

# SMOOTH EDGEWORTH EXPANSION AND WASSERSTEIN- $P$ BOUNDS FOR MIXING RANDOM FIELDS

TIANLE LIU AND MORGANE AUSTERN

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper, we consider  $d$ -dimensional mixing random fields  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  and study the convergence of the empirical average  $W_n := \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{i \in T_n} X_i^{(n)}$ . Under  $\alpha$ -mixing and moment conditions, we obtain smooth Edgeworth expansions for  $W_n$  of any order  $k \geq 1$  with better controlled remainder terms. We exploit this to obtain rates for the convergence of  $W_n$  to its normal limit in the Wasserstein- $p$  distance for any  $p \geq 1$ . The bounds depend on the moments of the random variables  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  and the rate of polynomial decay of the mixing coefficients. Finally, we apply those results to obtain tail inequalities and non-uniform Berry–Esseen bounds with polynomial decay.

## CONTENTS

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Related literature on Edgeworth expansion	4
1.2	Related literature on Wasserstein- $p$ convergence rate for the CLT	5
1.3	Paper outline	6
2	Notations	6
	Notations concerning integers and sets	6
	Notations for sequences	6
	Notations for functions	6
	Notations for probability distributions	6
	Notations for normal expectation	6
3	Main results	6
3.1	Main definitions: Random fields and mixing coefficients	6
3.2	Smooth Edgeworth expansion for mixing random fields	7
3.3	Wasserstein- $p$ bounds for mixing random fields	9
3.4	Application to tail bounds	10
4	Proof sketches	12
4.1	Proof sketch for smooth Edgeworth expansion	12
4.2	Proof sketch for Wasserstein- $p$ bounds	15
4.3	Proof roadmap and locations	16
	Appendix A Preliminary lemmas	20
	Appendix B Details of the constructive graph approach	21
	B.1 Example and motivation	21
	B.2 Graph theory background and definition of Genograms	27
	B.3 Relating Edgeworth expansion to graphs	34

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

*E-mail addresses:* tianleliu@fas.harvard.edu, maustern@fas.harvard.edu.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F05.

*Key words and phrases.* Normal approximation; Wasserstein distance; Edgeworth expansion;  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients; Stein's method.

Appendix C	Proofs of the theorems in Section 3.3	36
Appendix D	Proofs of the theorems in Section 3.2 and Theorem C.4	44
Appendix E	Proofs of Theorems 3.11 and 3.10	50
Appendix F	Proofs of Lemmas G.2 and G.3	52
Appendix G	Proof of the results in Section B	59
Appendix H	Proof of Lemma G.4	68

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The central limit theorem (CLT) is one of the most fundamental theorems in probability, and obtaining its rate of convergence has long been a key question. Over the last decade, considerable efforts have been deployed in obtaining optimal rates of convergence in CLT under transport distances [Rio, 2009, Ledoux et al., 2015, Bobkov, 2018, Bonis, 2020]. For two probability measures  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  over the real line  $\mathbb{R}$ , the Wasserstein- $p$  distance [Villani, 2009] between  $\nu$  and  $\mu$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\nu, \mu) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\nu, \mu)} \left( \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \gamma} [|X - Y|^p] \right)^{1/p},$$

where we denote by  $\Gamma(\nu, \mu)$  the set of all couplings of  $\nu$  and  $\mu$ . Let  $W_n := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  be a sum of  $n$  *i.i.d.* random variables with finite third moment, Agnew [1957], Esseen [1958] established that  $W_n$  converges to its normal limit at an optimal rate of  $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$  under Wasserstein-1 distance. However, obtaining tight bounds in Wasserstein- $p$  distance with a general  $p \geq 1$  turned out to be difficult, and had been a long-standing open problem before it was completely solved by Bobkov [2018], Bonis [2020], where they established that  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$ . Their results have in turn been used to establish moderate deviation bounds [Fang and Koike, 2023] and concentration inequalities [Austern and Mackey, 2022], and to formalize neural network approximations by Gaussian processes [Eldan et al., 2021]. Note that the majority of these results rely heavily on the independence assumption in their proof techniques. For example, it was used in Ledoux et al. [2015] to obtain a Stein kernel for  $W_n$ , in Bobkov [2018] to show classical Edgeworth expansions, and in Bonis [2020] to build an exchangeable pair. While some recent works have extended those results to locally dependent random variables and U-statistics [Fang, 2019, Fang and Liu, 2022, Liu and Austern, 2023], the class of dependent process considered is still restrictive. Notably they do not apply to Markov random fields, Bernoulli shifts, or stationary mixing sequences. To bridge this gap, we extend the Wasserstein- $p$  results to  $\alpha$ -mixing random fields under moment conditions.

Let  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  be a triangle array of  $d$  dimensional real-valued random fields whose dependence is controlled through the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients. We denote the empirical average

$$W_n := \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{i \in T_n} X_i^{(n)},$$

where  $T_n \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$  is a subset of indexes and  $\sigma_n^2 := \text{Var}(\sum_{i \in T_n} X_i^{(n)})$ . Under general mixing and moment conditions it is well known from Bolthausen [1982a] that  $W_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  holds, i.e.,  $W_n$  is asymptotically normal as long as the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients  $(\alpha_\ell)$  decrease such that  $\sum_{\ell \geq 1} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_\ell^{\delta/(2+\delta)} \rightarrow 0$  for some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\sup_{i \in T_n; n \geq 1} \|X_i^{(n)}\|_{2+\delta} < \infty$ . In this paper, we provide the first bounds on the Wasserstein- $p$  distance between the law of  $W_n$  and  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  that apply to mixing random fields for any general  $p \geq 1$ . More specifically we show

in Proposition 3.5 that under mixing and moment conditions we have

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-\beta}),$$

where  $\beta \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$  is a constant that will depend on the speed of decay of the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients. When  $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients decrease at the polynomial rate  $\alpha_\ell = \mathcal{O}(\ell^{-u})$  with  $u > d(p+1)$ , then  $\beta = 1/2$  and we obtain the optimal rate.

Interestingly Rio [2009] showed that the Wasserstein- $p$  distance can be bounded through the quantity  $\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathcal{N}h$  with  $h$  being  $\mathcal{C}^k$ -smooth functions (or more generally functions in some Hölder space), and  $\mathcal{N}h$  denoting the expectation of  $h$  under standard normal. In particular, to obtain Wasserstein- $p$  bounds with a general  $p > 1$ , one possible method is to expand this quantity to an arbitrary order  $k$ . More precisely for any  $k \geq 1$  and for any smooth functions  $h \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1}$ , we would like to show that, under conditions on  $(X_i^{(n)})$  and  $h$ , there exist coefficients  $h_{r, s_{1:r}}$  not depending on  $W_n$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathcal{N}h = \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(k)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(W_n) h_{r, s_{1:r}}}{(s_j + 1)!} + \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-(k+\gamma)/2}), \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\Gamma(k) := \{r, s_{1:r} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{j=1}^r s_j \leq k\}$ ,  $\kappa_\ell(\cdot)$  denotes the  $\ell$ -th cumulant of  $W_n$ , and  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  depends on the decay rate of mixing coefficients. (1.1) was first shown for *i.i.d.* random variables by Barbour [1986] and extended to locally dependent settings by Rinott and Rotar [2003]. For random fields with polynomially decaying  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients, as shown in Sunklodas [2007], Bentkus and Sunklodas [2007], it is already challenging to control the remainder terms in the first order expansion, and there is no previous result beyond that. In this paper, however, we are able to obtain such expansions to an arbitrary order  $k$  and explicitly control the remainder terms in this setting, filling the gap in literature. Despite the similarity in appearance this type of result is different from the classical Edgeworth expansions for  $\mathbb{P}(W_n \leq x) - \Phi(x)$ , and following Fang and Liu [2022] we will refer to it as *smooth Edgeworth expansions* due to the smooth conditions on  $h$ . Moreover, it is important to point out that our (1.1) is much stronger than smooth Edgeworth expansions in the form of (1.3) in Götze and Hipp [1983], Lahiri [1993, 1996] for two reasons. Firstly, we have explicit forms of the expansion in (1.1) in terms of cumulants and  $h$ . Secondly, the remainder terms have the rate  $\mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-(k+\gamma)/2})$  instead of  $o(|T_n|^{-k/2})$ . Note that the latter does not imply Wasserstein- $p$  bounds using Rio [2009]. In general, these Edgeworth type results have been of independent interest and used as great tools for establishing deviation and concentration inequalities [Bobkov, 2018, Liu and Austern, 2023] and for studying the accuracy of bootstrap estimators [Præstgaard and Wellner, 1993, Jansen and Pauls, 2003, Lahiri and Lahiri, 2003, Hall, 2013, Zhilova, 2022].

Another contribution of our paper is that we propose a new constructive graph approach to deal with dependence when we obtain the smooth Edgeworth expansions. To illustrate, by Stein's method it suffices to bound  $\mathbb{E}[W_n f(W_n) - f'(W_n)]$ , where  $f$  is the solution to the so-called Stein's equation. In specific we would like to show that

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n f(W_n)] = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W_n)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[f^{(j)}(W_n)] + \text{remainder terms}, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $f^{(j)}$  is the  $j$ -th order derivative of  $f$ . Even though (1.2) holds obviously for polynomials  $f$  of degree up to  $k$  with no remainder term, the difficulty is in showing this for more general smooth  $f$ , whose  $(k+1)$ -th derivative is not necessarily 0. Notably one cannot just perform a simple Taylor expansion of  $f(W_n)$  around 0, instead we need to rewrite  $\mathbb{E}[W_n f(W_n)] = \sum_{i \in T_n} \sigma_n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i f(W_n)]$ . Then for each  $i \in T_n$  one proceeds to a series of

Taylor developments around different terms that depend on  $i$ , the expansion order  $j \leq k$ , and the dependency structure of  $(X_i^{(n)})$ . These operations and term rearrangement need to be performed iteratively in order to get (1.2). Formally speaking we show that it can be achieved by carefully designing an inductive chain of systematically performed operations. As these operations and corresponding remainder terms are too complicated to track directly, we develop a new approach by building a bijection between expansion terms and classes of mathematical structures that we call “genograms”, consisting of rooted trees and one integer on each node. Importantly each level of expansion corresponds to a different class of genograms, which can be built either iteratively from the operations or directly from the definition of the genogram class. Finally we would be able to bound the remainder terms using double counting tricks from enumerative combinatorics. Similar approaches have notably been used in the construction of Feynman diagrams in quantum field theory [Sakurai and Napolitano, 2020], in solving Kardar–Parisi–Zhang (KPZ) equations [Hairer, 2013], and in understanding the universality phenomenon in semi-random matrices [Dudeja et al., 2023]. Another example is Friz et al. [2022], where the authors explored forest and cumulant type expansions of general random variables on a filtered probability space, and established a “broken exponential martingale” expansion that generalizes and unifies several previous formulae. However, such constructive graph approach is not commonly seen in the context of central limit theorems or mixing random fields.

**1.1. Related literature on Edgeworth expansion.** The classical Edgeworth expansion refers to an asymptotic expansion for  $\mathbb{P}(W_n \leq x) - \Phi(x)$  shown by Hsu [1945], and was generalized by Bhattacharya [1972], Götze and Hipp [1978], Bhattacharya and Rao [1986]. Notably Götze and Hipp [1978] showed that for independent random vectors with mean zero and covariance matrix  $I$ , under proper conditions on moments and a general function  $h$ , there exists a signed measure  $\Psi_{n,k}$  (depending on the cumulants of  $W_n$ ) such that

$$\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \int h \, d\Psi_{n,k} = o(|T_n|^{-k/2}), \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\Psi_{n,k}$  can be implicitly defined using Edgeworth polynomials and inverse Fourier transform. Note that it reduces to the classical Edgeworth expansion by taking  $h$  to be indicator functions and gives smooth Edgeworth expansions by considering smooth  $h$ . This type of results is typically obtained by carefully examining the characteristic functions, and some of them have been recently recovered using other approaches including the Stein’s method [Zhilova, 2022, Fang and Liu, 2022].

The expansion (1.3) has been extended to various settings beyond independence including Markov chains [Statulevičius, 1969, Hipp, 1985, Jensen, 1989, Malinovskii, 1987, Fernando and Liverani, 2021, Dolgopyat and Hafouta, 2023, Gouëzel, 2009], martingales [Mykland, 1993], U-statistics [Bickel et al., 1986, Loh, 1996, Bentkus et al., 1997],  $m$ -dependent random fields [Rhee, 1985, Heinich, 1987, Heinrich, 1990a], and mixing random sequences and fields [Götze and Hipp, 1983, Lahiri, 1993, 1996, Jensen, 1993, Lahiri, 2010]. Most of these works assumed a conditional Cramér condition, a condition that is known to be sub-optimal [Jirak, 2023]. Motivated by this observation, in Jirak et al. [2021] the authors studied Bernoulli shifts and related second-order Edgeworth to Berry–Esseen expansions.

The stronger smooth Edgeworth expansion (1.1) was first shown by Barbour [1986] for independent variables and extended to local dependence with remainder terms in the optimal order by Rinott and Rotar [2003]. Liu and Austern [2023] obtained similar results using a slightly different technique. Moreover, Rinott and Rotar [2003], Rotar [2008] further considered the setting of  $\phi$ -mixing and  $\alpha$ -mixing on graphs that could include mixing random fields as an example. However, they required the mixing coefficients to decay exponentially, and even with this stronger condition, they were only able to obtain a sub-optimal order  $\mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-(k+1)/2} \log^s |T_n|)$

for the remainder term, where  $s$  is a sufficiently large number depending on the expansion order and the dimension of the random field. In contrast, we obtain smooth Edgeworth expansions for  $\alpha$ -mixing random fields under polynomial constraints on the speed of decay of the mixing coefficient, and the order of the remainder term is optimal provided that the polynomial rate is large enough. This is achieved by a better exploitation of dependency structures via the newly proposed constructive graph approach compared to the chains of neighborhoods considered in [Rinott and Rotar \[2003\]](#), [Rotar \[2008\]](#), [Liu and Austern \[2023\]](#).

We further remark that as a byproduct of our analysis, we also prove upper bounds on the absolute values of the cumulants of  $W_n$  (see Proposition 3.6). Previously, [Janson \[1988\]](#) showed a similar bound under the dependency graph conditions and [Heinrich \[1990b\]](#), [Götze et al. \[1995\]](#) tightened the results for  $m$ -dependent random fields. [Götze and Hipp \[1983\]](#), [Lahiri \[1993, 1996\]](#) obtained similar cumulant bounds for mixing sequences in an effort to obtain Edgeworth expansions. Note that we provide the bounds on the cumulants of  $W_n$  for  $\alpha$ -mixing random fields in Appendix B, which is more general than the results mentioned above. Furthermore, [Döring and Eichelsbacher \[2013\]](#), [Döring et al. \[2022\]](#) showed that cumulant bounds are useful in moderate deviations.

**1.2. Related literature on Wasserstein- $p$  convergence rate for the CLT.** For independent variables and  $p \geq 1$ , the first paper to propose a Wasserstein- $p$  rate was [Bártfai \[1970\]](#). Under the hypothesis of finite exponential moments, they obtained that

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{p}}), \quad \forall p \geq 1.$$

[Sakhanenko \[1985\]](#) weakened the moment condition to finite  $p$ -th moments. However in both of these works the obtained rate is sub-optimal. [Rio \[1998, 2009\]](#) showed that in order to obtain a convergence rate of  $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ , it is necessary to require finite  $(p+2)$ -th moments of the random variables. They achieved this optimal rate for  $p \leq 2$  and conjectured that a similar rate should be valid for any arbitrary  $p > 2$ , which was demonstrated to be true by [Bobkov \[2018\]](#), [Bonis \[2020\]](#). Those two papers took different approaches. [Bobkov \[2018\]](#) exploited the classical Edgeworth expansion together with Rosenthal inequalities. [Bonis \[2020\]](#), on the other hand, used the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck interpolation combined with a Stein exchangeable pair argument, which also applies to random vectors. Prior to that, [Ledoux et al. \[2015\]](#) had obtained the optimal rate for Wasserstein- $p$  bounds, also using the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck interpolation but they required the existence of a Stein kernel, a significantly stronger assumption on the distribution of the random variables. Moreover, for the special case  $p = 2$ , the celebrated HWI inequality [[Otto and Villani, 2000](#)] and Talagrand quadratic transport inequality [[Talagrand, 1996](#)] can help obtain Wasserstein-2 bounds by relating it to the Kullback-Leibler divergence.

For dependent random variables, the Stein’s method offers a series of powerful techniques for obtaining Wasserstein-1 bounds in the dependence setting. See [Ross \[2011\]](#) for a survey of those methods. [Baldi and Rinott \[1989\]](#), [Barbour et al. \[1989\]](#) obtained Wasserstein-1 bounds under local dependence conditions, and the first-order smooth Edgeworth expansions in [Sunklodas \[2007\]](#), [Bentkus and Sunklodas \[2007\]](#) imply Wasserstein-1 bounds for  $\alpha$ -mixing sequences and fields. Contrary to the independent case, much less is known for the general Wasserstein- $p$  distance for dependent data. [Fang and Koike \[2022\]](#) modified the approach of [Bonis \[2020\]](#) and obtained a rate  $\mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-1/2} \log |T_n|)$  for the Wasserstein- $p$  distance for locally dependent random vectors. [Fang \[2019\]](#), [Liu and Austern \[2023\]](#), on the other hand, developed a new approach that relates higher-order smooth Edgeworth expansions to Wasserstein- $p$  bounds, where they utilized the result of [Rio \[2009\]](#) to upper bound Wasserstein distance by Zolotarev’s metrics (Lemma A.3). Their technique was proven to be effective for locally dependent variables and will be further adopted in this paper to deal with mixing random fields. (See the proof outline in Section 4.2.)

**1.3. Paper outline.** For clarity we present the notations that will be used throughout the paper in Section 2. In Section 3.2 we provide a smooth Edgeworth expansion and cumulant bound for mixing random fields. In Section 3.3 we show upper bounds on the Wasserstein- $p$  distance in CLT, and some applications to non-uniform Berry–Esseen type tail bounds. In Section 4, we make an overview of our proof techniques. We leave our proposed graph approach to Edgeworth expansions in Appendices B and G and proof details of the Wasserstein- $p$  bounds and applications in Appendix C.

## 2. NOTATIONS

**Notations concerning integers and sets.** In this paper, we will write  $\lceil x \rceil$  to denote the smallest integer that is bigger or equal to  $x$  and  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  denotes the largest integer smaller or equal to  $x$ . We use  $\mathbb{N}$  to denote the set of non-negative integers and let  $\mathbb{N}_+$  be the set of positive integers. For any  $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , denote  $[n] := \{\ell \in \mathbb{N}_+ : 1 \leq \ell \leq n\}$ . Moreover, for a finite set  $B$  we denote by  $|B|$  its cardinality.

**Notations for sequences.** Given a sequence  $(x_i)$  we will shorthand  $x_{1:\ell} = (x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$  and similarly for any subset  $B \subseteq \mathbb{N}_+$  we denote  $x_B := (x_i)_{i \in B}$ .

**Notations for functions.** For any real valued functions  $f(\cdot), g(\cdot) : \mathbb{N}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we write  $f(n) \lesssim g(n)$  or  $f(n) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$  if there exists some constant  $C$  (with dependencies that are fixed in the contexts) and an integer  $N > 0$  such that the inequality  $f(n) \leq Cg(n)$  holds for all  $n \geq N$ . We further write  $f(n) \asymp g(n)$  as shorthand for  $f(n) \lesssim g(n)$  and  $g(n) \lesssim f(n)$ .

**Notations for probability distributions.** For a random variable  $X$  we write by  $\mathcal{L}(X)$  the distribution of  $X$ .

**Notations for normal expectation.** Given a function  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a measurable function. Let  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  be a standard normal random variable. Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[|h(Z)|] < \infty$ , then we denote  $\mathcal{N}h = \mathbb{E}(h(Z))$ .

## 3. MAIN RESULTS

**3.1. Main definitions: Random fields and mixing coefficients.** A  $d$ -dimensional (discrete) random field  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  is defined as a family of real-valued random variables indexed by a subset of the lattice  $T \subsetneq \mathbb{Z}^d$  ( $|T| < \infty$ ). In general, for the central limit theorem to hold the dependence in  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  needs to be controlled. This is done through mixing coefficients that quantify the dependence between any two groups of variables indexed by indexes that are “far away” from one another.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space. Given two sub- $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ , the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficient or strong mixing coefficient between  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  is defined by

$$\alpha(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}} |\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) - \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)|. \quad (3.1)$$

We define the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients associated to a random field as follows:

**Definition 3.2.** Given a finite index set  $T \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ , suppose  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  is a random field on  $T$ . For any subset  $U \subseteq T$ , denote by  $\mathcal{F}_U := \sigma(X_i : i \in U)$ . For positive integers  $\ell, k_1, k_2$ , define the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients of  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  by

$$\alpha_{k_1, k_2; \ell} := 0 \vee \sup \left\{ \alpha(\mathcal{F}_{U_1}, \mathcal{F}_{U_2}) : U_1, U_2 \subseteq T, |U_1| \leq k_1, |U_2| \leq k_2, d(U_1, U_2) \geq \ell \right\}, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $d(U_1, U_2) := \min\{\|i_1 - i_2\| : i_1 \in U_1, i_2 \in U_2\}$ . Here  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the maximum norm on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ .

For clarity we fix a real number  $p \geq 1$  throughout the paper and consider the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients with  $k_1 = \lceil p \rceil + 1$  and  $k_2 = |T|$ . When there is no ambiguity we always denote  $\alpha_\ell := \alpha_{\lceil p \rceil + 1, |T|; \ell}$ . Intuitively the  $\alpha$ -mixing random field is a natural extension of the  $m$ -dependent random field as  $m$ -dependence corresponds to the case where  $\alpha_\ell = 0$  for all  $\ell \geq m + 1$ . Moreover note that  $\alpha$ -mixing is a weaker notion compared to  $\beta$ -mixing [Volkonskii and Rozanov, 1959],  $\rho$ -mixing [Kolmogorov and Rozanov, 1960], and  $\phi$ -mixing [Ibragimov, 1959, Cogburn, 1960]. See Doukhan [1994], Bradley [2005] for a comprehensive comparison.

In this paper, we will consider a sequence of random fields  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  with increasing index sets  $T_1 \subseteq T_2 \subseteq \dots \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ . We note that a common choice for the index set  $T_n$  is  $T_n = \{1, \dots, n\}^d$ , but that many other choices are possible. We will assume that the random variables are centered, meaning that  $\mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)}] = 0$ , and have a finite second moment  $\|X_1^{(n)}\|_2 < \infty$ . The dependence in the random field  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  will be controlled through its strong mixing coefficients  $\alpha_{k_1, k_2; \ell, n}$ . We will be interested in studying the re-scaled empirical average

$$W_n := \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{\ell \in T_n} X_\ell^{(n)}, \quad \text{where } \sigma_n^2 := \text{Var}\left(\sum_{\ell \in T_n} X_\ell^{(n)}\right).$$

Remark that under general condition it is well known that  $\sigma_n = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-1/2})$ , and if  $T_n = \{1, \dots, n\}^d$  then in general we have  $\sigma_n = \mathcal{O}(n^{-d/2})$ .

Let  $p \geq 1$  be a positive real, our goal will be to establish an Edgeworth expansion for  $W_n$  to the  $(\lceil p \rceil + 1)$ -th order and obtain an upper bound for Wasserstein- $p$  distance  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$ .

**3.2. Smooth Edgeworth expansion for mixing random fields.** We first formally define the class of functions for which we will obtain a smooth Edgeworth expansion

**Definition 3.3** (Hölder Space). *For any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and real number  $\omega \in (0, 1]$ , the Hölder space  $\mathcal{C}^{k, \omega}(\mathbb{R})$  is defined as the class of  $k$ -times continuously differentiable functions  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that the  $k$ -times derivative of  $f$  is  $\omega$ -Hölder continuous, i.e.,*

$$|f|_{k, \omega} := \sup_{x \neq y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{|\partial^k f(x) - \partial^k f(y)|}{|x - y|^\omega} < \infty.$$

Here  $\omega$  is called the Hölder exponent and  $|f|_{k, \omega}$  is called the Hölder coefficient. In particular, we define  $\Lambda_p := \{f \in \mathcal{C}^{\lceil p \rceil - 1, \omega}(\mathbb{R}) : |f|_{\lceil p \rceil - 1, \omega} \leq 1\}$ , where  $\omega = p + 1 - \lceil p \rceil$ .

Note that if  $k \geq 1$  is an integer then a function  $f \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R})$  is also in  $\mathcal{C}^{k, \omega}(\mathbb{R})$  if its  $k$ -th derivative is Lipschitz.

Given a constant  $p \geq 1$ , we will establish an expansion for  $\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)]$  for all smooth functions  $h \in \Lambda_p$ . For such an expansion to be achievable, we need to impose certain moment conditions on  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  that will notably guarantee the existence of cumulants of  $W_n$ . Additionally, we will impose certain conditions on the dependence of  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  by specifying conditions on the mixing coefficients  $(\alpha_{\ell, n})$ . More specifically we require that there exists  $r > p + 2$  such that

$$\sup_{n, i \in T_n} \mathbb{E}[|X_i^{(n)}|^r] < \infty, \quad (\text{Moment condition})$$

and

$$M_0 := \sup_n \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell, n}^{(r-p-2)/r} < \infty. \quad (\text{Mixing condition})$$

We note that the more moments the random fields  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  admit, the weaker the mixing requirement is. Notably when the random variables are uniformly bounded, meaning that  $\sup_{n, i \in T_n} \|X_i^{(n)}\|_\infty < \infty$ , we only require that  $\sup_n \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell, n} < \infty$ . We also note that

the larger the dimension  $d$  is the stronger the mixing condition is. Notably for Mixing condition to hold, we require that  $\alpha_{\ell,n} = o(l^{-d})$ .

Finally to obtain the desired result we also impose a non-degeneracy condition on the variance  $\sigma_n^2$ . Under the Mixing condition and Moment condition, it is well established that the variance can be controlled  $\sigma_n^2 = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|)$ . We will require that in addition

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_n^2 / |T_n| > 0. \quad (\text{Non-degeneracy condition})$$

When the random variables are *i.i.d.* this condition is equivalent to requiring that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(X_1^{(n)}) > 0.$$

Under those conditions we obtain that

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $p \geq 1$  be a real number and  $\omega := p + 1 - [p] \in (0, 1]$ . Let  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  be a real-valued centered random field with  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients  $(\alpha_{\ell,n})_{\ell \geq 1}$ . Suppose that there is a real number  $r > p + 2$  the Moment condition and the Mixing condition hold. Suppose in addition that the Non-degeneracy condition holds. Define*

$$M_{1,n} := |T_n|^{-p/2} + |T_n|^{-p/2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-\omega} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r}. \quad (3.3)$$

If  $M_{1,n} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then for any  $j \in [p-1]$ , we have  $\kappa_{j+2}(W_n) = \mathcal{O}(M_{1,n}^{j/p})$ , and for any  $h \in \Lambda_p$ , we have the expansion

$$\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathcal{N}h = \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma([p]-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(W_n)}{(s_j+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r (\partial^{s_j+1} \Theta) h \right] + \mathcal{O}(M_{1,n}), \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\Gamma([p]-1) = \{r, s_{1:r} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{j=1}^r s_j \leq [p]-1\}$ .

Note that here  $\Theta$  and  $\partial$  are functional operators which will be defined clearly later and that the second  $\prod$  indicates the composition of the operators in the parentheses rather than the product.

The order of  $M_{1,n}$  can be made explicit if we assume that the mixing coefficients  $\alpha_{\ell,n}$  decrease at a polynomial rate.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Suppose that  $\alpha_{\ell,n} \leq C\ell^{-v}$  for some constants  $v > 0$  and  $C > 0$  that do not depend on  $n$ . Let  $u := (r-p-2)v/r - (1-\omega)$ . Then we have*

$$M_{1,n} = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-\beta p}),$$

where

$$\beta = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } u > d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon & \text{if } u = d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{p+1}{p} - \frac{u}{dp}\right) & \text{if } d(p/2+1) < u < d(p+1) \end{cases},$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

We notably remark that if  $\alpha_{\ell,n} \leq C\ell^{-v}$  with  $v$  satisfying  $(r-p-2)v/r - (1-\omega) > d(p+1)$  then  $M_{1,n}$  is of the same order than in the *i.i.d.* setting meaning that  $M_{1,n} = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-p/2})$ . Finally in the process of deriving Theorem 3.4 we also show the following bound on the cumulant of  $W_n$ .



**Proposition 3.6.** *Under the same settings as Theorem 3.4 the  $(k+1)$ -th cumulant of  $W_n$  ( $[p] \geq k \geq 2$ ) is upper-bounded by*

$$|\kappa_{k+1}(W_n)| \lesssim |T_n|^{-(k-1)/2} \left( m^{dk} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-k-1)/r} \right). \quad (3.5)$$

**3.3. Wasserstein- $p$  bounds for mixing random fields.** Let  $p \geq 1$  be an arbitrary real number, write  $\omega := p + 1 - [p] \in (0, 1]$ . In this subsection, we characterize the rate of convergence of the CLT in the Wasserstein- $p$  distance for  $\alpha$ -mixing random fields.

To do so, we will need to impose some additional conditions on the mixing coefficients. More specifically we will require that there is an  $r > p + 2$  such that not only Moment condition and Mixing condition are satisfied but in addition that

$$|T_n|^{-p/2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-\omega} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (\text{Mixing condition 2})$$

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  be a triangular array of centered real-valued random fields with  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients  $(\alpha_{\ell,n})_{\ell \geq 1}$ . Suppose that there exists  $r > p+2$  such that the Moment condition, Mixing condition and Mixing condition 2 are satisfied. Assume in addition that Non-degeneracy condition also holds.*

*Then the Wasserstein- $p$  distance  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$  converges to 0, and we have*

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O} \left( |T_n|^{-1/2} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-\omega} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{1/p} \right). \quad (3.6)$$

*In particular,  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-1/2})$  if the following condition holds:*

$$\sup_n \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d(p+1)-\omega} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} < \infty.$$

Note that when the mixing coefficients decay at a uniform polynomial rate as specified in Proposition 3.5, the Wasserstein- $p$  distance converges as long as  $v > d(p/2 + 1)$ . In particular, for  $p = 1$  we need  $v > 3d/2$ . Interestingly this condition is sufficient but not necessary. In fact, when  $p$  is an integer we can significantly weaken the conditions for convergence:

**Theorem 3.8.** *For  $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , adopting the same notations as in Theorem 3.7. We suppose that Non-degeneracy condition hold and that there is  $r \geq p + 2$  such that Moment condition is satisfied and that  $\sup_n \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1)/r} < \infty$ . Then for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and  $\delta \in [0, 1]$  we have that the Wasserstein- $p$  distance  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$  is bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) &= \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-1/2} m^{2d}) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( |T_n|^{-1/2+(1-\delta)/(2p)} m^d \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1-\delta)/r} \right)^{1/p} \right) \\ &+ \mathcal{O} \left( |T_n|^{-1/2+1/(2p)} \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1)/r} \right)^{1/p} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Here we comment on the comparison between Theorem 3.7 and Theorem 3.8. Roughly speaking when the mixing coefficients decay sufficiently fast Theorem 3.7 leads to better convergence rate for the Wasserstein- $p$  distance; when the mixing coefficients decay relatively slower, Theorem 3.8 shows faster rate. Also, Theorem 3.8 requires weaker conditions for converge, and for  $p = 1$  the conditions required in Theorem 3.8 almost matches the best previous result (See Corollary C.5 for more details). Now for  $p \in \mathbb{N}^+$ , supposing  $\alpha_{\ell,n}$  decays polynomially, we can make the best of both Theorems 3.7 and 3.8 and obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.9.** *For  $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , adopting the same notations as in Theorem 3.7, we suppose that Non-degeneracy condition holds and that there is a  $r > p + 2$  such that Mixing condition and Moment condition hold. Assume in addition that*

$$\alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \leq C\ell^{-u} \quad \text{holds for some constants } u > d(p+1)/2 \text{ and } C > 0.$$

*Then the convergence rate of the Wasserstein- $p$  distance  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$  ( $p \geq 1$ ) is given by*

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-\beta}),$$

where

$$\beta = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } u > d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon & \text{if } u = d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \min\left\{\frac{p+1}{p} - \frac{u}{dp}, \frac{d}{u+dp}\right\} & \text{if } dp < u < d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{2p} + \epsilon\right) & \text{if } u = dp \\ \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{2p+1}{2p} - \frac{u}{dp}\right) & \text{if } d(p+1)/2 < u < dp \end{cases},$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

*In particular, for  $p = 1$  and  $\alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-3)/r} = \mathcal{O}(\ell^{-u})$ ,  $\beta$  is given by*

$$\beta = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } u > 2d \\ \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon & \text{if } u = 2d \\ \frac{1}{2} - \min\left\{2 - \frac{u}{d}, \frac{d}{u+d}\right\} & \text{if } d < u < 2d \end{cases},$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

**3.4. Application to tail bounds.** In this subsection, we show a specific application of our results to non-uniform Berry–Esseen bounds and concentration inequalities.

**3.4.1. Concentration inequalities.** Let  $t \geq 0$  be a real, our goal is to obtain a tail-bound for  $\mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t)$ . Such a bound is often referred to as a concentration inequality. For stationary sequences, sub-Gaussian concentration inequalities are known to hold for  $\phi$ -mixing sequences (see e.g. Yu [1994], Samson [2000]) or under conditions on the Dobrushin interdependence coefficient (see e.g. Chatterjee [2005], Austern and Orbanz [2022], Stroock and Zegarlinski [1992], Kontorovich and Ramanan [2008]). Sub-Gaussian concentration inequalities have also been obtained for locally dependent random variables and for graph dependent random variables (see e.g. Janson [2004], Zhang et al. [2019]). For  $\alpha$ -mixing sequences, however, no sub-Gaussian concentration inequalities are known to hold. When those mixing coefficients decrease exponentially fast sub-exponential concentration inequalities can instead be obtained. More concretely, let  $(Y_i)$  be a stationary sequence of bounded and centered random variables with  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients  $(\alpha^Y(i))$ . Merlevède et al. [2009] proved that if those were decreasing exponentially fast, meaning that there exist constants  $c_1, c_2 > 0$  such that

$$\alpha^Y(i) \leq c_1 e^{-c_2 n},$$

then there are constants  $K_1, K_2 > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \geq t\right) \leq e^{-K_1 t^2} + e^{-\frac{K_2 t \sqrt{n}}{\log(n) \log(\log(n))}}, \quad \forall t > 0.$$

This inequality is almost sub-Gaussian in  $t$  with a non-sub-Gaussian term that decreases exponentially fast. The proof of this result relies on carefully upper bounding the moment-generating function of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ . However, as noted earlier this result requires exponentially fast decreasing mixing coefficients. In this subsection we show how our results can be used to easily obtain concentration inequalities for *polynomially* fast decreasing mixing random fields.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  be a triangular array of centered real-valued random fields with strong mixing coefficients  $(\alpha_{\ell, n})_{\ell \geq 1}$ . Assume that there exists  $r > p + 2$  such that Moment condition, Mixing condition hold and such that  $\alpha_{\ell, n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \leq \tilde{C} \ell^{-u}$  holds for some constants  $u > d(p+1)/2$  and  $\tilde{C} > 0$ . In addition assume that Non-degeneracy condition also holds. Then there are constants  $K_1, K_2$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) \leq e^{-K_1 t^2} + \frac{K_2}{t^p |T_n|^{p\beta}}, \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where

$$\beta = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } u > d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon & \text{if } u = d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \min\left\{\frac{p+1}{p} - \frac{u}{dp}, \frac{d}{u+dp}\right\} & \text{if } dp < u < d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{2p} + \epsilon\right) & \text{if } u = dp \\ \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{2p+1}{2p} - \frac{u}{dp}\right) & \text{if } d(p+1)/2 < u < dp \end{cases},$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

Note that as here we only imposed for the mixing coefficients to decrease polynomially fast, instead of exponentially fast, we obtain a concentration inequality that decreases polynomially fast. However, we also note that this inequality is almost sub-Gaussian as the only non sub-Gaussian term decreases as the sample size increases at the rate of  $\mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-\beta p})$ .

