

# On stable central limit theorems for multivariate discrete-time martingales

Erich Häusler<sup>1</sup> and Harald Luschgy<sup>2</sup>

*Abstract*

We provide a systematic approach to stable central limit theorems for  $d$ -dimensional martingale difference arrays and martingale difference sequences. The conditions imposed are straightforward extensions of the univariate case.

## 1 Introduction

It is well-known that the convergence in distribution in many classical limit theorems in probability theory and mathematical statistics is in fact stable in the sense of Renyi, which broadens the possible range of applications of these limit theorems. A comprehensive account of the theory of stable convergence together with illustrative applications has been given in [5]. Chapter 6 of that book is devoted to stable convergence in central limit theorems for martingale difference arrays and martingale difference sequences of real-valued random variables. It is the aim of the present paper to show that the basic results presented there also hold true for arrays and sequences of  $d$ -dimensional random vectors for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  if the sufficient conditions are generalized to the  $d$ -dimensional case in a straightforward way. This provides a systematic approach to stable central limit theorems for  $d$ -dimensional martingale difference arrays and  $d$ -dimensional martingale difference sequences. For a specific example of such a result, see [4], Proposition 3.1.

The basic notations and definitions are as follows. Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , and for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n}$  be a sequence of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random vectors defined on a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ , where  $X_{nk} = (X_{nk,j})_{1 \leq j \leq d}^T$  is always read as a column vector. Moreover, let  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n}$  be a filtration in  $\mathcal{F}$ , i.e. the  $\mathcal{F}_{nk}$  are sub- $\sigma$ -fields of  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathcal{F}_{n0} \subset \mathcal{F}_{n1} \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{F}_{nk_n} \subset \mathcal{F}$ . The sequence  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n}$  is called *adapted to the filtration*  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n}$  if  $X_{nk}$  is measurable w.r.t.  $\mathcal{F}_{nk}$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$ . The triangular array  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $d$ -dimensional random vectors is called *adapted to the triangular array*  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\sigma$ -fields if the

---

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification:* 60F05, 60G42, 62F12, 62H12, 62M10

*Keywords and phrases:* Stable convergence, mixing convergence, multivariate discrete-time martingales, autoregressive processes, least squares estimate

<sup>1</sup>Mathematical Institute, University of Giessen, Giessen, Germany, erich.haesler@t-online.de

<sup>2</sup>FB IV, Mathematics, University of Trier, Trier, Germany, luschgy@uni-trier.de

row  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n}$  is adapted to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In this paper, all arrays  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are assumed to be adapted to the given array  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\sigma$ -fields.

An array  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  adapted to  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is called a *martingale difference array* if  $X_{nk,j} \in \mathcal{L}^1(P)$  with  $E(X_{nk,j} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) = 0$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq j \leq d$ . This means that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq j \leq d$  the sequence  $(X_{nk,j})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n}$  of real-valued random variables is a martingale difference sequence w.r.t. the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n}$ . The conditional expectation of a  $d$ -dimensional random vector  $Y = (Y_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d}^T$  with  $Y_j \in \mathcal{L}^1(P)$  for  $1 \leq j \leq d$  w.r.t a sub- $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined by  $E(Y | \mathcal{H}) = (E(Y_j | \mathcal{H}))_{1 \leq j \leq d}^T$  so that for a martingale difference array  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  w.r.t. the array  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  we have  $E(X_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) = 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$  where  $0$  is the null vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Expectations and conditional expectations for random matrices are defined analogously. A martingale difference array is called *square integrable* if all random vectors have components in  $\mathcal{L}^2(P)$ .

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we will present the main results about  $d$ -dimensional martingale difference arrays. Section 3 contains important consequences for  $d$ -dimensional martingale difference sequences. In Section 4 we will formulate several propositions concerning the relationship between different sets of conditions before giving their proofs in Section 5. In Section 6 we will investigate an application to autoregressions of order  $d$ . For the readers convenience and to make this work self-contained some basic facts on stationary and ergodic random processes are provided in the appendix.

## 2 Main results

From now on, we assume that the sequence  $(k_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is nondecreasing with  $k_n \geq n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}_{nk} = \bigcap_{m \geq n} \mathcal{F}_{mk}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \leq k \leq k_n$ , and  $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_{nk_n})$ . We always set  $\mathcal{F}_{\infty} = \sigma(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_{nk_n})$ . Let  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denote the standard Euclidean scalar product in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\|\cdot\|$  denote the associated Euclidean  $\ell^2$ -norm in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The multivariate centered normal distribution with covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  is denoted by  $N(0, \Sigma)$  and  $N(0, I_d)$  denotes the  $d$ -dimensional standard normal distribution. The distribution of an arbitrary random vector  $X$  is denoted by  $P^X$ , and equality in distribution of random vectors  $X$  and  $Y$  is denoted by  $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$ .

In our first theorem we consider martingale difference arrays under a conditional  $L_1$ -version of Lindeberg's classical condition.

**Theorem 2.1** *Let  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a martingale difference array of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random vectors adapted to the array  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Assume the conditional*

$L_1$ -version of Lindeberg's condition

$$(CLB_1^d) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for every  $\varepsilon > 0$

and Raikov's condition

$$(R^d) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} X_{nk}^T \rightarrow A \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for some random}$$

$\mathcal{G}$ -measurable symmetric and positive semi-definite  $d \times d$ -matrix  $A$ .

Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} \rightarrow A^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{G}\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $P^{N_d} = N(0, I_d)$  and  $N_d$  is independent of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

*Remark 2.2.* Since the map  $B \rightarrow B^{1/2}$  is continuous on the set of symmetric, positive semi-definite  $d \times d$ -matrices, the (uniquely determined and positive semi-definite) square root  $A^{1/2}$  of  $A$  is also  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable in the above setting. Under the *nesting condition*, namely,  $\mathcal{F}_{nk} \subset \mathcal{F}_{n+1,k}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \leq k \leq k_n$ , we obtain  $\mathcal{G}_{nk} = \bigcap_{m \geq n} \mathcal{F}_{mk} = \mathcal{F}_{nk}$  and thus  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_\infty$ . In this case,  $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ -measurability, symmetry and positive semi-definiteness of  $A$  (everywhere) can be assumed w.l.o.g.

*Proof of Theorem 2.1.* For  $d = 1$  Theorem 2.1 follows from Corollary 6.19 and Corollary 6.22 in [5]. To obtain Theorem 2.1 for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ , we will apply the Cramér-Wold device for stable convergence; see [5], Corollary 3.19, (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii). According to this tool for deriving the  $d$ -dimensional case from the one-dimensional case, we have to show that for any  $d \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$

$$(2.1) \quad \left\langle u, \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} \right\rangle \rightarrow \langle u, A^{1/2} N_d \rangle \quad \mathcal{G}\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$  is an arbitrary non-random vector. For this, let  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$  be fixed. For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\left\langle u, \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} \right\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \langle u, X_{nk} \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} Y_{nk}$$

with  $Y_{nk} := \langle u, X_{nk} \rangle$ . Then  $(Y_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a martingale difference array of real-valued random variables adapted to  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Because of  $|Y_{nk}| =$

$|\langle u, X_{nk} \rangle| \leq \|u\| \|X_{nk}\|$  we have for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  und  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(|Y_{nk}| 1_{\{|Y_{nk}| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \leq \|u\| \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon/\|u\|\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) .$$

Therefore, by  $(\text{CLB}_1^d)$ ,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(|Y_{nk}| 1_{\{|Y_{nk}| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , showing that  $(\text{CLB}_1^d)$  holds for the martingale difference array  $(Y_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $d = 1$ . Moreover, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} Y_{nk}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \langle u, X_{nk} \rangle^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} u^T X_{nk} X_{nk}^T u = u^T \left( \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} X_{nk}^T \right) u \rightarrow u^T A u$$

in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by  $(\text{R}^d)$ . Applying now the already proven Theorem 2.1 for  $d = 1$  we obtain

$$\left\langle u, \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} \right\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} Y_{nk} \rightarrow (u^T A u)^{1/2} N_1 \quad \mathcal{G}\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty ,$$

where  $N_1$  is a one-dimensional random variable with  $P^{N_1} = N(0, 1)$  which is independent of  $\mathcal{G}$ . According to the definition of stable convergence, see [5], Definition 3.15, to complete the proof of (2.1) it remains to show that

$$(2.2) \quad P^{(u^T A u)^{1/2} N_1 | \mathcal{G}} = P^{\langle u, A^{1/2} N_d \rangle | \mathcal{G}} .$$

For a deterministic matrix  $A$  we have  $P^{(u^T A u)^{1/2} N_1 | \mathcal{G}} = N(0, u^T A u)$  where

$$u^T A u = u^T A^{1/2} A^{1/2} u = (A^{1/2} u)^T A^{1/2} u = \langle A^{1/2} u, A^{1/2} u \rangle = \|A^{1/2} u\|^2 .$$

Hence

$$\langle u, A^{1/2} N_d \rangle = \langle A^{1/2} u, N_d \rangle \stackrel{d}{=} \|A^{1/2} u\| N_1 = (u^T A u)^{1/2} N_1 .$$

For a random  $A$ , both  $A$  and  $A^{1/2}$  are  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable so that (2.2) holds as well. Thus, Theorem 2.1 is proven.  $\square$

The most common and useful multivariate stable central limit theorem stated in the following theorem is a consequence of Theorem 2.1.

**Theorem 2.3** *In the situation of Theorem 2.1 let the martingale difference array  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be square integrable. Assume the conditional form of Lindeberg's condition*

$$(CLB^d) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for every  $\varepsilon > 0$

and

$$(N^d) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(X_{nk} X_{nk}^T | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \rightarrow A \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for some random}$$

$\mathcal{G}$ -measurable symmetric and positive semi-definite  $d \times d$ -matrix  $A$ .

Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} \rightarrow A^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{G}\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $N_d$  is as in Theorem 2.1.

*Proof.* By the subsequent Proposition 4.4, the conditions  $(CLB^d)$  and  $(N^d)$  imply the conditions  $(CLB_1^d)$  and  $(R^d)$ . Consequently, Theorem 2.3 follows from Theorem 2.1.

Alternatively, one may argue along the lines of the proof of Theorem 2.1 based on the corresponding univariate stable central limit theorem (see [5], Theorem 6.1).  $\square$

Our final result for arrays  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  holds for arbitrary adapted arrays without any moment assumptions and provides a generalization of Theorem 2.1. For  $0 < a < \infty$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$(2.3) \quad X_{nk}(a) = X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} - E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}).$$

**Theorem 2.4** *Let the array  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be adapted to  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Assume that for some  $a > 0$*

$$(T_a^d) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} + E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \rightarrow 0$$

in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(TM_a^d) \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}(a)\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and

$$(TR_a^d) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk}(a) X_{nk}(a)^T \rightarrow A \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for some}$$

random  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable symmetric and positive semi-definite  
 $d \times d$ -matrix  $A$ .

Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} \rightarrow A^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{G}\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $N_d$  is as in Theorem 2.1.

*Remark 2.5.* The subsequent Proposition 4.6 shows that for martingale difference arrays the conditions  $(CLB_1^d)$  and  $(R^d)$  imply the conditions  $(T_a^d)$ ,  $(TM_a^d)$  and  $(TR_a^d)$  for every  $a > 0$ . Hence, Theorem 2.1 follows in fact from Theorem 2.4.

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* Let  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be an array of  $d$ -dimensional random vectors satisfying  $(T_a^d)$ ,  $(TM_a^d)$  and  $(TR_a^d)$  for some  $0 < a < \infty$ , and let  $(X_{nk}(a))_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the bounded martingale difference array defined by (2.3). By Proposition 4.7 (a) the latter array satisfies conditions  $(CLB_1^d)$  and  $(R^d)$ . Consequently, Theorem 2.1 gives

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk}(a) \rightarrow A^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{G}\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Because (4.3) is true by Proposition 4.7 (a), an application of Theorem 3.18 (a) in [5] yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} \rightarrow A^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{G}\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.4. □

### 3 Martingales

Now we consider applications to martingales. For this, let  $(X_k)_{k \geq 1}$  be an infinite sequence of integrable  $d$ -dimensional random vectors  $X_k = (X_{k,j})_{1 \leq j \leq d}^T$  for  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  which is a martingale difference sequence w.r.t. the infinite filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_k)_{k \geq 0}$ . Setting  $\mathcal{F}_{nk} = \mathcal{F}_k$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \leq k \leq n$  we obtain an array  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\sigma$ -fields with  $k_n = n$ . Let  $(K_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of non-random  $d \times d$ -matrices

$K_n = (K_{n,j\ell})_{1 \leq j, \ell \leq d}$ . For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n$  we set  $X_{nk} = K_n X_k$ . Then  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a array of  $d$ -dimensional random vectors with

$$(3.1) \quad X_{nk,j} = \sum_{\ell=1}^d K_{n,j\ell} X_{k,\ell} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq k \leq n \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq d.$$

From (3.1) we see that  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a martingale difference array w.r.t. the array  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\sigma$ -fields. With  $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \sigma(\bigcup_{k=0}^\infty \mathcal{F}_k)$  we have the following corollary to Theorem 2.1.

