

Generalized law of iterated logarithm for the Lorentz gas with infinite horizon

Péter Bálint* and Dalia Terhesiu †

March 29, 2024

Abstract

We obtain a generalized law of iterated logarithm for a class of dependent processes with superdiffusive behaviour. Our results apply in particular to the Lorentz gas with infinite horizon.

1 Introduction and main results

The almost sure invariance principle (ASIP) with rates, also known as the strong invariance principle (SIP) or Strassen's invariance principle, is a much studied problem in probability theory, see [36] for a survey. Let $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i$ denote the sum of a stationary sequence of random variables taking values in \mathbb{R}^d , $d \geq 1$; then S_n satisfies an ASIP with rate n^δ for some $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ if there exists some non-degenerate covariance matrix σ^2 such that, possibly on an enlarged probability space,

$$|S_n - \sigma \cdot W(n)| = o(n^\delta) \quad (1.1)$$

almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $W(n) = \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i$ denotes standard Brownian motion at time n , or equivalently, the variables Z_i are i.i.d. standard Gaussians. It is known that the ASIP implies the law of iterated logarithms (LIL):

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|S_n|}{\sqrt{n \cdot L(Ln)}} = a \quad \text{almost surely, for some } a \in (0, \infty), \quad (1.2)$$

*Department of Stochastics, Institute of Mathematics, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Műegyetem rkp. 3., H-1111, Budapest, Hungary and HUN-REN-BME Stochastics Research Group, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Műegyetem rkp. 3., H-1111 Budapest, Hungary; *balint.peter@ttk.bme.hu*. Support of the NKFIH Research Fund, grants 142169 and 144059, is thankfully acknowledged.

†Institute of Mathematics, University of Leiden, Niels Bohrweg 1, 2333 CA Leiden, The Netherlands, *daliaterhesiu@gmail.com*

where $L(t) = \max(1, \log(t))$. It can be assumed that the stationary sequence arises as $Y_i = Y \circ T^i$ for some probability preserving transformation (or dynamical system) $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ and $Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. The problem of the ASIP has been studied for various classes of dynamical systems and observables – that satisfy the classical central limit theorem (CLT) and weak invariance principle (WIP) – by several authors, via different methods, see [23, 24, 25, 21, 22, 10] and references therein. A common feature of these works is that they assume (along with some decorrelation condition) that the random variables satisfy $Y \in L^p$ for some $p > 2$, and prove the ASIP with some rate that depends on p .

We are interested in the generalization of the ASIP and the LIL when the CLT and WIP holds with a *nonstandard norming sequence*, such as $\sqrt{n \log n}$. Important dynamical examples of physical interest, for this particular norming sequence are Sinai billiards with infinite horizon with the associated flight function (i.e., the distance in \mathbb{R}^d between consecutive collisions, see [33] and [8]).

A certain generalized form of the ASIP and of the LIL for i.i.d. random variables taking values in \mathbb{R}^d with infinite variance but still in the domain of attraction of a normal law were obtained in [16, 17, 18, 20]. We will focus on the case of \mathbb{R}^d regularly varying random variables $(Y_j)_{j \geq 0}$ of index -2 , but remark that in the case $d = 1$, the results in [18] are not limited to regular variation. For the case $d = 1$, regular variation of index -2 means that, as $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y > t) = (p + o(1))\ell(t)t^{-2}, \quad \mathbb{P}(Y < -t) = (q + o(1))\ell(t)t^{-2}$$

for some $p, q \geq 0, p + q = 1$ and some slowly varying function ℓ .

To recall the more general definition of regular variation in \mathbb{R}^d (see [31]) let $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} = \{t \in \mathbb{R}^d : |t| = 1\}$ denote the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^d . (Throughout, $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm.)

Definition 1.1 An \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable Y is *regularly varying* with index $-\alpha < 0$ if there exists a Borel probability measure σ on \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , such that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{P}(|Y| > \lambda t, Y/|Y| \in A)}{\mathbb{P}(|Y| > t)} = \lambda^{-\alpha} \sigma(A)$$

for all $\lambda > 0$ and all Borel sets $A \subset \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ with $\sigma(\partial A) = 0$. We say that Y is *nondegenerate* if $\int_{\mathbb{S}^{d-1}} |u \cdot \theta|^\alpha d\sigma(\theta) > 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

Taking $A = \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have that $|Y|$ is a regularly varying scalar function. Hence there exists a slowly varying function $\ell : [0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(|Y| > t) = t^{-\alpha} \ell(t)$.

Provided that $(Y_j)_{j \geq 0}$ is an i.i.d sequence of random variables defined on a probability space $(\Omega_0, \mathcal{F}_0, \mathbb{P}_0)$ and that Y_0 is regularly varying of index -2 with $\mathbb{E}(Y_0) = 0$,

$$a_n^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} Y_j \implies \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0^2), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.3)$$

where \implies denotes convergence in distribution, Σ_0 is a positive definite $d \times d$ matrix and a_n is given by $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n\tilde{\ell}(n)}{a_n^2} = 1$, where $\tilde{\ell} = 1 + \int_1^{1+x} \frac{\ell(u)}{u} du$.

Remark 1.2 Given several important billiard applications (infinite horizon Lorentz gas, Bunimovich stadium, dispersing billiards with cusps), a case of special significance is when $\ell(t) \equiv C$ for some positive constant C , and thus $\tilde{\ell}(t) \sim C \log t$. We will refer to this as the Lorentz case.

We recall the result in [18, 20] for the sequence $(Y_j)_{j \geq 0}$ of independent random variables along with the required assumption.

(H0) Let $(c_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a non-decreasing sequence so that

- (i) for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $M_\varepsilon \geq 1$ so that $\frac{c_n}{c_m} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{n}{m}$ for all $M_\varepsilon \leq m < n$;
- (ii) $\sum_n \mathbb{P}_0(|Y_0| > c_n) < \infty$.

We note that given a_n as in (1.3), $c_n/a_n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1.3 [17, Theorem 2], [18, Theorem 2], [19, Theorem 2.1]. *Let $(Y_j)_{j \geq 0}$ be an i.i.d sequence of \mathbb{R}^d random variables satisfying (1.3). Let $(c_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence satisfying (H0).*

Then, there exists a probability space $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{P}_1)$ and two sequences of independent random vectors $(Y_j^)_{j \geq 0}$, $(Z_j)_{j \geq 0}$ so that*

- Y_j^* is distributed as Y_j
- Z_j is distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$

and so that, almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} Y_j - \Gamma_n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} Z_j \right| = o(c_n),$$

where the matrix Γ_n is given by $\Gamma_n^2 = \text{cov}(Y_0 1_{|Y_0| < c_n})$.

When compared to the standard ASIP, a specific feature of Theorem 1.3 is the rescaling of Brownian motion with the truncated covariance matrix Γ_n , which occurs only for variables in the non-standard domain of attraction of the normal law. This reflects the fact that in this regime the limit phenomena are particularly sensitive to the specifics of the tail of the distribution, which typically makes the treatment quite challenging. Indeed, for SIP type results for i.i.d. random variables in the domain of a symmetric stable law of index $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ (see [32, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2]) there is no need for truncation and thus, no need for an analogue of Γ_n , and the main challenge is to obtain good rates (we refer to [32, Section 3]). Note also that in this $\alpha < 2$

case the approximation is, instead of sums of independent Gaussians, by sums of independent α -stable variables, and thus there is no natural analogue of the sequence $\sqrt{nL(L(n))}$ of (1.2) (for the standard CLT case), or the sequence (1.4) below (in our case), see [32, Theorem 2.1]. Thus, although as in the case of Theorem 1.3, there is infinite variance in the $\alpha < 2$ stable law scenario too, the limit phenomena are quite different, see also [15] for recent results in the dynamical context.

As in [20, 18] the main purpose of Theorem 1.3 is the implication of a precise form of a “generalized law of iterated logarithm (LIL)” for such i.i.d. processes, which we now recall.

Theorem 1.4 [20, Theorem 3], [18, Theorem 1]. *Assume the set up of Theorem 1.3. Set*

$$A(t) = \mathbb{E}(Y_0^2 1_{\{|Y_0| \leq t\}}), \quad a = \sup \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \exp \left(-\frac{\alpha^2 c_n^2}{2nA(c_n)} \right) = \infty \right\}.$$

Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} Y_j|}{c_n} = a.$$

Note that in Theorem 1.4, the limit a can be 0, infinite, or a positive finite number depending on the sequence c_n , and it is not always easy to say for which sequences we have $a \in (0, \infty)$, a situation which can be regarded as a “generalized law of iterated logarithm”. In special cases both the limit a and the sequence $(c_n)_{n \geq 1}$ can be described precisely:

Corollary 1.5 *Consider an i.i.d. sequence of random variables as in Theorems 1.3 and 1.4. Assume, furthermore, that the density $f(x)$ of the distribution function $\mathbb{P}(Y_j \leq x)$ satisfies $f(x) \sim C|x|^{-3}1_{|x| \geq 1}$, for some $C > 0$. Then, according to [20, p. 1622],*

$$\text{If } c_n = \sqrt{2C \cdot n \cdot L(n) \cdot LL(n) \cdot (1 + LLn \sin^2(LLLn))} \text{ for } L(t) = \max(1, \log t) \tag{1.4}$$

$$\text{then } \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} Y_j|}{c_n} = 1. \tag{1.5}$$

The argument in [20, p. 1622] is given for $C = 1$, but it is straightforward to get the corresponding statement for $C \neq 1$.

In this work we show that Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.4 essentially carry over to dependent random variables (arising from the evolution of dynamical systems) under some good assumptions. This includes in particular the flight function in the infinite horizon Lorentz gas, see Remark 1.2. Here “essentially” means that in Theorem 1.8

below (which is the generalization of the invariance principle in Theorem 1.3) the sequence c_n has to satisfy, on top of (H0), an additional assumption, see (HL0) below. Yet, this additional assumption is not much restrictive, in particular it allows the sequence defined in (1.4).

Besides Einmahl's results (in particular [19]) on the i.i.d case, two further important references for our work are [21] and [8]. In [21], Gouëzel proved the ASIP for a large class of processes with $Y \in L^p$ for some $p > 2$. In our argument, we adapt Gouëzel's strategy, specifically with $p = 4$, to our situation after truncating the variables Y_i . The choice of the truncation level is delicate and the method requires very precise bounds on the second and the fourth moment for partial sums of the appropriately truncated random variables. Although in [8] Chernov and Dolgopyat obtained moment bounds of similar character in the infinite horizon Lorentz gas, we improve significantly upon these bounds, in particular, we manage to remove some logarithmic factors from the bound on the fourth moment, obtaining this way a scaling essentially as good as for i.i.d. random variables, as expressed in condition (H3)(ii) below. Another important feature of our argument is that, on top of the truncation level c_n , we introduce an additional, slightly lower truncation level at d_n , see Formula (1.8) and condition (HL1) for details. This is partially inspired by [8] which also uses two truncation levels, yet, this idea has to be implemented at the level of almost sure convergence in our case.

Our paper is organized as follows. We state our results in sections 1.1 and 1.2 below, in particular, our abstract result is Theorem 1.8, and its main application (to Lorentz gas with infinite horizon) is stated in Theorem 1.10. The proof of Theorem 1.8 is broken down into several Propositions and Lemmas in sections 3, 4 and 5 – this is essentially an adaptation of Gouëzel's argument from [21], which nonetheless exploits the properties of our variables – expressed in the conditions of Theorem 1.8 – in a subtle way. These conditions are verified for the infinite horizon Lorentz gas in sections 2 and 6. In particular, the above mentioned improvement on the bound of the fourth moment of partial truncated sums for the infinite horizon Lorentz gas, an interesting result on its own, is proved in Section 6, and our condition (HL1) on the relation of the two truncation levels c_n and d_n is verified in Section 6, too. In the Appendix we check that the sequence (1.4) satisfies the required sumability condition of (HL0), completing this way the proof of our “generalized law of iterated logarithm” ie. Theorem 1.10(ii).

