

ON DECOUPLING IN BANACH SPACES

SONJA COX AND STEFAN GEISS

ABSTRACT. We consider decoupling inequalities for random variables taking values in a Banach space X . We restrict the class of distributions that appear as conditional distributions while decoupling and show that each adapted process can be approximated by a Haar type expansion in which only the same conditional distributions appear. Moreover, we show that in our framework a progressive enlargement of the underlying filtration does not effect the decoupling properties (e.g., the constants involved). As special case we deal with one-sided moment inequalities when decoupling dyadic (i.e., Paley-Walsh) martingales. We establish the decoupling constant in ℓ_K^∞ . As an example of an application, we demonstrate that Burkholder-Davis-Gundy type inequalities for stochastic integrals of X -valued processes can be obtained from decoupling inequalities for X -valued dyadic martingales.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	6
3. A factorization for regular conditional probabilities	9
4. Reduction of general decoupling	11
5. Characterization of $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ for Rademacher sums	14
6. Dyadic decoupling and stochastic integration	16
7. Dyadic decoupling in c_0 and ℓ_K^∞	23
8. Dyadic decoupling and chaos	25
9. Relations to other constants and open problems	26
Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 4.4	27
Appendix B. Extrapolation	39
Appendix C.	41
References	41

1. INTRODUCTION

The UMD-property is crucial in harmonic and stochastic analysis in Banach spaces, see e.g. [15, 16]. A Banach space X is said to satisfy the UMD-property if there exists a constant $c_{(1)} \geq 1$ such that for every martingale difference sequence $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ with values in X one has that

$$\frac{1}{c_{(1)}} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \theta_n d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq c_{(1)} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}; X)} \quad (1)$$

for all signs $\theta_n \in \{-1, 1\}$, i.e., one has **U**nconditional **M**artingale **D**ifferences. Here we vary over all stochastic bases $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N)$ and martingale difference

sequences $d_n : \Omega \rightarrow X \in \mathcal{L}^2(X)$ with respect to $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N$. The transformations

$$\sum_{n=1}^N d_n \mapsto \sum_{n=1}^N \theta_n d_n$$

are called UMD-transforms. There is an inherent property of these UMD-transforms: Assume that $\{1, \dots, N\} = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^L I_\ell$, where I_1, \dots, I_L are non-empty consecutive intervals, so that $D_\ell := \sum_{n \in I_\ell} d_n$ can be interpreted as a martingale difference sequence as well, then any UMD-transform

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L D_\ell \mapsto \sum_{\ell=1}^L \eta_\ell D_\ell$$

for $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_L \in \{-1, 1\}$ can be written as a UMD-transform of the finer sequence $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$. Combining this observation with an approximation argument of Maurey [26], where a martingale difference sequence is approximated by a blocked sequence of Haar functions, one obtains: In order to verify the UMD-property of the Banach space X , it is sufficient to consider X -valued Haar- or dyadic martingales (a martingale is *dyadic* if it is adapted to a dyadic filtration, dyadic martingales are also known as *Paley-Walsh martingales*).

On the other hand, McConnell [27] proved that the UMD property is equivalent to the existence of a constant $c_{(2)}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_{(2)}} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}, X)} \leq \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N e_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}, X)} \leq c_{(2)} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}, X)} \quad (2)$$

for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^N$ -martingale difference sequences $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ and $(e_n)_{n=1}^N$ such that $\mathcal{L}(d_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \mathcal{L}(e_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1})$, i.e. $(e_n)_{n=1}^N$ and $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ are *tangent*.

Note that the first and the second inequality in (2) are of identical type. This is no longer true if one imposes the additional condition that $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the *decoupled tangent* sequence of $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. In this case we refer to first inequality in (2) as an *upper decoupling inequality*, and we refer to the second inequality as a *lower decoupling inequality*. Analogously, the first and second inequality in (1) are of the same type, and this is no longer the case if one replaces the (deterministic) $(\theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in (1) by a (random) Rademacher sequence $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$: then one obtains the upper- and lower randomized UMD inequalities studied in [10]. Examples of spaces that satisfy upper decoupling inequalities but do not have the UMD property are L^1 and the space of bounded σ -additive measures (see e.g. [5, Examples 4.7 and 4.8]). Moreover, quasi-Banach spaces fail to satisfy the UMD property, but may satisfy decoupling inequalities, see [6, Section 5.1] and e.g. [5, Example 4.7].

The notions of tangent and decoupled sequences (see Definition 2.6 below) were introduced by Kwapien and Woyczyński in [22, 23], where also applications can be found. The decoupled tangent sequence $(e_n)_{n=1}^N$ of a sequence $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (adapted to a filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$) is unique in distribution and replaces parts of the dependence structure of $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ by a sequence of conditionally independent random variables. Although the definition of decoupling might not be explicit, there are canonical representations of a decoupled tangent sequence, see Kwapien and Woyczyński [23] and Montgomery-Smith [28].

There are various applications for decoupling in the literature. The proofs of Burkholder [3] and Bourgain [1] of the equivalence of the UMD-property of a Banach space X and the continuity of the X -valued Hilbert transform use decoupling arguments. For certain applications only one-sided inequalities are needed. For example, one-sided decoupling inequalities for martingales and the type- or cotype property imply martingale type or martingale cotype, respectively, and therefore by Pisier [31] an equivalent re-norming of the Banach space with a norm having a certain modulus of continuity or convexity, respectively. A classical case of decoupling, studied on its own, concerns randomly stopped sums of independent random variables, see for example the results of Klass [20, 21]. Another application for decoupling is stochastic integration. For example, to get sufficient conditions for the existence of stochastic integrals, only the upper decoupling is needed. A starting point for this was [23, Section 6] where the existence of decoupled tangent processes for left quasi-continuous processes in the Skorohod space is studied. Finally, Kallenberg [19] proved the existence of decoupled tangent semi-martingales and two-sided decoupling inequalities, and considered applications to multiple stochastic integrals.

Let us come back to the relation between (1) and (2). By the above reduction of the UMD-property to Haar- or dyadic martingales the equivalence of (2) to the UMD-property remains true if we require that $(e_n)_{n=1}^N$ is a decoupled tangent sequence of $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$. However, when attempting to pass from UMD-transforms to upper (or lower) decoupling inequalities in (2) we encounter the following problems:

(P1) *Blocking arguments* do not work as expected: If in the above notation $(e_n)_{n=1}^N$ is a decoupled tangent sequence of $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ and $(E_\ell)_{\ell=1}^L$ is a decoupled tangent sequence of $(D_\ell)_{\ell=1}^L$, then, in general, the distributions of $\sum_{n=1}^N e_n$ and $\sum_{\ell=1}^L E_\ell$ do not coincide. In other words, the decoupling of $(D_\ell)_{\ell=1}^L$ cannot be obtained by the decoupling of $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ by taking blocks.

(P2) As mentioned above, the consideration of *Haar martingales* in its *natural filtration* are sufficient to decide whether a Banach space is a UMD-space. On the other hand, it is unknown whether, for example, upper decoupling inequalities for dyadic martingales in (2) imply upper decoupling for all martingales, see Section 9. Regarding the filtration it was, for example, not clear whether upper decoupling inequalities for X -valued stochastic integrals with respect to a scalar Brownian motion $(W(t))_{t \geq 0}$ in its *natural* filtration imply upper decoupling inequalities under a *progressive enlargement* of the filtration such that $(W(t))_{t \geq 0}$ remains a Brownian motion in this filtration.

The aim of this article is to contribute to these problems as follows:

Section 3: Theorem 3.1 provides a factorization of a random variable along regular conditional probabilities. With this result we contribute to the results of Montgomery-Smith [28] (see also Kallenberg [18, Lemma 3.22]). This result is the key to approximate our adapted processes in terms of Haar-like series.

Section 4: The main result of Section 4 is Theorem 4.4 with the following corollary (the definition of $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}})$ is discussed below):

Theorem 1. *Let X, Y, Z be Banach spaces, where X is separable, let $S \in L(X, Y)$ and $T \in L(X, Z)$, and let $p \in (0, \infty)$. Assume $\underline{\Psi}_\lambda, \overline{\Psi} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, where Δ is a non-empty index-set, such that*

$$\sup_{\xi \in (0, \infty)} (1 + |\xi|)^{-p} \underline{\Psi}_\lambda(\xi) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\xi \in (0, \infty)} (1 + |\xi|)^{-p} \overline{\Psi}(\xi) < \infty,$$

and such that the $\underline{\Psi}_\lambda$ are lower semi-continuous and $\overline{\Psi}$ is upper semi-continuous. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of Borel probability measures on X such that $\int_X \|x\|^p \mu(dx) < \infty$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$ and such that $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{P}$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:

- (1) *For every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$ and finitely supported¹ $(d_n)_{n=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}})$ it holds that*

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Delta} \mathbb{E} \underline{\Psi}_\lambda \left(\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N S d_n \right\|_Y \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \overline{\Psi} \left(\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N T e_n \right\|_Z \right), \quad (3)$$

whenever $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an \mathbb{F} -decoupled tangent sequence of $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

- (2) *For every sequence of independent random variables $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N \subset \mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) \in \mathcal{P}$, and every $A_0 \in \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$, $A_n \in \sigma(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, it holds that*

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Delta} \mathbb{E} \underline{\Psi}_\lambda \left(\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N 1_{A_{n-1}} S \varphi_n \right\|_Y \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \overline{\Psi} \left(\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N 1_{A_{n-1}} T \varphi'_n \right\|_Z \right), \quad (4)$$

where $(\varphi'_n)_{n=1}^N$ is an independent copy of $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$.

In Theorem 1 we use Definition 4.2, where we extend the set \mathcal{P} to $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}} \supseteq \mathcal{P}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}} := \{ & \mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X) : \forall j \in \mathbb{N} \exists K_j \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \mu_{j,1}, \dots, \mu_{j,K_j} \in \mathcal{P} \\ & \text{such that } \mu_{j,1} * \dots * \mu_{j,K_j} \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty \\ & \text{and } (\mu_{j,1} * \dots * \mu_{j,K_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is uniformly } L^p\text{-integrable} \}. \end{aligned}$$

In Definition 4.1 $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}})$ is defined to be the set of \mathbb{F} -adapted sequences $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$ such that the regular versions κ_{n-1} of $\mathbb{P}(d_n \in \cdot | \mathcal{F}_{n-1})$ satisfy $\kappa_{n-1}[\omega, \cdot] \in \mathcal{P}$ on a set of measure one. Theorem 1 remains valid if one exchanges $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ with $(e_n)_{n=1}^N$ in (3) and $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$ with $(\varphi'_n)_{n=1}^N$ in (4), respectively.

In Theorem 1 (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is obvious, our contribution in (ii) \Rightarrow (i) is as follows: We extend the class of random variables, the admissible tangent distributions, and allow every progressive enlargement of the natural filtration of $\varphi = (\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$. We avoid the straight blocking argument as in the case of UMD-transform, but still get a counterpart to the Haar martingales in (4). Regarding problem (P2) we show that in (3) and (4) the same class of conditional distributions can be taken. Regarding the enlargement of filtration we obtain the positive result as desired. Common settings in Theorem 1 are the following:

¹Only for only finitely many n one has $d_n \neq 0$.

Δ	$\underline{\Psi}_\lambda(\xi)$	$\overline{\Psi}(\xi)$	$\sup_{\lambda \in \Delta} \mathbb{E} \underline{\Psi}_\lambda (\ SF\ _Y) \leq \mathbb{E} \overline{\Psi} (\ TG\ _Z)$
$\text{card}(\Delta) = 1$	ξ^p	$C^p \xi^p$	$\ SF\ _{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; Y)} \leq C \ TG\ _{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; Z)}$
$\text{card}(\Delta) = 1$	$1_{\{\xi > \mu\}}, \mu \geq 0$	$C^p \xi^p$	$\mathbb{P}(\ SF\ _Y > \mu) \leq C^p \mathbb{E} \ TG\ _Z^p$
$(0, \infty)$	$\lambda^p 1_{\{\xi > \lambda\}}$	$C^p \xi^p$	$\ SF\ _{\mathcal{L}^{p,\infty}(\mathbb{P}; Y)} \leq C \mathbb{E} \ TG\ _{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; Z)}$

Section 5: Theorem 5.1 provides a characterization of the measures $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$ where $\mathcal{P}^{\text{Rad}} := \{\frac{1}{2}\delta_{-\xi} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_\xi : \xi \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Section 6: We study upper decoupling inequalities for dyadic martingales and equivalent properties. More specifically, given $p \in (0, \infty)$ and a bounded and linear operator $T : X \rightarrow Y$ between Banach spaces X and Y , where X is separable, we let $D_p(T) := \inf c$, where the infimum is taken over all $c \in [0, \infty]$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r_n T v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; Y)} \leq c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)}$$

for all $N \geq 2$, for all $v_0 \in X$ and $v_n := h_n(r_1, \dots, r_n)$ with $h_n : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow X$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, where $(r_n)_{n=1}^N$ is a Rademacher sequence (the r_n are independent and take the values -1 and 1 with probability $1/2$) and $(r'_n)_{n=1}^N$ is an independent copy of $(r_n)_{n=1}^N$. Using Theorem 1 we prove the following (see Theorem 6.6 below):

Theorem 2. *For a separable Banach space X and $p, q \in (0, \infty)$ the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (1) $D_p(I_X) < \infty$.
- (2) *There exists a $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that for every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)})$, every \mathbb{F} -Brownian motion $W = (W(t))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ and every simple \mathbb{F} -predictable X -valued process $(H(t))_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ it holds that*

$$\left\| \int_0^\infty H(t) dW(t) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^q(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq c \|S(H)\|_{\mathcal{L}^q(\mathbb{P})}$$

with the square function $S(H)(\omega) := \|f \mapsto \int_0^\infty f(t) H(t, \omega) dt\|_{\gamma(\mathcal{L}^2((0, \infty); X)}$.

The relation between decoupling and stochastic integration has already been studied in e.g. [5, 9, 36]. Our contribution is that we take dyadic decoupling as a starting point and allow a progressive enlargement of the filtration in (1) \Rightarrow (2). Therefore, our result is an extension of both [5] and [9]: in [5] assertion (2) was proved under the (so far more restrictive) assumption that one has a general upper decoupling. On the other hand, it seems that the argument provided by Garling [9] requires the integrands to be adapted with respect to the filtration *generated* by the Brownian motion they are integrated against.

Section 7: Here we discuss the behavior of the upper decoupling constant for dyadic martingales in the space ℓ_K^∞ and prove the following result:

Theorem 3. *For the diagonal operator*

$$D_{\sqrt{\log}} : c_0 \rightarrow c_0 \quad \text{with} \quad D_{\sqrt{\log}}((\xi_k)_{k=1}^\infty) := \left(\frac{\xi_k}{\sqrt{1 + \log(k)}} \right)$$

we have $D_2(D_{\sqrt{\log}}) < \infty$.

Section 8: For the decoupling with respect to dyadic martingales as considered in Sections 6 and 7 we show in Theorem 8.3 that it is also natural to allow an upper decoupling with respect to a different distribution and that a Banach space X allows for decoupling with respect to a distribution in some fixed chaos obtained from $\mathcal{P}_{2\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$ if and only if $D_2(I_X) < \infty$.

In Section 9 we compare the decoupling constants in our results to related decoupling constants and state some open problems. Appendix A contains the proof of Theorem 4.4. For the reader's convenience, Appendix B contains a classical extrapolation result, Proposition B.1, which is provided in the exact form that it is needed in Section 6.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Some general notation. We let $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. For a vector space V and $B \subseteq V$ we set $-B := \{x \in V : -x \in B\}$. Given a non-empty set Ω , we let 2^Ω denote the system of all subsets of Ω and use $A \triangle B := (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$ for $A, B \in 2^\Omega$. A system of pair-wise disjoint subsets $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ of Ω is a *partition* of Ω , where I is an arbitrary index-set and $A_i = \emptyset$ is allowed, if $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i = \Omega$. If (M, d) is a metric space we define $d : M \times 2^M \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ by setting $d(x, A) := \inf\{d(x, y) : y \in A\}$ for all $(x, A) \in M \times 2^M$. If V is a Banach space and (M, d) a metric space, then $C(M; V)$ is the space of continuous maps from M to V , and $C_b(M; V)$ the subspace of bounded continuous maps from M to V .

BANACH SPACE VALUED RANDOM VARIABLES: Throughout this paper we let X be a separable Banach space (not identically to $\{0\}$ to avoid pathologies) and equip X with the Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}(X)$ generated by the norm-open sets. For $x \in X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, the corresponding open balls are given by $B_{x, \varepsilon} := \{y \in X : \|x - y\|_X < \varepsilon\}$. For $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ we let \bar{B} denote the closure of B (with respect to $\|\cdot\|_X$), we let B° denote the largest open set contained in B , and we let ∂B denote the set $\bar{B} \setminus B^\circ$. Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and a measurable space (S, Σ) , an \mathcal{F}/Σ -measurable mapping $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow S$ is called an *S -valued random variable*. Therefore an X -valued random variable is an $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{B}(X)$ -measurable mapping. For a random variable $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow S$ the law of ξ is given by $\mathcal{L}(\xi)(A) := \mathbb{P}(\xi \in A)$ for $A \in \Sigma$. If ξ_i are S -valued random variables on probability spaces $(\Omega_i, \mathcal{F}_i, \mathcal{P}_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, then ξ_1 and ξ_2 are *identical in law* if $\mathcal{L}(\xi_1) = \mathcal{L}(\xi_2)$.

LEBESGUE SPACES: For X a separable Banach space and (S, Σ) a measurable space, we define $\mathcal{L}^0((S, \Sigma); X)$ to be the space of $\Sigma/\mathcal{B}(X)$ -measurable mappings from S to X . If (S, Σ) is equipped with a σ -finite measure μ and $p \in (0, \infty)$, then we define

$$\mathcal{L}^p((S, \Sigma, \mu); X) := \left\{ \xi \in \mathcal{L}^0((S, \Sigma, \mu); X) : \|\xi\|_{\mathcal{L}^p((S, \Sigma, \mu); X)}^p := \int_S \|\xi\|_X^p d\mu < \infty \right\}.$$

If there is no risk of confusion we write for example $\mathcal{L}^p(\mu; X)$ or $\mathcal{L}^p(\Sigma; X)$ as shorthand notation for $\mathcal{L}^p((S, \Sigma, \mu); X)$, and we set $\mathcal{L}^p((S, \Sigma, \mu)) := \mathcal{L}^p((S, \Sigma, \mu); \mathbb{R})$.