**Corollary 3.1** (*Martingales*) *If*

$$(\text{CLB}_{1,K_n}^d) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n E(\|K_n X_k\| 1_{\{\|K_n X_k\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

*for every*  $\varepsilon > 0$

and

$$(\text{R}_{K_n}^d) \quad K_n \sum_{k=1}^n X_k X_k^T K_n^T \rightarrow A \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for some random}$$

$\mathcal{F}_\infty$ -measurable symmetric and positive semi-definite  $d \times d$ -matrix  $A$ ,

then

$$K_n \sum_{k=1}^n X_k \rightarrow A^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $P^{N_d} = N(0, I_d)$  and  $N_d$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ .

Note that in the martingale setting the nesting condition holds so that we have  $\mathcal{G}_{nk} = \bigcap_{m \geq n} \mathcal{F}_{mk} = \bigcap_{m \geq n} \mathcal{F}_k = \mathcal{F}_k$  and  $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{G}_{nn}) = \sigma(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{F}_n) = \mathcal{F}_\infty$ . Condition  $(\text{CLB}_{1,K_n}^d)$  clearly is condition  $(\text{CLB}_1^d)$  for the array  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and  $(\text{R}_{K_n}^d)$  is condition  $(\text{R}^d)$  with  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}_\infty$ . Therefore, the corollary is a special case of Theorem 2.1. Since the condition  $(\text{CLB}_{1,K_n}^d)$  is weaker than the condition

$$(\text{M}_{1,K_n}^d) \quad E\left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|K_n X_k\|\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

(see Proposition 4.2), Corollary 3.1 provides a discrete-time version of Theorem 2.2 in [4].

Theorem 2.3 gives the following result.

**Corollary 3.2** (*Martingales*) Let  $(X_k)_{k \geq 1}$  be a square integrable martingale difference sequence w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{F}_k)_{k \geq 0}$ . If

$$(\text{CLB}_{K_n}^d) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n E(\|K_n X_k\|^2 1_{\{\|K_n X_k\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for every  $\varepsilon > 0$

and

$$(\text{N}_{K_n}^d) \quad K_n \sum_{k=1}^n E(X_k X_k^T | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) K_n^T \rightarrow A \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for some}$$

random  $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ -measurable symmetric and positive semi-definite  
 $d \times d$ -matrix  $A$ ,

then

$$K_n \sum_{k=1}^n X_k \rightarrow A^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $N_d$  is as in Corollary 3.1.

Our next result is for  $d$ -dimensional stationary martingale difference sequences. The shift on  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N}$  is defined by  $S(x) = S((x_n)_{n \geq 1}) = (x_{n+1})_{n \geq 1}$ . Note that it is  $(\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N})$ -measurable, where  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denotes the Borel  $\sigma$ -field on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let

$$\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N}(S) = \left\{ A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N} : S^{-1}(A) = A \right\}$$

denote the  $\sigma$ -field of invariant measurable subsets of  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^\mathbb{N}$ . The Frobenius norm (or Euclidean  $\ell^2$ -norm) on the space  $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  of all real  $m \times n$ -matrices  $D$  is given by  $\|D\|_F = \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n D_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2}$ .

**Corollary 3.3** (*Stationary martingale differences*) Let  $X = (X_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued stationary martingale difference sequence w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  with  $\|X_1\| \in \mathcal{L}^2(P)$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n X_k \rightarrow E(X_1 X_1^T | \mathcal{I}_X)^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\mathcal{I}_X = X^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ ,  $N_d$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_\infty$  and  $P^{N_d} = N(0, I_d)$ . If  $X$  is additionally ergodic, then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n X_k \rightarrow E(X_1 X_1^T)^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-mixing as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$



*Proof.* We apply Corollary 3.1 with  $K_n = n^{-1/2}I_d$ . By stationarity of  $X$

$$\begin{aligned} E \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E \left( \|X_k\|^2 1_{\{\|X_k\| \geq \varepsilon n^{1/2}\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right) \right) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E \left( \|X_k\|^2 1_{\{\|X_k\| \geq \varepsilon n^{1/2}\}} \right) \\ &= E \left( \|X_1\|^2 1_{\{\|X_1\| \geq \varepsilon n^{1/2}\}} \right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because of  $E(\|X_1\|^2) < \infty$  so that condition  $(\text{CLB}_{K_n}^d)$  is satisfied. By Proposition 4.4, this condition implies  $(\text{CLB}_{1, K_n}^d)$ . As for condition  $(\text{R}_{K_n}^d)$ , we apply the ergodic theorem (see Theorem A.4 with  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) = (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ ,  $T = \mathbb{N}$  and  $f : (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,  $f(x) = \pi_1(x) \pi_1(x)^T$ , where  $\pi_1 : (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\pi_1(x) = x_1$ , so that  $\|f(X)\|_F \leq \|X_1\|^2$ ). This yields

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n X_k X_k^T \rightarrow E(X_1 X_1^T | \mathcal{I}_X) \quad \text{almost surely as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now the assertion follows from Corollary 3.1 and  $E(X_1 X_1^T | \mathcal{I}_X) = E(X_1 X_1^T)$  almost surely in the ergodic case.  $\square$

In our final result in this section we consider a sequence  $(\mathcal{H}_k)_{k \geq 1}$  of sub- $\sigma$ -fields of  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathcal{H}_k \supset \mathcal{H}_{k+1}$  for every  $k \geq 1$ , which we call a *reversed filtration*. Set  $\mathcal{H}_\infty := \bigcap_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{H}_k$ . We call a sequence  $(X_k)_{k \geq 1}$  of integrable  $d$ -dimensional random vectors which is adapted to  $(\mathcal{H}_k)_{k \geq 1}$  (i.e.  $X_k$  is  $\mathcal{H}_k$ -measurable for all  $k \geq 1$ ) a *reversed martingale difference sequence* if  $E(X_k | \mathcal{H}_{k+1}) = 0$  for all  $k \geq 1$ . Note that in general the partial sum  $\sum_{k=1}^n X_k$  will not be  $\mathcal{H}_n$ -measurable which means that the sequence  $(\sum_{k=1}^n X_k)_{n \geq 1}$  will not be a reversed martingale w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{H}_k)_{k \geq 1}$ . Therefore, the following limit theorem should not be confused with central limit theorems for reversed martingales as obtained e.g. in [9].

**Corollary 3.4** (*reversed martingale differences*) *Let  $(X_k)_{k \geq 1}$  be a square-integrable  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued reversed martingale difference sequence w.r.t. the reversed filtration  $(\mathcal{H}_k)_{k \geq 1}$ . If*

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{CLB}_{K_n}^{d,r}) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n E \left( \|K_n X_k\|^2 1_{\{\|K_n X_k\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{H}_{k+1} \right) &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ &\text{for every } \varepsilon > 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{N}_{K_n}^{d,r}) \quad K_n \sum_{k=1}^n E(X_k X_k^T | \mathcal{H}_{k+1}) K_n^T &\rightarrow A \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for some} \\ &\text{random } \mathcal{H}_\infty\text{-measurable symmetric and positive semi-definite} \end{aligned}$$

$d \times d$ -matrix  $A$ ,

then

$$K_n \sum_{k=1}^n X_k \rightarrow A^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{H}_\infty\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $P^{N_d} = N(0, I_d)$  and  $N_d$  is independent of  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ .

*Proof.* For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \leq k \leq n$  set  $\mathcal{F}_{nk} := \mathcal{H}_{n+1-k}$ . Then  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a triangular array of  $\sigma$ -fields as defined in the introduction. Let  $X_{nk} = \bar{K}_n X_{n+1-k}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Then  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a square integrable martingale difference array w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n E(\|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) &= \sum_{k=1}^n E(\|K_n X_{n+1-k}\|^2 1_{\{\|K_n X_{n+1-k}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{H}_{n+2-k}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n E(\|K_n X_k\|^2 1_{\{\|K_n X_k\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{H}_{k+1}) \end{aligned}$$

which converges to 0 in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by  $(\text{CLB}_{K_n}^{d,r})$  so that  $(\text{CLB}^d)$  is satisfied for the array  $(X_{nk}, \mathcal{F}_{nk})$ . Moreover, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n E(X_{nk} X_{nk}^T | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) &= K_n \sum_{k=1}^n E(X_{n+1-k} X_{n+1-k}^T | \mathcal{H}_{n+2-k}) K_n^T \\ &= K_n \sum_{k=1}^n E(X_k X_k^T | \mathcal{H}_{k+1}) K_n^T \end{aligned}$$

which converges to  $A$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by  $(\text{N}_{K_n}^{d,r})$  so that  $(\text{N}^d)$  is satisfied. In the present setting we have  $\mathcal{G}_{nk} = \bigcap_{m \geq n} \mathcal{F}_{mk} = \bigcap_{m \geq n} \mathcal{H}_{m+1-k} = \mathcal{H}_\infty$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \leq k \leq n$  so that  $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{G}_{nn}) = \mathcal{H}_\infty$ . Therefore, Theorem 2.3 implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^n X_{nk} \rightarrow A^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{H}_\infty\text{-stably as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

which in view of

$$\sum_{k=1}^n X_{nk} = K_n \sum_{k=1}^n X_{n+1-k} = K_n \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$$

is the assertion of the corollary.  $\square$

Clearly, Corollary 3.4 is the analogue of Corollary 3.2 for reversed martingale difference sequences. An analogue of Corollary 3.1 for reversed martingale difference

sequences can be obtained in the same way, which in turn implies an analogue of Corollary 3.3 for stationary reversed martingale difference sequences.

A special case of Corollary 3.4 for  $d = 1$  with convergence in distribution instead of stable convergence has been applied in [3]; see Theorem 5.8 of that paper. The reference to “reversed martingales” in the formulation of that theorem is somewhat irritating because reversed martingales play no role there, in the same way as they play no role in our Corollary 3.4.

## 4 Sufficient conditions

In this section we will disclose the relationship between the sufficient conditions in Theorems 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4 as well as the additional condition

$$(M_2^d) \quad E \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}\|^2 \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for square integrable arrays  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and the condition

$$(M_1^d) \quad E \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}\| \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for integrable arrays. It will turn out that the implications contained in the following table are true.

**Table 4.1** *Relationship between conditions in Theorems 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (M_2^d) \text{ and } (N^d) & \xrightarrow{(a)} & (M_1^d) \text{ and } (R^d) \\
 \downarrow (b) & & \downarrow (c) \\
 (CLB^d) \text{ and } (N^d) & \xrightarrow{(d)} & (CLB_1^d) \text{ and } (R^d) \xrightarrow{(e)} (T_a^d), (TM_a^d) \text{ and } (TR_a^d) \\
 & & \text{for all } 0 < a < \infty
 \end{array}$$

The conditions in the left column require square integrable random vectors, in the middle integrability is sufficient, and on the right-hand side no moment conditions are needed at all. The array  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is assumed to be adapted to the array  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , and for implication (e) it has to be a martingale difference array. The implications in Table 4.1 are proven in a sequence of propositions. The proofs are given in Section 5.

**Proposition 4.2** *For square integrable adapted arrays we have  $(M_2^d) \Rightarrow (CLB^d)$ , and for integrable arrays we have  $(M_1^d) \Rightarrow (CLB_1^d)$ .*

Proposition 4.2 shows that the implications (b) and (c) in Table 4.1 are true. The next result is a crucial tool in the proofs of Propositions 4.4 and 4.5.

**Lemma 4.3** *Let  $d = 2$ . Let  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a 2-dimensional square integrable adapted array. The conditions*

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( \|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0$$

and

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( \|X_{nk}\|^2 \right) \leq C < \infty \quad \text{for some constant } C \text{ and all } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

imply

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( X_{nk,1} X_{nk,2} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,1} X_{nk,2} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } L_1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

**Proposition 4.4** *For square integrable adapted arrays condition  $(\text{CLB}^d)$  implies  $(\text{CLB}_1^d)$  and conditions  $(\text{CLB}^d)$  and  $(\text{N}^d)$  imply  $(\text{R}^d)$ .*

Clearly, implication (d) in Table 4.1 follows from Proposition 4.4. Note that from the already proven implications (b) and (d) in Table 4.1 we see that conditions  $(\text{M}_2^d)$  and  $(\text{N}^d)$  imply  $(\text{R}^d)$ . Because condition  $(\text{M}_1^d)$  is trivially implied by  $(\text{M}_2^d)$ , implication (a) in Table 4.1 is also true.

