

# AN IMPROVED VERSION OF KAC'S CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM

SUPRIO BHAR, RITWIK MUKHERJEE, AND PRATHMESH PATIL

**ABSTRACT.** The classical Central Limit Theorem (CLT) states that for a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) random variables with finite mean and variance, the normalized sample mean converges to the standard normal distribution.

In 1946, Victor Kac proved a Central Limit type theorem for a sequence of random variables that were not independent. The random variables under consideration were obtained from the angle-doubling map. The idea behind Kac's proof was to show that although the random variables under consideration were not independent, they were what he calls *statistically independent* (in modern terminology, this concept is called long range independence). The final conclusion of his paper was that the sample averages of the random variables, suitably normalized converges to the standard normal distribution.

In the 1970's, Charles Stein revolutionized the field of probability by discovering a new method to obtain the limiting distribution for a sequence of random variables. Among other things, his method gave an alternative proof of the classical Central Limit Theorem.

We obtain an improvement of Victor Kac's result by applying Stein's method. We show that the normalized sample averages converge to the standard normal distribution in the Wasserstein metric, which is stronger than the convergence in distribution.

## CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Overview</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	Overview of Classical Central Limit Theorem	2
2.2	Overview of Kac's Central Limit Theorem	2
<b>3</b>	<b>Main result of this paper</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Acknowledgement</b>	<b>7</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>8</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Two fundamental results in Probability Theory are the Strong Law of Large Numbers and the Central Limit Theorem (see [1, 3]). The former states that the sample averages of a sequence of i.i.d random variables having finite mean, converge almost surely to the mean. The latter states that if in addition, the variance is finite and non zero, then the error is of the order of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ , where  $n$  is the sample size.

It is a natural question to ask what is the situation for random variables that are not independent. A simple example of that is as follows: choose  $\alpha$  in the closed interval  $[0, 1]$  with the uniform distribution. Now consider the sequence of numbers  $\{2^n \alpha\}$  modulo 1. Given a reasonable function  $f$  on  $[0, 1]$ , we can consider the sequence of random variables  $\{f(2^n \cdot)\}$ . The Ergodic Theorem states that for an  $L^1$  function  $f$ , almost surely, the sample averages converge to the integral of  $f$ .

In his paper [5], Victor Kac shows that the rate of this convergence is of the order of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ . More precisely, he shows that a suitable normalized sample average converges (in the sense of convergence in distribution) to the standard normal distribution.

We give an alternative proof of Kac's Theorem by using Stein's method. We show that the normalized

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F05, 37A99.

*Key words and phrases.* Central Limit Theorem, Wasserstein metric, Convergence in Distribution, Berry-Esseen Theorem, Bernoulli Shift process, Stein's Method.

sample averages converge to the standard normal distribution in the Wasserstein metric, which is stronger than the convergence in distribution.

Let us now delve into the details of what we have just described.

## 2. OVERVIEW

**2.1. Overview of Classical Central Limit Theorem.** We will start by reviewing classical CLT. Let  $\{X_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$  be a sequence of i.i.d random variables with finite mean and a finite non-zero variance (which will be denoted as  $\mu$  and  $\sigma^2$  respectively). Let us denote  $A_n$  to be the sample averages of these random variables, when the sample size is  $n$ , namely

$$A_n := \frac{X_0 + X_1 + \dots + X_{n-1}}{n}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

The strong law of large numbers states that almost surely,  $A_n$  converges to  $\mu$  (in this case, it is not necessary to assume that the variance is finite). Next, let us define  $W_n$  to be a suitably normalized sample average given by

$$W_n := \left( \frac{A_n - \mu}{\sigma_n / \sqrt{n}} \right), \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma_n^2$  is the variance of the random variable  $X_0 + X_1 + \dots + X_{n-1}$ . We note that since the random variables are i.i.d,


$$\sigma_n^2 = n\sigma^2. \quad (2)$$

The classical Central Limit Theorem states that  $W_n$  converges in distribution to the standard normal variable. A proof of this Theorem can be found in any standard Probability text book, such as [6, pp 100].

