose decay conditions directly on covariances. Jensen and Künsch (1994) and Comets and Janžura (1998) use a different strategy for spatial random fields of conditionally centered random variables that have expectation zero given all other variables. By exploiting the conditional centering, they are able to dispense with spatial mixing assumptions.

Different from Jensen and Künsch (1994) and Comets and Janžura (1998), we assume conditional centering given the past history in time, which is useful for eliminating covariances involving variables at distinct time points. This is related to the key property of uncorrelated increments for martingales. In addition we exploit the space-time structure and introduce a novel assumption of α -mixing for a random field at a given point in time conditional on the past history. This is natural to consider when the distribution of a space-time process is specified in terms of a sequence of conditional distributions given the past, see Section 2. Referring again to martingale terminology, this type of α -mixing is convenient since it essentially only pertains the spatial mixing properties of innovations. We note that our notion of conditional α -mixing is very different from the notion of conditional m -dependence in Biscio and Svane (2022) for spatial point processes where conditioning is on an underlying random field.

To give a concise statement of the various conditions needed, we introduce the novel concept of a space-time filtration which is an increasing sequence of σ -algebras that are indexed both by time points and subsets of space.

2. Examples of applications

To motivate our central limit we provide some illustrative examples of applications where we try to strike a balance between accessibility and practical relevance. The targets for our central limit are so-called score functions. These play a key role in statistical inference where parameter estimates are obtained by solving estimating equations where score functions involving unknown parameters are equated to zero.

2.1. A discrete time spatial birth-death point process

Consider a sequence of point processes X_0, \dots, X_K and spatial covariates Z_0, \dots, Z_K on \mathbb{R}^d , where the latter are considered non-random. For each $k = 0, \dots, K$, we observe $X_k \cap W$ and $Z_k(v)$, $v \in W$, where $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a bounded observation window. We consider a model for the X_k corresponding to a discrete-time spatial birth-death process that mimics the seasonal behaviour of a plant community.

Given X_{k-1} and Z_{k-1} , $X_k = S_k \cup B_k \cup I_k$ where $B_k = \cup_{u \in X_{k-1}} Y_u^k$ is a union of offspring clusters Y_u^k given by independent Poisson processes. For each $u \in X_{k-1}$, Y_u^k has an intensity function given by $\alpha k_u(\cdot)$ where $\alpha > 0$ and $k_u(\cdot)$ is the uniform density on the disc $b(u, \omega)$ with center u and radius ω . The intensity function depends on X_{k-1} only through u . The point process S_k represents plants from X_{k-1} that survived to time k and is given by $S_k = \{u \in X_{k-1} | R_u = 0\}$, where the R_u are Bernoulli variables conditionally independent given X_{k-1} and Z_{k-1} and with ‘survival’ probability $\mathbb{P}(R_u = 0 | X_{k-1}, Z_{k-1})$ depending on X_{k-1} and Z_{k-1} only through $Z_{k-1}(u)$. The ‘immigrant’ point processes I_k , $k \geq 1$, are independent Poisson processes of intensity $\rho \geq 0$. Given X_{k-1} , the process $B_k \cup I_k$ of new trees in generation k is a Poisson point process with intensity function given by $\rho + \alpha \sum_{u \in X_{k-1}} k_u(v)$, $v \in W$.

Suppose parametric models are imposed for the conditional distributions of $B_k \cup I_k$ and S_k given Z_{k-1} and X_{k-1} . For each k we let T_k^W denote the concatenation of likelihood score functions for the

conditional distributions of $B_k \cup I_k$ and S_k . Then T_k^W can be additively decomposed as

$$T_k^W = \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}} E_k(\mathbf{l}),$$

where $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : c(\mathbf{l}) \cap W \neq \emptyset\}$, $c(\mathbf{l})$ is the unit cube centered at \mathbf{l} and the likelihood score component $E_k(\mathbf{l})$ depends on $Z_{k-1}, X_{k-1}, B_k \cup I_k, S_k$ only through $Z_{k-1}(v)$, $v \in c(\mathbf{l}) \cap W$ and through the intersections of $X_{k-1}, B_k \cup I_k$, and S_k with $c(\mathbf{l}) \cap W$. **Due to boundary effects, the definition of the variables $E_k(\mathbf{l})$ may depend on W (when $c(\mathbf{l})$ is not entirely contained in W). Therefore we will later on, when considering a sequence of expanding windows W_n , add the index n and write $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$.**

Parametric inference is based on the accumulated score function

$$T^W = \sum_{k=1}^K T_k^W$$

which has zero mean (is unbiased) since each conditional score function has zero conditional mean by the first Bartlett identity. For asymptotic inference it is essential to establish asymptotic normality of T^W . Here relevant asymptotic regimes can be expanding time horizon $K \rightarrow \infty$, expanding observation window W or a combination of these.

The case of increasing window asymptotics is pertinent for rain forest point pattern data sets covering large study regions. Here tree positions are registered in censuses conducted a moderate number of times. For example, for the Barro Colorado Island data set (Condit et al., 2019), censuses are available at just eight time points which does not justify large K asymptotics.

2.2. Conditional autoregressive model

In this section, we consider a spatio-temporal autoregressive model. The model can also be viewed as a multivariate time series with graphical interactions at each time instance (Dahlhaus, 2000). Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite lattice and $G = (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E})$ be an undirected graph with vertices in \mathcal{D} and edges \mathcal{E} where $\mathbf{l} \neq \mathbf{j}$ in \mathcal{D} are connected if $\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\} \in \mathcal{E}$. For example, elements of \mathcal{D} may represent sub-regions (provinces, counties or municipalities) of a specific geographical region and edges in \mathcal{E} determine interconnections between these sub-regions due to e.g. adjacency or transportation routes.

Let $X_k = (X_k(\mathbf{l}))_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, be a sequence of random fields where for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}$, we assume that given the history X_0, \dots, X_{k-1} and the current neighbourhood $X_k(-\mathbf{k}) = X_k(\mathbf{l})$, $\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{k}\}$, $X_k(\mathbf{l})$ follows the conditional distribution

$$X_k(\mathbf{l}) | X_0, \dots, X_{k-1}, X_k(-\mathbf{k}) \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\beta \xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}}(\mathbf{l}) + \gamma \xi_k^{\text{spat}}(\mathbf{l}), 1/a(\mathbf{l}) \right), \quad (1)$$

where for some $r \geq 1$,

$$\xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}}(\mathbf{l}) = \sum_{j=1}^r \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}} b_j(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) X_{k-j}(\mathbf{j}),$$

with $X_{k-j}(\mathbf{l}) = 0$ for $k < j$, and

$$\xi_k^{\text{spat}}(\mathbf{l}) = \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{l}\}} b_0(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \left(X_k(\mathbf{j}) - \beta \xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}}(\mathbf{j}) \right).$$

Let $\xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}} = (\xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}}(\mathbf{l}))_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}}$, $\xi_k^{\text{spat}} = (\xi_k^{\text{spat}}(\mathbf{l}))_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}}$, $A = \text{diag}(a(\mathbf{l}) : \mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D})$, and $B_j = [b_j(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j})]_{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}}$, $j = 0, \dots, r$, with diagonal entries $b_0(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}) = 0$ for B_0 . Then,

$$\xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}} = \sum_{j=1}^r B_j X_{k-j} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_k^{\text{spat}} = B_0 (X_k - \beta \xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}}).$$

We assume that $b_0(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), \dots, b_r(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j})$ and $a(\mathbf{l})$ are known and $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ are unknown parameters. Based on observations of X_k for $k = 0, \dots, K$, a score function for estimation of β and γ is given by (see Section 5.2 of the supplementary material for details)

$$T = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}} E_k(\mathbf{l}),$$

where

$$E_k(\mathbf{l}) = \varepsilon_k(\mathbf{l}) \left(\xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}}(\mathbf{l}), \xi_k^{\text{spat}}(\mathbf{l}) \right)^\top$$

and $\varepsilon_k = A(X_k - \beta \xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}} - \gamma \xi_k^{\text{spat}})$.

We can asymptotically approximate the complicated distribution of T by a normal distribution as K tends to infinity.

