

The saddlepoint approximation for averages of conditionally independent random variables

Ziang Niu, Jyotishka Ray Choudhury, Eugene Katsevich

August 1, 2024

Abstract

Motivated by the application of saddlepoint approximations to resampling-based statistical tests, we prove that the Lugannani-Rice formula has vanishing relative error when applied to approximate conditional tail probabilities of averages of conditionally independent random variables. In a departure from existing work, this result is valid under only sub-exponential assumptions on the summands, and does not require any assumptions on their smoothness or lattice structure. The derived saddlepoint approximation result can be directly applied to resampling-based hypothesis tests, including bootstrap, sign-flipping and conditional randomization tests. We exemplify this by providing the first rigorous justification of a saddlepoint approximation for the sign-flipping test of symmetry about the origin, initially proposed in 1955. On the way to our main result, we establish a conditional Berry-Esseen inequality for sums of conditionally independent random variables, which may be of independent interest.

1 Introduction

1.1 Saddlepoint approximations to resampling-based tests

Resampling-based hypothesis testing procedures often have superior finite-sample performance to those of their asymptotic counterparts. Examples of these include the sign-flipping test for symmetry around the origin in the one-sample problem (Fisher, 1935), permutation tests for equality of distributions in the two-sample problem (Fisher, 1935; Pitman, 1937), bootstrap-based tests (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994), and the conditional randomization test for conditional independence (Candès et al., 2018). However, such procedures entail a much greater computational burden. This is particularly the case in modern applications where large numbers of hypotheses are tested simultaneously and multiplicity corrections substantially decrease the p -value threshold for significance. If M hypotheses are tested, then $O(M)$ resamples are required per test for sufficiently fine-grained p -values to meet the significance threshold, leading to a total computational cost of $O(M^2)$ resamples. In genome-wide association studies, for example, M can be in the millions, making resampling-based tests computationally infeasible.

A promising direction for accelerating resampling-based hypothesis testing is via closed-form approximations to tail probabilities of the resampling distribution, circumventing resampling while maintaining the finite-sample accuracy of the test. The most

common approach to obtaining such approximations is via the *saddlepoint approximation* (SPA), introduced by Daniels (1954) for approximating densities of sample averages and extended to tail probabilities by Lugannani and Rice (1980). These approximations are accurate for small sample sizes, even for approximating extreme tail probabilities. They are derived by exponentially tilting the distribution of the summands to match the observed value of the test statistic (requiring the solution of a *saddlepoint equation*), and then applying a normal approximation to the tilted distribution. In the context of resampling, the SPA has been applied to sign-flipping tests (Daniels, 1955), permutation tests (Robinson, 1982; Abd-Elfattah and Butler, 2007; Abd-Elfattah, 2009; Zhou and Wright, 2013), and the bootstrap (Davison and Hinkley, 1988; Jing et al., 1994; DiCiccio et al., 1994).

Despite the excellent empirical performance of SPAs for resampling-based tests, their theoretical justification has three key weaknesses. **First**, existing theory ignores the conditioning on the data inherent in resampling-based tests. Instead, the data are treated as fixed, and results for unconditional SPAs are invoked. Furthermore, existing results on saddlepoint approximations to p -values for resampling-based tests do not account for the fact that the tail probability cutoff is a function of the data, rather than fixed. **Second**, existing SPA theory requires assumptions on either the smoothness (Daniels, 1954; Lugannani and Rice, 1980; Jensen, 1995; Jing et al., 1994) or lattice structure (Jensen, 1995, Chapter 6.4 and Kolassa, 2006, Chapter 5) of the summands. These assumptions need not be satisfied by the summands arising from resampling-based tests. Existing works on SPAs for resampling-based procedures assume that resampling distributions are “close enough” to being continuous (Davison and Hinkley, 1988; Daniels and Young, 1991; DiCiccio et al., 1994). **Third**, existing works on SPAs for resampling-based tests assume without proof that the saddlepoint equation has a solution (a requirement for the construction of the SPA). Taken together, these limitations leave the application of SPAs to resampling-based tests on shaky theoretical ground.

1.2 Our contributions

In this paper, we address all three of these limitations by establishing a **saddlepoint approximation for the conditional tail probability of averages of conditionally independent random variables**. In particular, we consider a triangular array W_{in} of random variables that are independent and mean-zero conditionally on a σ -algebra \mathcal{F}_n for each n . We prove that the Lugannani-Rice approximation \hat{p}_n to the conditional tail probability

$$p_n \equiv \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \quad (1)$$

has vanishing relative error:

$$p_n = \hat{p}_n \cdot (1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)), \quad (2)$$

where $w_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ is a sequence of cutoff values such that $w_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ at any rate (Theorem 1). Showing that the *relative* rather than *absolute* error is small is particularly important,

giving accurate estimates even for very small p -values. **We avoid assumptions on the smoothness or lattice structure of the W_{in}** , assuming just that these random variables have light enough tails. Under these conditions, we also prove that the saddlepoint equation has a unique solution with probability approaching one.

Consider a hypothesis test based on the statistic $T_n \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}$ and the resampling distribution $\tilde{T}_n \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{X}_{in}$ for some resampling mechanism generating $\tilde{X}_{in} \mid \sigma(X_{1n}, \dots, X_{nn})$. Setting $W_{in} \equiv \tilde{X}_{in}$, $w_n \equiv T_n$, and $\mathcal{F}_n \equiv \sigma(X_{1n}, \dots, X_{nn})$, we find that the p -value of this test,

$$p_n \equiv \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{X}_{in} \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in} \mid X_{1n}, \dots, X_{nn} \right], \quad (3)$$

matches the definition (1). Therefore, the result (2) lays a solid mathematical foundation for applying the SPA to a range of resampling-based hypothesis tests with independently resampled summands, including the sign-flipping test, bootstrap-based tests, and the conditional randomization test (but not the permutation test). We exemplify this by providing **the first rigorous justification of an SPA for the sign-flipping test** of the kind originally proposed by Daniels (1955) (Theorem 2). In addition to justifying existing SPAs for resampling methods, our result paves the way for SPAs for newer resampling-based methods like the conditional randomization test, a direction we pursue in a parallel work (Niu et al., 2024b). Beyond the context of resampling-based tests, **our result gives the first set of conditions for validity of the SPA involving only tail assumptions on the summands**. On the way to our result, we prove a conditional Berry-Esseen inequality for the sum of conditionally independent random variables (Lemma 9), which may be of independent interest. Finally, we prove the equivalence of two tail probability approximations (Lugannani and Rice, 1980; Robinson, 1982) under general conditions (Proposition 1).