1.1 Main results

We first present an abstract version of the result, which will make the application to the Lorentz gas with infinite horizon easier. We phrase the following assumptions in terms of dynamical systems and observables associated with them. We consider an invariant probability measure preserving transformation (Ω, T, μ) .

Let $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and set $v_j = v \circ T^j$. Throughout, we assume

(H1) $\mathbb{E}_\mu(v) = 0$, v is regularly varying with index -2 , let ℓ be the involved slowly varying function and require that

$$a_n^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} v_j \implies \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma^2), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (1.6)$$

where Σ is a positive definite $d \times d$ matrix and where a_n is so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n\ell^*(n)}{a_n^2} = 1$, where the slowly varying function ℓ^* satisfies $\ell^*(t) = C_0 \tilde{\ell}(t)$, for some constant $C_0 > 0$. (Recall that $\tilde{\ell} = 1 + \int_1^{1+x} \frac{\ell(u)}{u} du$.)

Remark 1.6 In the Lorentz case billiard examples, the functions $\tilde{\ell}$ and ℓ^* are as follows. For the infinite horizon Lorentz gas, we have $\ell^*(t) = \tilde{\ell}(t) = C \log t$, with some $C > 0$, that is, we have $C_0 = 1$ and observe the same limit law as for iid sequences with the same tail behaviour (see [4], [8]). For Bunimovich stadia, we have $\ell^*(t) = C_0 \tilde{\ell}(t) = C_0 C \log t$ with $C_0 = \frac{4+3 \log 3}{4-3 \log 3}$. Thus, the relevant slowly varying function differs from that of the iid case by a nontrivial constant factor, an effect which is due to short range correlations between consecutive large values (see [5]).

We are interested in the almost sure behaviour of $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} v_j$, in the sense of an analogue of Theorem 1.3, and with this obtain an analogue of Theorem 1.4.

The remainder of our assumptions will be phrased in terms of the following truncated version of v . For $R \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ (and for any $l \geq 0$, consider also $R(= R_l) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$) define

$$W^R = v \cdot \mathbf{1}_{|v| \leq R} \quad \text{and accordingly} \quad W_l^R = W^R \circ T^l = v_l \cdot \mathbf{1}_{|v_l| \leq R}. \quad (1.7)$$

To ensure ‘enough independence’, we assume [21, Assumption(H)] at the level of characteristic functions of $n + m$ blocks derived from the truncated variables (1.7), with gaps of size k in between the two blocks. More precisely:

(H2) There exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $C, c > 0$ so that for any $n, m > 0$, $b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_{r+m+1}$, for any $k > 0$ and for all $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n+m} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|t_j| \leq \varepsilon_0$, and for arbitrary truncation levels $R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{n+m} \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}_\mu \left(e^{i \sum_{j=1}^n t_j (\sum_{l=b_j}^{b_{j+1}-1} W_l^{R_j}) + i \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+m} t_j (\sum_{l=b_{j+k}}^{b_{j+1+k}-1} W_l^{R_j})} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathbb{E}_\mu \left(e^{i \sum_{j=1}^n t_j (\sum_{l=b_j}^{b_{j+1}-1} W_l^{R_j})} \right) \cdot \mathbb{E}_\mu \left(e^{i \sum_{j=r+1}^{r+m} t_j (\sum_{l=b_{j+k}}^{b_{j+1+k}-1} W_l^{R_j})} \right) \right| \\ & \leq C \left(1 + \max_{0 \leq j \leq m+n} |b_{j+1} - b_j| \right)^{C(m+n)} e^{-ck}. \end{aligned}$$

In (H2) and throughout, we write e^{itx} instead of $e^{i\langle t, x \rangle}$. Note, furthermore, that the variable t_j in the characteristic function corresponds to the sum of the variables $W_l^{R_j}$ for $b_j \leq l < b_{j+1}$, which are all truncated at the same level R_j .

We further assume some control of moments of sums of truncated observables along with a precise form of the covariance matrix.

(H3) Let W_j^R be as in (1.7) with $R_j = R$ for all j . We require that

(i) $\mathbb{E}_\mu(W_j^R) = 0$, for any R .

For both (ii) and (iii), consider $m \in \mathbb{N}$ (the number of terms) and $0 < R(= R(m))$ (a truncation level), with $R \rightarrow \infty$ and $m \rightarrow \infty$, such that $m = o(R^2)$.

(ii) Additionally, restricting to $m = o(R^{2-r_1})$ and $R = o(m^{r_2})$ for some $r_1 > 0$ and $r_2 > 0$, we assume that¹ there exists $C > 0$ so that
$$\int \left| \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} W_j^R \right|^4 d\mu \leq C m R^2.$$

(iii) Assume there exists $C > 0$ so that $\text{cov}(\sum_{j=0}^{m-1} W_j^R) = C m \ell^*(R) \Sigma^2 (1 + o(1))$, where Σ and ℓ^* are as in (1.6).

Assumption (H3)(i) is for mere simplicity of the exposition. Else, inside the proofs, we could subtract the relevant mean.

We obtain a non iid version of Theorem 1.3 for a slightly more restrictive class of sequences c_n than the one in (H0). For concreteness, we specialize to the Lorentz case (see Remark 1.2), which in particular implies $\ell^*(R) \asymp \tilde{\ell}(R) \asymp L(R)$ (see conditions (H1) and (H3) above). Here and throughout, $L(t) = \max(1, \log t)$. Concerning the class of sequences c_n , we make the following assumptions.

(HL0) $c_n = \sqrt{n \cdot \ell^*(n) \cdot \ell_1(n)} \asymp \sqrt{n \cdot L(n) \cdot \ell_1(n)}$ for some slowly varying function $\ell_1(n)$, such that the following conditions hold.

- (i) There exists some $b > 1$ such that $\ell_1(n) \ll (LL(n))^b$ (note this assumption does not weaken our results as it puts an upper bound on c_n)
- (ii) c_n satisfies (H0). As we assume Lorentz case, and c_n is of the above form, this is equivalent to $\sum_n c_n^{-2} = \sum_n (nL(n)\ell_1(n))^{-1} < \infty$, in accordance with the previous item.
- (iii) Our additional sumability condition is formulated in terms of c_{2^n} . It is worth noting that $\ell^*(2^n) \asymp n$ while $L(n) \ll \ell_1(2^n) \ll (L(n))^b$, with b as in the item (i) above. We assume $\sum_n \frac{2^n LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2} < \infty$, or equivalently
$$\sum_n \frac{LL(n)}{n\ell_1(2^n)} < \infty.$$

Remark 1.7 The sequence c_n defined in (1.4) satisfies (HL0): while (i) is immediate and (ii) is proved in [20], item (iii) requires a justification: see Appendix A.

¹We will always apply (H3)(ii) in situations when $m = 2^{\alpha n}$ and $R = c_{2^n}$, where $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and the sequence c_k (in accordance with (H0)) is equal to \sqrt{k} up to slowly varying factors. Hence c_{2^n} is equal to $2^{n/2}$ up to factors that grow polynomially in n , and the requirements on the relation of m and R are satisfied.

We make a further assumption that allows us to simplify the exposition. To formulate it, we introduce an additional truncation level, lower than c_n (which is assumed to have the form specified in (HL0)). More precisely, let

$$d_n = \sqrt{nL(n)\ell_1(n)^{-99}}. \quad (1.8)$$

(HL1) Let $n \geq 1$ and set $\widetilde{W} = v \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d_{2^n} \leq |v| \leq c_{2^n}}$. Fix $r \geq 1$ and define $\widetilde{W}_l = \widetilde{W} \circ T^{l+r}$ for $l \geq 1$. Fix $K \in \mathbb{N}$ with $K < (d_{2^n})^2$. For $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \sum_{l=0}^k \widetilde{W}_l; \quad B_{k,\varepsilon} = \{x \in M : |\mathcal{S}_k| \geq \varepsilon c_{2^n}\}$$

and let $N_{k,\varepsilon} = B_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus (\cup_{k'=0}^{k-1} B_{k',\varepsilon})$.

We assume that there exists $C_1, C_2 > 0$ so that

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{E}_\mu(\mathcal{S}_K^2) \leq C_1 \cdot K \cdot L\left(\frac{c_n}{d_n}\right) \ll K \cdot LL(n).$$

$$(ii) \quad \sum_{k=1}^K \mu(N_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus B_{K,\varepsilon/2}) \leq C_2 \frac{K \cdot LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2}.$$

The first result below is an analogue of Theorem 1.3 in the non independent set up of Subsection 1.1.

Theorem 1.8 *Assume (H1)–(H3). Let $(c_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence satisfying (HL0). Suppose that (HL1) holds. Then, there exists a probability space $(\Omega^*, \mathcal{F}^*, \mathbb{P}^*)$ and two sequences of random vectors $(v_j^*)_{j \geq 0}$, $(Z_j)_{j \geq 0}$ so that*

- v_j^* is distributed as v_j ;
- the vectors $Z_j, j \geq 0$ are independent and distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$;

such that, almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} v_j^* - \Gamma_n \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} Z_j \right| = o(c_n),$$

where the matrix Γ_n is given by $\Gamma_n^2 = \ell^*(c_n) \Sigma^2$.

Note that $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} Z_j = W(n)$, where $W(n)$ is standard Brownian motion in dimension d , at time n .

The proof of Theorem 1.8 is provided in Section 3. It relies on a combination of arguments/results in [21] under (H2) and (H3) together with arguments/results in [18] (some established already in previous works by the same author).

With exactly the same proof as in [19], Theorem 1.8 gives the Generalized LIL (the analogue of Theorem 1.4):

Theorem 1.9 Assume (H1)–(H3). Let $(c_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence satisfying (HL0) and suppose that (HL1) holds. Set

$$A(t) = \ell^*(t) \|\Sigma\|^2, \quad a = \sup \left\{ \alpha \geq 0 : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \exp \left(-\frac{\alpha^2 c_n^2}{2nA(c_n)} \right) = \infty \right\}.$$

Then

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left| \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} v_j \right|}{c_n} = a,$$

While the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [19] heavily relies on the i.i.d. structure, the proof of Theorem 1.4 given Theorem 1.3 does not require independence. In the same way, Theorem 1.8 gives Theorem 1.9. Indeed, given Theorem 1.8, Theorem 1.9 reduces to

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\Gamma_n \cdot W(n)|}{c_n} = a,$$

which is proved in [19, proof of Corollary 2.4] in [19, section 4.2.1] and [19, section 4.2.2], cf. in particular [19, Formulas (4.4)–(4.5)] and [19, Formulas (4.8)–(4.9)].

Thus, our only task is to prove Theorem 1.8. Theorem 1.8 is the main new result of this paper and its proof is provided in Section 3.

1.2 Application to the Lorentz gas map with infinite horizon

In this section, we give a brief description of the infinite horizon Lorentz gas. For further details, see the references, in particular [8], [27], [33]. The \mathbb{Z}^d -periodic Lorentz gas describes the evolution of a point particle moving in the \mathbb{Z}^d -periodic domain \tilde{D} contained either in the plane \mathbb{R}^2 (if $d = 2$) or in the tube $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$ (if $d = 1$). The collisions are elastic (equality of pre-collision and post-collision angles). The Lorentz gas map $\hat{T} : \hat{M} \rightarrow \hat{M}$ is the collision map on the two-dimensional phase space (position in $\partial\tilde{D}$ and unit velocity) given by $\hat{M} = \partial\tilde{D} \times (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$.

We assume that \tilde{D} is the lifted domain (by the canonical projection from \mathbb{R}^2 (if $d = 2$) or from $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{T}$ (if $d = 1$) onto \mathbb{T}^2) of $D = \mathbb{T}^2 \setminus Q$, where $Q \subset \mathbb{T}^2$ is a finite union of convex obstacles (scatterers) with C^3 boundaries and nonvanishing curvature, and pairwise disjoint boundaries. Here \mathbb{T}^2 denotes the two dimensional torus. The Sinai (dispersing) billiard map $T : M \rightarrow M$ corresponding to the associated collision map is obtained from $\hat{T} : \hat{M} \rightarrow \hat{M}$ by quotienting. We denote by μ the unique ergodic T -invariant smooth probability measure on M .