3. The space-time central limit theorem

Consider for each $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ a random field $E_{k,n} = (E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}))_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n}$, on $\mathcal{D}_n \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 1$, where $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) = (E_{k,n}^{(1)}(\mathbf{l}), \dots, E_{k,n}^{(q)}(\mathbf{l}))^\top$, $q \geq 1$, and $(\mathcal{D}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of finite observation lattices while k can be viewed as a time index. **As explained in Section 2.1, the index n for the variables $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$ may be needed due to edge effects when the variables are constructed from an underlying process on a continuous observation window W_n .**

Depending on the context (see examples in Section 2), it may or may not be reasonable to assume properties like stationarity or mixing in time for the sequence $E_{k,n}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If the sequence $E_{k,n}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, can not be viewed as a part of a stationary sequence, it is convenient to consider it conditional on an initial condition represented by a σ -algebra \mathcal{H}_0 , see Section 3.1. Defining for $K, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$T_{K,n} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}), \tag{2}$$

we formulate in Section 3.3 a central limit theorem for $\Sigma_{K,n}^{-1/2} T_{K,n}$ with $\Sigma_{K,n} = \text{Var}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[T_{K,n}]$, that is, the variance conditional on the initial condition \mathcal{H}_0 . Conditions for the theorem are specified in Section 3.2.

3.1. Notation, space-time filtration and α -mixing

We define $d(x, y) = \max\{|x_i - y_i| : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and, reusing notation, $d(A, B) = \inf\{d(x, y) : x \in A, y \in B\}$, $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote by $|A|$ the cardinality or Lebesgue measure of A . The meaning of $|\cdot|$ and $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ will be clear from the context. **For $a \in \mathbb{R}$ we use the brief notation $\mathbb{E}[\dots]^a$ for the less ambiguous $(\mathbb{E}[\dots])^a$.**

Conditioning on the past history plays a crucial role for our result. We represent the history by what we call a space-time filtration whose definition not only involves time points but also spatial regions. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be the underlying probability space on which all random objects in this paper are defined. Recalling $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, we coin a set $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathcal{H}_{l,k,A} \mid l, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d\}$ of σ -algebras $\mathcal{H}_{l,k,A} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ a space time filtration if $\mathcal{H}_{l',k',A} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{l,k,A}$ for $l' \leq l \leq k \leq k'$ and $\mathcal{H}_{l,k,A} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{l,k,B}$ for $A \subseteq B$. For brevity we let $\mathcal{H}_k = \mathcal{H}_{0,k,\mathbb{R}^d}$. One can think of the σ -algebras $\mathcal{H}_{l,k,A}$ as being generated by stochastic processes like the space-time point process or space-time autoregressive model in Section 2 as well as possible space-time exogeneous variables restricted to the space-time domain $\{l, l+1, \dots, k\} \times A$. This in turn makes the $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I})$ measurable when defined in terms of the underlying processes.

For any σ -algebras $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, the conditional α -mixing coefficient of \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 given \mathcal{G}_0 is defined in Prakasa Rao (2009) as

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{G}_0}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) = \sup_{\substack{F_1 \in \mathcal{G}_1 \\ F_2 \in \mathcal{G}_2}} |\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(F_1 \cap F_2) - \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(F_1)\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(F_2)|,$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}_0}(F) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}_0}[I_F]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}_0}$ denotes the conditional expectation with respect to \mathcal{G}_0 , $I_F(\omega) = I[\omega \in F]$ and $I[\cdot]$ is the indicator function. Similarly, $\text{Var}_{\mathcal{G}_0}$ and $\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{G}_0}$ denote variance and covariance conditional on \mathcal{G}_0 . Note that $0 \leq \alpha_{\mathcal{G}_0}(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) \leq 1/4$ is a \mathcal{G}_0 -measurable random variable.

For $m, c_1, c_2 \geq 0$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ we define a spatial mixing coefficient

$$\alpha_{K,c_1,c_2}(m) = \sup_{1 \leq k \leq K} \sup_{\substack{A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \\ |A| \leq c_1, |B| \leq c_2 \\ d(A, B) \geq m}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}(\mathcal{H}_{0,k,A}, \mathcal{H}_{0,k,B}). \quad (3)$$

Moreover, for $m, r \geq 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, we define (with a slight abuse of notation) the time mixing coefficients

$$\alpha_{r,D}(m) = \sup_{\substack{l, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \\ l-k \geq m}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}(\mathcal{H}_{0,k,D}, \mathcal{H}_{(l-r)^+, l, D}) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{n,r}(m) = \alpha_{r, \mathcal{D}_n}(m), \quad (4)$$

where $(x)^+ = \max\{x, 0\}$. Finally, we combine (3) and (4) to obtain for $m, m', c_1, c_2, r \geq 0$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, and $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the space-time mixing coefficient

$$\alpha_{r,D;K,c_1,c_2}(m; m') = \sup_{\substack{l, k \leq K \\ l-k \geq m}} \sup_{\substack{A, B \subseteq D \\ |A| \leq c_1, |B| \leq c_2 \\ d(A, B) \geq m'}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}(\mathcal{H}_{0,k,A}, \mathcal{H}_{(l-r)^+, l, B}). \quad (5)$$

This extends the previous mixing coefficients since (3) is $\alpha_{\infty, \mathbb{R}^d; K, c_1, c_2}(m; 0)$ and the coefficients in (4) are $\alpha_{r, D; \infty, \infty, \infty}(0; m)$ and $\alpha_{r, \mathcal{D}_n; \infty, \infty, \infty}(0; m)$.

Remark 1. The definitions (3) and (4) involve in a standard way sup over space lags as well as over sizes of spatial regions or over time lags. The remarkable aspect of (3) is that it just involves conditional α -mixing for events up to time k conditional on the history up to the immediate past at time $k-1$. This is extremely convenient when considering the common case of processes specified sequentially by the distribution of the process at time k , $k \geq 1$, given the history up to time $k-1$, see also Section 3.2.1. For (4) we similarly only need to consider the development of the process from time k up to l given the history up to time $k-1$. The coefficient (5) is the natural space-time combination of (3) and (4).

3.2. Conditions

This section specifies and discusses conditions needed for the central limit theorem. We initially assume the existence of a space-time filtration \mathcal{H} so that the following conditional centering condition holds:

(A1) for any $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$, the random vectors $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$, $\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n$, are conditionally centered:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})] = 0.$$

We further need certain space or time ‘localization’ properties:

(A2) Consider $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \{k, k+1, \dots, K\}$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^{q|\mathcal{I}||\mathcal{T}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any measurable function and define $Y_n^{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I})} = f((E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}))_{(k', \mathbf{l}) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{I}})$.

(A2-1) there exists a distance $R > 0$ so that $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$ and $\mathbb{E}_{k-1}[Y_n^{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I})}]$ are measurable with respect to respectively $\mathcal{H}_{0,k,C(\mathbf{l})}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{0,k-1,\cup_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{I}} C(\mathbf{l})}$, where $C(\mathbf{l})$ denotes a cube of sidelength R centered at \mathbf{l} .

(A2-2) there exists a lag $r \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[Y_n^{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I})}]$ are measurable with respect to respectively $\mathcal{H}_{0,k,\mathcal{D}_n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(k-r)^+, k-1, \mathcal{D}_n}$.

(A2-3) there exists a distance $R > 0$ and a lag $r \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{i-1}}[Y_n^{(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{I})}]$, for all i in $\{1, \dots, k\}$, are measurable with respect to respectively $\mathcal{H}_{0,k,C(\mathbf{l})}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(i-r)^+, i-1, ((k-i) \cup_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{I}} C(\mathbf{l})) \cap \mathcal{D}_n}$, where $C(\mathbf{l})$ denotes a cube of sidelength R centered at \mathbf{l} .

Condition (A1) implies that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k'}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})] = 0$ for any $k' < k$. Combined with condition (A2) it further holds for any $0 \leq k' < k < l$, and $\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\mathbb{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{k'}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}), E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k'}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{l-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{l,n}^\top(\mathbf{j})] \right] = 0.$$

Moreover, it holds that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[T_{K,n}] = 0$ and

$$\Sigma_{K,n} = \sum_{k=1}^K \text{Var}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) \right] = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [\mathbb{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}), E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})]].$$

Next, we introduce the following conditional α -mixing conditions for the filtration \mathcal{H} :

(A3) there exists a real number $p > 2$ such that one of the following holds almost surely (where r is defined in (A2)).

(A3-1) for a fixed $K \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a function $\bar{\alpha} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [\alpha_{K, 2R^2, \infty}(m)]^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \leq \bar{\alpha}(m)$$

and $\bar{\alpha}(m) = O(m^\eta)$, where $\eta + d < 0$.