1.3 Related work

The literature on SPAs is vast, and has several book-length reviews (Jensen, 1995; Kolassa, 2006; Butler, 2007). We do not attempt to review this literature here, but we at least point to several relevant strands of work. We note that SPAs have been employed for conditional probabilities arising not just in resampling-based procedures but also in the context of inference conditional on sufficient statistics for nuisance parameters (Skovgaard, 1987; Jing and Robinson, 1994; Davison, 1998; Kolassa and Robinson, 2007). This direction is related to our work, but distinct in the sense that the summands are independent *before* conditioning, whereas in our work, the summands are independent *after* conditioning. There has also been work on applying the SPA to handle the null distributions of rank-based tests (Froda and Eeden, 2000; Jin and Robinson, 2003), whose discreteness is a challenge as in resampling-based tests. In this line of work, however, there is no conditioning involved. Finally, Daniels (1954) discusses conditions under which the saddlepoint equation has a unique solution, including when the summands W_{in} have compact support and the cutoff w_n falls within the interior of that support.

1.4 Overview of the paper

The organization of the remaining sections is as follows. In Section 2, we state Theorem 1, our main theoretical result. In Section 3, we apply Theorem 1 to the sign-flipping test. Next, we sketch the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 4, deferring several lemmas to the appendix. Finally, we conclude with a discussion in Section 5.

2 SPA for conditionally independent variables

Let $\{W_{in}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n, n \geq 1}$ be a triangular array of random variables on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and let $\mathcal{F}_n \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a sequence of σ -algebras so that $\mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n] = 0$ for each (i, n) and $\{W_{in}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ are independent conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n for each n . For a sequence of cutoff values $w_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$, we will consider SPAs for the conditional tail probability (1). We will first introduce tail assumptions on W_{in} (Section 2.1), which will prepare us to introduce the saddlepoint approximation (Section 2.2) and state our main result on its accuracy (Section 2.3). We close this section with a number of remarks (Section 2.4).

2.1 Tail assumptions on the summands

Let W be a random variable on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ be a σ -algebra. In the following two definitions, we extend the definitions of sub-exponential and compactly supported random variables to the conditional setting.

Definition 1 (CSE distribution). Consider a random variable $\theta \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\theta \geq 0$ almost surely and a constant $\beta > 0$. We say $W | \mathcal{G}$ is *conditionally sub-exponential* (CSE) with parameters (θ, β) if, almost surely,

$$\mathbb{P}[|W| \geq t | \mathcal{G}] \leq \theta \exp(-\beta t), \text{ for all } t > 0.$$

We denote this property via $W | \mathcal{G} \sim \text{CSE}(\theta, \beta)$.

Definition 2 (CCS distribution). Consider a random variable $\nu \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\nu \geq 0$ almost surely. We say $W | \mathcal{G}$ is *conditionally compactly supported* (CCS) on $[-\nu, \nu]$ if

$$W \in [-\nu, \nu] \text{ almost surely.}$$

We denote this property via $W | \mathcal{G} \sim \text{CCS}(\nu)$.

Now, we impose assumptions on the triangular array $\{W_{in}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n, n \geq 1}$ in terms of these definitions. We assume throughout that Assumption 1 or Assumption 2 holds.

Assumption 1 (CSE condition). *There exist $\theta_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and $\beta > 0$ such that*

$$W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n \sim \text{CSE}(\theta_n, \beta) \text{ for all } i, n, \quad \theta_n < \infty \text{ almost surely,} \quad \theta_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (4)$$

Assumption 2 (CCS condition). *There exist $\nu_{in} \in \mathcal{F}_n$ such that*

$$W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n \sim \text{CCS}(\nu_{in}), \quad \nu_{in} < \infty \text{ almost surely,} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{in}^A = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (5)$$

2.2 The saddlepoint approximation

The saddlepoint approximation is usually based on the cumulant-generating functions (CGFs) of the summands. For our purposes, we use conditional CGFs:

$$K_{in}(s) \equiv \log \mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n] \quad \text{and} \quad K_n(s) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}(s).$$

Either of the assumptions in the previous section guarantees the existence of these CGFs and their derivatives in a neighborhood of the origin.

Lemma 1. *Suppose Assumption 1 or Assumption 2 holds. Then, there exists a probability-one event \mathcal{A} and an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that, on \mathcal{A} ,*

$$K_{in}(s) < \infty \quad \text{for any } s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \text{ and for all } i \leq n, n \geq 1 \quad (6)$$

and

$$|K_{in}^{(r)}(s)| < \infty \quad \text{for any } s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \text{ and for all } i \leq n, n \geq 1, r \geq 1, r \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (7)$$

where $K_{in}^{(r)}$ denotes the r -th derivative of K_{in} .

The first step of the saddlepoint approximation is to find the solution \hat{s}_n to the saddlepoint equation:

$$K_n'(s) = w_n. \quad (8)$$

In particular, we restrict our attention to solutions in the interval $[-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2]$:

$$S_n \equiv \{s \in [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2] : K_n'(s) = w_n\}.$$

It is possible, for specific realizations of $K_n'(s)$ and w_n , that the set S_n is either empty or contains multiple elements. To make the saddlepoint approximation well-defined in these cases, we define \hat{s}_n as follows:

$$\hat{s}_n \equiv \begin{cases} \text{the single element of } S_n & \text{if } |S_n| = 1; \\ \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{sgn}(w_n) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Note that this definition ensures that $\hat{s}_n \in [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2]$.

With the solution to the saddlepoint equation in hand, we define the saddlepoint approximation as follows. If we define

$$\lambda_n \equiv \hat{s}_n \sqrt{nK_n''(\hat{s}_n)}; \quad r_n \equiv \begin{cases} \text{sgn}(\hat{s}_n) \sqrt{2n(\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n))} & \text{if } \hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n) \geq 0; \\ \text{sgn}(\hat{s}_n) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

then the saddlepoint approximation is given by

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \equiv 1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}. \quad (11)$$

When $w_n = 0$, we have $\hat{s}_n = \lambda_n = r_n = 0$. In this case, we take by convention that $1/0 - 1/0 \equiv 0$ in equation (11), so that $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}} \equiv 1/2$. We will also use the convention $0/0 = 1$. The approximation $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}}$ (11) is a direct generalization of the classical Lugannani-Rice formula (Lugannani and Rice, 1980) to the conditional setting.