**3.4.2. Non-uniform Berry–Esseen bounds.** In this subsection, we show how our results can be used to obtain non-uniform Berry–Esseen bounds with polynomial decay. In the case of *i.i.d.* observations the Berry–Esseen theorem guarantees that there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that as long as  $\|X_i^{(n)}\|_3 < \infty$  we have

$$\sup_t |\mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) - \Phi^c(t)| \leq C \sum_{i \in I_n} \|X_i^{(n)}\|_3^3 / \sigma_n^3,$$

where  $\Phi^c(t) := \mathbb{P}(Z \geq t)$  with  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . This theorem has been extended to locally dependent random variables [Chen and Shao, 2004], to  $\alpha$ -mixing Markov chains [Bolthausen, 1982b], to  $\phi$ -mixing random sequences [Rio, 1996], under martingale approximation conditions [Jirak, 2016] and to exponentially fast  $\alpha$ -mixing process [Tikhomirov, 1981]. However, one of the drawbacks of the Berry–Esseen inequality is that it does not depend on  $t$ . One would imagine that for large  $t$  we could find tighter bounds for  $|\mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) - \Phi^c(t)|$ . Non-uniform Berry–Esseen bounds establish this. Notably Chen and Shao [2004] (Theorem 2.5) showed that for locally dependent observations, under general conditions, there exists some universal constant  $C'$  such that

$$|\mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) - \Phi^c(t)| \leq \frac{C'}{1 + |t|^3} \sum_{i \in I_n} \|X_i^{(n)}\|_3^3 / \sigma_n^3, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This bound does decrease as  $|t|$  increases and does so at a rate of  $|t|^{-3}$ . This was extended to Bernoulli shifts [Jirak, 2015, 2016, 2023] and to associated variables [Dewan and Rao, 2005]. In this section, we show how  $\mathcal{W}_p$  bound can help us obtain non-uniform Berry–Esseen bounds that decrease polynomially fast in  $t$  for  $\alpha$ -mixing stationary random fields.

**Theorem 3.11.** *Let  $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  be a triangular array of real-valued centered random fields with strong mixing coefficients  $(\alpha_{\ell,n})_{\ell \geq 1}$ . Assume that there exists  $r > p + 2$  such that Moment condition, Mixing condition hold and such that  $\alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \leq \tilde{C}\ell^{-u}$  holds for some constants  $u > d(p+1)/2$  and  $\tilde{C} > 0$ . In addition assume that Non-degeneracy condition also holds. Then there is a constant  $C > 0$  such that for all  $\eta > 0$  and  $t > 0$  satisfying*

$$(\sqrt{2\pi p})^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2\eta \log t}}{t}\right) t^{1-\frac{\eta}{p+1}} \geq \frac{C}{|I_n|^{\beta p}},$$

we have

$$-\frac{C}{t|T_n|^{\beta(1-\frac{1}{p+1})}} \varphi\left(t\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)\right) \leq \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) - \Phi^c(t) \leq \frac{C}{|T_n|^{\beta(1-\frac{1}{p+1})} t^{1+\eta(1-\frac{1}{p+1})}},$$

where  $\varphi$  is the density function of  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and

$$\beta = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } u > d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon & \text{if } u = d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \min\left\{\frac{p+1}{p} - \frac{u}{dp}, \frac{d}{u+dp}\right\} & \text{if } dp < u < d(p+1) \\ \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{2p} + \epsilon\right) & \text{if } u = dp \\ \frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{2p+1}{2p} - \frac{u}{dp}\right) & \text{if } d(p+1)/2 < u < dp \end{cases},$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

## 4. PROOF SKETCHES

### 4.1. Proof sketch for smooth Edgeworth expansion.

4.1.1. *Introduction to the Stein's method.* The proof relies on the Stein's method, which we introduce here for completeness.

Let  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  be a standard normal random variable. For any measurable function  $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we write  $\mathcal{N}h := \mathbb{E}[h(Z)]$  when  $h(Z) \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{R})$ . The key idea of Stein's method [Stein, 1972] is that, for any random variable  $X$ , the difference between the expectations  $\mathbb{E}[h(X)]$  and  $\mathcal{N}h$  can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{N}h - \mathbb{E}[h(X)] = \mathbb{E}[Xf_h(X) - f_h'(X)], \quad (4.1)$$

where  $f_h$  is defined by

$$f_h(x) := \int_{-\infty}^x e^{(x^2-t^2)/2} (h(t) - \mathcal{N}h) dt = - \int_x^{\infty} e^{(x^2-t^2)/2} (h(t) - \mathcal{N}h) dt. \quad (4.2)$$

Actually an even stronger result holds which is that  $f_h(\cdot)$  is a solution to the following the differential equation

$$xf(x) - f'(x) = \mathcal{N}h - h(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (4.3)$$

For convenience we denote by  $\Theta$  the operator that maps  $h$  to  $f_h$  for any  $h$  such that  $\mathcal{N}|h| < \infty$ , i.e.,  $\Theta h = f_h$ . And we denote the differential operator by  $\partial$ . Then the Stein equation (4.1) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{N}h - \mathbb{E}[h(X)] = \mathbb{E}[X\Theta h(X) - \partial\Theta h(X)].$$

This will be critical in the proof of Theorem 3.4. Notably for  $h \in \Lambda_p$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}(h(W_n)) - \mathcal{N}h = -\mathbb{E}[W_n \Theta h(W_n) - \partial \Theta h(W_n)]. \quad (4.4)$$

Therefore, to obtain an expansion of  $\mathbb{E}(h(W_n))$  and prove Theorem 3.4 it is enough to study and further expand  $\mathbb{E}[W_n \Theta h(W_n) - \partial \Theta h(W_n)]$ . This will be helped by the smoothness properties of  $\Theta h$ .

**Lemma 4.1** (Part of Lemma 6 of [Barbour \[1986\]](#)). *For any  $p > 0$ , let  $h \in \Lambda_p$  be as defined in Definition A.2. Then  $\Theta h$ , the solution to (4.3) satisfies that  $\Theta h \in \mathcal{C}^{\lceil p \rceil - 1, \omega}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{\lceil p \rceil, \omega}(\mathbb{R})$  and the Hölder coefficients  $|\Theta h|_{\lceil p \rceil - 1, \omega}$  and  $|\Theta h|_{\lceil p \rceil, \omega}$  are bounded by some constant only depending on  $p$ .*

4.1.2. *Expanding the Stein equation to an arbitrary order.* As a consequence of (4.4) we see that to establish an expansion for  $\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)]$  it is sufficient to expand the Stein equation to an arbitrary order. More precisely, a key step will be to establish the following result:

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $k \geq 1$  be a constant. Let  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  be a real-valued centered random field with  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients  $(\alpha_{\ell, n})_{\ell \geq 1}$ . Suppose that there is a real number  $r > k + 1$  such that Moment condition and Non-degeneracy condition hold. Then for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k, \omega}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[W_n f(W_n)] &= \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W_n)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W_n)] + \mathcal{O} \left( |f|_{k, \omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-1)/2} \left( m^{d(k+\omega)} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1 + \lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+\omega)-\omega} \alpha_{\ell, n}^{(r-k-1-\omega)/r} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

In this subsection we present an overview on how such an expansion can be obtained. We let  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{\lceil p \rceil - 1, \omega}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{\lceil p \rceil, \omega}(\mathbb{R})$ . The goal is to expand  $\mathbb{E}[W_n f(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[f'(W_n)]$ . Note that by linearity of the expectation we have

$$\mathbb{E}[W_n f(W_n)] = \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{i \in I_n} \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)} f(W_n)].$$

We will re-express each term  $\mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)} f(W_n)]$  separately. To do so write

$$W_{i,b} := \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{\substack{j \in I_n, \\ \|i-j\| \geq b}} X_j^{(n)}, \quad \Delta_{i,b} := W_n - W_{i,b}, \quad \forall i \in T, b > 0.$$

As the random field  $(X_i^{(n)})$  is  $\alpha$ -mixing, we know that  $W_{i,b}$  is almost independent of  $X_i^{(n)}$  if  $b$  is large enough. Therefore, using Lemma A.1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)} f(W_n)] \approx \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)} (f(W_n) - f(W_{i,b}))].$$

As  $W_n - W_{i,b}$  tends to be small, this allows us to re-express  $\mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)} f(W_n)]$ . Indeed, using Taylor's expansion we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)} f(W_n)] &= \sum_{p=1}^k \frac{1}{p!} \mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)} (W_n - W_{i,b})^p f^{(p)}(W_{i,b})] + \text{remainder} \\ &= \sum_{p=1}^k \frac{1}{p!} \sigma_n^{-p} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_p \in I_n, \\ \|i_1 - i\| \leq b, \dots, \|i_p - i\| \leq b}} \mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} f^{(p)}(W_{i,b}) \right] + \text{remainder}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Note that under technical conditions we can expect the remainder terms to be on the order of  $\mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-(k-1)/2})$ . One difficulty in establishing our result is that we would like all the remainder terms to be of this order when the mixing coefficients decay fast enough.

The next step is to re-express (4.6) as a function of only  $W_n$  and the moments of  $(X_i^{(n)})$ . Hence for all indexes  $i, i_1, \dots, i_p \in T_n$  we aim to find some ‘‘other terms’’ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} f^{(p)}(W_{i,b}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} \right] \mathbb{E}[f^{(p)}(W_n)] + \text{other terms} + \text{remainder}, \quad (4.7)$$

with remainder terms that are negligible and on the order of  $\mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-(k-1)/2})$ . For this purpose for all subsets  $J \subset T$  we denote

$$W_{J,b} := \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{\substack{z \in T_n, \\ \min_{\tilde{z} \in J} \|z - \tilde{z}\| \geq b}} X_z^{(n)}.$$

If  $b$  is large enough and  $J = \{i, i_1, \dots, i_p\}$ , we remark that  $W_{J,b}$  is almost independent from  $\{X_i^{(n)}, X_{i_1}^{(n)}, \dots, X_{i_p}^{(n)}\}$ . Therefore, by exploiting Lemma A.1 we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} f^{(p)}(W_{i,J}) \right] \approx \mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} \right] \mathbb{E}[f^{(p)}(W_{i,J})].$$

This indicates that to determine what the ‘‘other terms’’ and the ‘‘remainder’’ are in (4.7) we need to expand the differences

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} (f^{(p)}(W_{i,b}) - f^{(p)}(W_{J,b})) \right],$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} \right] (\mathbb{E}[f^{(p)}(W_{J,b})] - \mathbb{E}[f^{(p)}(W_n)]).$$

This can again be done by applying Taylor’s expansion. For example, the second difference can be re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} \right] \mathbb{E}[f^{(p)}(W_{J,b})] - \mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} \right] \mathbb{E}[f^{(p)}(W_n)] \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{k-p} \mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} \right] \mathbb{E}[(W_{J,b} - W_n)^l f^{(p+l)}(W_{J,b})] + \text{remainder}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

We remark that the terms in the right-hand side of (4.8) involves the product of two different expectations. We will again aim to simplify  $\mathbb{E}[(W_{J,b} - W_n)^l f^{(p+l)}(W_{i,b})]$  by determining ‘‘other terms’’ and a ‘‘remainder term’’ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(W_{J,b} - W_n)^l f^{(p+l)}(W_{i,b})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(W_{J,b} - W_n)^l] \mathbb{E}[f^{(p+l)}(W_n)] + \text{other terms} + \text{remainder}. \end{aligned}$$

Establishing this will require us to do yet another Taylor’s expansion. We will therefore obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{l=1}^p X_{i_l}^{(n)} \right] \mathbb{E}[f^{(p)}(W_{J,b})] - \mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{j=1}^p X_{i_j}^{(n)} \right] \mathbb{E}[f^{(p)}(W_n)]$$




FIGURE 1. An example of genogram.

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{k-p} \sum_{\substack{i_{m_1}, \dots, i_{m_l} \in T_n, \\ \min_{\tilde{z} \in \{i, i_1, \dots, i_l\}} \|\tilde{z} - i_{m_j}\| \leq b, j \leq l}} \frac{(-1)^l}{\sigma_n^l} \mathbb{E} \left[ X_i^{(n)} \prod_{j=1}^p X_{i_j}^{(n)} \right] \mathbb{E} [X_{i_{m_1}}^{(n)} \dots X_{i_{m_l}}^{(n)}] \mathbb{E} [f^{(p+l)}(W_n)] \quad (4.9)$$

+ other terms + remainder.

Note that making those arguments formal requires successive use of Taylor's expansions which leads to increasingly complex expressions that will quickly become intractable as  $k$  increases. Therefore, to handle arbitrarily large  $k$  we will identify common terms found in the Taylor's expansions and represent those through rooted trees that we will call "genograms". In this goal, we note that for example in (4.9) product of expectations naturally appear. In general, the obtained expansions will be made of products of expectations of the form

$$\mathbb{E} [X_i^{(n)} X_{i_1}^{(n)} \dots X_{i_{l_1-1}}^{(n)}] \mathbb{E} [X_{i_{l_1}}^{(n)} \dots X_{i_{l_2-1}}^{(n)}] \dots \mathbb{E} [X_{i_{l_m-1}}^{(n)} \dots X_{i_{l_m-1}}^{(n)} f^{(q)}(W_n)], \quad (4.10)$$

where  $i, i_1, \dots, i_k \in T_n^{k+1}$  are  $k+1$  indexes and  $m, l_1, \dots, l_m \leq k+1$  and  $q \leq k$ . After summing things up and invoking the moment conditions on  $(X_i^{(n)})$  we can note that (4.10) is characterized by the distance between the indexes  $i, i_1, \dots, i_k$  and the number  $m$  of different expectations that are considered as well as the value of  $l_1, \dots, l_m$ . This will be represented through rooted trees that we call "genograms". Section 4.1.2 is an example of a genogram.

Each tree will contain  $k+1$  vertices and each vertex  $l$  will represent one possible index  $i_l$ . Those vertex are augmented by an "identifier", which is an integer  $s_l \geq -1$  that will codify the "distance" between  $i_l$  and the precedent indexes  $i, i_1, \dots, i_{l-1}$ . (Please refer to Appendix B for rigorous definitions.) The different branches of those trees will represent the different expectations in (4.10). For example the first branch of the genogram will represent  $\mathbb{E} [X_i^{(n)} X_{i_1}^{(n)} \dots X_{i_{l_1-1}}^{(n)}]$ , the second branch  $\mathbb{E} [X_{i_{l_1}}^{(n)} \dots X_{i_{l_2-1}}^{(n)}]$ . Note that to get tighter bounds than would otherwise be possible rather than representing one product of expectations genograms will represent sums of a few products of expectations and those can be interpreted as a generalization of covariances.

**4.2. Proof sketch for Wasserstein- $p$  bounds.** The key idea of our proofs is to approximate the sum of variables in a random field  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in I_n}$  by the empirical average of  $q_n$  *i.i.d.* random variables  $\xi_1^{(n)}, \dots, \xi_{q_n}^{(n)}$  ( $q_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ). Specifically, as shown in Lemma C.3 as long as the third and higher-order cumulants of  $W_n$  decay then there exist integers  $(q_n)$  and *i.i.d.* random variables such that the first  $k$  ( $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ ) cumulants of  $V_n := \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \xi_i^{(n)} / \sqrt{q_n}$  matches those of  $W_n$  for  $n$  large enough

$$\kappa_j(V_n) = \kappa_j(W_n), \quad j = 1, \dots, [p] + 1. \quad (4.11)$$

The decay of the cumulants is proven to hold in Proposition 3.6.

We then relate the cumulants to the Wasserstein- $p$  bound thanks to the fact that the Wasserstein- $p$  distance between  $W_n$  and any other random variable  $Y$  can be upper-bounded by integral probability metrics (Lemma A.3) meaning that to bound the Wasserstein- $p$  distance it is enough to

show that  $|\mathbb{E}(h(W_n)) - \mathbb{E}(h(Y))| = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-\beta p})$  for functions  $h \in \Lambda_p$ . To bound  $|\mathbb{E}(h(W_n)) - \mathbb{E}(h(Z))|$  we will exploit the Edgeworth expansions we established in Theorem 3.4:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathcal{N}h \\ &= \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(\lceil p \rceil - 1)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(W_n)}{(s_j+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r (\partial^{s_j+1} \Theta) h \right] + \text{Remainders}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

We then note that for *i.i.d.* random variables  $(\xi_i^{(n)})_{i=1}^{q_n}$ , such an expansion was already established in Barbour [1986]

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[h(V_n)] - \mathcal{N}h \\ &= \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(\lceil p \rceil - 1)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(V_n)}{(s_j+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r (\partial^{s_j+1} \Theta) h \right] + \text{Remainders}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

By comparing (4.13) and (4.12) one could note that if the cumulants of  $W_n$  and  $V_n$  are equal meaning that  $\kappa_j(V_n) = \kappa_j(W_n)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, \lceil p \rceil + 1$  then this would imply that  $|\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(V_n)]| = \text{Remainders}$  would be of the same order than the remainders. According to eq. (4.11), this is exactly what happens. Indeed one can choose  $q_n$  and  $\xi_i^{(n)}$  can be chosen to be such that  $\kappa_j(V_n) = \kappa_j(W_n)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, \lceil p \rceil + 1$ . As shown in Lemma A.3, this allows us to obtain an upper bound of the Wasserstein- $p$  distance between  $\mathcal{L}(W_n)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(V_n)$  for general  $p \geq 1$ . The desired result is therefore implied by the triangle inequality of the Wasserstein- $p$  distance

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{L}(V_n)) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(V_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)),$$

and the already known Wasserstein- $p$  bounds for *i.i.d.* random variables (Lemma C.2).

**4.3. Proof roadmap and locations.** In Appendix A we present a few preliminary lemmas. In Appendix B, we present the details of the constructive graph approach for smooth Edgeworth expansion. In Appendix B.1 we provide an example to rigorously illustrate the motivation of the approach. In Appendices B.2 and B.3 we present the technical lemmas or propositions in the process of performing our analysis, namely Proposition B.1, Lemmas B.2 and B.4, Theorem B.3, and Corollary B.5. In Appendix C we prove all the results in Section 3.3 based on Section 3.2 along with Theorem C.4. The rest of the proofs are deferred to Appendices D to H.

## REFERENCES

- R. P. Agnew. Estimates for global central limit theorems. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 28(1):26–42, 1957.
- M. Austern and L. Mackey. Efficient concentration with Gaussian approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.09922*, 2022.
- M. Austern and P. Orbanz. Limit theorems for distributions invariant under groups of transformations. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(4):1960–1991, 2022.
- P. Baldi and Y. Rinott. On normal approximations of distributions in terms of dependency graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, 17(4):1646–1650, 1989.
- A. D. Barbour. Asymptotic expansions based on smooth functions in the central limit theorem. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 72(2):289–303, 1986.
- A. D. Barbour, M. Karoński, and A. Ruciński. A central limit theorem for decomposable random variables with applications to random graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 47(2):125–145, 1989.
- P. Bártfai. über die entfernung der irrfahrtswege. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar*, 5:41–49, 1970.



- E. A. Bender and S. G. Williamson. *Lists, decisions and graphs*. S. Gill Williamson, San Diego, 2010.
- V. Bentkus and J. K. Sunklodas. On normal approximations to strongly mixing random fields. *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen*, 70(3-4):253–270, 2007.
- V. Bentkus, F. Götze, and W. R. van Zwet. An Edgeworth expansion for symmetric statistics. *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(2):851–896, 1997.
- R. N. Bhattacharya. Recent results on refinements of the central limit theorem. In *Proc. Sixth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob*, volume 2, pages 453–484, 1972.
- R. N. Bhattacharya and R. R. Rao. *Normal Approximation and Asymptotic Expansions*, volume 64. SIAM, Philadelphia, 1986.
- P. Bickel, F. Götze, and W. Van Zwet. The Edgeworth expansion for U-statistics of degree two. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1463–1484, 1986.
- S. G. Bobkov. Berry–Esseen bounds and Edgeworth expansions in the central limit theorem for transport distances. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 170(1):229–262, 2018.
- E. Bolthausen. The Berry–Esseen theorem for strongly mixing Harris recurrent Markov chains. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 60(3):283–289, 1982a.
- E. Bolthausen. On the central limit theorem for stationary mixing random fields. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 1047–1050, 1982b.
- T. Bonis. Stein’s method for normal approximation in Wasserstein distances with application to the multivariate central limit theorem. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 178(3): 827–860, 2020.
- R. C. Bradley. Basic properties of strong mixing conditions: A survey and some open questions. *Probability surveys*, 2:107–144, 2005.
- S. Chatterjee. *Concentration inequalities with exchangeable pairs*. Stanford University, Redwood, 2005.
- L. H. Chen and Q.-M. Shao. Normal approximation under local dependence. *The Annals of Probability*, 32(3):1985–2028, 2004.
- R. Cogburn. *Asymptotic properties of stationary sequences*, volume 3. University of California Press, Oakland, 1960.
- I. Dewan and B. P. Rao. Non-uniform and uniform Berry–Esseen type bounds for stationary associated sequences. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 17(2):217–235, 2005.
- D. Dolgopyat and Y. Hafouta. A Berry–Esseen theorem and Edgeworth expansions for uniformly elliptic inhomogeneous Markov chains. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 186 (1-2):439–476, 2023.
- H. Döring and P. Eichelsbacher. Moderate deviations via cumulants. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 26(2):360–385, 2013.
- H. Döring, S. Jansen, and K. Schubert. The method of cumulants for the normal approximation. *Probability Surveys*, 19:185–270, 2022.
- P. Doukhan. *Mixing: Properties and examples*. Springer, New York, 1994.
- R. Dudeja, Y. M. Lu, and S. Sen. Universality of approximate message passing with semirandom matrices. *The Annals of Probability*, 51(5):1616–1683, 2023.
- R. Eldan, D. Mikulincer, and T. Schramm. Non-asymptotic approximations of neural networks by gaussian processes. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1754–1775. PMLR, 2021.
- C.-G. Esseen. On mean central limit theorems. *Trans. Roy. Inst. Tech., Stockholm*, 2(120):1–30, 1958.
- X. Fang. Wasserstein-2 bounds in normal approximation under local dependence. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 24:1–14, 2019.
- X. Fang and Y. Koike. From  $p$ -Wasserstein bounds to moderate deviations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13307*, 2022.

- X. Fang and Y. Koike. From p-wasserstein bounds to moderate deviations. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 28:1–52, 2023.
- X. Fang and S.-H. Liu. Edgeworth expansion by Stein’s method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.04174*, 2022.
- K. Fernando and C. Liverani. Edgeworth expansions for weakly dependent random variables. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré-Probabilités et Statistiques*, volume 57, pages 469–505, 2021.
- P. K. Friz, J. Gatheral, and R. Radoičić. Forests, cumulants, martingales. *The Annals of Probability*, 50(4):1418–1445, 2022.
- F. Götze and C. Hipp. Asymptotic expansions in the central limit theorem under moment conditions. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 42(1):67–87, 1978.
- F. Götze and C. Hipp. Asymptotic expansions for sums of weakly dependent random vectors. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 64(2):211–239, 1983.
- F. Götze, L. Heinrich, and C. Hipp.  $m$ -dependent random fields with analytic cumulant generating function. *Scandinavian journal of statistics*, pages 183–195, 1995.
- S. Gouëzel. Local limit theorem for nonuniformly partially hyperbolic skew-products and Farey sequences. 2009.
- M. Hairer. Solving the kpz equation. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 559–664, 2013.
- P. Hall. *The bootstrap and Edgeworth expansion*. Springer Science & Business Media, New York, 2013.
- L. Heinbich. Asymptotic expansions in the central limit theorem for a special class of  $m$ -dependent random fields, I. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 134(1):83–106, 1987.
- L. Heinrich. Asymptotic expansions in the central limit theorem for a special class of  $m$ -dependent random fields, II: Lattice case. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 145(1):309–327, 1990a.
- L. Heinrich. Some bounds of cumulants of  $m$ -dependent random fields. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 149(1):303–317, 1990b.
- S. Heubach and T. Mansour. *Combinatorics of compositions and words*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, New York, 2009.
- C. Hipp. Asymptotic expansions in the central limit theorem for compound and Markov processes. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 69:361–385, 1985.
- P. L. Hsu. The approximate distributions of the mean and variance of a sample of independent variables. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 16(1):1–29, 1945.
- I. Ibragimov. Some limit theorems for stochastic processes stationary in the strict sense. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 125(4):711–714, 1959.
- S. Janson. Normal convergence by higher semiinvariants with applications to sums of dependent random variables and random graphs. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 305–312, 1988.
- S. Janson. Large deviations for sums of partly dependent random variables. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 24(3):234–248, 2004.
- A. Janssen and T. Pauls. How do bootstrap and permutation tests work? *The Annals of statistics*, 31(3):768–806, 2003.
- J. Jensen. Asymptotic expansions for strongly mixing harris recurrent Markov chains. *Scandinavian journal of statistics*, pages 47–63, 1989.
- J. Jensen. A note on asymptotic expansions for sums over a weakly dependent random field with application to the Poisson and Strauss processes. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 45:353–360, 1993.
- M. Jirak. On non-uniform Berry–Esseen bounds for time series. *Probab. Math. Statist*, 35(1):1–14, 2015.
- M. Jirak. Berry–Esseen theorems under weak dependence. 2016.

- M. Jirak. A Berry–Esseen bound with (almost) sharp dependence conditions. *Bernoulli*, 29(2): 1219–1245, 2023.
- M. Jirak, W. B. Wu, and O. Zhao. Sharp connections between Berry–Esseen characteristics and Edgeworth expansions for stationary processes. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 374(6):4129–4183, 2021.
- A. N. Kolmogorov and Y. A. Rozanov. On  $\alpha$ -mixing conditions for stationary Gaussian processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 5(2):204–208, 1960.
- L. Kontorovich and K. Ramanan. Concentration inequalities for dependent random variables via the martingale method. 2008.
- S. Lahiri. Edgeworth expansions for studentized statistics under weak dependence. *Ann. Statist.*, 38(1):388–434, 2010.
- S. Lahiri and S. Lahiri. *Resampling methods for dependent data*. Springer Science & Business Media, New York, 2003.
- S. N. Lahiri. Refinements in asymptotic expansions for sums of weakly dependent random vectors. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 791–799, 1993.
- S. N. Lahiri. Asymptotic expansions for sums of random vectors under polynomial mixing rates. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 206–224, 1996.
- M. Ledoux, I. Nourdin, and G. Peccati. Stein’s method, logarithmic Sobolev and transport inequalities. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 25(1):256–306, 2015.
- T. Liu and M. Austern. Wasserstein- $p$  bounds in the central limit theorem under local dependence, 2023.
- W.-L. Loh. An Edgeworth expansion for U-statistics with weakly dependent observations. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 171–186, 1996.
- V. Malinovskii. Limit theorems for Harris Markov chains, I. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 31(2):269–285, 1987.
- F. Merlevède, M. Peligrad, and E. Rio. Bernstein inequality and moderate deviations under strong mixing conditions. In *High dimensional probability V: the Luminy volume*, volume 5, pages 273–293. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 2009.
- P. A. Mykland. Asymptotic expansions for martingales. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 800–818, 1993.
- F. Otto and C. Villani. Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 173(2):361–400, 2000.
- J. Præstgaard and J. A. Wellner. Exchangeably weighted bootstraps of the general empirical process. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 2053–2086, 1993.
- W. S. Rhee. An Edgeworth expansion for a sum of  $m$ -dependent random variables. *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, 8(3):563–569, 1985.
- Y. Rinott and V. Rotar. On Edgeworth expansions for dependency-neighborhoods chain structures and Stein’s method. *Probability theory and related fields*, 126(4):528–570, 2003.
- E. Rio. About the Berry–Esseen theorem for weakly dependent sequences. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 104:255–282, 1996.
- E. Rio. Distances minimales et distances idéales. *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences-Series I-Mathematics*, 326(9):1127–1130, 1998.
- E. Rio. Upper bounds for minimal distances in the central limit theorem. *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, 45(3):802–817, 2009.
- S. Roman. *An introduction to Catalan numbers*. Springer, Cham, 2015.
- N. Ross. Fundamentals of Stein’s method. *Probability Surveys*, 8:210–293, 2011.
- V. Rotar. On Edgeworth expansions for dependency-neighborhoods chain structures with strong mixing characteristics. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 52(1):108–124, 2008.
- A. I. Sakhanenko. Estimates in an invariance principle. *Matematicheskije Trudy*, 5:27–44, 1985.

- J. Sakurai and J. Napolitano. *Modern Quantum Mechanics*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- P.-M. Samson. Concentration of measure inequalities for Markov chains and  $\phi$ -mixing processes. *The Annals of Probability*, 28(1):416–461, 2000.
- P. J. Smith. A recursive formulation of the old problem of obtaining moments from cumulants and vice versa. *The American Statistician*, 49(2):217–218, 1995.
- R. P. Stanley. *Enumerative Combinatorics*, volume 1 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2 edition, 2011. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139058520.006.
- V. Statulevičius. Limit theorems for sums of random variables related to a Markov chain, I, II, III. *Liet. Mat. Rink.(Lithuanian Mathematical Journal)*, 9:345–362, 1969.
- C. Stein. A bound for the error in the normal approximation to the distribution of a sum of dependent random variables. In *Proceedings of the sixth Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability, volume 2: Probability theory*, volume 6, pages 583–603. University of California Press, 1972.
- D. W. Stroock and B. Zegarlinski. The logarithmic Sobolev inequality for discrete spin systems on a lattice. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 149:175–193, 1992.
- J. Sunklodas. On normal approximation for strongly mixing random variables. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 97(1):251–260, 2007.
- M. Talagrand. Transportation cost for Gaussian and other product measures. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 6(3):587–600, 1996.
- A. N. Tikhomirov. On the convergence rate in the central limit theorem for weakly dependent random variables. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 25(4):790–809, 1981. doi: 10.1137/1125092. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/1125092>.
- C. Villani. *Optimal transport: Old and new*, volume 338. Springer, Heidelberg, 2009.
- V. Volkonskii and Y. A. Rozanov. Some limit theorems for random functions, I. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 4(2):178–197, 1959.
- B. Yu. Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 94–116, 1994.
- R. R. Zhang, X. Liu, Y. Wang, and L. Wang. McDiarmid-type inequalities for graph-dependent variables and stability bounds. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- M. Zhilova. New Edgeworth-type expansions with finite sample guarantees. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(5):2545–2561, 2022.

#### APPENDIX A. PRELIMINARY LEMMAS

In this section, we present some of the key preliminary lemmas that will be used throughout the proofs. The first lemma will allow us to control the correlation between different random variables in terms of their mixing coefficients

**Lemma A.1** (Theorem 3 of Chapter 1.2, Doukhan [1994]). *Suppose  $X, Y$  are two random variables.  $X$  is measurable with respect to the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $Y$  is measurable with respect to the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$ . Denoting  $\|X\|_p = (\mathbb{E}[|X|^p])^{1/p}$ , we have*

$$|\text{Cov}(X, Y)| \leq 8\alpha^{1/r}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\|X\|_p\|Y\|_q, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for any  $p, q, r \geq 1$  such that  $1/p + 1/q + 1/r = 1$ .

A key idea in the proofs of Section 3.3 will be to relate the Wasserstein- $p$  distance to other metrics called Zolotarev’s ideal metrics. This will in turn allow us to exploit the Edgeworth expansions we have obtained to derive rates for the CLT in terms of Wasserstein- $p$  distances.

**Definition A.2** (Zolotarev Distance). *Suppose  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  are two probability distributions on  $\mathbb{R}$ . For any  $p > 0$  and  $\omega := p + 1 - \lceil p \rceil \in (0, 1]$ , the Zolotarev- $p$  distance between  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  is defined by*

$$\mathcal{Z}_p(\mu, \nu) := \sup_{f \in \Lambda_p} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) d\mu(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) d\nu(x) \right),$$

where  $\Lambda_p := \{f \in C^{\lceil p \rceil - 1, \omega}(\mathbb{R}) : |f|_{\lceil p \rceil - 1, \omega} \leq 1\}$ .

Importantly the Wasserstein- $p$  distance can be controlled in terms of the Zolotarev distance.

**Lemma A.3** (Theorem 3.1 of Rio [2009]). *For any  $p \geq 1$ , there exists a positive constant  $C_p$ , such that for any pair of distributions  $\mu, \nu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  with finite absolute moments of order  $p$  such that*

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mu, \nu) \leq C_p (\mathcal{Z}_p(\mu, \nu))^{1/p}.$$

*In particular,  $\mathcal{W}_1(\mu, \nu) = \mathcal{Z}_1(\mu, \nu)$  by Kantorovich–Rubinstein duality.*

## APPENDIX B. DETAILS OF THE CONSTRUCTIVE GRAPH APPROACH

In this section, whenever it is not ambiguous we will drop the  $n$  notation and write  $\alpha_\ell, \sigma, W, X_i$  and  $T$  for respectively  $\alpha_{\ell, n}, \sigma_n, W_n, X_i^{(n)}$  and  $T_n$ .

In Section 4.1.2 we presented the intuition on how such an expansion can be obtained. To further help build intuition in Appendix B.1 we present the derivation in detail in the simpler case of a stationary random sequence  $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$  with  $k = \omega = d = 1$ . This section is only for illustration and can be skipped. Appendix B.1 for illustration we provide the full Edgeworth expansion when  $p = 1$ . In Appendix B.2 we define the concept of genograms and introduce key notations. Finally in Appendix B.3 we show how the main results.

**B.1. Example and motivation.** The key step in proving Theorem 3.4 is to obtain the following expansion of  $\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)]$  for  $f \in C^{k, \omega}(\mathbb{R})$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \text{Remainders}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where  $\kappa_{j+1}(W)$  is the  $(j + 1)$ -th cumulant of  $W$ .

In Section 4.1.2 we presented the intuition on how such an expansion can be obtained. To further help build intuition we here present the derivation in detail for the simpler case of stationary random sequences  $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$  with  $k = \omega = d = 1$ . For simplicity, we further assume  $f \in C^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap C^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ , i.e.,  $f''$  is continuous and bounded (see Definition 3.3). We will see that (B.1) reduces to an upper bound on the absolute value of  $\mathbb{E}[f'(W) - Wf(W)]$ .

Fixing a positive integer  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . For any positive integers  $i, j$ , we denote

$$W_{i,j} := \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{i-j-1} X_\ell + \sum_{\ell=i+j+1}^n X_\ell \right), \quad W_{i,j}^* := \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{i-j-1} X_\ell + \sum_{\ell=i+j}^n X_\ell \right),$$

where  $X_\ell := 0$  if  $\ell \leq 0$  or  $\ell \geq n + 1$ . Note that  $W_{i,j}^* - W_{i,j} = X_{i+j}$  and  $W_{i,j-1} - W_{i,j}^* = X_{i-j}$  if  $j \geq 2$ .

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[Wf(W) - f'(W)] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i(f(W) - f(W_{i,m}) - f'(W)(W - W_{i,m}))] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i f(W_{i,m})] + \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i (W - W_{i,m}) f'(W)] - \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] \\
& =: E_1 + E_2 + E_3 - \mathbb{E}[f'(W)].
\end{aligned}$$

Intuitively, for each  $i$ , we split  $W$  into two parts,  $W_{i,m}$  and  $W - W_{i,m}$ . The latter has limited number of  $X_j$ 's and converges to 0 when  $n$  is relatively large compared to  $m$ . Although the first part,  $W_{i,m}$ , has a lot of  $X_j$ 's in the sum, it is less dependent on  $X_i$ . As a result, the expectation terms can be controlled using the  $\alpha$ -mixing conditions of the random sequence.

To study  $E_1$  in (B.2), we apply the Taylor expansion and Young's inequality and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
|E_1| & = \left| \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i (f(W) - f(W_{i,m}) - f'(W)(W - W_{i,m}))] \right| \tag{B.3} \\
& \leq \frac{\|f''\|}{2\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_i (W - W_{i,m})|^2] = \frac{\|f''\|}{2\sigma^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[|X_i| \left(\sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} X_j\right)^2\right] \\
& = \frac{\|f''\|}{2\sigma^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \sum_{\ell=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E}[|X_i X_j X_\ell|] \\
& \leq \frac{\|f''\|}{2\sigma^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \sum_{\ell=i-m}^{i+m} \frac{1}{3} \left(\mathbb{E}[|X_i|^3] + \mathbb{E}[|X_j|^3] + \mathbb{E}[|X_\ell|^3]\right) \\
& \leq \frac{2(m+1)^2 \|f''\|}{\sigma^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_i|^3] \lesssim \|f''\| m^2 n^{-1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we consider  $E_2$ , and observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
E_2 & = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i f(W_{i,m})] \tag{B.4} \\
& = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i ((f(W_{i,j-1}) - f(W_{i,j}^*)) + (f(W_{i,j}^*) - f(W_{i,j})))] \\
& = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}\left[X_i (f(W_{i,j-1}) - f(W_{i,j}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - f'(W_{i,j-1})(W_{i,j-1} - W_{i,j}^*) - f'(W_{i,j}^*)(W_{i,j}^* - W_{i,j}))\right] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}\left[X_i (X_{i-j} f'(W_{i,j}) + X_{i+j} f'(W_{i,j}^*))\right] \\
& = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}\left[X_i (f(W_{i,j-1}) - f(W_{i,j}) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - f'(W_{i,j-1})(W_{i,j-1} - W_{i,j}^*) - f'(W_{i,j}^*)(W_{i,j}^* - W_{i,j}))\right] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}\left[X_i \left(X_{i-j} (f'(W_{i,j}) - \mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j})]) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + X_{i+j} (f'(W_{i,j}^*) - \mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j}^*)])\right)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} (\mathbb{E}[X_i X_{i-j}] \mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j})] + \mathbb{E}[X_i X_{i+j}] \mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j}^*)]) \\
= & \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i (f(W_{i,j-1}) - f(W_{i,j}) \\
& - f'(W_{i,j-1})(W_{i,j-1} - W_{i,j}^*) - f'(W_{i,j}^*)(W_{i,j}^* - W_{i,j}))] \\
& + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}\left[X_i \left(X_{i-j} (f'(W_{i,j}) - \mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j})]) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + X_{i+j} (f'(W_{i,j}^*) - \mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j}^*)])\right)\right] \\
& + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} (\mathbb{E}[X_i X_{i-j}] (\mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j})] - \mathbb{E}[f'(W)]) \\
& + \mathbb{E}[X_i X_{i+j}] (\mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j}^*)] - \mathbb{E}[f'(W)])) \\
& + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i (X_{i-j} + X_{i+j})] \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] \\
= & : E_4 + E_5 + E_6 + E_7.
\end{aligned}$$

Intuitively,  $E_4$  to  $E_6$  can be controlled with the  $\alpha$ -mixing conditions of  $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$ . For example in  $E_6$ , the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficient between the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $X_i$  and the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $X_{i-j}$  or  $X_{i+j}$  is no greater than  $\alpha_j$ . We will illustrate how this helps get an upper bound later.