(A3-2) for a fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a function $\tilde{\alpha} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [\alpha_{n,r}(m)]^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \leq \tilde{\alpha}(m)$$

and $\tilde{\alpha}(m) = O(m^\psi)$, where $\psi < -1$.

(A3-3) There exists a function $\tilde{\alpha} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\sup_{k,n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [\alpha_{r, \mathcal{D}_n; k, 2R^2, \infty}(m; m')]^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \leq \tilde{\alpha}(m; m')$$

and $\tilde{\alpha}(m; m') = O(m^\psi m'^\eta)$, where $\psi < -1$ and $\eta + d < 0$. In this case we write $\bar{\alpha}(m) = \tilde{\alpha}(0; m)$ in analogy to (A3-1).

Finally, to obtain a central limit theorem for $\Sigma_{K,n}^{-1/2} T_{K,n}$, we need the following sets of conditions:

(A4) there exist an $\epsilon \geq 3(p-2)$ and a constant $0 < M_\epsilon < \infty$ such that for

$$d_{K,n} = \sup_{1 \leq k \leq K} \sup_{l \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sup_{i=1, \dots, q} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\left| E_{k,n}^{(i)}(\mathbf{l}) \right|^{6+\epsilon} \right],$$

one of the following holds almost surely

(A4-1) $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} d_{K,n} \leq M_\epsilon^{6+\epsilon}.$

(A4-2) $\sup_{K \in \mathbb{N}} d_{K,n} \leq M_\epsilon^{6+\epsilon}.$

(A4-3) $\sup_{K \in \mathbb{N}} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} d_{K,n} \leq M_\epsilon^{6+\epsilon}.$

and, with $\lambda_{\min}(M)$ being the smallest eigen value of a symmetric matrix M ,

(A5) one of the following holds almost surely.

(A5-1) $0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{K,n}) / |\mathcal{D}_n|.$

(A5-2) $0 < \liminf_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{K,n}) / K.$

(A5-3) $0 < \liminf_{K,n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{K,n}) / (K|\mathcal{D}_n|).$

The conditional centering condition (A1) is trivially satisfied when the theorem is applied in the context of conditionally unbiased estimating functions for space-time processes. The localization condition (A2) in general holds trivially for the variables $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$ while the measurability condition for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[Y_n^{(\mathcal{T}, I)}]$ will typically follow from a space or time Markov property of the stochastic process considered. The possibly most controversial condition is conditional α -mixing (A3). This may be quite easy to verify when considering stochastic processes specified in terms of conditional distributions, see for example Section 2.1. We elaborate further in Section 3.2.1 below. The conditions of bounded moments (A4) and non-vanishing variance (A5) are typical for central limit theorems. The more difficult condition among these is (A5) which is often simply left as an assumption. However, we are able to give a practically verifiable sufficient condition for (A5) in our example in Section 2.2.

3.2.1. Criteria for α -mixing

The condition of α -mixing is translated into bounds for covariances using inequalities originally due to Davydov (1968) and later on Rio (1993) and Doukhan (1994) where we use the conditional version provided in Yuan and Lei (2013). While it is possible to impose decay conditions directly on covariances as in Doukhan and Lang (2016) we find that α -mixing is a well-established, concise and intuitively appealing measure of spatial dependence. Specific examples of α -mixing processes are m -dependent processes, Gaussian processes with sufficiently fast decay of the correlation function (Doukhan, 1994), Neyman-Scott processes with sufficiently fast decay of the cluster density (Waagepetersen and Guan, 2009) and Cox point processes with α -mixing random intensity function. Recently Poinas, Delyon and Lavancier (2019) established α -mixing for associated point processes which include the important class of determinantal point processes. In our setting, for example, for the iterated point process in Section 2.1, we may relax the assumption that the B_k are Poisson conditional on the past by the assumption that the B_k are conditionally α -mixing Neyman-Scott, Cox, or determinantal point processes.

3.3. Statement of theorem

Our central limit theorem is

Theorem 1. Let $(T_{K,n})_{K,n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of q -dimensional statistics of the form (2) and assume that condition (A1) holds. Assume further that either

- (i) conditions (A2-1), (A3-1), (A4-1), and (A5-1) hold, K is fixed, $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{D}_n| = \infty$, or
- (ii) conditions (A2-2), (A3-2), (A4-2), and (A5-2) hold, n is fixed, and $K \rightarrow \infty$.
- (iii) conditions (A2-3), (A3-3), (A4-3), and (A5-3) hold, $n, K \rightarrow \infty$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\mathcal{D}_n| = \infty$, and $K = O(|\mathcal{D}_n|^C)$ where $0 < C < \min\left(\tau, \frac{1}{d} - 2\tau\right)$ for a $0 < \tau < \min\{1/(4d), -1/(2\eta)\}$.

Then for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^q$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\exp(it^\top \Sigma_{K,n}^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_{K,n}) \right] \rightarrow \exp(\|t\|^2/2)$$

almost surely.

Examples of applications of Theorem 1 are provided in Section 2 while a proof of the theorem is given in Section 5. We conclude this section with a few remarks.

Remark 2. When K increases in case (iii), dependence may propagate over space which may dilute the effect of increasing spatial domain. This is particularly reflected by the localization condition (A2-3). Therefore, to exploit spatial mixing in case (iii) we need to temper increase of time K relative to increase of space $|\mathcal{D}_n|$.

Remark 3. The conclusion of Theorem 1 is the same for all cases (i)-(iii) and in practice we may not need the more complex setting of (iii) with n and K jointly tending to infinity. The case of K fixed, $n \rightarrow \infty$, is for example relevant in rain forest ecology where spatially large data sets are collected at a modest number of census times.

Remark 4. There exists some measurable function X_0 so that $\mathcal{H}_0 = \sigma(X_0)$. Write $\phi_{K,n}(x_0)$ for $\mathbb{E}[\exp(it^\top \Sigma_{K,n}^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_{K,n}) | X_0 = x_0]$ where expectation is with respect to a regular conditional distribution of the $E_{k,n}$, $1 \leq k \leq K$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, given $X_0 = x_0$. Then $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[\exp(it^\top \Sigma_{K,n}^{-\frac{1}{2}} T_{K,n})] = \phi_{K,n}(X_0)$ almost surely. In our proof we thus show that $\phi_{K,n}(x_0)$ converges to $\exp(\|t\|^2/2)$ for almost all values x_0 of X_0 .

Remark 5. The result in case (ii) ($K \rightarrow \infty$, n fixed) could alternatively under the same conditions be established using existing martingale central limit theorems (e.g. Brown, 1971, Hall et al., 2014). To apply these theorems it is required to control a sum of conditional variances. This, however, involves all the results from Sections 5.1-5.2, Section 3 in the supplementary material, and derivations similar to those used to handle the term A_1 in our proof. We therefore find it more natural to use our unified framework for all cases (i)-(iii).

Remark 6. In the proof of Theorem 1, we need to bound a large number, of the order $K^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4$, of certain covariances, see Section 5.3 and the supplementary material. The conditional centering property (A1) is crucial in this regard since it immediately reduces the number of the non-zero covariances

to be of the order $K^3|\mathcal{D}_n|^4$. However, it does not affect the order $|\mathcal{D}_n|^4$. This is why spatial mixing assumptions are required in case (i) and (iii).

4. Verification of conditions for application examples

In this section we discuss verification of central limit theorem conditions for the application examples of Section 2.

4.1. Discrete time spatial birth-death point process

Continuing from Section 2, for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $l \leq k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we define $\mathcal{H}_{l,k,A} = \sigma((X_{k'} \cap A), l \leq k' \leq k)$. We consider first case (i) of Theorem 1 and assume that the X_k are observed within an increasing sequence of observation windows W_n . Accordingly we introduce the subscript n for the index set \mathcal{D} , the variables $E_k(\mathbf{l})$, and the score function T_k^W .