2.3 Statement of main results

In preparation for the theorem statement, recall the following definitions for a sequence of random variables W_n and probability measures \mathbb{P}_n :

$$W_n = O_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1) \quad \text{if for each } \delta > 0 \text{ there is an } M > 0 \text{ s.t. } \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n[|W_n| > M] < \delta;$$

$$W_n = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1) \quad \text{if for each } \delta > 0 \text{ there is an } \eta > 0 \text{ s.t. } \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n[|W_n| < \eta] < \delta;$$

$$W_n = o_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1) \quad \text{if } \mathbb{P}_n[|W_n| > \eta] \rightarrow 0 \text{ for all } \eta > 0.$$

Theorem 1. *Let W_{in} be a triangular array of random variables that are mean-zero and independent for each n , conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n . Suppose either Assumption 1 or Assumption 2 holds, and that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (12)$$

Let $w_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ be a sequence with $w_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Then, the saddlepoint equation (8) has a unique and finite solution $\hat{s}_n \in [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2]$ with probability approaching 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[|S_n| = 1] = 1. \quad (13)$$

Furthermore, the saddlepoint approximation $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}}$ to the conditional tail probability (1) defined by equations (10) and (11) has vanishing relative error:

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] (1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)). \quad (14)$$

If we set $\mathcal{F}_n \equiv \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$, Theorem 1 reduces to the following variant of the classical Lugannani and Rice (1980) result:

Corollary 1. *Let W_{in} be a triangular array of random variables that are mean-zero and independent for each n . Suppose that each W_{in} is sub-exponential with constants $\theta, \beta > 0$, i.e.*

$$\mathbb{P}[|W_{in}| \geq t] \leq \theta \exp(-\beta t) \quad \text{for all } t > 0. \quad (15)$$

Furthermore, suppose that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2] > 0. \quad (16)$$

Given a sequence of cutoffs $w_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the saddlepoint equation (8) (based on the unconditional CGF K_n) has a unique solution \hat{s}_n on $[-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2]$ for all sufficiently large n . Furthermore, the unconditional saddlepoint approximation $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}}$ (based on the unconditional CGF K_n) has vanishing relative error

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \right] = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \right] (1 + o(1)). \quad (17)$$

2.4 Remarks on Theorem 1 and Corollary 1

Remark 1 (Generality and transparency of assumptions). While most of the existing literature is fragmented based on whether the summands W_{in} are smooth or lattice, Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 unify these two cases by not making any such assumptions. The price we pay for this generality is that our guarantee (14) does not come with a rate, as compared to most existing results. Nevertheless, we find it useful to have a single result encompassing a broad range of settings. Our assumptions are not only general but also transparent. Most existing results require complicated and difficult-to-verify conditions, often stated in terms of transforms of W_{in} . By contrast, consider for example the assumptions (15) (subexponential summands) and (16) (non-degenerate variance) in Corollary 1. These are standard and easy to understand and verify.

Remark 2 (Assumptions on the threshold w_n). The assumption $w_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ in Theorem 1 appears to be restrictive at the first glance. However, this assumption allows us to guarantee the existence of a solution the saddlepoint equation beyond the case of compact support (Daniels, 1954). On the other hand, the rate of convergence of w_n towards zero can be arbitrary, accommodating for two statistically meaningful regimes: (a) Moderate deviation regime: $w_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-\alpha})$, $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$ and (b) CLT regime: $w_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1/\sqrt{n})$. We discuss this further in Remark 8 after Theorem 2.

Remark 3 (Relative error guarantee). Our results (14) and (17) give explicit relative error guarantees. Even though informal statements of relative error bounds on tail probabilities are common in the literature, bounds are often stated in terms of absolute error instead, omitting rigorous statements of relative error bounds. Relative error bounds are particularly desirable in statistical applications when the true conditional probabilities are small.

Remark 4 (Technical challenges). The proof of Theorem 1 presents several technical challenges, requiring us to significantly extend existing proof techniques. One of the most significant challenges is the conditioning, which adds an extra layer of randomness to the problem. For example, the saddlepoint equation (8) is a random equation, with random solution \hat{s}_n , which we must show exists with probability approaching 1. Furthermore, the cutoff w_n is random, and in particular we must handle cases depending on the realization of the sign of this cutoff. A crucial step in our proof (which follows the general structure of that of Robinson, 1982) is to use the Berry-Esseen inequality, but the extra conditioning requires us to prove a new conditional Berry-Esseen theorem. Another challenge is that we allow w_n to decay to zero at an arbitrary rate, which requires a delicate analysis of the convergence of the SPA formula appearing in the RHS of the result (14).

Remark 5 (Form of tail probability approximation). As discussed above, our tail probability approximation (11) is a conditional adaptation of the Lugannani-Rice formula (Lugannani and Rice, 1980), which is the most common tail probability approximation in the literature. Aside from the Lugannani-Rice formula, another tail probability estimate is proposed in Robinson, 1982. In fact, we present an extension of Theorem 1 in Proposition 1 that employs a conditional variant of Robinson's formula:

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \equiv \exp \left(\frac{\lambda_n^2 - r_n^2}{2} \right) (1 - \Phi(\lambda_n)). \quad (18)$$

Proposition 1. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] = \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_R \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] (1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)). \quad (19)$$

In other words, $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{LR}$ (11) is equivalent to $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_R$ (18) with relative error $o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, linking Robinson's formula to that of Lugannani and Rice. A similar result was proved in the unconditional case by Kolassa (2007).

3 Application: Sign-flipping test

In this section, we apply Theorem 1 to derive and justify the validity of the Lugannani-Rice SPA for the sign-flipping test.

3.1 The sign-flipping test

Suppose

$$X_{in} = \mu_n + \varepsilon_{in}, \quad \varepsilon_{in} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} F_{in}, \quad (20)$$

where the error distributions F_{in} are symmetric, but potentially distinct and unknown. We are interested in testing

$$H_{0n} : \mu_n = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_{1n} : \mu_n > 0 \quad (21)$$

based on $T_n \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}$. Note that the SPA cannot directly be applied to approximate tail probabilities of T_n because the error distributions F_{in} are unknown. Instead, we can approximate the tail probability of T_n by conditioning on the observed data and resampling the signs of the data. In particular, define the resamples

$$\tilde{X}_{in} \equiv \pi_{in} X_{in}, \quad \pi_{in} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Rad}(0.5), \quad (22)$$

where $\text{Rad}(0.5)$ denotes the Rademacher distribution placing equal probability mass on ± 1 . Due to the assumed symmetry of the distributions F_{in} , flipping the signs of X_{in} preserves their distributions under the null hypothesis, guaranteeing finite-sample validity of the resampling-based p -value from equation (3) (Hemerik and Goeman, 2018; Hemerik et al., 2020). To circumvent the computationally costly resampling inherent in the sign-flipping test, we can obtain an accurate approximation to the p -value by applying the SPA to the tail probabilities of the resampling distribution

$$\tilde{T}_n \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{X}_{in} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_{in} X_{in}. \quad (23)$$

Such approximations have been proposed before (Daniels, 1955; Robinson, 1982; Davison and Hinkley, 1988), but have not been rigorously justified (see also Section 1.1). We will now apply Theorem 1 to derive and justify the Lugannani-Rice SPA for the sign-flipping test.