As for  $E_3$  in (B.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_3 & = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i (W - W_{i,m}) f'(W)] = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j f'(W)] \tag{B.5} \\
& = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j (f'(W) - \mathbb{E}[f'(W)])] + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] \\
& = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j (f'(W) - f'(W_{i,j,m}))] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] (\mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j,m})] - \mathbb{E}[f'(W)]) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j (\mathbb{E}[f'(W_{i,j,m})] - f'(W_{i,j,m}))] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] \\
= & : E_8 + E_9 + E_{10} + E_{11},
\end{aligned}$$

where we set

$$W_{i,j,m} := \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{i \wedge j - m - 1} X_\ell + \sum_{\ell=i \vee j + m + 1}^n X_\ell \right).$$

Next we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} E_7 + E_{11} &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i(X_{i-j} + X_{i+j})] \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right)^2 \right] \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] = \mathbb{E}[f'(W)]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $E_7 + E_{11}$  cancels out with  $-\mathbb{E}[f'(W)]$  in (B.4).

The terms  $E_8$  and  $E_9$  can be bounded by the Taylor expansion and Young's inequality in a way similar to (B.3).  $E_{10}$  can be controlled with the  $\alpha$ -mixing conditions of  $(X_i)_{i=1}^n$  by utilizing the covariance inequality as stated in Lemma A.1.

To illustrate on how to use the  $\alpha$ -mixing conditions, we consider a special case, where  $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ , i.e, both  $f'$  and  $f''$  are continuous and bounded. Under this condition, the second term in (B.2) can be controlled more easily. By Lemma A.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i X_j] \leq 8\alpha_{|i-j|}^{(r-2)/r} \|X_i\|_r \|X_j\|_r = 8\alpha_{|i-j|}^{(r-2)/r} \|X_1\|_r^2.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i f(W_{i,m})] \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i (f(W_{i,j}) - f(W_{i,j+1}))] \right| \quad (\text{B.6}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} |\mathbb{E}[X_i (f(W_{i,j}) - f(W_{i,j+1}))]| \\ &\leq \frac{\|f'\|}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[|X_i| (|X_{i-j}| + |X_{i+j}|)] \\ &= \frac{2\|f'\|}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i,j:|i-j| \geq m+1} \mathbb{E}[|X_i X_j|] \leq \frac{2\|f'\|}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i,j:|i-j| \geq m+1} 8\alpha_{|i-j|}^{(r-2)/r} \|X_1\|_r^2 \\ &\lesssim \|f'\| \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{n-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-2)/r}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, this term vanishes at  $n = m = \infty$  if  $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \alpha_\ell^{(r-2)/r}$  converges. For this special case, we need  $n \gg m^4 \rightarrow \infty$  so that both (B.3) and (B.6) will approach 0.

We omit the technical details on the rest of the derivation because the aim here is only to help build intuition. Please refer to [Sunklodas \[2007\]](#), [Bentkus and Sunklodas \[2007\]](#) for more information on this case.

More generally, consider a mean-zero random field  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  indexed by a finite set  $T \subsetneq \mathbb{Z}^d$  ( $d \geq 1$ ). To be able to bound  $\mathbb{E}[f'(W) - Wf(W)]$ , it is important to carefully keep track of which indexes in  $T$  are at a distance of less than  $m$  of each other as the corresponding random variables  $X_i$ 's are non-negligibly dependent. Similarly, we will also want to keep track of



which indexes are at distance of more than  $m$  from each other. Indeed, if all the indexes in  $U_1 \subsetneq T$  and  $U_2 \subsetneq T$  are at distance of more than  $m$  from each other, then the dependence between  $(X_{i_1})_{i_1 \in U_1}$  and  $(X_{i_2})_{i_2 \in U_2}$  is negligible, and we can control the correlation between those thanks to the mixing coefficients.

For  $k \geq 1$ , we would like to get an expansion (B.1) of  $\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)]$  with controllable remainders instead of directly bounding  $\mathbb{E}[Wf(W) - f'(W)]$ . We can achieve this by encoding the structure of all possible sums appearing in the process and reformulate the expansion using a better representation called the ‘‘genogram’’. As we have seen in the example of the simple case  $k = 1$ , we expect to obtain an expansion, where each summand of the remainders (e.g.  $E_1, E_4, E_5, E_6, E_8, E_9, E_{10}$ ) is an expectation or the product of expectations. We will use two different tools to control them, namely the Taylor expansion and the fact that covariances can be controlled by the mixing coefficients (see Lemma A.1).

For  $k = 1$ , we have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[Wf(W) - f'(W)] \\ &= E_1 + E_2 + E_3 - \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] \\ &= E_1 + (E_4 + E_5 + E_6 + E_7) + (E_8 + E_9 + E_{10} + E_{11}) - \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] \\ &= E_1 + E_4 + E_5 + E_6 + E_8 + E_9 + E_{10}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.7}$$

Note that we use the word ‘‘summand’’ here to refer to the variable that is being summed. For example,  $E_7$  is defined as

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i(X_{i-j} + X_{i+j})] \mathbb{E}[f'(W)].$$

Then the summand in  $E_7$  refers to

$$\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \mathbb{E}[X_i(X_{i-j} + X_{i+j})] \mathbb{E}[f'(W)],$$

and it factorizes into two expectations

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i(X_{i-j} + X_{i+j})] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[f'(W)]$$

with a scaling constant  $\sigma^{-2}$ .

Re-examining the procedure, we see that what we actually have done is approximating  $\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)]$  by  $E_7 + E_{11}$  with error terms  $E_1, E_4, E_5, E_6, E_8, E_9, E_{10}$ . Then the ‘‘local’’ errors,  $E_1, E_8, E_9$ , are bounded directly by remainder estimation from the Taylor expansion, while to study the other terms we need to apply Lemma A.1. As we try to generalize this, we need to be careful that to apply Lemma A.1, the error terms need to have a factor that appears as a covariance rather than any arbitrary expectation. The idea to enforce this requirement is that for any random variables  $X, Y$ , we keep track of  $\text{Cov}(X, Y)$  a priori instead of writing out  $\mathbb{E}[XY]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[Y]$  separately. To generalize, we will introduce a multilinear operator  $\mathcal{D}^*$ . In particular, for any random variables  $X, Y, Z$ , we let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^*(X) &:= \mathbb{E}[X], \quad \mathcal{D}^*(X, Y) := \text{Cov}(X, Y), \\ \mathcal{D}^*(X, Y, Z) &:= \mathbb{E}[XYZ] - \mathbb{E}[XY] \mathbb{E}[Z] - \mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[YZ] + \mathbb{E}[X] \mathbb{E}[Y] \mathbb{E}[Z]. \end{aligned}$$

In the previous example, we can rewrite the expansion as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] &= (E_1 + E_3) + E_2 \\ &= E_1 + (E_3 - E_{11}) + E_{11} + E_4 + E_5 + E_6 + E_7. \end{aligned} \tag{B.8}$$

Here

$$E_1 + E_3 = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, f(W) - f(W_{i,m})), \quad E_2 = \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, f(W_{i,m})).$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} & f(W) - f(W_{i,m}) - f'(W)(W - W_{i,m}) \\ &= (W - W_{i,m}) \int_0^1 \left( f'(\nu W + (1 - \nu)W_{i,m}) - f'(W) \right) d\nu \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} X_j \int_0^1 \left( f'(\nu W + (1 - \nu)W_{i,m}) - f'(W) \right) d\nu, \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i (f(W) - f(W_{i,m}) - f'(W)(W - W_{i,m}))] \tag{B.9} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathbb{E} \left[ X_i X_j \int_0^1 \left( f'(\nu W + (1 - \nu)W_{i,m}) - f'(W) \right) d\nu \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathcal{D}^* \left( X_i, X_j \int_0^1 \left( f'(\nu W + (1 - \nu)W_{i,m}) - f'(W) \right) d\nu \right). \end{aligned}$$

We can further check that

$$\begin{aligned} E_3 - E_{11} &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, X_j, f'(W)), \\ E_{11} &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i-m}^{i+m} \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, X_j) \mathcal{D}^*(f'(W)), \\ E_4 &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathcal{D}^* \left( X_i, X_{i-j} \int_0^1 \left( f'(\nu W_{i,j-1} + (1 - \nu)W_{i,j}^*) - f'(W_{i,j-1}) \right) \right), \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathcal{D}^* \left( X_i, X_{i+j} \int_0^1 \left( f'(\nu W_{i,j}^* + (1 - \nu)W_{i,j}) - f'(W_{i,j}^*) \right) \right), \\ E_5 &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \left( \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, X_{i-j}, f'(W_{i,j-1})) + \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, X_{i+j}, f'(W_{i,j}^*)) \right), \\ E_6 &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \left( \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, X_{i-j}) \mathcal{D}^*(f'(W_{i,j-1}) - f'(W)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, X_{i+j}) \mathcal{D}^*(f'(W_{i,j}^*) - f'(W)) \right), \\ E_7 &= \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, X_{i-j} + X_{i+j}) \mathcal{D}^*(f'(W)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, each summand in  $E_1 + E_3, E_2, E_1, E_3 - E_{11}, E_{11}, E_4, \dots, E_7$  is either a  $\mathcal{D}^*$  term or the product of two  $\mathcal{D}^*$  terms with some scaling constant.

Next we aim to encode the structure of these sums in a more efficient way. In general, we need to take into account the following issues:

- How each summand in the expansion factorizes into  $\mathcal{D}^*$  terms;
- How each  $\mathcal{D}^*$  term is constructed;
- Which values the running indexes in the summand are allowed to take.

To address all these issues, we introduce an abstract structure called a “genogram”, consisting of a rooted tree and integers bigger or equal to  $-1$  (called “identifiers”), each attached to a vertex of the rooted tree and satisfying certain requirements. Then we represent each sum (e.g.  $E_1 + E_3, E_2, E_1, E_3 - E_{11}, E_{11}, E_4, \dots, E_7$ ) with the help of genograms such that

- Each vertex of the rooted tree corresponds to a running index of summation (i.e.,  $i_1, i_2, \dots$ );
- Each branch (or each leaf) of the rooted tree corresponds to a  $\mathcal{D}^*$  factor of the summand;
- The signs of identifiers control how each  $\mathcal{D}^*$  term is constructed;
- The values of identifiers help determine the sets of values that running indexes take by encoding their distance structure, which reflects the dependency between corresponding random variables.

Interestingly, the process of expanding  $\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)]$  precisely corresponds to growing a class of genograms. Instead of deriving the expansion solely for  $\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)]$ , we get a similar expansion for any genogram  $G$  and quantities  $\mathcal{T}_f(G)$  (formally defined in (B.20)). In the expansion of  $\mathcal{T}_f(G)$ , the cumulants in (B.1) are replaced by other constants that depend on both  $G$  and the joint distribution of  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  but not on  $f$ .

As we will see later,  $\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)]$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{T}_f(G)$  with  $G$  being the order-1 genogram, which consists of only the root vertex. For this special case, directly calculation with  $f$  set to be polynomials helps recover the constants as the cumulants of  $W$ , and thus, (B.1) is obtained for general  $f$  by uniqueness of the constants. Finally, we carefully collect and control the remainders with the mixing coefficients.

The rest of the section is constructed as follows: In Appendix B.2, we formally define a genogram and related concepts. In Appendix B.2, we define three types of sums corresponding to a genogram, which will be used later in the expansion. In Appendix B.3, we show how to achieve the expansion by growing a class of genograms. In Appendix B.3, we control the remainders using the mixing coefficients. Finally, in Appendix D, we provide the proofs of Theorems 3.4 and C.4.

**B.2. Graph theory background and definition of Genograms.** A *rooted tree* is a tree in which one vertex has been designated the root. In a rooted tree, the *parent* of a vertex  $v$  is the vertex connected to  $v$  on the path from the root to  $v$ ; every vertex has a unique parent except the root, which has no parent. A *child* of a vertex  $v$  is a vertex of which  $v$  is the parent. An *ancestor* of a vertex  $v$  is any vertex other than  $v$  which is on the path from the root to  $v$ . A *sibling* to a vertex  $v$  is any other vertex on the tree which has the same parent as  $v$ . A *leaf* is a vertex with no children. See [Bender and Williamson \[2010\]](#) for a detailed exposition.

An order  $k$  *genogram* is defined as the tuple  $G := (V, E, \{s_v\}_{v \in V})$ , where  $(V, E)$  is a rooted tree with a vertex set  $V$  ( $|G| := |V| = k$ ) and an edge set  $E$ , and  $s_v$  is an integer called the *identifier* associated to each  $v \in V$  that satisfies the requirements below:

- $s_v = 0$  for the root  $v$ .  $s_v \geq -1$  for any other vertex  $v$ ;
- $s_v \geq 0$  if  $v$  is a child of the root;
- If  $v$  has more than one child, identifiers of  $v$ ’s children must be non-negative and mutually different.

Beware that the identifiers are part of the genograms by definition. We say that a vertex  $v$  is *negative* if and only if  $s_v = -1$ , *nil* if and only if  $s_v = 0$ , *positive* if and only if  $s_v \geq 1$ . The




FIGURE 2. Examples of order-7 genograms.




FIGURE 3. Examples of order-7 genograms with the compatible labeling.

requirements above implies that the identifier of each child of  $v$  is different, and therefore,  $v$ 's children can be uniquely identified by their identifiers. The last requirement also suggests that if  $v$  has more than one child, there is no negative and at most one nil among them. In other words, a negative vertex has no sibling, a nil vertex only has positive siblings, and any vertex must have an identifier different from all its siblings.

Furthermore, denote the set of all possible order- $k$  genograms by  $\mathcal{G}(k)$ . Figure 2 depicts two examples of genograms  $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}(7)$ , where each circle represents a vertex, the one representing the root is filled with gray, and the identifiers are marked inside the circles.

We remark that the notion of genograms resembles the ordered trees in combinatorics. An *ordered (rooted) tree*  $(V, E, \prec)$  is a rooted tree  $(V, E)$  where the children of every vertex are ordered (the order denoted by  $\prec$ ) [Stanley, 2011]. Note that  $\prec$  is a strict partial order on the vertex set  $V$ . By definition every genogram induces a unique ordered tree if we set  $v_1 \prec v_2 \Leftrightarrow s_{v_1} > s_{v_2}$  whenever  $v_1, v_2 \in V$  are siblings. However, an ordered tree corresponds to infinitely many genograms since the largest identifier is allowed to take any sufficiently large value in  $\mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$ .

*Compatible labeling, parent, progenitor, and ancestor.* Next we consider a labeling of the vertices of a genogram (or the induced ordered tree of a genogram). We say a labeling  $V = \{v[1], \dots, v[k]\}$  is *compatible* with  $G$  (or  $(V, E, \prec)$ ) if and only if

- It follows from a depth-first traversal:  $v[1]$  is the root, and for any  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ , the vertex  $v[j+1]$  is chosen to be a child of the vertex with the largest label  $\ell \leq j$  that has children. In particular,  $v[j+1]$  is  $v[j]$ 's child as long as  $v[j]$  has a child;
- It respects the partial order  $\prec$  induced by  $G$ : If  $v[j]$  and  $v[h]$  ( $2 \leq j, h \leq k, j \neq h$ ) are siblings, then we have  $s_j > s_h \Leftrightarrow j < h$  (or equivalently,  $v[j] \prec v[h] \Leftrightarrow j < h$ ). In other words, if a vertex has more than one child, a child with a larger identifier has a smaller label. In particular, if  $s_j = 0$ , then  $v[j]$  has the largest label  $j$ .

Figure 3 shows the compatible labelings of  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , where the labels are marked outside the circles that represent the vertices.

We remark that there is a unique compatible labeling given any genogram  $G$  (or any ordered tree  $(V, E, \prec)$ ).

Now we introduce more notations in order to express the compatible requirements for identifiers and the labeling in a more concise manner. Let  $G = (V, E, s_{1:k})$  be an order  $k$  genogram with vertices labelled as  $V = \{v[1], \dots, v[k]\}$  and where  $s_j$  is the identifier of  $v[j]$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . We denote the label of  $v[j]$ 's *parent* by  $p(j, G)$  for  $2 \leq j \leq k+1$ , and the label set of  $v[j]$ 's *ancestors* by  $A(j, G)$  (we set  $A(1, G) = \emptyset$ ). Moreover, we write

$$g(j, G) := \sup\{\ell : \ell = 1 \text{ or } \ell \in A(j, G) \ \& \ s_\ell \geq 1\}, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

and call  $v[g(j, G)]$  the *progenitor* of  $v[j]$ . In particular, we have that  $g(1, G) = 1$ . Intuitively,  $v[g(j, G)]$  is the positive vertex closest to  $v[j]$  in its ancestry if such vertex exists, in which case there is a path from  $v[g(j, G)]$  to  $v[p(j, G)]$ , the parent of  $v[j]$ , such that  $v[g(j, G)]$  is the only positive vertex along the path. Otherwise,  $v[g(j, G)]$  is set to be the root. Note that  $v[g(j, G)] \neq v[j]$  for  $2 \leq j \leq k$ . Take the genograms  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  in Figure 3 as examples,  $g(j, G_1) = 1$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq 7$  while in  $G_2$ ,  $g(1, G_2) = g(2, G_2) = g(3, G_2) = g(4, G_2) = 1$ ,  $g(5, G_2) = g(6, G_2) = 4$ , and  $g(7, G_2) = 6$ . We further denote

$$u(j, G) := \sup\{\ell \in \{j\} \cup A(j, G) : s_\ell \geq 0\}. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

In other words,  $v[u(j, G)]$  is the closest non-negative vertex in  $v[j]$ 's ancestry if  $v[j]$  is negative, otherwise  $u(j, G) = j$ . In particular,  $s_j = -1 \Leftrightarrow u(j, G) < j$ ,  $s_j \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow u(j, G) = j$ . For example, in the genogram  $G_1$  shown in Figure 3a,  $u(5, G_1) = 4$  and  $u(j, G_1) = j$  for  $j \neq 5$ . For ease of notation, when there is no ambiguity, we will abuse notations and write  $p(j)$ ,  $A(j)$ ,  $g(j)$ ,  $u(j)$  to mean  $p(j, G)$ ,  $A(j, G)$ ,  $g(j, G)$ ,  $u(j, G)$ .

We remark that the labeling has to respect the following properties:

**Proposition B.1.** *Let  $k$  be a positive integer,  $(V, E)$  be a rooted tree with the vertex set  $V = \{v[1], \dots, v[k]\}$  and edge set  $E$ , and  $s_1, \dots, s_k$  be  $k$  integers.  $(V, E, \{s_{1:k}\})$  is a genogram with the compatible labeling if and only if all the following statements are true:*

- (a)  $p(j+1) = \max\{p(\ell) : \ell \geq j+1, p(\ell) \leq j\}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$ ;
- (b)  $s_1 = 0$ .  $s_j \geq -1$  for  $2 \leq j \leq k$ ;
- (c) If  $s_j = -1$  ( $2 \leq j \leq k$ ), then (i)  $p(j) \neq 1$ , (ii)  $p(j) = p(h) \Leftrightarrow j = h$  for  $2 \leq h \leq k$ ;
- (d) If  $p(j) = p(h)$  ( $2 \leq j, h \leq k$ ), then  $s_j > s_h \Leftrightarrow j < h$ ,  $s_j = s_h \Leftrightarrow j = h$ .

*Induced sub-genograms.* Lastly, given  $G = (V, E, s_{1:k})$  and  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , we call an order- $j$  genogram  $G[j] := (V', E', s_{1:j})$  the induced *sub-genogram* of  $G$  the genograms by setting  $V' := \{v[1], \dots, v[j]\}$  and  $E' \subseteq E$  be the set of all edges between the vertices  $V'$  in  $G$ . We further denote  $H \subseteq G$  or  $G \supseteq H$  if and only if a genogram  $H$  is a sub-genogram of  $G$ . If  $j < k$ , we say  $G[j]$  is a *proper sub-genogram* of  $G$  and write  $G[j] \subsetneq G$  or  $G \supsetneq G[j]$ .

*Constructing sums from genograms.* Consider a  $d$ -dimensional random field  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  with the index set  $T$  satisfying  $T \subsetneq \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $|T| < \infty$ . We write

$$\sigma^2 := \text{Var}\left(\sum_{i \in T} X_i\right) \quad W := \sigma^{-1} \sum_{i \in T} X_i.$$

For any index subset  $J \subseteq T$ , we denote

$$W(J) := \sigma^{-1} \sum_{i \in T \setminus J} X_i.$$

In this subsection, we build sums  $\mathcal{S}(G)$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_f(G)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_f(G)$  from a genogram  $G$  and a given function  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1}(\mathbb{R})$  in four steps:

- Use the genogram  $G$  to define the sets of values taken by running indexes;
- Introduce the generalized covariance operator  $\mathcal{D}^*$ ;
- Construct an operator  $\mathcal{E}_G$  from  $G$ , which leads to the summand;

- Define  $\mathcal{S}(G), \mathcal{T}_f(G), \mathcal{U}_f(G)$ .

Note that these sums will be used in the next subsection to track the expansion of the quantity  $\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)]$ .

Firstly, as we have pointed in the roadmap, we will construct from an order- $k$  genogram  $G$  sums with  $k$  running indexes, where the  $v[j]$  corresponds to the  $j$ -th running index, denoted by  $i_j$ . Since  $i_j$  will appear in the subscript of  $X_{i_j}$ , the value of  $i_j$  needs to be chosen from  $T$ . It is important to note that the vertices  $v[1], \dots, v[k]$  as well as the genogram do not represent specific values of  $i_1, \dots, i_k$ . The genogram reflects the dependency structure of random variables appearing in the sum by encoding the distance structure between the running indexes.

Setting  $B_1 := T$  and  $D_1 := \emptyset$ ,  $i_1$  will be summed over  $B_1 \setminus D_1 = T$ . Next given the choice of the first  $j - 1$  running indexes ( $j \geq 2$ ), we aim to define two index sets,  $B_j$  and  $D_j$ , using the chosen values  $i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}$  and the order- $j$  sub-genogram  $G[j]$ . In the last step, we will take the sums over  $i_k \in B_k \setminus D_k, T \setminus B_k$  or  $T \setminus D_k$ , and then  $i_{k-1} \in B_{k-1} \setminus D_{k-1}, \dots, i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1$  in turn. We call  $B_j$  the *outer constraint (set)* of the running index  $i_j$ , and  $D_j$ , the *inner constraint (set)* of  $i_j$ . For ease of notation, on most occasions we do not explicitly write out the dependencies on  $G[j]$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}$  when referring to the constraint sets  $B_j$  and  $D_j$ . However, if we are considering multiple genograms, we will use  $B_j(G)$  and  $D_j(G)$  to specify the constraint sets of  $i_j$  with respect to  $G$  to avoid ambiguity.

We will formally define  $B_j$  and  $D_j$  for  $2 \leq j \leq k$  later by induction. But first we consider the case  $j = 2$  to build intuition. When the first running index is set to be some specific element  $i_1 \in T$ , we define  $B_2, D_2 \subseteq T$  using  $i_1$  and  $s_2$ , and  $i_2$  will be summed over  $B_2 \setminus D_2$ . If  $s_2 = 0$ ,  $i_2$  will be summed over all the indexes of distance no greater than  $m$  from  $i_1$ , in which case  $B_2$  and  $D_2$  are defined by

$$B_2 := \{i \in T : \|i - i_1\| \leq m\}, \quad D_2 := \emptyset,$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the maximum norm on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Note that  $m$  is a positive integer that we have fixed earlier.

Otherwise,  $s_2 \geq 1$ , we let  $i_2$  take the sum over a singleton  $B_2 \setminus D_2$ . In other words, the second running index has only one possible choice in the summation. Different values of  $1 \leq s_2 \leq |\{i \in T : \|i - i_1\| \geq m + 1\}| =: s^*$  will correspond to different singletons of elements in  $\{i \in T : \|i - i_1\| \geq m + 1\}$ . Let  $\prec$  be a strict total order on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . With the first level comparing the value of  $\|i - i_1\|$  and the second level using the strict order  $\prec$ , we perform a two-level sorting of all elements  $i$  from  $\{i \in T : \|i - i_1\| \geq m + 1\}$  and obtain an ascending sequence,  $z_1, \dots, z_{s^*}$ . Now  $i_2$  is chosen to be  $z_{s_2}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 &:= \{i \in T : \|i - i_1\| \leq m\} \cup \{z_j : 1 \leq j \leq s_2\}, \\ D_2 &:= \{i \in T : \|i - i_1\| \leq m\} \cup \{z_j : 1 \leq j \leq s_2 - 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

The motivation of using singletons arises from deriving (B.4), where we have decomposed the quantity  $\mathbb{E}[X_i f(W_{i,m})]$  into a telescoping sum:

$$\mathbb{E}[X_i f(W_{i,m})] = \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathbb{E}[X_i ((f(W_{i,j-1}) - f(W_{i,j}^*)) + (f(W_{i,j}^*) - f(W_{i,j})))].$$

In order to accurately approximate the differences  $f(W_{i,j-1}) - f(W_{i,j}^*)$  and  $f(W_{i,j}^*) - f(W_{i,j})$  by the Taylor expansions, the differences between the inputs of  $f$  need to be small enough. The best we can do is to put exactly one random variable in each of such differences.

In general, we introduce some new notations in order to define  $B_j$  and  $D_j$  ( $2 \leq j \leq k$ ) more conveniently. Denote the  $m$ -neighborhood of  $J \subseteq T$  as

$$N(J) := \{i \in T : d(i, J) \leq m\}, \quad \text{where } d(i, J) := \min_{j \in J} \|i - j\|. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

TABLE 1. The constraint sets with respect to  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ .

		$j$   1	2	3	4
$G_1$	$B_j(G_1)$	$T$	$N^{(2)}(i_1)$	$N^{(1)}(i_1)$	$N(i_1)$
	$D_j(G_1)$	$\emptyset$	$N^{(1)}(i_1)$	$N(i_1)$	$\emptyset$
$G_2$	$B_j(G_2)$	$T$	$N(i_1)$	$N^{(5)}(i_1, i_2)$	$N^{(3)}(i_1, i_2)$
	$D_j(G_2)$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$N^{(4)}(i_1, i_2)$	$N^{(2)}(i_1, i_2)$

		$j$	5	6	7
$G_1$	$B_j(G_1)$		$N(i_1)$	$N^{(2)}(i_1, i_4, i_5)$	$N(i_1, i_4, i_5)$
	$D_j(G_1)$		$\emptyset$	$N^{(1)}(i_1, i_4, i_5)$	$\emptyset$
$G_2$	$B_j(G_2)$		$N^{(2)}(i_1, i_2, i_4) \cup N^{(2)}(i_1, i_2)$	$N^{(1)}(i_1, i_2, i_4) \cup N^{(2)}(i_1, i_2)$	$N^{(1)}(i_1, i_2, i_4) \cup N^{(2)}(i_1, i_2)$
	$D_j(G_2)$		$N^{(1)}(i_1, i_2, i_4) \cup N^{(2)}(i_1, i_2)$	$N(i_1, i_2, i_4) \cup N^{(2)}(i_1, i_2)$	$N(i_1, i_2, i_4) \cup N^{(2)}(i_1, i_2)$

We will treat each element of  $T \setminus N(J)$  sequentially starting from the closest elements to  $J$ . To make this precise, for any positive integer  $j$ , we write  $A^{(j)}(J) := \{i \in T : d(i, J) = j\}$  to be the set of indexes in  $T$  that are at distance of  $j$  from  $J$ . Notably we remark that  $T \setminus N(J) = \bigcup_{j=m+1}^{|T|} A^{(j)}(J)$ . We write  $\text{rk}(i, J) = \sum_{\ell=m+1}^j |A^{(\ell)}(J)| + r$  if  $d(i, J) = j + 1$  ( $j \geq m$ ) and  $i$  is the  $r$ -th smallest element of  $A^{(j+1)}(J)$  with respect to the order  $\prec$ . Therefore,  $\text{rk}(\cdot, J)$  is a bijection between  $T \setminus N(J)$  and  $\{\ell \in \mathbb{Z} : 1 \leq \ell \leq |T \setminus N(J)|\}$ . The smaller  $\text{rk}(i, J)$  is, the closer  $i$  is from  $J$ . The value of  $\text{rk}(\cdot, J)$  does not have an intrinsic mathematical significance but will allow us to determine the order in which we will treat the indexes in  $T \setminus N(J)$ . Now denote

$$N^{(s)}(J) := \{i \in T : i \in N(J) \text{ or } \text{rk}(i, J) \leq s\}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

We note in particular that  $N^{(0)}(J) = N(J)$ , and  $N^{(s_L)}(J) = \{i \in T : d(i, J) \leq L\}$  for  $s_L := \sum_{\ell=0}^L |A^{(\ell)}(J)|$ .

For any  $2 \leq j \leq k$ , fixing the genogram  $G$  and a sequence  $i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1, \dots, i_{j-1} \in B_{j-1} \setminus D_{j-1}$ , we define

$$B_j := \begin{cases} N^{(s_j)}(i_\ell : \ell \in A(j)) \cup D_{g(j)} & \text{if } s_j \geq 0 \\ B_{u(j)} & \text{if } s_j = -1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$D_j := \begin{cases} N^{(s_j-1)}(i_\ell : \ell \in A(j)) \cup D_{g(j)} & \text{if } s_j \geq 1 \\ D_{g(j)} & \text{if } s_j \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Here (by abuse of notation)  $A(j)$  is the label set of  $v[j]$ 's ancestors, and  $u(j)$  and  $g(j)$  are defined in (B.11) and (B.10). Note that  $B_j$  and  $D_j$  depend on  $G[j]$  through  $s_j, A(j), u(j)$ , and  $g(j)$ . Moreover, by definition, we have that  $D_j \subseteq B_j$  for any  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . We remark that when the identifier  $s_j = 0$  then  $B_j \setminus D_j \subseteq N(i_\ell : \ell \in A(j))$ , and when  $s_j \geq 1$  then  $B_j \setminus D_j$  is either empty or a singleton with element the unique  $i$  such that  $\text{rk}(i, \{i_\ell \in T : \ell \in A(j)\}) = s_j$ . Finally, if  $s_j = -1$ , then  $B_j \setminus D_j = B_{p(j)} \setminus D_{p(j)}$ .

For instance, we consider the genograms  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  shown in Figure 3. The constraint sets of the running indexes are presented in Table 1.

Secondly, as described in the roadmap, we define the *generalized covariance operator*  $\mathcal{D}^*$  on a finite sequence of random variables  $(Y_i)_{i \geq 1}$ . To do so, we also need to inductively define another operator  $\mathcal{D}$  that takes in a finite sequence of random variables and outputs a new random

variable. For any random variable  $Y$ , define

$$\mathcal{D}^*(Y) := \mathbb{E}[Y], \quad \mathcal{D}(Y) := Y - \mathcal{D}^*(Y) = Y - \mathbb{E}[Y].$$

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}$  is already defined for a random sequence of length  $t - 1$ . Then for any random variables  $Y_1, \dots, Y_t$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t) &:= \mathcal{D}(Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t)) = Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t) - \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t)], \\ \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t) &:= \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t)) = \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t)]. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for any two random variables  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$ ,  $\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, Y_2) = \text{Cov}(Y_1, Y_2)$  gives the covariance between  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$ . Here we remark that  $\mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)$  and  $\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)$  are well-defined for a tuple of  $t$  random variables  $(Y_i)_{i=1}^t$  supposing that for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $i \leq j \leq t$  we have  $\mathbb{E}[|Y_i Y_{i+1} \cdots Y_j|] < \infty$ . It is straightforward to see from the definition that both operators are multilinear. We will show more properties of them in Appendix H.

Thirdly, we construct from any genogram a new operator  $\mathcal{E}_G$  that maps from  $|G|$  random variables to a real number. Note that this  $\mathcal{E}_G$  operator will provide us with the summands in  $\mathcal{S}(G)$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_f(G)$ , and  $\mathcal{U}_f(G)$ . If  $|G| = 1$ , for any random variable  $Y$ , define  $\mathcal{E}_G(Y) := \mathcal{D}^*(Y) = \mathbb{E}[Y]$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{E}_G$  is already defined for  $|G| \leq k - 1$ . Consider the case where  $|G| = k$ . Let

$$q_0 := \sup\{j : j = 1 \text{ or } p(j) \neq j - 1 \text{ for } 2 \leq j \leq k\}, \quad (\text{B.16})$$

In other words, either  $v[q_0 - 1]$  is the leaf with the largest label smaller than  $k$ , or alternatively  $v[k]$  is the only leaf and  $q_0 = 1$ . Intuitively,  $v[q_0]$  is the starting vertex of the last branch of  $G$ . Next we set  $w := |\{t : q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq k \text{ \& } s_t \geq 0\}|$  to be the number of all indices  $q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq k$  such that the identifier  $s_t \geq 0$ . If  $w = 0$ , define

$$\mathcal{E}_G(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_k) & \text{if } q_0 = 1 \\ \mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(Y_1, \dots, Y_{q_0-1}) \cdot \mathcal{D}^*(Y_{q_0} Y_{q_0+1} \cdots Y_k) & \text{if } q_0 \geq 2 \end{cases}, \quad (\text{B.17})$$

where  $G[q_0-1] \subseteq G$  is the unique order- $(q_0-1)$  sub-genogram of  $G$  as defined in Appendix B.2.

Otherwise, we write  $\{t : q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq k \text{ \& } s_t \geq 0\} = \{q_1, \dots, q_w\}$ . Without loss of generality, we suppose that  $q_0 + 1 \leq q_1 < \dots < q_w \leq k$  is increasing. We define

$$\mathcal{E}_G(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1 \cdots Y_{q_1-1}, Y_{q_1} \cdots Y_{q_2-1}, \dots, Y_{q_w} \cdots Y_k) & \text{if } q_0 = 1 \\ \mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(Y_1, \dots, Y_{q_0-1}) \cdot \mathcal{D}^*(Y_{q_0} \cdots Y_{q_1-1}, Y_{q_1} \cdots Y_{q_2-1}, \dots, Y_{q_w} \cdots Y_k) & \text{if } q_0 \geq 2 \end{cases}. \quad (\text{B.18})$$

By definition, we can see that  $\mathcal{E}_G(Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$  is either a  $\mathcal{D}^*$  term or the product of multiple  $\mathcal{D}^*$  terms, each of which corresponds to a branch of the rooted tree  $(V, E)$ .

Taking the genograms  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  shown in Figure 3 as examples,  $\mathcal{E}_{G_1}$  and  $\mathcal{E}_{G_2}$  are provided by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{G_1}(Y_1, \dots, Y_7) &= \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, Y_2) \mathcal{D}^*(Y_3) \mathcal{D}^*(Y_4 Y_5, Y_6) \mathcal{D}^*(Y_7), \\ \mathcal{E}_{G_2}(Y_1, \dots, Y_7) &= \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) \mathcal{D}^*(Y_4, Y_5) \mathcal{D}^*(Y_6 Y_7). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we define  $\mathcal{S}(G), \mathcal{T}_f(G), \mathcal{U}_f(G)$  with respect to any genogram  $G = (V, E, s_{1:k}) \in \mathcal{G}(k)$  and function  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1}(\mathbb{R})$ .

$$\mathcal{S}(G) := \sigma^{-k} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \sum_{i_2 \in B_2 \setminus D_2} \cdots \sum_{i_k \in B_k \setminus D_k} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k-1}}, X_{i_k}), \quad (\text{B.19})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_f(G) := \sigma^{-k} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \sum_{i_2 \in B_2 \setminus D_2} \cdots \sum_{i_k \in B_k \setminus D_k} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k-1}}, X_{i_k} \partial^{k-1} f(W(D_k))), \quad (\text{B.20})$$



$$\mathcal{U}_f(G) := \sigma^{-(k-1)} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \sum_{i_2 \in B_2 \setminus D_2} \cdots \sum_{i_{k-1} \in B_{k-1} \setminus D_{k-1}} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k-1}}, \Delta_f(G)), \quad (\text{B.21})$$

where

$$\Delta_f(G) := \begin{cases} \partial^{k-2} f(W(B_k)) - \partial^{k-2} f(W(D_k)) & \text{if } u(k) = k \\ \int_0^1 (k - u(k)) v^{k-1-u(k)} \left( \partial^{k-2} f(vW(D_k) + (1-v)W(B_k)) - \partial^{k-2} f(W(D_k)) \right) dv & \text{if } u(k) \leq k-1 \end{cases}$$

is called the *adjusted  $f$ -difference*. Note that  $\Delta_f(G)$  depends on  $G$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}$  through  $B_k, D_k$  and  $u(k)$ , where  $k = |G|$ . For ease of notation, we do not write out the other dependencies  $i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}$ .