By the first Bartlett identity (unbiasedness of score functions), $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$ is conditionally centered. Since $B_k \cup I_k = X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$ and $S_k = X_k \cap X_{k-1}$, $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$ is $\mathcal{H}_{0,k,c(\mathbf{l})}$ measurable. Defining $Y_n^{(\mathcal{T}, I)}$ as in (A2), $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[Y_n^{(\mathcal{T}, I)}]$ is a function only of X_{k-1} restricted to $(\cup_{\mathbf{i} \in I^c} c(\mathbf{i})) \oplus (K-k)\omega$ and is hence $\mathcal{H}_{0,k-1,(\cup_{\mathbf{i} \in I^c} c(\mathbf{i})) \oplus (K-k)\omega}$ measurable, which means that (A2-1) holds (here $A \oplus s = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d | d(\{x\}, A) \leq s\}$ for $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $s > 0$). Condition (A3-1) holds due to conditional independence of the Bernoulli variables R_u and since by independence properties of Poisson processes, $(B_k \cap I_k \cap A)$ and $(B_k \cap I_k \cap B)$ are independent given \mathcal{H}_{k-1} , $k = 1, \dots, K$, whenever $d(A, B) > 0$. It is easy to check that (A4-1) holds and assuming further that (A5-1) holds, case (i) of our Theorem 1 is applicable to

$$T_{K,n} = \sum_{k=1}^K T_k^{W_n} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}),$$

for any fixed K . The validity of (A5-1) depends on X_0 that e.g. must not be confined to a bounded region.

Imposing further conditions it is also possible to use the joint space-time asymptotic case (iii) of Theorem 1. Suppose that the immigrant intensity ρ is strictly positive, ensuring that the ‘forest’ never becomes extinct. Also for u in X_0 or $u \in \cup_{k \geq 1} I_k$ let C_u denote the cluster consisting of u and all its descendants, c.f. the birth-death dynamics for X_k , $k \geq 0$. If the probability of survival is small enough compared to the birth intensities, C_u will be finite almost surely and hence stochastically bounded in space and time. Thereby techniques similar to those in Cheysson and Lang (2021) can be used to establish the required α -mixing for case (iii) of Theorem 1.

4.2. Conditional autoregressive model

For this example we consider a fixed spatial domain \mathcal{D} and hence for notational simplicity skip the index n which is only pertinent for increasing spatial domain asymptotics.

We define

$$\mathcal{H}_{l,k,A} = \sigma(\{X_{k'}(\mathbf{l}) : \mathbf{l} \in A, l \leq k' \leq k\})$$

for $l, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $l \leq k$, and $A \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. The conditioning in (1) is then equivalent to conditioning on the history $\mathcal{H}_{k-1} = \mathcal{H}_{0,k-1,\mathcal{D}}$ and the neighborhood information $\mathcal{H}_{k,k,\mathcal{D} \setminus \{\mathbf{l}\}}$. Given \mathcal{H}_{k-1} , by Brook’s

factorization Lemma (Besag, 1974), X_k is a Gaussian Markov random field with mean vector $\mu_{k-1} = \beta \xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}}$ and precision matrix $Q = A(I_{|\mathcal{D}|} - \gamma B_0)$, where $I_{|\mathcal{D}|}$ is the $|\mathcal{D}| \times |\mathcal{D}|$ identity matrix. We assume Q is positive definite and symmetric.

Given \mathcal{H}_{k-1} ,

$$X_k \sim \beta \xi_{k-1}^{\text{temp}} + Q^{-1/2} Z_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (6)$$

where the Z_k , $k \geq 1$, are independent standard normal vectors.

Define for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \leq l$ the maximal conditional correlation coefficient

$$\rho_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}(\mathcal{H}_{0,k,\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{H}_{(l-r)^+,l,\mathcal{D}}) = \sup |\text{Corr}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[Z, Y]|,$$

where the supremum is over all random variables Z and Y that are respectively $\mathcal{H}_{0,k,\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{(l-r)^+,l,\mathcal{D}}$ measurable, and where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[Z^2] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[Y^2] < \infty$. It is shown in Section 5.1 in the supplementary material that for a $\psi < -1$ and any $\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}$, $\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[X_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}), X_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})] = O(m^\psi)$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ so that

$$\sup_{\substack{l,k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \\ l-k \geq m}} \rho_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}(\mathcal{H}_{0,k,\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{H}_{(l-r)^+,l,\mathcal{D}}) \leq \text{constant } m^\psi.$$

Since (see inequality (1.12) in Bradley, 2005)

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}(\mathcal{H}_{0,k,\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{H}_{(l-r)^+,l,\mathcal{D}}) \leq \frac{1}{4} \rho_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}(\mathcal{H}_{0,k,\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{H}_{(l-r)^+,l,\mathcal{D}}),$$

we have

$$\alpha_{n,r}(m) \leq \frac{1}{4} \sup_{\substack{l,k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \\ l-k \geq m}} \rho_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}(\mathcal{H}_{0,k,\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{H}_{(l-r)^+,l,\mathcal{D}}) \leq \text{constant } m^\psi,$$

which means that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[\alpha_{n,r}(m)]^{\frac{p-2}{p}}$ is $O(m^\psi)$ and hence condition (A3-2) holds.

By definition, $\xi_{k-1,n}^{\text{temp}}(\mathbf{l})$ and $\xi_{k,n}^{\text{spat}}(\mathbf{l})$ are respectively measurable with respect to $\mathcal{H}_{(k-r)^+,k-1,\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{k,k,\mathcal{D}_n \setminus \{\mathbf{l}\}}$. The conditional centering (A1) holds because

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\sigma(\mathcal{H}_{k-1} \cup \mathcal{H}_{k,k,\mathcal{D}_n \setminus \{\mathbf{l}\}})} [\epsilon_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})] \left(\xi_{k-1,n}^{\text{temp}}(\mathbf{l}), \xi_{k,n}^{\text{spat}}(\mathbf{l}) \right)^\top \right] = 0.$$

Hence, $T_{K,n}$ provides an unbiased estimating function. In addition, $E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})$ is $\mathcal{H}_{(k-r)^+,k,\mathcal{D}}$ measurable and for any $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \{k, k = 1, \dots, K\}$, $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{D}$, and measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^{2|\mathcal{T}||\mathcal{I}|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[f((E_{l,n}(\mathbf{l}))_{l \in \mathcal{T}, \mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{I}})]$ is $\mathcal{H}_{(k-r)^+,k-1,\mathcal{D}}$ measurable. This means that the localization condition (A2-2) holds.

It is shown in Section 5.3 of the supplementary material that

$$\Sigma_{K,n} = \text{Var}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[T_{K,n}] = \text{diag}(\lambda_{K,n}^{(1)}, \lambda_{K,n}^{(2)}),$$

where $\lambda_{K,n}^{(1)} \geq K \text{trace}(B_{1,n}^2)$ and $\lambda_{K,n}^{(2)} = 2K \text{trace}(B_{0,n}^2)$. We assume $\text{trace}(B_{0,n}^2) > 0$ and $\text{trace}(B_{1,n}^2) > 0$. Then, $\liminf_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{K,n}^{(1)}/K > 0$ and $\liminf_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{K,n}^{(2)}/K > 0$ and hence condition (A5-2) holds.

Following Section 5.4 in the supplementary material, condition (A4-2) holds for $\nu = 6 + \epsilon$ and $\epsilon \geq 3(p-2)$. Therefore, the case (ii) of Theorem 1 is applicable for the statistic $T_{K,n}$.

5. Proof of the central limit theorem

The following Sections 5.1-5.2 contain prerequisites needed for the proof in Section 5.3.

5.1. Mixing covariance inequalities

Let Y and Z be random variables with $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[|Y|^p] < \infty$ a.s. and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[|Z|^p] < \infty$ a.s. for some $p > 2$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then (Yuan and Lei, 2013, Theorem 3.4),

$$|\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[Y, Z]| \leq 8 (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[|Y|^p] \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[|Z|^p])^{\frac{1}{p}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_k}(\sigma(Y), \sigma(Z))^{\frac{p-2}{p}}, \quad (7)$$

where $\sigma(Y), \sigma(Z) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ denote the σ -algebras generated by Y and Z . By an application of Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[Y, Z]]| &\leq 8 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[|Y|^p] \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[|Z|^p])^{\frac{1}{p}} \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_k}(\sigma(Y), \sigma(Z))^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \right] \leq \\ &8 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[|Y|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[|Z|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} \right)^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\left(\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_k}(\sigma(Y), \sigma(Z))^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \right)^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \right]^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \\ &= 8 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|Y|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|Z|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_k}(\sigma(Y), \sigma(Z))]^{\frac{p-2}{p}}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

5.2. Bounds on covariances

In the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 5.3, we need to bound covariances of the form

$$\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I})E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}), E_{k',n}(\mathbf{I}')E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] \quad (9)$$

for $1 \leq k, k' \leq K$ and $k \leq l \leq K, k' \leq l' \leq K$ in the one-dimensional case $q = 1$.