3.2 The SPA for the sign-flipping test

We derive the saddlepoint approximation $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}}$. Defining $\mathcal{F}_n \equiv \sigma(X_{1n}, \dots, X_{nn})$, we first calculate the conditional cumulant-generating functions

$$K_{in}(s) \equiv \log \mathbb{E} \left[\exp(s\tilde{X}_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n \right] = \log \left(\frac{\exp(sX_{in}) + \exp(-sX_{in})}{2} \right) = \log \cosh(sX_{in})$$

and their first two derivatives

$$K'_{in}(s) = X_{in} - \frac{2X_{in}}{1 + \exp(2sX_{in})} \quad \text{and} \quad K''_{in}(s) = \frac{4X_{in}^2 \exp(2sX_{in})}{(1 + \exp(2sX_{in}))^2}. \quad (24)$$

Therefore, the saddlepoint equation (8) reduces to

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K'_{in}(s) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \iff \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{X_{in}}{1 + \exp(2sX_{in})} = 0. \quad (25)$$

Given a solution \hat{s}_n to the saddlepoint equation (whose existence and uniqueness is guaranteed by Theorem 2 below), we can define the quantities λ_n and r_n from equation (10):

$$\lambda_n \equiv \hat{s}_n \sqrt{nK''_n(\hat{s}_n)} = \hat{s}_n \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{4X_{in}^2 \exp(2\hat{s}_n X_{in})}{(1 + \exp(2\hat{s}_n X_{in}))^2}} \quad (26)$$

and

$$r_n \equiv \text{sgn}(\hat{s}_n) \sqrt{2n(\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n))} = \text{sgn}(\hat{s}_n) \sqrt{2 \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{s}_n X_{in} - \log \cosh(\hat{s}_n X_{in}))}, \quad (27)$$

where we set $r_n \equiv \text{sgn}(\hat{s}_n)$ when the quantity under the square root is negative. With these definitions, the SPA for the tail probability of interest is

$$\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{X}_{in} \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \equiv 1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}. \quad (28)$$

3.3 Guarantees for the SPA for the sign-flipping test

The following theorem (proved in Appendix G) gives sufficient conditions for this saddlepoint approximation to have vanishing relative error.

Theorem 2. *Suppose X_{in} are drawn from the probability model (20), such that*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{in}^2] > 0; \quad (29)$$

$$\text{there exists } \delta > 0 \text{ such that } \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|\varepsilon_{in}|^{4+\delta}] < \infty; \quad (30)$$

$$\mu_n = o(1). \quad (31)$$

Then, the saddlepoint equation (25) has a unique solution $\hat{s}_n \in [-1, 1]$ with probability approaching 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, the tail probability approximation (28) obtained from equations (26) and (27) has vanishing relative error:

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{X}_{in} \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] = \hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\text{LR}} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{X}_{in} \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] (1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)). \quad (32)$$

Remark 6. To our knowledge, this is the first rigorous result providing conditions under which an SPA for the sign-flipping test has vanishing relative error, even though SPAs for this test were first proposed almost seventy years ago (Daniels, 1955).

Remark 7. Conditions (29) and (30) in Theorem 2 are very mild. Condition (29) requires the non-degeneracy of the average of the second moment of the noise distribution. Condition (30) imposes average $4 + \delta$ moment condition on the noise distribution. Therefore, the SPA for the sign-flipping test handles very general noise distributions; in particular, no assumption is required on the cumulant generating functions of the noise distributions.

Remark 8. Condition (31) implies that the alternative hypothesis must “converge” to the null hypothesis. This is mainly required when proving the existence of the unique solution to the saddlepoint equation (25). Under the moderation deviation regime ($\mu_n = O(n^{-\alpha})$, $\alpha \in (0, 1/2)$), the power of the test with p-value defined by the LHS of (32) will converge to 1 under mild conditions. For the CLT regime ($\mu_n = h/\sqrt{n}$, $h \neq 0$), it is known as contiguous local alternative in statistical testing literature. This is a particularly interesting regime because the asymptotic power of the resampling-based test is strictly between α and 1 where α is the prespecified significance level, under mild conditions.

4 Proof of Theorem 1

The high-level structure of our proof is inspired by that of Robinson (1982): Exponentially tilt the summands, then apply the Berry-Esseen inequality to get a normal approximation after tilting, then tilt back. In this section, we sketch the proof our main result with the help of a sequence of lemmas, whose proofs we defer to Appendix H.

4.1 Solving the saddlepoint equation

First, we state a lemma lower-bounding the second derivative $K_n''(s)$, which will help us guarantee the existence and uniqueness of solutions to the saddlepoint equation (8).

Lemma 2. *Under the assumptions in Theorem 1, the function $K_n''(s)$ is nonnegative on $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$:*

$$K_n''(s) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \text{ almost surely.} \quad (33)$$

Furthermore, it is uniformly bounded away from zero on a neighborhood of the origin, in the sense that for each $\delta > 0$, there exist $\eta > 0$, $s^* \in (0, \varepsilon/2)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\inf_{s \in [-s^*, s^*]} K_n''(s) \geq \eta \right] \geq 1 - \delta \quad \text{for all } n \geq N. \quad (34)$$

This lemma guarantees that the function $K'_n(s)$ is nondecreasing on $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ and increasing at a positive rate near the origin. To better illustrate the intuition, we refer the reader to Figure 1. Since $w_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$, this implies that the saddlepoint equation (8) will have a solution for large enough n .




Figure 1: Illustration of the function $K'_n(s)$ for n large. The derivative of the function is nonnegative and strictly positive near the origin.