PROBABILITY MEASURES ON BANACH SPACES:

- (1) By $\mathcal{P}(X)$ we denote the set of all probability measures on $(X, \mathcal{B}(X))$ and for $p \in (0, \infty)$ we let

$$\mathcal{P}_p(X) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \int_X \|x\|_X^p d\mu(x) < \infty \right\}.$$

- (2) Given an index set $I \neq \emptyset$, a family $(\mu_i)_{i \in I} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ is *uniformly \mathcal{L}^p -integrable* if

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{i \in I} \int_{\{\|x\|_X \geq K\}} \|x\|_X^p d\mu_i(x) = 0.$$

Accordingly, a family of X -valued random variables $(\xi_i)_{i \in I}$ is *uniformly \mathcal{L}^p -integrable* if $(\mathcal{L}(\xi_i))_{i \in I}$ is uniformly \mathcal{L}^p -integrable.

- (3) For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and $\mu_n \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if μ_n converges weakly to μ , i.e. if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f(x) d\mu_n(x) = \int_X f(x) d\mu(x)$ for all $f \in C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$. Moreover, for a sequence of X -valued random variables $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and an X -valued random variable ξ (possibly defined on different probability spaces) we write $\xi_n \xrightarrow{w^*} \xi$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ provided that $\mathcal{L}(\xi_n) \xrightarrow{w^*} \mathcal{L}(\xi)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

One main aspect of this article will be to work with a non-empty subset $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ instead of with the full set of measures $\mathcal{P}(X)$ (see Theorem 4.4 below). Here we will mostly assume that $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\delta_0(B) = 1_{\{0 \in B\}}$ being the Dirac measure at $0 \in X$. This is done to consider finitely supported sequences of X -valued random variables $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in a convenient way, but sometimes also for convenience within the proofs.

We shall frequently use the following well-known result, which relates \mathcal{L}^p -uniform integrability and convergence of moments:

Lemma 2.1. *Let $p \in (0, \infty)$, let X be a separable Banach space, and let $\mu, (\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$ such that $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\int_X \|x\|^p d\mu_n \rightarrow \int_X \|x\|^p d\mu$.
- (2) $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly \mathcal{L}^p -integrable.

Proof. Apply e.g. [18, Lemma 4.11 (in (5) lim sup can be replaced by sup)] to the random variables ξ, ξ_1, ξ_2, \dots where $\xi = \|\zeta\|_X^p$ and $\xi_n = \|\zeta_n\|_X^p$, and where $\mathcal{L}(\zeta) = \mu$ and $\mathcal{L}(\zeta_n) = \mu_n$. \square

STOCHASTIC BASIS: We use the notion of a stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$, which is a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ equipped with a filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, $\mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, and where we set $\mathcal{F}_\infty := \sigma(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathcal{F}_n)$. For measurable spaces (Ω, \mathcal{F}) and (S, \mathcal{S}) , and $\xi = (\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a sequence of S -valued random variables on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) , we let $\mathbb{F}^\xi = (\mathcal{F}_n^\xi)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ denote the natural filtration generated by ξ , i.e. $\mathcal{F}_0^\xi := \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_n^\xi := \sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathcal{F}_\infty^\xi := \sigma(\xi_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$.

CONVENTION: If there is no risk of confusion, given an index set $I \neq \emptyset$ and a family $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ of random variables or elements of some Banach space, we say that this family is finitely supported if only finitely many of the a_i are not zero.

2.2. Stochastic kernels. We provide some details for regular versions of conditional probabilities we shall use later.

Definition 2.2. *Let X be a separable Banach space. Given a measurable space (S, Σ) , a map $\kappa : S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ is called a kernel if it is $\Sigma/\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ -measurable, where*

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(X)) := \sigma(\{\{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \mu(A) \in B\} : A \in \mathcal{B}(X), B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\}).$$

The following lemma is used later:

Lemma 2.3. *Let X be a separable Banach space, then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ is countably generated.*

Proof. As X is separable, there exists a countable π -system $\Pi \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X)$ that generates $\mathcal{B}(X)$. Indeed, for a dense and countable subset $D \subseteq X$ we may choose as π -system

$$\Pi := \left\{ \bigcap_{k=1}^n B_{x_k, \varepsilon_k} : n \in \mathbb{N}, x_k \in D, \varepsilon_k \in (0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{Q}, k = 1, \dots, n \right\}.$$

Define the countable system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ by

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \mu(B) \in (a, b)\} : a, b \in \mathbb{Q}, -\infty < a < b < \infty, B \in \Pi\}.$$

Define $\mathcal{A} := \{A \in \mathcal{B}(X) : \mathcal{P}(X) \ni \mu \mapsto \mu(A) \in \mathbb{R} \text{ is } \sigma(\mathcal{S})/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\text{-measurable}\}$. One may check that \mathcal{A} is a Dynkin system containing Π , whence the π - λ -Theorem implies $\sigma(\Pi) \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X)$ and thus $\mathcal{A} = \sigma(\Pi) = \mathcal{B}(X)$. \square

Remark 2.4. Let X be a separable Banach space and (S, Σ) a measurable space.

- (i) Alternatively one can say that a mapping $\kappa : S \times \mathcal{B}(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a kernel if and only if the following two conditions hold:
 - (a) For all $\omega \in S$ it holds that $\kappa[\omega, \cdot] \in \mathcal{P}(X)$.
 - (b) For all $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ the map $\omega \rightarrow \kappa[\omega, B]$ is $\Sigma/\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable.
- (ii) Let the space (S, Σ) be equipped with a probability measure \mathbb{P} and let $\Pi \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X)$ be a countable π -system that generates $\mathcal{B}(X)$ (see the proof of Lemma 2.3). For two kernels $\kappa, \kappa' : S \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ the following assertions are equivalent:
 - (a) $\kappa[\omega, B] = \kappa'[\omega, B]$ for \mathbb{P} -almost all $\omega \in S$, for all $B \in \Pi$.
 - (b) $\kappa[\omega, \cdot] = \kappa'[\omega, \cdot]$ for \mathbb{P} -almost all $\omega \in S$.

We need the existence of kernels describing conditional probabilities:

Theorem 2.5 ([18, Theorem 6.3]). *Let X be a separable Banach space, $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ a probability space, $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ a sub- σ -algebra, and let $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow X$ be a random variable. Then there is a $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{P}(X))$ -measurable kernel $\kappa : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ satisfying*

$$\kappa[\cdot, B] = \mathbb{P}(\xi \in B \mid \mathcal{G}) \text{ a.s.}$$

for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. If $\kappa' : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ is another kernel with this property, then $\kappa' = \kappa$ a.s.

We refer to κ as a *regular version* of $\mathbb{P}(\xi \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{G})$.

2.3. Decoupling. We briefly recall the concept of decoupled tangent sequences as introduced by Kwapien and Woyczyński in [23]. For more details we refer to [7, 24] and the references therein.

Definition 2.6. Let X be a separable Banach space, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0})$ be a stochastic basis, and let $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ -adapted sequence of X -valued random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. A sequence of X -valued and $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ -adapted random variables $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is called an $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ -decoupled tangent sequence of $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ provided there exists a σ -algebra $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\sigma((d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that the following two conditions are satisfied:

(i) TANGENCY: For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ one has

$$\mathbb{P}(d_n \in B \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \mathbb{P}(e_n \in B \mid \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \mathbb{P}(e_n \in B \mid \mathcal{H}) \text{ a.s.}$$

(ii) CONDITIONAL INDEPENDENCE: For all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B_1, \dots, B_N \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ one has

$$\mathbb{P}(e_1 \in B_1, \dots, e_N \in B_N \mid \mathcal{H}) = \mathbb{P}(e_1 \in B_1 \mid \mathcal{H}) \cdots \mathbb{P}(e_N \in B_N \mid \mathcal{H}) \text{ a.s.}$$

A construction of a decoupled tangent sequence is presented in [24, Section 4.3].

Example 2.7. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0})$ be a stochastic basis, $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\varphi'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ two independent and identically distributed sequences of independent, \mathbb{R} -valued random variables such that φ_n and φ'_n are \mathcal{F}_n -measurable and independent of \mathcal{F}_{n-1} for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ be an $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ -adapted sequence of X -valued random variables independent of $(\varphi'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then $(\varphi'_n v_{n-1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ -decoupled tangent sequence of $(\varphi_n v_{n-1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where one may take

$$\mathcal{H} := \sigma((\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}).$$

Similarly, $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\varphi'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ could be X -valued random variables and $(v_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ \mathbb{R} -valued.

3. A FACTORIZATION FOR REGULAR CONDITIONAL PROBABILITIES

By Theorem 3.1 below we contribute to the results obtained in Kallenberg [18, Lemma 3.22]) and Montgomery-Smith [28]. Our contribution is that we provide a factorization in the *strong sense*, not a representation in the distributional context. Theorem 3.1 is used to prove Proposition A.8 below, but might be of independent interest. Also the usage in the proof of Proposition A.8 yields to a refined argument for the existence of a decoupled tangent sequence, so that it contributes to [23] (cf. [7, Proposition 6.1.5]) as well.

Theorem 3.1. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a σ -algebra, let $d \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{F}; \mathbb{R})$ satisfy $d(\Omega) \subseteq [0, 1)$, and let $\kappa: \Omega \times \mathcal{B}([0, 1]) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a regular conditional probability kernel for $\mathcal{L}(d \mid \mathcal{G})$. Let $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}}) := (\Omega \times (0, 1], \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}((0, 1]), \mathbb{P} \otimes \lambda)$, where λ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{B}((0, 1])$. Set $[0, 0) := \emptyset$ and define $H: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $d^0: \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$H(\omega, s) := \kappa[\omega, [0, d(\omega))] + s\kappa[\omega, \{d(\omega)\}], \quad (5)$$

$$d^0(\omega, h) := \inf\{x \in [0, 1]: \kappa[\omega, [0, x]] \geq h\}. \quad (6)$$

Then

(i) H is $\bar{\mathcal{F}}/\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ -measurable, independent of $\mathcal{G} \otimes \{\emptyset, (0, 1]\}$, and uniformly $[0, 1]$ distributed,

- (ii) d^0 is $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1])/\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ -measurable, and
 (iii) there is an $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}) = 0$ such that $d^0(\omega, H(\omega, s)) = d(\omega)$ for all $(\omega, s) \in (\Omega \setminus \mathcal{N}) \times (0, 1]$.

Proof. (i): For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell \in \{1, \dots, 2^n\}$ let $A_{n,\ell} := [(\ell - 1)2^{-n}, \ell 2^{-n}]$. Define $H_n: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ by

$$H_n(\omega, s) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^n} 1_{\{d \in A_{n,\ell}\}}(\omega) (\kappa[\omega, [0, (\ell - 1)2^{-n}]] + s\kappa[\omega, A_{n,\ell}]).$$

Note that H_n is $\bar{\mathcal{F}}/\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ -measurable. Moreover, for all $(\omega, s) \in \bar{\Omega}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & |H_n(\omega, s) - H(\omega, s)| \\ & \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^n} 1_{\{d \in A_{n,\ell}\}}(\omega) (1 + s)\kappa[\omega, A_{n,\ell} \setminus \{d(\omega)\}] \\ & \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, H is the point-wise limit of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}/\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ -measurable functions, in particular, H is $\bar{\mathcal{F}}/\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ -measurable.

We now prove that the law of H_n is given by the Lebesgue measure $\lambda_{[0,1]}$ on $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ and that H_n is independent of $\mathcal{G} \otimes \{\emptyset, (0, 1]\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $G \in \mathcal{G}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}([0, 1])$. Note that for all $a, b \in [0, 1]$ satisfying $a + b \leq 1$ it holds that $b \int_0^1 1_{\{a+sb \in B\}} ds = \lambda_{[0,1]}(B \cap [a, a+b])$. Using this and Fubini's theorem we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\mathbb{P}}(G \cap \{H_n \in B\}) \\ & = \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^n} \int_0^1 \int_{G \cap \{\omega \in \Omega: \kappa[\omega, [0, (\ell-1)2^{-n}]] + s\kappa[\omega, A_{n,\ell}] \in B\}} 1_{\{d \in A_{n,\ell}\}}(\omega) d\mathbb{P} ds \\ & = \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^n} \int_G \kappa[\omega, A_{n,\ell}] \int_0^1 1_{\{\omega \in \Omega: \kappa[\omega, [0, (\ell-1)2^{-n}]] + s\kappa[\omega, A_{n,\ell}] \in B\}}(\omega) ds d\mathbb{P} \\ & = \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^n} \int_G \lambda_{[0,1]}(B \cap [\kappa[\omega, [0, (\ell-1)2^{-n}]], \kappa[\omega, [0, \ell 2^{-n}]]) d\mathbb{P} \\ & = \mathbb{P}(G) \cdot \lambda_{[0,1]}(B). \end{aligned}$$

This proves that H_n is uniformly-[0, 1] distributed and independent of $\mathcal{G} \otimes \{\emptyset, (0, 1]\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This completes the proof of (i), as H is the point-wise limit of $(H_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. (Use e.g. that \mathbb{R} -valued random variables ξ_1, ξ_2 are independent if and only if for every two bounded continuous functions $f, g \in C(\mathbb{R})$ it holds that $\mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1)g(\xi_2)] = \mathbb{E}[f(\xi_1)]\mathbb{E}[g(\xi_2)]$.)

(ii): For all $x \in [0, 1]$ note that

$$\{d^0 \leq x\} = \{(\omega, h) \in \Omega \times [0, 1]: \kappa[\omega, [0, x]] - h \geq 0\} \in \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1]). \quad (7)$$

(iii): It follows from (7) and the definition of H that we have, for all $x \in [0, 1]$, that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(\omega, s) \in \bar{\Omega}: d^0(\omega, H(\omega, s)) \leq x\} \\ & = \{(\omega, s) \in \bar{\Omega}: \kappa[\omega, [0, x]] \geq \kappa[\omega, [0, d(\omega)]] + s\kappa[\omega, \{d(\omega)\}]\} \end{aligned}$$

can be written as $B_x \times (0, 1]$ ome $B_x \in \mathcal{F}$ and that we have that

$$B_x \times (0, 1] \supseteq \{(\omega, s) \in \bar{\Omega}: d(\omega) \leq x\} =: C_x \times (0, 1].$$

On the other hand from the fact that the image measure of the map $(\omega, s) \mapsto (\omega, H(\omega, s))$ as map a map from $\bar{\Omega}$ into $\Omega \times [0, 1]$ equals $\mathbb{P} \otimes \lambda$ we obtain, for all $x \in [0, 1]$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(B_x) &= \bar{\mathbb{P}}(B_x \times (0, 1]) = \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 1_{\{d^0(\omega, h) \leq x\}} dh d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^1 1_{\{\kappa[\omega, [0, x]] \geq h\}} dh d\mathbb{P}(\omega) = \mathbb{E}\kappa[\cdot, [0, x]] = \mathbb{P}(C_x). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathbb{P}(B_x \setminus C_x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. Let $\mathcal{N} := \cup_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]} (B_q \setminus C_q)$ so that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}) = 0$. Then, observing that $B_x = \cap_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [x, 1]} B_q$ and $C_x = \cap_{q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [x, 1]} C_q$ for all $x \in [0, 1)$, we have for all $(\omega, s) \in (\Omega \setminus \mathcal{N}) \times (0, 1]$ that $d^0(\omega, H(\omega, s)) = d(\omega)$. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ a σ -algebra, X a separable Banach space, $d \in \mathcal{L}^0(\mathcal{F}; X)$. Let $(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{\mathcal{F}}, \bar{\mathbb{P}}) := (\Omega \times (0, 1], \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}((0, 1]), \mathbb{P} \otimes \lambda)$, where λ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{B}((0, 1])$. Then there exist random variables $H: \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $d^0: \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ such that*

- (i) H is a uniformly-[0, 1] distributed random variable independent of $\mathcal{G} \otimes \{\emptyset, [0, 1]\}$,
- (ii) d^0 is $\mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1])/\mathcal{B}(X)$ -measurable, and
- (iii) there is an $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{N}) = 0$ such that $d(\omega) = d^0(\omega, H(\omega, s))$ for all $(\omega, s) \in (\Omega \setminus \mathcal{N}) \times (0, 1]$.

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.1 and the fact that that X is Borel-isomorphic to $[0, 1]$, see e.g. [8, Theorem 13.1.1]. \square

4. REDUCTION OF GENERAL DECOUPLING

To formulate our main result we introduce two basic concepts: In Definition 4.1 we introduce a set of admissible adapted processes characterized by an assumption on the regular versions of the - in a sense - predictable projections, and in Definition 4.2 we introduce an extension of a given set of probability measures that is natural in our context.

Definition 4.1. *Let X be a separable Banach space, $p \in (0, \infty)$, $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(X)$, and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0})$ be a stochastic basis. We denote by $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}; X, \mathcal{P})$ the set of $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ -adapted sequences $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$ with the property that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an $\Omega_{n-1} \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{n-1}) = 1$ and $\kappa_{n-1}[\omega, \cdot] \in \mathcal{P}$ for all $\omega \in \Omega_{n-1}$, where κ_{n-1} is a regular version of $\mathbb{P}(d_n \in \cdot | \mathcal{F}_{n-1})$.*

Definition 4.2. *For a separable Banach space X , $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ we let*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}} := & \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X) : \forall j \in \mathbb{N} \exists K_j \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \mu_{j,1}, \dots, \mu_{j,K_j} \in \mathcal{P} \right. \\ & \text{such that } \mu_{j,1} * \dots * \mu_{j,K_j} \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu \text{ as } j \rightarrow \infty \\ & \left. \text{and } (\mu_{j,1} * \dots * \mu_{j,K_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ is uniformly } L^p\text{-integrable} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The following Lemma 4.3 reveals some basic properties of $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$. To this end, for $p \in (0, \infty)$ we introduce on $\mathcal{P}_p(X) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ the metric

$$d_p(\mu, \nu) := d_0(\mu, \nu) + \left| \int_X \|x\|^p d\mu(x) - \int_X \|x\|^p d\nu(x) \right| \quad (8)$$

where d_0 is a fixed metric on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ that metricizes the w^* -convergence, see for example [29, Theorem II.6.2].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ be non-empty. Then*

- (i) $(\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}})_{p\text{-ext}} = \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ and
- (ii) $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ is the smallest d_p -closed set \mathcal{Q} with $\mathcal{Q} \supseteq \mathcal{P}$ and $\mu * \nu \in \mathcal{Q}$ for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. The assertion follows from Lemma C.1 given the convolution is continuous with respect to d_p . To verify this, we let $\mu, \nu, \mu_n, \nu_n \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_p(\mu, \mu_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_p(\nu, \nu_n) = 0$. It is known that $\mu_n * \nu_n \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu * \nu$ as well (one can use [18, Theorem 4.30]). Because for $K > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{-\max\{0, p-1\}} \int_{\|x+y\|_X \geq K} \|x+y\|_X^p d\mu_n(x) d\nu_n(y) &\leq \int_{\{\|x\|_X \geq K/2\}} \|x\|_X^p d\mu_n(x) \\ &+ \int_{\{\|y\|_X \geq K/2\}} \|y\|_X^p d\nu_n(y) + \frac{2^{p+1}}{K^p} \int_X \|y\|_X^p d\nu_n(y) \int_X \|x\|_X^p d\mu_n(x) \end{aligned}$$

we get that $\mu_n * \nu_n$ is uniformly \mathcal{L}^p -integrable and use Lemma 2.1 to obtain the convergence of the p -th moments. \square

Now we formulate the main result of this section, i.e., Theorem 4.4 below. The proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix A.