**2.2. Overview of Kac's Central Limit Theorem.** Let us now consider the question considered by Victor Kac in his paper [5]. He investigated the following question: suppose we randomly choose a real number in the closed interval  $[0, 1]$  (with respect to the uniform distribution). Call this number  $\alpha$  and consider the iterates  $\alpha, T\alpha, T^2\alpha$ , where  $T : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the ergodic transformation, given by

$$T(\alpha) := 2\alpha \bmod 1. \quad (3)$$

We shall refer to this map as the ‘angle-doubling’ map ([4, Example 2.4]). In the Ergodic Theory literature, the map  $T$  is also linked to the Bernoulli Shifts (see [4], [7] and [11]).



Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be any  $L^1$  function. Consider the random variables  $X_k^f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , given by

$$X_k^f(\alpha) := f(T^k(\alpha)), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (4)$$

In contrast to the setting of the classical Central Limit Theorem, these random variables are not independent. A natural question to ask is, what can we say about the averages of these random variables? The Ergodic Theorem says that for almost all  $\alpha$ , the sample averages converge to the integral of  $f$ . In his paper [5], Kac shows that even though these random variables are not independent, a conclusion similar to that of the Central Limit Theorem holds (provided we make certain assumptions on the function  $f$ , in terms of decay of the Fourier coefficients). The idea behind his proof is to first show that the conclusion of the theorem holds for a suitable class of step functions  $\varphi$ . He achieves this by showing that the random variables  $X_n^\varphi$  are ‘statistically independent’ (see [5, Section 3]). He then uses an approximation argument to show that the conclusion holds for a more general  $f$  (whose Fourier coefficients satisfy the appropriate decay conditions). In particular, Kac establishes convergence in distribution to the standard normal distribution for a suitably normalized sample average of the collection  $\{X_k^f\}_{k=0}^\infty$ .

In this paper, we apply Stein’s method to the question considered by Kac, namely to the collection of random variables  $\{X_k^f\}_{k=0}^\infty$ . We show that the same normalized average of this collection converges to the standard normal distribution in the **Wasserstein Metric**. The central ingredient of our proof is to invoke a Theorem from Ross’s paper, namely [9, Theorem 3.2, pp. 219]. Since the convergence in Wasserstein metric is strictly stronger than the convergence in distribution (see [2, p. 10]), we have an improved version of Kac’s result.

### 3. MAIN RESULT OF THIS PAPER

Let us now recall the setup and result of Kac’s paper [5]. Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function that is in  $L^1$ . Choose a real number  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$  randomly (with respect to the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$ ). Let us now consider the map  $T : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , given by (3). Now look at the sample average of  $f$  composed with iterates of  $T$ , namely

$$A_n(\alpha) := \frac{X_0^f(\alpha) + X_1^f(\alpha) + \dots + X_{n-1}^f(\alpha)}{n}, \quad (5)$$

where  $X_k^f(\alpha)$  are as defined in (4). It is a standard fact that the map  $T$  is an Ergodic Transformation; proof of this assertion can be found in [4, Proposition 2.15, pp. 25]. Since  $T$  is Ergodic, it is a consequence of Birkhoff’s Ergodic Theorem that for almost all  $\alpha$  in  $[0, 1]$ , the sample average  $A_n(\alpha)$  converges to  $\mu$ , where

$$\mu := \int_0^1 f(t) dt.$$

Proof of Birkhoff’s Ergodic Theorem can be found in [4, Theorem 2.30, pp. 44].

Next, let  $\sigma_n^2$  denote the variance of the random variable  $X_0^f + X_1^f + \dots + X_{n-1}^f$ . Note that since the  $X_k^f$  are not independent, there is no simple formula analogous to (2). In fact,  $\sigma_n$  is the  $L^2$  norm of the function  $t$  going to  $A_n(t)$ , i.e.

$$\sigma_n^2 := \int_0^1 |A_n(t)|^2 dt. \quad (6)$$

Let us now assume that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma_n^2}{n} = \sigma^2 > 0. \quad (7)$$

Note that the existence of  $\sigma^2$  and positivity are part of the assumption. In particular,  $f$  is not identically zero.

Next, let us make further assumptions on  $f$ . Let us assume that  $f$  has the following Fourier series expansion, namely

$$f(t) \sim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \cos(2\pi nt).$$

Note that we extend  $f$  periodically on the whole of  $\mathbb{R}$ ; hence  $f$  is an even function. As a result the sine terms are absent. Moreover, assume that

$$|a_n| < \frac{M}{n^\beta} \quad (8)$$

for some constant  $M$  and for some  $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$ .