The Lorentz gas map $\hat{T} : \hat{M} \rightarrow \hat{M}$ can be viewed as a \mathbb{Z}^d -cover, $d = 1, 2$, of the dispersing billiard (T, M, μ) by the cell-change function $\kappa : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$. We assume that κ is unbounded, so that we are in the case of *infinite* horizon. Under certain nondegeneracy conditions, [33] proved that κ satisfies a central limit theorem and local limit theorem with positive-definite covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and nonstandard

normalisation $a_n = \sqrt{n \log n}$. These nondegeneracy conditions are as follows: a) in the case $d = 2$, one requires that there exist at least two nonparallel collisionless trajectories in the interior of \tilde{D} ; b) For $d = 1$, one requires that there exists a collisionless trajectory not orthogonal to the direction of the \mathbb{Z} -cover, which is equivalent to our assumption that $\kappa : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is unbounded.

We recall that a different proof (via standard pairs) of the above mentioned non standard CLT has been provided in [8] along with WIP. For other recent results on the Lorentz gas map and flow with infinite horizon, see [3, 27, 26, 28].

The flight function $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is given by the difference in \mathbb{R}^d between consecutive collision points. Moreover, it is known that Φ can be written as $\Phi = \kappa + \chi \circ T - \chi$, where χ is bounded.

A further property of the cell function κ , which we shall exploit is precise information of the corresponding density function. More precisely, we recall from [33, Proposition 6] that for some $C > 0$,

$$\mu(\kappa = N) \sim C|N|^{-3}, \quad (1.9)$$

where the event $\kappa = N$ indicates the next collision with a scatterer at distance $|N|$ from the current position.

The following result gives the generalized LIL for κ and Φ .

Theorem 1.10 *Consider the Sinai billiard map (M, T, μ) with infinite horizon and either the cell-change function $\kappa : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ or the flight function $\Phi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Let c_n be defined as in (1.4) (with exactly the same constant C as in (1.9)). Then

(i) $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \kappa \circ T^j$ and $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \Phi \circ T^j$ satisfy the conclusion of Theorem 1.8.

(ii) $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \kappa \circ T^j|}{c_n} = 1$, and a similar statement holds for Φ .

Notations. Throughout the proofs, we use “big O” and \ll notation interchangeably, writing $b_n = O(c_n)$ or $b_n \ll c_n$ if there are constants $C > 0$, $n_0 \geq 1$ such that $b_n \leq Cc_n$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Furthermore, $b_n \asymp c_n$ means that $b_n \ll c_n$ and $c_n \ll b_n$ hold simultaneously. This is not to be confused with the stronger property $b_n \sim c_n$ which means that $b_n = c_n \cdot (1 + o(1))$.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.10

In this section we derive Theorem 1.10 from Theorems 1.8 and 1.9 with c_n be defined as in (1.4).

We already know that such c_n satisfies (HL0): see Remark 1.7. Thus, to obtain (i) of Theorem 1.10, we need to verify that assumptions (H1)–(H3) hold. In this scenario, the probability measure preserving map (Ω, T, μ) is replaced by (M, T, μ) and the truncated observable $W_l^{R_l}$ as in (1.7) is defined with κ (respectively, Φ) instead of v . It is known that κ and Φ satisfy (H1), that is they are regularly varying observables with index -2 and as shown in [33] (via the Young tower constructed in [7, 34]), κ and Φ satisfy (1.6) with $a_n = \sqrt{n \log n}$. It is known that $\mu(\kappa) = 0$ and (H3)(i) holds by symmetry. (H3)(iii) is known to hold with $C = 2$ and $\ell^* = \log$ (see [8]). (H3)(ii) and (HL1) are verified in Section 6. (H2) is verified below.

Item (ii) of Theorem 1.10 follows from Theorem 1.9. The precise description of c_n and limit a is possible because using (1.9) we obtain that $A(t) = CL(t)\|\Sigma\|^2$; here C is the same as in (1.9). Given c_n as in (1.4) (with exactly this positive C), it is easy to see that $a = 1$.

Verifying (H2). We first recall a fact established in [21], which shows that (H2) holds under very mild assumptions on the transfer operator.

Let $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ be a non-singular transformation w.r.t. $m = \text{Leb}$ and let $L : L^1(m) \rightarrow L^1(m)$ be the transfer operator given by $\int_{\Omega} Lf g dm = \int_{\Omega} f g \circ T dm$, for $f \in L^1(m)$ and g bounded and measurable.

Now we define perturbations of the transfer operator L associated to our observable $v : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ (satisfying (H1)) and its truncations W^R (as defined in Formula (1.7)). Given a perturbation parameter $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a truncation level $R \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$, let

$$L_{t,R}f = L(e^{itW^R} f).$$

For $t = 0$ and arbitrary R , we apparently have $L_{0,R} = L_0 = L$.

The main difference between our (H2) and [21, Condition (H)] is that (H2) involves several truncation levels, but this does not create a problem in checking that (H2) holds under mild conditions on the perturbed operators $L_{t,R}$. Indeed, we can proceed essentially as in [21, Section 2].

To start, let us slightly generalize the following notion from [21, Formula (2.2)].

Definition 2.1 Recall the setting and the notation of section 1.1, in particular, let μ be an invariant measure for T . Suppose that there exists a Banach space \mathcal{B} (of functions or distributions), and moreover, some $u_0 \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{B}'$ (the dual of \mathcal{B}) so that for any $t_l \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|t_l| \leq \varepsilon_0$ with $0 \leq l \leq n-1$, and any $R_l \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$, again with $0 \leq l \leq n-1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu}(e^{i \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} t_l W_l^{R_l}}) = \langle \xi_0, L_{t_{n-1}, R_{n-1}} L_{t_{n-2}, R_{n-2}} \cdots L_{t_1, R_1} L_{t_0, R_0} u_0 \rangle. \quad (2.1)$$

In this case we say that the random variables $v \circ T^l$ along with their truncations $W_l^{R_l}$ are coded by $(\mathcal{B}, L_{t,R}, u_0, \xi_0)$.

Lemma 2.2 [21, Section 2] *Suppose that the random variables $v \circ T^l$ are coded by some $(\mathcal{B}, L_{t,R}, u_0, \xi_0)$ in the sense above. Assume, furthermore, that the family of operators L and $L_{t,R}$ satisfy the properties (I1) and (I2) below.*

(I1) *There exists $C > 0$ and $\delta_0 < 1$ such that $L(= L_0)$ as an operator acting on \mathcal{B} satisfies $L = \Pi + Q$ where Π is a one dimensional projection, while $\Pi Q = Q\Pi$ and for any $n \geq 1$ $\|Q^n\|_{\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}} \leq C\delta_0^n$.*

(I2) *There exists $C' > 0$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $|t| \leq \varepsilon_0$, all $R \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$, and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\|L_{t,R}^n\|_{\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}} \leq C'$.*

Then (H2) holds.

Moreover, instead (I2) it suffices to check the following (strong) continuity condition.

(I2c) *The family $L_{t,R}$ depends, in the operator norm of the space \mathcal{B} , continuously on the parameter $t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ at $t = 0$, uniformly in the truncation level R . That is $\|L_{t,R} - L\|_{\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$, uniformly in the truncation level R .*

Proof Let us note first that conditions (I1) and (I2c) together imply condition (I2). This is proved for one parameter families L_t in [21, Proposition 2.3]. To see that this extends to two parameter families $L_{t,R}$ if the continuity is uniform in R , recall that the essence of the argument is that under (I1) and (I2c), there exists some decomposition $L_{t,R} = \lambda_{t,R}\Pi_{t,R} + Q_{t,R}$ such that $\|Q_{t,R}^n\| \leq C\delta_0^n$ for small enough t , uniformly in n and R , $\Pi_{t,R}$ is a one dimensional projection that limits to Π as $t \rightarrow 0$, and thus $|\lambda_{t,R}| \leq 1$ for small t , again uniformly in R .

Now let us proceed to the verification of (H2) under (I1) and (I2). To simplify the exposition, we introduce the following shorthand notations. Keeping in mind that for any fixed t_j , ($j = 1, \dots, n+m$), in (H2) we consider the sum of the random variables $W_l^{R_j}$, with $b_j \leq l < b_{j+1}$, all of which are truncated at the same level R_j , let

$$L_j = L_{t_j, R_j}; \quad \text{i.e.} \quad L_j f = L(e^{it_j W^{R_j}} f) \quad \text{and} \quad e_j = b_{j+1} - b_j.$$

We record the following immediate consequence of (I2):

$$\|L_j^{e_j}\|_{\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}} \leq C', \quad \text{uniformly in } e_j. \quad (2.2)$$

As the characteristic functions are coded by our perturbed transfer operators in the sense of Definition 2.1, using the above notations, the left hand side of (H2) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\mu \left(e^{i \sum_{j=1}^n t_j \sum_{l=b_j}^{b_{j+1}-1} W_l^{R_j} + i \sum_{j=n+1}^{n+m} t_j \sum_{l=b_j+k}^{b_{j+1}+k-1} W_l^{R_j}} \right) \\ &= \langle \xi_0, L_{n+m}^{e_{n+m}} \cdots L_{n+1}^{e_{n+1}} L^k L_n^{e_n} \cdots L_1^{e_1} u_0 \rangle \\ &= \langle \xi_0, L_{n+m}^{e_{n+m}} \cdots L_{n+1}^{e_{n+1}} (L^k - \Pi) L_n^{e_n} \cdots L_1^{e_1} u_0 \rangle \\ &+ \langle \xi_0, L_{n+m}^{e_{n+m}} \cdots L_{n+1}^{e_{n+1}} (\Pi) L_n^{e_n} \cdots L_1^{e_1} u_0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This together with the bounds in (I1) (in particular $\|Q^n\|_{\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}} \leq C\delta_0^n$) and (2.2), allows us to proceed exactly the same way as in [21, Step 2, (H) holds, Subsection 2.5] to conclude that (H2) holds. \blacksquare

Given Lemma 2.2, we just need to recall previous results on the Sinai billiard map (M, T, μ) with infinite horizon and the cell-change function $\kappa : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$, where (I1) and (I2c) were shown to hold in the anisotropic Banach spaces constructed for the billiard map in [12, 13, 14], and further studied in [3]. We recall that the probability measure preserving map (Ω, T, μ) is replaced by (M, T, μ) and the truncated observable W_t^{Rt} is defined with κ instead of v .

Condition (I1) in Lemma 2.2 is stated for example in [12, Theorem 2.5], [13, Theorem 2.2], or [14, Theorem 2.4]. It is recalled also in [3, Section 5.2].

Condition (I2c) in Lemma 2.2 is verified in a stronger form in [3, Section 5.1]. Literally, [3] considers only the untruncated case $R = \infty$, in particular, [3, Formula (29)] implies that there exists some exponent $\nu > 0$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|L_{t,\infty} - L\|_{\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}} \leq C|t|^\nu.$$

In fact, [3, Formula (29)] also investigates how the modulus of continuity depends on the size of the scatterers, but this can be taken into account as a uniform constant in the present case. To see that the estimate extends to finite truncation levels $R < \infty$ with the same ν and C , note that the argument in [3, Section 5.1] relies on the growth lemma type estimates [3, Formula (19)] and [3, Formula (25)], along with the bound $|(e^{it\kappa} - 1)|_{W_i} \ll |t|^\nu |\kappa|^\nu|_{W_i}$, where W_i is some unstable curve. Now the effect of the truncation is that for unstable curves W_i on which $|\kappa|$ exceeds R the difference $e^{it\kappa^R} - 1$ simply vanishes, thus these curves make no contribution, and the total sum is definitely less than in the untruncated case $R = \infty$.

3 Proof of Theorem 1.8

The crucial ingredient for the proof of Theorem 1.8 is Proposition 3.1. To state it, let us introduce the following notation:

$$\text{Given } j \geq 1, \text{ let } \underline{j} = 2^{\lfloor \log_2 j \rfloor}, \tag{3.1}$$

that is, \underline{j} denotes the smallest power of 2 that does not exceed j .

