

LOWER BOUNDS FOR THE CONSTANTS IN NON-UNIFORM ESTIMATES OF THE RATE OF CONVERGENCE IN THE CLT

I. G. Shevtsova^{1,2,3}

We conduct a comparative analysis of the constants in the Nagaev–Bikelis and Bikelis–Petrov inequalities which establish non-uniform estimates of the rate of convergence in the central limit theorem for sums of independent random variables possessing finite absolute moments of order $2 + \delta$ with $\delta \in [0, 1]$. We provide lower bounds for the above constants and also for the constants in the structural improvements of Nagaev–Bikelis’ inequality. The lower bounds in Nagaev–Bikelis’ inequality and its structural improvements are given in dependence on δ and a structural parameter s as well as uniform with respect to both δ and s . Lower bounds for the constants in Nagaev–Bikelis’ with $\delta < 1$ and Bikelis–Petrov’s inequalities are presented for the first time.

1. Introduction

Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be independent random variables (r.v.’s) with distribution functions (d.f.’s) F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n , and $\mathbf{E}X_k = 0$, $\sigma_k^2 := \mathbf{E}X_k^2 < \infty$,

$$S_n := \sum_{k=1}^n X_k, \quad B_n^2 := \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2 = \mathbf{D}S_n > 0.$$

Let us denote

$$\bar{F}_n(x) := \mathbf{P}(S_n < xB_n), \quad \Phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-t^2/2} dt, \quad \Delta_n(x) = |\bar{F}_n(x) - \Phi(x)|, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$L_n(\varepsilon) := \frac{1}{B_n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E}X_k^2 \mathbf{1}(|X_k| > \varepsilon B_n), \quad \varepsilon > 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

If

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \mathbf{E}|X_k|^{2+\delta} < \infty \quad \text{for some } \delta > 0$$

denote also

$$L_{2+\delta, n} := \frac{1}{B_n^{2+\delta}} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{E}|X_k|^{2+\delta}, \quad \delta \in (0, 1].$$

We shall also use the notation $L_{2+\delta, n} := 1$ for $\delta = 0$. The quantities $L_n(\cdot)$ and $L_{2+\delta, n}$ are called the Lindeberg fraction and the Lyapounov fraction, respectively.

In the case of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random summands X_1, \dots, X_n and $\delta = 1$, Nagaev [10] proved that

$$\Delta_n(x) \leq K_0 \frac{L_{2+\delta, n}}{1 + |x|^{2+\delta}}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (1)$$

where $K_0 = K_0(\delta)$ is an absolute constant for every value of $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and may be chosen even independent on δ , i.e. to be an absolute constant *uniformly* for all $\delta \in [0, 1]$. Inequality (1) was proved in the general situation (in the presented form) by Bikelis [1] one year later, i.e., in 1966.

¹ Hangzhou Dianzi University, Hangzhou, China, e-mail: ishevtsova@cs.msu.ru

² Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

³ FRSC “Informatics and Control” of RAS, Moscow, Russia

The first upper bounds for $K_0(\delta)$ (in dependence on δ) were obtained by Paditz [17–20] in 1976–1979 and were of order $100 \div 2000$. These estimates further were considered and consequently improved by Michel [8] (i.i.d. case and $\delta = 1$) in 1981, Tysiak [29] in 1983, Mirachmedov and Paditz [9, 21, 22] in 1984–1989, Nefedova, Shevtsova, Grigorieva and Popov [6, 13, 15, 25–27] in 2011–2017. A detailed survey may be found, e. g., in [27]. The best known upper bounds for $K_0(\delta)$ are obtained in [27] (see also announcement [25]) and are presented in table 1 in the second and fifth columns.