To be more precise, fix $\delta > 0$. By Lemma 2 and the fact that $w_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$, let $\eta > 0$, $s_* \in (0, \varepsilon/2)$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_n] \geq 1 - \delta \quad \text{for all } n \geq N, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{E}_n \equiv \left\{ \inf_{s \in [-s_*, s_*]} K''_n(s) \geq \eta, |w_n| < s_* \eta \right\}. \quad (35)$$

On the event $\mathcal{E}_n \cap \mathcal{A}$, we can Taylor expand $K'_n(s)$ around $s = 0$ to obtain

$$K'_n(s) = K'_n(0) + sK''_n(\bar{s}) = sK''_n(\bar{s}) \quad \text{for } |\bar{s}| \in (0, |s|), \quad (36)$$

where we have used the fact that

$$K'_n(0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K'_{in}(0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n] = 0. \quad (37)$$

It follows from the Taylor expansion (36) that, for $n \geq N$, we have

$$K'_n(-s_*) \leq -s_* \eta < w_n < s_* \eta \leq K'_n(s_*).$$

By the continuity of $K'_n(s)$ on the event \mathcal{A} (Lemma 1), the intermediate value theorem implies that for each $n \geq N$, there exists a solution $\hat{s}_n \in (-s_*, s_*)$ to the saddlepoint equation (8) on the event $\mathcal{E}_n \cap \mathcal{A}$. Furthermore, for each $n \geq N$, this solution is unique

on $\mathcal{E}_n \cap \mathcal{A}$ because $K'_n(s)$ is strictly increasing on $[-s_*, s_*]$ and nondecreasing on the entire interval $[-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2]$. Hence, we have shown that, for arbitrary $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[|S_n| = 1] \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_n \cap \mathcal{A}] \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (38)$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ implies the first claim (13) of Theorem 1.

The following lemma records three properties of the saddlepoint \hat{s}_n , which will be useful in the remainder of the proof:

Lemma 3. *The saddlepoint \hat{s}_n satisfies the following properties:*

$$\text{sgn}(\hat{s}_n) = \text{sgn}(w_n) \text{ almost surely}; \quad (39)$$

$$\hat{s}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0; \quad (40)$$

$$K''_n(\hat{s}_n) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (41)$$

4.2 Decomposing based on the sign of w_n

Since w_n is random, it can have uncertainty on the sign. This is a technical challenge since the uncertain sign of w_n will also make the signs of λ_n, r_n uncertain. We observe that the desired result (14) is implied by the following three statements, which decompose the problem based on the sign of w_n :

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n > 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0; \quad (42)$$

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0; \quad (43)$$

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq 0 \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{2}. \quad (44)$$

In the next two subsections, we verify statements (43) and (44), respectively. This will leave just the statement (42).

4.2.1 Verifying statement (43)

Before verifying statement (43), we state a lemma on the properties of the quantities λ_n and r_n that are necessary for proving the statement:

Lemma 4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, r_n and λ_n are almost surely finite:*

$$|r_n| < \infty, |\lambda_n| < \infty, \text{ a.s.} \quad (\text{Finite})$$

Furthermore, the signs of w_n, r_n , and λ_n have the following relationships:

$$w_n > 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_n \geq 0, r_n \geq 0, \text{ a.s.}; \quad (\text{Sign1})$$

$$\mathbb{P}[w_n > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n = 0] \rightarrow 0; \quad (\text{Sign2})$$

$$\mathbb{P}[\hat{s}_n \neq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n = 0] \rightarrow 0; \quad (\text{Sign3})$$

$$r_n < 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_n \leq 0, \lambda_n < 0 \Rightarrow r_n \leq 0, \text{ a.s.} \quad (\text{Sign4})$$

Finally, r_n and λ_n satisfy the following convergence statements:

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (\text{Rate1})$$

$$\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (\text{Rate2})$$

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \frac{1}{r_n} \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (\text{Rate3})$$

$$\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \neq 0) \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \left(\frac{r_n}{\lambda_n} - 1 \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (\text{Rate4})$$

$$\frac{r_n}{\sqrt{n}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (\text{Rate5})$$

Now we claim that if the statement (42) holds, then we can derive the statement (43) by symmetry:

Lemma 5. *Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold and imply statement (42). We can apply the theorem to the triangular array $\widetilde{W}_{in} \equiv -W_{in}$ and set of cutoffs $\widetilde{w}_n \equiv -w_n$ to obtain that*

$$\mathbb{1}(\widetilde{w}_n > 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{W}_{in} \geq \widetilde{w}_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(\widetilde{r}_n) + \phi(\widetilde{r}_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\widetilde{\lambda}_n} - \frac{1}{\widetilde{r}_n} \right\}} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0,$$

where $\widetilde{r}_n = -r_n$ and $\widetilde{\lambda}_n = -\lambda_n$. Then under conditions (Finite), (Sign1), (Sign4) and (Rate1), the following convergence statement holds:

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \quad (45)$$

4.2.2 Verifying statement (44)

To prove the statement (44), we first state a conditional central limit theorem:

Lemma 6 (Niu et al., 2024a). *Consider a sequence of σ -algebras \mathcal{F}_n and probability measures \mathbb{P}_n . Let W_{in} be a triangular array of random variables, such that for each n , W_{in} are independent conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n under \mathbb{P}_n . Let*

$$S_n^2 \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}_{\mathbb{P}_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n].$$

If $\text{Var}_{\mathbb{P}_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty$ almost surely for each i and n , and for some $\delta > 0$ we have

$$n^{-\delta/2} \frac{1}{S_n^{2+\delta}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n} [|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n]|^{2+\delta} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0, \quad (46)$$

then

$$\sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n \left[\sqrt{\frac{n}{S_n^2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{in} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n]) \leq z \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] - \Phi(z) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

We can apply this result to the variables W_{in} to get the following convergence statements:

Lemma 7. *Suppose the conditions in Theorem 1 hold. Then we have*

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left[\sqrt{\frac{n}{K_n''(0)}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \leq t | \mathcal{F}_n \right] - \Phi(t) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \quad (47)$$

Moreover, for any sequence $y_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$, we know

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sqrt{\frac{n}{K_n''(0)}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = y_n | \mathcal{F}_n \right] \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \quad (48)$$

Setting $t = 0$ and $y_n = 0$ in Lemma 7, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq 0 | \mathcal{F}_n \right] &= 1 - \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \leq 0 | \mathcal{F}_n \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = 0 | \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 1 - \frac{1}{2} + 0 = \frac{1}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

which verifies (44).

4.3 Conditional Berry-Esseen bound on tilted summands

It remains to prove the statement (42) regarding the conditional tail probability $\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n | \mathcal{F}_n \right]$. This tail probability can be approximated using the conditional central limit theorem (Lemma 6). However, the central limit theorem is insufficiently accurate in the tails of the distribution. To overcome this challenge, we apply a normal approximation after exponential tilting, as is common in saddlepoint approximations (Robinson, 1982; Reid, 1988). The idea is to consider a probability distribution \mathbb{P}_n over the space such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n} [W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n] = w_n. \quad (49)$$

Under such \mathbb{P}_n , the distribution of $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in}$ can be approximated as a normal with conditional mean w_n , allowing us to avoid approximating extreme tail probabilities. We can then undo the exponential tilting to approximate the desired tail probability under the original measure \mathbb{P} .