For uniformly bounded arrays satisfying  $(\text{CLB}^d)$  the conditions  $(\text{N}^d)$  and  $(\text{R}^d)$  are in fact equivalent, as shown by the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.5** *For uniformly bounded adapted arrays, that is,  $\|X_{nk}\| \leq a$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$  and some  $a < \infty$ , conditions  $(\text{CLB}^d)$  and  $(\text{R}^d)$  imply  $(\text{N}^d)$ .*

Of course, in the preceding setting the conditions  $(\text{CLB}^d)$  and  $(\text{CLB}_1^d)$  are equivalent.

The next result proves implication (e) in Table 4.1.

**Proposition 4.6** *Let  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a martingale difference array w.r.t the  $\sigma$ -fields  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which satisfies  $(\text{CLB}_1^d)$  and  $(\text{R}^d)$ . Then  $(\text{T}_a^d)$ ,  $(\text{TM}_a^d)$  and  $(\text{TR}_a^d)$  are true for all  $a > 0$  and the limiting matrix  $A$  in  $(\text{R}^d)$  and  $(\text{TR}_a^d)$  is the same.*

Clearly, Proposition 4.6 shows that implication (e) in Table 4.1 is true, and all implications in Table 4.1 are proven. The first part of the next proposition will be crucial for deriving Theorem 2.4 from Theorem 2.1 as well as from Theorem 2.3.

**Proposition 4.7** *Let  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be adapted to the  $\sigma$ -fields  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Assume that for some  $a > 0$  conditions  $(T_a^d)$ ,  $(TM_a^d)$  and  $(TR_a^d)$  are satisfied.*

(a) *The array  $(X_{nk}(a))_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a uniformly bounded martingale difference array w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which satisfies the conditions  $(CLB_1^d)$  and  $(R^d)$  as well as*

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk}(a) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

(b) *The array  $(X_{nk}(a))_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  also satisfies conditions  $(M_2^d)$  and  $(N^d)$ .*

The second part of Proposition 4.7 says that an array  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n}$  of  $d$ -dimensional random vectors without any integrability assumptions which satisfies the three conditions  $(T_a^d)$ ,  $(TM_a^d)$  and  $(TR_a^d)$  for some  $0 < a < \infty$  appearing in the lower right corner of Table 4.1 is, as far as stable convergence of the row-sums is concerned, asymptotically equivalent to a uniformly bounded martingale difference array satisfying the conditions in the upper left corner of Table 4.1, which formally is the strongest set of conditions. Consequently, Table 4.1 shows that as soon as any one of the three Theorems 2.1, 2.3 or 2.4 is proven, the other two follow by appropriate implications in Table 4.1. We have chosen here to derive Theorem 2.1 directly from the one-dimensional case by an application of the Cramér-Wold device and to obtain Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 indirectly via Table 4.1, but other approaches are possible as well. Therefore, in an informal sense, all conditions appearing in Table 4.1 may be considered as being tantamount to each other.

In our final result in this section we will show that the conditional Lindeberg condition  $(CLB^d)$  holds if and only if it holds for every component of the random vectors  $X_{nk}$ . This result is not needed in this paper but it may turn out to be useful in applications.

**Proposition 4.8** *For any array  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $d$ -dimensional random vectors the following statements are equivalent:*

$$(i) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

*for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .*

(ii) For every  $1 \leq j \leq d$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( |X_{nk,j}|^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,j}| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

The same holds for conditions  $(\text{CLB}_1^d)$ ,  $(\text{M}_1^d)$  and  $(\text{M}_2^d)$ .

## 5 Proofs of the results of Section 4

*Proof of Proposition 4.2.* For the proof of  $(\text{M}_2^d) \Rightarrow (\text{CLB}^d)$  note that for all  $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$P \left( \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} \geq \delta \right) \leq P \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon \right).$$

Therefore,  $(\text{M}_2^d)$  implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Because  $(\text{M}_2^d)$  implies also uniform integrability of  $\{\max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}\|^2 : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ ,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( \|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0$$

follows from Lemma 6.13 in [5]. For the proof of  $(\text{M}_1^d) \Rightarrow (\text{CLB}_1^d)$  replace  $\|X_{nk}\|^2$  everywhere by  $\|X_{nk}\|$  and condition  $(\text{M}_2^d)$  by  $(\text{M}_1^d)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.3.* Set  $U_{nk} = X_{nk,1}$  and  $V_{nk} = X_{nk,2}$ . Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  be arbitrary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk} \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq \varepsilon\}} - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > \varepsilon\}} \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(|U_{nk}V_{nk}| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|>\varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} |U_{nk}V_{nk}| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|>\varepsilon\}} \\
&+ \left| \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|\leq\varepsilon\}} - E(U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|\leq\varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \right| \\
&=: I_n(\varepsilon) + II_n(\varepsilon) + III_n(\varepsilon),
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
E(I_n(\varepsilon)) &= E(II_n(\varepsilon)) = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(|U_{nk}| |V_{nk}| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|>\varepsilon\}}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|>\varepsilon\}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (4.1) implies  $E(I_n(\varepsilon)) \rightarrow 0$  and  $E(II_n(\varepsilon)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Moreover, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , because the real-valued random variables of the bounded martingale difference sequence

$$(U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|\leq\varepsilon\}} - E(U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|\leq\varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}))_{1 \leq k \leq k_n}$$

are pairwise uncorrelated,

$$\begin{aligned}
E(III_n(\varepsilon)^2) &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left[ (U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|\leq\varepsilon\}} - E(U_{nk}V_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|\leq\varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}))^2 \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}^2 V_{nk}^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|\leq\varepsilon\}}) \leq \varepsilon^2 \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(|U_{nk}| |V_{nk}|) \\
&\leq \varepsilon^2 \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\|^2) \leq \varepsilon^2 C
\end{aligned}$$

by condition (4.2). Hence for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$E \left( \left| \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk} \right| \right) \leq E(I_n(\varepsilon)) + E(II_n(\varepsilon)) + \varepsilon C^{1/2}.$$

Because  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary and  $E(I_n(\varepsilon)) \rightarrow 0$  and  $E(II_n(\varepsilon)) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  are true, the Lemma is proven.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.4.* Observe that because of

$$E(\|X_{nk}\| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|\geq\varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} E(\|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|\geq\varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})$$

for square integrable arrays condition  $(CLB_1^d)$  is an immediate consequence of condition  $(CLB^d)$ .

Condition  $(R^d)$  follows from  $(N^d)$  and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(X_{nk} X_{nk}^T | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} X_{nk}^T \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

which is equivalent to

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(X_{nk,j} X_{nk,\ell} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j} X_{nk,\ell} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for all  $1 \leq j, \ell \leq d$ . For the proof of (5.1) let  $j, \ell$  be arbitrary. Set  $U_{nk} = X_{nk,j}$  and  $V_{nk} = X_{nk,\ell}$ . Then we have to show

$$(5.2) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk} V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk} V_{nk} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For the proof of (5.2) for each  $0 < c < \infty$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define the stopping times

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n^U(c) &= \max \left\{ k \in \{0, 1, \dots, k_n\} : \sum_{i=1}^k E(U_{ni}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) \leq c \right\}, \\ \tau_n^V(c) &= \max \left\{ k \in \{0, 1, \dots, k_n\} : \sum_{i=1}^k E(V_{ni}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) \leq c \right\} \quad \text{and} \\ \tau_n(c) &= \tau_n^U(c) \wedge \tau_n^V(c) \end{aligned}$$

w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n}$  with  $\sum_{\emptyset} = 0$  and the real-valued random variables

$$U_{nk}(c) = U_{nk} 1_{\{k \leq \tau_n(c)\}} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{nk}(c) = V_{nk} 1_{\{k \leq \tau_n(c)\}}$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$ . Observe that these random variables are square integrable because  $|U_{nk}(c)| \leq |U_{nk}|$  and  $|V_{nk}(c)| \leq |V_{nk}|$ . Then for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 < c < \infty$

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk} V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk} V_{nk} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk} V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}(c) V_{nk}(c) | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}(c) V_{nk}(c) | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}(c) V_{nk}(c) \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}(c) V_{nk}(c) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk} V_{nk} \\
& =: I_n(c) + II_n(c) + III_n(c).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, using that  $\tau_n(c)$  is a stopping time w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_n(c) &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk} V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n(c)} E(U_{nk} V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \\
&= \sum_{k=\tau_n(c)+1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk} V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})
\end{aligned}$$

so that for all  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.4) \quad P(|I_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) &\leq P(\tau_n(c) < k_n) \leq P(\tau_n^U(c) < k_n) + P(\tau_n^V(c) < k_n) \\
&\leq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(U_{ni}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) > c\right) + P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(V_{ni}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) > c\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.5) \quad P(|III_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) \\
\leq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(U_{ni}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) > c\right) + P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(V_{ni}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) > c\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Next we will show  $II_n(c) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $0 < c < \infty$  by an application of Lemma 4.3. For this, we set  $Z_{nk}(c) = (U_{nk}(c), V_{nk}(c))^T$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$ . Note that for  $0 < c < \infty$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.6) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{kn}^2(c) + V_{nk}^2(c) | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n(c)} E(U_{kn}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n(c)} E(V_{nk}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n^U(c)} E(U_{kn}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n^V(c)} E(V_{nk}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \leq 2c
\end{aligned}$$

by definition of  $\tau_n^U$  and  $\tau_n^V$ . This implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2) \leq 2c$$

so that condition (4.2) is satisfied, Observe also that

$$\|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2 = U_{kn}^2(c) + V_{nk}^2(c) \leq U_{kn}^2 + V_{nk}^2 = X_{kn,j}^2 + X_{nk,\ell}^2 \leq 2\|X_{nk}\|^2$$

where the factor 2 is needed only in case  $j = \ell$  so that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2 1_{\{\|Z_{nk}(c)\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon/2^{1/2}\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})$$

which by (CLB<sup>d</sup>) implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2 1_{\{\|Z_{nk}(c)\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ . From this and the bound in (5.6) we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2 1_{\{\|Z_{nk}(c)\| \geq \varepsilon\}}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for every } \varepsilon > 0$$

by dominated convergence. Thus, (4.1) is also satisfied and Lemma 4.3 yields  $II_n(c) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From (5.3) we get for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < c < \infty$ , using (5.4) and (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\left|\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk}\right| \geq 3\varepsilon\right) \\ & \leq P(|I_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) + P(|II_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) + P(|III_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) \\ & \leq 2P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(U_{ni}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) > c\right) + 2P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(V_{ni}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) > c\right) \\ & \quad + P(|II_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) \\ & = 2P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(X_{ni,j}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) > c\right) + 2P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(X_{ni,\ell}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1}) > c\right) \\ & \quad + P(|II_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Now  $P(|II_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < c < \infty$  because of  $II_n(c) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_1$ , and the sequences  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(X_{ni,j}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1})\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} E(X_{ni,\ell}^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n,i-1})\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are bounded in probability as a consequence of condition (N<sup>d</sup>), from which the assertion follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.5.* Condition (N<sup>d</sup>) follows from (R<sup>d</sup>) and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(X_{nk}X_{nk}^T | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk}X_{nk}^T \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

which is equivalent to

$$(5.7) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(X_{nk,j}X_{nk,\ell}|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j}X_{nk,\ell} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for all  $1 \leq j, \ell \leq d$ . For the proof of (5.7) let  $j$  and  $\ell$  be fixed and set  $U_{nk} = X_{nk,j}$  and  $V_{nk} = X_{nk,\ell}$ . Then we have to show

$$(5.8) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk}|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For the proof of (5.8) for each  $0 < c < \infty$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we define the stopping times

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_n^U(c) &= \min \left\{ k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\} : \sum_{i=1}^k U_{ni}^2 > c \right\} \wedge k_n, \\ \tau_n^V(c) &= \min \left\{ k \in \{1, \dots, k_n\} : \sum_{i=1}^k V_{ni}^2 > c \right\} \wedge k_n \quad \text{and} \\ \tau_n(c) &= \tau_n^U(c) \wedge \tau_n^V(c) \end{aligned}$$

w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n}$  with  $\min \emptyset = \infty$  and the real-valued random variables

$$U_{nk}(c) = U_{nk} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \leq \tau_n(c)\}} \quad \text{and} \quad V_{nk}(c) = V_{nk} \mathbf{1}_{\{k \leq \tau_n(c)\}}$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$ . Then for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} (5.9) \quad & \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk}|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk}|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}(c)V_{nk}(c)|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}(c)V_{nk}(c)|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}(c)V_{nk}(c) \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}(c)V_{nk}(c) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk} \\ &=: I_n(c) + II_n(c) + III_n(c). \end{aligned}$$

Now, using that  $\tau_n(c)$  is a stopping time w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n}$ , we have

$$I_n(c) = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk}|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n(c)} E(U_{nk}V_{nk}|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})$$

$$= \sum_{k=\tau_n(c)+1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk}|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})$$

so that for all  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$(5.10) \quad P(|I_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) \leq P(\tau_n(c) < k_n) \leq P(\tau_n^U(c) < k_n) + P(\tau_n^V(c) < k_n) \\ \leq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} U_{ni}^2 > c\right) + P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} V_{ni}^2 > c\right).$$