Proposition 3.1 *Assume (H1)–(H3). Let $(c_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be defined as in (HL0). Given $j \geq 1$, let \underline{j} be as in (3.1), and let $W_j^{\underline{j}}$ be as in (1.7) with $R = c_{\underline{j}}$.*

There exists a sequence of independent Gaussian random vectors Z_j distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$ so that almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^n (W_j^{\underline{j}} - \sigma_j Z_j) \right| = o(c_n),$$

where σ_j is a positive definite symmetric matrix so that $\sigma_j^2 = \ell^*(c_j) \Sigma^2(1 + o(1))$ (with Σ and ℓ^* as in (H3)(iii)).

The proof of Proposition 3.1 is provided in Section 4. The remainder of the proof of Theorem 1.8 comes down to recalling a few results from [18], which do not require any form of independence.

Lemma 3.2 [18, Proof of Theorem 1, Step 2] [19, Item (iii) of Section 3.2] *Let $\Gamma_n = \ell^*(c_n) \Sigma^2$. Let Z_j the independent Gaussians defined in Proposition 3.1. Then, almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\Gamma_j - \sigma_j) Z_j = o(c_n).$$

We can now complete

Proof of Theorem 1.8 By Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, $\sum_{j=1}^n W_j^{c_j} - \sum_{j=1}^n \Gamma_j Z_j = o(c_n)$. By (HL0)(iii),

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(v_j \neq W_j^{c_j}) \ll \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} c_j^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^n}{c_{2^n}^2} < \infty,$$

and thus, by the Borel-Cantelli lemma, $\sum_{j=1}^n v_j - \sum_{j=1}^n W_j^{c_j} = o(c_n)$. Hence,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n v_j - \sum_{j=1}^n \Gamma_j Z_j = o(c_n). \quad (3.2)$$

By [19, Equation (3.16)] (see also [18, Proof of Theorem 1, Steps 3 and 4]), $\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^k (\Gamma_n - \Gamma_j) Z_j \right| = o(c_n)$. This together with (3.2) implies that

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{j=1}^k v_j - \Gamma_n \sum_{j=1}^k Z_j \right| = o(c_n).$$

■

4 Proof of Proposition 3.1

Proceeding as in [21, Section 5], we divide \mathbb{N} into intervals $[2^n, 2^{n+1})$ and further divide each such interval into intervals of ‘good’ length with gaps between them.

Fix $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1 - \beta)$. Decompose each interval $[2^n, 2^{n+1})$ into a union of $F(n) = 2^{\lfloor \beta n \rfloor}$ intervals $I_{n,j}$, $0 \leq j < F(n)$ of equal length and place $F(n)$ gaps $J_{n,j}$, $0 \leq j < F(n)$ between them. We choose the lengths of the gaps in the same

way as in [21, Section 5]. In particular, for $1 \leq j \leq F(n)$, write $j = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n\beta \rfloor} \alpha_k(j)2^k$, $\alpha_k(j) \in \{0, 1\}$ and let r be the smallest number so that $\alpha_r(j) \neq 0$. In this notation,

$$|J_{n,j}| = 2^{\lfloor \varepsilon_1 n \rfloor} 2^r \text{ for } j \neq 0 \text{ and } |J_{n,0}| = 2^{\lfloor \varepsilon_1 n \rfloor} 2^{\lfloor \beta n \rfloor}. \quad (4.1)$$

As such, the lengths of the gaps add up to $2^{\lfloor \varepsilon_1 n \rfloor} 2^{\lfloor \beta n \rfloor - 1} (\lfloor \beta n \rfloor + 2)$ and one can take

$$|I_{n,j}| = 2^{n - \lfloor n\beta \rfloor} - (\lfloor \beta n \rfloor + 2) 2^{\lfloor \varepsilon_1 n \rfloor - 1}. \quad (4.2)$$

The first proposition below uses the gaps (via the fast decorrelation expressed in (H2)) to show the sums $\sum_{l \in I_{n,j}} W_l^{c_{2^n}}$ can be regarded independent for distinct intervals $I_{(n,j)}$ (at the price of an almost surely $o(c_n)$ error). It is analogous to [21, Proposition 5.1] under assumption (H2). For its statement we need the lexicographical order \prec (as used in [21, Section 5]): we write $(n', j') \prec (n, j)$ if the interval $I_{n',j'}$ is to the left of $I_{n,j}$ for $0 \leq j' < F(n')$ and $0 \leq j < F(n)$.

Lemma 4.1 *Assume (H1)–(H3). Let $X_{n,j} = \sum_{l \in I_{n,j}} W_l^{c_{2^n}}$.*

There exists a coupling between $(X_{n,j})_{n \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq j < F(n)}$ and a sequence of independent random variables $(\hat{X}_{n,j})_{n \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq j < F(n)}$ with $\hat{X}_{n,j}$ distributed like $X_{n,j}$, such that, almost surely as $(n, j) \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \sum_{(n',j') \prec (n,j)} (X_{n',j'} - \hat{X}_{n',j'}) \right| = o(c_{2^n}).$$

The proof of this lemma is provided in Subsection 5.1.

The next lemma is an analogue of [21, Section 5.2] (coupling with Gaussians) under the current assumptions.

Lemma 4.2 *Assume (H1)–(H3), (HL0) and (HL1). Let $(\hat{X}_{n,j})_{n \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq j < F(n)}$ be the independent random variables obtained in Lemma 4.1.*

There exists a coupling between $\hat{X}_{n,j}$ and a sequence of independent Gaussian random variables $\tilde{Z}_{n,j}$ with covariance matrices

$$\text{cov}(\tilde{Z}_{n,j}) = \text{cov}(\hat{X}_{n,j}) = \ell^*(c_{2^n}) \cdot |I_{n,j}| \cdot \Sigma^2(1 + o(1))$$

so that almost surely as $(n, j) \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \sum_{(n',j') \prec (n,j)} (\hat{X}_{n',j'} - \tilde{Z}_{n',j'}) \right| = o(c_{2^n}).$$

The proof of this lemma is provided in Subsection 5.2.

As a consequence of the two previous lemmas, we obtain

Corollary 4.3 *Let $X_{n,j}$ and $\tilde{Z}_{n,j}$ as defined in Lemmas 4.1 and in 4.2, respectively. Then*

$$\left| \sum_{(n',j') \prec (n,j)} (X_{n',j'} - \tilde{Z}_{n',j'}) \right| = o(c_{2^n}).$$

We turn to maxima of sums and gaps.

Lemma 4.4 *Assume (H3), (HL0) and (HL1). Let $i_{n,j}$ be the smallest element of $I_{n,j}$. Then the following holds almost surely as $(n,j) \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\max_{r < |I_{n,j}|} \left| \sum_{l=i_{n,j}}^{i_{n,j}+r} W_l^{c_{2^n}} \right| = o(c_{2^n})$$

and a similar statement holds for $\tilde{Z}_{n',j'}$.

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is given in Subsection 5.3.

The next lemma shows that the gaps $J_{n,j}$ (see (4.1)) can be neglected.

Lemma 4.5 *Let c_n as in (HL0) and assume (H2) and (H3). Let $\mathcal{J} = \cup_{n,j} J_{n,j}$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, almost surely, as $k \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\left| \sum_{l < k, l \in \mathcal{J}} W_l^{c_k} \right| = o(k^{\beta/2 + 2\varepsilon + \varepsilon_1}).$$

A similar statement holds for $\tilde{Z}_{n',j'}$.

Lemma 4.5 is proved in Subsection 5.4 by controlling the L^2 norms of the truncated variables in the same manner as in [21, Proof of Lemma 5.9].

We can complete

Proof of Proposition 3.1 First note that, as for any (n,j) the Gaussian variable $\tilde{Z}_{n,j}$ has covariance $|I_{n,j}| \ell^*(c_{2^n}) \Sigma^2 (1 + o(1))^2$, it can be regarded as a sum of independent Gaussians, $\tilde{Z}_{n,j} = \sum_{l \in I_{n,j}} \tilde{Z}_l$, where \tilde{Z}_l is distributed as $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_l^2)$, with $\sigma_l^2 = \ell^*(c_l) \Sigma^2 (1 + o(1))$ as in the statement of the Proposition.

Now let $\mathcal{I} = \cup_{n,j} I_{n,j}$ be the union of the main blocks. By Corollary 4.3 and Lemma 4.4, $\left| \sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}, l < k} (W_l^{c_l} - \tilde{Z}_l) \right| = o(c_k) = o(c_k)$, almost surely, as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By

²Note that for $l \in I_{n,j}$ we have $l = 2^n$.

Lemma 4.5, $\left| \sum_{l \in \mathcal{J}, l < k} W_l^{c_l} \right| = o(k^{\beta/2 + 2\varepsilon + \varepsilon_1}) = o(c_k)$; in the last equalities we have used that $\beta < 1$ and that $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1$ can be arbitrarily small and also that $k \in \mathcal{J}$. Thus, $\left| \sum_{j=1}^k W_j^{c_j} - \tilde{Z}_j \right| = o(c_k)$, almost surely, as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

By definition, $\tilde{Z}_j = \sigma_j Z_j$, where as in the statement of Proposition 3.1, $\sigma_j^2 = \ell^*(c_j) \Sigma^2 (1 + o(1))$, and Z_j is a sequence of Gaussian random vectors distributed as $\mathcal{N}(\bar{0}, I)$. Thus, almost surely, as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^k W_j^{c_j} - \tilde{Z}_j \right| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^k (W_j^{c_j} - \sigma_j Z_j) \right| = o(c_k).$$

■

5 Proofs of the lemmas used in the proof of Theorem 1.8

5.1 Proof of Lemma 4.1

The proof of this lemma is analogous to [21, Proof of Proposition 5.1]. We recall the main elements partly for completeness, partly for use in some proofs below.

The proof exploits assumption (H2) and the Strassen Dudley theorem (see, for instance, [6, Theorem 6.9]), which we now recall. The Prokhorov metric $\pi(Y, Z)$ between two random variables Y and Z taking values in some metric space M is defined as

$$\inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid \mathbb{P}(Y \in A) < \mathbb{P}(Z \in A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(Z \in A) < \mathbb{P}(Y \in A^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(M)\},$$

where $\mathcal{B}(M)$ denotes the collection of Borel sets of M , and A^ε denotes the ε -neighborhood of A . Specifically, for real-valued random variables Y and Z with distribution functions P_Y and P_Z this reduces to

$$\inf\{\varepsilon > 0 \mid P_Y(x - \varepsilon) - \varepsilon \leq P_Z(x) \leq P_Y(x + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

In particular, if $|P_Y(x) - P_Z(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\pi(Y, Z) \leq \varepsilon$.

Theorem 5.1 [21, Theorem 3.4, Lemma 3.5] *Let Y, Z be two random variables taking values in \mathbb{R}^{dM} with probability distributions P_Y, P_Z and characteristic functions Ψ_Y, Ψ_Z . Let $\pi(P_Y, P_Z)$ denote the Prokhorov distance between these distributions.*

(a) *If $\pi(P_Y, P_Z) < c$ then there exists a coupling between Y and Z such that $\mathbb{P}(|Y - Z| > c) < c$.*

(b) There exists $C_d > 0$ so that for any $T^* > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(P_Y, P_Z) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^M |P_Y(|y_j| > T^*) - P_Z(|z_j| > T^*)| + \sum_{j=1}^M P_Y(|y_j| > T^*) \\ &\quad + (C_d T^*)^{(dM)/2} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{dM}} |\Psi_Y(t) - \Psi_Z(t)|^2 dt \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We can now recall the main steps of [21, Proof of Proposition 5.1]. We emphasise that these steps require (H2), (H3), Theorem 5.1 and that the observable of interest (in our set up $W_l^{c_{2^n}}$) is in $L^1(\mu)$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Recall $X_{n,j} = \sum_{l \in I_{n,j}} W_l^{c_{2^n}}$. Let $X_n = (X_{n,j})_{0 \leq j < F(n)}$ be vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{dF(n)}$. To exploit (H2), we shall proceed as in [21] working with variants of $X_{n,j}$ whose characteristic functions will be supported on a neighborhood of 0. More precisely, given ε_0 as in (H2), [21, Proposition 3.8] ensures that there exists a symmetric random variable V in \mathbb{R}^d , $V \in L^q$, for every $q \geq 2$, whose characteristic function is supported in $\{|t| \leq \varepsilon_0\}$. Let $V_{n,j}$ be independent copies of V , independent of everything else. Set $X_{n,j}^* = X_{n,j} + V_{n,j}$ and let $X_n^* = (X_{n,0}^*, X_{n,1}^*, \dots, X_{n,F(n)-1}^*)$ be vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{dF(n)}$.