Intuitively,  $\mathcal{S}(G)$  is analogous to the  $\mathcal{S}$ -sums defined for the local dependence case while  $\mathcal{T}_f(G)$  is analogous to the  $\mathcal{T}$ -sums. And  $\mathcal{U}_f(G)$  is defined in a similar spirit to the  $\mathcal{R}$ -sums as they are both used to handle the remainders.  $\Delta_f$  is obtained from the integral-form remainders of the Taylor expansions (see (B.9) and Lemma G.3). Eventually, we would like to expand  $\mathcal{T}_f(G)$  using  $\mathcal{S}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{U}_f(H)$  for some  $H \supseteq G$  as shown in Theorem B.3.

Now we revisit the case  $k = d = 1$  discussed in Appendix B.2. We rewrite the quantities that appear in (B.8), i.e.  $\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)], E_1 + E_3, E_2, E_1, E_3 - E_{11}, E_{11}, E_4, \dots, E_7$  using the notations we have developed so far. For example,


$$\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i f(W)] = \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1} f(W(D_1))) = \mathcal{T}_f(\textcircled{\circ}), \quad (\text{B.22})$$

and  $E_2$  is written as

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &= \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, f(W_{i,m})) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \left( \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, f(W_{i,j-1}) - f(W_{i,j}^*)) + \mathcal{D}^*(X_i, f(W_{i,j}^*) - f(W_{i,j})) \right) \\ &= - \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathcal{U}_f \left( \textcircled{\circ} \textcircled{\text{---}}_{-1}^{2(j-m)} \right) - \sum_{j=m+1}^{n-1} \mathcal{U}_f \left( \textcircled{\circ} \textcircled{\text{---}}^{2(j-m)} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^{2(n-m-1)} \mathcal{U}_f \left( \textcircled{\circ} \textcircled{\text{---}}^j \right). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we can express all the other quantities in a similar way, and (B.8) will transform into the following equation (details omitted):

$$\mathcal{T}_f(\textcircled{\circ}) = -\mathcal{U}_f(\textcircled{\circ} \textcircled{\text{---}} \textcircled{\circ}) - \sum_{j=1}^{2(n-m-1)} \mathcal{U}_f(\textcircled{\circ} \textcircled{\text{---}}^j)$$

FIGURE 4. Adding a new vertex to  $G_2$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathcal{U}_f \left( \textcircled{0} - \textcircled{0} - \textcircled{-1} \right) - \sum_{j=0}^{2(n-m-1)} \mathcal{U}_f \left( \textcircled{0} - \textcircled{0} - \textcircled{j} \right) + \mathcal{S} \left( \textcircled{0} - \textcircled{0} \right) \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{2(n-m-1)} \mathcal{U}_f \left( \textcircled{0} - \textcircled{j} - \textcircled{-1} \right) - \sum_{j=1}^{2(n-m-1)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{2(n-m-1)} \mathcal{U}_f \left( \textcircled{0} - \textcircled{j} - \textcircled{\ell} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{2(n-m-1)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} \mathcal{U}_f \left( \textcircled{0} \begin{array}{l} \textcircled{j} \\ \textcircled{\ell} \end{array} \right) + \sum_{j=1}^{2(n-m-1)} \mathcal{S} \left( \textcircled{0} - \textcircled{j} \right) \mathbb{E}[f'(W)].
\end{aligned}$$

**B.3. Relating Edgeworth expansion to graphs.** Firstly, we consider how to grow a genogram by following the compatible labeling order of the vertices. Initially, there is only the root and  $|G| = 1$ . We would like  $|G|$  to increase from 1 to  $k$  after repeatedly choosing a “growing” vertex and adding a child to that vertex. In order to obtain a genogram with the compatible labeling at each step, we observe that the growing vertex needs to be  $v[|G|]$  or an ancestor of  $v[|G|]$ , which is formally stated in Lemma B.2. Moreover, a negative vertex can only be added to  $v[|G|]$  because negative vertices do not have siblings as required in the definition of genograms (see Proposition B.1c).

**Lemma B.2.** *Let  $(V, E)$  be a rooted tree with  $V := \{v[1], \dots, v[k]\}$ , whose vertex labels satisfy Proposition B.1a. Then for any  $1 \leq j \leq k-1$  either  $p(j+1) = j$  or  $p(j+1) \in A(j)$  and  $j$  is a leaf.*

The proof of Lemma B.2 is in Appendix G.

In general, a genogram can be constructed by repeating the following two operations (not necessarily consecutively):

- $G \rightsquigarrow \Omega[j, s_{|G|+1}](G)$ : Fix the growing vertex  $v[j]$  to be  $v[|G|]$  or an ancestor of  $v[|G|]$  that satisfies  $\min_{t \leq |G|: p(t)=j} \{s_t\} \geq 1$ . Add a non-negative child  $v[|G|+1]$  to  $v[j]$  and choose  $s_{|G|+1}$  to satisfy  $0 \leq s_{|G|+1} < \min_{t \leq |G|: p(t)=j} \{s_t\}$ ;
- $G \rightsquigarrow \Lambda[h](G)$ : Add a path of  $h$  negative vertices to  $v[|G|]$ . In other words,  $v[|G|+t]$  is added as the single child of  $v[|G|+t-1]$  for  $t = 1, \dots, h$ , and we set  $s_{|G|+1} = \dots = s_{|G|+h} = -1$ .

Take  $G_2$  shown in Figure 3b as an example. A negative vertex can only be added as a child of  $v[7]$  while a non-negative vertex can be added as a child of  $v[4]$  with the identifier 0, 1 or 2, a child of  $v[6]$  with identifier 0, or a child of  $v[7]$  with any non-negative identifier.

**Theorem B.3.** *Given a genogram  $G$  and an integer  $k \geq |G|$ , then the equation below holds for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1}(\mathbb{R})$*

$$\mathcal{T}_f(G) = \sum_{\substack{H \supseteq G: \\ |H| \leq k, \\ s_{|G|+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{|H|-1} f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{|G|+1} \geq 0}} b_{H,G} \mathcal{U}_f(H), \quad (\text{B.23})$$

where the coefficients  $a_{H,G}$  and  $b_{H,G}$  are provided by

$$a_{H,G} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |H| = |G| \\ (-1)^{\gamma_H - \gamma_G + \tau_H - \tau_G} \prod_{j=|G|+1}^{|H|} \frac{1}{j+1-u(j,H)} & \text{if } |H| \geq |G| + 1 \end{cases}, \quad (\text{B.24})$$

$$b_{H,G} := \begin{cases} (-1)^{\gamma_H - \gamma_G + \tau_H - \tau_G + 1} & \text{if } |H| = |G| + 1 \\ (-1)^{\gamma_H - \gamma_G + \tau_H - \tau_G + 1} \prod_{j=|G|+1}^{|H|-1} \frac{1}{j+1-u(j,H)} & \text{if } |H| \geq |G| + 2 \end{cases}. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

Here  $\gamma_G$  denotes the number of leaves on  $G$  and  $\tau_G$  is the number of negative vertices on  $G$ .

It will be useful in the future to note that for all genograms  $H \supseteq G$  with  $|H| \geq |G| + 1$  we have  $a_{H,G} = -\frac{b_{H,G}}{|H|+1-u(|H|,H)}$ .

**Lemma B.4.** *Given a genogram  $G$  and an integer  $k \geq |G|$ , suppose there exist two sets of constants that only depend on  $G$  and the joint distribution of  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$ ,  $(Q_{|G|}, \dots, Q_k)$  and  $(Q'_{|G|}, \dots, Q'_k)$ , which satisfy that for any polynomial  $f$  of degree at most  $k - 1$ ,*

$$\mathcal{T}_f(G) = \sum_{j=|G|}^k Q_j \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j-1} f(W)] = \sum_{j=|G|}^k Q'_j \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j-1} f(W)].$$

Then  $Q_j = Q'_j$  for any  $|G| \leq j \leq k$ .

**Proof.** We prove the lemma by contradiction.

Let  $j$  be the smallest number such that  $Q_j \neq Q'_j$ . Since  $Q_{|G|}, \dots, Q_k$  does not depend on  $f$ , we choose  $f(x) = cx^j$  such that  $\partial^j f(x) = cj! \neq 0$ . But  $Q_{j+1} \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j+1} f(W)] = \dots = Q_k \mathbb{E}[\partial^{k-1} f(W)] = 0$ , which implies  $cQ_j = cQ'_j$ . This is a contradiction. Therefore,  $Q_j = Q'_j$  for any  $|G| \leq j \leq k$ .  $\blacksquare$

Let  $\mathcal{P}_0(k) := \{G \in \mathcal{G}(k) : s_j \leq 0, \text{ for any } 1 \leq j \leq k\}$  denote the set of order- $k$  genograms with no positive vertex. Let  $\mathcal{G}_0(k) := \mathcal{G}(k) \setminus \mathcal{P}_0(k)$  denote the set of order- $k$  genograms with at least one positive vertex. Let  $\mathcal{P}_1(k) := \{G \in \mathcal{G}(k) : s_j \leq 0, 1 \leq j \leq k-1, s_k \geq 1\}$  be the set of order- $k$  genograms where  $v[k]$  is the only positive vertex. Note that from the compatible conditions of identifiers, we know any genogram in  $\mathcal{P}_0(k)$  or  $\mathcal{P}_1(k)$  has only one branch.

**Corollary B.5.** *Given  $k \geq 2$ , the equation below holds for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R})$*

$$\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \quad (\text{B.26})$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1}}{k!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2) \sqcup \\ \mathcal{P}_1(k+2) \sqcup \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H), \quad (\text{B.27})$$

where  $\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1}$  and  $b_H$  are defined as

$$\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1} := \kappa_{k+1}(W) + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} \frac{k! b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{S}(H), \quad (\text{B.28})$$

$$b_H := \begin{cases} (-1)^{\gamma_H + \tau_H} & \text{if } |H| = 2 \\ (-1)^{\gamma_H + \tau_H} \prod_{j=2}^{|H|-1} \frac{1}{j+1-u(j)} & \text{if } |H| \geq 3 \end{cases}. \quad (\text{B.29})$$

Here  $\gamma_H$  is the number of leaves on  $H$ , and  $\tau_H$  is the number of negative vertices on  $H$ .

*Properties of the coefficients  $b_H$ .* We remark that from the definition of  $b_H$ , it is straightforward that for any  $H$ , we have the bound  $|b_H| \leq 1$ . Moreover, if two genograms  $H_1, H_2$  share the same tree structure  $(V, E)$  and the set of negative vertices (i.e.,  $\{j : s_j = -1\}$ ), then  $b_{H_1} = b_{H_2}$ .

*Controlling the remainders.* From now on, we consider the case when  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  is an  $\alpha$ -mixing, stationary random field of mean-zero random variables (see Definition 3.2), and proceed to control the terms  $\mathcal{S}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{U}_f(H)$  in Corollary B.5 to obtain Propositions 3.6 and 4.2 and Theorem 3.4.

### APPENDIX C. PROOFS OF THE THEOREMS IN SECTION 3.3

Before jumping into the details. We present two lemmas on the normal approximation for independent random variables. Lemma C.1 provides an expansion for the difference between  $\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)]$ , where  $S_n$  is an empirical average, and  $\mathcal{N}h$ . Lemma C.2 gives an upper bound on the Wasserstein distance between the distribution of this empirical average,  $S_n$ , and the standard normal distribution.

**Lemma C.1** (Theorem 1 of [Barbour \[1986\]](#)). *For any  $p > 0$ , let  $h \in \Lambda_p$  and  $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  where  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  are independent, with  $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[S_n^2] = 1$ . Then it follows that*

$$\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathcal{N}h = \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(\lceil p \rceil - 1)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(S_n)}{(s_j+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r (\partial^{s_j+1} \Theta) h \right] + \mathcal{O} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_i|^{p+2}] \right), \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where the first sum is over  $\Gamma(\lceil p \rceil - 1) := \{r, s_{1:r} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{j=1}^r s_j \leq \lceil p \rceil - 1\}$ .

We can see that Lemma C.1 and Theorem 3.4 look quite similar to one another with the only differences being the dependence structures of  $(X_i^{(n)})$  and the remainder terms in the expansions. This similarity inspires the proof of Theorem 3.7. To illustrate this, imagine that there would exist some *i.i.d.* random variables  $(\xi_i^{(n)})_{i=1}^{q_n}$  and a large sample size  $q_n$  such that the first  $\lceil p \rceil + 1$  cumulants of  $V_n := q_n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \xi_i^{(n)}$  match with those of  $W_n$ , then the expansion (4.5) and in (C.1) would be almost identical, and the difference between those would be controlled by the remainder terms  $(R_{j,1,n})$  and  $(R_{j,\omega,n})$ . If those remainder terms are small then we could exploit the asymptotic normality of  $V_n$  to obtain the asymptotic normality of  $W_n$ . We show that such a sequence exists when  $|I_n|$  is large.

**Lemma C.2** (Theorem 1.1 of [Bobkov \[2018\]](#)). *For any  $p \geq 1$ , let  $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  where  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  are independent and satisfy that  $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[S_n^2] = 1$ . Then it follows that*

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(S_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \leq C_p \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_i|^{p+2}] \right)^{1/p}, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where  $C_p$  continuously depends on  $p$ .

Moreover, we introduce the following lemma proposed by [Liu and Austern \[2023\]](#).

**Lemma C.3** (Cumulant Matching). *Let  $p \geq 1$  and  $k := \lceil p \rceil$ . If  $p > 1$ , let  $(u_j^{(n)})_{j=1}^{k-1}$  be a sequence of real numbers. Suppose that for any  $j = 1, \dots, k-1$ , we have  $u_j^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then there exist constants  $C_p, C'_p$  only depending on  $p$  and a positive value  $N > 0$  (that might depend on  $(u_j^{(n)})$ ) such that for any  $n > N$ , there exists  $q_n \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and a random variable  $\xi^{(n)}$  such that*

$$(a) \quad \mathbb{E}[\xi^{(n)}] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}[(\xi^{(n)})^2] = 1;$$

- (b)  $\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)}) = q_n^{j/2} u_j^{(n)}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, k-1$ ;
- (c) Either  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)})| = 0$  or  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)})| \geq C_p > 0$ ;
- (d)  $\mathbb{E}[|\xi^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \leq C'_p$ .

Furthermore,  $q_n$  can be chosen to be such that  $q_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $|I| \rightarrow \infty$ .

We note that the condition that  $u_j^{(n)} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  is crucial. Lemma C.3 is an asymptotic statement in the sense that for a given  $n \leq N$ ,  $q_n$  and  $\xi^{(n)}$  might not exist. Intuitively, Lemma C.3a and Lemma C.3b determines the cumulants of  $\xi^{(n)}$  and relates them to the cumulants of  $W_n$ . Lemma C.3c requires that the maximum  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)})|$  is either 0 or bounded away from 0 as  $n$  grows. And Lemma C.3d indicates that the  $(p+2)$ -th absolute moment is upper-bounded.

The proofs of our main results work in three stages:

- (1) Using Lemma C.3 we find a sequence of *i.i.d.* random variables  $(\xi_\ell^{(n)})_\ell$  and a sample size  $q_n$  such that the first  $k+1$  cumulants of  $W_n$  match the first  $k+1$  cumulants of  $V_n := q_n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{q_n} \xi_i^{(n)}$ ;
- (2) Using Lemma A.3 we remark that we can bound the Wasserstein distance between the distributions of  $W_n$  and an empirical average,  $V_n$ , of *i.i.d.* observations in terms of  $|\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(V_n)]|$  for a large class of functions  $h$ . We do so by exploiting Lemma C.1 and Theorem 3.4;
- (3) We remark that Lemma C.2 provides us with the bound on the Wasserstein distance between the distribution of  $V_n$  and the standard normal.

Then Theorem 3.7 follows from the triangle inequality of the Wasserstein metric:

$$\mathcal{W}_p(W_n, \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{L}(V_n)) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(V_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)).$$

Notably in Step 2 we need lemmas on the high-order smooth Edgeworth expansion for the  $\alpha$ -mixing fields, for which purpose we utilize Theorem 3.4 for the proof of Theorem 3.7 and introduce Theorem C.4 for the proof of Theorem 3.8. Furthermore, Proposition 3.5 and Corollary 3.9 are directly applications of Theorems 3.7 and 3.8 for random fields with  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients converging at a polynomial rate.

**Proof of Theorem 3.7.** By Theorem 3.4, we know that  $|\kappa_{j+2}(W_n)| \lesssim M_{1,n}^{j/p} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $M_{1,n}$  is defined in (3.3). Apply Lemma C.3 with  $u_j^{(n)} = \kappa_{j+2}(W_n)$  where  $j \in [k-1]$ . For  $n$  large enough, there exist constants  $C_p$  and  $C'_p$  (that do not depend on  $n$ ) and positive integers  $(q_n)$  and random variables  $(\xi^{(n)})$  such that

- (a)  $\mathbb{E}[\xi^{(n)}] = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[(\xi^{(n)})^2] = 1$ ;
- (b)  $\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)}) = q_n^{j/2} \kappa_{j+2}(W_n)$  for  $j \in [k-1]$ ;
- (c) Either  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)})| = 0$  or  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)})| \geq C_p > 0$ ;
- (d)  $\mathbb{E}[|\xi^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \leq C'_p$ .

Furthermore, we know that  $(q_n)$  satisfy  $q_n \rightarrow \infty$  diverges to infinity as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

We will use this to bound the distance between the distribution of  $W_n$  to the one of an empirical average of at least  $q_n$  *i.i.d.* random variables. Again we introduce an alternative sequence  $(\tilde{q}_n)$  that can be lower-bounded for all cases. In specific, we let  $\tilde{q}_n := |T|^{2(p+1)/p} \vee q_n$  if  $\kappa_3(W_n) = \dots = \kappa_{k+1}(W_n) = 0$ , and  $\tilde{q}_n := q_n$  otherwise. Then we still have  $\tilde{q}_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let  $\xi_1^{(n)}, \dots, \xi_{\tilde{q}_n}^{(n)}$  be *i.i.d.* copies of  $\xi^{(n)}$ . Define  $V_n := \tilde{q}_n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \xi_i^{(n)}$ .

By construction for any  $j \in [k-1]$  we have

$$\kappa_{j+2}(V_n) = \tilde{q}_n^{-(j+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \kappa_{j+2}(\xi_i^{(n)}) = \tilde{q}_n^{-j/2} \kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)}) = \kappa_{j+2}(W_n).$$

Thus, by Lemma C.1 and Theorem 3.4, for any  $h \in \Lambda_p$  we have

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(V_n)]| \lesssim M_{1,n} + \tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}]. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

To be able to have this upper bound not depend on  $\xi^{(n)}$  we will upper-bound

$$\tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}]$$

in terms of  $M_{1,n}$ . To do so we use the lower bounds on  $(\tilde{q}_n)$  implied by their choice.

If  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(W_n)| > 0$ , item (c) implies that there exists

$$C_p \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi_1^{(n)})| \stackrel{(*)}{=} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \{\tilde{q}_n^{j/2} |\kappa_{j+2}(W_n)|\} \stackrel{(**)}{\lesssim} \max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \{\tilde{q}_n^{j/2} M_{1,n}^{j/p}\},$$

where to get  $(*)$  we use item (b) and to get  $(**)$  we use Theorem 3.4. Thus, the following holds

$$\tilde{q}_n^{p/2} = (\tilde{q}_n^{-j_0/2})^{p/j_0} \lesssim M_{1,n},$$

where  $j_0$  is the integer satisfying that  $|\kappa_{j_0+2}(\xi^{(n)})| = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)})|$ . Note that  $M_{1,n}$  does not depend on the value of  $j_0$  anymore.

On the other hand, if  $\kappa_{j+2}(W_n) = 0$  for any  $j \in [k-1]$ , then by definitions we have  $\tilde{q}_n \geq |T_n|^{2(p+1)/p}$ . Moreover, by Hölder's inequality we obtain that

$$\sum_{i \in T_n} \mathbb{E}[|X_i^{(n)}|^2] \leq |T_n|^{p/(p+2)} \left( \sum_{i \in T_n} \mathbb{E}[|X_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \right)^{2/(p+2)}, \quad (\text{C.4})$$

and that

$$\left( \sum_{i \in T_n} X_i^{(n)} \right)^2 \leq |T_n| \sum_{i \in T_n} |X_i^{(n)}|^2. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Since  $\sigma_n^2 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i \in T_n} X_i^{(n)} \right)^2 \right]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}_n^{-p/2} &\leq |T_n|^{-(p+1)} \sigma_n^{-(p+2)} \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i \in T_n} X_i^{(n)} \right)^2 \right] \right)^{(p+2)/2} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \sigma_n^{-(p+2)} |T_n|^{-p/2} \left( \sum_{i \in T_n} \mathbb{E}[|X_i^{(n)}|^2] \right)^{(p+2)/2} \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} \sigma_n^{-(p+2)} \sum_{i \in T_n} \mathbb{E}[|X_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \lesssim |T_n|^{-p/2} \leq M_{1,n}, \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain  $(*)$  we use (C.5) and to obtain  $(**)$  we use (C.4).

Thus, using item (d) and the fact that  $\xi_1^{(n)}, \dots, \xi_{\tilde{q}_n}^{(n)}$  are *i.i.d.*, we obtain

$$\tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \leq C'_p \tilde{q}_n^{-p/2} \lesssim M_{1,n}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Therefore, by combining this with (C.3) we have that there is a constant  $K > 0$  that does not depend on  $h$  such that

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(V_n)]| \leq KM_{1,n}.$$

By taking supremum over  $h \in \Lambda_p$  and by Lemma A.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{L}(V_n)) &\lesssim \sup_{h \in \Lambda_p} |\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(V_n)]|^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \left( M_{1,n} + \tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \right)^{1/p} \lesssim M_{1,n}^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by combining Lemma C.2 and (C.6) we have

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(V_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \lesssim \left( \tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \right)^{1/p} \lesssim M_{1,n}^{1/p}.$$

Therefore, as the Wasserstein distance  $\mathcal{W}_p$  satisfies the triangle inequality we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) &\leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{L}(V_n)) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(V_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \\ &\lesssim M_{1,n}^{1/p} \lesssim |T_n|^{-1/2} + |T_n|^{-1/2} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-\omega} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

■

In order to prove Theorem 3.8, we need the following result, which is a refined version of Theorem 3.4 when  $p$  is an integer.

**Theorem C.4.** *Let  $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$ . Set  $(T_n) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$  be an increasing sequence of finite index sets such that  $|T_n| \rightarrow \infty$  and let  $(X_i^{(n)})_{i \in T_n}$  be a real-valued random field with  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients  $(\alpha_{\ell,n})_{\ell \geq 1}$ . Suppose that  $\mathbb{E}[X_i^{(n)}] = 0$ ,  $\sup_{n,i} \mathbb{E}[|X_i^{(n)}|^r] < \infty$  for some  $r > p + 2$ , and that the non-degeneracy condition  $\liminf_n \sigma_n^2/|T_n| > 0$  holds, where  $\sigma_n^2 := \text{Var}\left(\sum_{i \in T_n} X_i^{(n)}\right)$ . Denote  $W_n := \sigma_n^{-1} \sum_{i \in T_n} X_i$ . Furthermore, suppose that the mixing coefficients satisfy that*

$$\sup_n \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1)/r} \leq M_0 < \infty.$$

For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and  $\delta \in [0, 1]$  ( $m$  and  $\delta$  can depend on  $n$ ), let

$$\begin{aligned} M_{2,m,\delta,n} &:= |T_n|^{-p/2} m^{2dp} + |T_n|^{-(p-1+\delta)/2} m^{dp} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1-\delta)/r} \\ &\quad + |T_n|^{-(p-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1)/r}. \end{aligned} \tag{C.7}$$

If  $M_{2,m,\delta,n} \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then for any  $j \in [p-1]$ , we have  $\kappa_{j+2}(W_n) = \mathcal{O}(M_{2,m,\delta,n}^{j/p})$ , and that there exists  $\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n} = \mathcal{O}(M_{2,m,\delta,n}^{(p-1)/p})$  depending on  $p$  and the joint distribution of  $(X_i)_{i \in T_n}$

such that for any  $h \in \Lambda_p$  the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathcal{N}h &= \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(p-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(W_n)}{(s_j+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r (\partial^{s_j+1} \Theta) h \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n} - \kappa_{p+1}(W_n)}{p!} \mathcal{N} [\partial^p \Theta h] + \mathcal{O}(M_{2,m,\delta,n}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Theorem C.4 will also be proven along with Theorem 3.4 in Appendix D. We remark that Theorem C.4 is different from Theorem 3.4 in the following ways:

- $p$  is required to be an integer (this is mainly due to the proof technique we use),
- The remainder is controlled using  $M_{2,m,\delta,n}$  instead of  $M_{1,n}$ , which will lead to different convergence rates in the theorem,
- $\kappa_{p+1}(W_n)$  is replaced by  $\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n}$ .

Note that in general  $M_{1,n}$  does not dominate  $M_{2,m,\delta,n}$ , and vice versa, which leads to different conditions and convergence rates for the Wasserstein- $p$  distance in Theorems 3.7 and 3.8.

**Proof of Theorem 3.8.** We follow techniques similar to the proof of Theorem 3.7. By Theorem C.4, we have that  $|\kappa_{j+2}(W_n)| \lesssim M_{2,m,\delta,n}^{j/p} \rightarrow 0$  for any  $j \in [p-1]$  and  $|\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n}| \lesssim M_{2,m,\delta,n}^{(p-1)/p} \rightarrow 0$  as  $|T_n| \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $M_{2,m,\delta,n}$  is given in (C.7).

We will repeat all the derivation in the proof of Theorem 3.7 with  $\kappa_{p+1}(W_n)$  replaced by  $\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n}$  and  $M_{1,n}$  replaced by  $M_{2,m,\delta,n}$ . We now apply Lemma C.3 with  $u_j^{(n)} = \kappa_{j+2}(W_n)$  where  $j \in [p-2]$  and  $u_{p-1}^{(n)} = \tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n}$ . For any index set  $T_n$  with  $n$  large enough, there exist constants  $C_p$  and  $C'_p$  (that do not depend on  $n$ ) and positive integers ( $q_n$ ) and random variables ( $\xi^{(n)}$ ) such that

- $\mathbb{E}[\xi^{(n)}] = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[(\xi^{(n)})^2] = 1$ ;
- $\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)}) = q_n^{j/2} \kappa_{j+2}(W_n)$  for  $j \in [p-2]$ ,  $\kappa_{p+1}(\xi^{(n)}) = q_n^{(p-1)/2} \tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n}$ ;
- Either  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)})| = 0$  or  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)})| \geq C_p > 0$ ;
- $\mathbb{E}[|\xi^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \leq C'_p$ .

Furthermore, we know that  $q_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Again we will bound the distance between the distribution of  $W_n$  to the one of an empirical average of at least  $q_n$  *i.i.d.* random variables, and will need the lower bounds on ( $q_n$ ) for the convergence of the distribution of the empirical average to a standard normal. Thus, we introduce an alternative sequence ( $\tilde{q}_n$ ) by setting  $\tilde{q}_n := |T_n|^{2(p+1)/p} \vee q_n$  if  $\kappa_3(W_n) = \dots = \kappa_p(W_n) = \tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n} = 0$ , and  $\tilde{q}_n := q_n$  otherwise. Then we still have  $(\tilde{q}_n) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $|T_n| \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let  $\xi_1^{(n)}, \dots, \xi_{\tilde{q}_n}^{(n)}$  be *i.i.d.* copies of  $\xi^{(n)}$ . Define  $V_n := \tilde{q}_n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \xi_i^{(n)}$ .

By construction, for any integer  $j$  such that  $1 \leq j \leq p-1$ , we have

$$\kappa_{j+2}(V_n) = \tilde{q}_n^{-(j+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \kappa_{j+2}(\xi_i^{(n)}) = \tilde{q}_n^{-j/2} \kappa_{j+2}(\xi^{(n)}) = \begin{cases} \kappa_{j+2}(W_n) & 1 \leq j \leq p-2 \\ \tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n} & j = p-1 \end{cases}.$$

Thus, by Lemma C.1 and Theorem C.4, for any  $h \in \Lambda_p$ , we have

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(V_n)]| \lesssim M_{2,m,\delta,n} + \tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}]. \quad (\text{C.9})$$



To be able to have this upper bound not depend on  $\xi^{(n)}$  we will upper-bound

$$\tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}]$$

in terms of  $M_{2,m,\delta,n}$ . To do so we utilize the lower bounds on  $(\tilde{q}_n)$  implied by its choice.

If  $|\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n}| \vee \max_{1 \leq j \leq p-2} |\kappa_{j+2}(W_n)| > 0$ , item (c) implies that there exists

$$C_p \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p-1} |\kappa_{j+2}(\xi_1^{(n)})| \stackrel{(*)}{\lesssim} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p-1} \{\tilde{q}_n^{j/2} M_{2,m,\delta,n}^{j/p}\},$$

where we use item (b) and Theorem C.4 in (\*). Thus, we have the following inequality for some  $j_0 \in [p-1]$

$$\tilde{q}_n^{-p/2} = (\tilde{q}_n^{-j_0/2})^{p/j_0} \lesssim M_{2,m,\delta,n}.$$

On the other hand, if  $\kappa_3(W_n) = \dots = \kappa_p(W_n) = \tilde{\kappa}_{p+1,n} = 0$ , we get  $\tilde{q}_n \geq |T_n|^{2(p+1)/p}$  by definition of  $\tilde{q}_n$ . Since  $\sigma_n^2 = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i \in T_n} X_i^{(n)}\right)^2\right]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{q}_n^{-p/2} &= |T_n|^{-(p+1)} \sigma_n^{-(p+2)} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i \in T_n} X_i^{(n)}\right)^2\right]\right)^{(p+2)/2} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \sigma_n^{-(p+2)} |T_n|^{-p/2} \left(\sum_{i \in T_n} \mathbb{E}[|X_i^{(n)}|^2]\right)^{(p+2)/2} \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} \sigma_n^{-(p+2)} \sum_{i \in T} \mathbb{E}[|X_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \lesssim |T_n|^{-p/2} \leq M_{2,m,\delta,n}, \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (\*) we use (C.5) and to obtain (\*\*) we use (C.4).

Thus, using item (d) and the fact that  $\xi_1^{(n)}, \dots, \xi_{\tilde{q}_n}^{(n)}$  are *i.i.d.*, we obtain

$$\tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}] \leq C'_p \tilde{q}_n^{-p/2} \lesssim M_{2,m,\delta,n}. \quad (\text{C.10})$$

By taking supremum over  $h \in \Lambda_p$  and by Lemma A.3, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{L}(V_n)) &\lesssim \sup_{h \in \Lambda_p} |\mathbb{E}[h(W_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(V_n)]|^{1/p} \\ &\lesssim \left(M_{2,m,\delta,n} + \tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}]\right)^{1/p} \lesssim M_{2,m,\delta,n}^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by combining Lemma C.2 and (C.10) we have

$$\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(V_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \lesssim \left(\tilde{q}_n^{-(p+2)/2} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{q}_n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^{(n)}|^{p+2}]\right)^{1/p} \lesssim M_{2,m,\delta,n}^{1/p}.$$

Therefore, as the Wasserstein distance  $\mathcal{W}_p$  satisfies the triangle inequality we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{L}(V_n)) + \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(V_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \lesssim M_{2,m,\delta,n}^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim |T_n|^{-1/2} m^{2d} + |T_n|^{-1/2+(1-\delta)/(2p)} m^d \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1-\delta)/r} \right)^{1/p} \\ &+ |T_n|^{-1/2+1/(2p)} \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1)/r} \right)^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

■

As an application of Theorem 3.8, we show Corollary C.5.

**Corollary C.5.** *For  $p = 1$ , the Wasserstein distance  $\mathcal{W}_1(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$  converges to 0 as long as the moment and non-degeneracy conditions in Theorem 3.8 hold with  $r \geq 3$  and  $\alpha_{\ell,n}$  satisfies that*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_n \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-2)/r} &< \infty; \\ \sup_n \sum_{\ell=m}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-2-\epsilon)/r} &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } m \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{for some } \epsilon > 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof of Corollary C.5.** We apply Theorem 3.8 with  $p = 1$ ,  $\delta = \epsilon$ ,  $m \asymp |T_n|^{\frac{\epsilon \wedge (1/3)}{2d}}$ . Then  $m \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Since

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-2)/r} \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-2-\epsilon)/r},$$

the mixing condition I of Theorem 3.8 is satisfied. Now we check that

$$\begin{aligned} |T_n|^{-1/2} m^{2d} &\lesssim |T_n|^{-1/2+\epsilon} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \\ |T_n|^{-\epsilon/2} m^d \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\epsilon-\epsilon} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-2-\epsilon)/r} &\lesssim \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-2-\epsilon)/r}, \\ \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-2)/r} &\leq \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-2-\epsilon)/r}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $m \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have that by assumption  $\sum_{\ell=m+1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-2-\epsilon)/r}$  converges to zero. Thus, mixing condition II of Theorem 3.8 is also satisfied and the result follows. ■

Lastly, we prove Corollary 3.9 by applying Theorem 3.8 to random fields with  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients that converge at a polynomial rate, and combining the results of Proposition 3.5.

**Proof of Corollary 3.9.**

If  $u \geq d(p+1)$ , the results are directly implied by Proposition 3.5.

If  $dp < u < d(p+1)$ , on one hand, Proposition 3.5 gives that  $\beta \geq 1/2 + u/(dp) - (p+1)/p$ . On the other hand, we apply Theorem 3.8 with  $\delta = 1$  and  $m \asymp |T_n|^{\frac{1}{2(u+dp)}}$ . Then we have

$$|T_n|^{-1/2} m^{2d} \asymp |T_n|^{-1/2+d/(u+dp)},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |T_n|^{-1/2+(1-\delta)/(2p)} m^d \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1-\delta)/r} \right)^{1/p} \\
& \asymp |T_n|^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{d}{2(u+dp)} - \frac{u-d}{2(u+dp)p}} \lesssim |T_n|^{-1/2+d/(u+dp)}, \\
& |T_n|^{-1/2+1/(2p)} \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1)/r} \right)^{1/p} \\
& \asymp |T_n|^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2p} - \frac{u-dp}{2(u+dp)p}} = |T_n|^{-1/2+d/(u+dp)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Theorem 3.8 we get  $\mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-1/2+d/(u+dp)})$ .

If  $u = dp$ , apply Theorem 3.8 with  $\delta = m = 1$  and get that

$$\begin{aligned}
& |T_n|^{-1/2} m^{2d} \asymp |T_n|^{-1/2}, \\
& |T_n|^{-1/2+(1-\delta)/(2p)} m^d \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1-\delta)/r} \right)^{1/p} \\
& \leq |T_n|^{-1/2} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lceil |T_n|^{1/d} \rceil} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{1/p} \asymp |T_n|^{-1/2} \log|T_n|, \\
& |T_n|^{-1/2+1/(2p)} \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1)/r} \right)^{1/p} \\
& \leq |T_n|^{-1/2+1/(2p)} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lceil |T_n|^{1/d} \rceil} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{1/p} \asymp |T_n|^{-1/2+1/(2p)} \log|T_n|.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) \\
& = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-1/2}) + \mathcal{O}\left(|T_n|^{-1/2+1/(2p)} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{-1}\right) \\
& = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-1/2+1/(2p)} \log|T_n|).
\end{aligned}$$

If  $d(p+1)/2 < u < dp$ , the results also follows from Theorem 3.8 as

$$\begin{aligned}
& |T_n|^{-1/2} m^{2d} \asymp |T_n|^{-1/2}, \\
& |T_n|^{-1/2+(1-\delta)/(2p)} m^d \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1-\delta)/r} \right)^{1/p} \\
& \leq |T_n|^{-1/2} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-u-1} \right)^{1/p} \asymp |T_n|^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{dp-u}{dp}},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& |T_n|^{-1/2+1/(2p)} \left( \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T_n|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-1)/r} \right)^{1/p} \\
& \lesssim |T_n|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2p}+\frac{dp-u}{dp}} = |T_n|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2p+1}{2p}-\frac{u}{dp}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, Corollary 3.9 is proven.  $\blacksquare$

#### APPENDIX D. PROOFS OF THE THEOREMS IN SECTION 3.2 AND THEOREM C.4

**Proof of Proposition 3.6.** Applying Proposition 4.2 with  $f(x) = x^k/k! \in \Lambda_k$  where  $\Lambda_k := \{f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1,1}(\mathbb{R}) : |f|_{k-1,1} \leq 1\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[W f(W)] &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] \\
&+ \mathcal{O}\left(|T|^{-(k-1)/2} \left( m^{dk} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r} \right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (G.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[W f(W)] &= \frac{1}{k!} \mu_{k+1}(W) = \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} \kappa_{j+1}(W) \mu_{k-j}(W) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \frac{\kappa_{k+1}(W)}{k!}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$|\kappa_{k+1}(W)| \lesssim |T|^{-(k-1)/2} \left( m^{dk} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r} \right).$$

$\blacksquare$

**Proof of Theorem 3.4.** Let  $k := \lceil p \rceil$ . For convenience, for any  $j \in [k-1]$ , we denote

$$\widehat{R}_{j,\omega} := |T|^{-(j+\omega-1)/2} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(j+\omega)-\omega} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-j-2)/r} \right).$$

Then we have that  $M_1 = \widehat{R}_{k,\omega}$ , and that by Proposition 3.6,  $|\kappa_{j+2}(W)| \lesssim \widehat{R}_{j,1}$ .