Similarly

$$(5.11) \quad P(|III_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) \leq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} U_{ni}^2 > c\right) + P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} V_{ni}^2 > c\right).$$

Next we will show  $II_n(c) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $0 < c < \infty$  by an application of Lemma 4.3. For this, we set  $Z_{nk}(c) = (U_{nk}(c), V_{nk}(c))^T$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$ . Note that for  $0 < c < \infty$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(5.12) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{kn}^2(c) + V_{nk}^2(c) = \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n(c)} U_{kn}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n(c)} V_{nk}^2 \\ \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n^U(c)} U_{kn}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n^V(c)} V_{nk}^2 \\ \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n^U(c)-1} U_{kn}^2 + \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} U_{nk}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\tau_n^V(c)-1} V_{nk}^2 + \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} V_{nk}^2 \leq 2c + 2a^2$$

by definition of  $\tau_n^U$  and  $\tau_n^V$  and because  $U_{nk}^2 \leq \|X_{nk}\|^2 \leq a^2$  and likewise  $V_{nk}^2 \leq a^2$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$ . Consequently,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2) = E\left(\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2\right) \leq 2c + 2a^2,$$

which shows that  $(Z_{nk}(c))_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  satisfies condition (4.2) in Lemma 4.3. Next, we will show that condition (4.1) is also satisfied. For this, note that for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$

$$\|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2 = U_{nk}^2(c) + V_{nk}^2(c) \leq U_{nk}^2 + V_{nk}^2 = X_{nk,j}^2 + X_{nk,\ell}^2 \leq 2\|X_{nk}\|^2$$

where the factor 2 is needed only in case  $j = \ell$  so that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2 1_{\{\|Z_{nk}(c)\| \geq \varepsilon\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \leq 2 \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon/2^{1/2}\}}|\mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}).$$

Therefore, (CLB<sup>d</sup>) and Lemma 6.5 in [5] imply

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \|Z_{nk}(c)\|^2 1_{\{\|Z_{nk}(c)\| \geq \varepsilon\}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty \text{ for every } \varepsilon > 0.$$

In view of (5.12) condition (4.1) follows by dominated convergence. Consequently, from Lemma 4.3 we obtain  $II_n(c) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for all  $0 < c < \infty$ . From (5.9) we get for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < c < \infty$ , using (5.10) and (5.11),

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left( \left| \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(U_{nk}V_{nk} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} U_{nk}V_{nk} \right| \geq 3\varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq P(|I_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) + P(|II_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) + P(|III_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) \\ & \leq 2P \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} U_{ni}^2 > c \right) + 2P \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} V_{ni}^2 > c \right) + P(|II_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) \\ & = 2P \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{ni,j}^2 > c \right) + 2P \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{ni,\ell}^2 > c \right) + P(|II_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Now  $P(|II_n(c)| \geq \varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $0 < c < \infty$  because of  $II_n(c) \rightarrow 0$  in  $L_1$ , and the sequences  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{ni,j}^2\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{ni,\ell}^2\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are bounded in probability as a consequence of condition (R<sup>d</sup>), from which the assertion follows.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.6.* Let  $a > 0$  be arbitrary. From the martingale difference property of  $(X_{nk})_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  we obtain for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq k \leq k_n$

$$(5.13) \quad E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) = -E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}).$$

Proof of (T<sub>a</sub><sup>d</sup>): By (5.13)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \right\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \left\| E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \right\| \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \left\| E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \right\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}), \end{aligned}$$

and from (CLB<sub>1</sub><sup>d</sup>) we obtain

$$(5.14) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By Lemma 6.5 in [5] it follows from (CLB<sub>1</sub><sup>d</sup>) that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \|X_{nk}\| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and therefore also

$$(5.15) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\|>a\}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Combining (5.15) and (5.14) we get  $(T_a^d)$ .

Proof of  $(TM_a^d)$ : For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  by (5.13)

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}(a)\| &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}\| + \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})\| \\ &= \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}\| + \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})\| \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}\| + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the second summand on the right-hand side converges to zero in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by  $(CLB_1^d)$  and that this condition also implies

$$(5.16) \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

in view of Proposition 6.6 in [5] which completes the proof.

Proof of  $(TR_a^d)$ : Condition  $(TR_a^d)$  follows from  $(R^d)$  and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} X_{nk}^T - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk}(a) X_{nk}(a)^T \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(5.17) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j} X_{nk,\ell} - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j}(a) X_{nk,\ell}(a) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

for all  $1 \leq j, \ell \leq d$ . For the proof of (5.17) let  $j, \ell$  be arbitrary. Then for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j} X_{nk,\ell} - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j}(a) X_{nk,\ell}(a) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j} X_{nk,\ell} - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} [X_{nk,j} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} - E(X_{nk,j} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})] \times \\ &\quad [X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} - E(X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j} X_{nk,\ell} - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j} X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} E \left( X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} E \left( X_{nk,j} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \\
& - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( X_{nk,j} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) E \left( X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \\
& =: I_n + II_n + III_n - IV_n.
\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_n| & = \left| \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j} X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} |X_{nk,j}| |X_{nk,\ell}| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$

$$P \left( \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq P \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq k_n} \|X_{nk}\| > a \right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

by (5.16) so that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} \|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

which clearly entails  $I_n \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have, again using (5.13),

$$\begin{aligned}
|II_n| & = \left| \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk,j} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} E \left( X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} |X_{nk,j}| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} \left| E \left( X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \right| \\
& = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} |X_{nk,j}| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} \left| E \left( X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \right| \\
& \leq a \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( |X_{nk,\ell}| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \\
& \leq a \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( \|X_{nk}\| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By (CLB<sub>1</sub><sup>d</sup>) the right-hand side of these inequalities converges to zero in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  so that also  $II_n \rightarrow 0$  in probability as well as  $III_n \rightarrow 0$  in probability simply by interchanging  $j$  and  $\ell$ .

Finally, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , again using (5.13),

$$\begin{aligned}
|IV_n| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} |E(X_{nk,j} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})| |E(X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})| \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} |E(X_{nk,j} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})| |E(X_{nk,\ell} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1})| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(|X_{nk,j}| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) E(|X_{nk,\ell}| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}) \\
&\leq a \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(\|X_{nk}\| 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the right-hand side converges to zero in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by (CLB<sub>1</sub><sup>d</sup>) which proves  $IV_n \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and concludes the proof of the proposition.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.7.* (a) From (TM<sub>a</sub><sup>d</sup>) and  $\|X_{nk}(a)\| \leq 2a$  for all  $n$  and  $k$  we see that (M<sub>1</sub><sup>d</sup>) holds true for the truncated array  $(X_{nk}(a))_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which clearly is a uniformly bounded martingale difference array w.r.t.  $(\mathcal{F}_{nk})_{0 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Therefore, (CLB<sub>1</sub><sup>d</sup>) also holds true by Proposition 4.2. Assumption (TR<sub>a</sub><sup>d</sup>) is exactly condition (R<sup>d</sup>) for the truncated array  $(X_{nk}(a))_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . As to (4.3), for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} - \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk}(a) = \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| > a\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E(X_{nk} 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \leq a\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}),$$

and (4.3) is equivalent to (T<sub>a</sub><sup>d</sup>).

(b) Condition (M<sub>2</sub><sup>d</sup>) for the uniformly bounded array  $(X_{nk}(a))_{1 \leq k \leq k_n, n \in \mathbb{N}}$  follows from (TM<sub>a</sub><sup>d</sup>) by dominated convergence. Condition (N<sup>d</sup>) follows from Propositions 4.2 and 4.5.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.8.* Statement (ii) follows from (i) because  $|X_{nk,j}| \leq \|X_{nk}\|$  for all  $n, k$  and  $j$  so that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E\left(X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,j}| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E\left(\|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1}\right)$$



for all  $n$  and  $j$ . To obtain statement (i) from (ii) observe that for all  $n$  and  $k$

$$\|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} = \sum_{j=1}^d X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{\sum_{\ell=1}^d X_{nk,\ell}^2 \geq \varepsilon^2\}} \leq \sum_{j,\ell=1}^d X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{X_{nk,\ell}^2 \geq \varepsilon^2/d\}}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{X_{nk,\ell}^2 \geq \varepsilon^2/d\}} &= X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,\ell}| \geq \varepsilon/d^{1/2}\}} \\ &= X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,\ell}| \geq \varepsilon/d^{1/2}\} \cap \{|X_{nk,\ell}| \leq |X_{nk,j}|\}} + X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,\ell}| \geq \varepsilon/d^{1/2}\} \cap \{|X_{nk,\ell}| > |X_{nk,j}|\}} \\ &\leq X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,j}| \geq \varepsilon/d^{1/2}\}} + X_{nk,\ell}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,\ell}| \geq \varepsilon/d^{1/2}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence for all  $n, k$  and  $\varepsilon$

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} &\leq \sum_{j,\ell=1}^d X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,j}| \geq \varepsilon/d^{1/2}\}} + \sum_{j,\ell=1}^d X_{nk,\ell}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,\ell}| \geq \varepsilon/d^{1/2}\}} \\ &= 2d \sum_{j=1}^d X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,j}| \geq \varepsilon/d^{1/2}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for all  $n$  and  $\varepsilon$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( \|X_{nk}\|^2 1_{\{\|X_{nk}\| \geq \varepsilon\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right) \leq 2d \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^{k_n} E \left( X_{nk,j}^2 1_{\{|X_{nk,j}| \geq \varepsilon/d^{1/2}\}} \mid \mathcal{F}_{n,k-1} \right)$$

so that (i) holds. The proofs of the statements about  $(\text{CLB}_1^d)$ ,  $(\text{M}_1^d)$  and  $(\text{M}_2^d)$  are similar.  $\square$

## 6 Application: Stable autoregressive models of order $d$

We consider an autoregressive process  $(Y_n)_{n \geq -d+1}$  of order  $d$  generated recursively by

$$Y_n = \theta_1 Y_{n-1} + \cdots + \theta_d Y_{n-d} + Z_n, \quad n \geq 1,$$

where  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $(Z_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is an i.i.d. sequence of real random variables with  $Z_1 \in \mathcal{L}^2(P)$ ,  $E(Z_1) = \bar{0}$ ,  $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(Z_1) > 0$  and the initial value  $(Y_0, \dots, Y_{-d+1})^T$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random vector independent of  $(Z_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $Y_0, \dots, Y_{-d+1} \in \mathcal{L}^2(P)$ . The least squares estimator for the parameter  $\theta$  on the basis of the observations  $Y_{-d+1}, \dots, Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  is given by

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \left( \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} Y_k, \quad n \geq 1,$$

where  $U_k = (Y_k, Y_{k-1}, \dots, Y_{k-d+1})^T$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , and where  $(\sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T)^{-1} := 0$  if the random symmetric and positive semidefinite matrix  $\sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T$  is not positive definite and therefore singular.

We prove a mixing central limit theorem for  $\widehat{\theta}_n$  in the so-called stable case of the autoregressive model. For classical convergence in distribution the asymptotic theory for  $\widehat{\theta}_n$  is well-known in this case; see e.g. [1], Chapter 5, [2], Chapter 8 and [10].

The process  $(U_n)_{n \geq 0}$  can be expressed as a  $d$ -dimensional autoregression of order one, namely

$$U_n = BU_{n-1} + W_n, \quad n \geq 1,$$

where

$$B = B(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 & \dots & \theta_{d-1} & \theta_d \\ & & & 0 \\ & I_{d-1} & & \vdots \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad W_n = (Z_n, 0, \dots, 0)^T.$$

Then, by induction, we have

$$(6.1) \quad U_n = B^n U_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n B^{n-j} W_j = B^n U_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n B^{j-1} W_{n+1-j}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Let  $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(U_0, Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ ,  $n \geq 0$ . Then all processes are adapted to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ .

In the sequel we assume that the spectral radius of  $B$  is strictly less than one, i.e. all eigenvalues of  $B$  are strictly less than one in absolute value. This condition defines the *stable case* in the theory of autoregression models. Then there exists a submultiplicative norm  $\|\cdot\|_B$  on the space  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  of all real  $d \times d$ -matrices with  $\|B\|_B < 1$ ; see [11], Theorem 4.24. The Frobenius norm  $\|\cdot\|_F$  on  $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  is also submultiplicative, satisfies  $\|D\|_F = \|D^T\|_F$  and is compatible with the Euclidean  $\ell^2$ -norm  $\|\cdot\|$  (same notation on various spaces), i.e.  $\|Du\| \leq \|D\|_F \|u\|$  for all  $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  as a consequence of submultiplicativity and  $\|u\|_F = \|u\|$ . Since all norms on  $\mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  are equivalent, there is a real constant  $C(B)$  such that  $\|D\|_F \leq C(B) \|D\|_B$  for all  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ .

Note that the above condition on the eigenvalues of  $B$  implies the existence of a stationary distribution  $\mu$ ,  $U_n \xrightarrow{d} \mu$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\mu$  is the distribution of  $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B^j W_{j+1}$ , and for the choice  $P^{U_0} = \mu$  the process  $(Y_{n-d+1})_{n \geq 0}$  is strictly stationary. The covariance matrix of  $\mu$  is given by

$$\sigma^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B^j \widetilde{I}_d (B^j)^T,$$

where  $\tilde{I}_d$  denotes the  $d \times d$ -matrix with a one in the upper left corner and zeros elsewhere. To see that both series converge observe that  $\|B^j\|_B \leq \|B\|_B^j$  for all  $j \geq 1$  by submultiplicativity of  $\|\cdot\|_B$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_1 &:= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B^j\|_F = \|I_d\|_F + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|B^j\|_F \leq d^{1/2} + C(B) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|B^j\|_B \\ &\leq d^{1/2} + C(B) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|B\|_B^j < \infty \end{aligned}$$

because  $\|B\|_B < 1$ . Therefore

$$E \left( \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B^j\|_F |Z_{j+1}| \right) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B^j\|_F E(|Z_{j+1}|) = \kappa_1 E(|Z_1|) < \infty$$

so that

$$(6.2) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B^j W_{j+1}\| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B^j\|_F \|W_{j+1}\| = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B^j\|_F |Z_{j+1}| < \infty$$

almost surely (which is true already under  $E \log^+ |Z_1| < \infty$ , cf. [5], Lemma 8.1) and

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left\| B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T \right\|_F \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B^j\|_F \left\| \tilde{I}_d \right\|_F \left\| (B^j)^T \right\|_F = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B^j\|_F^2 =: \kappa_2 < \infty$$

in view of  $\kappa_1 < \infty$ . In the following theorem it will be crucial that the symmetric matrix

$$\Sigma = \Sigma(\vartheta) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T$$

is positive definite and therefore invertible. This will be shown at the end of this section in Lemma 6.3. The  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{F}_\infty = \sigma(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_n)$  is defined by the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ .

**Theorem 6.1** *In the above setting,*

$$\sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta) \rightarrow \Sigma^{-1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-mixing}$$

and

$$\left( \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \right)^{1/2} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta) \rightarrow \sigma N_d \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-mixing}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $P^{N_d} = N(0, I_d)$ ,  $N_d$  is independent of  $\mathcal{F}_\infty$  and  $\Sigma^{-1/2} := (\Sigma^{1/2})^{-1}$ .

The above statements may also be read as

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \widehat{\theta}_n - \theta \right) \rightarrow N \left( 0, \Sigma^{-1} \right) \quad \text{mixing}$$

and

$$\left( \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \right)^{1/2} \left( \widehat{\theta}_n - \theta \right) \rightarrow N \left( 0, \sigma^2 I_d \right) \quad \text{mixing},$$

where mixing is short for  $\mathcal{F}$ -mixing. In case  $d = 1$  Theorem 6.1 reduces to Theorem 9.1 in [5].

We will present here two proofs of Theorem 6.1. Both proofs are based on the fact that the process  $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $X_n = U_{n-1} Z_n$  is a square integrable martingale difference sequence. In the first proof we use the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  introduced above and apply the stable central limit theorem of Corollary 3.2 with  $K_n = n^{-1/2} I_d$ , and stationarity plays no role. The conditional Lindeberg condition ( $\text{CLB}_{K_n}^d$ ) and the norming condition ( $\text{N}_{K_n}^d$ ) will be verified by elementary but lengthy computations exploiting nothing more than the dynamics of the  $U_n$ -process via the representation (6.1). The second proof uses the fact that for a starting value  $\bar{U}_0$  with  $P^{\bar{U}_0} = \mu$  the process  $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is strictly stationary and ergodic and is a martingale difference sequence w.r.t. a filtration  $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  defined below so that Corollary 3.3 can be applied in this special case. In a second step it is not difficult to show that the asymptotics of the normalized sums  $n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^n X_k$  is the same for all starting values.

*First proof of Theorem 6.1.* As announced above, we apply the stable central limit theorem of Corollary 3.2 with  $K_n = n^{-1/2} I_d$  to the square integrable martingale difference sequence  $(X_n)_{n \geq 1}$  with  $X_n = U_{n-1} Z_n$  w.r.t. the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ .

*Step 1.* In a first step, we prove the conditional Lindeberg condition ( $\text{CLB}_{K_n}^d$ ). For all  $n \geq 1$  and  $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n E \left( \|K_n X_k\|^2 1_{\{\|K_n X_k\| \geq \varepsilon\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E \left( \|U_{k-1} Z_k\|^2 1_{\{\|U_{k-1} Z_k\| \geq \varepsilon \sqrt{n}\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|U_{k-1}\|^2 E \left( Z_k^2 1_{\{\|U_{k-1} Z_k\| \geq \varepsilon \sqrt{n}\} \cap \{\|U_{k-1}\| \leq \delta \sqrt{n}\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|U_{k-1}\|^2 E \left( Z_k^2 1_{\{\|U_{k-1} Z_k\| \geq \varepsilon \sqrt{n}\} \cap \{\|U_{k-1}\| > \delta \sqrt{n}\}} | \mathcal{F}_{k-1} \right) \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|U_{k-1}\|^2 \right) E \left( Z_1^2 1_{\{|Z_1| \geq \varepsilon / \delta\}} \right) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|U_{k-1}\|^2 1_{\{\|U_{k-1}\| > \delta \sqrt{n}\}} \sigma^2 \\ &=: I_n(\varepsilon, \delta) + II_n(\delta) \sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

For all  $\delta > 0$  we will show that  $II_n(\delta) \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For this, note that for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $\delta, \tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$  we have

$$P\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|U_{k-1}\|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{\|U_{k-1}\| > \delta\sqrt{n}\}} \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}\right) \leq P\left(\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|U_{k-1}\| > \delta\sqrt{n}\right)$$

so that it is enough to show that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|U_{k-1}\| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

From (6.1) we obtain for all  $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|U_{k-1}\| &\leq \|B^{k-1}U_0\| + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \|B^j W_{k-1-j}\| \leq \|B^{k-1}\|_F \|U_0\| + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \|B^j\|_F \|W_{k-1-j}\| \\ &\leq \kappa_3 \|U_0\| + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \|B^j\|_F |Z_{k-1-j}| \leq \kappa_3 \|U_0\| + \kappa_1 \max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} |Z_j|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\kappa_3 := \sup_{j \geq 0} \|B^j\|_F < \infty$  because of  $\kappa_1 < \infty$ . Consequently, for all  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \|U_{k-1}\| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \kappa_3 \|U_0\| + \kappa_1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} |Z_j|,$$

where the right-hand side converges in probability to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because  $(Z_i)_{i \geq 1}$  is an i.i.d. sequence with  $E(Z_1^2) < \infty$ , and  $II_n(\delta) \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  is proven. From the above bound on  $\|U_{k-1}\|$  we also obtain for all  $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} E(\|U_{k-1}\|^2)^{1/2} &\leq \kappa_3 E(\|U_0\|^2)^{1/2} + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} \|B^j\|_F E(Z_1^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \kappa_3 E(\|U_0\|^2)^{1/2} + \kappa_1 \sigma =: \kappa_4. \end{aligned}$$

This gives  $E(\|U_{k-1}\|^2) \leq \kappa_4^2$  for all  $k \geq 1$  so that for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$

$$E(|I_n(\varepsilon, \delta)|) = E\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|U_{k-1}\|^2\right) E(Z_1^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|Z_1| > \varepsilon/\delta\}}) \leq \kappa_4^2 E(Z_1^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|Z_1| > \varepsilon/\delta\}}).$$

Hence for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} P(|I_n(\varepsilon, \delta) + II_n(\delta)\sigma^2| \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}) &\leq P(|I_n(\varepsilon, \delta)| \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}/2) + P(|II_n(\delta)| \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}/2\sigma^2) \\ &\leq \frac{2}{\tilde{\varepsilon}} E(|I_n(\varepsilon, \delta)|) + P(|II_n(\delta)| \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}/2\sigma^2) \\ &\leq \frac{2\kappa_4^2}{\tilde{\varepsilon}} E(Z_1^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{|Z_1| > \varepsilon/\delta\}}) + P(|II_n(\delta)| \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}/2\sigma^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\varepsilon, \tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$  are fixed. Because of  $II_n(\delta) \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $E(Z_1^2) < \infty$  the right-hand side of this inequality can be made arbitrarily small for all large  $n$  by choosing  $\delta$  sufficiently small. This concludes the proof of  $(\text{CLB}_{K_n}^d)$ .

*Step 2.* We now turn to the proof of  $(\text{N}_{K_n}^d)$  and show

$$(6.3) \quad K_n \sum_{k=1}^n E(X_k X_k^T | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) K_n^T \rightarrow \sigma^4 \Sigma \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For all  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$K_n \sum_{k=1}^n E(X_k X_k^T | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) K_n^T = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E(Z_k U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T Z_k | \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T$$

so that (6.3) follows from

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \rightarrow \sigma^2 \Sigma \quad \text{in probability as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For all  $n \geq 1$  we obtain from (6.1)

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n B^{k-1} U_0 U_0^T (B^{k-1})^T + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n B^{k-1} U_0 \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} B^{j-1} W_{k-j} \right)^T \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} B^{j-1} W_{k-j} \right) U_0^T (B^{k-1})^T \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} B^{j-1} W_{k-j} \right) \left( \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} B^{j-1} W_{k-j} \right)^T \\ & =: I_{1,n} + I_{2,n} + I_{3,n} + I_{4,n}. \end{aligned}$$

For all  $n \geq 1$ , let  $G_{1,n}(I) = B^{n-1} U_0 U_0^T (B^{n-1})^T$ . Then

$$\|G_{1,n}(I)\|_F \leq \|B^{n-1}\|_F \|U_0\|^2 \|B^{n-1}\|_F \leq \|B^{n-1}\|_F^2 \|U_0\|^2 \rightarrow 0$$

everywhere because  $\kappa_1 < \infty$  so that

$$\|I_{1,n}\|_F = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n G_{1,k}(I) \right\|_F \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|G_{1,k}(I)\|_F \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{everywhere}$$

which implies  $I_{1,n} \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Our next aim is to show that  $I_{2,n} \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $n \geq 1$ , let  $G_{2,n}(I) = B^{n-1}U_0 \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} B^{j-1}W_{n-j} \right)^T$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|G_{2,n}(I)\|_F &\leq \|B^{n-1}\|_F \|U_0\| \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} B^{j-1}W_{n-j} \right\| \\ &\leq \|B^{n-1}\|_F \|U_0\| \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|B^{j-1}\|_F |Z_{n-j}| \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} E(\|G_{2,n}(I)\|_F) &\leq \|B^{n-1}\|_F E(\|U_0\|) E(|Z_1|) \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|B^{j-1}\|_F \\ &\leq \|B^{n-1}\|_F E(\|U_0\|) E(|Z_1|) \kappa_1 \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because  $\kappa_1 < \infty$ . Consequently,

$$E(\|I_{2,n}\|_F) = E\left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n G_{2,k}(I) \right\|_F\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E(\|G_{2,k}(I)\|_F) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

which proves  $I_{2,n} \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Because of  $I_{3,n} = I_{2,n}^T$  we also have  $I_{3,n} \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, it remains to consider  $I_{4,n}$ . For all  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{4,n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j,m=1}^{k-1} B^{j-1}W_{k-j}W_{k-m}^T (B^{m-1})^T \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j,m=1}^{k-1} B^{k-j-1}W_jW_m^T (B^{k-m-1})^T \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j,m=1}^{k-1} B^{k-j-1}\tilde{I}_d (B^{k-m-1})^T Z_jZ_m \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} B^{k-j-1}\tilde{I}_d (B^{k-j-1})^T Z_j^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq j < m \leq k-1} B^{k-j-1}\tilde{I}_d (B^{k-m-1})^T Z_jZ_m \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{1 \leq m < j \leq k-1} B^{k-j-1}\tilde{I}_d (B^{k-m-1})^T Z_jZ_m =: II_{1,n} + II_{2,n} + II_{3,n}. \end{aligned}$$

We will examine  $II_{3,n}$  first. For all  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
II_{3,n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=2}^{k-1} \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} B^{k-1-j} \tilde{I}_d (B^{k-1-m})^T Z_j Z_m \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \sum_{k=j+1}^n \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} B^{k-1-j} \tilde{I}_d (B^{k-1-m})^T Z_j Z_m \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} \left( \sum_{k=j+1}^n B^{k-j-1} \tilde{I}_d (B^{k-m-1})^T \right) Z_j Z_m =: \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} M_n(j, m) Z_j Z_m,
\end{aligned}$$

with deterministic  $d \times d$ -matrices  $M_n(j, m)$ . Now for all  $n \geq 2$

$$E(\|II_{3,n}\|_F^2) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{p,q=1}^d E \left( \left( \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} M_n(j, m)_{p,q} Z_m \right] Z_j \right)^2 \right).$$