4.3.1 Exponential tilting

Given tilting parameter s , define a new probability measure $\mathbb{P}_{n,s}$ on the measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{F}) via

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{n,s}}{d\mathbb{P}} \equiv \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\exp(sW_{in})}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n]}. \quad (50)$$

We employ a variant of tilting measure (50) based on a random tilting parameter $s_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ that satisfies the criterion $\mathbb{P}[s_n \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)] = 1$. The following lemma presents some properties of the tilted measure \mathbb{P}_{n,s_n} :

Lemma 8. *First, events in \mathcal{F}_n are preserved under \mathbb{P}_{n,s_n} :*

$$\mathbb{P}_{n,s_n}[A_n] = \mathbb{P}[A_n] \quad \text{for all } A_n \in \mathcal{F}_n. \quad (51)$$

It follows that any random variable measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_n has the same distribution under \mathbb{P}_{n,s_n} as under \mathbb{P} . Second, the random variables $\{W_{in}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ are independent conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n under \mathbb{P}_{n,s_n} . Third, on the event \mathcal{A} , the conditional mean and variance of W_{in} under \mathbb{P}_{n,s_n} are given by the first two derivatives of the conditional cumulant generating function K_{in} :

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,s_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = K'_{in}(s_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}_{n,s_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = K''_{in}(s_n) \quad \text{for all } i \leq n, n \geq 1 \quad (52)$$

almost surely.

It follows from equation (52) that, almost surely,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{n,s_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = K'_n(s_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}_{n,s_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = K''_n(s_n).$$

To ensure the property (49), it suffices to take $\mathbb{P}_n \equiv \mathbb{P}_{n,\hat{s}_n}$, where \hat{s}_n is the solution to the saddlepoint equation (8). Therefore, our next step is to construct a normal approximation for the average $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in}$ under the sequence of tilted probability measures \mathbb{P}_{n,\hat{s}_n} .

4.3.2 Conditional Berry-Esseen

It turns out that rate of the normal approximation is important to obtain a relative error bound, so we use the conditional Berry-Esseen theorem rather than the central limit theorem on the tilted summands.

Lemma 9 (Conditional Berry-Esseen theorem). *Suppose W_{1n}, \dots, W_{nn} are independent random variables conditional on \mathcal{F}_n , under \mathbb{P}_n . If*

$$S_n^2 \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}_{\mathbb{P}_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1) \quad (53)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}[|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n]|^3 \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = O_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1), \quad (54)$$

then

$$\sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n \left[\sqrt{\frac{n}{S_n^2}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{in} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n]) \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] - \Phi(t) \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1).$$

Now, we wish to apply the Lemma 9 to the triangular array $\{W_{in}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n, n \geq 1}$ under the sequence of tilted probability measures \mathbb{P}_{n,\hat{s}_n} . The following lemma shows that the requisite conditions are satisfied.

Lemma 10. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, the conditions (53) and (54) are satisfied by the sequence of probability measures $\mathbb{P}_n \equiv \mathbb{P}_{n, \hat{s}_n}$.*

Noting from equation (52) that $S_n^2 = K_n''(\hat{s}_n)$, we conclude from the conditional Berry-Esseen theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n \left[\sqrt{\frac{n}{K_n''(\hat{s}_n)}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} - K_n'(\hat{s}_n) \right) \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] - \Phi(t) \right| \\ & \equiv \sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n \left[\tilde{Z}_n \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] - \Phi(t) \right| \\ & = O_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1), \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where we have denoted by \tilde{Z}_n the quantity converging to the standard normal distribution. Note that \tilde{Z}_n is not exactly the same as

$$Z_n \equiv \sqrt{\frac{n}{K_n''(\hat{s}_n)}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} - w_n \right), \tag{56}$$

since it is possible that $K_n'(\hat{s}_n) \neq w_n$. Since the probability of this event is tending to zero (13), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n[Z_n \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n] - \Phi(t) \right| \\ & = \mathbb{1}(K_n'(\hat{s}_n) = w_n) \sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n[\tilde{Z}_n \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n] - \Phi(t) \right| \\ & \quad + \mathbb{1}(K_n'(\hat{s}_n) \neq w_n) \sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n[Z_n \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n] - \Phi(t) \right| \\ & \leq \sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n[\tilde{Z}_n \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n] - \Phi(t) \right| + \mathbb{1}(K_n'(\hat{s}_n) \neq w_n) \sqrt{n} \\ & = O_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1) + o_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1) = O_{\mathbb{P}_n}(1). \end{aligned}$$

By conclusion (51) from Lemma 8 and the measurability with respect to \mathcal{F}_n of the quantity $\sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n[Z_n \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n] - \Phi(t) \right|$, it follows that

$$\sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}_n[Z_n \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n] - \Phi(t) \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \tag{57}$$

Therefore, we have provided a normal approximation for the average $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in}$ under the sequence of tilted probability measures $\mathbb{P}_{n, \hat{s}_n}$. Next, we undo the exponential tilting to approximate the desired tail probability under the original measure \mathbb{P} .

4.4 Gaussian integral approximation after tilting back

4.4.1 Tilting back to the original measure

The following lemma helps connect the tilted measure to the original one, allowing us to interchange the order of the tilting and the conditioning:

Lemma 11.

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] = \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \right) \frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{P}_{n, \hat{s}_n}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right], \quad (58)$$

where \hat{s}_n is the solution to the saddlepoint equation (9) for each n .

To evaluate the right-hand side of equation (58), we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{P}_{n, \hat{s}_n}} &= \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{E}[\exp(\hat{s}_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]}{\exp(\hat{s}_n W_{in})} \\ &= \exp \left(n \left(K_n(\hat{s}_n) - \hat{s}_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \right) \right) \\ &= \exp \left(n(K_n(\hat{s}_n) - \hat{s}_n w_n) - \hat{s}_n \sqrt{n K_n''(\hat{s}_n)} \sqrt{\frac{n}{K_n''(\hat{s}_n)}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} - w_n \right) \right) \\ &\equiv \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} r_n^2 - \lambda_n Z_n \right), \end{aligned}$$

recalling λ_n and r_n from equation (10) and Z_n (56) the quantity converging to normality (57). This allows us to rewrite the probability of interest as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{1}(Z_n \geq 0) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} r_n^2 - \lambda_n Z_n \right) \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &= \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} r_n^2 \right) \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{1}(Z_n \geq 0) \exp(-\lambda_n Z_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{1}(Z_n \geq 0) \exp(-\lambda_n Z_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{\exp \left(\frac{1}{2} r_n^2 \right) \left(1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\} \right)} \equiv \frac{D_n}{U_n}. \quad (60)$$

Hence, we have simplified the desired statement (42) to

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n > 0) \left(\frac{D_n}{U_n} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \quad (61)$$

4.4.2 Reduction to a Gaussian integral approximation

Next, we exploit the convergence of Z_n to normality (57) to replace the numerator D_n with a Gaussian integral:

Lemma 12. *For sequences Z_n and λ_n of random variables, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_n} \left[\mathbb{1}(Z_n \geq 0) \exp(-\lambda_n Z_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] - \int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z) \phi(z) dz \right| \\ \leq 2 \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}_n[Z_n \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n] - \Phi(t)|. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

almost surely.