The covariance (9) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{k^*-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I})E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}), E_{k',n}(\mathbf{I}')E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')]] \\ &+ \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k^*-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I})E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})], \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k^*-1}}[E_{k',n}(\mathbf{I}')E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')]], \end{aligned}$$

where $k^* = \max\{k, l, k', l'\}$. If precisely one index coincides with k^* , then by conditional centering, the covariance (9) is zero. Thus, the covariance (9) can only be non-zero in the cases a) $k^* = k = l > l' \geq k'$ or $k^* = k' = l' > l \geq k$, b) $k^* = l = l' > k, k'$, c) $k^* = k = l = l' > k'$ or $k^* = l' = k' = l > k$, and d) $k^* = k = l = k' = l'$. To derive bounds in the cases a)-d) we exploit recursively the space-time structure, conditional centering, and conditional α -mixing. We consider below a) for cases (i)-(iii). The remaining simpler b)-d) are covered in Section 3 in the supplementary material. The obtained bounds for (9) are summarized in Table 1.

5.2.1. Bounds in case (iii) a)

Consider the case $k^* = k = l > l' \geq k'$ ($k^* = k' = l' > l \geq k$ is handled the same way). Then $\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I})E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j}), E_{k',n}(\mathbf{I}')E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] = 0$ and hence the covariance (9) reduces to

$$\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I})E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})], E_{k',n}(\mathbf{I}')E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] . \quad (10)$$

Table 1. Bounds on the covariance (9) in different cases.

a)	case (i)	$8M_\epsilon^4 K \bar{\alpha}(d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2)$
	case (ii)	$8M_\epsilon^4 \left(\bar{\alpha}(k-1-l') + I[k'=l'] \sum_{i=1}^{l'-1} \bar{\alpha}(k-1-i) \right)$
	case (iii)	$8M_\epsilon^4 \left(\bar{\alpha}(k-1-l'; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - R) \right.$
		$\left. + I[k'=l'] \sum_{i=1}^{l'-1} \bar{\alpha}(k-1-i; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - (l'+1-i)R/2) \right)$
b)	case (i) + (iii)	$8M_\epsilon^4 \bar{\alpha}(d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - R)$
	case (ii)	$2M_\epsilon^4$
c)	case (i) + (iii)	$8M_\epsilon^4 \bar{\alpha}(d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - R)$
	case (ii)	$2M_\epsilon^4$
d)	case (i) + (iii)	$8M_\epsilon^4 K \bar{\alpha}(d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2)$
	case (ii)	$2M_\epsilon^4$

We rewrite (10) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})] (E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}') - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')]] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})] \sum_{i=1}^{l'} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_i} [E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{i-1}} [E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')]) \right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{l'} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{i-1}} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})], \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_i} [E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')])].
\end{aligned}$$

If $k' < l'$ then $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{l'-1}} [E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] = 0$ and therefore $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_i} [E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] = 0$ for all $i \leq l' - 1$ meaning that the only non-zero term in the previous expression is the one for $i = l'$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{l'-1}} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})], E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}'))]. \quad (11)$$

If condition (A2-3) holds, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})]$ and $E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')$ are measurable with respect to respectively $\mathcal{H}_{(k-r)^+, k-1, C(\mathbf{l}) \cup C(\mathbf{j}) \cap \mathcal{D}_n}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{0, l', C(\mathbf{l}') \cup C(\mathbf{j}') \cap \mathcal{D}_n}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_{l'-1}} (\mathcal{H}_{0, l', C(\mathbf{l}') \cup C(\mathbf{j}') \cap \mathcal{D}_n}, \mathcal{H}_{(k-r)^+, k-1, C(\mathbf{l}) \cup C(\mathbf{j}) \cap \mathcal{D}_n}) \\
& \leq \alpha_{r, \mathcal{D}_n; k, 2R^2, 2R^2} (k-1-l'; d(C(\mathbf{l}) \cup C(\mathbf{j}), C(\mathbf{l}') \cup C(\mathbf{j}'))) \\
& \leq \alpha_{r, \mathcal{D}_n; k, 2R^2, 2R^2} (k-1-l'; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - R),
\end{aligned}$$

we can use (8) to bound (11) and hence (10) by

$$\begin{aligned}
& 8 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})] \right]^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[|E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')|^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
& \quad \times \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\alpha_{r, \mathcal{D}_n; k, 2R^2, 2R^2} (k-1-l'; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - R) \right]^{\frac{p-2}{p}}
\end{aligned}$$

By Jensen's inequality, we can bound $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})] \right]^p \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}$ by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})]^p$ and then by M_ϵ^2 using equation (2) in the supplementary material. Using the same reasoning on the

second term in the previous expression and using condition [\(A3-3\)](#) on the third term yields the bound

$$8M_\epsilon^4 \tilde{\alpha}(k-1-l', d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - R). \quad (12)$$

for the covariance [\(10\)](#).

Consider next $l' = k'$. In this case we distinguish between $i = l'$ and $i < l'$. For the term with $i = l'$ we by similar arguments as above again obtain the bound [\(12\)](#). For $i < l'$, if condition [\(A2-3\)](#) holds, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_i} [E_{l',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')]]$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{H}_{(i+1-r)^+, i, ((l'-i)C(\mathbf{l}') \cup C(\mathbf{j}')) \cap \mathcal{D}_n}$. Thus, since

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_{\mathcal{H}_{i-1}} \left(\mathcal{H}_{(k-r)^+, k-1, C(\mathbf{l}) \cup C(\mathbf{j}) \cap \mathcal{D}_n}, \mathcal{H}_{(i+1-r)^+, i, ((l'-i)C(\mathbf{l}') \cup C(\mathbf{j}')) \cap \mathcal{D}_n} \right) \\ & \leq \alpha_{r, \mathcal{D}_n; k, 2R^2, 2((k-i)R)^2} (k-1-i; d(C(\mathbf{l}) \cup C(\mathbf{j}), (l'-i)(C(\mathbf{l}') \cup C(\mathbf{j}')))) \\ & \leq \alpha_{r, \mathcal{D}_n; k, 2R^2, 2((k-i)R)^2} (k-1-i; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - (l'-i+1)R/2) \end{aligned}$$

from [\(2\)](#) in the supplementary material, [\(8\)](#), and condition [\(A3-3\)](#) we obtain the bound $8M_\epsilon^4 \tilde{\alpha}(k-1-i), d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - (l'+1-i)R/2)$.

Collecting everything, [\(10\)](#) is bounded in case (iii) by

$$8M_\epsilon^4 \left(\tilde{\alpha}(k-1-l'; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - R) + I[k' = l'] \sum_{i=1}^{l'-1} \tilde{\alpha}(k-1-i; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - (l'+1-i)R/2) \right).$$

In case (i) with K fixed we can use $l' \leq K$ and simplify the bound to $8M_\epsilon^4 \tilde{\alpha}(d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR)$ and in case (ii) with n fixed we can simplify to $8M_\epsilon^4 \left(\tilde{\alpha}(k-1-l') + I[k' = l'] \sum_{i=1}^{l'-1} \tilde{\alpha}(k-1-i) \right)$.

5.3. Proof of [Theorem 1](#)

Proof. By an extension of the Cramér-Wold device (Lemma 2.1 in [Biscio, Poinas and Waagepetersen, 2018](#)), it suffices to verify [Theorem 1](#) in the univariate case $q = 1$. Then $\Sigma_{K,n} = \sigma_{K,n}^2 = \text{Var}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [T_{K,n}]$ is scalar and by conditional centering [\(A1\)](#),

$$\sigma_{K,n}^2 = \sum_{k,k'=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}' \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}')] = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}' \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}')].$$

We introduce spatial and temporal truncation distances m_n and l_K as follows. In case [\(i\)](#), $l_K = \infty$ and $m_n = |D_n|^\tau$ with $0 < \tau < \min\{1/(4d), -1/(2\eta)\}$ so that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$m_n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \frac{m_n^{2d}}{|D_n|^{1/2}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad m_n^\eta |D_n|^{1/2} \rightarrow 0. \quad (13)$$

In case [\(ii\)](#), $m_n = \infty$ and $l_K = K^{\tilde{\tau}}$ with $0 < \tilde{\tau} < -1/(2\psi)$ so that as $K \rightarrow \infty$,

$$l_K \rightarrow \infty, \quad \frac{l_K}{|K|^{1/2}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad l_K^\psi |K|^{1/2} \rightarrow 0. \quad (14)$$

In case [\(iii\)](#), we choose $m_n = |D_n|^\tau$ and $l_K = K^{\tilde{\tau}}$ with τ and $\tilde{\tau}$ as above, so that as $n, K \rightarrow \infty$, both [\(13\)](#) and [\(14\)](#) are satisfied.