Since the  $Z_j$  are independent with mean zero we obtain for  $1 \leq j' < j$  that

$$\begin{aligned}
&E \left( \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{j'-1} M_n(j', m)_{p,q} Z_m \right] Z_{j'} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} M_n(j, m)_{p,q} Z_m \right] Z_j \right) \\
&= E \left( \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{j'-1} M_n(j', m)_{p,q} Z_m \right] Z_{j'} \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} M_n(j, m)_{p,q} Z_m \right] \right) E(Z_j) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

and likewise for  $1 \leq j < j'$ . Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\|II_{3,n}\|_F^2) &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{p,q=1}^d \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} E \left( \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} M_n(j, m)_{p,q} Z_m \right]^2 Z_j^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \sum_{p,q=1}^d \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} E \left( \left[ \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} M_n(j, m)_{p,q} Z_m \right]^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \sum_{p,q=1}^d \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} E \left( \left[ M_n(j, m)_{p,q} Z_m \right]^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \sum_{p,q=1}^d \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} M_n(j, m)_{p,q}^2 E(Z_m^2) = \frac{\sigma^4}{n^2} \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} \|M_n(j, m)\|_F^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the next to the last equation follows as before from the independence of the  $Z_j$  and  $E(Z_j) = 0$ . Now for all  $2 \leq j \leq n-1$  and  $1 \leq m \leq j-1$

$$\|M_n(j, m)\|_F \leq \sum_{k=j+1}^n \|B^{k-j-1}\|_F \|\tilde{I}_d\|_F \|(B^{k-m-1})^T\|_F$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k=j+1}^n \|B^{k-j-1}\|_F \|B^{k-m-1}\|_F = \sum_{\ell=0}^{n-j-1} \|B^\ell\|_F \|B^{\ell+j-m}\|_F \\
&\leq \|B^{j-m}\|_F \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \|B^\ell\|_F^2 = \kappa_2 \|B^{j-m}\|_F.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this bound we obtain for all  $n \geq 1$

$$E(\|II_{3,n}\|_F^2) \leq \sigma^4 \kappa_2^2 \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \sum_{m=1}^{j-1} \|B^{j-m}\|_F^2 \leq \sigma^4 \kappa_2^3 \frac{1}{n}$$

which proves  $II_{3,n} \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Because of  $II_{2,n} = II_{3,n}^T$  we also have  $II_{2,n} \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . It remains to consider

$$II_{1,n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T Z_{k-j-1}^2.$$

For this, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
II_{1,n} - \sigma^2 \Sigma &= II_{1,n} - \sigma^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T (Z_{k-j-1}^2 - \sigma^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=k-1}^{\infty} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T =: III_{1,n} - \sigma^2 III_{2,n}.
\end{aligned}$$

As for the deterministic  $III_{2,n}$ , let, for  $n \geq 1$ ,  $G_{2,n}(III) = \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T$ . Then

$$\|G_{2,n}(III)\|_F \leq \sum_{j=n-1}^{\infty} \|B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T\|_F \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

because  $\kappa_2 < \infty$  so that

$$\|III_{2,n}\|_F = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n G_{2,k}(III) \right\|_F \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|G_{2,k}(III)\|_F \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

It remains to show that  $III_{1,n} \rightarrow 0$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For this, we set  $V_j = Z_j^2 - \sigma^2$  for all  $j \geq 1$ . These random variables are i.i.d. and integrable with mean zero. For all  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
III_{1,n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T V_{k-j-1} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} B^{k-j-1} \tilde{I}_d (B^{k-j-1})^T V_j \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k=j+1}^n B^{k-j-1} \tilde{I}_d (B^{k-j-1})^T V_j =: \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} R_n(j) V_j,
\end{aligned}$$

with deterministic  $d \times d$ -matrices  $R_n(j)$ . Because of  $E(V_j) = 0$  for all  $j \geq 1$ , for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $0 < c < \infty$  we can write

$$\begin{aligned} III_{1,n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} R_n(j) [V_j 1_{\{|V_j| \leq c\}} - E(V_j 1_{\{|V_j| \leq c\}})] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} R_n(j) V_j 1_{\{|V_j| > c\}} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} R_n(j) E(V_j 1_{\{|V_j| > c\}}) \\ &=: IV_{1,n} + IV_{2,n} - IV_{3,n}. \end{aligned}$$

For all  $n \geq 2$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n-1$  we have

$$\|R_n(j)\|_F \leq \sum_{k=j+1}^n \|B^{k-j-1}\|_F \|\tilde{I}_d\|_F \|(B^{k-j-1})^T\|_F = \sum_{k=j+1}^n \|B^{k-j-1}\|_F^2 \leq \kappa_2.$$

This bound yields for all  $n \geq 1$

$$E(\|IV_{2,n}\|_F) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|R_n(j)\|_F E(|V_1| 1_{\{|V_1| > c\}}) \leq \kappa_2 E(|V_1| 1_{\{|V_1| > c\}})$$

and

$$\|IV_{3,n}\|_F \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|R_n(j)\|_F E(|V_1| 1_{\{|V_1| > c\}}) \leq \kappa_2 E(|V_1| 1_{\{|V_1| > c\}}).$$

To produce a bound for  $IV_{1,n}$  we set  $V_j(c) = V_j 1_{\{|V_j| \leq c\}} - E(V_j 1_{\{|V_j| \leq c\}})$  and get

$$\begin{aligned} E(\|IV_{1,n}\|_F^2) &= \frac{1}{n^2} E\left(\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} R_n(j) V_j(c)\right\|_F^2\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{p,q=1}^d E\left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} R_n(j)_{p,q} V_j(c)\right)^2\right) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{p,q=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} E\left(R_n(j)_{p,q}^2 V_j(c)^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that the  $R_n(j)_{p,q}$  are deterministic and the random variables  $V_j(c)$  are independent with mean zero. Because of  $|V_j(c)| \leq 2c$  we obtain

$$E(\|IV_{1,n}\|_F^2) \leq 4c^2 \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|R_n(j)\|_F^2 \leq 4c^2 \kappa_2^2 \frac{1}{n}.$$

Combining the bounds established so far we arrive at

$$E(\|III_{1,n}\|_F) \leq E(\|IV_{1,n}\|_F) + E(\|IV_{2,n}\|_F) + \|IV_{3,n}\|_F$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq E \left( \|IV_{1,n}\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} + E \left( \|IV_{2,n}\|_F \right) + \|IV_{3,n}\|_F \\
&\leq 2c\kappa_2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + 2\kappa_2 E \left( |V_1| 1_{\{|V_1|>c\}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

for every  $0 < c < \infty$ . Because of  $E(|V_1|) < \infty$  the right-hand side of this inequality can be made arbitrarily small for all sufficiently large  $n$  by choosing  $c$  large enough. This proves  $E(\|III_{1,n}\|_F) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $III_{1,n} \rightarrow 0$  in probability follows. This concludes the proof of (6.4) and therefore of (6.3).

*Step 3.* Corollary 3.2 now implies

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} Z_k = K_n \sum_{k=1}^n X_k \rightarrow \sigma^2 \Sigma^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-mixing as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

To complete the proof of the theorem we will rely on the following fact: Let  $\tilde{X}, \tilde{X}_n, n \geq 1$ , be  $d$ -dimensional random vectors defined on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ , let  $\Omega_n \in \mathcal{F}, n \geq 1$ , be events with  $P(\Omega_n) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and let  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -field of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(6.6) \quad \tilde{X}_n \rightarrow \tilde{X} \quad \mathcal{G}\text{-mixing} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \tilde{X}_n 1_{\Omega_n} \rightarrow \tilde{X} \quad \mathcal{G}\text{-mixing}.$$

This follows from Theorem 3.18 (a) in [5] because for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have  $P\left(\left\|\tilde{X}_n - \tilde{X}_n 1_{\Omega_n}\right\| \geq \varepsilon\right) \leq P(\Omega_n^c) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  so that  $\left\|\tilde{X}_n - \tilde{X}_n 1_{\Omega_n}\right\| \rightarrow 0$  in probability. We will apply (6.6) with  $\Omega_n = \left\{\det\left(\sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T\right) > 0\right\}$  for  $n \geq 1$ , for which

$$P(\Omega_n^c) \leq P\left(\left|\det\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T\right) - \det(\sigma^2 \Sigma)\right| > \frac{1}{2} \det(\sigma^2 \Sigma)\right) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  by (6.4) because the determinant of a matrix is a continuous function of the matrix components. Define  $f : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  by

$$f(D, x) = \begin{cases} D^{-1}x & , \quad D \in \text{GL}(d, \mathbb{R}), \\ 0 & , \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then  $f$  is Borel measurable and continuous at every point in the open subset  $\text{GL}(d, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . We have on  $\Omega_n$

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\theta}_n - \theta &= \left( \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} Y_k - \theta \\
&= \left( \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} (U_{k-1}^T \theta + Z_k) - \theta
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \left( \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \right)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} Z_k$$

because  $\sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T$  is invertible so that still on  $\Omega_n$

$$\sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta) = f \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} Z_k \right) =: C_n$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \right)^{1/2} (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta) &= f \left( \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \right)^{1/2}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} Z_k \right) \\ &=: D_n. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (6.4), (6.5) and Theorem 3.18 (b) in [5] that

$$\left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} Z_k \right) \rightarrow (\sigma^2 \Sigma, \sigma^2 \Sigma^{1/2} N_d) \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-mixing}$$

and, using the continuity of the square root of positive semidefinite matrices,

$$\left( \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \right)^{1/2}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} Z_k \right) \rightarrow (\sigma \Sigma^{1/2}, \sigma^2 \Sigma^{1/2} N_d) \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-mixing}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Using Theorem 3.18 (c) in [5], this yields

$$C_n \rightarrow f(\sigma^2 \Sigma, \sigma^2 \Sigma^{1/2} N_d) \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-mixing}$$

and

$$D_n \rightarrow f(\sigma \Sigma^{1/2}, \sigma^2 \Sigma^{1/2} N_d) \quad \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-mixing}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Second proof of Theorem 6.1.* As explained above, the second proof of Theorem 6.1 exploits stationarity and ergodicity of the autoregressive model.

From now on we work with a bilateral i.i.d. sequence  $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  with  $Z_1 \in \mathcal{L}^2(P)$ ,  $E(Z_1) = 0$  and  $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}(Z_1) \in (0, \infty)$  (which represents a bilateral extension of the sequence of innovations  $(Z_n)_{n \geq 1}$ ). Let  $W_n = (Z_n, 0, \dots, 0)^T$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Recall the dynamics

$$U_n = U_n(U_0) = B^n U_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n B^{j-1} W_{n+1-j} =: B^n U_0 + L_n, \quad n \geq 0,$$

established in (6.1), where the summand  $L_n$  is independent of the initial value  $U_0$ . The random variable  $\bar{U}_0 = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B^j W_{-j}$  is well-defined by the argument which proved (6.2) and satisfies the integrability and independence assumptions on the initial values of the  $U_n$ -process. Write  $\bar{U}_n = U_n(\bar{U}_0)$  for  $n \geq 0$  so that  $(\bar{U}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is the  $U_n$ -process for the initial value  $\bar{U}_0$ .

*Step 1.* The processes  $(\bar{U}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  and  $(\bar{U}_{n-1} Z_n)_{n \geq 1}$  are stationary and ergodic.

To see this we apply Lemma A.3 with  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}) = (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ ,  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B}) = (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  and  $T_2 = \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $\mathbb{N}$ , respectively. Note that for  $n \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_n &= B^n \bar{U}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n B^{j-1} W_{n-(j-1)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B^{n+j} W_{-j} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} B^k W_{n-k} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B^{n+j} W_{n-(n+j)} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} B^k W_{n-k} = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} B^k W_{n-k} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} B^k W_{n-k} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B^k W_{n-k} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B^k e_1 Z_{n-k} \end{aligned}$$

almost surely, where  $e_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$  (moving average representation of  $\bar{U}_n$ ). This suggests the choice  $\Lambda = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} : \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|B\|_B^j |x_j| < \infty \right\}$  and  $f : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B^j e_1 x_j & , \quad x \in \Lambda \\ 0 & , \quad x \notin \Lambda. \end{cases}$$

Then clearly  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ ,  $P\left(\left((Z_j)_{j \geq 0} \in \Lambda\right)\right) = P\left(\left((Z_{n-j})_{j \geq 0} \in \Lambda\right)\right) = 1$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $f$  is measurable. We obtain  $\bar{U}_n = f\left(\left((Z_{n-j})_{j \geq 0}\right)\right)$  almost surely for  $n \geq 0$ . Since  $(Z_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is stationary and ergodic (cf. [8], Proposition 4.5 or [7], Example 20.26), this yields stationarity and ergodicity of  $(\bar{U}_n)_{n \geq 0}$  by Lemma A.3. Next choose  $f_1 : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $f_1(x) = x_0 f(S^{\mathbb{N}_0}(x))$ . Then

$$f_1\left(\left((Z_{n-j})_{j \geq 0}\right)\right) = Z_n f\left(\left((Z_{n-1-j})_{j \geq 0}\right)\right) = Z_n \bar{U}_{n-1}$$

almost surely for  $n \geq 1$  which again by Lemma A.3 yields stationarity and ergodicity of  $(\bar{U}_{n-1} Z_n)_{n \geq 1}$ .