Theorem 4.4. *Let X be a separable Banach space, let $\Phi \in C(X \times X; \mathbb{R})$ be such that there exist constants $C, p \in (0, \infty)$ for which it holds that*

$$|\Phi(x, y)| \leq C(1 + \|x\|_X^p + \|y\|_X^p)$$

for all $(x, y) \in X \times X$, and let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ with $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{P}$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:

- (i) For every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$ with $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and every finitely supported² $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}})$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n\right) \leq 0, \quad (9)$$

provided that $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an \mathbb{F} -decoupled tangent sequence of $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

- (ii) For every probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, every finitely supported sequence of independent random variables $\varphi = (\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) \in \mathcal{P}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and every $A_n \in \mathcal{F}_n^\varphi$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi'_n 1_{A_{n-1}}\right) \leq 0, \quad (10)$$

where $(\varphi'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an independent copy of $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

²Recall that this means that there is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d_n \equiv 0$ for $n > N$.

Remark 4.5. For a sequence of random variables $(1_{A_{n-1}}\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as in the setting of statement (ii) in Theorem 4.4 it holds that $(1_{A_{n-1}}\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}^{\varphi, \varphi'}; X, \mathcal{P})$ with $\mathbb{F}^{\varphi, \varphi'} = (\mathcal{F}_n^{\varphi, \varphi'})_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ given by $\mathcal{F}_0^{\varphi, \varphi'} := \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_n^{\varphi, \varphi'} := \sigma(\varphi_1, \varphi'_1, \dots, \varphi_n, \varphi'_n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, the implication (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is obvious by Example 2.7.

Theorem 4.4 can be extended to more general Φ . This is done by exploiting the following observation that is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.4:

Corollary 4.6. *Let X be a separable Banach space and let $\Phi_\lambda \in C(X \times X; \mathbb{R})$, $\lambda \in \Delta$, for an arbitrary non-empty index-set Δ . Suppose that there exist a $p \in (0, \infty)$ and constants $C_\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, $\lambda \in \Delta$, such that*

$$|\Phi_\lambda(x, y)| \leq C_\lambda(1 + \|x\|_X^p + \|y\|_X^p)$$

for all $(x, y) \in X \times X$, and let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ with $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{P}$. Then assertions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.4 remain equivalent when inequalities (9) and (10) are replaced by

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Delta} \mathbb{E}\Phi_\lambda \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n \right) \leq 0$$

and

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Delta} \mathbb{E}\Phi_\lambda \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi'_n 1_{A_{n-1}} \right) \leq 0,$$

respectively.

This corollary allows us to prove Theorem 1 from Section 1:

Proof of Theorem 1. The statement for general Δ follows from the case $\Delta = \{\lambda_0\}$ so that we may assume this case and let $\underline{\Psi} := \underline{\Psi}_{\lambda_0}$. By the lower- and upper semi-continuity we can find continuous $\underline{\Psi}^\ell, \overline{\Psi}^\ell : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\underline{\Psi}^\ell(\xi) \uparrow \underline{\Psi}(\xi)$ and $C(1 + |\xi|^p) \geq \overline{\Psi}^\ell(\xi) \downarrow \overline{\Psi}(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in [0, \infty)$. Next, we set $\Phi_\ell(x, y) := \underline{\Psi}^\ell(\|Sx\|_Y) - \overline{\Psi}^\ell(\|Ty\|_Z)$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the monotone convergence theorem implies that for all $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{L}^p(X)$ the conditions $\sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\Phi_\ell(\xi, \eta) \leq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\underline{\Psi}(\|S\xi\|_Y) - \overline{\Psi}(\|T\eta\|_Z)] \leq 0$ are equivalent. \square

Let us list some common choices of \mathcal{P} in the setting of decoupling inequalities. To do so, we exploit the following lemma:

Lemma 4.7. *Let $C, p \in (0, \infty)$, let X be a separable Banach space, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, and let $\Phi \in C(X; \mathbb{R})$ be such that*

$$|\Phi(x)| \leq C(1 + \|x\|_X^p) \tag{11}$$

for all $x \in X$. Assume $\xi, \xi_n \in \mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\xi_n \xrightarrow{w^*} \xi$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and that $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly L^p -integrable. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\Phi(\xi_n) = \mathbb{E}\Phi(\xi). \tag{12}$$

Proof. It follows from the uniform L^p -integrability of $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and estimate (11) that $(\Phi(\xi_n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly L^1 -integrable. Moreover, note that $\Phi(\xi_n) \xrightarrow{w^*} \Phi(\xi)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, so that we may apply Lemma 2.1 for $p = 1$. \square

We remark that $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$ in $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$, $\xi_n, \xi \in \mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$, implies the assumptions of Lemma 4.7 (see [18, Lemma 4.7]).

Example 4.8 (ADAPTED PROCESSES). If $p \in (0, \infty)$ and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_p(X)$, then $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}} = \mathcal{P}$ by Lemma 4.7 and the space $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P})$ consists of all $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ -adapted processes $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$.

Example 4.9 (L^p -MARTINGALES). If $p \in [1, \infty)$ and \mathcal{P} consists of all mean zero measures in $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$, then $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}} = \mathcal{P}$ by Lemma 4.7 (one can test with $\Phi(x) := \langle x, a \rangle$, where $a \in X'$ and X' is the norm-dual) and $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P})$ consists of all L^p -integrable \mathbb{F} -martingale difference sequences.

Example 4.10 (CONDITIONALLY SYMMETRIC ADAPTED PROCESSES). Suppose $p \in (0, \infty)$ and \mathcal{P} consists of all symmetric measures in $\mathcal{P}_p(X)$. As a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ is symmetric if and only if for all $f \in C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$ it holds that $\int_X f(x) d\mu(x) = \int_X f(-x) d\mu(x)$, it follows that $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}} = \mathcal{P}$. Moreover, the set $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P})$ consists of all sequences of X -valued $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ -adapted sequences of random variables $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $d_n \in \mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$ and d_n is \mathcal{F}_{n-1} -conditionally symmetric for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ it holds that $\mathbb{P}(d_n \in B | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \mathbb{P}(d_n \in -B | \mathcal{F}_{n-1})$ a.s.

Example 4.11 (ONE DIMENSIONAL LAWS). If $p \in (0, \infty)$, $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{P}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$, and

$$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}_0, X) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(X) : \exists \mu_0 \in \mathcal{P}_0, x \in X : \mu(\cdot) = \mu_0(\{r \in \mathbb{R} : rx \in \cdot\}) \right\},$$

then an X -valued random variable φ satisfies $\mathcal{L}(\varphi) \in \mathcal{P}$ if and only if there exists an $x \in X$ and a \mathbb{R} -valued random variable φ_0 such that $\varphi = x\varphi_0$ and $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_0) \in \mathcal{P}_0$. Moreover, $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P})$ contains all sequences of the form $(\varphi_n v_{n-1})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ where $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ -adapted sequence of \mathbb{R} -valued random variables such that φ_n is independent of \mathcal{F}_{n-1} and $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) \in \mathcal{P}_0$, and $v_{n-1} \in \mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{F}_{n-1}; X)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, it holds that

$$\mathcal{P}((\mathcal{P}_0)_{p\text{-ext}}, X) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}.$$

For a discussion of the case that $\mathcal{P}_0 = \{\frac{1}{2}(\delta_{-1} + \delta_1)\}$ and $X = \mathbb{R}$ we refer to the next section.

5. CHARACTERIZATION OF $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ FOR RADEMACHER SUMS

Given $p \in (0, \infty)$ and a non-empty $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{P}_p(X)$, there does not seem to be a simple characterization of $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ as defined in Definition 4.2. However, Theorem 5.1 below deals with this question in the specific case that $X = \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^{\text{Rad}} := \{\frac{1}{2}\delta_{-\xi} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\xi} : \xi \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Recall that a *Rademacher sequence* is a sequence of independent, identically distributed random variables $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}(r_1) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_{-1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_1$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{P}^{\text{Rad}} = \{\frac{1}{2}\delta_{-\xi} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{\xi} : \xi \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Then $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}} = \mathcal{P}_{2\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$ for all $p \in (0, \infty)$ and for every $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{2\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$ there exist $\sigma \in [0, \infty)$ and $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2$ such that $\mu = \mathcal{L}(\sigma\gamma + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n r_n)$, where γ is a standard Gaussian random variable and $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a Rademacher sequence independent of γ .*

Proof. Let $p \in (0, \infty)$ and let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$, and let $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Rademacher sequence. Then for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist finitely supported $a_k = (a_{k,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2$ such that $a_{k,n} \geq 0$ and, if we define $\psi_k := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{k,n} r_n$, then $(\psi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly L^p -integrable and $\mathcal{L}(\psi_k) \xrightarrow{w^*} \mu$.

(a) It follows from the Kahane-Khintchine inequalities that $(\psi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly L^q -integrable for all $q \in (0, \infty)$, from which we can conclude that $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}} = \mathcal{P}_{q\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$ for all $p, q \in (0, \infty)$ and that $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}|\psi_k|^2 < \infty$. As the law of ψ_k is invariant with respect to permutations of the underlying Rademacher sequence we assume that

$$0 \leq a_{k,n+1} \leq a_{k,n} \quad \text{for all } n, k \in \mathbb{N},$$

so that

$$\sup_{k,n \in \mathbb{N}} a_{k,n} = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} a_{k,1} \leq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|a_k\|_{\ell^2} =: c < \infty.$$

(b) **Finding an appropriate sub-sequence $(\xi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $(\psi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$:** Step (a) implies that

$$a_{k,n} \leq cn^{-1/2} \quad \text{for } k, n \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (13)$$

As $(a_{j,1})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded it contains a convergent sub-sequence $(a_{j_i^1,1})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with limit $a_{0,1}$. Because $(a_{j_i^1,2})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded as well, there is a convergent sub-sequence $(a_{j_i^2,2})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with limit $a_{0,2}$. Continuing, we extract from $(a_{j_i^{m-1},m})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ a convergent sub-sequence $(a_{j_i^m,m})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with limit $a_{0,m}$. Finally, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we pick $k_m \in \{j_i^m : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with $1 \leq k_1 < k_2 < \dots$ such that $|a_{k_m,n} - a_{0,n}| < cm^{-1/2}$ for all $n \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. By (13) it follows that $|a_{0,n} - a_{k_m,n}| \leq c \min\{m^{-1/2}, n^{-1/2}\}$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, by Fatou's lemma we have $\|a_0\|_{\ell^2} \leq c$ and therefore $\sup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \|a_{k_m} - a_0\|_{\ell^2} \leq 2c$, whence there exists a $\sigma \in [0, 2c]$ and a sub-sequence $(b_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}} := (a_{k_{m_j}})_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $m_j \geq j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|b_j - a_0\|_{\ell^2} = \sigma$. Note that by construction we have

$$|a_{0,n} - b_{j,n}| \leq c \min\{j^{-1/2}, n^{-1/2}\}$$

for all $j, n \in \mathbb{N}$. The random variables $\xi_j := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_{j,n} r_n$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, form a sub-sequence of $(\psi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, so that $\xi_j \xrightarrow{w^*} \psi$ as well.

(c) **Decomposition of $(\xi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$:** By construction there exists a non-decreasing sequence $(N_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{N} such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} N_j = \infty$ and such that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{N_j} |a_{0,n} - b_{j,n}|^2 = 0$, e.g. $N_j := \lfloor j^r \rfloor$ for some $r \in (0, 1)$. Now we decompose

$$\xi_j = \sum_{n=1}^{N_j} b_{j,n} r_n + \sum_{n=N_j+1}^{\infty} b_{j,n} r_n =: \eta_j + \zeta_j.$$

The random variables η_j and ζ_j are independent. Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{0,n} r_n - \eta_j \right|^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{N_j} |a_{0,n} - b_{j,n}|^2 + \sum_{n=N_j+1}^{\infty} |a_{0,n}|^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } j \rightarrow \infty.$$

Regarding the $(\zeta_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ we observe that, by construction,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{n > N_j} |b_{j,n}| = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=N_j+1}^{\infty} |b_{j,n}|^2 = \sigma^2,$$

where we use $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|b_j - a_0\|_{\ell^2} = \sigma$ and $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \|a_0 - (b_{j,n} 1_{n \leq N_j})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\|_{\ell^2} = 0$. Adapting the Lindeberg condition [18, Theorem 5.12]) yields that $\zeta_j \xrightarrow{w^*} \sigma \gamma$ where γ is a standard Gaussian distributed random variable. Now the assertion follows by the independence of η_j and ζ_j , and because of $\eta_j \xrightarrow{w^*} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_{0,n} r_n$. \square

Remark 5.2. Let $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Rademacher sequence and define

$$\mathcal{P} := \left\{ \mathcal{L} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n r_n \right) : (a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \ell^2 \right\}.$$

Then we have the following:

- (i) $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_{2\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$ as \mathcal{P} does not contain the Gaussian law $N(0, 1)$: let $(r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Rademacher sequence and $a = (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2$, and suppose $\xi := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n r_n \sim N(0, 1)$. We have $\mathbb{E}\xi^2 = \|a\|_{\ell^2}^2$ and $\mathbb{E}\xi^4 = 3\|a\|_{\ell^2}^4 - 2\|a\|_{\ell^4}^4$. Hence if $\mathbb{E}\xi^2 = 1$, then $\mathbb{E}\xi^4 < 3$, so that ξ cannot have a standard Gaussian law.
- (ii) There are symmetric measures in $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ that do not belong to $\mathcal{P}_{2\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$: we take a symmetric $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R})$ such that for a random variable ξ with the law μ we have $\mathbb{P}(\xi = 0) > 0$, $\mathbb{E}\xi^2 = 1$, and $\mathbb{E}\xi^4 = 3$. The condition $\mathbb{P}(\xi = 0) > 0$ implies that we can assume $\xi = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n r_n$ for $a = (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \ell^2$. But now we can conclude with the argument from (i).

6. DYADIC DECOUPLING AND STOCHASTIC INTEGRATION

In this section we consider the case of decoupling of dyadic martingales and combine our main result, i.e., Theorem 4.4 with a standard extrapolation argument to obtain a decoupling result that is useful for the theory of stochastic integration of vector-valued stochastic processes, see Theorem 6.6 below.

Before we start we explain by the next lemma that *any reasonable upper decoupling* implies that the underlying Banach space X cannot contain subspaces E_N of dimension N , $N = 1, 2, \dots$, such that the Banach-Mazur distances of E_N to ℓ_N^{∞} are uniformly bounded in N . The lemma is an adaptation of the examples found in [10] and [37].

Lemma 6.1. *Let $q \in [2, \infty)$. Then there exists a constant $c_q \in (0, \infty)$ such that for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, every sequence of independent, identically distributed \mathbb{R} -valued random variables $\varphi = (\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$, and every sequence of independent, identically distributed mean-zero \mathbb{R} -valued random variables $\varphi' = (\varphi'_n)_{n=1}^N$ independent of φ and such that $\mathbb{E}(|\varphi'_1|^q) < \infty$ there exists an $(\mathcal{F}_n^{\varphi})_{n=0}^N$ -adapted ℓ_{2N}^{∞} -valued sequence $(v_n)_{n=0}^{N-1}$ such that:*

- (i) $\mathbb{E} \left(\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\ell_{2N}^{\infty}}^q \right) \leq c_q^q N^{\frac{q}{2}} \mathbb{E}(|\varphi'_1|^q)$.
- (ii) *If for some $c \in (0, \infty)$, $\eta \in (0, 1]$ it holds that $\mathbb{P}(|\varphi_1| \geq c) = \eta$, then $\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\ell_{2N}^{\infty}} \geq \frac{c\eta N}{2} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for $N \geq 2/\eta$.*

Proof. Set $\mathbb{D}_N := \{-1, 1\}^N$ and for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}_N$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ define $\mathbb{D}_N(\alpha) := \{e \in \mathbb{D}_N : e_1 = \alpha_1, \dots, e_n = \alpha_n\}$. Moreover, for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ define

$\alpha_n: \Omega \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ and $v_{n-1}: \Omega \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\mathbb{D}_N)$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_n(\omega) &:= \begin{cases} 1, & \varphi_n(\omega) > 0 \\ -1, & \varphi_n(\omega) \leq 0 \end{cases}, \\ v_{n-1}(\omega)(e) &:= e_n 1_{\mathbb{D}_N((\alpha_1(\omega), \dots, \alpha_{n-1}(\omega)))}(e),\end{aligned}$$

where we agree that $v_0(\omega)(e) := e_1$. Note that $(v_n)_{n=0}^{N-1}$ is $(\mathcal{F}_n^\varphi)_{n=0}^{N-1}$ -adapted. Moreover, for all $\omega \in \Omega$ it holds that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n(\omega) v_{n-1}(\omega) \right\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{D}_N)} = \sum_{n=1}^N |\varphi_n(\omega)|, \quad (14)$$

which can be exploited in the following way to obtain the second assertion of the lemma: We let $A_n := \{|\varphi_n| \geq c\}$. Then we get for $N \geq 2/\eta$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=1}^N |\varphi_n| \geq \frac{c\eta N}{2}\right) &\geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=1}^N 1_{A_n} \geq \frac{\eta N}{2}\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=1}^N 1_{A_n} \geq N\eta - 1\right) \\ &= \sum_{N\eta-1 \leq \ell \leq N} \eta^\ell (1-\eta)^{N-\ell} \binom{N}{\ell} \geq \frac{1}{2}\end{aligned}$$

where we use that $N\eta - 1$ is less than or equal the median of the binomial distribution [17, Corollary 1]. On the other hand, for all $\omega \in \Omega$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n(\omega) v_{n-1}(\omega) \right\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{D}_N)} \\ &\leq \sup_{n \in \{1, \dots, N\}} (|\alpha_1(\omega) \varphi'_1(\omega) + \dots + \alpha_{n-1}(\omega) \varphi'_{n-1}(\omega)| + |\varphi'_n(\omega)|) \\ &\leq 3 \sup_{n \in \{1, \dots, N\}} |\alpha_1(\omega) \varphi'_1(\omega) + \dots + \alpha_n(\omega) \varphi'_n(\omega)|,\end{aligned}$$

which by the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality (using that φ' has mean zero and is independent of φ) leads to the first assertion of the Lemma. \square

6.1. Stochastic integrals and γ -radonifying operators. Let X be a separable Banach space, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)})$ be a stochastic basis³, and let $W = (W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be an $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ -Brownian motion, i.e., a centered \mathbb{R} -valued Gaussian process such that for all $0 \leq s \leq t < \infty$ it holds that W_t is \mathcal{F}_t -measurable, $W_t - W_s$ is independent from \mathcal{F}_s , and $\mathbb{E}W_s W_t = s$. A process $H: [0, \infty) \times \Omega \rightarrow X$ is called *simple and predictable* provided that there exists a partition $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_N < \infty$ and random variables $v_n \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathcal{F}_{t_n}; X)$, $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$, such that for all $t \in [0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$H(t, \omega) = \sum_{n=1}^N 1_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]}(t) v_{n-1}(\omega).$$

For $H: [0, \infty) \times \Omega \rightarrow X$ an X -valued simple predictable process we define the stochastic integral $\int_0^\infty H(s) dW(s)$ in the usual way and we define

$$u_H: \mathcal{L}^2((0, \infty)) \times \Omega \rightarrow X \quad \text{by} \quad u_H(f)(\omega) := \int_0^\infty f(t) H(t, \omega) dt.$$

³We do not need the *usual conditions* on the stochastic basis in this article.