δ	non-i.i.d. case			i.i.d. case		
	$K_0(\delta)$	$K_{s_1}(\delta)$	s_1	$K_0(\delta)$	$K_{s_1}(\delta)$	s_1
1	21.82	18.19	1	17.36	15.70	0.646
0.9	20.07	16.65	1	16.24	14.61	0.619
0.8	18.53	15.34	1	15.20	13.61	0.625
0.7	17.14	14.20	1	14.13	12.71	0.570
0.6	15.91	13.19	0.859	13.15	11.90	0.498
0.5	14.84	12.30	0.834	12.26	11.17	0.428
0.4	13.92	11.53	0.806	11.43	10.51	0.350
0.3	13.10	10.86	0.778	10.66	9.93	0.273
0.2	12.35	10.28	0.748	9.92	9.42	0.183
0.1	11.67	9.77	0.710	9.18	8.97	0.074

Table 1. Upper bounds for the constants $K_s(\delta)$ from inequalities (1) and (8) for some $s \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta \in (0, 1]$.

Let us note that Bikelis in [1, Theorem 4] obtained, in fact, a stronger result, which can be called a non-uniform analogue of the Osipov inequality [16]: for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\Delta_n(x) \leq \frac{A}{(1+|x|)^3 B_n} \int_0^{(1+|x|)B_n} L_n(z) dz \quad (2)$$

$$= \frac{A}{(1+|x|)^3 B_n^3} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E} X_k^2 \min \{ |X_k|, (1+|x|)B_n \} \quad (3)$$

$$= A \sum_{k=1}^n \left[\frac{\mathbb{E} X_k^2 \mathbf{1}(|X_k| > (1+|x|)B_n)}{(1+|x|)^2 B_n^2} + \frac{\mathbb{E} |X_k|^3 \mathbf{1}(|X_k| \leq (1+|x|)B_n)}{(1+|x|)^3 B_n^3} \right], \quad (4)$$

where A is an absolute constant. Inequality (2) trivially yields (1): Indeed, following the reasoning of Bikelis and multiplying the quadratic and the cubic functions in the integrands in (4) by

$$\left(\frac{|X_k|}{(1+|x|)B_n} \right)^\delta \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{(1+|x|)B_n}{|X_k|} \right)^{1-\delta} \geq 1,$$

respectively, we get (1) with

$$K_0(\delta) \leq A \sup_{x>0} \frac{(1+x)^{2+\delta}}{1+x^{2+\delta}} = A \cdot \frac{(1+x)^{2+\delta}}{1+x^{2+\delta}} \Big|_{x=1} = A \cdot 2^{1+\delta} \leq 4A, \quad \delta \in [0, 1]. \quad (5)$$

Though expression (4), obviously, was kept in mind by Bikelis when he was deducing (1), it was not given in the explicit form in [1], however. Inequality (4) appears for the first time only in the work of Petrov [23] in 1979, where the author deduces it from Bikelis' inequality (2) in the course of the proof of inequality (7) below.

In order to formulate Petrov's inequality (7) below let us introduce a set \mathcal{G} of all even functions $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $g(x) > 0$ for $x > 0$ and the functions $g(x)$, $x/g(x)$ are non-decreasing for $x > 0$.

In recent paper [4] it was proved that every function $g \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfies the following inequalities for all $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ and $a > 0$:

$$g_*(x; a) := \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|x|}{a} \right\} \leq \frac{g(x)}{g(a)} \leq \max \left\{ 1, \frac{|x|}{a} \right\} =: g^*(x; a), \quad (6)$$

where $g_*(\cdot; a), g^*(\cdot; a) \in \mathcal{G}$ for every $a > 0$.

Petrov [23] proved that for every function $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \mathbb{E}X_k^2 g(X_k) < \infty$ we have

$$\Delta_n(x) \leq \frac{A \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}X_k^2 g(X_k)}{(1 + |x|)^2 B_n^2 g((1 + |x|)B_n)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (7)$$

with the same constant A as in (4), that is, *universal* for all functions $g \in \mathcal{G}$.

Observe that inequality (7) follows trivially from (4) with the account of (6). The proofs of (7) in [23] and (6) in [4] are based on the same ideas, Petrov applying them only to the concrete functional of a function $g \in \mathcal{G}$, while the authors of [4] — directly to all the functions in \mathcal{G} (see (6)). On the other hand, Bikelis' inequality (3) trivially follows from (7) with

$$g(u) = g_*(u; (1 + |x|)B_n) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{|u|}{(1 + |x|)B_n} \right\} \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Moreover, inequality (7) with $g(u) = |u|^\delta \in \mathcal{G}$ also yields Nagaev–Bikelis inequality (1) with $K_0 \leq 4A$. However, the numerical optimization of the constant A with the concrete function $g(u) = |u|^\delta$ (which is not an extremal in (7)), in fact, leads to sharper upper bounds for A which coincides with K_0 in this case (see table 1) than those that can be obtained for the universal constant A (with the extremal function $g = g_*$).