*Step 2.* We also need the following asymptotic equivalences between the process  $\bar{U}_n = U_n(\bar{U}_0)$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , and the process  $U_n = U_n(U_0)$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , with an arbitrary initial value  $U_0$ , namely

$$(6.7) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n U_{j-1} U_{j-1}^T - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{U}_{j-1} \bar{U}_{j-1}^T \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{almost surely}$$

and

$$(6.8) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n U_{j-1} Z_j - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{U}_{j-1} Z_j \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{almost surely}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

As for (6.7), let  $G_n = U_{n-1} U_{n-1}^T - \bar{U}_{n-1} \bar{U}_{n-1}^T$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} G_n &= B^{n-1} \left( U_0 U_0^T - \bar{U}_0 \bar{U}_0^T \right) (B^{n-1})^T + B^{n-1} (U_0 - \bar{U}_0) L_{n-1}^T \\ &\quad + L_{n-1} \left( U_0^T - \bar{U}_0^T \right) (B^{n-1})^T \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\|G_n\|_F \leq \|B^{n-1}\|_F^2 (\|U_0\|^2 + \|\bar{U}_0\|^2) + 2\|B^{n-1}\|_F (\|U_0\| + \|\bar{U}_0\|) \|L_{n-1}\|.$$

Using

$$\|L_{n-1}\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|B^{j-1}\|_F \|W_{n-j}\| = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|B^{j-1}\|_F |Z_{n-j}|,$$

we find

$$E(\|L_{n-1}\|) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \|B^{j-1}\|_F E(|Z_{n-j}|) \leq \kappa_1 E(|Z_1|) < \infty$$

so that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E(\|B^{n-1}\|_F \|L_{n-1}\|) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|B^{n-1}\|_F E(\|L_{n-1}\|) \leq \kappa_1^2 E(|Z_1|) < \infty.$$

This yields  $\|B^{n-1}\|_F \|L_{n-1}\| \rightarrow 0$  almost surely. Combined with  $\|B^{n-1}\|_F^2 \rightarrow 0$  we obtain  $\|G_n\|_F \rightarrow 0$  almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Consequently,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n U_{j-1} U_{j-1}^T - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{U}_{j-1} \bar{U}_{j-1}^T \right\|_F = \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n G_j \right\|_F \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|G_j\|_F \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

As for (6.8) we have for  $n \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n U_{j-1} Z_j - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{U}_{j-1} Z_j &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n (U_{j-1} - \bar{U}_{j-1}) Z_j \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n B^{j-1} (U_0 - \bar{U}_0) Z_j \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n U_{j-1} Z_j - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{U}_{j-1} Z_j \right\| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \|B^{j-1}\|_F (\|U_0\| + \|\bar{U}_0\|) |Z_j| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\|U_0\| + \|\bar{U}_0\|) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \|B^{j-1}\|_F |Z_j| \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in view of (6.2).

From Step 1 we know that  $(\bar{U}_{n-1} Z_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is stationary and ergodic, and it is a martingale difference sequence w.r.t. the filtration  $(\mathcal{G}_n)_{n \geq 0}$ , where  $\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma(U_0, Z_j, j \in \mathbb{Z}, j \leq n)$ , with  $E(\|\bar{U}_0 Z_1\|^2) = E(\|\bar{U}_0\|^2) E(Z_1^2) < \infty$  by independence of  $\bar{U}_0$  and  $Z_1$  and  $E(\|\bar{U}_0\|^2) < \infty$  and  $E(Z_1^2) = \sigma^2 < \infty$ . Therefore, by Corollary 3.3,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \bar{U}_{k-1} Z_k \rightarrow E(\bar{U}_0 Z_1 (\bar{U}_0 Z_1)^T)^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{G}_\infty\text{-mixing as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_\infty = \sigma(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_n)$ , with  $E(\bar{U}_0 Z_1 (\bar{U}_0 Z_1)^T) = E(Z_1^2) E(\bar{U}_0 \bar{U}_0^T) = \sigma^4 \Sigma$  so that

$$(6.9) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \bar{U}_{k-1} Z_k \rightarrow \sigma^2 \Sigma^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{G}_\infty\text{-mixing as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

From (6.9) and (6.8) we obtain for  $U_n = U_n(U_0)$  with an arbitrary initial value  $U_0$  by an application of Theorem 3.18 (a) in [5]

$$(6.10) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} Z_k \rightarrow \sigma^2 \Sigma^{1/2} N_d \quad \mathcal{G}_\infty\text{-mixing and hence } \mathcal{F}_\infty\text{-mixing}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  since  $\mathcal{F}_\infty \subset \mathcal{G}_\infty$ . Furthermore, Step 1 and the ergodic theorem (cf. Theorem A.4 with  $X = \bar{U}$ ,  $T = \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $f : (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,  $f(x) = \pi_0(x) \pi_0(x)^T$ , where  $\pi_0 : (\mathbb{R}^d)^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\pi_0(x) = x_0$  and  $\|f(\bar{U})\|_F \leq \|\bar{U}_0\|^2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(P)$ ) imply

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{U}_{j-1} \bar{U}_{j-1}^T = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \bar{U}_j \bar{U}_j^T \rightarrow E(\bar{U}_0 \bar{U}_0^T) = \sigma^2 \Sigma \quad \text{almost surely as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

so that by (6.7)

$$(6.11) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \rightarrow \sigma^2 \Sigma \quad \text{almost surely as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Step 3.* The remaining part of the proof is the same as Step 3 in the first proof of Theorem 6.1, because (6.10) is the same as (6.5) and (6.11) can be used instead of (6.4).  $\square$

From the equations

$$\sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T = \sum_{k=1}^m U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T + \sum_{k=m+1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T \quad \text{for all } n > m \geq 1$$

for symmetric and positive semidefinite matrices we see that  $\sum_{k=1}^n U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T$  is positive definite for all  $n \geq m$  whenever  $\sum_{k=1}^m U_{k-1} U_{k-1}^T$  is positive definite. Therefore, the sequence  $(\Omega_n)_{n \geq 1}$  of events appearing in Step 3 the proof of Theorem 6.1 is non-decreasing so that  $P(\Omega_n) < 1$  for all  $n \geq 1$  or  $P(\Omega_n) = 1$  for all  $n \geq n_0$  and some  $n_0 \geq 1$ . The following examples show that both cases do indeed occur.

*Examples 6.2.* 1. Let  $P(U_0 = 0) > 0$  and  $P(Z_1 = 0) > 0$ . For all  $n \geq 1$  we have  $\{Y_n = Y_{n-1} = \dots = Y_1 = Y_0 = \dots = Y_{-d+1} = 0\} \subset \Omega_n^c$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} P(\Omega_n^c) &\geq P(Y_n = Y_{n-1} = \dots = Y_1 = Y_0 = \dots = Y_{-d+1} = 0) \\ &\geq P(Z_n = \dots = Z_1 = 0, U_0 = 0) = P(Z_1 = 0)^n P(U_0 = 0) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

2. For  $n \geq 1$ , let

$$\tilde{Y}_n = \begin{pmatrix} Y_0 & Y_{-1} & \dots & Y_{-d+2} & Y_{-d+1} \\ Y_1 & Y_0 & \dots & Y_{-d+3} & Y_{-d+2} \\ Y_2 & Y_1 & \dots & Y_{-d+4} & Y_{-d+3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ Y_{d-1} & Y_{d-2} & \dots & Y_1 & Y_0 \\ Y_d & Y_{d-1} & \dots & Y_2 & Y_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ Y_{n-1} & Y_{n-2} & \dots & Y_{n-d+1} & Y_{n-d} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U_0^T \\ U_1^T \\ U_2^T \\ \vdots \\ U_{d-1}^T \\ U_d^T \\ \vdots \\ U_{n-1}^T \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then  $\tilde{Y}_n^T \tilde{Y}_n = \sum_{j=1}^n U_{j-1} U_{j-1}^T$  and  $\text{rank}(\tilde{Y}_n) = \text{rank}(\tilde{Y}_n^T \tilde{Y}_n)$ . We consider three cases.

*Case 1.* Assume  $P(Y_0 \neq 0) = 1$  and  $P(Y_{-1} = \dots = Y_{-d+1} = 0) = 1$ . Then with probability one  $\tilde{Y}_d$  is a lower triangular matrix with all diagonal elements different from zero so that  $\text{rank}(\tilde{Y}_d) = d$  almost surely which implies  $P(\Omega_d) = 1$ , whence  $P(\Omega_n) = 1$  for all  $n \geq d$ .

*Case 2.* Assume  $P(U_0 = 0) = 1$  and  $P(Z_1 \neq 0) = 1$ . Then  $Y_1 = U_0^T \theta + Z_1 = Z_1 \neq 0$  with probability one so that  $\text{rank}(\tilde{Y}_{d+1}) = d$  almost surely and therefore  $P(\Omega_{d+1}) = 1$ , whence  $P(\Omega_n) = 1$  for all  $n \geq d+1$ .  $\square$



*Case 3.* Assume that  $P^{Z_1}$  is continuous. Then  $\text{rank}(\tilde{Y}_{2d}) = d$  almost surely. In fact, it follows that  $P^{Y_n}$  is continuous for every  $n \geq 1$  and we have  $d \geq \text{rank}(\tilde{Y}_{2d}) \geq \text{rank}(D_d)$ , where  $D_d$  denotes the  $d \times d$ -submatrix of  $\tilde{Y}_{2d}$  consisting of the last  $d$  rows of  $\tilde{Y}_{2d}$ , i.e.

$$D_d = \begin{pmatrix} Y_d & Y_{d-1} & \dots & Y_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ Y_{2d-2} & Y_{2d-3} & \dots & Y_{d-1} \\ Y_{2d-1} & Y_{2d-2} & \dots & Y_d \end{pmatrix}.$$

In order to show that  $\text{rank}(D_d) = d$  almost surely consider for  $1 \leq j \leq d$  the  $j \times j$ -submatrices  $F_j$  of  $D_d$  given by

$$F_j = \begin{pmatrix} Y_j & Y_{j-1} & \dots & Y_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ Y_{2j-2} & Y_{2j-3} & \dots & Y_{j-1} \\ Y_{2j-1} & Y_{2j-2} & \dots & Y_j \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $F_d = D_d$ , and let  $\Lambda_j = \{\det(F_j) \neq 0\}$ . Then by induction,  $P(\Lambda_j) = 1$  for every  $1 \leq j \leq d$  since  $\Lambda_1 = \{Y_1 \neq 0\}$  and  $P(Y_1 \neq 0) = 1$  and assuming  $P(\Lambda_{j-1}) = 1$  for some  $2 \leq j \leq d$ , we obtain by Laplace expansion of  $\det(F_j)$  along the last row of  $F_j$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_j^c \cap \Lambda_{j-1} &= \{\det(F_j) = 0\} \cap \Lambda_{j-1} \\ &= \left\{ Y_{2j-1} (-1)^{j+1} \det(F_{j-1}) + f_1(Y_1, \dots, Y_{2j-2}) = 0 \right\} \cap \Lambda_{j-1} \\ &= \{Y_{2j-1} + f_2(Y_1, \dots, Y_{2j-2}) = 0\} \cap \Lambda_{j-1} \\ &= \{\vartheta_1 Y_{2j-2} + \dots + \vartheta_d Y_{2j-1-d} + Z_{2j-1} + f_2(Y_1, \dots, Y_{2j-2}) = 0\} \cap \Lambda_{j-1} \\ &= \{Z_{2j-1} = f_3(Y_m, \dots, Y_{2j-2})\} \cap \Lambda_{j-1} \subset \{Z_{2j-1} = f_3(Y_m, \dots, Y_{2j-2})\} \end{aligned}$$

for  $m = (2j - 1 - d) \wedge 1$  and certain Borel measurable functions  $f_1, f_2 : \mathbb{R}^{2j-2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $f_3 : \mathbb{R}^s \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $s = 2j - 1 - m = 2j - 2$  if  $2j - 2 \geq d$  and  $s = d$  if  $2j - 2 \leq d - 1$  so that by independence of  $Z_{2j-1}$  and  $(Y_m, \dots, Y_{2j-2})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\Lambda_j^c) &= P(\Lambda_j^c \cap \Lambda_{j-1}) \leq P(Z_{2j-1} = f_3(Y_m, \dots, Y_{2j-2})) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^s} P(Z_{2j-1} = f_3(y_1, \dots, y_s)) dP^{(Y_m, \dots, Y_{2j-2})}(y_1, \dots, y_s) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies  $P(\Omega_{2d}^c) \leq P(\Lambda_d^c) = 0$  and thus  $P(\Omega_n) = 1$  for all  $n \geq 2d$ .  $\square$

Finally, invertibility of the matrix  $\Sigma$  is shown in the following lemma which already occurs in [1], Lemma 5.5.5.