Note that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ we obtain a finite rank operator $u_H(\omega) : \mathcal{L}^2((0, \infty)) \rightarrow X$. Given a finite rank operator $T : \mathcal{L}^2((0, \infty)) \rightarrow X$ one can define the γ -radonifying norm $\|\cdot\|_{\gamma(\mathcal{L}^2((0, \infty)); X)}$ by

$$\|T\|_{\gamma(\mathcal{L}^2((0, \infty)); X)} := \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \gamma_n T e_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}', X)},$$

where $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{L}^2((0, \infty))$ and $(\gamma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of independent standard Gaussian random variables on some probability space $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$. The γ -radonifying norm is independent of the chosen orthonormal basis. For more information about the γ -radonifying norm see, for example [32, Chapter 3] or the survey article [34]. For the relevance of γ -radonifying norms to the definition of vector-valued stochastic integrals, see the definition of and results on $W_p(X)$ in Definition 6.3 and Theorem 6.6 below, or see [35] for more details.

6.2. Decoupling constants. In order to state our result, Theorem 6.6, we first recall that a random variable $f \in \mathcal{L}^0((\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}); X)$ is conditionally symmetric given a sub- σ -algebra \mathcal{G} provided that $\mathbb{P}(\{f \in B\} \cap G) = \mathbb{P}(\{f \in -B\} \cap G)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ and $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

For future arguments it is convenient to provide an explicit representation of a probability space with a dyadic filtration, as well as an extended space on which we can explicitly define decoupled dyadic martingales:

Setting 6.2. For $\mathbb{D} := \{-1, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ let $r = (r_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $r_n : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$, satisfy $r_n(e) = e_n$. Let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}} := \sigma(r_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ and $(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}, n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}} := (\mathcal{F}_n^r)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and assume that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}}$ is the probability measure on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}}$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}}(r_1 = e_1, \dots, r_n = e_n) = 2^{-n}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e \in \mathbb{D}$. Moreover, let $(\mathbb{D}', \mathcal{F}'_{\mathbb{D}}, \mathbb{P}'_{\mathbb{D}}, (r'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (\mathcal{F}'_{\mathbb{D}, n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$ be a copy of this construction.

We also introduce some constants:

Definition 6.3. Assume the Setting 6.2, let X be a separable Banach space, and let $p \in (0, \infty)$.

$\underline{D}_p(X)$: Let $D_p(X) \in [0, \infty]$ be the infimum over all $c \in [0, \infty]$ such that for all $N \geq 2$ it holds that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}}; X)} \leq c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_{\mathbb{D}}; X)}$$

for all $v_0 \in X$ and $v_n := f_n(r_1, \dots, r_n)$ with $f_n : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow X$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$.

$\underline{W}_p(X)$: Recall the notation introduced in Section 6.1. Let $W_p(X) \in [0, \infty]$ be the infimum over all $c \in [0, \infty]$ such that for every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)})$, every $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ -Brownian motion W , and every $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)}$ -simple predictable process $H : [0, \infty) \times \Omega \rightarrow X$ one has that

$$\left\| \int_0^{\infty} H(s) dW(s) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq c \left\| \|u_H\|_{\gamma(\mathcal{L}^2((0, \infty)); X)} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P})}.$$

$\underline{\text{UMD}}_p^{+,s}(X)$: Let $\text{UMD}_p^{+,s}(X) \in [0, \infty]$ be the infimum over all $c \in [0, \infty]$ such that for every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}})$ and every finitely supported sequence

of X -valued random variables $(d_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $d_n \in \mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{F}_n; X)$ and d_n is \mathcal{F}_{n-1} -conditionally symmetric for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}}; X)}. \quad (15)$$

$\underline{H}_p(X)$: Let $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the Haar system for $\mathcal{L}^2((0, 1])$ with $\text{ess sup}(|h_n|) = 1$, and let $\underline{H}_p(X) \in [0, \infty]$ be the infimum over all $c \in [0, \infty]$ such that for all finitely supported sequences $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in X one has that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_n x_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p((0, 1]; X)} \leq c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n h_n x_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p((0, 1] \times \mathbb{D}; X)}.$$

$|H|_p(X)$: Let $(h_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as in the definition of $\underline{H}_p(X)$, and let $|H|_p(X) \in [0, \infty]$ be the infimum over all $c \in [0, \infty]$ such that for all finitely supported sequences $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in X one has that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h_n x_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p((0, 1]; X)} \leq c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} r_n |h_n| x_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p((0, 1] \times \mathbb{D}; X)}.$$

Remark 6.4. Note that the processes $(r_n v_{n-1})_{n=1}^N$ considered in the definition of $D_p(X)$ above are precisely the X -valued dyadic martingales.

Remark 6.5. Theorem 4.4 (see also Theorem 1) and Theorem 5.1 imply that for a stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^\infty)$, independent standard Gaussian random variables $(g_n)_{n=1}^N$ such that g_n is \mathcal{F}_n -measurable, but independent from \mathcal{F}_{n-1} , and $v_n \in \mathcal{L}^p((\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P}); X)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, one has for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N g_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq D_p(X) \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N g'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'; X)}, \quad (16)$$

where $(g'_n)_{n=1}^N$ are independent standard Gaussian random variables defined on an auxiliary probability space $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$.

The aim of this section is to verify the following two theorems. The relation between the constants introduced in Definition 6.3 is given by the first theorem:

Theorem 6.6. *Let X be a separable Banach space and $p \in (0, \infty)$.*

- (i) *If $D_p(X) < \infty$, then $D_q(X) < \infty$ for all $q \in (0, \infty)$.*
- (ii) *If $K_{p,2}$ is the constant in the L^p -to- L^2 Kahane-Khintchine inequality, then*

$$W_p(X) \leq K_{p,2} D_p(X).$$

Conversely, if $W_p(X) < \infty$, then $D_p(X) < \infty$.

- (iii) *$D_p(X) = \text{UMD}_p^{+,s}(X) = H_p(X) = |H|_p(X)$.*

The second theorem states that, in a sense, $D_p(X)$ is minimal for all $p \in [2, \infty)$. To state this theorem we introduce the following notation (see also Example 4.11): for $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ we define

$$\mathcal{P}(\nu, X) := \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(X) : \exists x \in X : \mu(\cdot) = \nu(\{r \in \mathbb{R} : rx \in \cdot\}) \right\}.$$

Theorem 6.7. *Let X be a separable Banach space, $p \in [2, \infty)$, let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy $\int_{\mathbb{R}} r d\mu(r) = 0$, $\sigma^2 := \int_{\mathbb{R}} |r|^2 d\mu(r) \in (0, \infty)$, and let $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ be the standard Gaussian law. Then the following holds:*

- (i) $\mathcal{P}(\gamma, X) \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\mu, X))_{p\text{-ext}}$.
- (ii) *If there exist $q \in (0, p]$, $c \in (0, \infty)$ such that for every probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, every finitely supported sequence of independent random variables $\varphi = (\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) \in \mathcal{P}(\mu, X)$, and every $A_n \in \mathcal{F}_n^\varphi$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, it holds that*

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n 1_{A_{n-1}} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^q(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi'_n 1_{A_{n-1}} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^q(\mathbb{P}; X)} \quad (17)$$

where $(\varphi'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an independent copy of $(\varphi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, then $D_q(X) < \infty$.

Proof. (i) Let $(\xi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of independent, μ -distributed random variables, and let $\mu_n := \mathcal{L}((\sigma\sqrt{n})^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^n \xi_k)$. Observe that $\mathcal{L}((\sigma\sqrt{n})^{-1} \xi_1) \in \mathcal{P}(\mu, \mathbb{R})$. Moreover, it follows from e.g. [2, Theorem 5] that $\mu_n \xrightarrow{w^*} \gamma$ and that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |r|^p d\mu_n(r) \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}} |r|^p d\gamma(r)$. It thus follows from Lemma 2.1 that $\gamma \in (\mathcal{P}(\mu, \mathbb{R}))_{p\text{-ext}}$ and hence $\mathcal{P}(\gamma, X) \subseteq (\mathcal{P}(\mu, X))_{p\text{-ext}}$.

(ii) Observe that $\gamma \in (\mathcal{P}(\mu, \mathbb{R}))_{p\text{-ext}}$ implies $\gamma \in (\mathcal{P}(\mu, \mathbb{R}))_{q\text{-ext}}$ for all $q \in (0, p]$. Applying Theorem 4.4 (Theorem 1) implies inequality (16) with p replaced by q and $D_p(X)$ replaced by c from inequality (17). The part (ii) of the proof below of Theorem 6.6 gives exactly $W_q(X) < \infty$, and applying Theorem 6.6 once more (this time directly) gives $D_q(X) < \infty$. \square

For the proof of Theorem 6.6 we shall use the following lemma.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, let X be a separable Banach space, let $p \in (0, \infty)$, let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a σ -algebra, and let $f \in L^p(\mathcal{F}; X)$ be \mathcal{G} -conditionally symmetric. Then there exists a sequence of \mathcal{G} -conditionally symmetric \mathcal{F} -simple functions $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - f_n\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} = 0$.*

Proof. Let $(g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of $\sigma(f)$ -simple functions such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - g_n\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} = 0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $m_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B_{n,k} \in \sigma(f)$, $x_{n,k} \in X$, $k \in \{1, \dots, m_n\}$, be such that $g_n = \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} x_{n,k} 1_{\{f \in B_{n,k}\}}$. Define, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_n = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} x_{n,k} (1_{\{f \in B_{n,k}\}} - 1_{\{-f \in B_{n,k}\}})$ and observe that f_n is \mathcal{G} -conditionally symmetric because f is \mathcal{G} -conditionally symmetric. Moreover, the conditional symmetry of f implies that $\mathcal{L}(f) = \mathcal{L}(-f)$, whence

$$\begin{aligned} & \|f - f_n\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{2} \left(f - \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} x_{n,k} 1_{\{f \in B_{n,k}\}} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(-f - \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} x_{n,k} 1_{\{-f \in B_{n,k}\}} \right) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} \\ &\leq 2^{(\frac{1}{p}-1)^+} \left\| f - \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} x_{n,k} 1_{\{f \in B_{n,k}\}} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} = 2^{(\frac{1}{p}-1)^+} \|f - g_n\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Theorem 6.6. Part (i) is the assertion of Proposition B.1 below.

Part (ii): First we check $W_p(X) \leq K_{p,2}D_p(X)$. For $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_N < \infty$ inequality (16) gives

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N (W_{t_n} - W_{t_{n-1}})v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq D_p(X) \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N (W'_{t_n} - W'_{t_{n-1}})v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'; X)}$$

for all \mathcal{L}^p -integrable and $\mathcal{F}_{t_{n-1}}$ -measurable random variables $v_{n-1} : \Omega \rightarrow X$ where $(W'_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motion defined on an auxiliary basis $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}', (\mathcal{F}'_t)_{t \in [0, \infty)})$. Exploiting the Kahane-Khintchine inequality gives that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N (W'_{t_n} - W'_{t_{n-1}})v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'; X)} \\ & \leq K_{p,2} \left(\int_{\Omega} \left(\int_{\Omega'} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N (W'_{t_n}(\omega') - W'_{t_{n-1}}(\omega'))v_{n-1}(\omega) \right\|_X^2 d\mathbb{P}'(\omega') \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}. \end{aligned}$$

For $H := \sum_{n=1}^N 1_{(t_{n-1}, t_n]} v_{n-1}$ the result follows by the known relation

$$\left(\int_{\Omega'} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N (W'_{t_n}(\omega') - W'_{t_{n-1}}(\omega'))v_{n-1}(\omega) \right\|_X^2 d\mathbb{P}'(\omega') \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|u_H(\omega)\|_{\gamma(\mathcal{L}^2((0, \infty)); X)}.$$

Conversely, let us assume that $W_p(X) < \infty$. Then Lemma 6.1 implies that X has finite cotype. Thus the proof of [37, Theorem 2.2] guarantees that $D_p(X) < \infty$. Here we exploit the fact that [25, Proposition 9.14] works (in their notation) with the parameter $r \in (0, 1)$ as well: one starts on the left-hand side with \mathcal{L}^r , estimates this by \mathcal{L}^1 , applies [25, Proposition 9.14], and uses [25, Proposition 4.7] (Khintchine's inequality for a vector valued Rademacher series) to change \mathcal{L}^1 back to \mathcal{L}^r on the right-hand side.

Part (iii) is divided into several steps:

PROOF of $H_p(X) = |H|_p(X)$: This is immediate as, in the notation of Definition 6.3, the sequences $(r_n h_n)_{n=1}^N$ and $(r_n |h_n|)_{n=1}^N$ have the same distribution for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

PROOF of $H_p(X) \leq \text{UMD}_p^{+,s}(X)$: This inequality follows by taking $d_n = h_n x_n$, and $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(h_0, \dots, h_n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, in the definition of $\text{UMD}_p^{+,s}(X)$.

PROOF of $D_p(X) = |H|_p(X)$: We use the following standard construction. Let $N \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, let $\Delta_N := \{(n, k) : n = 0, \dots, N-1, k = 0, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$, $A_{0,0} := \mathbb{D}$, and let

$$A_{n,k} := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n (r_j + 1)2^{j-2} = k \right\} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{D}, n} \quad \text{for } (n, k) \in \Delta_N \setminus \{(0, 0)\}.$$

If we set $h_{n,k} := r_{n+1} 1_{A_{n,k}}$ for $(n, k) \in \Delta_N$, then $(h_{n,k})_{(n,k) \in \Delta_N}$ has the same distribution as $(h_\ell)_{\ell=1}^{2^N-1}$. Let $v_0 \in X$ and $f_n : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow X$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$,

be given and let $v_n: \mathbb{D} \rightarrow X$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ satisfy $v_n = f_n(r_1, \dots, r_n)$. Let $x_{n,k} \in X$ be the value of v_n on $A_{n,k}$ for $(n,k) \in \Delta_N$. Then one has

$$\sum_{n=1}^N r_n v_{n-1} = \sum_{(n,k) \in \Delta_N} h_{n,k} x_{n,k} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n v_{n-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} r'_{n+1} |h_{n,k}| x_{n,k}. \quad (18)$$

Next, observe that $(r'_{n+1} |h_{n,k}|)_{(n,k) \in \Delta_N}$ and $(r'_{n,k} |h_{n,k}|)_{(n,k) \in \Delta_N}$ have the same distribution, where $(r'_{n,k})_{(n,k) \in \Delta_N}$ is a Rademacher system on an auxiliary probability space. This implies that $D_p(X) \leq |H|_p(X)$. Similarly, given $(x_{n,k})_{(n,k) \in \Delta_N}$, we can construct $(v_n)_{n=0}^{N-1}$ such that (18) holds. This implies $D_p(X) \geq |H|_p(X)$.

PROOF OF $\text{UMD}_p^{+,s}(X) \leq D_p(X)$: With Lemma 6.8 we approximate each d_n in $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{F}_n; X)$ so that we may assume that the d_n take finitely many values only. Let

$$\varepsilon_0 := \inf\{\|d_n(\omega)\|_X : n = 1, \dots, N, \omega \in \Omega, d_n(\omega) \neq 0\} > 0$$

where $\inf \emptyset := 1$. Take an $x \in X$ with $0 < \|x\|_X < \varepsilon_0$ and the Rademacher sequence $(r'_n)_{n=1}^N$ given by the Setting 6.2. If we define

$$\tilde{d}_n(\omega, e') := d_n(\omega) + r'_n(e')x, \quad \text{then} \quad \tilde{d}_n(\omega, e') \neq 0$$

for all $(\omega, e') \in \Omega \times \mathbb{D}'$, then \tilde{d}_n is conditionally symmetric given the σ -algebra $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} \otimes \mathcal{F}'_{\mathbb{D}, n-1}$. Because we may let $\|x\|_X \downarrow 0$ it suffices to verify the statement for $(\tilde{d}_n)_{n=1}^N$ or, in other words, we may assume without loss of generality that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the range of d_n is a finite set that does not contain 0.

Note that by removing all (i.e., at most finitely many) atoms of measure zero in the σ -algebra \mathcal{F}_N^d and ‘updating’ the definition of $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ accordingly, we may assume that the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n^d)_{n=1}^N$ has the property that \mathcal{F}_n^d is generated by finitely many atoms of positive measure.