Let us now define the random variable  $W_n^f$  given by

$$W_n^f(\alpha) := \frac{A_n(\alpha) - \mu}{\sigma_n/\sqrt{n}}. \quad (9)$$

The main result of Kac's paper is as follows (which is [5, Theorem 1, pp. 41]):

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an  $L^1$  function, with Fourier coefficients satisfying (8). Let  $\{X_k^f\}_{k=0}^\infty$  be the collection of random variables as defined by (4) and let  $W_n^f$  be as defined by (9). Suppose equation (7) is satisfied. Under these assumptions,  $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(W_n^f \leq a) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^a e^{-\frac{t^2}{2}} dt$$

Before stating the result of this paper, let us first make a few definitions.

**Definition 3.2** ([9, p. 214], [10]). Let  $X, Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be two random variables. We define the **Wasserstein distance** between these two variables as

$$d_W(X, Y) := \sup\{\mathbb{E}(h(X) - h(Y)) : h \in \text{Lip}^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})\},$$

where  $\text{Lip}^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  denotes the space of 1-Lipschitz functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .

It is well-known that  $d_W$  is indeed a metric and defines a notion of convergence, which further implies the convergence in distribution. We are now ready to state the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 3.3** (Main result: CLT for Angle Doubling Map). *Let  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a non-zero  $L^1$  function, with Fourier coefficients satisfying (8). Let  $\{X_k^f\}_{k=0}^\infty$  be the collection of random variables as defined by (4) and let  $W_n^f$  be as defined by (9). Suppose equation (7) is satisfied. Under these assumptions, the random variables  $W_n^f$  converge to the standard normal random variable in the Wasserstein metric.*

Since the convergence in Wasserstein metric is strictly stronger than the convergence in distribution (see [2, p. 10]), we have an improved version of Kac's result. In order to prove the above Theorem, let us first review a few important concepts from Ross's paper and Kac's paper that are relevant for our paper. Let us start by recalling the concept of *dependency neighbourhood*.

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be a finite collection of random variables. We say this collection has dependency neighbourhoods  $N_i \subset \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$  if  $i \in N_i$  and  $X_i$  is independent of  $X_j$ , whenever  $j \notin N_i$ .

Let us now recall the following Theorem from Ross's paper [9, Theorem 3.2, pp. 219].

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $X_0, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$  be random variables such that  $\mathbb{E}[X_i^4] < \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$ . Let the collection  $\{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  have dependency neighborhood  $N_i$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, n$  and define  $D_n := \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} |N_i|$ . Then*

$$d_W(W_n^X, Z) \leq \frac{D_n^2}{\sigma_n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}|X_i|^3 + \frac{\sqrt{28}D_n^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{\pi}\sigma_n^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}|X_i|^4},$$

where  $Z$  denotes a standard normal random variable.

This Theorem will play a crucial role in our proof of showing that  $W_n^f$  converges to  $Z$  in the Wasserstein metric.

Let us now review the basic idea of Kac's proof. A crucial Lemma that Kac proves in his paper is to show that the main conclusion holds for a suitable class of step functions. Let us state that Lemma explicitly (which is [5, Lemma 5, pp. 40])

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $[0, 1]$  be divided into  $2^r$  intervals of equal length. Let  $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a step function such that on the interval  $[\frac{i}{2^r}, \frac{i+1}{2^r}]$  it is a constant, for all  $i = 0$  to  $2^r - 1$ . Assume  $\varphi$  satisfies equation (7). Then the conclusion of Theorem 3.1 holds.*

**Remark 3.7.** *Note that we are not making any assumptions on the Fourier coefficients of  $\varphi$ .*

Since this Theorem and its proof will play a very important role in our paper, we briefly recall the proof from Kac's paper [5]. Given a  $t \in [0, 1]$ , let us consider the binary expansion of  $t$ . Let us consider the digits of  $t$  to be  $\varepsilon_1(t), \varepsilon_2(t), \dots$ . Note that each  $\varepsilon_i(t)$  is either 0 or 1. A crucial observation in Kac's proof is that the step functions considered here can be represented as

$$\varphi(t) = P(\varepsilon_1(t), \varepsilon_2(t), \dots, \varepsilon_r(t)), \quad (10)$$

where  $P$  is a *polynomial* in  $r$ -variables. In other words,  $\varphi(t)$  depends *only* on the first  $r$  digits of  $t$  and furthermore, this dependence is through some explicit polynomial  $P$  as in (10). Using this crucial observation, Kac then shows that the random variables  $X_n^\varphi$  are statistically independent. Finally, he invokes a Lemma by Markoff [8, pp. 302-309], that says that if the random variables are statistically independent, then the conclusion of the Central Limit Theorem still holds. This fact is also stated in [5, Lemma 4, pp. 38-39], by referring to Markoff's paper [8].