Firstly, we perform induction on  $k$  to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h &= \sum_{(r,s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(k-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(W)}{(s_j+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r (\partial^{s_j+1} \Theta) h \right] \\
&+ \mathcal{O}\left( \sum_{\binom{k}{(k)}} \widehat{R}_{s_{1,1}} \widehat{R}_{s_{2,1}} \cdots \widehat{R}_{s_{r-1,1}} \widehat{R}_{s_r,\omega} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{D.1}$$

where  $\Gamma(k-1) = \{r, s_{1:r} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : s_1 + \cdots + s_r = k-1\}$ .

For  $p = 1$ , by Lemma 4.1,  $f = \Theta h \in \mathcal{C}^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ . Both  $|f|_{0,1}$  and  $|f|_{1,1}$  is bounded by some constant. By the Stein equation and (4.5), we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h &= \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] - \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(|T|^{-1/2}\left(1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{2d-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-3)/r}\right)\right) = \mathcal{O}(\widehat{R}_{1,1}). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose the proposition holds for  $1 \leq p \leq k-1$  ( $k \geq 2$ ), consider the case of  $k-1 < p \leq k$  ( $p = k + \omega - 1$ ). By Lemma 4.1,  $f = \Theta h \in \mathcal{C}^{k+1,\omega}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $|f|_{k+1,\omega}$  is bounded by some constant that only depends on  $p$ . Thus, by (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h &= \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] - \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] \\ &= -\sum_{j=2}^k \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \mathcal{O}\left(|T|^{-p/2}\left(1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-\omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r}\right)\right) \\ &= -\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h(W)] + \mathcal{O}(\widehat{R}_{k,\omega}). \end{aligned}$$

Noting that  $\partial^{j+1} \Theta h \in \mathcal{C}^{k-j-1,\omega}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $|\partial^{j+1} \Theta h|_{k-j-1,\omega}$  is bounded by a constant only depending on  $k$ , the inductive hypothesis shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h(W)] - \mathcal{N}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h] \\ &= \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(k-j-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{\ell=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_\ell+2}(W)}{(s_\ell+1)!} \mathcal{N}\left[\prod_{\ell=1}^r (\partial^{s_\ell+1} \Theta) \circ \partial^{j+1} \Theta h\right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(k-j)} \widehat{R}_{s_{1,1},1} \cdots \widehat{R}_{s_{r-1,1},1} \widehat{R}_{s_r,\omega}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here we use  $\Gamma(k-j) = \{r, s_{1:r} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{\ell=1}^r s_\ell \leq k-j\}$ .

Since  $|\kappa_{j+2}(W)| \lesssim \widehat{R}_{j,1}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h &= -\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h(W)] + \mathcal{O}(\widehat{R}_{k,1}) \\ &= -\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \mathcal{N}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(k-j-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{\ell=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_\ell+2}(W)}{(s_\ell+1)!} \mathcal{N}\left[\prod_{\ell=1}^r (\partial^{s_\ell+1} \Theta) \circ \partial^{j+1} \Theta h\right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}\left(\widehat{R}_{k,\omega} + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \widehat{R}_{j,1} \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(k-j)} \widehat{R}_{s_{1,1},1} \cdots \widehat{R}_{s_{r-1,1},1} \widehat{R}_{s_r,\omega}\right) \\ &= \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(k-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{\ell=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_\ell+2}(W)}{(s_\ell+1)!} \mathcal{N}\left[\prod_{\ell=1}^r (\partial^{s_\ell+1} \Theta) h\right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(k)} \widehat{R}_{s_{1,1},1} \cdots \widehat{R}_{s_{r-1,1},1} \widehat{R}_{s_r,\omega}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By induction, (D.1) is true for any non-negative integer  $k$ .

Next we prove

$$\widehat{R}_{s_1,1} \cdots \widehat{R}_{s_{r-1},1} \widehat{R}_{s_r,\omega} \leq \widehat{R}_{k,\omega} (1+M)^k, \quad \text{for any } s_1 + \cdots + s_r = k, s_j \geq 1, 1 \leq j \leq r. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

In fact, by Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_{j,1} &\leq |T|^{-j/2} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d(j+1)-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right) \\ &\leq |T|^{-j/2} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d(k+\omega)-\omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{\frac{jd}{kd-(d-1)(1-\omega)}} \\ &\quad \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d(j+1)-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{\frac{(k-j)d-(d-1)(1-\omega)}{kd-(d-1)(1-\omega)}}, \\ \widehat{R}_{j,\omega} &\leq |T|^{-(j+\omega-1)/2} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right) \\ &\leq |T|^{-(j+\omega-1)/2} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d(k+\omega)-\omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{\frac{jd-(d-1)(1-\omega)}{kd-(d-1)(1-\omega)}} \\ &\quad \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{\frac{(k-j)d}{kd-(d-1)(1-\omega)}}. \end{aligned}$$

By substituting them into (D.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{R}_{s_1,1} \cdots \widehat{R}_{s_{r-1},1} \widehat{R}_{s_r,\omega} \\ &\leq |T|^{-(k+\omega-1)} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d(k+\omega)-\omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right) \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^k \\ &\leq \widehat{R}_{k,\omega} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^k \leq \widehat{R}_{k,\omega} (1+M)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $M < \infty$  by assumption and  $M_1 = \widehat{R}_{k,\omega}$ . (3.4) is proven.

Finally, we prove  $|\kappa_{j+2}(W)| \lesssim M_1^{j/p}$  for any  $1 \leq j \leq p-1$ . In fact, by Hölder's inequality again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_{j,1} &\leq |T|^{-j/2} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d(j+1)-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right) \\ &\leq |T|^{-j/2} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d(k+\omega)-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{\frac{j}{k+\omega-1}} \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor T \rfloor^{1/d}} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right)^{\frac{k+\omega-1-j}{k+\omega-1}} \\ &\leq M_1^{j/p} (1+M)^{\frac{k+\omega-1-j}{k+\omega-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get the upper bounds for the cumulants in terms of  $M_1$ :

$$|\kappa_{j+2}(W)| \lesssim \widehat{R}_{j,1} \lesssim M_1^{j/p}, \quad \text{for any } 1 \leq j \leq p-1.$$

Theorem 3.4 is proven.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Proposition 3.5.** By assumption we know  $\alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \leq C\ell^{-(u-\omega+1)}$ . Thus, we have

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-\omega} \alpha_{\ell,n}^{(r-p-2)/r} \lesssim \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-\omega} \ell^{u-\omega+1} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-u-1}.$$

If  $u > d(p+1)$ , then we have  $d(p+1) - u - 1 < -1$ . Thus, the sum is finite and does not depend on  $n$ , which implies that  $M_{1,n} = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-p/2})$ .

If  $u = d(p+1)$ , then similarly we have

$$M_{1,n} = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-p/2}) + \mathcal{O}\left(|T_n|^{-p/2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{-1}\right) = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-p/2} \log |T_n|).$$

Lastly if  $d(p/2 + 1) < u < d(p+1)$ , we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} M_{1,n} &= \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-p/2}) + \mathcal{O}\left(|T_n|^{-p/2} \sum_{\ell=1}^{\lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-u-1}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-p/2} \lfloor |T_n|^{1/d} \rfloor^{d(p+1)-u}) = \mathcal{O}(|T_n|^{-p/2-u/d+(p+1)}), \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Now let's prove Theorem C.4.

**Proof of Theorem C.4.** Note that  $p$  is required to be an integer in this lemma. For convenience, for any  $k \in [p]$ , we denote

$$\widehat{R}_k := |T|^{-k/2} \left( m^{d(k+1)} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+1)-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-2)/r} \right).$$

Then by Proposition 3.6,  $|\kappa_{k+2}(W)| \lesssim \widehat{R}_k$ .

Also denote

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{R}_p &:= |T|^{-p/2} m^{d(p+1)} + |T|^{-(p-1+\delta)/2} m^{d(p-1)} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-p-1-\delta)/r} \\ &\quad + |T|^{-(p-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-p-1)/r}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by definition  $\widetilde{R}_p \leq M_{2,m,\delta}$ .

Firstly, we perform induction on  $p$  to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h \\ &= \sum_{(r,s_1,r) \in \Gamma(p-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(W)}{(s_j+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r (\partial^{s_j+1} \Theta) h \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{j=1}^p \widehat{R}_j^{p/j}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(p-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(W)}{(s_j+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r (\partial^{s_j+1} \Theta) h \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1} - \kappa_{p+1}(W)}{k!} \mathcal{N} [\partial^p \Theta h] + \mathcal{O} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \widehat{R}_j^{p/j} + \widetilde{R}_p \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{D.4}$$

where  $\Gamma(p-1) = \{r, s_{1:r} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{\ell=1}^r s_\ell \leq p-1\}$ .

For  $p=1$ , by Lemma 4.1,  $f = \Theta h \in \mathcal{C}^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ . Both  $|f|_{0,1}$  and  $|f|_{1,1}$  is bounded by some constant. By Stein equation and (4.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h = \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] - \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left( |T|^{-1/2} \left( m^{2d} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{2d-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-3)/r} \right) \right) = \mathcal{O}(\widehat{R}_1).
\end{aligned}$$

By (G.22), we also have

$$\mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h = \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] - \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = (1 - \tilde{\kappa}_2) \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] + \mathcal{O}(\widetilde{R}_1).$$

Suppose the proposition holds for  $1, \dots, p-1$ , consider the case of  $p$ . By Lemma 4.1,  $f = \Theta h \in \mathcal{C}^{p,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{p+1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ . Both  $|f|_{p,1}$  and  $|f|_{p+1,1}$  are bounded by some constant that only depends on  $p$ . Thus, by (G.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h = \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] - \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] \\
&= - \sum_{j=2}^p \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] \\
&\quad + \mathcal{O} \left( |T|^{-p/2} \left( m^{d(p+1)} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(p+1)-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-2)/r} \right) \right) \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h(W)] + \mathcal{O}(\widehat{R}_p),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h = \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] - \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] \\
&= - \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h(W)] - \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1}}{p!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^p \Theta h(W)] + \mathcal{O}(\widetilde{R}_p),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1}$  is some constant that only depends on the joint distribution of  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$ , and it satisfies that

$$|\tilde{\kappa}_{p+1} - \kappa_{p+1}(W)| \lesssim |T|^{-(p-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-p-1)/r} < \widetilde{R}_p.$$

Noting that  $\partial^{j+1} \Theta h \in \mathcal{C}^{p-j-1,1}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $|\partial^{j+1} \Theta h|_{p-j-1,1}$  is bounded by a constant only depending on  $k$ , the inductive hypothesis is given by

$$\mathbb{E}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h(W)] - \mathcal{N}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h]$$



$$= \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(p-j-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{\ell=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_\ell+2}(W)}{(s_\ell+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{\ell=1}^r (\partial^{s_\ell+1} \Theta) \circ \partial^{j+1} \Theta h \right] + \mathcal{O} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-j} \widehat{R}_\ell^{(p-j)/\ell} \right).$$

Here we use  $\Gamma(p-j-1) = \{r, s_{1:r} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{\ell=1}^r s_\ell \leq p-j-1\}$ .

By Proposition 3.6 and Young's inequality, we have the following bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} |\kappa_{j+2}(W) \widehat{R}_\ell^{(p-j)/\ell}| &\lesssim \widehat{R}_j \widehat{R}_\ell^{(p-j)/\ell} \leq \widehat{R}_j^{p/j} + \widehat{R}_\ell^{p/\ell}, \\ |\widetilde{\kappa}_{p+1} \widehat{R}_\ell^{1/\ell}| &\lesssim (\widehat{R}_{p-1} + \widetilde{R}_p) \widehat{R}_\ell^{1/\ell} \lesssim \widehat{R}_{p-1}^{p/(p-1)} + \widetilde{R}_p^{p/(p-1)} + \widehat{R}_\ell^{p/\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

On one hand, we now have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h &= - \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h(W)] + \mathcal{O}(\widehat{R}_p) \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \mathcal{N}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(p-j-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{\ell=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_\ell+2}(W)}{(s_\ell+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{\ell=1}^r (\partial^{s_\ell+1} \Theta) \circ \partial^{j+1} \Theta h \right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O} \left( \widehat{R}_p + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \widehat{R}_j^{p/j} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-j} \widehat{R}_\ell^{p/\ell} \right) \\ &= \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(p-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{\ell=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_\ell+2}(W)}{(s_\ell+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{\ell=1}^r (\partial^{s_\ell+1} \Theta) h \right] + \mathcal{O} \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^p \widehat{R}_\ell^{p/\ell} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (D.3) holds for the case  $p$ .

On the other hand, we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h(W)] - \mathcal{N}h &= \mathbb{E}[f'(W)] - \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h(W)] - \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}_{p+1}}{p!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^p \Theta h(W)] + \mathcal{O}(\widetilde{R}_p) \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \mathcal{N}[\partial^{j+1} \Theta h] \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{p-2} \frac{\kappa_{j+2}(W)}{(j+1)!} \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(p-j-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{\ell=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_\ell+2}(W)}{(s_\ell+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{\ell=1}^r (\partial^{s_\ell+1} \Theta) \circ \partial^{j+1} \Theta h \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}_{p+1}}{p!} \mathcal{N}[\partial^p \Theta h] + \mathcal{O} \left( \widetilde{R}_p + \widetilde{R}_p^{p/(p-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \widehat{R}_j^{p/j} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{p-j} \widehat{R}_\ell^{p/\ell} \right) \\ &= \sum_{(r, s_{1:r}) \in \Gamma(p-1)} (-1)^r \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{\kappa_{s_j+2}(W)}{(s_j+1)!} \mathcal{N} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^r (\partial^{s_j+1} \Theta) h \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{\widetilde{\kappa}_{p+1} - \kappa_{p+1}(W)}{k!} \mathcal{N}[\partial^p \Theta h] + \mathcal{O} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \widehat{R}_j^{p/j} + \widetilde{R}_p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (D.4) also holds for the case  $p$ . By induction, we have established (D.3) and (D.4).

Next we prove that if  $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-p-1)/r} < \infty$ , then for any  $j \in [k]$ ,  $\widehat{R}_j^{1/j}$  has the following bound:

$$\widehat{R}_j^{1/j} \lesssim |T|^{-1/2} \left( m^{2dk} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+1)-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r} \right)^{1/k}. \quad (\text{D.5})$$

In fact, by Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |T|^{jk/2} \cdot \widehat{R}_j^k &\leq \left( m^{d(j+1)} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(j+1)-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r} \right)^k \\ &\leq \left( m^{d(j+1)k/j} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+1)-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r} \right)^j \\ &\quad \left( 1 + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r} \right)^{k-j} \\ &\lesssim \left( m^{2dk} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+1)-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r} \right)^j. \end{aligned}$$

By taking  $1/j$ -th power on both sides, (D.5) is proven.

For (D.4), we apply (D.5) with  $k = p - 1$  and get for  $j \in [p - 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{R}_j^{p/j} &\lesssim |T|^{-p/2} \left( m^{2d(p-1)} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-p-1)/r} \right)^{p/(p-1)} \\ &\lesssim |T|^{-p/2} m^{2dp} + \left( |T|^{-(p-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-p-1)/r} \right)^{p/(p-1)} \\ &\lesssim |T|^{-p/2} m^{2dp} + |T|^{-(p-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-p-1)/r} \leq M_{2,m,\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

given that  $M_{2,m,\delta}$  converges to 0 as  $|T| \rightarrow \infty$ .

By substituting this into (D.4), we complete the proof of (C.8). Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\kappa_{j+2}(W)| &\lesssim \widehat{R}_j \lesssim M_{2,m,\delta}^{j/p}, \quad \text{for any } 1 \leq j \leq p-1, \\ |\widetilde{\kappa}_{p+1} - \kappa_{p+1}(W)| &\lesssim |T|^{-(p-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dp-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-p-1)/r} \leq M_{2,m,\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Theorem C.4 is proven. ■

#### APPENDIX E. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 3.11 AND 3.10

In this section we present the proofs for Theorem 3.11 and Theorem 3.10.

#### Proof of Theorem 3.11.

For ease of notation we write  $\omega_p := \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$ . Choose  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ . Then remark that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there is  $G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  such that  $\|G - W_n\|_p \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) + \epsilon$ . Therefore, by the union bound we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) &= \mathbb{P}(W_n - G + G \geq t) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(W_n - G \geq (1 - \rho)t) + \mathbb{P}(G \geq \rho t) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Phi^c(\rho t) + \frac{\|W_n - G\|_p^p}{((1 - \rho)t)^p} \\ &\leq \Phi^c(\rho t) + \frac{(\omega_p + \epsilon)^p}{((1 - \rho)t)^p} \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (a) we have used Markov's inequality. Now as this holds for any arbitrary choice of  $\epsilon > 0$  we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) \leq \Phi^c(\rho t) + \frac{\omega_p^p}{((1 - \rho)t)^p}.$$

Define the function  $g_t : x \mapsto (1 - x)^{p+1} e^{-\frac{(xt)^2}{2}}$ , then we can remark that  $g_t : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is a bijection. Choose  $\rho_t^* := g_t^{-1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi p}\omega_p^p}{t^{p+1}}\right)$ . Moreover, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) &\leq \Phi^c(\rho_t^* t) + \varphi(\rho_t^* t) (1 - \rho_t^*) t \frac{\omega_p^p}{t^{p+1} (1 - \rho_t^*)^{p+1} \varphi(\rho_t^* t)} \tag{E.1} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Phi^c(t) + (1 - \rho_t^*) t \varphi(\rho_t^* t) \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \\ &\leq \Phi^c(t) + \frac{p^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \omega_p^{1 - \frac{1}{p+1}}}{t} \varphi\left(\rho_t^* t \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (a) we used the fact that  $\Phi^c(\rho_t^* t) \leq \Phi^c(t) + (1 - \rho_t^*) t \sup_{x \in [\rho_t^* t, t]} \varphi(x)$ .

Suppose that  $t \geq 1$  and satisfies  $1 - \frac{\sqrt{2\beta \log t}}{t} \leq 1$ . Define

$$x := \frac{\sqrt{2\beta \log t}}{t},$$

we notice that  $x \in [0, 1]$ . We remark that if

$$\omega_p \leq (\sqrt{2\pi p})^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{2\beta \log t}}{t}\right) t^{1 - \frac{\beta}{p+1}}.$$

then we have  $g_t^{-1}(x) \geq \frac{\sqrt{2\pi p}\omega_p^p}{t^{p+1}}$ . Therefore as  $g_t^{-1}(\cdot)$  is a decreasing function we have that  $x \leq \rho_t^*$  which implies that

$$\mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) \leq \Phi^c(t) + \frac{1}{t^{1+\beta(1-\frac{1}{p+1})}} p^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \omega_p^{1-\frac{1}{p+1}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right).$$

Moreover, similarly we can remark that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(G \geq (1 + \rho)t) &\leq \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) + \mathbb{P}(G - W_n \geq \rho t) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) + \frac{(\omega_p + \epsilon)^p}{\rho^p t^p} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as this holds for any arbitrary  $\epsilon > 0$  we obtain that

$$\Phi^c((1 + \rho)t) \leq \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) + \frac{\omega_p^p}{\rho^p t^p}.$$

Moreover, we can definite  $\tilde{g}_t : x \mapsto e^{-(1+x)^2 t^2} x^{p+1}$  then choose  $\tilde{\rho}_t^* := \tilde{g}_t^{-1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi p} \omega_p^p}{t^{p+1}}\right)$ . We similarly obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) \geq \Phi^c(t) - \frac{p^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \omega_p^{1-\frac{1}{p+1}}}{t} \varphi\left(t\left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right)\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right). \quad (\text{E.2})$$

■

***Proof of Theorem 3.10.*** For ease of notation we write  $\omega_p := \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1))$ . Then remark that for all  $\epsilon > 0$  there is  $G \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  such that  $\|G - W_n\|_p \leq \mathcal{W}_p(\mathcal{L}(W_n), \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) + \epsilon$ . Therefore, by the union bound we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) &= \mathbb{P}(W_n - G + G \geq t) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(W_n - G \geq \frac{t}{2}) + \mathbb{P}(G \geq \frac{t}{2}) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Phi^c\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) + \frac{\|W_n - G\|_p^p}{\frac{t^p}{2^p}} \\ &\leq \Phi^c\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) + \frac{(\omega_p + \epsilon)^p}{\frac{t^p}{2^p}} \end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (a) we have used Markov's inequality. Now as this holds for any arbitrary choice of  $\epsilon > 0$  we conclude that

$$\mathbb{P}(W_n \geq t) \leq \Phi^c\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) + \frac{2^p \omega_p^p}{t^p}.$$

According to Corollary 3.9 there is a constant  $K_2$  such that  $\omega_p \leq \frac{K_2^{1/p}}{2^{|T_n|^\beta}}$ . Moreover, it is also clear that there is a constant  $K_1 > 0$  such that  $\Phi^c\left(\frac{t}{2}\right) \leq e^{-K_1 t^2}$ . Therefore, we obtain the desired result. ■

## APPENDIX F. PROOFS OF LEMMAS G.2 AND G.3

***Proof of Lemma G.2.*** Consider the label set of all positive ancestors of  $v[\ell]$ , i.e.,  $\{j \in A(\ell) : s_j \geq 1\}$ . Let  $z := |\{j \in A(\ell) : s_j \geq 1\}|$ . If  $z \geq 1$ , we write

$$\{j \in A(\ell) : s_j \geq 1\} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_z\},$$

where  $2 \leq r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_z \leq \ell - 1$ .

Then consider all possible genograms constructed by adding a non-negative child to a vertex of  $G$ . On one hand, Proposition B.1d implies that it is only possible to add such a child to  $v[\ell]$  or  $v[p(r_j)]$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq z$  (provided that  $z \geq 1$ ), and if a genogram is obtained by adding  $v[\ell + 1]$  as a non-negative child of  $v[p(r_j)]$ , then  $s_{\ell+1} \leq s_{r_j} - 1$  because  $\ell + 1 > r_j$ .

On the other hand, we show that for  $1 \leq j \leq z$ ,

$$s_{r_j} \leq s_t \text{ for any } t \leq \ell \text{ such that } p(t) = p(r_j).$$

Supposing this is true and  $v[\ell]$  is added as a child of  $v[p(r_j)]$  with  $s_{\ell+1} \leq s_{r_j} - 1$ , then  $s_{\ell+1}$  is smaller than the identifiers of all  $v[\ell + 1]$ 's siblings. Hence Proposition B.1 holds and  $\Omega[p(r_j, s)](G)$  is indeed a genogram with the compatible labeling.

In fact,  $p(t) = p(r_j)$  ( $t \leq \ell$ ) implies that  $t \notin A(r_j)$  and  $r_j \notin A(t)$ . If  $t > r_j$ , by Lemma G.1, for any  $t'$  such that  $r_j \in A(t')$ , we have  $t' < t$ . In particular, let  $t' = \ell$ . Then  $\ell < t$ , contradicting  $t \leq \ell$ . Thus,  $t \leq r_j$ . Proposition B.1d implies that  $s_t \geq s_{r_j}$ .

Thus, we have shown

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &:= \{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell + 1) : H \supseteq G, s_{\ell+1} \geq 0\} \\ &= \{\Omega[p(r_j), s](G) : 1 \leq j \leq w, 0 \leq s \leq s_{r_j} - 1\} \sqcup \{\Omega[\ell, s](G) : s \geq 0\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.1})$$

where  $\sqcup$  denotes the disjoint union of sets. This directly implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{s \geq 0} \mathcal{U}_f(\Omega[\ell, s](G)) + \sum_{j \in A(\ell) : s_j \geq 1} \sum_{s=0}^{s_j-1} \mathcal{U}_f(\Omega[p(j), s](G)) \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ p(\ell+1) = \ell}} \mathcal{U}_f(H) + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ p(\ell+1) < \ell}} \mathcal{U}_f(H). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.2})$$

Therefore, to conclude the proof we only need to show that this is also equal to

$$\mathcal{T}_f(G) - \mathcal{S}(G) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W)].$$

For convenience, we list all elements of  $\mathcal{H}$  (see (F.1)) in a sequence. If  $z = 0$ , we write

$$H_t := \Omega[\ell, t - 1](G).$$

Otherwise, let

$$H_t := \begin{cases} \Omega[p(r_j), s - 1](G) & \text{if } t = \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} r_i + s \\ \Omega[\ell, s - 1](G) & \text{if } t = \sum_{i=1}^z r_i + s \end{cases}.$$

In other words,  $H_t$  is a genogram of order  $\ell + 1$  and the sequence  $(H_t)_{t \geq 1}$  can be enumerated as

$$\begin{aligned} (H_t)_{t \geq 1} : & \quad \Omega[p(r_1), 0](G), \quad \Omega[p(r_1), 1](G), \quad \dots, \quad \Omega[p(r_1), s_{r_1} - 1](G), \\ & \quad \Omega[p(r_2), 0](G), \quad \Omega[p(r_2), 1](G), \quad \dots, \quad \Omega[p(r_2), s_{r_2} - 1](G), \\ & \quad \dots, \\ & \quad \Omega[p(r_z), 0](G), \quad \Omega[p(r_z), 1](G), \quad \dots, \quad \Omega[p(r_z), s_{r_z} - 1](G), \\ & \quad \Omega[\ell, 0](G), \quad \Omega[\ell, 1](G), \quad \dots \end{aligned}$$

We write

$$c_0 := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } z = 0 \\ s_{r_1} + \dots + s_{r_z} + 1 & \text{if } z \geq 1 \end{cases},$$

and remark that  $H_t = \Omega[\ell, t - c_0](G)$  for  $t \geq c_0$ .

For any  $t \geq 1$ , we note that  $H_t$  is an order- $(\ell + 1)$  genogram. We write  $B_j(H_t)$  and  $D_j(H_t)$  respectively the outer and inner constraints of  $i_j$  with respect to  $H_t$ . We remark that as  $H_t[\ell] = G$ , this directly implies that  $B_j(H_t) = B_j(G) = B_j$  and  $D_j(H_t) = D_j(G) = D_j$  for all  $j \leq \ell$ .

Let  $i_1, \dots, i_\ell$  be indexes in  $i_j \in B_j \setminus D_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ . We note that the sets  $B_{\ell+1}(H_t)$  and  $D_{\ell+1}(H_t)$  will depend on the value of  $t \geq 1$ .

Firstly, in  $H_1$  we remark that by definition (B.10), if  $z \geq 1$ , the vertices  $v[\ell + 1]$  and  $v[r_1]$  have the same parent and that the identifier of  $\ell + 1$  is 0. This implies that if  $z \geq 1$ ,

$$D_{\ell+1}(H_1) = D_{g(\ell+1, H_1)} = D_{g(r_1, H_1)} = D_{g(r_1, G)} = D_{g(r_1)} = D_1 = \emptyset.$$

If  $z = 0$ , the progenitor of  $v[\ell + 1]$  is either  $v[\ell]$  or  $v[1]$ . In both cases, the inner constraint is empty, i.e.,  $D_\ell = D_1 = \emptyset$ . Thus,

$$D_{\ell+1}(H_1) = D_{g(\ell+1, H_1)} = \emptyset.$$

Note that here we have used  $g(j, H)$  to denote the progenitor label of  $v[j]$  with respect to the genogram  $H$ . Throughout the proof,  $H$  is omitted only if  $H = G$ .

Next we establish that for all  $t \geq 1$  the following holds:  $B_{\ell+1}(H_t) = D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1})$ .

If  $z = 0$ , the result is directly implied by the definitions (B.14) and (B.15) as we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\ell+1}(H_t) &= N^{(t)}(i_t : t \in A(\ell + 1, H_t)) \cup D_{g(\ell+1, H_t)} \\ &= N^{(t)}(i_t : t \in A(\ell + 1, H_{t+1})) \cup D_{g(\ell+1, H_{t+1})} \\ &= D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $A(j, H)$  is used to denote the label set of  $v[j]$ 's ancestors with respect to the genogram  $H$ . Again  $H$  is omitted only if  $H = G$ .

If  $z \geq 1$ , we remark that according to the values of  $t$  the relationship between the genograms  $H_{t+1}$  and  $H_t$  will be different. To make this clear, we distinguish 4 different cases according to the values of  $t$ :

1.  $t = \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} r_i + k + 1$  for  $1 \leq j \leq z$  and  $0 \leq k \leq s_{r_j} - 2$ , in which case we observe that

$$B_{\ell+1}(H_t) = B_{\ell+1}(\Omega[p(r_j), k](G)), \quad D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1}) = D_{\ell+1}(\Omega[p(r_j), k + 1](G));$$

2.  $t = \sum_{i=1}^z r_i + k + 1$  for  $k \geq 0$ , where we have

$$B_{\ell+1}(H_t) = B_{\ell+1}(\Omega[\ell, k](G)), \quad D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1}) = D_{\ell+1}(\Omega[\ell, k + 1](G));$$

3.  $t = \sum_{i=1}^j r_i$  for  $1 \leq j \leq z - 1$ , where we observe that

$$B_{\ell+1}(H_t) = B_{\ell+1}(\Omega[p(r_j), s_{r_j} - 1](G)), \quad D_{\ell+1}(H_t) = D_{\ell+1}(\Omega[p(r_{j+1}), 0](G));$$

4.  $t = \sum_{i=1}^z r_i$ , in which case we have

$$B_{\ell+1}(H_t) = B_{\ell+1}(\Omega[p(r_z), s_{r_z} - 1](G)), \quad D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1}) = D_{\ell+1}(\Omega[\ell, 0](G)).$$

Again cases 1 and 2 are directly implied by the definitions (B.14) and (B.15). Indeed, for all  $1 \leq j \leq z$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\ell+1}(H_t) &= N^{(k+1)}(i_t : t \in A(\ell + 1, H_t)) \cup D_{g(\ell+1, H_t)} \\ &= N^{(k+1)}(i_t : t \in A(\ell + 1, H_{t+1})) \cup D_{g(\ell+1, H_{t+1})} \\ &= D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We now prove cases 3 and 4. In this goal, let  $t = \sum_{i=1}^j r_i$  for a given  $j \leq z - 1$ . Since in  $H_t$ , the vertices  $v[\ell + 1]$  and  $v[r_j]$  are siblings, we have  $A(\ell + 1, H_t) = A(r_j, H_t) = A(r_j)$  and  $g(\ell + 1, H_t) = g(r_j, H_t) = g(r_j)$ . On the other hand, for case 3 we notice that as in  $H_{t+1}$  the vertices  $v[\ell + 1]$  and  $v[r_{j+1}]$  are siblings, we have  $g(\ell + 1, H_{t+1}) = g(r_{j+1}) = r_j$ . For case 4, similarly we have  $g(\ell + 1, H_{t+1}) = g(\ell) = r_j$ . Equipped with those equations, we remark that

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\ell+1}(H_t) &= N^{(s_{r_j}-1)}(i_t : t \in A(\ell + 1, H_t)) \cup D_{g(\ell+1, H_t)} \\ &= N^{(s_{r_j}-1)}(i_t : t \in A(r_j)) \cup D_{g(r_j)}, \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we also remark that as the identifier of  $\ell + 1$  in  $H_{t+1}$  is 0, we have

$$D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1}) = D_{g(\ell+1, H_{t+1})} = D_{r_j} = N^{(s_{r_j}-1)}(i_t : t \in A(r_j)) \cup D_{g(r_j)}.$$

Thus,  $B_{\ell+1}(H_t) = D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1})$ .

Therefore, we have established that  $B_{\ell+1}(H_t) = D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1})$  for any  $t \geq 1$ .

Since the index set  $T$  of the random field is finite, there exists a finite number  $c_1 \geq c_0$  such that  $N^{(c_1-c_0)}(i_t : t \in A(\ell) \text{ or } t = \ell) = T$ . Then

$$B_{\ell+1}(H_{c_1}) \supseteq N^{(c_1-c_0)}(i_t : t \in A(\ell+1, H_{c_1})) = N^{(c_1-c_0)}(i_t : t \in A(\ell) \text{ or } t = \ell) = T.$$

On the other hand,  $B_{\ell+1}(H_{c_1}) \subseteq T$ . Thus, we have  $B_{\ell+1}(H_{c_1}) = T$ . We remark that by definition of  $c_0$  and  $c_1$  we have

$$\emptyset = D_{\ell+1}(H_1) \subseteq B_{\ell+1}(H_1) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq B_{\ell+1}(H_{c_0}) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq B_{\ell+1}(H_{c_1}) = T.$$

We prove that for  $c_0 \leq t \leq c_1 - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathcal{E}_{H_t}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell}, \Delta_f(H_t)) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell}(\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_t)))) - \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_t)))) \\ & - \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell}) \left( \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_t)))] - \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_t)))] \right); \end{aligned}$$

and similarly that for  $1 \leq t \leq c_0 - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_{H_t}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell}, \Delta_f(H_t)) \\ &= \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell}) \left( \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_t)))] - \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_t)))] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.3})$$

Note that by definition  $\mathcal{E}_G$  is the product of  $\mathcal{D}^*$  factors. Let

$$q_0 := \sup\{j : j = 1 \text{ or } p(j) \neq j - 1 \text{ for } 2 \leq j \leq \ell\}.$$

Intuitively,  $v[q_0]$  is the starting vertex of the last branch of  $(V, E)$ . Now set  $w = |\{t : q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq \ell \text{ \& } s_t \geq 0\}|$ . If  $w \geq 1$ , we set  $\{q_1, \dots, q_w\} = \{t : q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq \ell \text{ \& } s_t \geq 0\}$ . Without loss of generality, we suppose that the sequence  $q_0 + 1 \leq q_1 < \dots < q_w \leq \ell$  is increasing. By definition, the last factor in  $\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell})$  is given by

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}} \cdots X_{i_\ell}) & \text{if } w = 0 \\ \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}} \cdots X_{i_{q_1-1}}, \dots, X_{i_{q_w}} \cdots X_{i_\ell}) & \text{if } w \geq 1 \end{cases}.$$

And the last factor in  $\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell-1}}, X_{i_\ell} \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell)))$  is

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}} \cdots X_{i_\ell} \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell))) & \text{if } w = 0 \\ \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}} \cdots X_{i_{q_1-1}}, \dots, X_{i_{q_{(w-1)}}} \cdots X_{i_{q_w-1}}, X_{i_{q_w}} \cdots X_{i_\ell} \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell))) & \text{if } w \geq 1 \end{cases}.$$

For convenience, in this proof we temporarily denote

$$\mathfrak{D}^*(\cdot) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}^*(\cdot) & \text{if } w = 0 \\ \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}} \cdots X_{i_{q_1-1}}, \dots, X_{i_{q_{(w-1)}}} \cdots X_{i_{q_w-1}}, \cdot) & \text{if } w \geq 1 \end{cases}.$$

Since  $s_{\ell+1} \geq 0$ , we have

$$\Delta_f(H_t) = \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_t))) - \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_t))).$$

For  $c_0 \leq t \leq c_1 - 1$ , we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathfrak{D}^*(X_{i_{q_w}} \cdots X_{i_\ell}, \Delta_f(H_t)) \\ &= \mathfrak{D}^*(X_{i_{q_w}} \cdots X_{i_\ell}, \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_t))) - \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_t)))) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \mathfrak{D}^*(X_{i_{q_w}} \cdots X_{i_\ell} \mathcal{D}(\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_t))) - \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_t)))) \\ &= \mathfrak{D}^*(X_{i_{q_w}} \cdots X_{i_\ell} (\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_t))) - \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_t)))) \end{aligned}$$

$$- \mathfrak{D}^*(X_{i_{q_w}} \cdots X_{i_\ell}) \left( \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_t)))] - \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_t)))] \right).$$

Here the equality (\*) is implied by Lemma H.2. Noticing that  $v[\ell+1]$  is the child of  $v[\ell]$ , we combine this with the definition of the  $\mathcal{E}_G$  operator and obtain (F.3).

For  $1 \leq t \leq c_0 - 1$ , we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_w}} \cdots X_{i_\ell}) \mathcal{D}^*(\Delta_f(H_t)) \\ &= \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_w}} \cdots X_{i_\ell}) \left( \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_t)))] - \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_t)))] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $v[\ell+1]$  is added as a child of  $v[r_j]$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq z$  and  $r_j < \ell$ ,  $v[\ell]$  is a leaf in  $H_t$ . We obtain (F.3) by applying the definition of the  $\mathcal{E}_G$  operator again.