Bearing in mind that for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ the random variable d_n takes only finitely many non-zero values, each with positive probability, one may check that for every atom $A \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}^d$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, there exist disjoint sets $A^+, A^- \in \mathcal{F}_n^d$ such that $A = A^+ \cup A^-$, $\mathbb{P}(A^+) = \mathbb{P}(A^-)$, and $\mathcal{L}(d_n|A^+) = \mathcal{L}(-d_n|A^-)$. Now we introduce a Rademacher sequence $(\rho_n)_{n=1}^N$, $\rho_n: \Omega \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$, defined as follows: for each atom A of \mathcal{F}_{n-1}^d we set $\rho_n|_{A^+} \equiv 1$, and $\rho_n|_{A^-} \equiv -1$, where A^+ and A^- form a partition of A as described above. Moreover, we let $v_n := \rho_n d_n$ so that $d_n = \rho_n v_n$. By construction, ρ_n is independent from $\mathcal{F}_{n-1}^d \vee \sigma(v_n)$. It follows from the definition of $D_p(X)$ and Theorem 1 (see also Example 2.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} = \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \rho_n v_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq D_p(X) \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n v_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_{\mathbb{D}}; X)} \\ & = D_p(X) \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n r_n v_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_{\mathbb{D}}; X)} = D_p(X) \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_{\mathbb{D}}; X)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

7. DYADIC DECOUPLING IN c_0 AND ℓ_K^∞

The aim of this section is to determine the asymptotics of $D_2(\ell_K^\infty)$. For this purpose we begin with the proof of Theorem 3:

Proof of Theorem 3. First we fix $K, N \in \mathbb{N}$ and restrict $D_{\sqrt{\log}}$ to $D_{\sqrt{\log}} : \ell_K^\infty \rightarrow \ell_K^\infty$. We take the Rademacher variables $(r_n)_{n=1}^N$ and $(r'_n)_{n=1}^N$ from Setting 6.2, let $v_0 \in \ell_K^\infty$, $f_n : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \ell_K^\infty$ and $v_n := f_n(r_1, \dots, r_n)$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} d_n &= (d_n^{(1)}, \dots, d_n^{(K)}) := r_n v_{n-1} : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \ell_\infty^K \quad \text{for } n \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \\ M_n^k &:= d_1^{(k)} + \dots + d_n^{(k)} \quad \text{for } n \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \\ S_2(M^{(k)}) &:= \left(\sum_{n=1}^N |d_n^{(k)}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We add $d_0 = M_0 = (M_0^{(1)}, \dots, M_0^{(K)}) \equiv 0 \in \ell_\infty^K$ to be in accordance with the literature. By an extension of the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality [13, Lemma 4.3] it is known (see [11, equation (4)]) that there is a $c_1 \in (0, \infty)$ with

$$\|(M_n^{(k)})_{n=0}^N\|_{\text{BMO}_{\psi_2}} \leq c_1 \|S_2(M^{(k)})\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{D}_\mathbb{P})} \quad \text{for } k \in \{1, \dots, K\},$$

where $\psi_2(t) := t^2$ and the BMO_{ψ} -spaces are introduced in [11, p. 239]. From [11, Theorem 1.5] we also know that, for $\alpha_k := (1 + \log k)^{-1/2}$,

$$\left\| \left(\sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \alpha_k |M_n^{(k)}| \right)_{n=0}^N \right\|_{\text{BMO}_{\psi_2}} \leq c_2 \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \left\| (M_n^{(k)})_{n=0}^N \right\|_{\text{BMO}_{\psi_2}}$$

for some $c_2 \in (0, \infty)$, where one has to observe (in the notation of [11]) that $\psi_2 = \overline{\psi_2}$ by [11, Example 4.3]. If we introduce the operators $A, B : E_N \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^0(\mathbb{D})$, where E_N consists of all sequences $d = (d_n)_{n=0}^N$ as above (note that $K, N \in \mathbb{N}$ are fixed),

$$A(d) := \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \alpha_k \left| M_N^{(k)} \right| \quad \text{and} \quad B(d) := \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} S_2(M^{(k)}),$$

then the two previous estimates yield to $\|A(d)\|_{\text{BMO}_{\psi_2}} \leq c_1 c_2 \|B(d)\|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{D})}$. By [11, Theorem 1.7] we deduce $\|A(d)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{D})} \leq c \|B(d)\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{D})}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \frac{\left| \sum_{n=1}^N d_n^{(k)} \right|}{\sqrt{1 + \log(k)}} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{D})} &\leq c \left\| \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \left(\sum_{n=1}^N |d_n^{(k)}|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{D})} \\ &= c \left\| \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n d_n^{(k)} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}'_\mathbb{D})} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{D})} \\ &\leq c \left\| \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n d_n^{(k)} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{D} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_\mathbb{D})} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{D})} \\ &= c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{D} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_\mathbb{D}; \ell_K^\infty)}. \end{aligned}$$

The statement follows with $K \rightarrow \infty$ by monotone convergence and by observing that $\|(\xi_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}\|_{c_0} = \sup_{K \in \mathbb{N}} \|(\xi_k)_{k=1}^K\|_{\ell_\infty^K}$ and that the constants c_1, c_2, c do not depend on K and N . \square

Corollary 7.1 below complements [30, Proposition 8.6.8, Example 8.6.13] where it is shown that for every Banach space X , $N \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, $v_0 \in X$, and $v_n := f_n(r_1, \dots, r_n)$ with $f_n: \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow X$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, it holds that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}}; X)} \leq \sqrt{N} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_{\mathbb{D}}; X)}.$$

Here the decoupling constant \sqrt{N} depends on the length of the dyadic martingale which we are going to decouple. In Corollary 7.1 we strengthen this result for $X = \ell_{2^N}^\infty$ by obtaining the same asymptotic upper bound, but now independent from the length of the martingale.

Corollary 7.1. *There is a constant $c \in [1, \infty)$ such that for all $K \in \mathbb{N}$ one has*

$$\frac{1}{c} \sqrt{1 + \log(K)} \leq D_2(\ell_K^\infty) \leq c \sqrt{1 + \log(K)}.$$

Proof. The lower bound is known (see e.g. [10], [37], or Lemma 6.1). The upper bound follows directly from Theorem 3, because (with the notation of the definition of $D_2(X)$ and with a_1, \dots, a_K being the unit vectors in ℓ_K^1)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}}; \ell_K^\infty)}}{\sqrt{1 + \log(K)}} &\leq \left\| \sup_{k \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \frac{\left| \sum_{n=1}^N \langle r_n v_{n-1}, a_k \rangle \right|}{\sqrt{1 + \log(k)}} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}})} \\ &\leq D_2(D_{\sqrt{\log}}) \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{D}} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_{\mathbb{D}}; \ell_K^\infty)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Given $\delta \in (0, 1]$, we say that a sequence $(a_k)_{k \in I} \subset X'$, where X' is the norm-dual of X and where $I = \{1, \dots, K\}$ or $I = \mathbb{N}$, is δ -norming, provided that $\|a_k\|_{X'} = 1$ and $\sup_{k \in I} |\langle x, a_k \rangle| \geq \delta \|x\|_X$ for all $x \in X$.

Corollary 7.2. *Let X be a separable Banach space, let $(a_\ell)_{\ell \in I} \subset X'$ be δ -norming for some $\delta \in (0, 1]$, and let $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^{\text{Rad}}(X) := \{\frac{1}{2}\delta_x + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{-x} : x \in X\}$. For every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$ with $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and every finitely supported $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{A}_2(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P}_{2\text{-ext}})$ it holds that*

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq \frac{D_2(D_{\sqrt{\log}})}{\delta} \left\| \sup_{k \in I} \left[\sqrt{1 + \log(k)} \left| \left\langle \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n, a_k \right\rangle \right| \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}; X)},$$

provided that $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an \mathbb{F} -decoupled tangent sequence of $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Proof. Theorems 1 and 3 imply that for all $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and $I_K := I \cap \{1, \dots, K\}$ we have that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \sup_{K \in \mathbb{N}} \left\| \sup_{k \in I_K} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \log(k)}} \left| \left\langle \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n, \sqrt{1 + \log(k)} a_k \right\rangle \right| \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}; X)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \frac{D_2(D\sqrt{\log})}{\delta} \sup_{K \in \mathbb{N}} \left\| \sup_{k \in I_K} \left\langle \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n, \sqrt{1 + \log(k)} a_k \right\rangle \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}; X)} \\
 &= \frac{D_2(D\sqrt{\log})}{\delta} \left\| \sup_{k \in I} \left[\sqrt{1 + \log(k)} \left\langle \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n, a_k \right\rangle \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}; X)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

8. DYADIC DECOUPLING AND CHAOS

For the dyadic decoupling considered in Sections 6 and 7 we show in Theorem 8.3 below that it is also natural to allow decoupling with respect to a different distribution (cf. Definition 8.1), i.e. one can vary the distribution used for the upper decoupling on the right side without changing any requirements on the underlying Banach space X . Moreover, Theorem 8.3 shows that a Banach space X allows for decoupling with respect to a distribution in some fixed chaos obtained from $\mathcal{P}_{2\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$ if and only if it allows for decoupling with respect the first chaos, i.e., if and only if $D_2(X) < \infty$.

Definition 8.1. Let $p \in (0, \infty)$, $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(\mathbb{R})$, and X be a separable Banach space. Then $D_p(X; \mu, \nu)$ is the infimum over all $c \in [0, \infty]$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} \leq c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \psi'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'; X)}$$

for all $N \geq 2$, where $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N$ are independent random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with law μ , $\psi'_1, \dots, \psi'_N : \Omega' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are independent random variables on $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$ with law ν , $v_0 \in X$, and $v_n = f_n(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \in \mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ and Borel functions $f_n : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow X$.

Definition 8.2. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ and $L \in \mathbb{N}$ a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ belongs to the L -th chaos $\mathcal{C}_L(\alpha)$ if there are an integer $K \geq L$ and $(a_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_L})_{1 \leq \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_L \leq K} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with

$$\mu = \mathcal{L} \left(\sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_L \leq K} a_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_L} \varphi_{\ell_1} \cdots \varphi_{\ell_L} \right), \quad (19)$$

where $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_K : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are independent with law α .

Theorem 8.3. For a separable Banach space X , $p \in [1, \infty)$, $L \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}^{\text{Rad}}$, and $\delta_0 \neq \mu \in \mathcal{C}_L(\alpha)$ the following assertions are equivalent:

- (i) $D_p(X) < \infty$.
- (ii) There exists a symmetric $\nu \in \bigcap_{r \in (0, \infty)} \mathcal{P}_r(\mathbb{R})$ such that $D_p(X; \mu, \nu) < \infty$.
- (iii) $D_p(X; \mu, \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{-1} + \delta_1)) < \infty$.
- (iv) $D_p(X; \mu, \mu) < \infty$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii) Let μ be represented by (19) (i.e., we are given $K, L \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $K > L$ and $(a_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_L})_{1 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 < \dots < \ell_L \leq K} \in \mathbb{R}$). If we define ν by setting

$$\nu := \mathcal{L} \left(\sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_L \leq K} a_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_L} \varphi_{\ell_1}^1 \cdots \varphi_{\ell_L}^L \right),$$

where $\varphi_k^\ell : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(\ell, k) \in \{1, \dots, L\} \times \{1, \dots, K\}$ are independent and symmetric random variables with law α , then it follows immediately by iteratively applying Theorem 4.4 (or Theorem 1) that $D_p(X; \mu, \nu) \leq (D_p(X))^L < \infty$. Note that ν is symmetric and that, in general, $\mu \neq \nu$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii) By Lemma 6.1 the assumption $D_p(X; \mu, \nu) < \infty$ implies that X has finite cotype. This enables us to apply [25, Proposition 9.14] to deduce that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \psi'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'; X)} \leq c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_D; X)},$$

where the constant $c > 0$ depends only on p , the cotype of X , and ν .

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv) Let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N$ be independent random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with law μ , $v_0 \in X$, and $v_n = f_n(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n) \in \mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ and Borel functions $f_n : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow X$. We use [25, Lemma 4.5] to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} &\leq D_p(X; \mu, \tfrac{1}{2}(\delta_{-1} + \delta_1)) \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N r'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'_D; X)} \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}|\varphi'_1 - \varphi''_1|^{-1} D_p(X; \mu, \tfrac{1}{2}(\delta_{-1} + \delta_1)) \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N (\varphi'_n - \varphi''_n) v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}' \otimes \mathbb{P}''; X)} \\ &\leq 2 |\mathbb{E}|\varphi'_1 - \varphi''_1|^{-1} D_p(X; \mu, \tfrac{1}{2}(\delta_{-1} + \delta_1)) \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n v_{n-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'; X)} \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi'_1, \dots, \varphi'_N : \Omega' \rightarrow X$ and $\varphi''_1, \dots, \varphi''_N : \Omega'' \rightarrow X$ are independent copies of $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N$. The implication (iv) \Rightarrow (i) follows from Theorem 6.7. \square

9. RELATIONS TO OTHER CONSTANTS AND OPEN PROBLEMS

9.1. Randomized UMD constants. Garling [10] introduced upper- and lower randomized UMD inequalities. In our notation the corresponding constants would be $\text{UMD}_p^+(X)$ and $\text{UMD}_p^-(X)$, where $\text{UMD}_p^+(X)$ is defined as $\text{UMD}_p^{+,s}(X)$ but *without* the condition *conditionally symmetric*, and $\text{UMD}_p^-(X)$ is the constant for the reverse inequality. In general, this leads to a different behavior of the optimal constants. For example, it follows from Hitzchenko [14, Theorem 1.1] that $\sup_{p \in [2, \infty)} D_p(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$. But, as outlined in [5, p. 348], one has $\text{UMD}_p^+(\mathbb{R}) \geq \sqrt{p}$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$ by combining the result of Burkholder [4, Theorem 3.1] about the optimal behavior of the constant in the square function inequality and the behavior of the constant in the Khintchine inequality for Rademacher variables.

9.2. General decoupling constants.

- (a) McConnell proved in [27, Theorem 2.2] (see also [12]) that a Banach space X is a UMD space if and only if tangent sequences have equivalent moments.
- (b) Cox-Veraar [5, Example 4.7] proved that the upper decoupling of martingales is valid in L_1 , note that L_1 is a pro-type of a non-UMD space.

9.3. Stochastic integration. In the development of stochastic integration theory in Banach spaces (as presented in e.g. [36] and [5]) the issue regarding the undesirable assumption on the filtration in the work by Garling [9] was known to the authors. In those articles the problem was circumvented in two ways:

- (a) In [36, Lemma 3.4], a decoupling argument due to Montgomery-Smith [28] is used to prove that for $p \in (1, \infty)$ it holds that $W_p(X) \leq \beta_p(X)$, where $\beta_p(X)$ is the L^p -UMD constant of X . This approach does not cover $p \in (0, 1]$, and moreover the UMD property does not seem to be natural in this setting as (for example) it excludes L_1 , but $W_p(L_1) < \infty$ for all $p \in (0, \infty)$ (see also [5]).
- (b) In [5, Theorem 5.4] it is observed that $W_p(X) < \infty$ if $D_p^{\text{gen}}(X) < \infty$, where $D_p^{\text{gen}}(X)$ is the infimum over all $c \in [0, \infty]$ such that

$$\left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{F}; X)} \leq c \left\| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{F}; X)}$$

whenever $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an \mathbb{F} -decoupled tangent sequence of a finitely supported X -valued \mathbb{F} -adapted sequence of random variables $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

9.4. Open problems. The approach in Section 9.3(b) is unsatisfactory in the following respect: The Brownian motion is naturally connected to Rademacher sequences, but the definition of $D_p^{\text{gen}}(X)$ had to use more general distributions because of the progressive enlargement of the filtration, which was explicitly allowed in [5]. The handling of $D_p^{\text{gen}}(X)$ is more involved than the handling of $D_p(X)$ in certain situations. One example concerns extrapolation results in the sense of Proposition B.1. Here it has been one of the contributions of [5] to prove extrapolation properties for the general decoupling, which is more involved than our extrapolation in Proposition B.1. So, the systematic approach of this article revealed the following open questions:

- (a) Is there a constant $c_p > 0$, depending at most on p , such that, for all Banach spaces X ,

$$D_p^{\text{gen}}(X) \leq c_p D_p(X)?$$

- (b) Or one might ask without requiring a uniform estimate: Is that true that $D_p(X) < \infty$ implies $D_p^{\text{gen}}(X) < \infty$?
- (c) Another problem (which was not in the focus of this article) would be: What is the relation between $D_p(X)$ and $\text{UMD}_p^+(X)$ from Subsection 9.1?

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 4.4

In order to prove Theorem 4.4 it suffices, by Remark 4.5, to prove that the second statement in the theorem implies the first. In Section A.3 we will show that this implication is an immediate corollary of Propositions A.1 and A.8 below. Propositions A.1 demonstrates that a progressive extension of the underlying filtration and an extension of the set \mathcal{P} can be carried out. Proposition A.8 uses Corollary 3.2 to show that one can pass from relatively simple sequences of random variables to the sequences considered in (i) in Theorem 4.4.

A.1. Progressive enlargement of the filtration and extension of \mathcal{P} . The main result of this subsection is

Proposition A.1. *Let X be a Banach space, let $\Phi \in C(X \times X; \mathbb{R})$ be such that there exist constants $C, p \in (0, \infty)$ for which it holds that*

$$|\Phi(x, y)| \leq C(1 + \|x\|_X^p + \|y\|_X^p) \quad (20)$$

for all $(x, y) \in X \times X$, and let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ be a set of probability measures satisfying $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ be defined as in Definition 4.2. Then the following assertions are equivalent:

- (i) For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N)$, every sequence of independent random variables $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$ with $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) \in \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ such that φ_n is \mathcal{F}_n measurable and independent of \mathcal{F}_{n-1} , and for all $A_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$, $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n 1_{A_{n-1}}\right) \leq 0,$$

whenever $(\varphi'_n)_{n=1}^N$ is a copy of $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$ independent of \mathcal{F}_N .

- (ii) For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, every sequence of independent random variables $(\varphi_n)_{n=0}^N$ on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) \in \mathcal{P}$, and for all $A_n \in \mathcal{F}_n^\varphi$, $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n 1_{A_{n-1}}\right) \leq 0,$$

whenever $(\varphi'_n)_{n=0}^N$ is an independent copy of $(\varphi_n)_{n=0}^N$.

Concerning the proof of Proposition A.1, it is obvious that we need only prove (ii) \Rightarrow (i). For this we need a series of lemmas. Here Lemmas A.2 and A.3 are obtained by an adaptation of [33, Lemma 12.8], in which the dyadic setting is considered and which simplifies the procedure originally sketched in [26].

Recall that a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is called *divisible* if for every $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and every $\theta \in (0, 1)$ there exists an $A_\theta \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A_\theta \subset A$ and $\mathbb{P}(A_\theta) = \theta\mathbb{P}(A)$.

Lemma A.2. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a divisible probability space, X be a separable Banach space, $F \in \mathcal{F}$, and let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ be of the form $\mu = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \delta_{x_k}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in (0, 1)$, and some distinct $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$. Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a σ -algebra generated by a finite partition $(A_i)_{i=1}^k$ of Ω with $\mathbb{P}(A_i) > 0$. Then there exists an \mathcal{F} -measurable, μ -distributed random variable φ that is independent of \mathcal{G} , for which there exist $H_1, H_2 \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi)$ satisfying $H_1 \subseteq F \subseteq H_2$ and*

$$\mathbb{P}(H_2 \setminus H_1) \leq \left[\max_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \alpha_j \right] \min \{ \mathbb{P}(G_2 \setminus G_1) : G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}, G_1 \subseteq F \subseteq G_2 \}.$$

Proof. As $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is divisible, we can construct a partition $(A_{i,j})_{\substack{i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \\ j \in \{1, \dots, n\}}}$ of Ω with $A_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F}$ for all i, j , such that $A_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_{i,j}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, and such that $\mathbb{P}(A_{i,j}) = \alpha_j \mathbb{P}(A_i)$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.