After that, the author uses an approximation argument (namely he approximates  $f$  by a step function) to show that Theorem 3.1 is true for a general class of functions  $f$  (provided of course,  $f$  satisfies the hypothesis of the Theorem).

In the next section we show how to modify this idea to get convergence in the Wasserstein metric. For this, we crucially use the result on dependency neighborhood, namely Theorem 3.5.

We now start the proof of Theorem 3.3. As one might expect, we first show establish the result for a suitable step function.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $[0, 1]$  be divided into  $2^r$  intervals of equal length. Let  $\varphi : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a step function such that on the interval  $[\frac{i}{2^r}, \frac{i+1}{2^r}]$  it is a constant, for all  $i = 0$  to  $2^r - 1$ . Assume  $\varphi$  satisfies equation (7). Then the conclusion of Theorem 3.3 holds.*

**Remark 3.9.** *Again, no assumptions are being made on the Fourier coefficients of  $\varphi$ .*

**Proof of Lemma 3.8:** We will be using Theorem 3.5 to prove this Lemma. First of all, we note that without loss in generality, we can assume that

$$\int_0^1 \varphi(t) dt = 0. \quad (11)$$

This is because, if the integral is equal to  $\mu$ , which is non-zero, then we can define the step function

$$\tilde{\varphi}(t) := \varphi(t) - \mu.$$

Assuming we have proved the Lemma for  $\tilde{\varphi}$ , the result follows for  $\varphi$  as well. Henceforth, we will assume that the integral of  $\varphi$  is zero. Next, given a  $t \in [0, 1]$ , let  $\varepsilon_1(t), \varepsilon_2(t), \dots$  denote the digits of  $t$  in the binary expansion of  $t$ . By equation (10),  $\varphi(t)$  depends *only* on the first  $r$  digits of  $t$ , namely it depends only on  $\varepsilon_1(t), \dots, \varepsilon_r(t)$ .

We now note that for all  $t$ ,  $n$  and  $k$ ,

$$\varepsilon_k(T^n t) = \varepsilon_{k+n}(t). \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, the random variables  $\varepsilon_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are i.i.d. and

$$\begin{aligned} X_n^\varphi(t) &= \varphi(T^n t) \\ &= P(\varepsilon_{1+n}(t), \varepsilon_{2+n}(t), \dots, \varepsilon_{r+n}(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Since,  $\varepsilon_i$ 's are i.i.d., the joint distribution of  $(\varepsilon_{1+n}, \dots, \varepsilon_{r+n})$  depends on  $r$  and hence on  $\varphi$ , but not on  $n$ . Hence  $X_n^\varphi$ 's are identically distributed. In particular, the variance of  $X_n^\varphi$  is same as variance of  $X_0^\varphi$ , which is equal to the integral of  $\varphi^2$  from 0 to 1, i.e.

$$\text{Var}(X_n^\varphi) = \int_0^1 \varphi(t)^2 dt.$$

For the same reason, the third and fourth absolute moments, namely  $\mathbb{E}|X_n^\varphi|^3$  and  $\mathbb{E}|X_n^\varphi|^4$  are constants, independent of  $n$ . We also note that since  $\varphi$  is a step function; we have

$$\int_0^1 \varphi(t)^4 dt < \infty, \quad (13)$$

which ensures the finiteness of  $\mathbb{E}|X_n^\varphi|^4$ . We have already assumed that the integral of  $\varphi$  is zero (equation (11)). This implies that all the expectations  $\mathbb{E}[X_n^\varphi]$  are equal to zero (since they are all equal to  $\mathbb{E}[X_0^\varphi]$ , which in turn is equal to the integral of  $\varphi$ ). Hence, the first two hypotheses of Theorem 3.5 are satisfied.