Finally, using the definitions of  $\mathcal{T}_f(G)$  and  $\mathcal{S}(G)$ , we derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{T}_f(G) - \mathcal{S}(G) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W)] = \\ & \sigma^{-\ell} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \sum_{i_2 \in B_2 \setminus D_2} \cdots \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \left( \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell-1}}, X_{i_\ell} \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell))) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell-1}}, X_{i_\ell}) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W)] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell-1}}, X_{i_\ell} \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell))) - \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell}) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W)] \\ &= \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell-1}}, X_{i_\ell} \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(B_{\ell+1}(H_{c_0-1})))) \\ & \quad - \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell}) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_{\ell+1}(H_1)))] \\ &= - \sum_{t=c_0}^{c_1-1} \mathcal{E}_{H_t}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell}, \Delta_f(H_t)) + \sum_{t=1}^{c_0-1} \mathcal{E}_{H_t}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_\ell}, \Delta_f(H_t)). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is due to a telescoping sum argument since  $B_{\ell+1}(H_t) = D_{\ell+1}(H_{t+1})$  for  $1 \leq t \leq c_0 - 1$  and for  $c_0 \leq t \leq c_1 - 1$ . Taking the sums over  $i_j \in B_j \setminus D_j$  where  $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{T}_f(G) - \mathcal{S}(G) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W)] \\ &= - \sum_{t=c_0}^{c_1-1} \mathcal{U}_f(H_t) + \sum_{t=1}^{c_0-1} \mathcal{U}_f(H_t) \\ &= - \sum_{s \geq 0} \mathcal{U}_f(\Omega[\ell, s](G)) + \sum_{j \in A(\ell): s_j \geq 1} \sum_{s=0}^{s_j-1} \mathcal{U}_f(\Omega[p(j), s](G)). \end{aligned}$$

■

**Proof of Lemma G.3.** If  $u(\ell) = \ell$  then by definition,

$$\Delta_f(G) = \partial^{\ell-2} f(W(B_\ell)) - \partial^{\ell-2} f(W(D_\ell)).$$

Applying the Taylor expansion with integral-form remainders, we get

$$\Delta_f(G) \tag{F.4}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{j!} (W(B_\ell) - W(D_\ell))^j \partial^{\ell-2+j} f(W(D_\ell)) + \frac{1}{(k+1)!} (W(B_\ell) - W(D_\ell))^{k+1} \\
&\quad \int_0^1 (k+1)v^k \left( \partial^{k+\ell-1} f(vW(D_\ell) + (1-v)W(B_\ell)) - \partial^{k+\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell)) \right) dv \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \frac{(-1)^j}{j! \sigma^j} \left( \sum_{i \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} X_i \right)^j \partial^{\ell-2+j} f(W(D_\ell)) + \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{(k+1)! \sigma^{k+1}} \left( \sum_{i \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} X_i \right)^{k+1} \\
&\quad \int_0^1 (k+1)v^k \left( \partial^{k+\ell-1} f(vW(D_\ell) + (1-v)W(B_\ell)) - \partial^{k+\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell)) \right) dv \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} (-1)^j \sigma^{-j} \frac{1}{j!} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \cdots \sum_{i_{\ell+j-1} \in B_{\ell+j-1} \setminus D_{\ell+j-1}} X_{i_\ell} \cdots X_{i_{\ell+j-1}} \partial^{\ell+j-2} f(W(D_{\ell+j})) \\
&\quad + (-1)^{k+1} \sigma^{-(k+1)} \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \cdots \sum_{i_{\ell+k} \in B_{\ell+k} \setminus D_{\ell+k}} X_{i_\ell} \cdots X_{i_{\ell+k}} \\
&\quad \int_0^1 (k+1)v^k \left( \partial^{\ell+k-1} f(vW(D_{\ell+k+1}) + (1-v)W(B_{\ell+k+1})) - \partial^{\ell+k-1} f(W(D_{\ell+k+1})) \right) dv \\
&= -\sigma^{-1} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} X_{i_\ell} \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=2}^{k+1} (-1)^j \sigma^{-j} \frac{1}{j!} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \cdots \sum_{i_{\ell+j-1} \in B_{\ell+j-1} \setminus D_{\ell+j-1}} X_{i_\ell} \cdots X_{i_{\ell+j-1}} \partial^{\ell+j-2} f(W(D_{\ell+j-1})) \\
&\quad + (-1)^{k+1} \sigma^{-(k+1)} \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \cdots \sum_{i_{\ell+k} \in B_{\ell+k} \setminus D_{\ell+k}} X_{i_\ell} \cdots X_{i_{\ell+k}} \Delta_f(\Lambda[k+1](G)),
\end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (\*) we have used the fact that  $v[\ell+1], \dots, v[\ell+k+1]$  are negative vertices in  $\Lambda[k+1](G)$  and  $\Lambda[j](G) \subseteq \Lambda[k+1](G)$  for  $0 \leq j \leq k$ , which implies that  $B_\ell = B_{\ell+1} = \dots = B_{\ell+k+1}$  and  $D_\ell = D_{\ell+1} = \dots = D_{\ell+k+1}$  from the constructions of  $B_j$ 's and  $D_j$ 's.

In (B.16), we defined  $q_0$  to be

$$q_0 := \sup\{j : j = 1 \text{ or } p(j) \neq j - 1 \text{ for } 2 \leq j \leq \ell\}.$$

We write  $w := |\{t : q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq \ell \text{ \& } s_t \geq 0\}|$ . Since  $\ell = u(\ell)$ , we know  $s_\ell \geq 0$  and  $w \geq 1$ . We suppose without loss of generality that the elements of  $\{t : q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq \ell \text{ \& } s_t \geq 0\} = \{q_1, \dots, q_w\}$  are presented in increasing order:  $q_0 + 1 \leq q_1 < \dots < q_w = \ell$ . Moreover, by definition, the term  $\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell-1}}, \Delta_f(G))$  is the product of  $\mathcal{D}^*$  factors, and we remark that its last factor is

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}} \cdots X_{i_{\ell-1}}, \Delta_f(G)) & \text{if } w = 1 \\ \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}} \cdots X_{i_{q_1-1}}, \dots, X_{i_{q_{(w-1)}}} \cdots X_{i_{\ell-1}}, \Delta_f(G)) & \text{if } w \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

For convenience, in this proof we temporarily denote

$$\mathcal{D}^*(\cdot) := \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}} \cdots X_{i_{\ell-1}}, \cdot) & \text{if } w = 1 \\ \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}} \cdots X_{i_{q_1-1}}, \dots, X_{i_{q_{(w-1)}}} \cdots X_{i_{\ell-1}}, \cdot) & \text{if } w \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

And write

$$\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell-1}}, \Delta_f(G)) = \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathcal{D}^*(\Delta_f(G)).$$

Combining this with (F.4) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell-1}}, \Delta_f(G)) = \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{D}^*(\Delta_f(G)) \\
& = -\sigma^{-1} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{D}^*(X_{i_\ell} \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell))) + \sum_{j=2}^{k+1} \frac{(-1)^j}{j! \sigma^j} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \cdots \sum_{\substack{i_{\ell+j-1} \in \\ B_{\ell+j-1} \setminus D_{\ell+j-1}}} \\
& \quad \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{D}^*(X_{i_\ell} \cdots X_{i_{\ell+j-2}} X_{i_{\ell+j-1}} \partial^{\ell+j-1} f(W(D_{\ell+j}))) \\
& \quad + \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{(k+1)! \sigma^{k+1}} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \cdots \sum_{i_{\ell+k} \in B_{\ell+k} \setminus D_{\ell+k}} \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{D}^*(X_{i_\ell} \cdots X_{i_{\ell+k}} \Delta_f(\Lambda[k+1](G))) \\
& \stackrel{(*)}{=} -\sigma^{-1} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell-1}}, X_{i_\ell} \partial^{\ell-1} f(W(D_\ell))) + \sum_{j=2}^{k+1} \frac{(-1)^j}{j! \sigma^j} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \cdots \sum_{\substack{i_{\ell+j-1} \in \\ B_{\ell+j-1} \setminus D_{\ell+j-1}}} \\
& \quad \mathcal{E}_{\Lambda[j-1](G)}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell+j-2}}, X_{i_{\ell+j-1}} \partial^{\ell+j-1} f(W(D_{\ell+j}))) \\
& \quad + \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{(k+1)! \sigma^{k+1}} \sum_{i_\ell \in B_\ell \setminus D_\ell} \cdots \sum_{i_{\ell+k} \in B_{\ell+k} \setminus D_{\ell+k}} \mathcal{E}_{\Lambda[k+1](G)}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{\ell+k}}, \Delta_f(\Lambda[k+1](G))),
\end{aligned}$$

where to get (\*) we have used the condition that  $v[\ell+1], \dots, v[\ell+k+1]$  are negative vertices in  $\Lambda[k+1](G)$ . Indeed, the factorization stay the same due to the fact that they are all added to the same branch, and  $q_1, \dots, q_w$  remain the same since  $v[\ell+1], \dots, v[\ell+k+1]$  are all negative. Taking the sum over  $i_j \in B_j \setminus D_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq \ell-1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_f(G) &= \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} (-1)^j \frac{1}{j!} \mathcal{T}_f(\Lambda[j-1](G)) + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[k+1](G)) \quad (\text{F.5}) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{j+1} \frac{1}{(j+1)!} \mathcal{T}_f(\Lambda[j](G)) + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[k+1](G)).
\end{aligned}$$

Now consider the case  $u(\ell) < \ell$ . Let  $G[u(\ell)] := (V', E', s_{1:u(\ell)}) \subseteq G$  be the order- $u(\ell)$  sub-genogram of  $G$  as defined in the last paragraph of Appendix B.2. Now by (F.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_f(G[u(\ell)]) &= \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{j+1} \frac{1}{(j+1)!} \mathcal{T}_f(\Lambda[j](G[u(\ell)])) \\
& \quad + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{1}{(k+1)!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[k+1](G[u(\ell)])).
\end{aligned}$$

Replacing  $k$  by  $\ell - u(\ell) - 1$  and  $\ell - u(\ell) + k$  respectively, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_f(G[u(\ell)]) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-u(\ell)-1} (-1)^{j+1} \frac{1}{(j+1)!} \mathcal{T}_f(\Lambda[j](G[u(\ell)])) \\
& \quad + (-1)^{\ell-u(\ell)} \frac{1}{(\ell-u(\ell))!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[\ell-u(\ell)](G[u(\ell)])), \quad (\text{F.6})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_f(G[u(\ell)]) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-u(\ell)+k} (-1)^{j+1} \frac{1}{(j+1)!} \mathcal{T}_f(\Lambda[j](G[u(\ell)])) \\
&\quad + (-1)^{\ell-u(\ell)+k+1} \frac{1}{(\ell-u(\ell)+k+1)!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[\ell-u(\ell)+k+1](G[u(\ell)])).
\end{aligned} \tag{F.7}$$

By taking the difference of (F.6) and (F.7) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(-1)^{\ell-u(\ell)} \frac{1}{(\ell-u(\ell))!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[\ell-u(\ell)](G[u(\ell)])) \\
&= \sum_{j=\ell-u(\ell)}^{\ell-u(\ell)+k} (-1)^{j+1} \frac{1}{(j+1)!} \mathcal{T}_f(\Lambda[j](G[u(\ell)])) \\
&\quad + (-1)^{\ell-u(\ell)+k+1} \frac{1}{(\ell-u(\ell)+k+1)!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[\ell-u(\ell)+k+1](G[u(\ell)])).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_f(G) &= \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[\ell-u(\ell)](G[u(\ell)])) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{j+1} \frac{(\ell-u(\ell))!}{(j+1+\ell-u(\ell))!} \mathcal{T}_f(\Lambda[j+\ell-u(\ell)](G[u(\ell)])) \\
&\quad + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{(\ell-u(\ell))!}{(k+1+\ell-u(\ell))!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[k+1+\ell-u(\ell)](G[u(\ell)])) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{j+1} \frac{(\ell-u(\ell))!}{(j+1+\ell-u(\ell))!} \mathcal{T}_f(\Lambda[j](G)) \\
&\quad + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{(\ell-u(\ell))!}{(k+1+\ell-u(\ell))!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[k+1](G)).
\end{aligned}$$

■

## APPENDIX G. PROOF OF THE RESULTS IN SECTION B

First we introduce the following lemma and prove Lemma B.2.

**Lemma G.1.** *Let  $(V, E)$  be a rooted tree whose vertices are ordered from a depth-first traversal (i.e., the labels satisfy Proposition B.1a). Suppose  $i \notin A(j)$  and  $j \notin A(i)$  for some  $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ . Then for any  $t$  such that  $i \in A(t)$ , we have  $t < j$ .*

**Proof.** First let  $\prec$  be the strict total order on  $V$  such that for any  $u, w \in V$ ,  $u \prec w$  if and only if the label of  $u$  is smaller than the label of  $w$ . For any two vertex subsets  $U, W \subseteq V$ , we denote  $U \prec W$  if and only if  $u \prec w$  for any  $u \in U$  and  $w \in W$ .

**Claim.** *Let  $\prec$  be defined as above. Suppose  $u, w \in V$  ( $u \neq w$ ) are siblings in  $(V, E)$ . Let*

$$U := \{v : v = u \text{ or } u \text{ is an ancestor of } v\}, \quad W := \{v : v = w \text{ or } w \text{ is an ancestor of } v\}.$$

*Then either  $U \prec W$  or  $W \prec U$ .*

To prove this we can perform induction on  $k = |U| + |W|$ . If  $k = 2$ , this is true because  $U$  and  $W$  each contain one element and  $\prec$  is a strict total order on  $V$ . Now suppose the claim is

true for  $k$  and consider the case for  $k + 1$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $|U| \geq 2$ , and thus,  $u$  is not a leaf.

If there is only one leaf in  $U$ , denoted by  $u_0$  ( $u_0 \neq u$ ), then restricting on  $V' := V \setminus \{u_0\}$ , we get a new rooted tree  $(V', E')$  and the order on  $V'$  is induced by that on  $V$ . Then  $(V', E')$  also satisfies Proposition B.1a and  $u, w$  are still siblings in  $(V', E')$ . By inductive hypothesis, either  $U \setminus \{u_0\} \prec W$  or  $W \prec U \setminus \{u_0\}$ . Since  $u_0$  is the only leaf in  $U$ , the parent of  $u_0$ , denoted by  $u_1$  has only one child, which implies that  $u_0 := \min_{\prec} \{v : u_1 \prec v\}$ . Thus, we have  $U \prec W$  or  $W \prec U$ .

If there are at least two leaves in  $U$ , two of which are denoted by  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  ( $u, u_1, u_2$  are mutually different). Let  $V'_1 := V \setminus \{u_1\}$  and  $V'_2 := V \setminus \{u_2\}$ . Restricting on  $V'_1$  or  $V'_2$ , we get a new rooted tree  $(V'_1, E'_1)$  or  $(V'_2, E'_2)$  with the vertex order on  $V'_1$  or  $V'_2$  induced by  $\prec$ , respectively. By inductive hypothesis on  $(V'_1, E'_1)$ , we get  $U \setminus \{u_1\} \prec W$  or  $W \prec U \setminus \{u_1\}$ . Similarly, we have  $U \setminus \{u_2\} \prec W$  or  $W \prec U \setminus \{u_2\}$ . Since  $u \in (U \setminus \{u_1\}) \cap (U \setminus \{u_2\}) \neq \emptyset$  and  $U = (U \setminus \{u_1\}) \cup (U \setminus \{u_2\})$ , we conclude that  $U \prec W$  or  $W \prec U$ .

By induction the claim is true. Let  $h := \max A(i) \cap A(j)$ , which is the closest common ancestor of  $v[i]$  and  $v[j]$ . Since  $i \notin A(j)$ , we have  $h < i$  and similarly  $h < j$ . Let  $v[i_0]$  be the vertex such that  $i_0 \in A(i)$  and  $p(i_0) = h$ , and  $v[j_0]$  be the vertex such that  $j_0 \in A(j)$  and  $p(j_0) = h$ . The definition of  $h$  implies that  $i_0 \neq j_0$ .

Let  $U := \{v[t] : t = i_0 \text{ or } i_0 \in A(t)\}$  and  $W := \{v[t] : t = j_0 \text{ or } j_0 \in A(t)\}$ . Note that  $v[i_0]$  and  $v[j_0]$  are siblings. Using the claim above we get  $U \prec W$  or  $W \prec U$ . Noticing that  $v[i] \in U$ ,  $v[j] \in W$  and  $i < j$ , we conclude that  $U \prec W$ . If  $i \in A(t)$ , then we have  $v[t] \in U$  and  $t < j$ . ■

**Proof of Lemma B.2.** Firstly, if  $p(j + 1) \neq j$ , then  $v[j]$  is a leaf. Otherwise, suppose  $v[j]$  has a child  $v[h]$  where  $h > j + 1$ . Then  $p(h) > p(j + 1)$  contradicts Proposition B.1a.

Suppose  $p(j + 1) \neq j$  and  $p(j + 1) \notin A(j)$ . Proposition B.1a implies that  $p(j + 1) \leq j$ . Thus, we know  $p(j + 1) < j$ . Since  $v[j]$  is a leaf, we have  $j \notin A(p(j + 1))$ . Thus, by Lemma G.1, for any  $t$  such that  $p(j + 1) \in A(t)$ , we have  $t < j$ . In particular, let  $t = j + 1$  and we get  $j + 1 < j$ . This is a contradiction. Thus, either  $p(j + 1) = j$  or  $v[j]$  is a leaf and  $p(j + 1) \in A(j)$ . ■

From the derivation of (B.4), we note that the expansion of  $\mathcal{T}_f(G)$  is typically achieved by constructing a telescoping sum followed by the Taylor expansions. We will see later that the first operation of growing genograms corresponds to the telescoping sum argument, and the second one corresponds to the Taylor expansion, which will be formalized in Lemmas G.2 and G.3.

**Lemma G.2.** *Given an integer  $\ell$  and an order- $\ell$  genogram  $G$ , let  $\Omega[j, s](G)$  ( $1 \leq j \leq \ell$ ,  $s \geq 0$ ) be the genogram obtained by growing a child from the vertex  $v[j]$ , as defined in (a). Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{T}_f(G) - \mathcal{S}(G) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W)] \\ &= - \sum_{s \geq 0} \mathcal{U}_f(\Omega[\ell, s](G)) + \sum_{j \in A(\ell): s_j \geq 1} \sum_{s=0}^{s_j-1} \mathcal{U}_f(\Omega[p(j), s](G)), \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ p(\ell+1, H) = \ell}} \mathcal{U}_f(H) + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ p(\ell+1, H) < \ell}} \mathcal{U}_f(H), \end{aligned}$$

where  $p(j)$  is the label of the parent of  $v[j]$ ,  $s_j$  is the identifier, and  $\mathcal{G}(k)$  is the set of all order- $k$  genograms, all of which are defined in Appendix B.2.

Note that Lemma G.2 (proved in Appendix F) generalizes the idea of expanding to a telescoping sum while deriving (B.4).

**Lemma G.3.** *Given two integers  $\ell \geq 1, k \geq 0$ , and an order- $\ell$  genogram  $G$ , let  $\Lambda[j](G)$  ( $0 \leq j \leq k+1$ ) be the genogram obtained by gluing a path of  $j$  negative vertices to  $v[\ell]$ , as defined in (b) of Appendix B.2. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_f(G) &= \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{j+1} \frac{(\ell - u(\ell))!}{(j+1 + \ell - u(\ell))!} \mathcal{T}_f(\Lambda[j](G)) \\ &\quad + (-1)^{k+1} \frac{(\ell - u(\ell))!}{(k+1 + \ell - u(\ell))!} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[k+1](G)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.1})$$

where  $u(j)$  is given by (B.11).

As we have pointed out, Lemma G.3 is a direct consequence of the Taylor expansion, and the proof is also provided in Appendix F.

**Proof of Theorem B.3.** For convenience, denote  $\ell := |G|$ . We prove by performing induction on  $k$  ( $k \geq \ell$ ).

If  $k = \ell$ , then we note that the set  $\{H \supseteq G : |H| \leq k\} = \{G\}$  only contains the genogram  $G$ . Moreover, in (B.24) we set  $a_{G,G} = 1$ . Therefore, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{H \supseteq G: \\ |H| \leq k, \\ s_{|G|+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{|H|-1} f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{|G|+1} \geq 0}} b_{H,G} \mathcal{U}_f(H) \\ &= \mathcal{S}(G) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{|G|-1} f(G)] + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} b_{H,G} \mathcal{U}_f(H). \end{aligned}$$

Next let  $H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1)$  be a genogram of order  $\ell+1$  such that  $H \supseteq G$  and such that  $s_{\ell+1} \geq 0$ . Note that  $s_{\ell+1} \geq 0$  implies that  $\tau_H = \tau_G$ . To calculate  $\gamma_H - \gamma_G$ , we check that the parent of  $v[\ell+1]$  is either  $v[\ell]$  (i.e.,  $p(\ell+1, H) = \ell$ ) or an ancestor of  $v[\ell]$ . If its parent is  $v[\ell]$  then the number of leaves in  $H$ , denoted by  $\gamma_H$ , is the same as that of  $G$ , and hence by (B.25)  $b_{H,G} = -1$ . Otherwise, the number of leaves increases by exactly one:  $\gamma_H = \gamma_G + 1$ , which implies  $b_{H,G} = 1$ . Thus, (B.23) reduces to

$$\sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} b_{H,G} \mathcal{U}_f(H) = - \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ p(\ell+1, H) = \ell}} \mathcal{U}_f(H) + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ p(\ell+1, H) < \ell}} \mathcal{U}_f(H),$$

Using Lemma G.2 we directly obtain that

$$\mathcal{T}_f(G) = \mathcal{S}(G) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{\ell-1} f(W)] - \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ p(\ell+1, H) = \ell}} \mathcal{U}_f(H) + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(\ell+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ p(\ell+1, H) < \ell}} \mathcal{U}_f(H),$$

and the desired result is proven.

Now supposing the statement is true for  $k$ , we will establish that the desired result also holds for  $k + 1$ .

By inductive hypothesis we have

$$\mathcal{T}_f(G) = \sum_{\substack{H \supseteq G: \\ |H| \leq k, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{|H|-1} f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} b_{H,G} \mathcal{U}_f(H). \quad (\text{G.2})$$

For any  $H \in \mathcal{G}(k + 1)$ , by Lemma G.3 we have

$$\mathcal{U}_f(H) = -\frac{1}{k+2-u(k+1, H)} (\mathcal{T}_f(H) + \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[1](H))). \quad (\text{G.3})$$

Combining (G.3) with (G.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_f(G) &= \sum_{\substack{H \supseteq G: \\ |H| \leq k, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{|H|-1} f(W)] - \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} \frac{b_{H,G}}{k+2-u(k+1, H)} \mathcal{T}_f(H) \quad (\text{G.4}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} \frac{b_{H,G}}{k+2-u(k+1, H)} \mathcal{U}_f(\Lambda[1](H)) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{\substack{H \supseteq G: \\ |H| \leq k, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{|H|-1} f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{T}_f(H) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ s_{k+2} = -1}} b_{K,G} \mathcal{U}_f(K). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $s_{k+2} = -1$  implies that  $\tau_K = \tau_H + 1$  and  $\gamma_K = \gamma_H$  (since  $p(k+2, K) = k+1$ ). Moreover, equality (a) is due to the fact that for any  $H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1)$  we have  $a_{H,G} = -\frac{b_{H,G}}{k+2-u(k+1, H)}$ , and that for any  $K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)$  with  $s_{k+2} = -1$  we have  $b_{K,G} = (-1)^{\gamma_K - \gamma_H + \tau_K - \tau_H} \frac{b_{H,G}}{k+2-u(k+1, H)} = -\frac{b_{H,G}}{k+2-u(k+1, H)}$ .

Next by another application of Lemma G.2, we get that

$$\mathcal{T}_f(H) - \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)] = - \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq H, \\ s_{k+2} \geq 0, \\ p(k+2, K) = k+1}} \mathcal{U}_f(K) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq H, \\ s_{k+2} \geq 0, \\ p(k+2, K) < k+1}} \mathcal{U}_f(K). \quad (\text{G.5})$$

Combining this with (G.4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_f(G) &= \sum_{\substack{H \supseteq G: \\ |H| \leq k, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{|H|-1} f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)] \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ s_{k+2} \geq 0, \\ p(k+2, K) = k+1}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{U}_f(K) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ s_{k+2} \geq 0, \\ p(k+2, K) < k+1}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{U}_f(K) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ s_{k+2} = -1}} b_{K,G} \mathcal{U}_f(K), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.6})$$

where  $H$  is the order- $(k + 1)$  sub-genogram of  $K$ .

Now we simplify (G.6). For  $K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)$  such that  $p(k+2, K) = k+1$ , we have  $\gamma_K = \gamma_H$ . And  $s_{k+2} \geq 0$  implies that  $\tau_K = \tau_H$ . Thus,  $b_{K,G} = (-1)^{\gamma_K - \gamma_H + \tau_K - \tau_H} \frac{b_{H,G}}{k+2-u(k+1,H)} = \frac{b_{H,G}}{k+2-u(k+1,H)} = -a_{H,G}$ . For  $K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)$  such that  $p(k+2, K) < k+1$ , we have  $\gamma_K = \gamma_H + 1$ . Thus,  $b_{K,G} = (-1)^{\gamma_K - \gamma_H + \tau_K - \tau_H} \frac{b_{H,G}}{k+2-u(k+1,H)} = -\frac{b_{H,G}}{k+2-u(k+1,H)} = a_{H,G}$ . (G.6) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_f(G) &= \sum_{\substack{H \supseteq G: \\ |H| \leq k, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{|H|-1} f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1): \\ H \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)] \quad (\text{G.7}) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ s_{k+2} \geq 0, \\ p(k+2, K) = k+1}} b_{K,G} \mathcal{U}_f(K) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ s_{k+2} \geq 0, \\ p(k+2, K) < k+1}} b_{K,G} \mathcal{U}_f(K) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, \\ s_{k+2} = -1}} b_{K,G} \mathcal{U}_f(K) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{H \supseteq G: \\ |H| \leq k+1, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} a_{H,G} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^{|H|-1} f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq G, \\ s_{\ell+1} \geq 0}} b_{K,G} \mathcal{U}_f(K). \quad (\text{G.8}) \end{aligned}$$

The last equality is from the observation that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{H \supseteq G : |H| \leq k+1, s_{\ell+1} \geq 0\} \\ &= \{H \supseteq G : |H| \leq k, s_{\ell+1} \geq 0\} \sqcup \{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1) : H \supseteq G, s_{\ell+1} \geq 0\}, \\ &\{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2) : K \supseteq G, s_{\ell+1} \geq 0\} \\ &= \{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2) : K \supseteq G, s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, s_{k+2} \geq 0, p(k+2, K) = k+1\} \sqcup \\ &\quad \{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2) : K \supseteq G, s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, s_{k+2} \geq 0, p(k+2, K) < k+1\} \sqcup \\ &\quad \{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2) : K \supseteq G, s_{\ell+1} \geq 0, s_{k+2} = -1\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sqcup$  denotes the disjoint union of sets. Note that (G.7) is precisely (B.23) for the case  $k+1$ . By induction Theorem B.3 is proven.  $\blacksquare$

***Proof of Corollary B.5.*** We write  $G_0 = (1, \emptyset, 0)$  to be the genogram consisting only of the root. We remark that as already discussed in (B.22),

$$\mathcal{T}_f(G_0) = \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)].$$

As  $G_0$  is a genogram of order-1, applying Theorem B.3 we have that for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\mathcal{T}_f(G_0) = \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} Q_j \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j-1} f(W)] + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)} b_{H,G_0} \mathcal{U}_f(H), \quad (\text{G.9})$$

where  $Q_1 = \mathcal{S}(G_0) = 0$  and for all  $j \geq 2$  we take

$$Q_j = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(j): H \supseteq G_0, s_2 \geq 0} a_{H,G_0} \mathcal{S}(H) \stackrel{(a)}{=} - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(j)} \frac{b_{H,G_0}}{j+1-u(j,H)} \mathcal{S}(H), \quad (\text{G.10})$$

where  $a_{H,G_0}$  and  $b_{H,G_0}$  are defined in Theorem B.3, and where to obtain (a) we used the fact that for all genograms  $H$  of order bigger than 2, we have  $a_{H,G_0} = -\frac{b_{H,G_0}}{|H|+1-u(|H|,H)}$ . The expression above shows that  $Q_j$  only depends on the joint distribution of  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$ . Furthermore, we see that by definition  $b_{H,G_0}$  is identical to the  $b_H$  defined in the corollary.

For any  $H \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)$  and polynomial  $f$  of degree at most  $k$ ,  $\partial^k f$  is a constant. Therefore,  $\Delta_f(H) = 0$ , which directly implies that

$$\mathcal{U}_f(H) = \sigma^{-(k+1)} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \sum_{i_2 \in B_2 \setminus D_2} \cdots \sum_{i_{k+1} \in B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}}, \Delta_f(H)) = 0.$$

Therefore, by combining this with (G.9) we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} Q_j \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j-1} f(W)]. \quad (\text{G.11})$$

On the other hand, for any random variable, the moments  $(\mu_j)_{j \geq 0}$  and cumulants  $(\kappa_j)_{j \geq 0}$ , provided that they exist, are connected through the following relations [Smith, 1995]:

$$\mu_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{n-1}{j-1} \kappa_j \mu_{n-j}. \quad (\text{G.12})$$

If we choose  $f(x) = x^j$  where  $j \in [k]$ , then by (G.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] &= \mu_{j+1}(W) = \sum_{h=1}^{j+1} \binom{j}{h-1} \kappa_h(W) \mu_{j+1-h}(W) \\ &= \sum_{h=0}^j \binom{j}{h} \kappa_{h+1}(W) \mu_{j-h}(W) = \sum_{h=1}^{k+1} \frac{\kappa_h(W)}{h!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^{h-1} f(W)]. \end{aligned}$$

Any polynomial  $f$  of degree at most  $k$  can be written as  $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^k a_j x^j$ . By linearity of expectations, we know

$$\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \frac{\kappa_j(W)}{(j-1)!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)].$$

Compare this to (G.11) and apply Lemma B.4. We conclude that  $Q_j = \kappa_j(W)/(j-1)!$  for any  $j \in [k+1]$ . Thus, for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R})$ , we have shown

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] &= \sum_{j=2}^{k+1} Q_j \mathbb{E}[\partial^{j-1} f(W)] + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k Q_{j+1} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{k-1}(\mathbb{R})$ , we also have

$$\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H). \quad (\text{G.13})$$

As  $\mathcal{P}_0(k+1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}(k+1)$  we can decompose  $\sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H)$  into two sums as

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1) \setminus \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H). \quad (\text{G.14})$$



For  $H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)$ , applying Lemma G.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) &= - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{T}_f(H) \\
&\quad - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq H, \\ s_{k+2} = -1}} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{U}_f(K) \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{=} - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{T}_f(H) + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2): \\ s_{k+2} = -1}} b_K \mathcal{U}_f(K)
\end{aligned} \tag{G.15}$$

where in  $(*)$  we use the fact that  $b_K = (-1)^{\gamma_K - \gamma_H + \tau_K - \tau_H} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} = -\frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)}$  since  $s_{k+2} = -1$  implies that  $\gamma_K = \gamma_H$  and  $\tau_K = \tau_H + 1$ .

Noting that for any  $H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)$ , if an order- $(k+2)$  genogram  $K$  satisfies that  $K \supseteq H$ , then we have  $p(k+2, K) = k+1$  since we have that  $s_j \leq 0$  for any  $j \in [k+1]$ . Thus, Lemma G.2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} (\mathcal{T}_f(H) - \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)]) &= - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{G}(k+2): \\ K \supseteq H, \\ s_{k+2} \geq 0}} \mathcal{U}_f(K) \\
&= - \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2): \\ s_{k+2} = 0}} \mathcal{U}_f(K) - \sum_{K \in \mathcal{P}_1(k+2)} \mathcal{U}_f(K).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (G.15) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \\
&= - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2): \\ s_{k+2} = -1}} b_K \mathcal{U}_f(K) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2): \\ s_{k+2} = 0}} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{U}_f(K) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{P}_1(k+2)} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{U}_f(K) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)] + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2): \\ s_{k+2} = -1}} b_K \mathcal{U}_f(K) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{K \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2): \\ s_{k+2} = 0}} b_K \mathcal{U}_f(K) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{P}_1(k+2)} b_K \mathcal{U}_f(K) \\
&= - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{S}(H) \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)] + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2) \sqcup \mathcal{P}_1(k+2)} b_K \mathcal{U}_f(K).
\end{aligned} \tag{G.16}$$

Again (a) is obtained by checking that  $\gamma_K = \gamma_H$  and  $\tau_K = \tau_H$ , and thus,  $b_K = \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)}$ .

Since we have already established that  $Q_j = \kappa_j(W)/(j-1)!$ , by (G.10), the following equation holds that

$$\frac{\kappa_{k+1}(W)}{k!} = Q_{k+1} = - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+1)} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{S}(H).$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1}}{k!} &= \frac{\kappa_{k+1}(W)}{k!} + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{S}(H) \\ &= - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} \frac{b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{S}(H). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.17})$$

Combining (G.14), (G.16), and (G.17) with (G.13), we obtain (B.27). ■

**Lemma G.4.** *Let  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  be a random field indexed by  $T \subsetneq \mathbb{Z}^d$  ( $|T| < \infty$ ). Given  $k \geq 1$ , suppose that there is a real number  $r > k+1$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[|X_1|^r] < \infty$ . Assume that the non-degeneracy condition holds that  $\liminf_{|T| \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^2/|T| > 0$ . Then for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$  we have*

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} |\mathcal{S}(H)| \lesssim |T|^{-(k-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-1)/r}. \quad (\text{G.18})$$

(Where the constant dropped from using the notation  $\lesssim$  does not depend on  $m$ .)

Given  $\omega \in (0, 1]$ , for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1, \omega}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , we have

$$\left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-2)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+\omega-1)-\omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\omega)/r}, \quad (\text{G.19})$$

$$\left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-2)/2} m^{d(k+\omega-1)}. \quad (\text{G.20})$$

Moreover, if  $k \geq 2$ , for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2, 1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{k-1, 1}(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and real number  $\delta \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_1(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \lesssim |f|_{k-2, 1}^{1-\delta} |f|_{k-1, 1}^\delta |T|^{-(k-2+\delta)/2} m^{d(k-1)} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\delta)/r}. \quad (\text{G.21})$$

The proof of this lemma is long and technical, so we move it to Appendix H of the supplementary material. Now combining Corollary B.5 and Lemma G.4, we have both Proposition 4.2 and the following result.

**Proposition G.5.** *Let  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  be a random field indexed by  $T \subsetneq \mathbb{Z}^d$  ( $|T| < \infty$ ). Given  $1 \leq k \leq p+1$ , suppose that there is a real number  $r > k+1$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[|X_1|^r] < \infty$ . Assume that the non-degeneracy condition holds that  $\liminf_{|T| \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^2/|T| > 0$ . For any  $f \in$*

$\mathcal{C}^{k-1,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{k,1}(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$  and real number  $\delta \in [0, 1]$  we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1}}{k!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)] + \mathcal{O}\left(|f|_{k,1}|T|^{-k/2} m^{d(k+1)}\right) \\ &\quad + |f|_{k-1,1}^{1-\delta} |f|_{k,1}^\delta |T|^{-(k-1+\delta)/2} m^{dk} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-1-\delta)/r} \\ &\quad + |f|_{k-1,1} |T|^{-(k-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-1)/r}, \end{aligned} \tag{G.22}$$

where  $\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1}$  is some constant that only depends on the joint distribution of  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$ , and it satisfies that

$$|\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1} - \kappa_{k+1}(W)| \lesssim |T|^{-(k-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-1)/r}.$$

**Proof of Propositions 4.2 and G.5.** By Corollary B.5, we have the expansion

$$\mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H).$$

By Lemma G.4 with  $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$  we get the upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| + \left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+2)} \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ &\lesssim |f|_{k,\omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-1)/2} \left( m^{d(k+\omega)} + \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+\omega)-\omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-1-\omega)/r} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Again by Corollary B.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Wf(W)] &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\kappa_{j+1}(W)}{j!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^j f(W)] \\ &\quad + \frac{\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1}}{k!} \mathbb{E}[\partial^k f(W)] + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2) \cup \mathcal{P}_1(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1}$  satisfies that

$$\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1} := \kappa_{k+1}(W) - \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} \frac{k! b_H}{k+2-u(k+1)} \mathcal{S}(H).$$

Note that  $|b_H| \leq 1$ . By Lemma G.4 we get

$$|\tilde{\kappa}_{k+1} - \kappa_{k+1}(W)| \leq k! \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} |\mathcal{S}(H)| \lesssim |T|^{-(k-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-1)/r}.$$

By Lemma G.4 with  $\omega = 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| + \left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_1(k+2)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| + \left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ & \lesssim |f|_{k,1} |T|^{-k/2} m^{d(k+1)} + |f|_{k-1,1}^{1-\delta} |f|_{k,1}^\delta |T|^{-(k-1+\delta)/2} m^{dk} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-1-\delta)/r} \\ & \quad + |f|_{k-1,1} |T|^{-(k-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-1)/r}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (G.22) is proven.  $\blacksquare$

#### APPENDIX H. PROOF OF LEMMA G.4

Before we proceed to Lemma G.4, we need a generalization of Young's inequality.