Let Q_n be a random variable distributed like X_n and consider the $\mathbb{R}^{dD(n)}$ random vectors $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{n-1}, X_n)$ and $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{n-1}, Q_n)$, where $D(n) = \sum_{j=1}^n F(j) \ll 2^{\beta n}$. Note that $J_{n,0}$ is a gap of length $k \approx 2^{\varepsilon_1 n + \beta n}$ between between $(X_j)_{j < n}$ and X_n . Let ϕ and γ be the characteristic functions of $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{n-1}, X_n)$ and $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{n-1}, Q_n)$. Reasoning as in the first part of the proof of [21, Lemma 5.2], we have under the current (H2) that for all $|t_{m,j}| \leq \varepsilon_0$ and for n large enough,

$$|\phi - \gamma| \ll e^{-c2^{\varepsilon_1 n + \beta n}}.$$

Set $Q_n^* = Q_n + V_n$, where V_n is an independent copy of V , independent of everything else. Consider the $\mathbb{R}^{dD(n)}$ random vectors $(X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_{n-1}^*, X_n^*)$ and $(X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_{n-1}^*, Q_n^*)$ with characteristic functions ϕ^* and γ^* , which are obtained by multiplying ϕ, γ by the characteristic function of V . Thus, $|\phi^* - \gamma^*| \ll e^{-c2^{\varepsilon_1 n + \beta n}}$.

As in the last paragraph of [21, Proof of Lemma 5.2], the distance between the distributions requires only that for all n , $\|W_l^{c_{2^n}}\|_{L^1(\mu)} \leq C$, for some $C > 0$ independent of n and l ; this is true because $v \in L^1(\mu)$. We apply Theorem 5.1(b) with $T^* = e^{2\varepsilon_1 n/2}$ and obtain, by the Markov inequality, that the terms associated to the tails of the distributions are bounded by $\ll 2^n e^{-2\varepsilon_1 n/2}$.

Putting the previous two facts together and using Theorem 5.1,

$$\pi((X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_{n-1}^*, X_n^*), (X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_{n-1}^*, Q_n^*)) \ll 4^{-n}. \quad (5.1)$$

Using (5.1) and proceeding as in [21, Proof of Corollary 5.3], we obtain that there exists a coupling between (X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots) and (R_1^*, R_2^*, \dots) , where the variables

$R_n^* = (R_{n,j}^*)_{j < F(n)}$ are distributed as the X_n^* , but independent of each other, so that

$$\mu(|X_{n,j}^* - R_{n,j}^*| \geq C4^{-n}) \leq C4^{-n}. \quad (5.2)$$

The next step is then to show – based on (H2), with an argument analogous to [21, Proof of Lemma 5.4] – that

$$\pi\left((R_{n,j}^*)_{0 \leq j < F(n)}, (\hat{X}_{n,j}^*)_{0 \leq j < F(n)}\right) \leq C4^{-n}, \quad (5.3)$$

where $\hat{X}_{n,j}^* = \hat{X}_{n,j} + V_{n,j}$ with $(\hat{X}_{n,j})_{n \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq j < F(n)}$ a sequence of independent random variables distributed like $X_{n,j}$. We recall the main ingredients of the argument in [21, Proof of Lemma 5.4] needed to obtain (5.3), partly for completeness, partly for use in the proof of Lemma 4.5 below. The main idea of [21, Proof of Lemma 5.4] is to make the variables $(R_{n,j}^*)_{0 \leq j < F(n)/2}$ independent of $(R_{n,j}^*)_{0 \leq j < F(n)/2}$ by using a large gap $J_{n,F(n)/2}$ and proceed in each remaining half using the gap in the middle of this half and repeating the procedure. For $0 \leq i < \lfloor n\beta \rfloor$ define $\tilde{Y}_{n,j}^i$ so that for $0 \leq k < 2^{\lfloor n\beta \rfloor - 1}$, the random variable $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{n,k}^i = (\tilde{Y}_{n,j}^i)_{k2^i \leq j < (k+1)2^i}$ is distributed like $(X_{n,j}^*)_{k2^i \leq j < (k+1)2^i}$ and so that $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{n,k}^i$ is independent of $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{n,k'}^i$ if $k \neq k'$. The argument of [21, Proof of Lemma 5.4] simply goes through provided that the distance between the characteristic function of the random variables $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{n,k}^i$ and $(\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{n,2k}^{i-1}, \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{n,2k+1}^{i-1})$ is $O(e^{-c2^{n\varepsilon_1+i}})$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{n,k}^i$ consists of 2^i sums of variables $W_l^{c2^n}$ along blocks of length $2^{n-\lfloor n\beta \rfloor}$ with a gap of size $\approx 2^{n\varepsilon_1+i}$ in the middle, (H2) applies and, the required result $O(e^{-c2^{n\varepsilon_1+i}})$ follows. Finally, let $\hat{X}_{n,j}^* = \tilde{Y}_{n,j}^0$.

By (5.1) and (5.3) and Borel-Cantelli lemma (after summing over j and n),

$$\left| \sum_{(n',j') \prec (n,j)} (X_{n',j'}^* - \hat{X}_{n',j'}^*) \right| = o(2^{n/2}) = o(c_{2^n}).$$

To obtain the result for $X_{n,j}$, one needs to argue that the contribution of $V_{n,j}$ is negligible. As in [21, Proof of Proposition 5.1], this can be done using the law of iterated logarithms for the centered, independent random variables $V_{n,j} \in L^2(\mu)$:

$$\left| \sum_{(n',j') \prec (n,j)} V_{n,j} \right| \leq CN_{n,j}^{1/2} \cdot \sqrt{\log \log(N_{n,j})}.$$

where $N_{n,j}$ is the cardinality of the set $\{(n',j') : (n',j') \prec (n,j)\}$. Since $N_{n,j} \leq \sum_{n'=1}^n \sum_{j'=0}^{F(n')-1} 1 \leq C2^{\beta n}$,

$$\left| \sum_{(n',j') \prec (n,j)} V_{n,j} \right| = o(2^{(\beta n + \varepsilon n)/2}),$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $\beta < 1$ and ε is arbitrary, $o(2^{(\beta n + \varepsilon n)/2}) = o(2^{n/2})$, we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{(n',j') \prec (n,j)} (X_{n',j'} - \hat{X}_{n',j'}) \right| = o(2^{n/2}) = o(c_{2^n}), \quad (5.4)$$

as required. \square

5.2 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Let $(\hat{X}_{n,j})_{n \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq j < F(n)}$ be the independent random variables obtained in Lemma 4.1.

In this section we exploit assumption (HL1)(i) with $d_n = \sqrt{nL(n)\ell_1(n)^{-99}}$ as in (1.8) and $r = i_{n,j}$. More precisely, fix (n, j) and for $l = 0, \dots, |I_{n,j}|$ let

$$\widetilde{W} = v \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d_{2^n} \leq |v| \leq c_{2^n}}, \quad \widetilde{W}_l = W_{l+i_{n,j}}^{c_{2^n}} - W_{l+i_{n,j}}^{d_{2^n}} = \widetilde{W} \circ T^{l+i_{n,j}}.$$

Note that

$$\ell^*(c_{2^n}) \asymp \ell^*(d_{2^n}) \asymp n \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{c_n}{d_n} \asymp (\ell_1(n))^{50} \quad (5.5)$$

Let $Y_{n,j} = \sum_{l \in I_{n,j}} W_l^{d_{2^n}}$, and let $\hat{Y}_{n,j}$ be distributed as $Y_{n,j}$, but independent for $(n', j') \neq (n, j)$.

The first result below says that the additional truncation in terms of d_{2^n} causes an error which is almost surely $o(c_{2^n})$.

Lemma 5.2 *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} \mu \left(\left| \hat{X}_{n,j} - \hat{Y}_{n,j} \right| > \varepsilon c_{2^n} \right) < \infty.$$

Proof We will use Chebyshev's inequality, hence need a bound on the second moment of

$$\hat{X}_{n,j} - \hat{Y}_{n,j} = \sum_{l \in I_{n,j}} (W_l^{c_{2^n}} - W_l^{d_{2^n}}).$$

Using (HL1)(i) and (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_\mu(|\hat{X}_{n,j} - \hat{Y}_{n,j}|^2) &\ll \sum_{l \in I_{n,j}} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left((W_l^{c_{2^n}} - W_l^{d_{2^n}})^2 \right) = \sum_{l \in I_{n,j}} \mathbb{E}_\mu \left((\widetilde{W}_l)^2 \right) \\ &\ll |I_{n,j}| L \left(\frac{c_{2^n}}{d_{2^n}} \right) \ll |I_{n,j}| LL(n). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Hence, the Chebyshev inequality implies

$$\sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} \mu \left(\left| \hat{X}_{n,j} - \hat{Y}_{n,j} \right| > \varepsilon c_{2^n} \right) \ll \frac{F(n) \cdot |I_{n,j}| \cdot LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2} \ll \frac{LL(n)}{n \ell_1(2^n)}$$

which is sumable in n , by assumption (HL0)(iii). \blacksquare

It remains to couple the independent variables $\hat{Y}_{n,j}$ truncated at the lower level d_{2^n} to appropriate Gaussians, as stated in the next Lemma, the analogue of [21, Lemma 5.6] in the present set up.

Lemma 5.3 *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists a coupling between $(\hat{Y}_{n,0}, \hat{Y}_{n,1}, \dots, \hat{Y}_{n,F(n)-1})$ and $(S_{n,0}, S_{n,1}, \dots, S_{n,F(n)-1})$, where $S_{n,j}$ are independent, centered Gaussian vectors $\text{cov}S_{n,j} = \text{cov}\hat{Y}_{n,j}$ so that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\sum_n \mu \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq F(n)} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} Y_{n,j} - S_{n,j} \right| \geq \frac{c_{2^n}}{L(n)} \right) < \infty.$$

Proof We apply [35, Corollary 3] as recalled in [21, Proposition 5.5] to $\hat{Y}_{n,j}$. We briefly recall the statement. Let Y_0, \dots, Y_{b-1} be independent centered \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables. Let $p \geq 2$ and $M = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{b-1} \mathbb{E}|Y_j|^p \right)^{1/p}$. Assume that there exists a sequence $0 = m_0 < m_1 < \dots < m_s = b$ so that given $\Xi_k = Y_{m_k} + \dots + Y_{m_{k+1}-1}$, $B_k = \text{cov}\Xi_k$, the following holds for all $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for all $0 \leq k \leq s$ and for some $C > 1$:

$$100M^2|w|^2 \leq \langle B_k w, w \rangle \leq 100CM^2|w|^2. \quad (5.7)$$

Then there exists a coupling between (Y_0, \dots, Y_{b-1}) and a sequence of independent Gaussian random vectors (S_0, \dots, S_{b-1}) with $\text{cov}S_j = \text{cov}Y_j$ and so that

$$\mu \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq b} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} Y_j - S_j \right| \geq Mz \right) < c_0 z^{-p} + e^{-C_0 z}, \quad (5.8)$$

for all $z \geq C_0 \log s$ with C_0 a constant that depends only on C , dimension d and exponent p .