We would like to combine the result of this lemma with the convergence of Z_n to normality (57) to reduce the desired statement (61) to a Gaussian integral approximation. Before doing so, we first state a result that we will use to show that the difference between D_n and the Gaussian integral $\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z)\phi(z)dz$ is negligible, even after dividing by U_n :

Lemma 13. *Under conditions (Finite), (Sign4) and (Rate1), we have*

$$r_n \geq 0 \Rightarrow U_n \neq 0 \text{ almost surely; } \mathbb{P}[r_n < 0 \text{ and } U_n = 0] \rightarrow 0. \quad (63)$$

Under conditions (Rate1), (Rate2) and (Rate5), we have

$$\frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 0)}{\sqrt{n}U_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (64)$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{1}(w_n > 0) \left| \frac{D_n}{U_n} - \frac{\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z)\phi(z)dz}{U_n} \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 0, \lambda_n \geq 0) \left| \frac{D_n}{U_n} - \frac{\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z)\phi(z)dz}{U_n} \right| && \text{by (Sign1)} \\ & \leq \frac{2\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 0, \lambda_n \geq 0) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}_n[Z_n \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n] - \Phi(t)|}{|U_n|} && \text{by Lemma 12} \\ & \leq \frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 0)}{\sqrt{n}|U_n|} O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) && \text{by (57)} \\ & = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) && \text{by (64)} \\ & = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n > 0) \left(\frac{\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z)\phi(z)dz}{U_n} - 1 \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (65)$$

By statements (Sign1), (Sign2), and (63), it follows that it suffices to show the Gaussian integral approximation

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \left(\frac{\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z)\phi(z)dz}{U_n} - 1 \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad (66)$$

which is stated in the following lemma:

Lemma 14. *Under conditions (Finite), (Rate1), (Rate2), and (Rate3), the Gaussian integral approximation (66) holds.*

This completes the proof Theorem 1.

5 Discussion

In this paper, we presented a general sufficient condition to guarantee the saddlepoint equation to have a unique solution with probability tending 1, and for the Lugannani-Rice saddlepoint approximation to be valid for conditionally independent but not necessarily identically distributed random variables. This result is applicable for general (conditional) distributions, placing no assumptions on their smoothness. Our results lay a solid mathematical foundation for existing applications of the saddlepoint approximation to resampling-based tests, including those based on the bootstrap and sign-flipping. Furthermore, they pave the way for applications of the saddlepoint approximation to new resampling-based tests, such as the conditional randomization test. We pursue the latter application in a parallel work (Niu et al., 2024b).

The current work has several limitations, pointing the way to future work. First, our results require conditionally independent summands, which excludes permutation tests. Second, the requirement of our results for the cutoff w_n to converge to 0 excludes the interesting case when the cutoff is bounded away from zero, i.e. $w_n = \Omega_p(1)$, which is known as the large deviation regime. Third, our results apply only to the sample average statistic but not to more complex statistics, such as studentized averages, for which saddlepoint approximations have been explored (Daniels and Young, 1991; Jing et al., 1994; Jing et al., 2004). Fourth, our results give approximations for tail probabilities (corresponding to hypothesis tests) but not for quantiles (corresponding to confidence interval construction). In future work, it would be interesting to extend our results in these directions.

6 Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to John Kolassa, who provided valuable feedback on an earlier version of this paper. This work was partially support by NSF DMS-2113072 and NSF DMS-2310654.

References

- Abd-Elfattah, Ehab F. (2009). “Testing for independence: Saddlepoint approximation to associated permutation distributions”. In: *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 3, pp. 625–632.
- Abd-Elfattah, Ehab F. and Ronald W. Butler (2007). “The Weighted Log-Rank Class of Permutation Tests : P-Values and Confidence Intervals Using Saddlepoint Methods”. In: 94.3, pp. 543–551.
- Butler, Ronald (2007). *Saddlepoint approximations with applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Candès, Emmanuel, Yingying Fan, Lucas Janson, and Jinchi Lv (2018). “Panning for gold: ‘model-X’ knockoffs for high dimensional controlled variable selection”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 80.3, pp. 551–577.

- Chen, Louis H.Y., Larry Goldstein, and Qi-Man Shao (2011). *Normal approximations by Stein's method*. Vol. 23. 1. Springer.
- Daniels, Henry E. (1954). "Saddlepoint Approximations in Statistics". In: *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 25.4, pp. 631–650.
- (1955). "Discussion on the Paper by Dr. Box and Dr. Andersen". In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 17.1, pp. 26–34.
- Daniels, Henry E. and G. Alastair Young (1991). "Saddlepoint approximation for the studentized mean, with an application to the bootstrap". In: *Biometrika* 78.1, pp. 169–179.
- Davidson, James (1994). *Stochastic Limit Theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Davison, Anthony C. (1998). "Approximate Conditional Inference in Generalized Linear Models". In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B (Methodological)* 50.3, pp. 445–461.
- Davison, Anthony C. and David V. Hinkley (1988). "Saddlepoint Approximations in Resampling Methods". In: *Biometrika* 75.3, pp. 417–431.
- DiCiccio, Thomas J., Michael A. Martin, and G. Alastair Young (1994). "Analytical approximations to bootstrap distribution functions using saddlepoint methods". In: *Statistica Sinica* 4.1, pp. 281–295.
- Efron, Bradley and Robert Tibshirani (1994). *An introduction to the bootstrap*. Chapman and Hall.
- Fisher, Ronald (1935). *The Design of Experiments*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.
- Froda, Sorana and Constance van Eeden (2000). "A Uniform Saddlepoint Expansion for the Null-Distribution of the Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Statistic". In: *The Canadian Journal of Statistics / La Revue Canadienne de Statistique* 28.1, p. 137.
- Hemerik, Jesse and Jelle Goeman (2018). "Exact testing with random permutations". In: *Test* 27.4, pp. 811–825.
- Hemerik, Jesse, Jelle J Goeman, and Livio Finos (2020). "Robust testing in generalized linear models by sign-flipping score contributions". In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 82.3, pp. 841–864.
- Jensen, Jens Ledet (1995). *Saddlepoint Approximations*.
- Jin, Rungao and John Robinson (2003). "Saddlepoint Approximations of the Two-Sample Wilcoxon Statistic". In: *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, pp. 149–158.
- Jing, Bing Yi, Andrey Feuerverger, and John Robinson (1994). "On the Bootstrap Saddlepoint Approximations". In: *Biometrika* 81.1, pp. 211–215.
- Jing, Bing Yi and John Robinson (1994). "Saddlepoint Approximations for Marginal and Conditional Probabilities of Transformed Variables". In: *Annals of Statistics* 22.3, pp. 1115–1132.
- Jing, Bing Yi, Qi Man Shao, and Wang Zhou (2004). "Saddlepoint approximation for student's t-statistic with no moment conditions". In: *Annals of Statistics* 32.6, pp. 2679–2711.
- Klenke, Achim (2017). *Probability theory*. Vol. 941, pp. 1–23.
- Kolassa, John E. (2006). *Series Approximation Methods in Statistics*. Third Edit. Springer.
- (2007). "A proof of the asymptotic equivalence of two-tail probability approximations". In: *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods* 36.2, pp. 221–228.