**Lemma H.1.** *Given  $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ , let  $Y_1, \dots, Y_t$  be a sequence of random variables, and real numbers  $p_1, \dots, p_t > 1$  satisfy that  $1/p_1 + \dots + 1/p_t = 1$ . Then for any  $(\ell, \eta_{1:\ell}) \in C(t) := \{\ell, \eta_{1:\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{j=1}^\ell \eta_j = t\}$ , we have that*

$$[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright (|Y_1|, \dots, |Y_t|) \leq \frac{1}{p_1} \mathbb{E}[|Y_1|^{p_1}] + \dots + \frac{1}{p_t} \mathbb{E}[|Y_t|^{p_t}]. \quad (\text{H.1})$$

**Proof.** First, we prove

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y_1 \cdots Y_t|] \leq \frac{1}{p_1} \mathbb{E}[|Y_1|^{p_1}] + \dots + \frac{1}{p_t} \mathbb{E}[|Y_t|^{p_t}], \quad (\text{H.2})$$

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y_1|] \cdots \mathbb{E}[|Y_t|] \leq \frac{1}{p_1} \mathbb{E}[|Y_1|^{p_1}] + \dots + \frac{1}{p_t} \mathbb{E}[|Y_t|^{p_t}]. \quad (\text{H.3})$$

In this goal, note that Young's inequality is stated as follows: For any  $a_1, \dots, a_t \geq 0$ , and  $p_1, \dots, p_t > 1$  such that  $1/p_1 + \dots + 1/p_t = 1$ , we have

$$a_1 \cdots a_t \leq \frac{1}{p_1} a_1^{p_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{p_t} a_t^{p_t}.$$

Thus, by Young's inequality we know that

$$|Y_1 \cdots Y_t| \leq \frac{1}{p_1} |Y_1|^{p_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{p_t} |Y_t|^{p_t}.$$

Taking the expectation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y_1 \cdots Y_t|] \leq \frac{1}{p_1} \mathbb{E}[|Y_1|^{p_1}] + \dots + \frac{1}{p_t} \mathbb{E}[|Y_t|^{p_t}].$$

Again by Young's inequality, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y_1|] \cdots \mathbb{E}[|Y_t|] \leq \frac{1}{p_1} \mathbb{E}[|Y_1|^{p_1}] + \dots + \frac{1}{p_t} \mathbb{E}[|Y_t|^{p_t}].$$

By Jensen's inequality,  $\mathbb{E}[|Y_i|^{p_i}] \leq \mathbb{E}[|Y_i|^{p_i}]$  for  $i \in [t]$ . This implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[|Y_1|] \cdots \mathbb{E}[|Y_t|] \leq \frac{1}{p_1} \mathbb{E}[|Y_1|^{p_1}] + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_t} \mathbb{E}[|Y_t|^{p_t}].$$

Finally, we prove (H.1). Let  $1/q_j := \sum_{i=\eta_{j-1}+1}^{\eta_j} 1/p_i$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k] \triangleright (|Y_1|, \dots, |Y_k|) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[|Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}|] \mathbb{E}[|Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_2}|] \cdots \mathbb{E}[|Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{k-1}+1} \cdots Y_k|] \\ &\stackrel{(H.3)}{\leq} \frac{1}{q_1} \mathbb{E}[|Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}|^{q_1}] + \cdots + \frac{1}{q_k} \mathbb{E}[|Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{k-1}+1} \cdots Y_k|^{q_k}] \\ &\stackrel{(H.2)}{\leq} \frac{1}{p_1} \mathbb{E}[|Y_1|^{p_1}] + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_{\eta_1}} \mathbb{E}[|Y_{\eta_1}|^{p_{\eta_1}}] + \cdots \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{p_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{k-1}+1}} \mathbb{E}[|Y_{k+1-u_k}|^{p_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{k-1}+1}}] + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_k} \mathbb{E}[|Y_k|^{p_k}]. \end{aligned}$$

■

Secondly, let's show some properties of the  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{D}^*$  operators that will be useful later.

**Lemma H.2.** *Let  $(Y_i)_{i=1}^t$  be a sequence of random variables. Suppose for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $i \leq j \leq t$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[|Y_i \cdots Y_j|] < \infty$ . Then the following holds for all  $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $t \geq 2$  and for any  $j = 1, \dots, t-1$ :*

$$\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_j \mathcal{D}(Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_t)) = \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t), \quad (\text{H.4})$$

$$\mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_j \mathcal{D}(Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_t)) = \mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t). \quad (\text{H.5})$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) = \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_{t-2}, Y_{t-1} \mathcal{D}(Y_t)) \\ &= \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_{t-2}, Y_{t-1} Y_t) - \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_{t-1}) \mathbb{E}[Y_t]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.6})$$

Moreover, we know that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)] = 0.$$

**Proof of Lemma H.2.** We perform induction on  $j$  to prove that

$$\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_j \mathcal{D}(Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_t)) = \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t).$$

If  $j = 1$ , this is precisely the definition. Supposing the lemma holds for  $j$  ( $j \leq t-1$ ), consider the case for  $j+1$ . By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_{j+1} \mathcal{D}(Y_{j+2}, \dots, Y_t)) \\ &= \mathcal{D}(Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_{j+1} \mathcal{D}(Y_{j+2}, \dots, Y_t))) \\ &= \mathcal{D}(Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t)) = \mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have used the inductive hypothesis in the second equation. By induction, (H.5) is proven.

Now for any  $j = 1 \cdots t-1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_j \mathcal{D}(Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_t)) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_j \mathcal{D}(Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_t))\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t)\right] = \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we remark that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{D}(Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t)] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t)] = 0.\end{aligned}$$

■

**Lemma H.3.** *Let  $(Y_i)_{i=1}^t$  be a sequence of random variables. Suppose for any  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $i \leq j \leq t$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[|Y_i \cdots Y_j|] < \infty$ . Then we have the following expression for  $\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t)$  and  $\mathcal{D}(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t)$ :*

$$\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t) = \sum_{(\ell, \eta_{1:\ell}) \in C(t)} (-1)^{\ell-1} [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t), \quad (\text{H.7})$$

$$\mathcal{D}(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t) = Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t - \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} Y_1 \cdots Y_j \mathcal{D}^*(Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_t). \quad (\text{H.8})$$

where  $C(t) = \{\ell, \eta_{1:\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \eta_j = t\}$ .

**Proof of Lemma H.3.** We perform induction on  $t$ .

If  $t = 1$ , then by definition  $\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1) = \mathbb{E}[Y_1] = [1] \triangleright (Y_1)$  and  $\mathcal{D}(Y_1) = Y_1 - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] = Y_1 - \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1)$ .

Supposing the results hold for  $1, 2, \dots, t-1$ , we consider the case  $t$ . Suppose that we have  $\mathbb{E}[|Y_1 \cdots Y_t|] < \infty$ . By the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t)] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t] - \mathbb{E}(Y_1) \mathcal{D}^*(Y_2, \dots, Y_t) - \sum_{j=3}^t \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \cdots Y_{j-1} \mathcal{D}^*(Y_j, \dots, Y_t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t] - \sum_{j=2}^t \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \cdots Y_{j-1} \mathcal{D}^*(Y_j, \dots, Y_t)] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t] - \sum_{j=2}^t \sum_{C(t-j+1)} \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \cdots Y_{j-1} (-1)^{\ell-1} [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright (Y_j, \dots, Y_t)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t] + \sum_{j=2}^t \sum_{C(t-j+1)} (-1)^\ell [j-1, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright (Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t] + \sum_{C(t) \setminus \{\ell=1, \eta_1=t\}} (-1)^{\ell-1} [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright (Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \\ &= \sum_{C(t)} (-1)^{\ell-1} [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright (Y_1, \dots, Y_t),\end{aligned}$$

where to get (a) we have used the fact that by inductive hypothesis (H.8) holds for  $t-1$ , and to get (b) we have used the fact that we assumed that (H.7) hold for  $t-1$ . Finally, to get (c) we have used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}C(t) &= \{\ell, \eta_{1:\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \eta_j = t\} \\ &= \{\ell = 1, \eta_1 = t\} \cup \bigcup_{i=2}^t \{\ell, \eta_{1:\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \ell \geq 2, \eta_1 = i, \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \eta_j = t\}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_t) &= Y_1 \mathcal{D}(Y_2, \dots, Y_t) - \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \\
&= Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t - Y_1 \mathcal{D}^*(Y_2, \dots, Y_t) - \sum_{j=2}^{t-1} Y_1 \cdots Y_j \mathcal{D}^*(Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_t) - \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \\
&= Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t - \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) - \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} Y_1 \cdots Y_j \mathcal{D}^*(Y_{j+1}, \dots, Y_t).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the results also hold for  $t$ . And the proof is complete by induction.  $\blacksquare$

Next we need the following notions of *compositional  $\mathcal{D}^*$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  operators*.

$$[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) := \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\eta_2}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t), \quad (\text{H.9})$$

$$[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) := \mathcal{D}(Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\eta_2}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t). \quad (\text{H.10})$$

Note that a compositional  $\mathcal{D}$  term is a random variable while a compositional  $\mathcal{D}^*$  operator gives a deterministic value. We remark that

$$\mathbb{E}[[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{D}(Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t)] = 0. \quad (\text{H.11})$$

Moreover, by definition and (H.4), we can directly check that

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \\
&= [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{s-1}, \eta_s + 1] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_s}, [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_s+1}, \dots, Y_t)).
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.12})$$

The following lemma shows some upper bounds on their norms.

**Lemma H.4.** *Let  $(Y_i)_{i=1}^t$  be random variable such that for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $i \leq j \leq t$  we have  $\mathbb{E}[|Y_i Y_{i+1} \cdots Y_j|] < \infty$ . Then for any  $q \geq 1$  the following holds*

$$|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)| \leq \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(t)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|, \dots, |Y_t|), \quad (\text{H.13})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)| &\leq |\mathbb{E}[Y_1 \cdots Y_t]| \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(j)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|, \dots, |Y_j|) \cdot |\mathbb{E}[Y_{j+1} \cdots Y_t]|,
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.14})$$

$$\|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)\|_q \leq 2 \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(t)} \left( [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|^q, \dots, |Y_t|^q) \right)^{1/q}. \quad (\text{H.15})$$

where  $C(t) := \{s, \zeta_s \in \mathbb{N}_+ : \sum_{j=1}^s \zeta_j = t\}$ .

**Proof.** Applying Lemma H.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)| \\
&= |\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\eta_2}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t)|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(t)} (-1)^{s-1} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\eta_2}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(t)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}|, |Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\eta_2}|, \dots, |Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t|) \\
&\leq \sum_{(s, \lambda_{1:s}) \in C(t)} [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|, |Y_2|, \dots, |Y_t|),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the fact that for every  $(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(t)$ , if we write  $\lambda_1 := \sum_{h=1}^{\zeta_1} \eta_h$  and  $\lambda_j := \sum_{h=\zeta_{j-1}}^{\zeta_j} \eta_h$  for all  $j \leq s$ , we have that  $(s, \lambda_{1:s}) \in C(t)$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|, |Y_2|, \dots, |Y_t|) \\
&= [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}|, |Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\eta_2}|, \dots, |Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t|).
\end{aligned}$$

Using similar ideas, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)| \\
&= |\mathcal{D}^*(Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\eta_2}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t)| \\
&\stackrel{\text{(H.7)}}{=} \left| \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(t)} (-1)^{s-1} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t) \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E}[Y_1 \cdots Y_t] + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(j)} (-1)^s [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright \right. \\
&\quad \left. (Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j-1}+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j}) \cdot \mathbb{E}[Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j+1} \cdots Y_t] \right| \\
&\leq |\mathbb{E}[Y_1 \cdots Y_t]| + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(j)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright \\
&\quad (|Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}|, \dots, |Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j-1}+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j}|) \cdot |\mathbb{E}[Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j+1} \cdots Y_t]| \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} |\mathbb{E}[Y_1 \cdots Y_t]| + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{(s, \lambda_{1:s}) \in C(\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright \\
&\quad (|Y_1|, |Y_2|, \dots, |Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j}|) \cdot |\mathbb{E}[Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j+1} \cdots Y_t]| \\
&\leq |\mathbb{E}[Y_1 \cdots Y_t]| + \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \sum_{(s, \lambda_{1:s}) \in C(h)} [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|, |Y_2|, \dots, |Y_h|) \cdot |\mathbb{E}[Y_{h+1} \cdots Y_t]|,
\end{aligned}$$

where to obtain  $(*)$  we have used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|, \dots, |Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j}|) \\
&= [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}|, \dots, |Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j-1}+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j}|).
\end{aligned}$$

Now let's prove (H.15). By Lemma H.3, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t)\|_q \\
&= \|\mathcal{D}(Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, Y_{\eta_1+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\eta_2}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t)\|_q \\
&\stackrel{\text{(H.8)}}{=} \left\| Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t - \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t) \right\|
\end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j} \cdot \mathcal{D}^*(Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j+1}}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t) \Big\|_q \\
= & \left\| Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t - [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j} \right. \\
& \left. \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(\ell-j)} (-1)^{s-1} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j+1}}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t) \right\|_q
\end{aligned}$$

We upper-bound this using the triangle inequality. Indeed, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \right\|_q \\
\leq & \left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \right| + \|Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t\|_q \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(\ell-j)} \|Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j}\|_q \cdot \\
& \left| [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j+1}}, \dots, Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t) \right| \\
\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} & \left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \right| + \|Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t\|_q \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(\ell-j)} \|Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j}\|_q \cdot \\
& \left( [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j+1} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j+1}}|^q, \dots, |Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t|^q) \right)^{1/q} \\
\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} & \left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \right| + \|Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t\|_q \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} \sum_{(s, \lambda_{1:s}) \in C(\eta_{j+1}+\dots+\eta_\ell)} \|Y_1 \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j}\|_q \cdot \\
& \left( [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s] \triangleright (|Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_j+1}|^q, \dots, |Y_t|^q) \right)^{1/q} \\
\leq & \left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \right| + \|Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_t\|_q + \sum_{h=1}^{t-1} \sum_{(s, \lambda_{1:s}) \in C(t-h)} \|Y_1 \cdots Y_h\|_q \cdot \\
& \left( [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s] \triangleright (|Y_{h+1}|^q, \dots, |Y_t|^q) \right)^{1/q} \\
= & \left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_t) \right| + \sum_{(s, \lambda_{1:s}) \in C(t)} \left( [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|^q, \dots, |Y_t|^q) \right)^{1/q} \\
\stackrel{(H.13)}{\leq} & \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(t)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|, \dots, |Y_t|) \\
& + \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(t)} \left( [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|^q, \dots, |Y_t|^q) \right)^{1/q} \\
\leq & 2 \sum_{(s, \zeta_{1:s}) \in C(t)} \left( [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_1|^q, \dots, |Y_t|^q) \right)^{1/q},
\end{aligned}$$

where to obtain (\*) we have used the fact that by Jensen inequality for any random variable  $X \in \mathcal{L}^q(\mathbb{R})$  we have  $|\mathbb{E}[X]| \leq (\mathbb{E}[|X|^q])^{1/q}$ ; and where to obtain (\*\*) we have used the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} & [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s] \triangleright (|Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j+1}}|^q, \dots, |Y_t|^q) \\ & = [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_s] \triangleright (|Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j+1}} \cdots Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{j+1}}|^q, \dots, |Y_{\eta_1+\dots+\eta_{\ell-1}+1} \cdots Y_t|^q). \end{aligned}$$

■

**Lemma H.5.** *Let  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  be a stationary random field of random variables with a finite index set  $T$  and finite  $L^r$ -norms, i.e.,  $\sup_i \|X_i\|_r \leq M < \infty$ , where  $r$  is a real number such that  $r > 2$ . Let  $S_{T_0, \omega}$  be a random variable that satisfies  $|S_{T_0, \omega}| \leq |\sum_{i \in T_0} X_i|^\omega$  where  $T_0 \subseteq T$  is an index set and  $0 \leq \omega \leq 1$ . Fix  $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $1 \leq t < r - 1$  and  $i_{1:t} \in T$ .*

*For any  $\ell, \eta_{1:\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_\ell = t + 1$ , we have*

$$|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_t}, X_{i_{t+1}})| \leq 2^t M^{t+1}, \quad (\text{H.16})$$

$$|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \leq 2^t |T_0|^\omega M^{t+\omega}. \quad (\text{H.17})$$

*We further let  $j$  be an integer that satisfies  $2 \leq j \leq t + 1$  and define the  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$  by*

$$\mathcal{F}_1 := \sigma(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_j}), \quad \mathcal{F}_2 := \sigma(X_{i_{j+1}}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}}),$$

$$\mathcal{F}_3 := \begin{cases} \sigma(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) & \text{if } j \leq t \\ \sigma(S_{T_0, \omega}) & \text{if } j = t + 1 \end{cases}.$$

*For any  $s, \ell, \eta_{1:\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_s = j - 1$  and  $\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_\ell = t + 1$ , we have*

$$|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_t}, X_{i_{t+1}})| \leq 2^{t+3} (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2))^{(r-t-1)/r} M^{t+1}, \quad (\text{H.18})$$

$$|[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \leq 2^{t+3} |T_0|^\omega (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-t-\omega)/r} M^{t+\omega}, \quad (\text{H.19})$$

*where  $\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$  is the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients between  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_2$ , and  $\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3)$  is the  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients between  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_3$ .*

**Proof.** For ease of notation denote  $M := \|X_{i_1}\|_r$ . To prove (H.16), we remark that

$$\begin{aligned} & |[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})| \\ & \stackrel{(\text{H.13})}{\leq} \sum_{(\ell', \zeta_{1:\ell'}) \in C(t+1)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{\ell'}] \triangleright (|X_{i_1}|, \dots, |X_{i_{t+1}}|) \\ & \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 2^t \frac{1}{t+1} (\|X_{i_1}\|_{t+1}^{t+1} + \dots + \|X_{i_{t+1}}\|_{t+1}^{t+1}) \leq 2^t M^{t+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where (\*) is implied by Lemma H.1 and the fact that  $|C(t+1)| = 2^t$  [Heubach and Mansour, 2009].

For (H.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \\ & \stackrel{(\text{H.13})}{\leq} \sum_{(\ell', \zeta_{1:\ell'}) \in C(t+1)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{\ell'}] \triangleright (|X_{i_1}|, \dots, |X_{i_t}|, |S_{T_0, \omega}|) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq |T_0|^\omega \sum_{(\ell', \zeta_{1:\ell'}) \in C(t+1)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{\ell'}] \triangleright \left( |X_{i_1}|, \dots, |X_{i_t}|, \left| \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right|^\omega \right) \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} |T_0|^\omega \sum_{(\ell', \zeta_{1:\ell'}) \in C(t+1)} \left( \frac{1}{t+\omega} (\|X_{i_1}\|_{t+\omega}^{t+\omega} + \dots + \|X_{i_t}\|_{t+\omega}^{t+\omega}) + \frac{\omega}{t+\omega} \left\| \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right\|_{t+\omega}^{t+\omega} \right) \\
&\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} 2^t |T_0|^\omega \left( \frac{1}{t+\omega} (\|X_{i_1}\|_{t+\omega}^{t+\omega} + \dots + \|X_{i_t}\|_{t+\omega}^{t+\omega}) + \frac{\omega}{t+\omega} \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} \|X_i\|_{t+\omega}^{t+\omega} \right) \\
&\leq 2^t |T_0|^\omega \cdot M^{t+\omega}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used Lemma H.1 in (\*), and (\*\*) is implied by  $|C(t+1)| \leq 2^t$  and Jensen's inequality as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right\|_{t+\omega}^{t+\omega} = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right|^{t+\omega} \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} |X_i|^{t+\omega} \right] = \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} \mathbb{E} [|X_i|^{t+\omega}] = \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} \|X_i\|_{t+\omega}^{t+\omega}.
\end{aligned}$$

To show (H.18), we remark that assumption we have that  $s$  is such that  $\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_s = j-1$ . Therefore, according to (H.12), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}}) \tag{H.20} \\
&= [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_s, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}}) \\
&= [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{s-1}, \eta_s + 1] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{j-1}}, [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by exploiting (H.14), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{s-1}, \eta_s + 1] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{j-1}}, [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} \cdot [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})] \right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{w=1}^{j-2} \sum_{(s', \zeta_{1:s'}) \in C(w)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{s'}] \triangleright (|X_{i_1}|, \dots, |X_{i_w}|) \cdot \\
&\quad \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_{w+1}} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} \cdot [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})] \right| \tag{H.21}
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma H.1, we know that

$$[\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{s'}] \triangleright (|X_{i_1}|, \dots, |X_{i_w}|) \leq \frac{1}{w} (\|X_{i_1}\|_w^w + \dots + \|X_{i_w}\|_w^w) \leq M^w. \tag{H.22}$$

Combining (H.20), (H.21), and (H.22), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}}) \right| \tag{H.23} \\
&\leq \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} \cdot [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})] \right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{w=1}^{j-2} \sum_{(s', \zeta_{1:s'}) \in C(w)} M^w \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_{w+1}} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} \cdot [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})] \right| \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \sum_{w=0}^{j-2} 2^{(w-1) \vee 0} M^w \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_{w+1}} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} \cdot [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})] \right|
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{w=1}^{j-1} 2^{(w-2) \vee 0} M^{w-1} \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} \cdot [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})] \right|.$$

where (\*) is due to the fact that  $|C(w)| = 2^{w-1}$ .

As mentioned in (H.11), by definition of the compositional  $\mathcal{D}$  operator we know that

$$\mathbb{E} [[\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})] = 0.$$

Thus, we can apply Lemma A.1:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} \cdot [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})] \right| \\ & \leq 8(\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2))^{(r-t+w-2)/r} \|X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}}\|_{r/(j-w)} \\ & \quad \|[\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})\|_{r/(t-j+2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.24})$$

By Lemma H.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}}\|_{r/(j-w)} &= \left( \mathbb{E} [ \|X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}}\|_{r/(j-w)}^r ] \right)^{(j-w)/r} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{j-w} (\|X_{i_w}\|_r^r + \cdots + \|X_{i_{j-1}}\|_r^r) \right)^{(j-w)/r} \leq M^{j-w}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.25})$$

Moreover, remark that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|[\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})\|_{r/(t-j+2)} \\ & \stackrel{(\text{H.15})}{\leq} 2 \sum_{(\ell', \zeta_1, \ell') \in C(t-j+2)} \left( [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright (|X_{i_j}|^{r/(t-j+2)}, \dots, |X_{i_{t+1}}|^{r/(t-j+2)}) \right)^{(t-j+2)/r} \\ & \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 2^{t-j+2} \left( \frac{1}{t-j+2} (\|X_{i_j}\|_r^r + \cdots + \|X_{i_{t+1}}\|_r^r) \right)^{(t-j+2)/r} \leq 2^{t-j+2} M^{t-j+2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.26})$$

Note that (\*) is implied by the fact that  $|C(t-j+2)| = 2^{t-j+1}$  and Lemma H.1.

Substituting (H.25) and (H.26) into (H.24), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} \cdot [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}})] \right| \\ & \leq 2^{t-j+5} (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2))^{(r-t+w-2)/r} M^{t-w+2}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this and (H.23), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{t+1}}) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{w=1}^{j-1} 2^{(w-2) \vee 0} \cdot 2^{t-j+5} (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2))^{(r-t+w-2)/r} M^{t+1} \\ & \leq 2^{t+3} (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2))^{(r-t-1)/r} M^{t+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we prove (H.19). We consider two cases,  $2 \leq j \leq t$  and  $j = t + 1$ .

If  $2 \leq j \leq t$ , by (H.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \\ &= [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_s, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \\ &= [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{s-1}, \eta_s + 1] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{j-1}}, [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.27})$$

By (H.14), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{s-1}, \eta_s + 1] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^* \left( X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{j-1}}, [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \right) \right| \\
& \leq \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})] \right| \\
& \quad + \sum_{w=1}^{j-2} \sum_{(s', \zeta_{1:s'}) \in C(w)} [\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{s'}] \triangleright (|X_{i_1}|, \dots, |X_{i_w}|) \cdot \\
& \quad \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_{w+1}} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})] \right|.
\end{aligned} \tag{H.28}$$

Combining (H.27), (H.28), and (H.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^* (X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \right| \\
& \leq \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})] \right| \\
& \quad + \sum_{w=1}^{j-2} \sum_{(s', \zeta_{1:s'}) \in C(w)} M^w \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_{w+1}} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})] \right| \\
& \stackrel{(*)}{=} \sum_{w=1}^{j-1} 2^{(w-2) \vee 0} M^{w-1} \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})] \right|,
\end{aligned} \tag{H.29}$$

where (\*) is due to the fact that  $|C(w)| = 2^{w-1}$ .

We apply Lemma A.1 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} [X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})] \right| \\
& \leq 8 (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-t+w-1-\omega)/r} \|X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}}\|_{r/(j-w)} \cdot \\
& \quad \left\| [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \right\|_{r/(t+1+\omega-j)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{H.30}$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| [\eta_{s+1}, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \right\|_{r/(t+1+\omega-j)} \\
& \stackrel{(H.15)}{\leq} 2|T_0|^\omega \sum_{(\ell', \lambda_{1:\ell'}) \in C(t+2-j)} \left( [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\ell'}] \triangleright \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left( |X_{i_j}|^{\frac{r}{t+1+\omega-j}}, \dots, |X_{i_t}|^{\frac{r}{t+1+\omega-j}}, \left| \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right|^{\frac{r\omega}{t+1+\omega-j}} \right) \right)^{\frac{t+1+\omega-j}{r}} \\
& \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 2|T_0|^\omega \sum_{(\ell', \lambda_{1:\ell'}) \in C(t+2-j)} \left( \frac{1}{t+1+\omega-j} (\|X_{i_j}\|_r^r + \dots + \|X_{i_t}\|_r^r) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{\omega}{t+1+\omega-j} \left\| \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right\|_r^r \right)^{\frac{t+1+\omega-j}{r}}
\end{aligned} \tag{H.31}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{(**)}{\leq} 2^{t+2-j}|T_0|^\omega \left( \frac{1}{t+1+\omega-j} (\|X_{i_j}\|_r^r + \cdots + \|X_{i_t}\|_r^r) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\omega}{t+1+\omega-j} \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} \|X_i\|_r^r \right)^{\frac{t+1+\omega-j}{r}} \\
&\leq 2^{t+2-j}|T_0|^\omega M^{t+1+\omega-j},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma H.1 in (\*), and (\*\*) is implied by  $|C(t+2-j)| = 2^{t+1-j}$  and Jensen's inequality as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right\|_r^r = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right|^r \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} |X_i|^r \right] = \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} \mathbb{E}[|X_i|^r] = \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} \|X_i\|_r^r.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (H.25) and (H.31) into (H.30), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \mathbb{E}[X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_{j-1}} \cdot [\eta_{s+1}, \cdots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}(X_{i_j}, \cdots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega})] \right| \\
&\leq 2^{t+5-j}|T_0|^\omega (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-t+w-1-\omega)/r} M^{t+1+\omega-w}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (H.29), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| [\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \cdots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{w=1}^{j-1} 2^{(w-2) \vee 0} M^{w-1} \cdot 2^{t+5-j}|T_0|^\omega (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-t+w-1-\omega)/r} M^{t+1+\omega-w} \\
&\leq 2^{t+3}|T_0|^\omega (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-t-\omega)/r} M^{t+\omega}.
\end{aligned}$$

If  $j = t + 1$ , then  $\eta_1 + \cdots + \eta_s = j - 1 = t$  implies that  $s = \ell - 1$  and  $\eta_\ell = 1$ . By (H.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \cdots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \tag{H.32} \\
&= [\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_s, 1] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \cdots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \\
&= [\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_{s-1}, \eta_s + 1] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \cdots, X_{i_t}, \mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})).
\end{aligned}$$

By (H.14), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| [\eta_1, \cdots, \eta_{s-1}, \eta_s + 1] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \cdots, X_{i_t}, \mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})) \right| \tag{H.33} \\
&\leq \left| \mathbb{E}[X_{i_1} \cdots X_{i_t} \cdot \mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})] \right| \\
&\quad + \sum_{w=1}^t \sum_{(s', \zeta_{1:s'}) \in C(w)} [\zeta_1, \cdots, \zeta_{s'}] \triangleright (|X_{i_1}|, \cdots, |X_{i_w}|) \cdot \left| \mathbb{E}[X_{i_{w+1}} \cdots X_{i_t} \cdot \mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})] \right| \\
&\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} \sum_{w=1}^t 2^{(w-2) \vee 0} M^{w-1} \left| \mathbb{E}[X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_t} \cdot \mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})] \right|,
\end{aligned}$$

where (\*) is due to (H.22) and the fact that  $|C(w)| = 2^{w-1}$ .

Combining (H.32) and (H.33), we have

$$\left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \right| \leq \sum_{w=1}^t 2^{(w-2) \vee 0} M^{w-1} \left| \mathbb{E}[X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_t} \cdot \mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})] \right|. \quad (\text{H.34})$$

Again we apply Lemma A.1 and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}[X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_t} \cdot \mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})] \right| \\ & \leq 8(\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-t+w-1-\omega)/r} \|X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_t}\|_{r/(t+1-w)} \cdot \|\mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})\|_{r/\omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.35})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})\|_{r/\omega} & \leq 2\|S_{T_0, \omega}\|_{r/\omega} \leq 2\left\| \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right\|_r^\omega \\ & \leq 2|T_0|^\omega \left\| \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} X_i \right\|_r^\omega \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 2|T_0|^\omega \left( \frac{1}{|T_0|} \sum_{i \in T_0} \|X_i\|_r^r \right)^{\omega/r} \leq 2|T_0|^\omega M^\omega. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.36})$$

Once again we have used Jensen's inequality to get (\*).

Substituting (H.25) and (H.36) into (H.35), we get

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[X_{i_w} \cdots X_{i_t} \cdot \mathcal{D}(S_{T_0, \omega})] \right| \leq 16(\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-t+w-1-\omega)/r} |T_0|^\omega M^{t-w+\omega+1}.$$

Combining this and (H.34), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| [\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_t}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{w=1}^t 2^{(w-2) \vee 0} M^{w-1} \cdot 16(\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-t+w-1-\omega)/r} |T_0|^\omega M^{t-w+\omega+1} \\ & \leq 2^{t+3} |T_0|^\omega (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-t-\omega)/r} M^{t+\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Before providing the upper bound for the sums of  $\mathcal{S}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{U}_f(H)$ , we first control the  $\mathcal{E}_G$  operator defined in Appendix B.2 using  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients.

**Lemma H.6.** *Let  $(X_i)_{i \in T}$  be a stationary random field of random variables with a finite index set  $T$  and finite  $L^r$ -norms, i.e.,  $\sup_i \|X_i\|_r \leq M < \infty$ . Given an order- $(k+1)$  genogram  $G$ , we have the following bounds:*

(a) *For any real number  $r > k+1$ , we have*

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, X_{i_{k+1}}) \right| \leq 2^k M^{k+1}. \quad (\text{H.37})$$

(b) *For any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1, \omega}(\mathbb{R})$ , we have*

$$\left| \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G)) \right| \leq 2^k \sigma^{-\omega} |B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}|^\omega \cdot |f|_{k-1, \omega} M^{k+\omega}, \quad (\text{H.38})$$

where  $\sigma^2 := \text{Var}(\sum_{i \in T} X_i)$ .

*If  $k \geq 2$ , for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2, 1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{k-1, 1}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\omega \in [0, 1]$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G)) \right| \\ & \leq 2^{k+1} \sigma^{-\omega} |B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}|^\omega \cdot |f|_{k-2, 1}^{1-\omega} |f|_{k-1, 1}^\omega M^{k+\omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.39})$$

(c) For any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1,\omega}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $c_1 < c_2$ , we have

$$\left| \sum_{c_1 \leq s_{k+1} < c_2} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G)) \right| \leq 2^k \sigma^{-\omega} (c_2 - c_1)^\omega |f|_{k-1,\omega} M^{k+\omega},$$

where the sum is taken over genograms whose  $c_1 \leq s_{k+1} < c_2$  with the vertex set, the edge set, and  $s_{1:k}$  fixed.

If  $k \geq 2$ , for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{k-1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $\omega \in [0, 1]$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $c_1 < c_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{c_1 \leq s_{k+1} < c_2} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G)) \right| \\ & \leq 2^{k+1} \sigma^{-\omega} (c_2 - c_1)^\omega |f|_{k-2,1}^{1-\omega} |f|_{k-1,1}^\omega M^{k+\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose there exists  $1 < j \leq k+1$  such that  $s_j \geq 1$ . Then the following holds:

(d) For any real number  $r > k+1$ , we have

$$|\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, X_{i_{k+1}})| \leq 2^{k+3} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1}, \quad (\text{H.40})$$

where  $\ell_0$  is the smallest integer  $\ell$  such that

$$k(2\ell + 1)^d \geq \max_{1 \leq j \leq k+1} s_j + k(2m + 1)^d.$$

(e) For any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1,\omega}(\mathbb{R})$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G))| \\ & \leq 2^{k+3} \sigma^{-\omega} |B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}|^\omega \cdot |f|_{k-1,\omega} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.41})$$

where  $\ell_0$  is defined as above.

If  $k \geq 2$ , for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{k-1,1}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\omega \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G))| \\ & \leq 2^{k+4} \sigma^{-\omega} |B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}|^\omega \cdot |f|_{k-2,1}^{1-\omega} |f|_{k-1,1}^\omega \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.42})$$

(f) For any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1,\omega}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $c_1 < c_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{c_1 \leq s_{k+1} < c_2} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G)) \right| \\ & \leq 2^{k+3} \sigma^{-\omega} (c_2 - c_1)^\omega |f|_{k-1,\omega} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.43})$$

where  $\ell_0$  is the smallest integer  $\ell$  such that

$$k(2\ell + 1)^d \geq c_1 \vee \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} s_j + k(2m + 1)^d.$$

If  $k \geq 2$ , for any  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{k-1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $\omega \in [0, 1]$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}_+$  such that  $c_1 < c_2$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G))| \\ & \leq 2^{k+4} \sigma^{-\omega} (c_2 - c_1)^\omega \cdot |f|_{k-2,1}^{1-\omega} |f|_{k-1,1}^\omega \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H.44})$$

**Proof of Lemma H.6.** We will perform induction on  $k$  to prove this lemma. But before that, we will present some preliminary results.