We further define $\bar{S}_{K,n} = T_{K,n}/V_{K,n}$ where

$$V_{K,n}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})],$$

and $\mathcal{J}_{K,n} = \{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) : \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n, d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \leq m_n\}$. Then $V_{K,n}^2$ coincides with $\sigma_{K,n}^2$ in case (ii) and $V_{K,n}^2$ is a spatially truncated version of $\sigma_{K,n}^2$ in cases (i) and (iii). In Section 4 of the supplementary material it is shown that, uniformly in K ,

$$\left| 1 - V_{K,n}^2 / \sigma_{K,n}^2 \right| \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{a.s.} 0. \quad (15)$$

We next need to define a quantity $\bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})$ (see paragraph below) as a sum over variables $E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})$ so that we can show convergence to zero of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_1]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_2]$, and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_3]$ where

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= it e^{it \bar{S}_{K,n}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) \bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}) \right), \\ A_2 &= \frac{e^{it \bar{S}_{K,n}}}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) (1 - it \bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}) - \exp\{-it \bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})\}), \\ A_3 &= \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) \exp\{it (\bar{S}_{K,n} - \bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}))\}, \end{aligned}$$

and, following [Bolthausen \(1982\)](#), $(it - \bar{S}_{K,n}) e^{it \bar{S}_{K,n}} = A_1 - A_2 - A_3$.

If the above mentioned convergences hold then for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[(it - \bar{S}_{K,n}) e^{it \bar{S}_{K,n}} \right] \rightarrow 0$, which by Lemma 2 in [Bolthausen \(1982\)](#) (see also the discussion in [Biscio, Poinas and Waagepetersen, 2018](#)) implies $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [\exp(it \bar{S}_{K,n})] \rightarrow \exp(t^2/2)$ which again implies the desired result $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\exp\left(it \frac{T_{K,n}}{\sigma_{K,n}}\right) \right] \rightarrow \exp(t^2/2)$.

To handle A_1 we want $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) \bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}) \right] / V_{K,n}^2 = 1$ and we want a small number of terms in $\bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})$. However, we also prefer that $S_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})$ is close to $\bar{S}_{K,n}$ in order to deal with A_3 . A suitable compromise is given by

$$\bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}) = \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{(l, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})} E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}),$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}) = \{(l, \mathbf{j}) : k \leq l \leq K, l - k \leq l_K, (\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}\}.$$

Compared to $\bar{S}_{K,n}$ we avoid all $E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})$ for l prior to k . Combined with the truncation by m_n or l_K in space or ahead in time (or both) this makes the number of terms in $\bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})$ small. Also, omitting $E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})$ terms for $l < k$ turns out not to be a problem for handling A_3 .

In the remainder we consider the convergences of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_1]$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_2]$, and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_3]$.

5.3.1. Convergence of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_1]$

First note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) \bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}) \right] &= \frac{1}{V_{K,n}^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})] \\ &= \frac{1}{V_{K,n}^2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j})] = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is due to conditional centering. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [A_1^2] &\leq \frac{t^2}{V_{K,n}^4} \text{Var}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})} E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) \right] \\ &= \frac{t^2}{V_{K,n}^4} \sum_{k, k'=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}' \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}) \\ (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}(k', \mathbf{l}')}} \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}), E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] = \frac{t^2}{V_{K,n}^4} (2a + b + 2c + d), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{l'=1}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ l'-k' \leq l_K}}^{l'} \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}} \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j}), E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] \\ b &= \sum_{l=2}^K \sum_{\substack{k, k'=1 \\ l-k, l-k' \leq l_K}}^{l-1} \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}} \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}), E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] \\ c &= \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ k-k' \leq l_K}}^{k-1} \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}} \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j}), E_{k',n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j}')] \\ d &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}} \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j}), E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}') E_{k,n}(\mathbf{j}')] \end{aligned}$$

are corresponding to cases a)-d) in Section 5.2. We control a-d in each of the cases (i) and (ii) using the bounds in Table 1.

Case (i): In case (i),

$$\begin{aligned} |a| &\leq 8K^4 M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha} (d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \\ |b| &\leq 8K^3 M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha} (d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - R) \\ |c| &\leq 8K^2 M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{I}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha} (d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - R) \end{aligned}$$

$$|d| \leq 8K^2 M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha}(\mathbf{d}(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2).$$

The proof now proceeds by splitting the above sums according to whether $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}') < 3m_n$ or not. We omit the details which follow quite closely the proof of the spatial case (see e.g. [Biscio and Waagepetersen, 2019](#)) and obtain that $a = O(K^4 |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d})$, $b = O(K^3 |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d})$, $c = O(K^2 |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d})$ and $d = O(K^2 |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d})$. Hence, a, b, c, d are all $O(|\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d})$ for K fixed.

Case (ii): In case (ii),

$$\begin{aligned} |a| &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{l'=1}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{l'=1 \\ l'-k' \leq l_K}}^{l'} \left(\tilde{\alpha}(k-1-l') + I[k'=l'] \sum_{i=1}^{l'-1} \tilde{\alpha}(k-1-i) \right) \\ &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 \left(l_K \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{l'=1}^{k-1} \tilde{\alpha}(k-1-l') + \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{l'=1}^{k-1} \sum_{z=k-1-l'}^{k-2} \tilde{\alpha}(z) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first term can be directly bounded by $8M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 l_K K \sum_{z=0}^\infty \tilde{\alpha}(z)$. By condition [\(A3-2\)](#), $\tilde{\alpha}_n(z) = O(z^\psi)$, $\psi < -1$, and $\sum_{z=0}^\infty \tilde{\alpha}_n(z) \leq \text{constant} \sum_{z=0}^\infty z^\psi < \infty$. Hence this expression is $O(K l_K |\mathcal{D}_n|^4)$. The second term can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &8M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 \sum_{z=0}^{K-2} \tilde{\alpha}(z) \#\{(k, l') : 1 \leq l' < k \leq K, k-1-l' \leq z \leq k-2\} \\ &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 \sum_{z=0}^{K-2} \tilde{\alpha}(z) \#\{(k, t) : 2 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq t \leq K, t-1 \leq z \leq k-2\} \\ &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 \sum_{z=0}^{K-2} \tilde{\alpha}(z) \#\{(k, t) : 2+z \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq t \leq z+1\} \\ &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 K^2 \left(\frac{1}{K} \sum_{z=0}^{K-2} (z+1) \tilde{\alpha}(z) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By condition [\(A3-2\)](#), $(z+1)\tilde{\alpha}_n(z) \xrightarrow{z \rightarrow \infty} 0$. Hence, by Cesàro summation, $\frac{1}{K} \sum_{z=0}^{K-2} (z+1)\tilde{\alpha}_n(z) \xrightarrow{K \rightarrow \infty} 0$ and this expression is $o(|\mathcal{D}_n|^4 K^2)$. We further have $|b| \leq 2M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 l_K^2$, $|c| \leq 2M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 l_K$ and $|d| \leq 2M_\epsilon^4 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4 K$. Then a, b, c, d are all $O(K l_K^2 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4) + o(K^2 |\mathcal{D}_n|^4)$ which is $o(K^2)$ for n fixed as a consequence of [\(14\)](#).

Case (iii): In case (iii),

$$\begin{aligned} |b| &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{l=2}^K \sum_{\substack{k, k'=1 \\ l-k, l-k' \leq l_K}}^{l-1} \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha}(\mathbf{d}(\{\mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{j}'\}) - R) \\ &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 K l_K^2 \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha}(\mathbf{d}(\{\mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{j}'\}) - R) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |c| &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ k-k' \leq l_K}}^{k-1} \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha}(d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{j}'\}) - R) \\ &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 K l_K \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha}(d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{j}'\}) - R) \end{aligned}$$

Similarl to case (i), by splitting the sum according to whether $d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}') < 3m_n$ or not (see Biscio and Waagepetersen, 2019) we get that $|b| = O(Kl_K^2 |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d})$ and $|c| = O(Kl_K |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d})$.