Let us also mention that, in 2001, Chen and Shao [2] reproved Bikelis' inequality (4) by Stein's method; moreover, the authors of [2] refer to Bikelis' work [1], but cite only weaker inequality (1) stating erroneously that results of [1] are of a less general character and hold true only under the assumption of finiteness of third-order moments of random summands.

The value of the constant A also remained unknown for a long time. It's first upper bounds were obtained only in 2005–2007 by Neammanee and Thongtha [11, 12, 28]. Then they were improved by Korolev and Popov [7] to the presently best known bounds: $A \leq 39.32$ in the i.i.d. case and $A \leq 47.65$ in the general situation. Moreover, in [7] it is also shown that the following improved estimates hold for large values of the argument $|x| \geq 10$: $A \leq 24.13$ in the i.i.d. case and $A \leq 29.62$ in the general situation.

Let us also note that, in 2011, Gavrilenko, Nefedova, and Shevtsova [5, 14, 25, 27] suggested structural improvements of Nagaev–Bikelis inequality (1) in the following form:

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} (1 + |x|^{2+\delta}) \Delta_n(x) \leq \inf_{s \geq 0} K_s(\delta) (L_{2+\delta, n} + sT_{2+\delta, n}), \quad (8)$$

where

$$T_{2+\delta, n} := \frac{1}{B_n^{2+\delta}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j^{2+\delta} \leq \frac{1}{B_n^{2+\delta}} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}|X_j|^{2+\delta} = L_{2+\delta, n}$$

and, of course, $K_s(\delta) \leq K_0(\delta)$ for all $s \geq 0$. However, values of the constants $K_s(\delta)$ for $s > 0$ turn to be strictly less than for $s = 0$, which makes estimate (8) more favorable than the classical Nagaev–Bikelis inequality (1) for large values of the ratio $L_{2+\delta, n}/T_{2+\delta, n}$ (which is never less than one and may be infinitely large). The best known upper bounds for the constants $K_s(\delta)$ are obtained in [25, 27] and are cited in table 1 for some $s \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta \in (0, 1]$, where $s_1(\delta)$ is the optimal value of $s \geq 0$, that minimizes $K_s(\delta)$ (within the method used), so that $K_s(\delta) = K_{s_1}(\delta)$ for $s > s_1(\delta)$.

As regards lower bounds for the constants $K_0(\delta)$ and A , presently a couple of lower bounds is known only for $K_0(1)$. The first one follows from Chistyakov's result [3]:

$$K_0(1) \geq \lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{\ell \rightarrow 0} \sup_{n, X_1, \dots, X_n: L_{3,n} = \ell} |x|^3 \Delta_n(x) / \ell = 1.$$

The second one was obtained in a recent paper [24] by Pinelis who considered $n = 1$, $P(X_1 = 1 - p) = p = 1 - P(X_1 = -p)$, $x = 1 - p$ and $p = 0.08$ and improved the above bound to

$$K_0(1) \geq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}, X_1} (1 + |x|^3) \Delta_1(x) \frac{\sigma_1^3}{\mathbb{E}|X_1|^3} > 1.0135 \dots$$

2. Main results

Using Pinelis' lower bound for $K_0(1)$ and inequality (5) it is easy to obtain a lower bound for the constant A in Bikelis' (2), (3), (4) and Petrov's (7) inequalities in the following form:

$$A \geq \sup_{\delta \in (0,1)} K_0(\delta) / 2^{1+\delta} \geq K_0(1) / 4 > 0.2533.$$

However, one can act more delicate (similarly to Pinelis [24]) and obtain a sharper lower bound.