Let us now study the dependency neighborhood of the random variables  $X_n^\varphi$ . Let us consider the collection

$$\{X_0^\varphi, X_1^\varphi, \dots, X_n^\varphi\}.$$

Define  $N_k$  to be the following set:

$$N_k := \{k - r + 1, \dots, k + r - 1\}.$$

We now note that  $X_k^\varphi$  is independent of the  $X_j^\varphi$  if  $j \notin N_k$ . This is because the  $\varepsilon_i$ 's in  $X_k^\varphi$  do not appear in the other random variable  $X_j^\varphi$  if  $j \notin N_k$ . Moreover,  $N_k$  is the largest such set of indices with this property. Therefore the dependency neighborhood of  $X_k^\varphi$  is given by  $N_k$ . Since  $|N_k|$  is at most  $2r - 1$  for all  $k$ , we have

$$D_n \leq 2r - 1, \quad (14)$$

a constant independent of  $n$  and which depends only on  $\varphi$  through  $r$ .

Let us now compute the covariance of  $X_i^\varphi$  and  $X_j^\varphi$ . We claim that

$$\text{Cov}(X_i^\varphi, X_j^\varphi) = \rho(|i - j|) \int_0^1 \varphi(t)^2 dt, \quad (15)$$

where  $\rho(i)$  denotes the correlation between  $X_0^\varphi$  and  $X_i^\varphi$ . Let us denote by  $\stackrel{d}{=}$  the equality of two random variables in distribution. Without loss of generality, take  $i < j$ . We have,

$$(X_i^\varphi, X_j^\varphi) = (P(\varepsilon_{1+i}, \dots, \varepsilon_{r+i}), P(\varepsilon_{1+j}, \dots, \varepsilon_{r+j})) \quad (16)$$

$$\stackrel{d}{=} (P(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_r), P(\varepsilon_{1+j-i}, \dots, \varepsilon_{r+j-i})) \quad (17)$$

which implies

$$(X_i^\varphi, X_j^\varphi) \stackrel{d}{=} (X_0^\varphi, X_{j-i}^\varphi). \quad (18)$$

To avoid confusion, let us clarify the meaning of the right hand sides of equations (16) and (17). The expression  $P(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_r)$  denotes the random variable  $t$  going to  $P(\varepsilon_1(t), \dots, \varepsilon_r(t))$ .

Using equation (18), we conclude that

$$\text{Cov}(X_i^\varphi, X_j^\varphi) = \text{Cov}(X_0^\varphi, X_{j-i}^\varphi) = \rho(j - i) \sqrt{\text{Var}(X_0^\varphi) \text{Var}(X_{j-i}^\varphi)},$$

which proves (15). □

Finally, we estimate the growth of the sample standard deviation, namely  $\sigma_n$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sigma_n^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \left( \text{Var} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} X_i^\varphi \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \text{Var}(X_i^\varphi) + \sum_{\substack{i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\} \\ i \neq j}} \text{Cov}(X_i^\varphi, X_j^\varphi) \right) \\ &= \left( 1 + \frac{J_n}{n} \right) \int_0^1 \varphi(x)^2 dx, \quad \text{where} \quad J_n := \sum_{\substack{i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\} \\ i \neq j}} \rho(|i - j|). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Let us now analyse  $J_n$ . Whenever,  $|i-j| > r-1$ ,  $X_0^\varphi$  and  $X_{|i-j|}^\varphi$  are independent and consequently,  $\rho(|i-j|) = 0$ . Then,

$$J_n := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} J_{n,i} \quad \text{where} \quad J_{n,i} := \sum_{\substack{j: 0 < |i-j| \leq r-1 \\ j \in \{0,1,\dots,n-1\}}} \rho(|i-j|).$$

Without loss of generality, we work with  $n \geq 2r-1$ . For  $i \geq r-1$ ,  $J_{n,i} = 2 \sum_{k=1}^{r-1} \rho(k) =: C_3$ , a constant independent of  $n$ . Again, by construction,  $|\rho(j)| \leq 1$  for any  $j$  and consequently,  $\sum_{i=0}^{r-2} J_{n,i}$  is bounded by  $(r-1)^2$ , independent of  $n$ . Hence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{J_n}{n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{r-2} J_{n,i} + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=r-1}^{n-1} J_{n,i} = 0 + C_3 = C_3.$$