The partition $(A_{i,j})_{\substack{i \in \{1, \dots, k\} \\ j \in \{1, \dots, n\}}}$ is assumed to satisfy some conditions with respect to the set F which we shall explain below. Before doing so, we observe that given such

a partition, the random variable φ defined by $\varphi := \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^n x_j 1_{A_{i,j}}$ has the law μ and is independent of $\mathcal{G} = \sigma((A_i)_{i=1}^k)$, and

$$\sigma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi) = \sigma(\{A_{i,j} : i \in \{1, \dots, k\}, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}).$$

Let $I_0 \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ be such that $i \in I_0$ if and only if $A_i \cap F = \emptyset$, and $I_1 \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ be such that $i \in I_1$ if and only if $A_i \subseteq F$. Set $I_{\text{mix}} = \{1, \dots, k\} \setminus (I_0 \cup I_1)$ (one or two of the sets I_0, I_1, I_{mix} may be empty). Observe that

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{mix}}} \mathbb{P}(A_i) = \min \{ \mathbb{P}(G_2 \setminus G_1) : G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}, G_1 \subseteq F \subseteq G_2 \}. \quad (21)$$

For $i \in I_0 \cup I_1$ we simply partition the set A_i into sets $(A_{i,j})_{j=1}^n$ that satisfy $A_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{i,j}) = \alpha_j \mathbb{P}(A_i)$$

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. For $i \in I_{\text{mix}}$ we choose the partition $(A_{i,j})_{j=1}^n$ not only such that it satisfies $A_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(A_{i,j}) = \alpha_j \mathbb{P}(A_i)$$

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, but also such that there is *at most one* $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\emptyset \neq F \cap A_{i,j} \subsetneq A_{i,j}$. It follows from this construction and from (21) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \{ \mathbb{P}(H_2 \setminus H_1) : H_1, H_2 \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi), H_1 \subseteq F \subseteq H_2 \} \\ & \leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{mix}}} \left[\max_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \alpha_j \right] \mathbb{P}(A_i) \\ & = \left[\max_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \alpha_j \right] \min \{ \mathbb{P}(G_2 \setminus G_1) : G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}, G_1 \subseteq F \subseteq G_2 \}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma A.3. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a divisible probability space, X be a separable Banach space and let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ be of the form $\mu = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \delta_{x_k}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in (0, 1)$, and some distinct $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$. Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a σ -algebra generated by a finite partition of atoms with positive measure. Then for every $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{F} -measurable independent μ -distributed random variables $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$ that are independent of \mathcal{G} such that there exists an $A_\varepsilon \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}|1_A - 1_{A_\varepsilon}| < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Define $\delta := \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \alpha_j \in (0, 1)$ and let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\delta^m < \varepsilon$.

Step 1. Apply Lemma A.2 with \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F} as given to find an \mathcal{F} -measurable, μ -distributed random variable φ_1 that is independent of \mathcal{G} , and sets $H_{1,1}, H_{1,2} \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi_1)$ such that $H_{1,1} \subseteq A \subseteq H_{1,2}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(H_{1,2} \setminus H_{1,1}) \leq \delta.$$

Define $\mathcal{G}_1 := \sigma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi_1)$ that is, by construction, a σ -algebra generated by a finite partition of sets of positive measure.

Step i , $i = 2, \dots, m$. Apply Lemma A.2 with $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{G}_{i-1}$, and with \mathcal{F} as given, to find an \mathcal{F} -measurable, μ -distributed random variable φ_i that is independent of \mathcal{G}_{i-1} , and sets $H_{i,1}, H_{i,2} \in \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{i-1}, \varphi_i)$ such that $H_{i,1} \subseteq A \subseteq H_{i,2}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(H_{i,2} \setminus H_{i,1}) \leq \delta \mathbb{P}(H_{i-1,2} \setminus H_{i-1,1}) \leq \delta^i.$$

Set $\mathcal{G}_i := \sigma(\mathcal{G}_{i-1}, \varphi_i)$.

We have now obtained a sequence of independent, \mathcal{F} -measurable, μ -distributed random variables $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$ that are independent of \mathcal{G} , and sets $H_{m,1}, H_{m,2} \in \mathcal{G}_m = \sigma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m)$ such that $H_{m,1} \subseteq A \subseteq H_{m,2}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}(H_{m,2} \setminus H_{m,1}) \leq \delta^m < \varepsilon.$$

Setting $A_\varepsilon = H_{m,1}$ we obtain that $\mathbb{E}|1_A - 1_{A_\varepsilon}| < \varepsilon$. \square

Lemma A.4. *Let X be a separable Banach space, $p \in (0, \infty)$, let $\Phi \in C(X \times X, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy (20) for all $(x, y) \in X \times X$, let $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a measurable mapping $P_\varepsilon: X \rightarrow X$ with finite range such that for every sequence of independent random variables $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N, \varphi'_1, \dots, \varphi'_N)$ on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) = \mathcal{L}(\varphi'_n) = \mu_n$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and for all $F_1, \dots, F_N \in \mathcal{F}$ it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \Phi \left(\sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n 1_{F_n}, \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n 1_{F_n} \right) - \Phi \left(\sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n) 1_{F_n}, \sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi'_n) 1_{F_n} \right) \right| < \varepsilon. \quad (22)$$

Moreover, if for some $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ it holds that μ_n is not a Dirac measure, then P_ε may be chosen such that $\mu_n \circ P_\varepsilon^{-1}$ is not a Dirac measure.

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, set $M_p = \sum_{n=1}^N \int_X \|x\|_X^p d\mu_n(x)$ and let $K \subseteq X$ be a compact set such that

$$\sup_{n \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \int_{K^c} (1 + N^p M_p + N^p \|x\|_X^p) d\mu_n(x) < 2^{-(p-1)^+} (8CN)^{-1} \varepsilon, \quad (23)$$

where C is as in (20). (Note that such a set K exists as X is separable and hence μ_1, \dots, μ_N are Radon measures, and moreover $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$.) It follows that for $K^N = K \times \dots \times K$ (N times) one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{(K^N)^c} \left(1 + N^p \sum_{n=1}^N \|x_n\|_X^p \right) d\mu_1(x_1) \dots d\mu_N(x_N) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\{x_j \in K^c\}} \left(1 + N^p \sum_{n=1}^N \|x_n\|_X^p \right) d\mu_1(x_1) \dots d\mu_N(x_N) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\{x_j \in K^c\}} (1 + N^p \|x_j\|_X^p) d\mu_1(x_1) \dots d\mu_N(x_N) \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{n=1, n \neq j}^N \int_{\{x_j \in K^c\}} N^p \|x_n\|_X^p d\mu_1(x_1) \dots d\mu_N(x_N) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\{x_j \in K^c\}} (1 + N^p M_p + N^p \|x_j\|_X^p) d\mu_1(x_1) \dots d\mu_N(x_N) \\ & < 2^{-(p-1)^+} (8C)^{-1} \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

As Φ is continuous, it is uniformly continuous on $K \times K$ and hence there exists a $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ such that if $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 \in K$ and $\|x_1 - x_2\|_X < \delta$, $\|y_1 - y_2\|_X < \delta$, then it holds that $|\Phi(x_1, y_1) - \Phi(x_2, y_2)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Note that without loss of generality we may

assume that $\delta \leq N^{-1/p}$ and that $K \neq \emptyset$. Now let $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{U_1, \dots, U_M\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X)$ be a partition of K such that for all $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ it holds that $U_m \neq \emptyset$ and

$$\sup_{m \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \sup_{x, y \in U_m} \|x - y\|_X < N^{-1}\delta.$$

Let $x_1, \dots, x_M \in X$ be such that $x_m \in U_m$, $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. Let $x_0 \in \{x \in X : \|x\|_X = N^{-1}\delta\} \setminus \{x_1, \dots, x_M\}$ (this will be important for the last part of the proof of the lemma). Define $P_\varepsilon : X \rightarrow X$ by

$$P_\varepsilon(x) = \begin{cases} x_m; & x \in U_m, \\ x_0; & x \notin K. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Observe that by construction for all $x \in X$ it holds that

$$\|P_\varepsilon(x)\|_X \leq \|x\|_X + N^{-1}\delta \leq \|x\|_X + N^{-(1+\frac{1}{p})} \quad (26)$$

and for all $x \in K$ it holds that

$$\|x - P_\varepsilon(x)\|_X < N^{-1}\delta. \quad (27)$$

We verify that P_ε satisfies the desired properties. Indeed clearly P_ε has finite range. Moreover, let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and let $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N, \varphi'_1, \dots, \varphi'_N)$ be random variables on this space such that $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) = \mathcal{L}(\varphi'_n) = \mu_n$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and let $F_1, \dots, F_N \in \mathcal{F}$. For simplicity of notation define $\xi = \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n 1_{F_n}$, $\xi' = \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n 1_{F_n}$, $\xi_\varepsilon = \sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n) 1_{F_n}$, and $\xi'_\varepsilon = \sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi'_n) 1_{F_n}$. Define

$$K_\varphi = \{\omega \in \Omega : (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N, \varphi'_1, \dots, \varphi'_N) \in K^{2N}\}.$$

Observe that by (27) for $\omega \in K_\varphi$ it holds that

$$\|\xi(\omega) - \xi_\varepsilon(\omega)\|_X \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \|\varphi_n - P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n)\|_X < \delta,$$

and similarly $\|\xi'(\omega) - \xi'_\varepsilon(\omega)\|_X < \delta$, whence for all $\omega \in K_\varphi$ it holds that

$$|\Phi(\xi(\omega), \xi'(\omega)) - \Phi(\xi_\varepsilon(\omega), \xi'_\varepsilon(\omega))| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (28)$$

By the estimate above, Assumption (20), and inequalities (26) and (24) it now follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}|\Phi(\xi, \xi') - \Phi(\xi_\varepsilon, \xi'_\varepsilon)| \\ &= \int_{K_\varphi} |\Phi(\xi, \xi') - \Phi(\xi_\varepsilon, \xi'_\varepsilon)| d\mathbb{P} + \int_{K_\varphi^c} |\Phi(\xi, \xi') - \Phi(\xi_\varepsilon, \xi'_\varepsilon)| d\mathbb{P} \\ &< \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + C \int_{K_\varphi^c} (2 + \|\xi\|_X^p + \|\xi'\|_X^p + \|\xi_\varepsilon\|_X^p + \|\xi'_\varepsilon\|_X^p) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + 2C \int_{K_\varphi^c} \left(1 + N^p \left(\sum_{n=1}^N \|\varphi_n\|_X^p + \sum_{n=1}^N \|P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n)\|_X^p \right) \right) d\mathbb{P} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + 2^{(p-1)^+} 4C \int_{K_\varphi^c} \left(1 + N^p \sum_{n=1}^N \|\varphi_n\|_X^p \right) d\mathbb{P} < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of $\xi, \xi', \xi_\varepsilon$ and ξ'_ε this completes the proof of estimate (22).

In order to prove the final statement in the lemma, we make some minor adjustments to the proof above. Indeed, suppose that for some $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ it holds that μ_n is not a Dirac measure. It follows that there exists a compact set $F \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ such that $\mu_n(F) \in (0, 1)$. Now proceed as above, but with the additional assumption that the set K satisfying (23) also satisfies $F \subseteq K$, and that the partition $\{U_1, \dots, U_M\}$ is chosen such that $U_m \cap F \in \{U_m, \emptyset\}$ for all $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. As x_0, x_1, \dots, x_M are all distinct values by construction, this ensures that there exists a set $G \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ such that $P_\varepsilon^{-1}(G) = F$. \square

Lemma A.5. *Let X be a separable Banach space, $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, and let $\mathcal{B}_{\mu\text{-cont}}(X) = \{B \in \mathcal{B}(X) : \mu(\partial B) = 0\}$. Then for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ and all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an $B_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu\text{-cont}}(X)$ such that $\mu(B \Delta B_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Define

$$\mathcal{A} = \{B \in \mathcal{B}(X) : \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists B_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu\text{-cont}}(X) \text{ such that } \mu(B \Delta B_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon\}.$$

One may check that \mathcal{A} is a Dynkin-system and that \mathcal{A} contains all closed sets, whence the result follows by the π - λ -Theorem. \square

Lemma A.6. *For $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a separable Banach space X let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_N : \Omega \rightarrow X$ and $\varphi_{1,k}, \dots, \varphi_{N,k} : \Omega_k \rightarrow X$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, be families of independent random variables with*

$$w^*\text{-}\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{n,k} = \varphi_n \quad \text{for } n \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

Let $(\varphi'_n)_{n=1}^N : \Omega \rightarrow X^N$ and $(\varphi'_{n,k})_{n=1}^N : \Omega_k \rightarrow X^N$ be independent copies of $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$ and $(\varphi_{n,k})_{n=1}^N$, respectively, $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $B_n \in \mathcal{B}(X^n)$ such that $\mathbb{P}((\varphi_j)_{j=1}^n \in \partial B_n) = 0$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$. Then, for the w^ -convergence in $X \times X$ it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} w^*\text{-}\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} & \left(\varphi_{1,k} v_0 + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi_{n,k} \mathbf{1}_{\{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}}, \varphi'_{1,k} v_0 + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi'_{n,k} \mathbf{1}_{\{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \right) \\ & = \left(\varphi_1 v_0 + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi_n \mathbf{1}_{\{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}}, \varphi'_1 v_0 + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi'_n \mathbf{1}_{\{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By [18, Theorem 4.30] we find probability spaces $(M^{(n)}, \Sigma^{(n)}, \mathbb{Q}^{(n)})$ and $(M'^{(n)}, \Sigma'^{(n)}, \mathbb{Q}'^{(n)})$, and random variables

$$\psi_{n,k}, \psi_n : M^{(n)} \rightarrow X \quad \text{and} \quad \psi'_{n,k}, \psi'_n : M'^{(n)} \rightarrow X,$$

such that

- (i) $\psi_{n,k} \stackrel{d}{=} \varphi_{n,k}$, $\psi_n \stackrel{d}{=} \varphi_n$, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{n,k} = \psi_n$ $\mathbb{Q}^{(n)}$ -a.s.
- (ii) $\psi'_{n,k} \stackrel{d}{=} \varphi'_{n,k}$, $\psi'_n \stackrel{d}{=} \varphi'_n$, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \psi'_{n,k} = \psi'_n$ $\mathbb{Q}'^{(n)}$ -a.s.

We let $(M, \Sigma, \mathbb{Q}) := \left[\otimes_{n=1}^N (M^{(n)}, \Sigma^{(n)}, \mathbb{Q}^{(n)}) \right] \otimes \left[\otimes_{n=1}^N (M'^{(n)}, \Sigma'^{(n)}, \mathbb{Q}'^{(n)}) \right]$ and extend $\psi_{n,k}, \psi_n, \psi'_{n,k}, \psi'_n$ to M . Note that for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$ it holds that $\mathbb{Q}((\psi_j)_{j=1}^n \in \partial B_n) = 0$ whence an application of the Portmanteau Theorem (see e.g. [18, Theorem 4.25]) to B_n^0 and $\overline{B_n}$, the interior and closure of B_n , implies that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{1}_{\{(\psi_{j,k})_{j=1}^n \in B_n\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{(\psi_j)_{j=1}^n \in B_n\}} \quad \mathbb{Q}\text{-a.s.}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\psi_{1,k} v_0 + \sum_{n=2}^N \psi_{n,k} 1_{\{(\psi_{j,k})_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \right] = \psi_1 v_0 + \sum_{n=2}^N \psi_n 1_{\{(\psi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \quad \mathbb{Q}\text{-a.s.}$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\psi'_{1,k} v_0 + \sum_{n=2}^N \psi'_{n,k} 1_{\{(\psi_{j,k})_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \right] = \psi'_1 v_0 + \sum_{n=2}^N \psi'_n 1_{\{(\psi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \quad \mathbb{Q}\text{-a.s.},$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition A.1. **(a)** We verify that if **(ii)** holds, then **(ii)** remains valid with \mathcal{P} replaced by $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$.

(a.0) First we consider $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$ such that for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ there exist a $K_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\mu_{n,k})_{k=1}^{K_n} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ with $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) = \mu_{n,1} * \dots * \mu_{n,K_n}$. As $A_n \in \mathcal{F}_n^\varphi$ for $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ there are $B_n \in X^n$ such that $A_n = \{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^n \in B_n\}$ for $n \geq 1$, whereas for $n = 0$ we have $A_0 \in \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. Now let $((\psi_{n,k})_{k=1}^{K_n})_{n=1}^N$ be independent random variables satisfying $\mathcal{L}(\psi_{n,k}) = \mu_{n,k}$. Then it holds in distribution that

$$\varphi_1 1_{A_0} + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi_n 1_{\{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{K_1} \psi_{1,k} 1_{A_0} + \sum_{n=2}^N \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \psi_{n,k} 1_{\{(\sum_{\ell=1}^{K_j} \psi_{j,\ell})_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}}$$

and

$$\varphi'_1 1_{A_0} + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi'_n 1_{\{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{k=1}^{K_1} \psi'_{1,k} 1_{A_0} + \sum_{n=2}^N \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \psi'_{n,k} 1_{\{(\sum_{\ell=1}^{K_j} \psi_{j,\ell})_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}}$$

where $((\psi'_{n,k})_{k=1}^{K_n})_{n=1}^N$ is an independent copy of $((\psi_{n,k})_{k=1}^{K_n})_{n=1}^N$. Hence if **(ii)** holds, then **(ii)** remains valid with \mathcal{P} replaced by the set of finite convolutions of elements from \mathcal{P} .

(a.1) Assume that $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) \in \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. By Lemmas A.5 and 4.7 we can restrict the A_n to $A_n = \{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^n \in B_n\}$ with $\mathbb{P}((\varphi_j)_{j=1}^n \in \partial B_n) = 0$ and $B_n \in \mathcal{B}(X^n)$ for $n \in 1, \dots, N-1$, whereas we keep $A_0 \in \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$. We find a uniformly \mathcal{L}_p -integrable family of independent random variables $(\varphi_{n,k})_{n=1, k=1}^{N, \infty}$ such that $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_{n,k})$ is a finite convolution of measures from \mathcal{P} and $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_{n,k}) \xrightarrow{w^*} \mathcal{L}(\varphi_n)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Lemma A.6 gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\varphi_{1,k} 1_{A_0} + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi_{n,k} 1_{\{(\varphi_{j,k})_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}}, \varphi'_{1,k} 1_{A_0} + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi'_{n,k} 1_{\{(\varphi_{j,k})_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \right) \\ & \xrightarrow{w^*} \left(\varphi_1 1_{A_0} + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi_n 1_{\{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}}, \varphi'_1 1_{A_0} + \sum_{n=2}^N \varphi'_n 1_{\{(\varphi_j)_{j=1}^{n-1} \in B_{n-1}\}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By Lemma 4.7 we conclude step (a), i.e. **(ii)** is valid for $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$.

(b) We now prove that if **(ii)** holds with \mathcal{P} replaced by $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$, then **(i)** holds.