Theorem 1. *For the absolute constant A in Bikelis' (2), (3), (4) and Petrov's (7) inequalities, also in the i.i.d. case, we have*

$$A \geq (1 + \sqrt{p^{-1} - 1})^2 (\Phi(\sqrt{p^{-1} - 1}) - 1 + p) \Big|_{p=0.15} > 1.6153.$$

Similar reasoning leads to the following lower bounds for the constants $K_0(\delta)$ in Nagaev–Bikelis inequality (1) and $K_s(\delta)$ in (8) with arbitrary $\delta \in [0, 1]$ (observe that inequalities (1), (8) hold true also for $\delta = 0$ with $L_{2+\delta,n} = T_{2+\delta,n} = 1$, as it follows, say, from (7) with $g(u) \equiv 1$).

Theorem 2. *For the constants $K_0(\delta)$ in (1) and $K_s(\delta)$ in (8) for every $s \geq 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$, also in the i.i.d. case, we have*

$$K_s(\delta) \geq \sup_{0 < p < 1, q = 1-p} q^{\delta/2} \cdot \frac{p^{1+\delta/2} + q^{1+\delta/2}}{p^{1+\delta} + q^{1+\delta} + s(pq)^{\delta/2}} \left| 1 - \frac{1}{p} \Phi \left(-\sqrt{\frac{q}{p}} \right) \right|, \quad (9)$$

in particular,

$$K_0(\delta) \geq \sup_{0 < p < 1, q = 1-p} q^{\delta/2} \cdot \frac{p^{1+\delta/2} + q^{1+\delta/2}}{p^{1+\delta} + q^{1+\delta}} \left| 1 - \frac{1}{p} \Phi \left(-\sqrt{\frac{q}{p}} \right) \right|, \quad \delta \in [0, 1], \quad (10)$$

$$K_s(\delta) \geq \begin{cases} 1/(1+s), & \delta = 0, \\ 1, & \delta \in (0, 1], \end{cases} \quad s \geq 0. \quad (11)$$

The lower bound in (11) is obtained by letting $p \rightarrow 0+$ in (9). It turns out that $p \rightarrow 0+$ is indeed an extremal for either $\delta = 0$ or $s > 0$ (the numerically optimal values of p are very close to zero), so we leave lower bounds in (11) as finite ones for $\delta = 0$ and all $s \geq 0$ or $s > 0$ and all $\delta \in [0, 1]$, while an accurate optimization in (10) with respect to $p \in (0, 1)$ for fixed $\delta \in (0, 1]$ leads to sharper lower bounds for $K_0(\delta)$ given in table 2 in the second row. The values of the minorant (10) in table 2 are accompanied with the corresponding values of p (in the third row) close to the extremal ones which guarantee the announced lower bounds.

δ	0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	1
$K_0 \geq$	1	1.0061	1.0108	1.0139	1.0158	1.0167	1.0168	1.0164	1.0157	1.0147	1.0135
p	0	0.06	0.066	0.07	0.074	0.076	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08

Table 2. Lower bounds for the constants $K_0(\delta)$ from (1), constructed with respect to formula (10), for some $\delta \in [0, 1]$.

3. Proofs

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1

To construct a lower bound for the constant A consider Petrov's inequality (7) with

$$g(u) \equiv 1 \in \mathcal{G} \quad \text{and} \quad n = 1.$$

Then we have

$$A \geq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}, X_1} (1 + |x|)^2 \Delta_1(x),$$

where the least upper bound is taken with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and all distributions of the r.v. X_1 with $\mathbb{E}X_1 = 0$, $\mathbb{E}X_1^2 \in (0, \infty)$. Now letting

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 = \sqrt{q/p}) = p = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X_1 = -\sqrt{p/q}), \quad x = \sqrt{q/p}, \quad q = 1 - p, \quad p \in (0, 1),$$

we obtain

$$A \geq \sup_{p \in (0, 1), q = 1 - p} (1 + \sqrt{q/p})^2 \left| q - \Phi(\sqrt{q/p}) \right|.$$

The announced lower bound follows by taking here $p = 0.15$.