Using equation (19), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma_n^2}{n} = (1 + C_3) \int_0^1 \varphi(x)^2 dx.$$

We now conclude, using Theorem 3.5 that  $d_W(W_n^{X_\varphi}, Z) = o(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$  as  $n$  goes to infinity. This completes the proof of Lemma 3.8.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove our main Theorem for a general function. First, let us prove one auxiliary result. We make a very simple observation that bounds the size of Wasserstein distance by the size of the  $L^2$  distance.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be random variables. Then*

$$d_W(X, Y) \leq \|X - Y\|_{L^2}.$$

**Proof:** The proof follows by unwinding definitions. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} d_W(X, Y) &= \sup\{|\mathbb{E}(h(X) - h(Y))| : h \text{ is 1-Lipschitz}\} \\ &\leq \sup\{|\mathbb{E}((h(X) - h(Y)))| : h \text{ is 1-Lipschitz}\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}|X - Y| \quad \text{using the fact that the } h \text{ is 1-Lipschitz} \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}|X - Y|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|X - Y\|_{L^2}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to prove the main theorem.

**Proof of Theorem 3.3:** For the function  $f$  under consideration, we recall from [5, Lemma 3] that given an  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a step function  $\varphi$  with its such that the endpoints of its intervals of constancy of the form  $\frac{i}{2^r}$ ,  $\int_0^1 \varphi(x) dx = 0$  and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m} \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \varphi(T^k \cdot) \right\|_{L^2}^2 > 0$$

such that for large  $n$ ,

$$\|W_n^f - W_n^\varphi\|_{L^2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (20)$$

By the triangle inequality for the Wasserstein metric  $d_W$  and using Lemmas 3.8 and 3.10, we have

$$d_W(W_n^f, Z) \leq d_W(W_n^f, W_n^\varphi) + d_W(W_n^\varphi, Z) \leq \|W_n^f - W_n^\varphi\|_{L^2} + d_W(W_n^\varphi, Z) < \varepsilon$$

for large  $n$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Suprio Bhar gratefully acknowledges support from the DST INSPIRE Faculty Scheme (DST/INSPIRE/04/2017/002835) from Government of India.

## REFERENCES

- [1] P. BILLINGSLEY, *Probability and measure*, Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, third ed., 1995. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [2] S. BOBKOV AND M. LEDOUX, *One-dimensional empirical measures, order statistics, and Kantorovich transport distances*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 261 (2019), pp. v+126.
- [3] K. L. CHUNG, *A course in probability theory*, Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA, third ed., 2001.
- [4] M. EINSIEDLER AND T. WARD, *Ergodic Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, Guildford, England, 2011 ed., Sept. 2010.
- [5] M. KAC, *On the distribution of values of sums of the type  $\sum f(2^k t)$* , Annals of Mathematics, 47 (1946), pp. 33–49.
- [6] D. KHOSHNEVISAN, *Product spaces*, in Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Graduate studies in mathematics, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, Mar. 2007, pp. 53–64.
- [7] U. KRENGEL, *Ergodic theorems*, vol. 6 of De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1985. With a supplement by Antoine Brunel.
- [8] A. MARKOV AND H. LIEBMANN, *Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*, Cornell University Library historical math monographs, B. G. Teubner, 1912.
- [9] N. ROSS, *Fundamentals of stein's method*, Probability Surveys, 8 (2011).
- [10] C. VILLANI, *Optimal transport*, vol. 338 of Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009. Old and new.
- [11] R. J. ZIMMER, *Ergodic theory and semisimple groups*, vol. 81 of Monographs in Mathematics, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 1984.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KANPUR, UTTAR PRADESH- 208016, INDIA.  
*Email address:* `suprio@iitk.ac.in`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, HBNI, BHUBANESWAR, ODISHA- 752050, INDIA.  
*Email address:* `ritwikm@niser.ac.in`

UNIVERSITÉ DE GENÈVE, SECTION DE MATHÉMATIQUES, UNI DUFOUR, 24, RUE DU GÉNÉRAL DUFOUR, CASE POSTALE 64, 1211 GENEVA 4, SWITZERLAND.  
*Email address:* `Prathmesh.Patil@etu.unige.ch`