We will apply this statement with $b = F(n)$, $Y_j = \hat{Y}_{n,j}$, $p = 4$ and $z = n^{1/4} \cdot L(n)$. Let us check that the conditions hold. By (H3)(ii) we have (recall $|I_{n,j}| = 2^{(1-\beta)n}$ with $\beta < 1$ while $2^{n/2} = o(d_{2^n})$, so the required relation of number of terms and truncation level, $|I_{n,j}| = o((d_{2^n})^2)$, holds)

$$\mathbb{E}(|\hat{Y}_{n,j}|^4) \ll |I_{n,j}|(d_{2^n})^2,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= \left(\sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} \mathbb{E}(|\hat{Y}_{n,j}|^4) \right)^{1/4} \ll (F(n)2^{(1-\beta)n}d_{2^n}^2)^{1/4} \ll 2^{n/4}d_{2^n}^{1/2} \\
&\ll 2^{n/2} (L(2^n)\ell_1(2^n)^{-80})^{1/4} \ll 2^{n/2}n^{1/4}(L(n))^{-20}. \quad (5.9)
\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$M^2 \ll 2^n \sqrt{n},$$

while, by (H3) (ii)

$$\sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} \text{cov} \hat{Y}_{n,j} \asymp \sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} |I_{n,j}| \ell^*(d_{2^n}) \gg 2^n n$$

which is larger in magnitude than M^2 . On the other hand, recalling that Σ is non degenerate (by (H1)), there must exist some constant C_1 so that for any large n , for any $0 \leq m < m' < F(n)$ for any vector w in \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$C_1^{-1}(m' - m)2^{(1-\beta)n}|w|^2 \leq \left\langle \sum_{j=m}^{m'-1} \text{cov} Y_{n,j} w, w \right\rangle \leq C_1(m' - m)2^{(1-\beta)n}|w|^2$$

and each individual term is bounded by

$$|\text{cov} Y_{n,j}| |w|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu(|Y_{n,j}|^2) |w|^2 \leq (\mathbb{E}_\mu(|Y_{n,j}|^4))^{1/2} |w|^2 \leq M^2 |w|^2.$$

So, one can group $Y_{n,j}$ into consecutive blocks so that (5.7) holds with some constant C . Note also that, for the number of blocks, $s = \sqrt{n}\ell_2(n)$ with some slowly varying function ℓ_2 , hence the condition $z \gg \log s$ holds with the above specified $z = n^{1/4}L(n)$.

Now, using (5.9), we have

$$z \cdot M = n^{1/4}L(n)2^{n/2}n^{1/4}(\ell_1(2^n))^{-20} \ll \sqrt{2^{2n}n\ell_1(2^n)}(\ell_1(2^n))^{-1} \ll \frac{C_2^n}{L(n)}$$

where we have used that $L(n) \ll \ell_1(2^n)$ by (HL0)(ii) (see also (HL0)(iii)). The conclusion follows by (5.7) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq F(n)} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} Y_{n,j} - S_{n,j} \right| \geq \frac{C_2^n}{L(n)} \right) &< \mu \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq b} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} Y_j - S_j \right| \geq Mz \right) \\
&< c_0 z^{-4} + e^{-C_0 z} < c_0 (nL(n)^4)^{-1} + e^{-C_0 n^{1/4}}
\end{aligned}$$

which is summable in n . ■

Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 imply that there exist a coupling such that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq F(n)} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \hat{X}_{n,j} - S_{n,j} \right| = o(c_{2^n})$$

almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As

$$\sum_{m=0}^n c_{2^m} \leq \left(\sum_{m=0}^n 2^{m/2} \right) \sqrt{\ell^*(2^n) \ell_1(2^n)} \ll c_{2^n},$$

it follows that

$$\sum_{(n',j') \prec (n,j)} \hat{X}_{n',j'} - S_{n',j'} = o(c_{2^n}),$$

almost surely, as $(n, j) \rightarrow \infty$.

We can now complete

Proof of Lemma 4.2 Let $S_{n,j}$ be independent, centered Gaussian vectors obtained in Lemma 5.3. We still need to construct a sequence of independent Gaussian random vectors $\tilde{Z}_{n,j}$ with $\text{cov}(\tilde{Z}_{n,j}) = \ell^*(c_{2^n}) \cdot |I_{n,j}| \cdot \Sigma^2$ and a coupling between $S_{n,j}$ and $\tilde{Z}_{n,j}$. We may rely on [21, Lemma 5.7], which provides such a construction, such that

$$\sum_{(n',j') \prec (n,j)} \left(\frac{S_{n',j'}}{\sqrt{\ell^*(c_{2^n})}} - \frac{\tilde{Z}_{n',j'}}{\sqrt{\ell^*(c_{2^n})}} \right) = o(2^{(\beta+\varepsilon_1)n/2}).$$

The conclusion follows – together with Lemma 5.3 – as $c_n = o(\sqrt{\ell^*(c_{2^n})} \cdot 2^{(\beta+\varepsilon_1)n/2})$, and $\beta + \varepsilon_1 < 1$. \blacksquare

5.3 Proof of Lemma 4.4

Throughout this section we use the notation introduced in Section 5.2. First, we need a strengthening of Lemma 5.2, which will be derived from (HL1)(ii).

Lemma 5.4 *For any $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} \mu \left(\max_{r < |I_{n,j}|} \left| \sum_{l=0}^r \tilde{W}_l \right| \geq \varepsilon c_{2^n} \right) < \infty. \quad (5.10)$$

Proof Note that Lemma 5.2 can be formulated as

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} \mu \left(\left| \sum_{l=0}^{|I_{n,j}|} \tilde{W}_l \right| \geq \varepsilon c_{2^n} \right) < \infty. \quad (5.11)$$

Next, we exploit (HL1)(ii) with $r = i_{n,j}$ and $K = |I_{n,j}|$. Note that r and K are fixed since n and j are fixed. In concrete terms, for $k = 1, \dots, K$, we apply (HL1)(ii) to

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \sum_{l=0}^k \widetilde{W}_l; \quad B_{k,\varepsilon} = \{x \in M \mid |\mathcal{S}_k| \geq \varepsilon c_{2^n}\}$$

and $N_{k,\varepsilon} = B_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus (\cup_{k'=0}^{k-1} B_{k',\varepsilon})$. By (HL1)(ii) $\sum_{k=1}^K \mu(N_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus B_{K,\varepsilon/2}) \ll K \frac{LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2}$.

By the argument used in (5.6), $\mu(B_{K,\varepsilon/2}) \ll \frac{K \cdot LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2}$. Thus,

$$\mu\left(\cup_{k=0}^K B_{k,\varepsilon}\right) \ll \frac{K \cdot LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2}.$$

The required sumability for (5.10) follows by the argument used in the proof of Lemma 5.2. \blacksquare

Proof of Lemma 4.4. By Lemma 5.4, it remains to prove

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} \mu\left(\max_{r < |I_{n,j}|} \left| \sum_{l=i_{n,j}}^{i_{n,j}+r} W_l^{d_{2^n}} \right| \geq \varepsilon c_{2^n}\right) < \infty.$$

By the Markov inequality

$$\mu\left(\max_{r < |I_{n,j}|} \left| \sum_{l=i_{n,j}}^{i_{n,j}+r} W_l^{c_{2^n}} \right| \geq \varepsilon c_{2^n}\right) \leq (\varepsilon c_{2^n})^{-4} \int \max_{r < |I_{n,j}|} \left| \sum_{l=i_{n,j}}^{i_{n,j}+r} W_l^{d_{2^n}} \right|^4 d\mu. \quad (5.12)$$

By [30, Theorem B], there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\int \max_{r < |I_{n,j}|} \left| \sum_{l=i_{n,j}}^{i_{n,j}+r} W_l^{d_n} \right|^4 d\mu \leq C \cdot \int \left| \sum_{l \in I_{n,j}} W_l^{d_{2^n}} \right|^4 d\mu$$

By (H3)(ii) with $R = d_{2^n}$ and n replaced by $|I_{n,j}|$ (note that $|I_{n,j}| \asymp 2^{(1-\beta)n} = o((d_{2^n})^{2-r_1})$ for some $r_1 > 0$),

$$\int \left| \sum_{l=0}^{|I_{n,j}|} W_l^{d_{2^n}} \right|^4 d\mu \ll |I_{n,j}| (d_{2^n})^2.$$

Now recall that $d_n^2 = n \cdot L(n) \cdot (\ell_1(n))^{-99}$ while $c_n^2 = n \cdot L(n) \cdot \ell_1(n)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\max_{r < |I_{n,j}|} \left| \sum_{l=i_{n,j}}^{i_{n,j}+r} W_l^{d_{2^n}} \right| \geq \varepsilon c_{2^n}\right) &\ll \frac{|I_{n,j}| d_{2^n}^2}{c_{2^n}^4} \\ &\ll \frac{|I_{n,j}|}{c_{2^n}^2 (\ell_1(2^n))^{101}} \ll \frac{|I_{n,j}|}{2^n \cdot n \cdot (\ell_1(2^n))^{100}} \end{aligned}$$

Now summing on $j = 0, \dots, F(n) - 1$, we may use $\sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} |I_{n,j}| \asymp 2^n$, and get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{F(n)-1} \mu \left(\max_{r < |I_{n,j}|} \left| \sum_{l=i_{n,j}}^{i_{n,j}+r} W_l^{d_{2^n}} \right| \geq \varepsilon C_{2^n} \right) \ll (n \cdot (\ell_1(2^n))^{100})^{-1}.$$

This bound is sumable in n due to assumption (HL0)(iii). \square

5.4 Proof of Lemma 4.5

Since we are looking at the truncated process for which the second moment is finite, it makes sense to apply the Gal-Koksma strong law of large numbers [21, Proposition 3.7]. As such, we can proceed as [21, Section 5.4]. We recall the main steps in our set up, which are slightly different because the effects of the truncation have to be dealt with.

Our key Lemma, analogous to [21, Proof of Lemma 5.9], is

Lemma 5.5 *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ so that for any interval $J \subset \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J \cap \mathcal{J}} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \leq C |J \cap \mathcal{J}|^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

This allows to complete in the same manner as in [21, Section 5.4],

Proof of Lemma 4.5 The Gal-Koksma strong law of large numbers [21, Propostion 3.7] says that if $(X_l)_{l \geq 0}$ are centered random variables and if $\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{l=m}^{m+n-1} X_l \right|^2 \leq C n^r$ for some $r \geq 1$ and some $C > 0$, then for any $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, $\frac{\sum_{l=1}^N X_l}{N^{r/2+\varepsilon_2}} \rightarrow 0$, almost surely, as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

We can apply Gal-Koksma to $W_l^{c_l}$; this is possible because by assumption (H3)(i), $W_l^{c_l}$ are centered.

By Lemma 5.5 for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J \cap \mathcal{J}} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \leq C |J \cap \mathcal{J}|^{1+\varepsilon}$. Taking $k \in [2^n, 2^{n+1})$ and recalling (4.1),

$$|J \cap \mathcal{J}| \leq \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{j=0}^{F(m)-1} |J_{m,j}| \ll \sum_{m=1}^n m 2^{\varepsilon_1 m + \beta m} \ll n 2^{\varepsilon_1 n + \beta n} \ll k^{\beta + 3\varepsilon_1/2}.$$

It follows from Gal-Koksma that $\sum_{l < k, l \in \mathcal{J}} W_l^{c_l} = o(k^{\beta/2 + 2\varepsilon + \varepsilon_1})$, as desired. \blacksquare

It remains to provide

Proof of Lemma 5.5 As already mentioned, this proof is analogous to [21, Proof of Lemma 5.9]. The only aspect which is different in our set up is that for estimating second moments of (truncated) sums we need to use (H3)(iii) instead of [21, Proposition 4.1] and the current (H2) (instead of [21, Assumption (H)]).

To start, let us recall that $L(\cdot) = \log(\max(\cdot, e))$ and introduce the notation

$$N = \max_{l \in J} L(l). \quad (5.13)$$

Via (H3), second moment moment bounds of sums of truncated variables will include factors of the type $\ell^*(c_l)$ for various $l \in J$. all these contributions can be estimated using

$$\ell^*(c_{2^n}) \asymp L(2^n) \ll N.$$

Now use, as in the second displayed equation inside [21, Proof of Lemma 5.9], the convexity inequality

$$\left(\sum_{l \in J \cap \mathcal{J}} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \leq 3 \left(\sum_{l \in J_0} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 + 3 \left(\sum_{l \in J_1} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 + 3 \left(\sum_{l \in J_2} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2,$$

where J_0, J_2 are the first and last intervals in $J \cap \mathcal{J}$ and where J_1 is the remaining part.