For $|d|$ we get

$$|d| = 8M_\epsilon^4 K^2 \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha}(d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2).$$

We follow Biscio and Waagepetersen (2019) by splitting the above sum according to whether $d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{l}') < 3m_n$ or not and conclude that there exists a constant $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \bar{\alpha}(d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \\ &\leq \tilde{C} |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d} \left(\sum_{z \geq 3m_n} z^{d-1} \bar{\alpha}(z - 2m_n - KR/2) + \sum_{z \leq 4m_n} z^{d-1} \bar{\alpha}(z - KR/2) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the first sum, since $C < \tau$ then $K = o(|D_n|^\tau) = o(m_n)$ and we get for sufficiently large n ,

$$\sum_{z \geq 3m_n} z^{d-1} \bar{\alpha}(z - 2m_n - KR/2) = O\left(\sum_{z \geq 3m_n} z^{\eta+d-1}\right) = o(1).$$

By splitting the second sum according to whether $z - KR/2 < 0$ or not we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z \leq 4m_n} z^{d-1} \bar{\alpha}(z - KR/2) &\leq \sum_{z \leq \lfloor KR/2 \rfloor} z^{d-1} + \sum_{z \leq \lfloor 4m_n - KR/2 \rfloor} (z + KR)^{d-1} \bar{\alpha}(z) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{KR}{2}\right)^2 + \sum_{z=0}^{\infty} (z + KR/2)^{d-1} \bar{\alpha}(z). \end{aligned}$$

The term $(z + KR/2)^{d-1}$ consists of monomials of the form $z^i K^{d-1-i}$ for all $i \leq d-1$ and $\sum_{z=0}^{\infty} z^i \bar{\alpha}(z)$ is finite by assumption (A3-3). Thus

$$\left(\frac{KR}{2}\right)^2 + \sum_{z=0}^{\infty} (z + KR/2)^{d-1} \bar{\alpha}(z) = O(K^d),$$

and $|d| = O(K^{2+d} |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d})$.

To bound $|a|$ we can combine the previous reasoning used to deal with $|d|$ and the method used to bound $|a|$ in case (ii).

$$\begin{aligned}
|a| &\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{l'=1}^{k-1} \sum_{\substack{k'=1 \\ l'-k' \leq l_K}}^{l'} \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \left(\tilde{\alpha}(k-1-l'; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - (k'+1-l')R/2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + I[k'=l'] \sum_{i=1}^{k'-1} \tilde{\alpha}(k-1-i; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - (k'+1-i)R/2) \right) \\
&\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \left(l_K \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{t=0}^{k-2} \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{l'=1}^{k-1} \sum_{t=k-l'}^{k-2} \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \right) \\
&\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \left(l_K K \sum_{t=0}^K \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{t=0}^{K-2} \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \# \{(k, l') : 1 \leq l' < k \leq K, k-l' \leq t \leq k-2\} \right) \\
&\leq 8M_\epsilon^4 \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \left(l_K K \sum_{t=0}^K \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + K \sum_{t=0}^{K-2} t \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the same reasoning as in the bound of $|d|$ and condition (A3-3) we get

$$\sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) = O(|\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d} t^\psi K^d).$$

Hence

$$l_K K \sum_{t=0}^K \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) = O(l_K |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d} K^{d+1})$$

and

$$\sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Hence, by Cesàro summation,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{t=0}^{K-2} \sum_{(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}), (\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}') \in \mathcal{J}_{K,n}} t \tilde{\alpha}(t; d(\{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}\}, \{\mathbf{l}', \mathbf{j}'\}) - KR/2) \xrightarrow[K \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Thus $|a| = O(l_K |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d} K^{d+1}) + o(K^2)$. In conclusion, a, b, c, d are all $O(K^{2+d} |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d}) + o(K^2)$.

In summary, $V_{K,n}^4 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|A_1|^2]$ is $O(m_n^{2d} |\mathcal{D}_n|)$ in case (i), $o(K^2)$ in case (ii), and $O(K^{2+d} |\mathcal{D}_n| m_n^{2d}) + o(K^2)$ in case (iii). By (15), assumption (A5-1), (A5-2), or (A5-3), $|\mathcal{D}_n|/V_{K,n}^2$, $K/V_{K,n}^2$ or $|\mathcal{D}_n|K/\sigma_{K,n}^2$ are $O(1)$ as n, K , or both n and K tends to infinity. Hence $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|A_1|^2]$ is $O(m_n^{2d} |\mathcal{D}_n|^{-1})$ in case (i) and $o(1)$ in case (ii), and $O(K^d m_n^{2d} |\mathcal{D}_n|^{-1}) + o(1) = O(|\mathcal{D}_n|^{d(C+2\tau)-1}) + o(1)$ (since $K = O(|\mathcal{D}_n|^C)$) in case (iii). Thus $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_1]$ converges to zero in all cases (i)-(iii).

5.3.2. Convergence of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_2]$

According to Taylor's formula, there exists a constant c so that

$$|1 - it\bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}) - \exp\{-it\bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})\}| \leq ct^2 \bar{S}_{K,n}^2(k, \mathbf{l}).$$

We thus get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|A_2|] &\leq \frac{ct^2}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})| \bar{S}_{K,n}^2(k, \mathbf{l})] \\ &= \frac{ct^2}{V_{K,n}^3} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{(l, \mathbf{j}), (l', \mathbf{j}') \in I_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})| E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')]. \end{aligned}$$

By conditional centering and since $l, l' \geq k$, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})| E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) E_{l',n}(\mathbf{j}')] = 0$ unless $l = l'$. By Hölder's inequality

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})| E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}')]| \leq \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})|^3] \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})|^3] \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}')|^3] \right)^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

and hence in case (i) from (A4-1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|A_2|] &\leq \frac{ct^2}{V_{K,n}^3} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{l=k}^K \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}' \in \mathcal{D}_n \\ d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \leq m_n, d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}') \leq m_n}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l})| E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}')] \\ &\leq \frac{ct^2}{V_{K,n}^3} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{l=k}^K \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}' \in \mathcal{D}_n \\ d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \leq m_n, d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}') \leq m_n}} M_{\epsilon}^3 \leq \frac{ct^2}{V_{K,n}^3} K^2 |\mathcal{D}_n| (2\lceil m_n \rceil + 1)^{2d} M_{\epsilon}^3, \end{aligned}$$

since the cardinality of $\{\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \leq m_n\}$ is at most $(2\lceil m_n \rceil + 1)^d$.

In the case (ii), (A4-2) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|A_2|] \leq \frac{ct^2}{V_{K,n}^3} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}' \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{\substack{k \leq l \leq K \\ l-k \leq l_K}} M_{\epsilon}^3 \leq \frac{ct^2}{V_{K,n}^3} K |\mathcal{D}_n|^3 l_K M_{\epsilon}^3.$$

For case (iii) we obtain from (A4-3) that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|A_2|] \leq \frac{ct^2}{V_{K,n}^3} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{\substack{k \leq l \leq K \\ l-k \leq l_K}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{j}' \in \mathcal{D}_n \\ d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) \leq m_n, d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}') \leq m_n}} M_\epsilon^3 \leq \frac{ct^2}{V_{K,n}^3} K |\mathcal{D}_n| (2\lceil m_n \rceil + 1)^{2d} l_K M_\epsilon^3.$$

Since $|\mathcal{D}_n|^{3/2}/V_{K,n}^3$, $K^{3/2}/V_{K,n}^3$, and $|\mathcal{D}_n|^{3/2}K^{3/2}/V_{K,n}^3$ are $O(1)$ in respectively cases (i), (ii), and (iii) and using (13) and (14), $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|A_2|]$ converges to zero in each of the cases (i)-(iii).