**Lemma 6.3** *The matrix  $\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T$  is positive definite. Consequently,  $\Sigma = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T + \sum_{j=d}^{\infty} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T$  is positive definite as well and hence invertible.*

*Proof.* Since  $\tilde{I}_d$  is symmetric and idempotent,  $B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T = B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j \tilde{I}_d)^T$  so that  $u^T B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T u = \left\| (B^j \tilde{I}_d)^T u \right\|^2$  for every  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Moreover, the first row of  $(B^j \tilde{I}_d)^T$  is given by the transposed first column of  $B^j$  denoted by  $(B^j)_{\bullet,1}$  while all other rows of  $(B^j \tilde{I}_d)^T$  are zero which implies  $\left\| (B^j \tilde{I}_d)^T u \right\|^2 = \langle (B^j)_{\bullet,1}, u \rangle^2$ . Consequently, we obtain for every  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$u^T \left( \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T \right) u = \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} u^T B^j \tilde{I}_d (B^j)^T u = \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} \langle (B^j)_{\bullet,1}, u \rangle^2.$$

For every  $j = 0, \dots, d-1$  the first column of the  $d \times d$ -matrix  $B^j$  satisfies  $(B^j)_{j+1,1} = 1$  and  $(B^j)_{j+k,1} = 0$  for  $k = 2, \dots, d-j$ . This follows by induction from  $(B^0)_{\bullet,1} = (I_d)_{\bullet,1} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)^T$  and

$$(B^{j+1})_{\bullet,1} = (BB^j)_{\bullet,1} = \left( \langle \theta, (B^j)_{\bullet,1} \rangle, (B^j)_{11}, \dots, (B^j)_{d-1,1} \right)^T.$$

Now assume  $\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \langle (B^j)_{\bullet,1}, u \rangle^2 = 0$  for some  $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Hence  $\langle (B^j)_{\bullet,1}, u \rangle = 0$  for every  $j = 0, \dots, d-1$  or equivalently  $Du = 0$ , where the  $j$ -th row of the  $d \times d$ -matrix  $D$  denoted by  $D_{j\bullet}$  is given by  $D_{j\bullet} = ((B^{j-1})_{\bullet,1})^T$  for  $j = 1, \dots, d$ . Then  $D$  is a lower triangular matrix with all diagonal elements equal to 1 so that  $\det(D) = 1 \neq 0$ . We conclude that  $u = 0$  is the only solution of the equation  $Du = 0$ .  $\square$

## Appendix

We recall some basic facts about stationarity and ergodicity of random processes. Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A})$  denote a measurable space and let  $T \in \{\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{Z}\}$ . The shift  $S = S^T$  on  $\mathcal{X}^T$  is defined by  $S(x) = S((x_n)_{n \in T}) = (x_{n+1})_{n \in T}$ . It is  $(\mathcal{A}^T, \mathcal{A}^T)$ -measurable. Let  $\mathcal{A}^T(S) = \{A \in \mathcal{A}^T : S^{-1}(A) = A\}$  denote the  $\sigma$ -field of invariant (more precisely,  $S$ -invariant) measurable subsets of  $\mathcal{X}^T$ . Let  $X = (X_n)_{n \in T}$  be an  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued process defined on some probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  and note that  $X$  can be seen as an  $\mathcal{X}^T$ -valued random vector. The process  $X$  is called (*strictly*) *stationary* if  $P^{S(X)} = P^X$  and *ergodic* if  $P^X(\mathcal{A}^T(S)) = \{0, 1\}$ .

In the sequel let  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{B})$  be a further measurable space and let  $T_1, T_2 \in \{\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{Z}\}$ .

**Lemma A.1** *Let  $g : \mathcal{X}^{T_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{T_2}$  be an  $(\mathcal{A}^{T_1}, \mathcal{B}^{T_2})$ -measurable map which is equivariant in the sense of  $g \circ S^{T_1} = S^{T_2} \circ g$ . Then, if  $X = (X_n)_{n \in T_1}$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued stationary process, the  $\mathcal{Y}$ -valued process  $Y := g(X)$  is stationary. If  $X$  is ergodic, then  $Y$  is ergodic.*

Here the equation  $Y = g(X)$  means

$$Y_n = \pi_n^{T_2}(Y) = \pi_n^{T_2}(g(X)) = (\pi_n^{T_2} \circ g)(X) =: g_n(X) = g_n((X_n)_{n \in T_1})$$

for all  $n \in T_2$ , where  $\pi_n^{T_2} : \mathcal{Y}^{T_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  denote the projections on  $\mathcal{Y}^{T_2}$ .

*Proof.* (see [6], Lemma A1.1) Assume that  $X$  is stationary. Then

$$P^{S^{T_2}(Y)} = P^{S^{T_2} \circ g(X)} = P^{g \circ S^{T_1}(X)} = \left( P^{S^{T_1}(X)} \right)^g = (P^X)^g = P^{g(X)} = P^Y$$

so that  $Y$  is stationary. Next we note that  $g^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{T_2}(S^{T_2})) \subset \mathcal{A}^{T_1}(S^{T_1})$ . In fact, if  $H \in \mathcal{B}^{T_2}(S^{T_2})$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} (S^{T_1})^{-1}(g^{-1}(H)) &= (g \circ S^{T_1})^{-1}(H) = (S^{T_2} \circ g)^{-1}(H) = g^{-1}\left((S^{T_2})^{-1}(H)\right) \\ &= g^{-1}(H). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if  $X$  is ergodic, then

$$P^Y(\mathcal{B}^{T_2}(S^{T_2})) = P^X(g^{-1}(\mathcal{B}^{T_2}(S^{T_2}))) \subset P^X(\mathcal{A}^{T_1}(S^{T_1})) = \{0, 1\}$$

which shows that  $Y$  is ergodic.  $\square$

Equivariance of  $g = (g_n)_{n \in T_2}$  may be read as follows.

**Lemma A.2** *Assume  $T_1 = \mathbb{Z}$  if  $T_2 = \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $g : \mathcal{X}^{T_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{T_2}$  be measurable and let  $S = S^{T_1}$ .*

(a) *Let  $T_2 \in \{\mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Then  $g$  is equivariant if and only if  $g_n = h \circ S^n$  for every  $n \in T_2$  and some measurable map  $h : \mathcal{X}^{T_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ . The same holds true in case  $T_2 = \mathbb{N}$  and  $T_1 = \mathbb{Z}$ .*

(b) *Let  $T_2 = \mathbb{N}$  and  $T_1 \in \{\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_0\}$ . Then  $g$  is equivariant if and only if  $g_n = h \circ S^{n-1}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and some measurable map  $h : \mathcal{X}^{T_1} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ . A sufficient condition for equivariance of  $g$  is  $g_n = h \circ S^n$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and some measurable map  $h$ .*

*Proof.* Note that equivariance of  $g$  means that  $g_n \circ S = g_{n+1}$  for every  $n \in T_2$ . In any case, the condition  $g_n = h \circ S^n$  for every  $n \in T_2$  implies equivariance of  $g$ . In fact, we obtain

$$g_{n+1} = h \circ S^{n+1} = h \circ S^n \circ S = g_n \circ S$$

for every  $n \in T_2$  so that  $g$  is equivariant. Also the condition  $g_n = h \circ S^{n-1}$  for every  $n \in T_2 = \mathbb{N}$  implies equivariance of  $g$  since

$$g_{n+1} = h \circ S^n = h \circ S^{n-1} \circ S = g_n \circ S$$

for every  $n \in T_2$ .

(a) Assume that  $g$  is equivariant. Let  $T_2 \in \{\mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Then we obtain from  $g_{n+1} = g_n \circ S$ ,  $n \in T_2$  by induction  $g_n = g_0 \circ S^n$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . If  $T_2 = \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $T_1 = \mathbb{Z}$  and by induction  $g_{-n} \circ S^n = g_0$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  so that  $g_{-n} = g_0 \circ S^{-n}$  for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  since  $S = S^{\mathbb{Z}}$  is bijective. If  $T_2 = \mathbb{N}$  and  $T_1 = \mathbb{Z}$ , then by induction  $g_n = g_1 \circ S^{n-1}$ ,  $n \in T_2 = \mathbb{N}$ . Choosing  $h = g_1 \circ S^{-1}$  yields  $g_n = h \circ S^n$  for every  $n \in T_2 = \mathbb{N}$ .

(b) If  $g$  is equivariant, then by induction  $g_n = g_1 \circ S^{n-1}$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . □

As a consequence we obtain the following preservation of stationarity and ergodicity.

**Lemma A.3** *Let  $T_1 = \mathbb{Z}$  and let  $X = (X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be an  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued stationary and ergodic process. Let  $f : \mathcal{X}^{\mathbb{N}_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  be an  $(\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}_0}, \mathcal{B})$ -measurable map and let  $Y_n = f\left((X_{n-j})_{j \geq 0}\right)$  for every  $n \in T_2$ . Then  $Y = (Y_n)_{n \in T_2}$  is stationary and ergodic.*

*Proof.* The map  $\varphi : \mathcal{X}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$ ,  $\varphi(x) = (x_{-j})_{j \geq 0}$  is  $(\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}_0})$ -measurable since  $\pi_j^{\mathbb{N}_0}(\varphi(x)) = x_{-j} = \pi_{-j}^{\mathbb{Z}}(x)$  for  $j \geq 0$ , where  $\pi_j^{\mathbb{N}_0}$  and  $\pi_{-j}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  are projections on  $\mathcal{X}^{\mathbb{N}_0}$  and  $\mathcal{X}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ , respectively, and  $\pi_{-j}^{\mathbb{Z}}$  is  $(\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{A})$ -measurable. Define  $g = (g_n)_{n \in T_2} : \mathcal{X}^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{T_2}$  by  $g_n = f \circ \varphi \circ (S^{\mathbb{Z}})^n$ . Then  $g$  is equivariant by Lemma A.2 and we have  $g_n(x) = f\left((x_{n-j})_{j \geq 0}\right)$  for every  $x \in \mathcal{X}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ ,  $n \in T_2$  so that  $Y = g(X)$ . The assertion follows from Lemma A.1. □

The pointwise ergodic theorem of Birkhoff in this setting reads as follows. Let  $T \in \{\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{Z}\}$  and let  $\mathcal{I} := \mathcal{A}^T(S)$ , where  $S = S^T$ .

**Theorem A.4** (*Ergodic theorem, Birkhoff*) *Let  $X = (X_n)_{n \in T}$  be an  $\mathcal{X}$ -valued stationary process. If  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(P^X)$ , then*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f\left((X_{k+j})_{k \in T}\right) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f \circ S^j(X) \rightarrow E_{P^X}(f|\mathcal{I}) \circ X = E(f(X)|\mathcal{I}_X)$$

*almost surely as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  with  $\mathcal{I}_X = X^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ . The same holds true for measurable maps  $f : \mathcal{X}^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k \times m}$  with  $\|f(X)\|_F \in \mathcal{L}^1(P)$  by componentwise application of the result for real-valued functions  $f$ .*

*Proof.* See [8], Theorem 2.3, or [7], Theorem 20.14. □

Note that by Lemmas A.1 and A.2, the processes  $Y_j = f \circ S^j(X)$ ,  $j \geq 0$  and  $Y_j = f \circ S^{j-1}(X)$ ,  $j \geq 1$  are stationary.

## References

- [1] Anderson, T.W., *The Statistical Analysis of Time Series*. Wiley, New York 1971.
- [2] Brockwell, P.J., Davis, R.A., *Time Series: Theory and Methods*. Springer, New York 1987.
- [3] Conze, J.-P., Raugi, A., Limit theorems for sequential expanding dynamical systems on  $[0,1]$ , *Contemporary mathematics*, 2007, 430, pp. 89-121, hal-00365220
- [4] Crimaldi, I., Pratelli, L., Convergence results for multivariate martingales. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 115 (2005), 571-577.
- [5] Häusler, E., Luschgy, H., *Stable Convergence and Stable Limit Theorems*. Springer, Cham 2015.
- [6] Kallenberg, O., *Probabilistic Symmetries and Invariance Principles*. Springer, New York 2005.
- [7] Klenke, A., *Probability Theory*. Springer, Berlin 2013.
- [8] Krengel, U., *Ergodic Theory*. De Gruyter, Berlin 1985.
- [9] Loynes, R.M., The central limit theorem for backwards martingales. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie Verw. Gebiete* 13 (1969), 1-8.
- [10] Mann, H., Wald, A., On the statistical treatment of linear stochastic difference equations. *Econometrica* 11 (1943), 173-200.
- [11] Schott, J.R., *Matrix Analysis for Statistics* 3ed, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey 2017.