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2

To construct lower bounds for the constants $K_s(\delta)$ consider inequality (8) with

$$n = 1, \quad \mathbb{P}(X_1 = \sqrt{q/p}) = p = 1 - \mathbb{P}(X_1 = -\sqrt{p/q}), \quad x = \sqrt{q/p}, \quad q = 1 - p, \quad p \in (0, 1).$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{E}X_1 = 0, \quad \sigma_1^2 = 1, \quad \mathbb{E}|X_1|^{2+\delta} = \frac{p^{1+\delta} + q^{1+\delta}}{(pq)^{\delta/2}},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} K_s(\delta) &\geq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}, X_1} (1 + |x|^{2+\delta}) \frac{\Delta_1(x) \sigma_1^{2+\delta}}{\mathbb{E}|X_1|^{2+\delta} + s \sigma_1^{2+\delta}} \\ &\geq \sup_{0 < p < 1, q = 1 - p} \left(1 + \left(\frac{q}{p} \right)^{1+\delta/2} \right) \left| q - \Phi\left(\sqrt{\frac{q}{p}} \right) \right| \frac{(pq)^{\delta/2}}{p^{1+\delta} + q^{1+\delta} + s(pq)^{\delta/2}} \\ &= \sup_{0 < p < 1, q = 1 - p} q^{\delta/2} \cdot \frac{p^{1+\delta/2} + q^{1+\delta/2}}{p^{1+\delta} + q^{1+\delta} + s(pq)^{\delta/2}} \left| 1 - \frac{1}{p} \Phi\left(-\sqrt{\frac{q}{p}} \right) \right| \end{aligned}$$

for all $\delta \in [0, 1]$ and $s \geq 0$. Now letting $p \rightarrow 0+$ and taking into account that

$$\Phi(-x) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}x} e^{-x^2/2}, \quad x > 0,$$

we obtain a lower bound

$$K_s(\delta) \geq \lim_{p \rightarrow 0} \left| 1 - \frac{1}{p} \Phi\left(-\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}} \right) \right| = 1 - \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (1 + x^2) \Phi(-x) = 1,$$

universal for all $s \geq 0$ and $\delta \in [0, 1]$, while an accurate optimization with respect to $p \in (0, 1)$ for fixed $\delta \in (0, 1]$ and $s = 0$ leads to sharper lower bounds for $K_0(\delta)$ given in table 2.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project No. 19-07-01220-a) and by the Ministry for Education and Science of Russia (grant No. MD–189.2019.1).