(b.0) Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N)$ and $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$ be as in **(i)**, and set $\mu_n := \text{law}(\varphi_n)$. If each μ_n is a Dirac measure in an $x_n \in X$, then $\mathbb{E}\Phi(\sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n 1_{A_{n-1}})$ is a weighted sum of terms $\Phi(\sum_{n \in I} x_n, \sum_{n \in I} x_n)$ with $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ (the empty

sum is treated as zero). In this case (ii) implies that each of these terms is non-positive, so that in what follows we assume there exists an $\ell \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ such that μ_ℓ is *not* a Dirac measure. We will prove that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n 1_{A_{n-1}}\right) < 3\varepsilon, \quad (29)$$

which completes the proof of (i). By passing to the larger probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \otimes ([0, 1], \mathcal{B}([0, 1]), \lambda)$ (where λ is the Lebesgue measure), endowed with the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_n \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1]))_{n=0}^N$, we may assume that $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_n, \mathbb{P})$ is divisible for all $n \in \{0, \dots, N\}$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and let P_ε be as in Lemma A.4 with the property that $\mu_\ell \circ P_\varepsilon^{-1}$ is not a Dirac measure. Recall from Lemma A.4 that

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n 1_{A_{n-1}}\right) - \Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n) 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi'_n) 1_{A_{n-1}}\right)\right| < \varepsilon. \quad (30)$$

(b.1) Set $\mu_{\ell, \varepsilon} := \mu_\ell \circ P_\varepsilon^{-1}$ and recall that $\mu_{\ell, \varepsilon}$ is not a single Dirac measure, but a finite sum of Dirac measures. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we proceed as follows:

Step 0. We apply Lemma A.3 with $\mathcal{G} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_0$ to find a $k_{m,1} \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ and a sequence of independent, \mathcal{F}_0 -measurable, $\mu_{\ell, \varepsilon}$ -distributed random variables $(\psi_{m,1}, \dots, \psi_{m, k_{m,1}-1})$, and to find an $A_{m,0} \in \sigma(\psi_{m,1}, \dots, \psi_{m, k_{m,1}-1})$ with

$$\|1_{A_0} - 1_{A_{m,0}}\|_{L^p(\mathbb{P})} \leq 2^{-m}.$$

Set $\psi_{m, k_{m,1}} := P_\varepsilon(\varphi_1)$.

Step n ; $n = 1, \dots, N-1$. Apply Lemma A.3 with $\mathcal{G} = \sigma(\psi_{m,1}, \dots, \psi_{m, k_{m,n}})$ (note that $\psi_{m, k_{m,1}} = P_\varepsilon(\varphi_1), \dots, \psi_{m, k_{m,n}} = P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n)$) and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{n+1}$, to find a $k_{m, n+1} \in \{k_{m,n} + 2, k_{m,n} + 3, \dots\}$ and independent, \mathcal{F}_{n+1} -measurable, $\mu_{\ell, \varepsilon}$ -distributed random variables $(\psi_{m, k_{m,n}+1}, \dots, \psi_{m, k_{m, n+1}-1})$, independent of the σ -algebra $\sigma(\psi_{m,1}, \dots, \psi_{m, k_{m,n}})$ as well, and to find an $A_{m,n} \in \sigma(\psi_{m,1}, \dots, \psi_{m, k_{m, n+1}-1})$ with

$$\|1_{A_n} - 1_{A_{m,n}}\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P})} \leq 2^{-m}.$$

Set $\psi_{m, k_{m, n+1}} := P_\varepsilon(\varphi_{n+1})$.

(b.2) By construction,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N (1_{A_{m, n-1}} - 1_{A_{n-1}}) P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} \\ = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{n=1}^N (1_{A_{m, n-1}} - 1_{A_{n-1}}) P_\varepsilon(\varphi'_n) \right\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P}; X)} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence by Lemma 4.7 there exists an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for $B_{n-1} = A_{M, n-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n) 1_{B_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi'_n) 1_{B_{n-1}}\right) \right. \\ \left. - \mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n) 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi'_n) 1_{A_{n-1}}\right) \right| < \varepsilon. \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

(b.3) We would like to apply (ii) to $\sum_{n=1}^N 1_{B_{n-1}} \varphi_n$, however, our construction of B_{n-1} only guarantees that $P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n)$ is independent of B_{n-1} , *not* that φ_n is independent of B_{n-1} . Hence we proceed as follows. Let $k_n := k_{M,n}$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $(\tilde{\psi}_k)_{k=1}^{k_N}$ be a sequence of independent random variables such that $\tilde{\psi}_{k_n}$ is μ_n -distributed for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and $\tilde{\psi}_k$ is μ_ℓ -distributed for all $k \in \{1, \dots, k_N\} \setminus \{k_1, \dots, k_N\}$. By the Factorization Lemma for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ there exists a $C_{n-1} \in X^{k_{n-1}}$ such that

$$B_{n-1} = \left\{ (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{k_{n-1}}) \in C_{n-1} \right\}.$$

Define, for $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\tilde{B}_{n-1} = \{(P_\varepsilon(\tilde{\psi}_k))_{k=1}^{k_{n-1}} \in C_{n-1}\}$. By construction,

$$\left(\sum_{n=1}^N 1_{B_{n-1}} P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n), \sum_{n=1}^N 1_{B_{n-1}} P_\varepsilon(\varphi'_n) \right) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\sum_{n=1}^N 1_{\tilde{B}_{n-1}} P_\varepsilon(\tilde{\psi}_{k_n}), \sum_{n=1}^N 1_{\tilde{B}_{n-1}} P_\varepsilon(\tilde{\psi}'_{k_n}) \right),$$

where $(\tilde{\psi}'_k)_{k=1}^{k_N}$ is an independent copy of $(\tilde{\psi}_k)_{k=1}^{k_N}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Phi \left(\sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi_n) 1_{B_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\varphi'_n) 1_{B_{n-1}} \right) \\ = \mathbb{E}\Phi \left(\sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\tilde{\psi}_{k_n}) 1_{\tilde{B}_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\tilde{\psi}'_{k_n}) 1_{\tilde{B}_{n-1}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

By the assumption that Proposition A.1 (ii) holds for $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) \in \mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi \left(\sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{\psi}_{k_n} 1_{\tilde{B}_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N \tilde{\psi}'_{k_n} 1_{\tilde{B}_{n-1}} \right) \leq 0.$$

The inequality above in combination with Lemma A.4 implies that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi \left(\sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\tilde{\psi}_{k_n}) 1_{\tilde{B}_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N P_\varepsilon(\tilde{\psi}'_{k_n}) 1_{\tilde{B}_{n-1}} \right) < \varepsilon.$$

Combining the inequality above with (32), (31), and (30) we arrive at the desired estimate (29). \square

A.2. From simple decoupling to general decoupling. In addition to the space $\mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P})$ introduced in Definition 4.1 we shall need the following one:

Definition A.7. Let X be a separable Banach space, $p \in (0, \infty)$, $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(X)$, and let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be a stochastic basis. We shall denote by $\mathcal{A}_{p\text{-simple}}(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N; X, \mathcal{P})$ the set of $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=1}^N$ -adapted sequences $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ such that for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ there exist $K_n \in \mathbb{N}$, a partition $(A_{n-1,k})_{k=1}^{K_n} \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ of Ω consisting of sets of positive measure, and $\mu_{n,1}, \dots, \mu_{n,K_n} \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^{K_n} 1_{A_{n-1,k}} \mu_{n,k}$ is a regular version of $\mathbb{P}(d_n \in \cdot | \mathcal{F}_{n-1})$.

Proposition A.8. Let X be a separable Banach space, let $\Phi \in C(X \times X; \mathbb{R})$ be such that there exist constants $C, p \in (0, \infty)$ for which it holds that

$$|\Phi(x, y)| \leq C(1 + \|x\|_X^p + \|y\|_X^p) \quad (33)$$

for all $(x, y) \in X \times X$, and let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ with $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{P}$. Then the following assertions are equivalent:

- (i) For every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$ with $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ and every finitely supported $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathcal{A}_p(\Omega, \mathbb{F}; X, \mathcal{P})$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n, \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e_n\right) \leq 0,$$

whenever $(e_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an \mathbb{F} -decoupled tangent sequence of $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

- (ii) For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N)$ and $(d_n)_{n=1}^N \in \mathcal{A}_p\text{-simple}(\Omega, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N; X, \mathcal{P})$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^N d_n, \sum_{n=1}^N e_n\right) \leq 0,$$

whenever $(e_n)_{n=1}^N$ is an $(\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N$ -decoupled tangent sequence of $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$.

- (iii) For every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, every stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N)$, every sequence of independent random variables $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$ with $\mathcal{L}(\varphi_n) \in \mathcal{P}$ such that φ_n is \mathcal{F}_n -measurable and independent of \mathcal{F}_{n-1} , and for all $A_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$, $n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}\Phi\left(\sum_{n=1}^N \varphi_n 1_{A_{n-1}}, \sum_{n=1}^N \varphi'_n 1_{A_{n-1}}\right) \leq 0,$$

whenever $(\varphi'_n)_{n=1}^N$ is a copy of $(\varphi_n)_{n=1}^N$ independent of \mathcal{F}_N .

We shall use the following lemmas to prove the proposition above.

Lemma A.9. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, let $K \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $A_k \in \mathcal{F}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, be such that $(A_k)_{k=1}^K$ is a partition of Ω and $\mathbb{P}(A_k) > 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. Let X be a separable Banach space and let $d: \Omega \rightarrow X$ be a random variable. Let $\kappa: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$ be a regular version of $\mathcal{P}(d \in \cdot | \sigma((A_k)_{k=1}^K))$, i.e., $\kappa = \sum_{k=1}^K \mu_k 1_{A_k}$ for some $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K \in \mathcal{P}(X)$. Let $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$ be an auxiliary probability space and let $(d'_k)_{k=1}^K$ be a sequence of independent X -valued random variables on $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}(d'_k) = \mu_k$, and let, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, $d_k: (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}) \times (\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}') \rightarrow X$ be a random variable defined by

$$d_k(\omega, \omega') = d(\omega) 1_{A_k}(\omega) + d'_k(\omega') 1_{\Omega \setminus A_k}(\omega) \quad (34)$$

for all $(\omega, \omega') \in \Omega \times \Omega'$. Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a σ -algebra such that $\sigma((A_k)_{k=1}^K) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Define $\mathcal{G}_0 = \mathcal{G} \otimes \{\emptyset, \Omega'\}$ and for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ define

$$\mathcal{G}_k = \sigma(\mathcal{G}_0, d_1, \dots, d_k). \quad (35)$$

Then the following holds:

- (i) For all $(\omega, \omega') \in \Omega \times \Omega'$ it holds that $d(\omega) = \sum_{k=1}^K d_k(\omega, \omega') 1_{A_k}(\omega)$.
- (ii) $(d_k)_{k=1}^K$ is $(\mathcal{G}_k)_{k=1}^K$ -adapted.
- (iii) $\mathcal{L}(d_k) = \mu_k$.
- (iv) $(\mathcal{G}_0, \sigma(d_1), \dots, \sigma(d_K))$ are independent if and only if for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, all $A \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfying $A \subseteq A_k$ and $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$, and all $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}(d \in B | A) := \frac{\mathbb{P}(\{d \in B\} \cap A)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} = \mu_k(B). \quad (36)$$

Proof. Claims (i), (ii) and (iii) are trivial. Regarding claim (iv), suppose that d_k is independent of \mathcal{G}_{k-1} for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, then in particular $(d_k)_{k=1}^K$ is

independent of \mathcal{G}_0 . Let $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, $A \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfying $A \subseteq A_k$ and $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$, and $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ be given. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(d \in B | A) &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\{d \in B\} \cap A)}{\mathbb{P}(A)} = \frac{\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'(\{d_k \in B\} \cap (A \times \Omega'))}{\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'(A \times \Omega')} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'(d_k \in B) = \mu_k(B), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (i), independence, and (iii). In order to prove the reverse implication, let $B_1, \dots, B_K \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, let $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, and let $A \in \mathcal{G}$ be such that $A \subseteq A_k$ and $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'((A \times \Omega') \cap \{d_1 \in B_1, \dots, d_K \in B_K\}) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \otimes \mathbb{P}'\left[(A \cap \{d \in B_k\}) \times \left(\bigcap_{\ell \in \{1, \dots, K\} \setminus \{k\}} \{d'_\ell \in B_\ell\}\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(d \in B_k | A) \prod_{\ell \in \{1, \dots, K\} \setminus \{k\}} \mathbb{P}'(d'_\ell \in B_\ell) = \mathbb{P}(A) \prod_{\ell \in \{1, \dots, K\}} \mu_\ell(B_\ell). \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

This suffices to prove the reverse implication. \square

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $(d_n)_{n=1}^N \in \mathcal{A}_{p\text{-simple}}(\Omega, \mathbb{P}, (\mathcal{F}_n)_{n=0}^N; X, \mathcal{P})$ i.e., for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ we have a $K_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

- (i) $\mathbb{P}(d_n \in \cdot | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} \mu_{n,k} 1_{A_{n-1,k}}$ a.s., where
- (ii) $A_{n-1,1}, \dots, A_{n-1,K_n} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ is a partition of Ω with $\mathbb{P}(A_{n-1,k}) > 0$ and $\mu_{n,1}, \dots, \mu_{n,K_n} \in \mathcal{P}$.

We set $K_0 := 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J_0 &:= \{(n, k) : n \in \{0, \dots, N\}, k \in \{1, \dots, K_n\}\}, \\ J &:= \{(n, k) : n \in \{1, \dots, N\}, k \in \{1, \dots, K_n\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

On J_0 we introduce the lexicographical order $(m, j) \prec (n, k)$ if either $m < n$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, K_m\}$ or $m = n$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. For an auxiliary probability space $(\Omega', \mathcal{F}', \mathbb{P}')$ and independent random variables $d'_{n,k} : \Omega' \rightarrow X$ with $\mathcal{L}(d'_{n,k}) = \mu_{n,k}$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and $k \in \{1, \dots, K_n\}$ let

$$d_{n,k}(\omega, \omega') := d_n(\omega) 1_{A_{n-1,k}}(\omega) + d'_{n,k}(\omega') 1_{\Omega \setminus A_{n-1,k}}(\omega).$$

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{0,1} &:= \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \{\emptyset, \Omega'\}, \\ \mathcal{G}_{n,k} &:= \mathcal{G}_{n-1, K_{n-1}} \vee \sigma(d_{n,1}, \dots, d_{n,k}) \quad (n \in \{1, \dots, N\}, k \in \{1, \dots, K_n - 1\}), \\ \mathcal{G}_{n, K_n} &:= \mathcal{G}_{n-1, K_{n-1}} \vee \sigma(d_{n,1}, \dots, d_{n, K_n}) \vee \left(\mathcal{F}_n \otimes \{\emptyset, \Omega'\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we let

- (i) $K := K_1 + \dots + K_N$,
- (ii) $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)_{\ell=0}^K$ be the lexicographical ordering of $(\mathcal{G}_{n,k})_{(n,k) \in J_0}$,
- (iii) $(\varphi_\ell)_{\ell=1}^K$ be the lexicographical ordering of $(d_{n,k})_{(n,k) \in J}$,
- (iv) $(A_\ell)_{\ell=0}^{K-1}$ be the lexicographical ordering of $(A_{n-1,k})_{(n,k) \in J}$,
- (v) $(\varphi'_\ell)_{\ell=1}^K$ be the lexicographical ordering of $(d'_{n,k})_{(n,k) \in J}$.

Lemma A.10. *The following holds true:*

- (i) $(\varphi_\ell)_{\ell=1}^K$ is $(\mathcal{H}_\ell)_{\ell=1}^K$ -adapted and φ_ℓ is independent from $\mathcal{H}_{\ell-1}$.
- (ii) $A_\ell \in \mathcal{H}_\ell$ for $\ell \in \{0, \dots, K-1\}$.
- (iii) $\sum_{n=1}^N d_n = \sum_{\ell=1}^K \varphi_\ell 1_{A_{\ell-1}}$.
- (iv) If $e_n := \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} d'_{n,k} 1_{A_{n-1,k}}$, then
 - (a) $(e_n)_{n=1}^N$ is a decoupled tangent sequence of $(d_n)_{n=1}^N$ and
 - (b) $\sum_{n=1}^N e_n = \sum_{\ell=1}^K \varphi'_\ell 1_{A_{\ell-1}}$.

Proof. (i) Fix $\ell \in \{1, \dots, K\}$. By definition, φ_ℓ is \mathcal{H}_ℓ -measurable. To show that φ_ℓ is independent from $\mathcal{H}_{\ell-1}$ it is enough to verify that

$$\mathcal{G}_{n-1, K_{n-1}}, d_{n,1}, \dots, d_{n, K_n}$$

are independent for $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Because

$$\mathcal{G}_{n-1, K_{n-1}} = \mathcal{F}_{n-1} \otimes \sigma \left(d'_{m,j} : m \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}, j \in \{1, \dots, K_m\} \right),$$

where for $n=1$ the second factor is replaced by $\{\emptyset, \Omega'\}$, it remains to check that

$$\left(\mathcal{F}_{n-1} \otimes \{\emptyset, \Omega'\} \right), d_{n,1}, \dots, d_{n, K_n}$$

are independent. But this follows from Lemma A.9.

(ii) and (iv) follow by construction.

(iii) follows from $d_n(\omega) = \sum_{k=1}^{K_n} d_{n,k}(\omega, \omega') 1_{A_{n-1,k}}(\omega)$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. \square

Proof of Proposition A.8. (i) \Rightarrow (iii) follows by Example 2.7.

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii) follows from Lemma A.10.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i) Let $(d_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as in (i) with $d_n \equiv 0$ if $n > N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. By Corollary 3.2 we obtain for $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ random variables $d_n^0 : \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ and $H_n : \Omega \times (0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that d_n^0 is $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1]) / \mathcal{B}(X)$ -measurable, H_n is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} \otimes \{\emptyset, (0, 1]\}$ with $\mathcal{L}(H_n) = \lambda$, and $d_n(\omega) = d_n^0(\omega, H_n(\omega, s))$ for all $(\omega, s) \in \Omega_n \times (0, 1]$ for some $\Omega_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ of measure one. We define $\bar{\Omega} := \Omega \times (0, 1]^N$, $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_0 := \mathcal{F}_0 \otimes \{\emptyset, (0, 1]^N\}$, $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_n := \mathcal{F}_n \otimes \sigma(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_n)$, where $\pi_n : (0, 1]^N \rightarrow (0, 1]$ is the projection onto the n -th coordinate, and $\bar{\mathbb{P}} := \mathbb{P} \otimes \lambda_N$ where λ_N is the Lebesgue measure on $(0, 1]^N$. Then $\bar{H}_n, \bar{d}_n, \bar{e}_n : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ are given by $\bar{H}_n(\omega, s) := H_n(\omega, \pi_n(s))$, $\bar{d}_n(\omega, s) := d_n^0(\omega, \bar{H}_n(\omega, s))$, and $\bar{e}_n(\omega, s) := d_n^0(\omega, \pi_n(s))$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. We get:

- (i) $\{(\omega, s) \in \bar{\Omega} : \bar{d}_n(\omega, s) = d_n(\omega)\} \supseteq \Omega_n \times (0, 1]$
- (ii) The fact that \bar{H}_n is uniformly-[0, 1] distributed and independent of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{n-1}$ and d_n^0 is $\mathcal{F}_{n-1} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1]) / \mathcal{B}(X)$ -measurable implies that $(\bar{e}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_n)_{n=1}^N$ -decoupled tangent sequence of $(\bar{d}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.
- (iii) The function $\kappa_{n-1}[\omega, B] := \lambda(\{h \in [0, 1] : d_n^0(\omega, h) \in B\})$, $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, is a regular conditional probability for $\mathbb{P}(d_n \in \cdot | \mathcal{F}_{n-1})$.