Firstly, we observe that if  $s_{k+1} \geq 1$ , then  $B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}$  is a singleton and therefore,  $|B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}| = 1$  which implies that Lemma H.6b is a special case of Lemma H.6c and that Lemma H.6e is a special case of Lemma H.6f by setting  $c_2 = c_1 + 1$ . For notational convenience, we combine the two cases by denoting

$$\tilde{\Delta}_f := \begin{cases} \Delta_f(G) & \text{if } s_{k+1} \leq 0 \\ \sum_{c_1 \leq s_{k+1} < c_2} \Delta_f(G) & \text{if } s_{k+1} \geq 1 \end{cases}.$$

Then by definition of  $\mathcal{E}_G$ , we have

$$\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \tilde{\Delta}_f) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G)) & \text{if } s_{k+1} \leq 0 \\ \sum_{c_1 \leq s_{k+1} < c_2} \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(G)) & \text{if } s_{k+1} \geq 1 \end{cases}.$$

Further let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_{k+1} &:= \begin{cases} B_{k+1} & \text{if } s_{k+1} \leq 0 \\ N^{(c_2-1)}(i_\ell : \ell \in A(k+1)) \cup D_{g(k+1)} & \text{if } s_{k+1} \geq 1 \end{cases}, \\ \tilde{D}_{k+1} &:= \begin{cases} D_{k+1} & \text{if } s_{k+1} \leq 0 \\ N^{(c_1-1)}(i_\ell : \ell \in A(k+1)) \cup D_{g(k+1)} & \text{if } s_{k+1} \geq 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

If  $s_{k+1} \geq c_1 \geq 1$ , we have  $u(k+1) = k+1$ . The following holds due to a telescoping sum argument:

$$\tilde{\Delta}_f = \partial^{k-1} f(W(\tilde{B}_{k+1})) - \partial^{k-1} f(W(\tilde{D}_{k+1})).$$

Thus, we get that

$$\tilde{\Delta}_f = \begin{cases} \partial^{k-1} f(W(\tilde{B}_{k+1})) - \partial^{k-1} f(W(\tilde{D}_{k+1})) & \text{if } u(k+1) = k+1 \\ \int_0^1 (k+1-u(k+1))v^{k-u(k+1)} \cdot \\ \quad (\partial^{k-1} f(vW(\tilde{D}_{k+1}) + (1-v)W(\tilde{B}_{k+1})) - \partial^{k-1} f(W(\tilde{D}_{k+1}))) dv & \text{if } u(k+1) \leq k \end{cases}.$$

If  $u(k+1) = k+1$ , we have

$$|\tilde{\Delta}_f| \leq |\partial^{k-1} f(W(\tilde{B}_{k+1})) - \partial^{k-1} f(W(\tilde{D}_{k+1}))| \leq \sigma^{-\omega} |f|_{k-1, \omega} \left| \sum_{i \in \tilde{B}_{k+1} \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}} X_i \right|^\omega.$$

If  $u(k+1) \leq k$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{\Delta}_f| &\leq \int_0^1 (k+1-u(k+1))v^{k-u(k+1)} \cdot \\ &\quad \left| \partial^{k-1} f(vW(\tilde{D}_{k+1}) + (1-v)W(\tilde{B}_{k+1})) - \partial^{k-1} f(W(\tilde{D}_{k+1})) \right| dv \\ &\leq \sigma^{-\omega} |f|_{k-1, \omega} \cdot \left| \sum_{i \in \tilde{B}_{k+1} \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}} X_i \right| \int_0^1 (k+1-u(k+1))v^{k-u(k+1)} dv \\ &\leq \sigma^{-\omega} |f|_{k-1, \omega} \left| \sum_{i \in \tilde{B}_{k+1} \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}} X_i \right|^\omega. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in both cases, we can write

$$\tilde{\Delta}_f = \sigma^{-\omega} |f|_{k-1, \omega} S_{T_0, \omega},$$

where  $T_0 = \tilde{B}_{k+1} \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}$  and  $S_{T_0, \omega}$  (which depends on  $f$  by definition) satisfies

$$|S_{T_0, \omega}| \leq |\sum_{i \in T_0} X_i|^\omega.$$

If  $k \geq 2$  and  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{C}^{k-1,1}(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-1,1}(\mathbb{R})$  implies that

$$|\tilde{\Delta}_f| \leq \sigma^{-1} |f|_{k-1,1} |\sum_{i \in T_0} X_i|.$$

On the other hand,  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{k-2,1}(\mathbb{R})$  implies that

$$|\tilde{\Delta}_f| \leq 2|f|_{k-2,1}.$$

Thus, for any  $\omega \in [0, 1]$ , we have

$$|\tilde{\Delta}_f| \leq 2\sigma^{-\omega} |f|_{k-2,1}^{1-\omega} |f|_{k-1,1}^\omega |\sum_{i \in T_0} X_i|^\omega.$$

In this setting, we can write

$$\tilde{\Delta}_f = 2\sigma^{-\omega} |f|_{k-2,1}^{1-\omega} |f|_{k-1,1}^\omega S_{T_0, \omega},$$

where  $T_0 = \tilde{B}_{k+1} \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}$  and  $S_{T_0, \omega}$  (which depends on  $f$  by definition) satisfies

$$|S_{T_0, \omega}| \leq |\sum_{i \in T_0} X_i|^\omega.$$

Then Lemmas H.6b and H.6c reduce to

(g)

$$|\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \leq 2^k |T_0|^\omega M^{k+\omega}. \quad (\text{H.45})$$

And Lemmas H.6e and H.6f reduce to

(h)

$$|\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \leq 2^{k+3} |T_0|^\omega \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}, \quad (\text{H.46})$$

where  $\ell_0$  is the smallest integer  $\ell$  such that

$$k(2\ell + 1)^d \geq c_1 \vee \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} s_j + k(2m + 1)^d.$$

Secondly, if  $s_j \geq 1$  for some  $1 < j \leq k + 1$ , we denote the  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{F}_{j-} := \sigma(X_{i_t} : t \in A(j))$  and

$$\mathcal{F}_{j+} := \begin{cases} \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus D_j) & \text{if } 2 \leq j \leq k \\ \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}) & \text{if } j = k + 1 \end{cases}.$$

We will establish that  $\alpha(\mathcal{F}_{j-}, \mathcal{F}_{j+}) \leq \alpha_{\ell_0}$  where  $\alpha(\cdot, \cdot)$  is defined in Definition 3.1.

In this goal, we will write  $\mathbb{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(i, b) := \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \|i - z\| \leq b\}$  for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the maximum norm on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . This is the set of elements at a distance at most  $b$  from  $i$ . Similarly, if  $I \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$  we write  $\mathbb{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(I, b) := \{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d : \min_{i \in I} \|i - z\| \leq b\}$ . We denote by  $\ell$  ( $\ell \geq m + 1$ ) the distance between  $i_j$  and  $\{i_t : t \in A(j)\}$  in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ , and by  $q$  the number of indices whose distance from  $\{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}$  is at least  $m + 1$  and at most  $\ell$  meaning that we set

$$\begin{aligned} q &:= |\{s \in T : d(\{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}, s) \in [m + 1, \ell]\}| \\ &= |T \cap \mathbb{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}, \ell) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}, m)|. \end{aligned}$$

To bound  $q$ , we note that for any  $i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  and  $b \in \mathbb{N}$  we have exactly  $(2b + 1)^d$  elements in  $\mathbb{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(i, b)$ . Thus, we have

$$q \leq (j - 1)((2\ell + 1)^d - (2m + 1)^d) \leq k((2\ell + 1)^d - (2m + 1)^d).$$

Moreover, by definition,  $N^{(s_j)}(i_t : t \in A(j)) \setminus N(i_t : t \in A(j))$  contains the smallest  $s_j$  indexes (with respect to the strict order on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ ) in  $T \setminus N(i_t : t \in A(j))$ . We remark that all the

elements in  $N^{(s_j)}(i_t : t \in A(j)) \setminus N(i_t : t \in A(j))$  have distance at least  $m + 1$  and at most  $\ell$  from  $\{i_t : t \in A(j)\}$  meaning that

$$N^{(s_j)}(i_t : t \in A(j)) \setminus N(i_t : t \in A(j)) \subseteq \mathbb{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}, \ell) \setminus \mathbb{B}_{\|\cdot\|}(\{i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}\}, m).$$

Thus, we have  $q \geq s_j$ . As a result,

$$k(2\ell + 1)^d \geq s_j + k(2m + 1)^d.$$

As  $\ell_0 := \min_{\ell} \{\ell : k(2\ell + 1)^d \geq s_j + k(2m + 1)^d\}$ , we have  $\ell \geq \ell_0$ . Thus, we obtain that  $\alpha(\mathcal{F}_{j-}, \mathcal{F}_{j+}) \leq \alpha_{\ell} \leq \alpha_{\ell_0}$ .

Now we finish the proof of Lemmas H.6a, H.6d, H.6g and H.6h by performing induction on  $k$ .

If  $k = 1$ , by definition we have

$$\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}) = \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2}), \quad \mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, S_{T_0, \omega}) = \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, S_{T_0, \omega}).$$

By (H.16) and (H.17), we have

$$|\mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2})| \leq 2M^2, \quad |\mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \leq 2|T_0|^{\omega} M^{1+\omega}.$$

Thus, Lemmas H.6a and H.6g hold for  $k = 1$ . Now supposing  $s_2 \geq 1$ , by (H.18) and (H.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, X_{i_2})| &\leq 2^4 (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2))^{(r-2)/r} M^2, \\ |\mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, S_{T_0, \omega})| &\leq 2^4 |T_0|^{\omega} (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-1-\omega)/r} M^{1+\omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_1 := \sigma(X_{i_1}) = \mathcal{F}_{2-}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_2 := \sigma(X_{i_2}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{2+}$ , and

$$\mathcal{F}_3 := \sigma(X_i : i \in T_0) = \sigma(X_i : i \in \tilde{B}_2 \setminus \tilde{D}_2) \subseteq \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus \tilde{D}_2) = \mathcal{F}_{2+}.$$

As we have shown  $\alpha(\mathcal{F}_{2-}, \mathcal{F}_{2+}) \leq \alpha_{\ell_0}$ , we obtain

$$\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) \leq \alpha_{\ell_0}, \quad \alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3) \leq \alpha_{\ell_0}.$$

Thus, Lemmas H.6d and H.6h also hold for  $k = 1$ .

Suppose Lemmas H.6a, H.6d, H.6g and H.6h are true for  $|G| \leq k$ . Consider the case where  $|G| = k + 1$ . Let

$$q_0 := \sup\{j : j = 1 \text{ or } p(j) \neq j - 1 \text{ for } 2 \leq j \leq k + 1\}, \quad (\text{H.47})$$

We remark that  $q_0$  is the first vertex in the branch of  $G$  with the highest indexes. We set  $w := |\{t : q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq k + 1 \text{ \& } s_t \geq 0\}|$  to be the number of all indices  $q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq k + 1$  such that the identifier  $s_t \geq 0$ . If  $\max_{1 \leq j \leq k+1} s_j \geq 1$ , we let  $j_0$  be an integer that satisfies  $s_{j_0} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k+1} s_j \geq 1$ . We remark that such an index always exists.

We will first propose a simplified formulation for  $\mathcal{E}_G$  that will hold irrespective of the value of  $w$ . Then we will distinguish two main cases in our analysis namely (i) when  $q_0 = 1$  and (ii) when  $q_0 \geq 2$ .

In this goal, we first remark that if  $w = 0$ , by definition we know that for any random variables  $Y_1, \dots, Y_{k+1}$  the following holds

$$\mathcal{E}_G(Y_1, \dots, Y_{k+1}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1 Y_2 \cdots Y_{k+1}) & \text{if } q_0 = 1 \\ \mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(Y_1, \dots, Y_{q_0-1}) \cdot \mathcal{D}^*(Y_{q_0} Y_{q_0+1} \cdots Y_{k+1}) & \text{if } q_0 \geq 2 \end{cases},$$

where  $G[q_0-1] \subseteq G$  is the unique order- $(q_0-1)$  sub-genogram of  $G$  as defined in Appendix B.2.

For  $w \geq 1$ , we write  $\{t : q_0 + 1 \leq t \leq k + 1 \text{ \& } s_t \geq 0\} = \{q_1, \dots, q_w\}$ . Without loss of generality, we suppose that the sequence  $q_0 + 1 \leq q_1 < \dots < q_w \leq k + 1$  is increasing. By definition

$$\mathcal{E}_G(Y_1, \dots, Y_{k+1}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1 \cdots Y_{q_1-1}, Y_{q_1} \cdots Y_{q_2-1}, \dots, Y_{q_w} \cdots Y_{k+1}) & \text{if } q_0 = 1 \\ \mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(Y_1, \dots, Y_{q_0-1}) \cdot \mathcal{D}^*(Y_{q_0} \cdots Y_{q_1-1}, Y_{q_1} \cdots Y_{q_2-1}, \dots, Y_{q_w} \cdots Y_{k+1}) & \text{if } q_0 \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

Set  $q_{w+1} := k + 2$ , then by exploiting the definition of compositional  $\mathcal{D}^*$  operators, we remark that  $\mathcal{E}_G$  will take the following form irrespectively of the fact that  $w \geq 1$  or not:

$$\mathcal{E}_G(Y_1, \dots, Y_{k+1}) := \begin{cases} [q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_1, \dots, Y_{k+1}) & \text{if } q_0 = 1 \\ \mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(Y_1, \dots, Y_{q_0-1}) \cdot [q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(Y_{q_0}, \dots, Y_{k+1}) & \text{if } q_0 \geq 2 \end{cases} \quad (\text{H.48})$$

In particular, we know that

$$\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}}) = \begin{cases} [q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}}) & \text{if } q_0 = 1 \\ \mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}}) \cdot [q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}}) & \text{if } q_0 \geq 2 \end{cases} \quad (\text{H.49})$$

$$\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega}) = \begin{cases} [q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega}) & \text{if } q_0 = 1 \\ \mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}}) \cdot [q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, X_{i_{q_0+1}}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega}) & \text{if } q_0 \geq 2 \end{cases} \quad (\text{H.50})$$

We will use this simplified representation to prove the desired result. If  $q_0 = 1$ , by (H.16) and (H.17) we remark that

$$\begin{aligned} |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| &\leq 2^{k+3} M^{k+1}, \\ |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| &\leq 2^{k+3} |T_0|^\omega M^{k+\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemmas H.6a and H.6g are true when  $q_0 = 1$ .

Supposing  $s_{j_0} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k+1} s_j \geq 1$  ( $j_0 \geq 2$  since  $s_1 = 0$ ), by definition of  $q_1, \dots, q_w$  we know there is some  $1 \leq w' \leq w$  such that  $q_{w'} = j_0$ . Hence

$$(q_1 - q_0) + \dots + (q_{w'} - q_{w'-1}) = j_0 - 1.$$

By (H.18) and (H.19) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \\ &\leq 2^{k+3} (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2))^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &|[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \\ &\leq 2^{k+3} |T_0|^\omega (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_1 := \sigma(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{j_0-1}}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0-},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_2 := \sigma(X_{i_{j_0}}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}}) \stackrel{(*)}{\subseteq} \begin{cases} \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus D_{j_0}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0+} & \text{if } j_0 \leq k \\ \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0+} & \text{if } j_0 = k + 1 \end{cases},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_3 := \begin{cases} \sigma(X_{i_{j_0}}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \subseteq \sigma(X_i : i = j_0, \dots, k, \text{ or } i \in T \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}) & \text{if } j_0 \leq k \\ \stackrel{(**)}{\subseteq} \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus D_{j_0}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0+} & \\ \sigma(S_{T_0, \omega}) \subseteq \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0+} & \text{if } j_0 = k + 1 \end{cases}.$$

Here (\*) and (\*\*) are due to the fact that  $p(j) = j - 1$  for any  $2 \leq j \leq k + 1$  since it implies that  $1, \dots, j_0 - 1 \in A(j)$  for any  $j_0 \leq j \leq k + 1$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| &\leq 2^{k+3} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1}, \\ |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| &\leq 2^{k+3} |T_0|^\omega \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemmas H.6d and H.6h are true when  $q_0 = 1$ .

If  $q_0 \geq 2$ , note that

$$|\mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}})| \leq 2^{q_0-2} M^{q_0-1}, \quad (\text{H.51})$$

which is true for  $q_0 = 2$  since  $\mathcal{E}_{G[1]}(X_{i_1}) = \mathbb{E}[X_{i_1}]$  and is precisely the inductive hypothesis for  $q_0 \geq 3$ .

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}})| \cdot \\ &\quad |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, X_{i_{q_0+1}}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 2^{q_0-2} M^{q_0-1} \cdot 2^{k+1-q_0} M^{k+2-q_0} \leq 2^k M^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where (\*) is due to (H.51) and (H.16). Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}})| \cdot \\ &\quad |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, X_{i_{q_0+1}}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \\ &\leq 2^{q_0-2} M^{q_0-1} \cdot 2^{k+1-q_0} |T_0|^\omega M^{k+1+\omega-q_0} \leq 2^k |T_0|^\omega M^{k+\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemmas H.6a and H.6g are true when  $q_0 \geq 2$ .

Supposing  $s_{j_0} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k+1} s_j \geq 1$ , we claim that  $p(j_0) = j_0 - 1$ . In fact, if  $p(j_0) < j_0 - 1$ , set  $j'_0 = p(j_0) + 1$ . Since  $j'_0 < j_0$  and  $v[j'_0]$  and  $v[j_0]$  are siblings, by Proposition B.1d we have  $s_{j'_0} > s_{j_0}$ , which contradicts the definition of  $j_0$ . Therefore, we have shown  $p(j_0) = j_0 - 1$ , and thus,  $j_0 \neq q_0$  by definition of  $q_0$ .

If  $j_0 \geq q_0 + 1$ , by definition of  $q_1, \dots, q_w$  we know there is some  $1 \leq w' \leq w$  such that  $q_{w'} = j_0$ . Hence

$$(q_1 - q_0) + \dots + (q_{w'} - q_{w'-1}) = j_0 - q_0.$$

Thus, by (H.18) and (H.19) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &|[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \\ &\leq 2^{k-q_0+4} (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2))^{(r-k+q_0-2)/r} M^{k-q_0+2}, \\ &|[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \\ &\leq 2^{k-q_0+4} |T_0|^\omega (\alpha(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_3))^{(r-k+q_0-1-\omega)/r} M^{k-q_0+1+\omega}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_1 := \sigma(X_{i_{q_0}}, \dots, X_{i_{j_0-1}}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0-},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_2 := \sigma(X_{i_{j_0}}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}}) \stackrel{(*)}{\subseteq} \begin{cases} \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus D_{j_0}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0+} & \text{if } j_0 \leq k \\ \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0+} & \text{if } j_0 = k+1 \end{cases},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_3 := \begin{cases} \sigma(X_{i_{j_0}}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega}) \subseteq \sigma(X_i : i = j_0, \dots, k, \text{ or } i \in T \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}) & \text{if } j_0 \leq k \\ \stackrel{(**)}{\subseteq} \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus D_{j_0}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0+} & \\ \sigma(S_{T_0, \omega}) \subseteq \sigma(X_i : i \in T \setminus \tilde{D}_{k+1}) = \mathcal{F}_{j_0+} & \text{if } j_0 = k+1 \end{cases}.$$

Here  $(*)$  and  $(**)$  are due to the fact that  $p(j) = j - 1$  for any  $q_0 + 1 \leq j \leq k + 1$  since it implies that  $q_0, \dots, j_0 - 1 \in A(j)$  for any  $j_0 \leq j \leq k + 1$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \\ & \leq |\mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}})| \cdot \\ & \quad |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, X_{i_{q_0+1}}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \\ & \leq 2^{q_0-2} M^{q_0-1} \cdot 2^{k-q_0+4} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k+q_0-2)/r} M^{k-q_0+2} \\ & \leq 2^{k+3} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \\ & \leq |\mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}})| \cdot \\ & \quad |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, X_{i_{q_0+1}}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \\ & \leq 2^{q_0-2} M^{q_0-1} \cdot 2^{k-q_0+4} |T_0|^\omega \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k+q_0-1-\omega)/r} M^{k-q_0+1+\omega} \\ & \leq 2^{k+3} |T_0|^\omega \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $2 \leq j_0 \leq q_0 - 1$ , by inductive hypothesis we have

$$|\mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}})| \leq 2^{q_0+1} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{r-q_0+1} M^{q_0-1}. \quad (\text{H.52})$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \\ & \leq |\mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}})| \cdot \\ & \quad |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, X_{i_{q_0+1}}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \\ & \stackrel{(*)}{\leq} 2^{q_0+1} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-q_0+1)/r} M^{q_0-1} \cdot 2^{k-q_0+1} M^{k-q_0+2} \\ & \leq 2^{k+3} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(*)$  is implied by (H.52) and (H.37). Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \\ & \leq |\mathcal{E}_{G[q_0-1]}(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{q_0-1}})| \cdot \\ & \quad |[q_1 - q_0, \dots, q_{w+1} - q_w] \triangleright \mathcal{D}^*(X_{i_{q_0}}, X_{i_{q_0+1}}, \dots, X_{i_k}, S_{T_0, \omega})| \\ & \leq 2^{q_0+1} \alpha_{\ell_0}^{r-q_0+1} M^{q_0-1} \cdot 2^{k-q_0+1} |T_0|^\omega M^{k-q_0+1+\omega} \\ & \leq 2^{k+3} |T_0|^\omega \alpha_{\ell_0}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Lemmas H.6d and H.6h are true when  $q_0 \geq 2$ .

By induction the proof is complete. ■

Equipped with the tools in Lemma H.6, we are able to show the proof of Lemma G.4.

**Proof of Lemma G.4.** For each of (G.18)–(G.21), we conduct the sum in two steps:

- (1) Fixing an ordered tree  $(V, E, \prec)$  with the compatible labeling. Here  $V = \{v[1], \dots, v[k+1]\}$  denotes the vertex set and  $E$  denotes the edge set. We take the sum of  $\mathcal{S}(H)$  or  $\mathcal{U}_f(H)$  over all possible values of  $s_1, \dots, s_{k+1}$  such that  $H$  is a genogram that induces  $(V, E, \prec)$ ;
- (2) Sum over all possible ordered trees  $(V, E, \prec)$  of order- $(k+1)$ .

Note that an ordered tree corresponds to infinitely many genograms (as there is an infinite number of possible identifiers). However, when the index set  $T$  of the random field is finite, only finitely many genograms give non-zero values of  $\mathcal{S}(H)$  and  $\mathcal{U}_f(H)$ .

For the second step, we observe that the total number of ordered trees of order- $(k+1)$  solely depends on  $k$ . (In fact, this is exactly the  $k$ -th Catalan number [Roman, 2015].) Hence summing over all such trees only contributes to the constant in the bounds. As for the first step, the following statement will be crucial to our proof.

**Claim.** Fix a positive integer  $s \geq 1$ . For any  $2 \leq t \leq k+1$ , given a sequence  $i_1, \dots, i_{t-1}$ , the sum of  $|B_t \setminus D_t|$  over  $-1 \leq s_t \leq s$  is smaller or equal to  $2(k(2m+1)^d + s)$ .

To see this we will consider the following three cases:

1. When  $s_t = -1$  and  $s_{u(t)} = 0$ ;
2. When  $s_t = -1$  and  $s_{u(t)} \geq 1$ ;
3. When  $0 \leq s_t \leq s$ .

Firstly, if  $s_t = -1$  and  $s_{u(t)} = 0$ , then we note that

$$B_t \setminus D_t = B_{u(t)} \setminus D_{u(t)} \subseteq N(i_h : h \in A(u(t))) \subseteq N(i_h : h \in A(t)) \subseteq N^{(s)}(i_h : h \in A(t)).$$

If  $s_t = -1$  and  $s_{u(t)} \geq 1$ , then by definition,  $B_t \setminus D_t = B_{u(t)} \setminus D_{u(t)}$  has at most one element namely  $i_{u(t)}$ . Thus,  $B_t \setminus D_t \in N(i_h : h \in A(t)) \subseteq N^{(s)}(i_h : h \in A(t))$ .

Finally, if  $0 \leq s_t \leq s$ , by definition,  $B_t \setminus D_t \subseteq N^{(s)}(i_h : h \in A(t))$ .

To bound  $\sum_{s_t \leq s} |B_t \setminus D_t|$  we remark that the sets  $B_t \setminus D_t$  are disjoint for different values of  $0 \leq s_t \leq s$ . Thus, this implies that

$$\sum_{s_t \leq s} |B_t \setminus D_t| \leq 2|N^{(s)}(i_h : h \in A(t))|.$$

To further bound this, note that for any index  $i$ , the indices with distance from  $i$  at most  $m$  lie in the  $d$ -dimensional hypercube centered at  $i$  with the sides of length  $2m+1$ . Thus,  $|N(i_h : h \in A(t))| \leq k(2m+1)^d$ . By noticing that for any subset  $J$  (by definition of  $N^{(s)}(\cdot)$ ) there is at most  $s$  elements in  $N^{(s)}(J) \setminus N(J)$  we obtain that

$$|N^{(s)}(i_h : h \in A(t))| = |N(i_h : h \in A(t))| + s \leq k(2m+1)^d + s.$$

Next we establish (G.18).

Suppose  $v[j_0]$  is a vertex with the largest identifier among all vertices and  $s_{j_0} = s$ . By (H.40) of Lemma H.6, we obtain that

$$|\mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \lesssim \alpha_{\ell_s}^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1},$$

where  $\ell_s$  is the smallest integer  $\ell$  that satisfies

$$k(2\ell+1)^d \geq s + k(2m+1)^d. \tag{H.53}$$

Thus, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ s_{j_0}=s, \\ s_h \leq s, \forall h \neq j_0}} |\mathcal{S}(H)| \\
& \leq \sigma^{-(k+1)} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ s_{j_0}=s, \\ s_h \leq s, \forall h \neq j_0}} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \sum_{i_2 \in B_2 \setminus D_2} \cdots \sum_{i_{k+1} \in B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}} |\mathcal{E}_G(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_{k+1}})| \\
& \leq 2^{2k+3} \sigma^{-(k+1)} |T| (k(2m+1)^d + s)^{k-2} \alpha_{\ell_s}^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the set  $\{s_1, \dots, s_{k+1} : \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h = s\}$  is the union (not necessarily disjoint) of  $\{s_1, \dots, s_{k+1} : s_j = s, s_h \leq s \forall 1 \leq h \leq k+1\}$  over  $2 \leq j \leq k+1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h = s}} |\mathcal{S}(H)| & \leq \sum_{j_0=2}^{k+1} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ s_{j_0}=s, \\ s_h \leq s, \forall h \neq j_0}} |\mathcal{S}(H)| \\
& \leq 2^{2k+3} k \sigma^{-(k+1)} |T| (k(2m+1)^d + s)^{k-1} \alpha_{\ell_s}^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we take the sum over all possible  $|T| \geq s \geq 1$  and obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h \geq 1}} |\mathcal{S}(H)| & \leq \sum_{s=1}^{|T|} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h = s}} |\mathcal{S}(H)| \tag{H.54} \\
& \leq 2^{2k+3} k \sigma^{-(k+1)} |T| \sum_{s=1}^{|T|} (k(2m+1)^d + s)^{k-1} \alpha_{\ell_s}^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

To further bound this it will be important to know what is the number of different possible values of  $s$  will have the same  $\ell_s = \ell$ . To do so, we note that by definition (H.53) of  $\ell_s$  any such  $s$  must satisfy

$$k(2\ell_s + 1)^d \geq s + k(2m+1)^d \geq k(2\ell_s - 1)^d + 1,$$

which implies that for any  $\ell \geq m+1$

$$|\{s : \ell_s = \ell\}| \leq k(2\ell + 1)^d - k(2\ell - 1)^d \leq 2kd(2\ell + 1)^{d-1}.$$

On the other hand,  $s \leq |T| - 1$  implies that

$$k(2\ell_s - 1)^d + 1 \leq |T| + k(2m+1)^d + 1 \leq (|T|^{1/d} + k(2m+1))^d + 1.$$

Thus, we have  $\ell_s \leq m+1 + \lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor$  for any  $s$ . And we conclude that

$$|\{s : \ell_s = \ell\}| \leq \begin{cases} 2kd(2\ell + 1)^{d-1} & \text{if } m+1 + \lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor \geq \ell \geq m+1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Therefore, by combining this with (H.54) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h \geq 1}} |\mathcal{S}(H)| \\
& \leq 2^{2k+3} k \sigma^{-(k+1)} |T| \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1 + \lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} 2kd(2\ell + 1)^{d-1} (k(2\ell + 1)^d)^{k-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r} M^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$



$$\stackrel{(a)}{\lesssim} |T|^{-(k-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r},$$

where to obtain (a) we used the assumption that the asymptotic variance does not degenerate:

$$\liminf_{|T| \rightarrow \infty} \sigma^2/|T| > 0.$$

For any  $G \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)$ , there exists at least one positive vertex. Thus,  $\max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h \geq 1$ . Now that the number of labeled rooted trees on  $k+1$  vertices only depends on  $k$ , we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} |\mathcal{S}(H)| &= \sum_{\substack{(V,E,<): \\ |V|=k+1}} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ H=(V,E,s_{1:(k+1)}) \\ \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)}} |\mathcal{S}(H)| \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{(V,E,<): \\ |V|=k+1}} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h \geq 1}} |\mathcal{S}(H)| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{(V,E,<): \\ |V|=k+1}} |T|^{-(k-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r} \\ &\lesssim |T|^{-(k-1)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{dk-1} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-1)/r}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we prove (G.19).

Again suppose  $v[j_0]$  is a vertex with the largest identifier among all vertices and  $s_{j_0} = s$ . In other words,  $\max\{s_t : 1 \leq t \leq k+1\} = s = s_{j_0}$ . We discuss the following two cases (i) when  $j_0 \leq k$  (whose analysis will be further split depending on the fact that  $s_{k+1} \geq 1$  or not), and (ii) when  $j_0 = k+1$ .

First consider the case where  $j_0 \leq k$ . From the claim above, we know that for any  $2 \leq t \leq k$ ,  $t \neq j_0$ , given a sequence  $i_1, \dots, i_{t-1}$ , we have that  $\sum_{s_t \leq s} |B_t \setminus D_t| \leq 2(k(2m+1)^d + s)$ .

Suppose that  $s_{k+1} \leq 0$ , then by (H.41) of Lemma H.6, we know that

$$|\mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H))| \lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} \sigma^{-\omega} |B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}|^{\omega} \alpha_{\ell_s}^{(r-k-\omega)/r},$$

where  $\ell_s$  is the smallest integer  $\ell$  that satisfies

$$k(2\ell+1)^d \geq s + k(2m+1)^d.$$

If  $s_{k+1} \geq 1$  then by (H.43) of Lemma H.6 we have

$$\left| \sum_{1 \leq s_{k+1} \leq s} \mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H)) \right| \lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} \sigma^{-\omega} s^{\omega} \alpha_{\ell_s}^{(r-k-\omega)/r}.$$

Thus, as we have shown that  $|B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}| \leq k(2m+1)^d$  since  $B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1} \subseteq N(i_h : h \in A(k+1))$  we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{s_{k+1} \leq s} \mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H)) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{s_{k+1}=0, -1} \mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H)) \right| + \left| \sum_{1 \leq s_{k+1} \leq s} \mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H)) \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim |f|_{k-1,\omega} \sigma^{-\omega} (k(2m+1)^d + s)^\omega \alpha_{\ell_s}^{(r-k-\omega)/r}.$$

Noting that  $b_H$  is the same for genograms with the same  $(V, E, \prec)$  and negative vertices, and that  $|b_H| \leq 1$  (see the remark following Corollary B.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ \exists 1 \leq j_0 \leq k \text{ s.t.} \\ s_{j_0} = \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h = s}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{j_0=1}^k \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_{j_0}=s, \\ s_j \leq s, 1 \leq j \leq k}} \left| \sum_{s_{k+1} \leq s} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| = \sum_{j_0=1}^k \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_{j_0}=s, \\ s_j \leq s, 1 \leq j \leq k}} |b_H| \left| \sum_{s_{k+1} \leq s} \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ & \leq \sigma^{-k} \sum_{j_0=1}^k \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_{j_0}=s, \\ s_j \leq s, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k}} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \sum_{i_2 \in B_2 \setminus D_2} \cdots \sum_{i_k \in B_k \setminus D_k} \left| \sum_{s_{k+1} \leq s} \mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H)) \right| \\ & \lesssim k |f|_{k-1,\omega} \sigma^{-(k+\omega)} |T| (k(2m+1)^d + s)^{k-2+\omega} \alpha_{\ell_s}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ \exists 1 \leq j_0 \leq k \text{ s.t.} \\ s_{j_0} = \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h \geq 1}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \leq \sum_{s=1}^{|T|} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ \exists 1 \leq j_0 \leq k \text{ s.t.} \\ s_{j_0} = \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h = s}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ & \lesssim k |f|_{k-1,\omega} \sigma^{-(k+\omega)} |T| \sum_{s=1}^{|T|} (k(2m+1)^d + s)^{k-2+\omega} \alpha_{\ell_s}^{(r-k-\omega)/r} M^{k+\omega} \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\lesssim} |f|_{k-1,\omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-2)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1 + \lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+\omega-1)-1} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\omega)/r}, \end{aligned}$$

where once again to obtain (a) we used the fact that by assumption  $\limsup |T|/\sigma^2 < \infty$ .

We now consider the case where  $j_0 = k+1$ . To do so we first note that by (H.43) of Lemma H.6 for any  $\ell \geq 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\substack{k(2\ell+1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^d \\ s_{k+1}=k(2\ell-1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^d+1}} \mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H)) \right| \\ & \lesssim |f|_{k-1,\omega} \sigma^{-\omega} (k(2\ell+1)^d - k(2\ell-1)^d)^\omega \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\omega)/r} \\ & \lesssim |f|_{k-1,\omega} \sigma^{-\omega} \ell^{d\omega-\omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\omega)/r}. \end{aligned} \tag{H.55}$$

Taking the sum over  $\ell$  and  $s_{1:k}$ , we get

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ s_j \leq s_{k+1}, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ s_{k+1} \geq 1}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \tag{H.56}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_j \leq s_{k+1}, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ s_{k+1} \geq 1}} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{k+1}=k(2\ell-1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^{d+1}}^{k(2\ell+1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^d} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\
&= \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_j \leq s_{k+1}, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ s_{k+1} \geq 1}} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} |b_H| \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{k+1}=k(2\ell-1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^{d+1}}^{k(2\ell+1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^d} \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_j \leq s_{k+1}, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ s_{k+1} \geq 1}} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \cdots \sum_{i_k \in B_k \setminus D_k} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{k+1}=k(2\ell-1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^{d+1}}^{k(2\ell+1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^d} \mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H)) \right| \\
&\lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} \sigma^{-(k+\omega)} |T| (k(2m+1)^d + s_{k+1})^{k-1} \ell^{d\omega - \omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\omega)/r} \\
&\lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} \sigma^{-(k+\omega)} |T| (k(2\ell+1)^d)^{k-1} \ell^{d\omega - \omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\omega)/r} \\
&\lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-2)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+\omega-1) - \omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\omega)/r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ H=(V, E, s_{1:(k+1)}) \\ \in \mathcal{G}_0(k+1)}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k+1}: \\ \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h \geq 1}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_j \leq s_{k+1}, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ s_{k+1} \geq 1}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| + \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ \exists j_0 \leq k \text{ s.t.} \\ s_{j_0} = \max_{1 \leq h \leq k+1} s_h \geq 1}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\
&\lesssim \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} |f|_{k-1, \omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-2)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+\omega-1) - \omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\omega)/r} \\
&\lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-2)/2} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d(k+\omega-1) - \omega} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\omega)/r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we prove (G.20). If  $H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)$ , then for any  $t \leq k$  we know that  $i_{t+1} \in N(i_{1:t})$ . In other words, new indexes lie in the  $m$ -neighborhood of previous ones. By (H.38), we have

$$|\mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H))| \leq 2^k \sigma^{-\omega} |B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}|^\omega \cdot |f|_{k-1, \omega} M^{k+\omega},$$

Taking the sums over  $i_j \in B_j \setminus D_j$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{U}_f(H)| &\leq 2^k \sigma^{-\omega} |B_{k+1} \setminus D_{k+1}|^\omega \cdot |f|_{k-1, \omega} M^{k+\omega} \prod_{j=1}^k |B_j \setminus D_j| \\ &\lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-2)/2} m^{d(k+\omega-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| &\leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ H=(V, E, s_{1:(k+1)}) \\ \in \mathcal{P}_0(k+1)}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k+1}: \\ s_j=0 \text{ or } -1, \\ \forall 1 \leq j \leq k+1}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k+1}: \\ s_j=0 \text{ or } -1, \\ \forall 1 \leq j \leq k+1}} |b_H| |\mathcal{U}_f(H)| \leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k+1}: \\ s_j=0 \text{ or } -1, \\ \forall 1 \leq j \leq k+1}} |\mathcal{U}_f(H)| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} |f|_{k-1, \omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-2)/2} m^{d(k+\omega-1)} \\ &\lesssim |f|_{k-1, \omega} |T|^{-(k+\omega-2)/2} m^{d(k+\omega-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, to prove (G.21), we follow the derivation similar to (H.56) to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{H \in \mathcal{P}_1(k+1)} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ H=(V, E, s_{1:(k+1)}) \\ \in \mathcal{P}_1(k+1)}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_j \leq 0, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ s_{k+1} \geq 1}} b_H \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} |b_H| \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ s_j \leq 0, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ s_{k+1} \geq 1}} \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \leq \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{1:(k+1)}: \\ s_j \leq 0, \forall 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ s_{k+1} \geq 1}} \mathcal{U}_f(H) \right| \\ &\leq \sigma^{-k} \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_j=0 \text{ or } -1, \\ \forall 1 \leq j \leq k}} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{k+1}=k(2\ell-1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^{d+1}}}^{k(2\ell+1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^d} \mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H)) \right| \\ &\leq \sigma^{-k} \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_j=0 \text{ or } -1, \\ \forall 1 \leq j \leq k}} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \dots \sum_{i_k \in B_k \setminus D_k} \left| \sum_{\substack{s_{k+1}=k(2\ell-1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^{d+1}}}^{k(2\ell+1)^d \\ -k(2m+1)^d} \mathcal{E}_H(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_k}, \Delta_f(H)) \right| \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\lesssim} |f|_{k-2, \delta}^{1-\delta} |f|_{k-1, \delta}^\delta \sigma^{-(k+\delta)} \sum_{\substack{(V, E, \prec): \\ |V|=k+1}} \sum_{\substack{s_{1:k}: \\ s_j=0 \text{ or } -1, \\ \forall 1 \leq j \leq k}} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{i_1 \in B_1 \setminus D_1} \dots \sum_{i_k \in B_k \setminus D_k} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\delta)/r} \\ &\stackrel{(**)}{\lesssim} |f|_{k-2, 1}^{1-\delta} |f|_{k-1, 1}^\delta \sigma^{-(k+\delta)} 2^{k-1} |T| (k(2m+1)^d)^{k-1} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_\ell^{(r-k-\delta)/r} \end{aligned}$$

$$\lesssim |f|_{k-2,1}^{1-\delta} |f|_{k-1,1}^{\delta} |T|^{-(k+\delta-2)/2} m^{d(k-1)} \sum_{\ell=m+1}^{m+1+\lfloor \frac{|T|^{1/d}}{2} \rfloor} \ell^{d\delta-\delta} \alpha_{\ell}^{(r-k-\delta)/r}.$$

Note that the inequality (\*) is due to (H.44). For (\*\*), we note that  $s_j = 0$  or  $-1$  for  $2 \leq j \leq k$ , and that the number of choices for  $i_j$  ( $2 \leq j \leq k$ ) is upper-bounded by  $k(2m+1)^d$  since  $i_j$  lies in the  $m$ -neighborhood of  $i_1, \dots, i_{j-1}$ . ■