5.3.3. Convergence of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_3]$

Note that

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[A_3]| \leq \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{\mathbf{l} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \sum_{k=1}^K |\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}), \exp\{it(\bar{S}_{K,n} - \bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}))\}]|.$$

We can partition the difference $\bar{S}_{K,n} - \bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l})$ as $B_1 + B_2$, where

$$B_1 = \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})$$

and

$$B_2 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{l=k}^K \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n: d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) > m_n} E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}), & \text{in case (i)} \\ \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{l=k: l-k > l_K}^K \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}), & \text{in case (ii)} \\ \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \left[\sum_{l=k: l-k \leq l_K}^K \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n: d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) > m_n} E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) + \sum_{l=k: l-k > l_K}^K \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) \right], & \text{in case (iii).} \end{cases}$$

Since B_1 is \mathcal{H}_{k-1} measurable and using conditional centering,

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}), \exp\{it(\bar{S}_{K,n} - \bar{S}_{K,n}(k, \mathbf{l}))\}]| &= |\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}), e^{it(B_1+B_2)}]| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[e^{itB_1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) e^{itB_2}]]| \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) e^{itB_2}]]. \end{aligned}$$

In case (i), B_2 is a function of $\{E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) : l = k, \dots, K, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n, d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) > m_n\}$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) e^{itB_2}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[e^{itB_2}]] = \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}), \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[e^{itB_2}]].$$

The localization assumption (A2-1) implies that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[e^{itB_2}]$ is $\mathcal{H}_{0,k, \cup_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n: d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) > m_n} C(\mathbf{j})}$ measurable and hence by (8) and (A3-1),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}[|\text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}[E_{k,n}(\mathbf{l}), \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_k}[e^{itB_2}]]|] &\leq 8M_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}\left[\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}\left(\mathcal{H}_{0,k,C(\mathbf{l})}, \mathcal{H}_{0,k, \cup_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n: d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) > m_n} C(\mathbf{j})}\right)\right]^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \\ &\leq 8M_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0}\left[\alpha_{K,R^2,\infty}(d(C(\mathbf{l}), \cup_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n: d(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{j}) > m_n} C(\mathbf{j})))\right]^{\frac{p-2}{p}} \leq 8M_\epsilon \bar{\alpha}(m_n - 2R) \leq \text{constant } m_n^\eta. \end{aligned}$$

In case (ii), B_2 is a function of $\{E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) : l = k + \lfloor l_K \rfloor + 1, \dots, K, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n\}$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n} e^{itB_2}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k+\lfloor l_K \rfloor}} [e^{itB_2}]] = \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}), \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k+\lfloor l_K \rfloor}} [e^{itB_2}]].$$

By the localization assumption (A2-2), $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k+\lfloor l_K \rfloor}} [e^{itB_2}]$ is $\mathcal{H}_{(k+l_K-r)^+, k+\lfloor l_K \rfloor, \mathcal{D}_n}$ measurable and using same type of arguments as for (i),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) e^{itB_2}]|] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} \left[\left| \text{Cov}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}), \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k+\lfloor l_K \rfloor}} [e^{itB_2}]] \right| \right] \\ &\leq 8M_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [\alpha_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}}(\mathcal{H}_{0,k}, \mathcal{D}_n, \mathcal{H}_{(k+l_K-r)^+, k+\lfloor l_K \rfloor, \mathcal{D}_n})] \frac{p-2}{p} \leq 8M_\epsilon \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [\alpha_{n,r}(l_K)] \frac{p-2}{p} \\ &\leq 8M_\epsilon \tilde{\alpha}(l_K) \leq \text{constant } l_K^\psi. \end{aligned}$$

Considering case (iii), $B_2 = B_{21} + B_{22}$ with

$$B_{21} = \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{l=k:l-k \leq l_K} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n: d(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{j}) > m_n} E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{22} = \frac{1}{V_{K,n}} \sum_{l=k:l-k > l_K} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n} E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j}).$$

Thus

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) e^{itB_2}]| \leq |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) e^{itB_{22}}]| + |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) (e^{itB_{21}} - 1) e^{itB_{22}}]|.$$

Since B_{22} coincides with B_2 in case (ii) we can proceed as in case (ii) for the term $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) e^{itB_{22}}]$ in the above inequality and conclude $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [|\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) e^{itB_{22}}]|]$ is $O(l_K^\psi)$. For the second term, by a first order Taylor expansion and (2) in the supplementary material,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) (e^{itB_{21}} - 1) e^{itB_{22}}]| &\leq \sqrt{2}|t| \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [|E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) B_{21}|] \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}|t|}{V_{k,n}} \sum_{l=k:l-k \leq l_K} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_{k-1}} [|E_{k,n}(\mathbf{I}) E_{l,n}(\mathbf{j})|] = O(l_K |D_n| M_\epsilon^2 / V_{k,n}). \end{aligned}$$

We have $|D_n|/V_{K,n}^2$, $K/V_{K,n}^2$ or $|D_n|K/\sigma_{K,n}^2$ are $O(1)$ as n , K , or both n and K tends to infinity. Using (13) or (14), $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}_0} [A_3] \rightarrow 0$ in cases (i)-(iii). \square

Supplementary Material

The supplementary material for this article provides supporting results and computations for the proof of Theorem 1 and for Section 2.2. It can be found at [http://doi.org/10.1017/\[TO BE SET\]](http://doi.org/10.1017/[TO BE SET]).

References

- BESAG, J. (1974). Spatial interaction and the statistical analysis of lattice systems. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* **36** 192–225.
- BISCIO, C. A. N., POINAS, A. and WAAGEPETERSEN, R. (2018). A note on gaps in proofs of central limit theorems. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* 7–10.

- BISCIO, C. A. N. and SVANE, A. M. (2022). A functional central limit theorem for the empirical Ripley's K-function. *Electron. J. Stat.* **16** 3060–3098. <https://doi.org/10.1214/22-EJS2017>
- BISCIO, C. A. N. and WAAGEPETERSEN, R. (2019). A general central limit theorem and a subsampling variance estimator for α -mixing point processes. *Scand. J. Stat.* **46** 1168–1190.
- BOLTHAUSEN, E. (1982). On the Central Limit Theorem for Stationary Mixing Random Fields. *Ann. Probab.* **10** 1047–1050.
- BRADLEY, R. C. (2005). Basic properties of strong mixing conditions. A survey and some open questions. *Probab. Surv.* **2** 107–144.
- BROWN, B. M. (1971). Martingale central limit theorems. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **42** 59–66.
- CHEYSSON, F. and LANG, G. (2021). Strong-mixing rates for Hawkes processes and application to Whittle estimation from count data. 29 pages, 10 figures.
- COMETS, F. and JANŽURA, M. (1998). A Central Limit Theorem for Conditionally Centred Random Fields with an Application to Markov Fields. *J. Appl. Probab.* **35** 608–621.
- CONDIT, R., PEREZ, R., AGUILAR, S., LAO, S., FOSTER, R. and HUBBELL, S. P. (2019). Complete data from the Barro Colorado 50-ha plot: 423617 trees, 35 years [Dataset]., 2019 version. Dryad, <https://doi.org/10.15146/5xcp-0d46>.
- DAHLHAUS, R. (2000). Graphical interaction models for multivariate time series. *Metrika* **51** 157–172.
- DAVYDOV, Y. A. (1968). Convergence of Distributions Generated by Stationary Stochastic Processes. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **13** 691–696.
- DOUKHAN, P. (1994). *Mixing, Properties and Examples. Lecture Notes in Statistics* **85**. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- DOUKHAN, P. and LANG, G. (2016). Weak dependence of point processes and application to second-order statistics†. *Statistics* **50** 1221–1235.
- GUYON, X. (1995). *Random Fields on a Network. Probability and its Applications*. Springer, New York.
- HALL, P., HEYDE, C. C., BIRNBAUM, Z. W. and LUKACS, E. (2014). *Martingale Limit Theory and Its Application. Communication and Behavior*. Elsevier Science.
- HEINRICH, L. (2013). Asymptotic Methods in Statistics of Random Point Processes. In *Stochastic Geometry, Spatial Statistics and Random Fields: Asymptotic Methods* (E. Spodarev, ed.) 115–150. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- JENSEN, J. L. and KÜNSCH, H. R. (1994). On asymptotic normality of pseudo likelihood estimates for pairwise interaction processes. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **46** 475–486. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00773511>
- KARÁCSONY, Z. (2006). A central limit theorem for mixing random fields. *Miskolc Math. Notes* **7** 147–160.
- LEONENKO, N. N. (1975). Central limit theorem for m -dependent random fields in schemes related to series schemes. *Ukrainian Math. J.* **27** 556–559.
- POINAS, A., DELYON, B. and LAVANCIER, F. (2019). Mixing properties and central limit theorem for associated point processes. *Bernoulli* **25** 1724 – 1754.
- PRAKASA RAO, B. L. S. (2009). Conditional independence, conditional mixing and conditional association. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **61** 441–460.
- RIO, E. (1993). Covariance inequalities for strongly mixing processes. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **29** 587–597.
- WAAGEPETERSEN, R. and GUAN, Y. (2009). Two-step estimation for inhomogeneous spatial point processes. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.* **71** 685–702.
- YUAN, D. and LEI, L. (2013). Some conditional results for conditionally strong mixing sequences of random variables. *Sci. China Math.* **56** 845–859.