Next note that for all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ there exists an $d_n^{0, \varepsilon} : \Omega \times [0, 1] \rightarrow X$ which satisfies

$$d_n^{0, \varepsilon}(\omega, s) = \sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} 1_{F_{n-1, k, \varepsilon}}(\omega) f_{n, k, \varepsilon}(s),$$

with $m_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{N}$, $f_{n, k, \varepsilon} \in \mathcal{L}^p([0, 1]; X)$, pair-wise disjoint $F_{n-1, 1, \varepsilon}, \dots, F_{n-1, m_\varepsilon, \varepsilon} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}$ of positive measure, and $\|d_n^{0, \varepsilon} - d_n^0\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\Omega \times [0, 1]; X)} < \varepsilon$. Moreover, we can pick

$f_{n,k,\varepsilon}$ such that $\mathcal{L}(f_{n,k,\varepsilon}) \in \mathcal{P}$. Indeed, let $(f_\ell)_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{L}^p([0,1]; X)$ be dense. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we can choose an appropriate $\eta = \eta(p, \varepsilon) > 0$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &:= \{\omega \in \Omega : \|d_n^0(\omega, \cdot) - f_1\|_{\mathcal{L}^p([0,1]; X)} < \eta\}, \\ S_2 &:= \{\omega \in \Omega : \|d_n^0(\omega, \cdot) - f_2\|_{\mathcal{L}^p([0,1]; X)} < \eta\} \setminus S_1, \dots \end{aligned}$$

From these sets $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ we extract the collection $(F_{n-1,k,\varepsilon})_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon}$, find $\omega_k \in F_{n-1,k,\varepsilon} \cap \kappa_{n-1}^{-1}(\mathcal{P})$, and let $f_{n,k,\varepsilon} := d_n^0(\omega_k, \cdot)$. We continue and define $\bar{d}_n^\varepsilon, \bar{e}_n^\varepsilon : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow [0,1]$ by $\bar{d}_n^\varepsilon(\omega, s) := d_n^{0,\varepsilon}(\omega, \bar{H}_n(\omega, s))$, and $\bar{e}_n^\varepsilon(\omega, s) := d_n^{0,\varepsilon}(\omega, \pi_n(s))$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. By construction we have

- (i) $\|\bar{e}_n^\varepsilon - \bar{e}_n\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\bar{\Omega}; X)} = \|\bar{d}_n^\varepsilon - \bar{d}_n\|_{\mathcal{L}^p(\bar{\Omega}; X)} < \varepsilon$ for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,
- (ii) $(\bar{e}_n^\varepsilon)_{n=1}^N$ is an $(\bar{\mathcal{F}}_n)_{n=1}^N$ -decoupled tangent sequence of $(\bar{d}_n^\varepsilon)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$,
- (iii) a conditional regular conditional probability kernel of d_n^ε given $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{n-1}$ is given by $\sum_{k=1}^{m_\varepsilon} 1_{F_{n-1,k,\varepsilon}}(\omega) \mathcal{L}(f_{n,k,\varepsilon})$.

This concludes (ii) \Rightarrow (i). \square

A.3. Proof of Theorem 4.4. (ii) \Rightarrow (i) First we apply Proposition A.1 to deduce from Theorem 4.4 (ii) the statement in Proposition A.1 (i). Now we use Proposition A.8 (iii) for $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$ instead of for \mathcal{P} and obtain Proposition A.8 (i) for $\mathcal{P}_{p\text{-ext}}$, which is Theorem 4.4 (i).

APPENDIX B. EXTRAPOLATION

The following extrapolation result is standard. It was proved for the general decoupling (which is not exactly the same as what we state in Proposition B.1 below) in [5] or can be proved by more general results (for example, from [11]). For the convenience of the reader we include a proof for our setting.

Proposition B.1. *Let X be a Banach space and let $D_q(X) \in [0, \infty]$, $q \in (0, \infty)$, be as defined in Definition 6.3. If there exists a $p \in (0, \infty)$ such that $D_p(X) < \infty$, then $D_q(X) < \infty$ for all $q \in (0, \infty)$.*

Proof. Fix $N \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$. Let $(r_n)_{n=1}^N, (r'_n)_{n=1}^N$ be independent Rademacher sequences on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and let $v_0 \in X$ and $h_n : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow X$, $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, be given. Define $v_n : \Omega \rightarrow X$ by $v_n := h_n(r_1, \dots, r_n)$ for $n \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, and $v_N := 0 \in X$ for notational convenience. Let $f_0 = g_0 := 0 \in X$, and

$$f_n := \sum_{j=1}^n r_j v_{j-1} \quad \text{and} \quad g_n := \sum_{j=1}^n r'_j v_{j-1}$$

for $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Fix $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$ and let $\delta, \beta \in (0, \infty)$ satisfy $\beta > 1 + \delta$. Define the stopping times $\mu, \nu, \sigma : \Omega \rightarrow \{1, \dots, N+1\}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &:= \min\{n \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\} : \|f_n\|_X > \lambda\}, \\ \nu &:= \min\{n \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\} : \|f_n\|_X > \beta\lambda\}, \\ \sigma &:= \min\{n \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\} : \max\{\|g_n\|_X, \|v_n\|_X\} > \delta\lambda\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\min \emptyset := N + 1$. Define $f_N^*, g_N^*, v_{N-1}^* : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $f_N^* := \sup_{n \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \|f_n\|_X$, $g_N^* := \sup_{n \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \|g_n\|_X$, $v_{N-1}^* := \sup_{n \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}} \|v_n\|_X$, and

$${}^\mu f_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma} := \sum_{j=2}^N r_j v_{j-1} 1_{\{\mu < j \leq \nu \wedge \sigma\}} \quad \text{and} \quad {}^\mu g_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma} := \sum_{j=2}^N r'_j v_{j-1} 1_{\{\mu < j \leq \nu \wedge \sigma\}}.$$

By definition of $D_p(X)$ it holds that

$$\|{}^\mu f_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma}\|_{L^p(X)} \leq D_p(X) \|{}^\mu g_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma}\|_{L^p(X)}. \quad (38)$$

On the set $\{\sigma > \mu\}$ we have

$$\|{}^\mu g_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma}\|_X = \|g_{\nu \wedge \sigma \wedge N} - g_\mu\|_X \leq \|v_{(\nu \wedge \sigma \wedge N)-1}\|_X + \|g_{(\nu \wedge \sigma \wedge N)-1}\|_X + \|g_\mu\|_X \leq 3\delta\lambda.$$

As ${}^\mu g_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma} = 0$ on $\{\sigma \leq \mu\}$, it follows that

$$\|{}^\mu g_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma}\|_{L^p(X)} \leq 3\delta\lambda [\mathbb{P}(\sigma > \mu)]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq 3\delta\lambda [\mathbb{P}(f_N^* > \lambda)]^{\frac{1}{p}}. \quad (39)$$

On the other hand, on the set $\{\nu \leq N, \sigma = N + 1\}$ we have $\nu > 1$ because $\delta < \beta$ and thus on that set we have

$$\|{}^\mu f_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma}\|_X \geq \|f_\nu - r_\mu v_{\mu-1} - f_{\mu-1}\|_X \geq \beta\lambda - \delta\lambda - \lambda. \quad (40)$$

By (40), Chebyshev's inequality, and estimates (38) and (39) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(f_N^* > \beta\lambda, g_N^* \vee v_{N-1}^* \leq \delta\lambda) &= \mathbb{P}(\nu \leq N, \sigma = N + 1) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|{}^\mu f_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma}\|_X \geq (\beta - \delta - 1)\lambda) \\ &\leq (\beta - \delta - 1)^{-p} \lambda^{-p} \|{}^\mu f_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma}\|_{L^p(X)}^p \\ &\leq [D_p(X)]^p (\beta - \delta - 1)^{-p} \lambda^{-p} \|{}^\mu g_N^{\nu \wedge \sigma}\|_{L^p(X)}^p \\ &\leq [3\delta D_p(X)]^p (\beta - \delta - 1)^{-p} \mathbb{P}(f_N^* > \lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

As $\lambda > 0$ was arbitrary, it follows from (41) that for all $q \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}|f_N^*|^q \leq \beta^q [3\delta D_p(X)]^p (\beta - \delta - 1)^{-p} \mathbb{E}|f_N^*|^q + \beta^q \delta^{-q} [\mathbb{E}|g_N^*|^q + \mathbb{E}|v_{N-1}^*|^q]. \quad (42)$$

Fix $q \in (0, \infty)$, and set $\beta := 2$ and $\delta := 2^{-1 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{q}{p}} 3^{-1} [D_p(X)]^{-1}$. Note that $D_p(X) \geq 1$ as $X \neq \{0\}$, so that $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$, $\beta - \delta - 1 \geq \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$\beta^q [3\delta D_p(X)]^p (\beta - \delta - 1)^{-p} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

By the Lévy-Octaviani lemma applied conditionally (see e.g. [24, Corollary 1.1.1]) we have $\max\{\mathbb{E}|v_{N-1}^*|^q, \mathbb{E}|g_N^*|^q\} \leq 2\mathbb{E}\|g_N\|_X^q$. By substituting this into (42) we obtain

$$E|f_N^*|^q \leq \frac{1}{2} E|f_N^*|^q + 4\beta^q \delta^{-q} \mathbb{E}\|g_N\|_X^q \quad \text{and hence} \quad E|f_N^*|^q \leq 8 \cdot 2^q \delta^{-q} \mathbb{E}\|g_N\|_X^q.$$

Recalling the choice of δ , we obtain

$$8 \cdot 2^q \delta^{-q} \leq 8 \cdot 2^q [2^{-1 - \frac{1}{p} - \frac{q}{p}} 3^{-1} [D_p(X)]^{-1}]^{-q} = 8 \cdot 2^{2q + \frac{q}{p} + \frac{q^2}{p}} 3^q [D_p(X)]^q.$$

We conclude that $D_q(X) \leq 3 \cdot 2^{\frac{3}{4} + 2 + \frac{1}{p} + \frac{q}{p}} D_p(X)$, which completes the proof. \square

APPENDIX C.

Lemma C.1. *Assume a metric space (M, d) and a continuous map $*$: $M \times M \rightarrow M$ with $(x * y) * z = x * (y * z)$ for $x, y, z \in M$. Let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{P} \subseteq M$ and*

$$\overline{\mathcal{P}}^* := \text{cl}_d(\{x_1 * \cdots * x_L : x_1, \dots, x_L \in \mathcal{P}, L \in \mathbb{N}\})$$

where the closure on the right side is taken with respect to d . Then one has $\overline{(\overline{\mathcal{P}}^*)}^* = \overline{\mathcal{P}}^*$ and $\overline{\mathcal{P}}^*$ is the smallest d -closed set \mathcal{Q} with $\mathcal{Q} \supseteq \mathcal{P}$ and $\mu * \nu \in \mathcal{Q}$ for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Proof. The equality $\overline{(\overline{\mathcal{P}}^*)}^* = \overline{\mathcal{P}}^*$ follows from the continuity of $*$ and a standard diagonalization procedure. This also implies that $\mu * \nu \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}^*$ for all $\mu, \nu \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}^*$. Now let us assume a set \mathcal{Q} as in the assertion. Then $x_1 * \cdots * x_L \in \mathcal{Q}$ for all $x_1, \dots, x_L \in \mathcal{P}$. As \mathcal{Q} is closed we deduce $\overline{\mathcal{P}}^* \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$. \square

Acknowledgments. The first author is supported by the research programme *VENI Vernieuwingsimpuls* with project number 639.031.549, which is financed by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). The second author is supported by the project *Stochastic Analysis and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, Interactions and Applications* of the Academy of Finland with project number 298641. The authors wish to thank Mark Veraar, Peter Spreij and Stanisław Kwapien for useful comments. In particular, we thank Stanisław Kwapien for Theorem 5.1. The first author would also like to thank Lotte Meijer.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain. Some remarks on Banach spaces in which martingale difference sequences are unconditional. *Ark. Mat.*, 21:163–168, 1983.
- [2] B. M. Brown. Characteristic functions, moments, and the central limit theorem. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 41:658–664, 1970.
- [3] D.L. Burkholder. A geometric condition that implies the existence of certain singular integrals of Banach-space-valued functions. *Conference on harmonic analysis in honor of Antoni Zygmund, Wadsworth Math. Ser., Wadsworth, Belmont, CA, 1983*, I, II:270–286, 1981.
- [4] D.L. Burkholder. Sharp inequalities for martingales and stochastic integrals. *Astérisque*, (157-158):75–94, 1988. Colloque Paul Lévy sur les Processus Stochastiques (Palaiseau, 1987).
- [5] S.G. Cox and M.C. Veraar. Vector-valued decoupling and the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality. *Illinois J. Math.*, 55(1):343–375 (2012), 2011.
- [6] P. Cioica-Licht, S. Cox, and M. Veraar. Stochastic integration in quasi-Banach spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.08947*, 2018.
- [7] V.H. de la Peña and E. Giné. *Decoupling*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999. From dependence to independence, Randomly stopped processes. *U-statistics and processes. Martingales and beyond*.
- [8] R.M. Dudley. *Real Analysis and Probability*. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics, 2002.
- [9] D.J.H. Garling. Brownian motion and UMD-spaces. In *Probability and Banach spaces (Zaragoza, 1985)*, volume 1221 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 36–49. Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [10] D.J.H. Garling. Random martingale transform inequalities. In *Probability in Banach spaces 6 (Sandbjerg, 1986)*, volume 20 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 101–119. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990.
- [11] S. Geiss. BMO_ψ -spaces and applications to extrapolation theory. *Studia Math.*, 122(3):235–274, 1997.
- [12] P. Hitczenko. On tangent sequences of UMD-space valued random vectors. Unpublished.
- [13] P. Hitczenko. Upper bounds for the l_p -norms of martingales. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields*, 86:225–238, 1990.

- [14] P. Hitczenko. On a domination of sums of random variables by sums of conditionally independent ones. *Ann. Probab.*, 22(1):453–468, 1994.
- [15] T. Hytönen, J. van Neerven, M. Veraar, and L. Weis. *Analysis in Banach spaces. Vol. I. Martingales and Littlewood-Paley theory*, volume 63 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [16] T. Hytönen, J. van Neerven, M. Veraar, and L. Weis. *Analysis in Banach spaces. Vol. II*, volume 67 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2017. Probabilistic methods and operator theory.
- [17] R. Kaas and J.M. Buhrman. Mean, median and mode in binomial distributions. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 34(1):13–18, 1980.
- [18] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2002.
- [19] O. Kallenberg. Tangential existence and comparison with applications to single and multiple integration. *Probab. Math. Statist.*, 37(1):21–52, 2017.
- [20] M.J. Klass. A best possible improvement of Wald’s equation. *Ann. Probab.*, 16(2):840–853, 1988.
- [21] M.J. Klass. Uniform lower bounds for randomly stopped Banach space valued random sums. *Ann. Probab.*, 18(2):790–809, 1990.
- [22] S. Kwapien and W.A. Woyczyński. Tangent sequences of random variables: basic inequalities and their applications. In *Almost everywhere convergence*, pages 237–265. Academic Press, Boston, 1989.
- [23] S. Kwapien and W.A. Woyczyński. Semimartingale integrals via decoupling and tangent processes. *Probab. Math. Statist.*, 12(2):165–200, 1991.
- [24] S. Kwapien and W.A. Woyczyński. *Random series and stochastic integrals: single and multiple*. Probability and its Applications. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1992.
- [25] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand. *Probability in Banach spaces*, volume 23 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991. Isoperimetry and processes.
- [26] B. Maurey. Système de Haar. In *Séminaire Maurey-Schwartz 1974–1975: Espaces L_{supp} , applications radonifiantes et géométrie des espaces de Banach, Exp. Nos. I et II*, pages 26 pp. (erratum, p. 1). Centre Math., École Polytech., Paris, 1975.
- [27] T.R. McConnell. Decoupling and stochastic integration in UMD Banach spaces. *Probab. Math. Statist.*, 10(2):283–295, 1989.
- [28] S. Montgomery-Smith. Concrete representation of martingales. *Electron. J. Probab.*, 3:No. 15, 15 pp., 1998.
- [29] K.R Parthasarathy. *Probability measures on metric spaces*. Academic Press, 1967.
- [30] A. Pietsch and J. Wenzel. *Orthonormal systems and Banach space geometry*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [31] G. Pisier. Martingales with values in uniformly convex spaces. *Israel J. Math.*, 20:326–350, 1975.
- [32] G. Pisier. *The volume of convex bodies and Banach space geometry*. Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- [33] J.M.A.M. van Neerven. *Stochastic Evolution Equations*. 2008. Lecture Notes to the 10th Internet Seminar, available at <http://fa.its.tudelft.nl/~neerven/>.
- [34] J.M.A.M. van Neerven. γ -radonifying operators—a survey. In *The AMSI-ANU Workshop on Spectral Theory and Harmonic Analysis*, volume 44 of *Proc. Centre Math. Appl. Austral. Nat. Univ.*, pages 1–61. Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra, 2010.
- [35] J.M.A.M. van Neerven, M. Veraar, and L. Weis. Stochastic integration in Banach spaces—a survey. In *Stochastic analysis: a series of lectures*, volume 68 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 297–332. Birkhäuser/Springer, Basel, 2015.
- [36] J.M.A.M. van Neerven, M.C. Veraar, and L. Weis. Stochastic integration in UMD Banach spaces. *Ann. Probab.*, 35(4):1438–1478, 2007.
- [37] M.C. Veraar. Randomized UMD Banach spaces and decoupling inequalities for stochastic integrals. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 135(5):1477–1486 (electronic), 2007.

KORTEWEG-DE VRIES INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, POSTBUS 94248,
NL-1090 GE AMSTERDAM, NETHERLANDS
E-mail address: `s.g.cox@uva.nl`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ, P.O. Box 35, FIN-
40014 UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ, FINLAND
E-mail address: `stefan.geiss@jyu.fi`