Note that $\mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J_0} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \ll \mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J_0} W_l^{\max_{l \in J_0} c_l} \right)^2$ and $\mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J_2} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \ll \mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J_2} W_l^{\max_{l \in J_2} c_l} \right)^2$. This together with (H3) gives

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J_0} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \ll |J_0| \cdot \ell^*(\max_{l \in J_0} c_l), \quad \mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J_2} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \ll |J_2| \cdot \ell^*(\max_{l \in J_2} c_l).$$

Under (HL0), for all m large enough, $\ell^*(m) \approx L(m)$. Recalling the assumption on c_n in (HL0),

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J_0} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \ll |J_0| \cdot N, \quad \mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J_2} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \ll |J_2| \cdot N. \quad (5.14)$$

We claim that for any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{l \in J_1} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \ll |J_1|^{1+\varepsilon}. \quad (5.15)$$

This together with (5.14) gives the conclusion.

If J_1 is empty, there is nothing to do. If J_1 is not empty, the proof of the claim (5.15) follows the argument of [21, Proof of Equation (5.18)] with again, the only difference that we have to use (H3) instead of [21, Proposition 4.1] and we need the current (H2).

Recall that as before (4.1), an interval has rank r if its length is $2^{\lfloor \varepsilon_1 n \rfloor + r}$. Let $\mathcal{J}^{(n,r)}$ denote the union of intervals $J_{n,j}$ of rank $0 \leq r \leq \lfloor n\beta \rfloor$. Recall, furthermore, (5.13). The number of sets $\mathcal{J}^{(n,r)}$ intersecting J_1 is at most $\sum_{n=0}^N (\lfloor n\beta \rfloor + 1) \ll N^2$.

Proceeding as in the argument used in obtaining [21, Equation (5.19)], we can rely on the convexity inequality and get

$$\left(\sum_{l \in J_1} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \ll N^2 \sum_{n,r} \left(\sum_{l \in J_1 \cap \mathcal{J}^{(n,r)}} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2. \quad (5.16)$$

Let us fix some relevant (n, r) and enumerate the intervals in $\mathcal{J}^{(n,r)}$ as K_1, \dots, K_t for $t = 2^{\lfloor n\beta \rfloor - 1 - r}$, $0 \leq r \leq \lfloor n\beta \rfloor$. Let $T_s = \sum_{l \in K_s} W_l^{c_l}$. To complete the proof of Lemma 5.5, the key bound, analogous to [21, Equation (5.20)], is that for any subset $S \subset \{1, \dots, t\}$

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu \left(\sum_{s \in S} T_s \right)^2 \ll \left(\sum_{s \in S} \mathbb{E}_\mu(T_s^2) + |S| \right) \cdot N. \quad (5.17)$$

(5.17) can be proved using (H2) and (H3), see below, but let us first see how to obtain (5.15) from (5.17). By (H3), $\mathbb{E}_\mu(T_s^2) \ll (\sum_{l \in K_s} W_l^{\max_{l \in K_s} c_l})^2 \ll |K_s| \cdot N$. This type of bound holds for any set K which is a union of intervals in $\mathcal{J}^{(n,r)}$. Taking $K = J_1 \cap \mathcal{J}^{(n,r)}$ and combining with (5.16),

$$\left(\sum_{l \in J_1} W_l^{c_l} \right)^2 \ll N^2 \sum_{n,r} |J_1 \cap \mathcal{J}^{(n,r)}| \cdot N$$

and the claim (5.15) follows as $N \ll |J_1|^\varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, whenever J_1 is nonempty (note that if J_1 is nonempty, it has to contain at least one interval of length $\asymp 2^{\beta N}$).

It remains to justify (5.17) proceeding as in the proof of [21, Equation (5.20)]. Let (U_1, \dots, U_t) be independent random variables such that U_s is distributed like T_s . We recall that given ε_0 as in (H2), [21, Proposition 3.8] ensures that there exists a symmetric random variable V in \mathbb{R}^d , $V \in L^q$, $q \geq 2$, whose characteristic function is supported in $\{|t| \leq \varepsilon_0\}$. Let $V_1, \dots, V_t, V'_1, \dots, V'_t$ be independent random variables distributed like V and define $\tilde{T}_s = T_s + V_s$, $\tilde{U}_s = U_s + V'_s$. Using intervals of rank greater than k as gaps and using the procedure recalled in justifying (5.3) above we obtain (in the same manner as in the proof of [21, Equation (5.21)]),

$$\pi \left((\tilde{T}_1, \dots, \tilde{T}_t), (\tilde{U}_1, \dots, \tilde{U}_t) \right) \ll e^{2\delta n},$$

for some $\delta > 0$. Now we may proceed as in [21]: by Theorem 5.1 there exists a coupling between the (\tilde{T}_j) and the (\tilde{U}_j) ($j = 1, \dots, t$) such that, outside a set O of measure $\ll e^{-2\delta n}$, we have $|\tilde{T}_j - \tilde{U}_j| \ll e^{-2\delta n}$ for any $j = 1, \dots, t$. Then, for any subset $S \subset \{1, \dots, t\}$ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{s \in S} \tilde{T}_s \right\|_{L^2} \leq \left\| \mathbf{1}_O \cdot \sum_{s \in S} \tilde{T}_s \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \mathbf{1}_{O^c} \cdot \sum_{s \in S} (\tilde{T}_s - \tilde{U}_s) \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \sum_{s \in S} \tilde{U}_s \right\|_{L^2}. \quad (5.18)$$

To estimate the first term in (5.18), [21] uses an L^p bound for a relevant $p > 2$, here we proceed slightly differently; we rely on (H3i) and get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{1}_O \cdot \sum_{s \in S} \tilde{T}_s \right\|_{L^2} &\leq \|\mathbf{1}_O\|_{L^4} \cdot \left\| \sum_{s \in S} \tilde{T}_s \right\|_{L^4} \\ &\ll e^{-2\delta n/4} \cdot \sum_{s \in S} \left\| \tilde{T}_s \right\|_{L^4} \ll e^{-2\delta n/4} \cdot |S| \cdot 2^{n/4} \cdot c_{2^n}^{1/2} \\ &\ll e^{-2\delta n/4} \cdot 2^{2n} \leq C \end{aligned}$$

for some $C > 0$. From this point on, the argument can be completed literally as in [21]; the second term in (5.18) can be bounded by some $C > 0$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{s \in S} T_s \right\|_{L^2} &\leq \left\| \sum_{s \in S} \tilde{T}_s \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \sum_{s \in S} V_s \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C + \left\| \sum_{s \in S} U_s \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \sum_{s \in S} V_s \right\|_{L^2} + \left\| \sum_{s \in S} V'_s \right\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C + \left(\sum_{s \in S} \mathbb{E}_\mu(T_s^2) \right)^{1/2} + C|S|^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

■

6 Verification of (H3)(ii) and (HL1) for the Lorentz gas

6.1 Verification of (H3)(ii): bound on the fourth moment

Let $\mathcal{S} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} W^R \circ T^i$, that is, the number of terms is n and the truncation level is R . Throughout, we assume $n = o(R^{2-r_1})$ and $R = O(n^{r_2})$, where $r_1 > 0$ and $r_2 > 0$ are some fixed exponents - this implies also $\log R \asymp \log n$. Our aim is to bound $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{S}^4)$. For brevity let $Y_i = W^R \circ T^i$ and $Y = Y_0$. We also assume $\mathbb{E}Y = 0$ which holds in the Lorentz gas by symmetry. We have

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{S}^4 \ll \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq k \leq l \leq n-1} \mathbb{E}(Y_i Y_j Y_k Y_l)$$

We distinguish several cases depending on the indices i, j, k, l . For some large constant C , let

Case 1. Either $|i - j| \geq C \log n$ or $|k - l| \geq C \log n$. By decay of correlations (see eg. [4, Lemma 4.1]) the contribution of such terms is

$$\ll n^4 \cdot R^4 \theta^{C \log n} = O(1)$$

here n^4 is the number of terms and for C sufficiently large the decay of correlations can be made $\theta^{C \log n} \ll n^{-10r_2+10}$ so that it kills all polynomially growing factors.

Case 2. Both $|i - j| \leq C \log n$ and $|k - l| \leq C \log n$ but $|j - k| \geq C \log n$, we may again apply decay of correlations but now the expectations $\mathbb{E}(Y_i Y_j)$ (and $\mathbb{E}(Y_k Y_l)$) are nonzero. Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, any such term contributes by $(\mathbb{E}(Y^2))^2 \ll (\log R)^2$ (correlations give an $O(1)$ correction) hence the total contribution is

$$n^2(\log R)^2(\log n)^2 \ll n^2(\log R)^4 \ll\ll nR^{2-r_1}(\log R)^4 \ll nR^2.$$

Case 3. $|i - j| \leq C \log n$, $|k - l| \leq C \log n$ and $|j - k| \leq C \log n$. As further bounds will rely on it, first let us estimate $\mathbb{E}(Y_i^2 Y_j^2) = \mathbb{E}(Y^2 Y_{j-i}^2)$. We again distinguish two cases.

Case a, $i = j$. We only have $\mathbb{E}Y^4 \ll \sum_{m=1}^R m^4 m^{-3} \ll R^2$.

Case b, $j > i$. Let

$$M_m = \{\omega \in M \mid |v(\omega)| = m\} \quad (6.1)$$

for some $m \geq 1$. Then $\mu(M_m) \ll m^{-3}$ and (see [8, Formula (9.6)])

$$\mu(M_m \cap T^{-(j-i)} M_{m'}) \ll m^{-9/4} (m')^{-2}.$$

This gives

$$\mathbb{E}(Y^2 Y_{j-i}^2) \ll \sum_{m=1}^R \sum_{m'=1}^R m^2 (m')^2 m^{-9/4} (m')^{-2} \ll R^{3/4} R = R^{7/4}.$$

Now let us get back to the investigation of Case 3 above. Let us consider first the terms when $i = j$ and $k = l$. If, furthermore, $j = k$ then we get a single term when all indices coincide contributing with

$$\mathbb{E}(Y^4) \ll R^2,$$

see above. Otherwise, if $i = j < k = l$, (yet $k - j < C \log n$) we may apply Case b above to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_j^2 Y_k^2) \ll R^{7/4}$$

and as there are $\ll n \log n$ such terms (first fix $(i =)j$, then can pick $k(=l)$ in $\ll \log n$ ways) their total contribution is

$$\ll R^{7/4} n \log n \ll nR^2.$$

Now if either $j > i$ or $l > k$ (yet the conditions of Case 3 remain valid), first we apply a Cauchy-Schwartz to such terms and get

$$\ll (\mathbb{E}(Y_i^2 Y_j^2))^{1/2} \cdot (\mathbb{E}(Y_k^2 Y_l^2))^{1/2}.$$

As either $j > i$ or $l > k$, to at least one of the factors Case b applies and we get $\ll R^{7/8} R = R^{15/8}$. the total contribution of such terms is

$$nR^{15/8}(\log R)^3 \ll nR^2.$$

6.2 Verification of (HL1)

Recall that $\widetilde{W} = v \cdot \mathbf{1}_{d_{2^n} \leq |v| \leq c_{2^n}}$ and that $\widetilde{W}_l = \widetilde{W} \circ T^{l+r}$ for $l \geq 1$ and r fixed.

6.3 Verification of (HL1)(i)

By exponential decay of correlations, see [8, Proposition 9.1], the contribution of cross terms is of $O(K)$, and thus (see also [8, Proof of Lemma 11.1])

$$\mathbb{E}_\mu ((\mathcal{S}_K)^2) \ll K \cdot L \left(\frac{c_{2^n}}{d_{2^n}} \right) \ll K \cdot LL(n), \quad (6.2)$$

as required.