REFERENCES

1. A. Bikelis, “Estimates of the remainder term in the central limit theorem”, *Litovsk. Mat. Sb.* (in Russian), **6**, No. 3, 323–346 (1966).
2. L. H. Y. Chen and Q. M. Shao, “A non-uniform Berry–Esseen bound via Stein’s method”, *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields*, **120**, 236–254 (2001).
3. G. P. Chistyakov, “On a problem of A. N. Kolmogorov”, *J. Math. Sci.*, **68**, No. 4, 604–625 (1994).
4. R. Gabdullin, V. Makarenko, and I. Shevtsova, “Esseen–Rozovskii type estimates for the rate of convergence in the Lindeberg theorem”, *J. Math. Sci.*, **234**, No. 6, 847–885 (2018).
5. S. V. Gavrilenko, “An improvement of the nonuniform estimates of convergence rate of distributions of Poisson random sums to the normal law”, *Informatics and its Applications* (in Russian), **5**, No. 1, 12–24 (2011).
6. M. E. Grigorieva and S. V. Popov, “On nonuniform convergence rate estimates in the central limit theorem”, *Systems and Means of Informatics* (in Russian), **22**, No. 1, 180–204 (2012).
7. V. Yu. Korolev and S. V. Popov, “Improvement of convergence rate estimates in the central limit theorem under weakened moment conditions”, *Dokl. Math.*, **86**, No. 1, 506–511 (2012).
8. R. Michel, “On the constant in the nonuniform version of the Berry–Esseen theorem”, *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Geb.*, **55**, No. 1, 109–117 (1981).
9. Sh. A. Mirachmedov, “On the absolute constant in the nonuniform convergence rate estimate in the central limit theorem”, *Izv. AN UzSSR, Ser. Fiz.-Mat. Nauk* (in Russian), **1984**, No. 4, 26–30 (1984).
10. S. V. Nagaev, “Some limit theorems for large deviations”, *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **10**, No. 2, 214–235 (1965).
11. K. Neammanee, “On the constant in the nonuniform version of the Berry–Esseen theorem”, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.*, No. 12, 1951–1967 (2005).
12. K. Neammanee and P. Thongtha, “Improvement of the non-uniform version of Berry–Esseen inequality via Paditz–Siganov theorems”, *J. Inequal. Pure and Appl. Math.*, **8**, No. 4, 1–20 (2007).
13. Yu. S. Nefedova and I. G. Shevtsova, “On the accuracy of the normal approximation to distributions of Poisson random sums”, *Informatics and its Applications* (in Russian), **5**, No. 1, 39–45 (2011).
14. Yu. S. Nefedova and I. G. Shevtsova, “Structural improvement of nonuniform estimates for the rate of convergence in the central limit theorem with applications to Poisson random sums”, *Dokl. Math.*, **84**, No. 2, 675–680 (2011).
15. Yu. S. Nefedova and I. G. Shevtsova, “On non-uniform convergence rate estimates in the central limit theorem”, *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **57**, No. 1, 28–59 (2013).
16. L. V. Osipov, “Refinement of Lindeberg’s theorem”, *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **11**, No. 2, 299–302 (1966).
17. L. Paditz, “Abschätzungen der Konvergenzgeschwindigkeit im zentralen Grenzwertsatz”, *Wiss. Z. der TU Dresden*, No. 25, 1169–1177 (1976).
18. L. Paditz, *Über die Annäherung der Verteilungsfunktionen von Summen unabhängiger Zufallsgrößen gegen unbegrenzt teilbare Verteilungsfunktionen unter besonderer Beachtung der Verteilungsfunktion der standardisierten Normalverteilung*, Dissertation A, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden (1977).

19. L. Paditz, “Abschätzungen der Konvergenzgeschwindigkeit zur Normalverteilung unter Voraussetzung einseitiger Momente”, *Math. Nachr.*, No. 82, 131–156 (1978).
20. L. Paditz, “Über eine Fehlerabschätzung im zentralen Grenzwertsatz”, *Wiss. Z. der TU Dresden*, **28**, No. 5, 1197–1200 (1979).
21. L. Paditz and Sh. A. Mirachmedov, “Pis’mo v redakciju (Zamechanie k ocenke absolutnoj postojannoju v neravnomernoj ocenke skorosti shodimosti v c.p.t.)”, *Izv. AN UzSSR, Ser. Fiz.-Mat. Nauk* (in Russian), No. 3, 80 (1986).
22. L. Paditz, “On the analytical structure of the constant in the nonuniform version of the Esseen inequality”, *Statistics (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag)*, **20**, No. 3, 453–464 (1989).
23. V. V. Petrov, “A limit theorem for sums of independent, nonidentically distributed random variables”, *J. Soviet Math.*, **20**, No. 3, 2232–2235 (1982).
24. I. Pinelis, “On the nonuniform Berry–Esseen bound”, *arXiv:1301.2828* (2013).
25. I. G. Shevtsova, “On the absolute constant in the Berry–Esseen inequality and its structural and non-uniform improvements”, *Informatics and its Applications* (in Russian), **7**, No. 1, 124–125 (2013).
26. I. G. Shevtsova, *Accuracy of the Normal Approximation: Methods of Estimation and New Results* (in Russian), Argamak–Media, Moscow (2016).
27. I. G. Shevtsova, *On the absolute constants in Nagaev–Bikelis-type inequalities*, in: *Inequalities and Extremal Problems in Probability and Statistics*, I. Pinelis (ed.), Elsevier, London, (2017), pp. 47–102.
28. P. Thongtha and K. Neammanee, “Refinement on the constants in the non-uniform version of the Berry–Esseen theorem”, *Thai J. Math.*, **5**, 1–13 (2007).
29. W. Tysiak, *Gleichmäßige und nicht-gleichmäßige Berry–Esseen Abschätzungen*, Dissertation, Gesamthochschule Wuppertal, Wuppertal (1983).