6.4 Verification of (HL1)(ii)

Recall that K is fixed so that $K < (d_{2^n})^2$ and that for $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \sum_{l=0}^k \widetilde{W}_l; \quad B_{k,\varepsilon} = \{x \in M : |\mathcal{S}_k| \geq \varepsilon c_{2^n}\}$$

and $N_{k,\varepsilon} = B_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus (\cup_{k'=0}^{k-1} B_{k',\varepsilon})$.

We need to show that $\sum_{k=1}^K \mu(N_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus B_{K,\varepsilon/2}) \leq C_2 \frac{K \cdot LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2}$. This type of bound is essentially given in [8, pp.696–697] and [4, pp. 506–508], nevertheless, we summarize the main ingredients here.

Note that the points $x \in N_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus B_{K,\varepsilon/2}$ simultaneously satisfy three conditions:

$$|\mathcal{S}_k| \geq \varepsilon \cdot c_{2^n}; \quad |\mathcal{S}_K - \mathcal{S}_k| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \cdot c_{2^n}; \quad \widetilde{W}_k \neq 0. \quad (6.3)$$

Let us consider the third condition: $\widetilde{W}(x) \neq 0$ implies that $x \in M_m$ for some m with $d_{2^n} \leq m \leq c_{2^n}$ (recall (6.1) for the definition of M_m). Now we may use [9, Lemma

5.1] (see also [33, Lemma 16]): there exist constants $p, q > 0$ such that for any $C > 0$ there exists a subset $\widetilde{M}_m \subset M_m$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(M_m \setminus \widetilde{M}_m) &\ll m^{-p} \mu(M_m); \quad \text{and} \\ x \in \widetilde{M}_m &\Rightarrow T^i x \notin M_r \text{ for } r > m^{1-q} \text{ whenever } i = 1, \dots, C \cdot L(m). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{m \geq d_{2^n}} (M_m \setminus \widetilde{M}_m)\right) \ll \sum_{m \geq d_{2^n}} m^{-(3+p)} \ll (d_{2^n})^{-(2+p)} = o(c_{2^n}^{-2}),$$

we may assume that whenever $\widetilde{W}_k \neq 0$, we have $T^{(k+i_{n,j})}x \in \widetilde{M}_m$ for some m with $d_{2^n} \leq m \leq c_{2^n}$. However, this implies $\widetilde{W}_{k'} = 0$ for $k' = (k+1), \dots, k + Cn$ (recall $L(d_{2^n}) \asymp n$). In terms of the three conditions of (6.3) this implies that the contribution of $\mu(N_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus B_{K,\varepsilon/2})$ can be disregarded unless $K - k > Cn$. Furthermore, the values $\widetilde{W}_k \neq 0$ and $\widetilde{W}_{k'} \neq 0$ for $k' > k + Cn$ are strongly decorrelated (by exponential decay of correlations, see eg. [4, Lemma 4.1]) and are of order γ^n for some $\gamma < 1$ that can be made arbitrary small by choosing C large. To conclude, let

$$F_k = |\mathcal{S}_k| \cdot \mathbf{1}_{N_{k,\varepsilon}}; \quad G_k = |\mathcal{S}_K - \mathcal{S}_k|.$$

Then, by the Chebyshev inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(N_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus B_{K,\varepsilon/2}) &\leq \mu\left(F_k \geq \varepsilon c_{2^n} \text{ and } G_k \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} c_{2^n}\right) \\ &\leq \mu\left(F_k \cdot G_k \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} (c_{2^n})^2\right) \\ &\ll \frac{\mu(F_k^2 G_k^2)}{c_{2^n}^4} \ll [\mu(F_k^2) \mu(G_k^2) + \gamma^{-n}] / c_{2^n}^4 \end{aligned}$$

and the contribution from γ^{-n} is under control. Reasoning as in (6.2), the second moment of each term in the sum defining G_k is of $O(LL(n))$. Thus,

$$\mu(G_k^2) \ll (K - k) \cdot LL(n) \ll KLL(n).$$

To bound $\mu(F_k^2)$, note that for $x \in N_{k,\varepsilon}$

$$|\mathcal{S}_k(x)| \leq |\mathcal{S}_{k-1}(x)| + |\widetilde{W}_k(x)| \ll \varepsilon c_{2^n} + c_{2^n} \ll c_{2^n}$$

thus

$$\mu(F_k^2) \ll (c_{2^n})^2 \cdot \mu(N_{k,\varepsilon}) \ll (c_{2^n})^2 \cdot (d_{2^n})^{-2}.$$

Putting all these estimates together and recalling that $K \leq d_{2^n}^2$ by assumption,

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \mu(N_{k,\varepsilon} \setminus B_{K,\varepsilon/2}) \ll K \cdot \frac{K \cdot LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2 (d_{2^n})^2} \ll \frac{K \cdot LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2},$$

as required.

A The sequence c_n defined in (1.4) satisfies (HL0)(iii)

The argument in [20, p. 1622] shows that given c_n as in (1.4), $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (c_k)^{-2} < \infty$. We need to show that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^n LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2} < \infty$.

Proceeding as in the argument in [20, p. 1622], a change of variables shows that

$$\sum_n \frac{2^n LL(n)}{(c_{2^n})^2} \ll \int_1^{\infty} \frac{y}{1 + e^y \sin^2 y} dy.$$

We just need to argue that the above integral is finite, which can be seen as follows. Let $U_k = B_{\frac{1}{(k\pi)^3}}(k\pi)$, $k \geq 1$ and set $V_k = [(k - \frac{1}{2})\pi, (k + \frac{1}{2})\pi] \setminus U_k$. Note that

$$\int_{\frac{\pi}{2}}^{\infty} \frac{y}{1 + e^y \sin^2 y} dy = \sum_k \left(\int_{U_k} + \int_{V_k} \right) \frac{y}{1 + e^y \sin^2 y} dy.$$

On V_k we have $\sin^2 y \geq (\frac{1}{2k\pi})^6$. Note that $|V_k| = \pi$. Thus, $\int_{V_k} \frac{y}{1 + e^y \sin^2 y} dy \leq \pi \frac{(2k\pi)^7}{e^{k\pi}}$, which is sumable in k .

On U_k we have $\sin^2 y \geq 0$. Note that $|U_k| = \frac{2}{(k\pi)^3}$. Thus, $\int_{U_k} \frac{y}{1 + e^y \sin^2 y} dy \leq \frac{4k\pi}{(k\pi)^3}$, which is also sumable in k .

References

- [1] J. Aaronson. *An Introduction to Infinite Ergodic Theory*. Math. Surveys and Monographs **50**, Amer. Math. Soc., 1997.
- [2] J. Aaronson and M. Denker. Local limit theorems for partial sums of stationary sequences generated by Gibbs-Markov maps. *Stoch. Dyn.* **1** (2001) 193–237.
- [3] P. Bálint, H. Bruin and D. Terhesiu. Periodic Lorentz gas with small scatterers. *Probab Th. Relat. Fields* **186** (2023), 159–219.
- [4] P. Bálint, N. Chernov, and D. Dolgopyat. Limit theorems for dispersing billiards with cusps. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 308(2):479–510, 2011.
- [5] P. Bálint, S. Gouëzel. Limit theorems in the stadium billiard. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **263** (2006) 461–512.
- [6] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*, 2nd ed. Wiley, New York.(1999).

- [7] N. Chernov. Decay of correlations and dispersing billiards. *J. Statist. Phys.* **94** (1999) 513–556.
- [8] N. Chernov, D. Dolgopyat. Anomalous current in periodic Lorentz gases with infinite horizon. *Russian Math. Surveys* **64-4** (2009), 651–699.
- [9] N. Chernov and H.-K. Zhang. Improved estimates for correlations in billiards. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 277(2):305–321, 2008.
- [10] C. Cuny, J. Dedecker, A. Korepanov, F. Merlevéde, Rates in almost sure invariance principle for nonuniformly hyperbolic maps, Preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.12714>
- [11] M. Demers, C. Liverani. *Stability of statistical properties in two dimensional piecewise hyperbolic maps*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **360** (2008) 4777–4814.
- [12] M. Demers, H.-K. Zhang. *Spectral analysis of the transfer operator for the Lorentz gas*. Journal of Modern Dynamics **5:4** (2011), 665–709.
- [13] M. Demers, H.-K. Zhang. *A functional analytic approach to perturbations of the Lorentz gas*. Commun. Math. Phys. **324** (2013), 767–830.
- [14] M. Demers, H.-K. Zhang. *Spectral analysis of hyperbolic systems with singularities*. Nonlinearity **27** (2014), 379–433.
- [15] D. Dolgopyat, S. Liu. *An analogue of Law of Iterated Logarithm for Heavy Tailed Random Variables*. Preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.15378>
- [16] U. Einmahl. A useful estimate in the multidimensional invariance principle. *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields* **76** (1987) 81-101
- [17] U. Einmahl. Strong Approximations for Partial Sums of I.I.D. B-valued R.V.’s in the Domain of Attraction of a Gaussian Law, *Probab. Th. Rel. Fields* **77** (1988) 65–85.
- [18] U. Einmahl. A Generalization of Strassen’s Functional LIL, *J. Theor. Probab.* **20** (2007) 901–915.
- [19] U. Einmahl. A new strong invariance principle for sums of independent random vectors, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* **364** (2009) 5–31.
- [20] U. Einmahl and D. Li. Some results on two sided LIL behaviour, *Ann. Prob.* **33** (2005) 1601–1624.
- [21] S. Gouëzel. Almost sure invariance principle for dynamical systems by spectral methods, *Ann. Prob.* **38** (2010) 1639–1671.

- [22] A. Korepanov. Rates in almost sure invariance principle for dynamical systems with some hyperbolicity. *Comm. in Math. Phys.* (2018) **363** 173–190.
- [23] F. Merlevéde, E. Rio, Strong approximation of partial sums under dependence conditions with application to dynamical systems. *Stoch. Process. Appl.* 122 (2012), 386–417.
- [24] I. Melbourne, M. Nicol, Almost sure invariance principle for nonuniformly hyperbolic systems, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **260** (2005), 131–146.
- [25] I. Melbourne, M. Nicol, Almost sure invariance principle for nonuniformly hyperbolic systems, A vector-valued almost sure invariance principle for hyperbolic dynamical systems, *Ann. Probab.* **37** (2009), 478–505.
- [26] I. Melbourne, F. Pène, D. Terhesiu. Local large deviations for periodic infinite horizon Lorentz gases. To appear in *J. d’Analyse*.
- [27] F. Pène, D. Terhesiu. Sharp error term in local limit theorems and mixing for Lorentz gases with infinite horizon. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **382** (2021), no. 3, 1625–1689.
- [28] F. Pène, D. Terhesiu. Strong mixing for the periodic Lorentz gas flow with infinite horizon. Preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04254>
- [29] W. Philipp, W. Stout. Almost sure invariance principles for partial sums of weakly dependent random variables. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*(1975) **2** 161
- [30] J. R. Serfling. Moment inequalities for the maximum cumulative sum. *Ann. Math. Statist.*(1970) **41** 1227–1234.
- [31] E. L. Rvačeva. On domains of attraction of multidimensional distributions. *Lvov. Gos. Univ. Uč. Zap. Ser. Meh.-Mat.* **29** (1954) 5–44.
- [32] W. Stout. Almost Sure Invariance Principles When $\mathbb{E}(X_1^2) = \infty$. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete* **49** (1979) 23–32.
- [33] D. Szász, T. Varjú. *Limit laws and recurrence for the planar Lorentz process with infinite horizon*. *J. Stat. Phys.* **129** (2007), no. 1, 59–80.
- [34] L.-S. Young. Statistical properties of dynamical systems with some hyperbolicity. *Ann. of Math.* **147** (1998) 585–650.
- [35] A. Y. Zaistev. Estimates for the rate of strong approximation in the multidimensional invariance principle. *J. Math. Sci. N. Y.* **145** 4856–4865.
- [36] A. Y. Zaistev. The accuracy of strong Gaussian approximation for sums of independent random vectors. *Russian Math. Surveys* **68** (2013) 721–761.