- Kolassa, John E. and John Robinson (2007). “Conditional saddlepoint approximations for non-continuous and non-lattice distributions”. In: *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 137.1, pp. 133–147.
- Lugannani, Robert and Stephen Rice (1980). “Saddle point approximation for the distribution of the sum of independent random variables”. In: *Advances in Applied Probability* 12.2, pp. 475–490.
- Niu, Ziang, Abhinav Chakraborty, Oliver Dukes, and Eugene Katsevich (2024a). “Reconciling model-X and doubly robust approaches to conditional independence testing”. In: *Annals of Statistics, to appear*.
- Niu, Ziang, Jyotishka Ray Choudhury, and Eugene Katsevich (2024b). “Computationally efficient and statistically accurate conditional independence testing with spaCRT”. In: *arxiv*.
- Pitman, E. J. G. (1937). “Significance Tests Which May be Applied to Samples From any Populations”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 4.1, pp. 119–130.
- Reid, N. (1988). “Saddlepoint methods and statistical inference”. In: *Statistical Science* 3.2, pp. 213–238.
- Robinson, J. (1982). “Saddlepoint Approximations for Permutation Tests and Confidence Intervals”. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 44.1, pp. 91–101.
- Skovgaard, Ib M. (1987). “Saddlepoint Expansions for Conditional Distributions”. In: *Journal of Applied Probability* 24.4, pp. 875–887.
- Zhou, Yi Hui and Fred A. Wright (2013). “Simple and accurate trend tests using a permutation approximation”. In: *5th International Conference on Bioinformatics and Computational Biology 2013, BICoB 2013*, pp. 277–282.

A Preliminaries on regular conditional distribution

To better understand the argument involving conditional distribution, we briefly discuss the basic definition of regular conditional distribution. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the Borel σ -algebra on \mathbb{R}^n and Ω, \mathcal{F}_n be the sample space and a sequence of σ -algebras. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $\kappa_n : \Omega \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a regular conditional distribution of $W_n \equiv (W_{1n}, \dots, W_{nn})^\top$ given \mathcal{F}_n if

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \mapsto \kappa_n(\omega, B) &\text{ is measurable with respect to } \mathcal{F}_n \text{ for any fixed } B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n); \\ B \mapsto \kappa_n(\omega, B) &\text{ is a probability measure on } (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)); \\ \kappa_n(\omega, B) &= \mathbb{P}[(W_{1n}, \dots, W_{nn}) \in B | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega), \text{ for almost all } \omega \in \Omega \text{ and all } B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n). \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma from Klenke, 2017, Theorem 8.37 ensures that the general existence of κ_n .

Lemma 15 (Theorem 8.37 in Klenke, 2017). *Suppose $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{P})$ is the Probability triple. Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$ be a sub- σ -algebra. Let Y be a random variable with values in a Borel space (E, \mathcal{E}) (for example, E is Polish, $E = \mathbb{R}^d$). Then there exists a regular conditional distribution $\kappa_{Y, \mathcal{F}}$ of Y given \mathcal{F} .*

Result from Klenke, 2017, Theorem 8.38 guarantees that the conditional expectation and the integral of measurable function with respect to regular conditional distribution are almost surely same.

Lemma 16 (Modified version of Theorem 8.38 in Klenke, 2017). *Let X be a random variable $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{P})$ with values in a Borel space (E, \mathcal{E}) . Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$ be a σ -algebra and let $\kappa_{X, \mathcal{F}}$ be a version of regular conditional distribution of X given \mathcal{F} . Further, let $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be measurable and $\mathbb{E}[|f(X)|] < \infty$. Then we can define a version of the conditional expectation of $f(X)$ given \mathcal{F} as:*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X) | \mathcal{F}](\omega) = \int f(x) d\kappa_{X, \mathcal{F}}(\omega, x), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

B A version of conditional expectation

In this paper, we will use regular conditional distribution (RCD) to fix a version of the conditional expectations used in the paper. Suppose $\kappa_{in} : \Omega \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ is a version of the RCD of W_{in} given \mathcal{F}_n and $\kappa_n : \Omega \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a version of the RCD of $W_n \equiv (W_{1n}, \dots, W_{nn})^\top$ given \mathcal{F}_n . The conditional independent assumption can be formulated as

$$\kappa_n(\omega, B) = \prod_{i=1}^n \kappa_{in}(\omega, B_i), \quad B = B_1 \times \dots \times B_n, \quad \forall B_1, \dots, B_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

Define the tilted RCD:

$$\frac{d\kappa_{in,s}(\omega, x)}{d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x)} \equiv \frac{\exp(sx)}{\int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x)}, \quad \frac{d\kappa_{n,s}(\omega, x)}{d\kappa_n(\omega, x)} \equiv \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\exp(sx)}{\int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x)}, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega.$$

Consider the measure $\mathbb{P}_{n,s}$ defined in (50) and define measure $\mathbb{P}_{in,s}$:

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}_{in,s}}{d\mathbb{P}} \equiv \frac{\exp(sW_{in})}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n]}.$$

For any measurable function $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we define the conditional expectation under original measure \mathbb{P} , tilted measure $\mathbb{P}_{in,s}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{n,s}$ respectively as

$$\mathbb{E}[f(W_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) \equiv \int f(x)d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega, \quad (67)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{in,s}[f(W_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) \equiv \int f(x) \frac{\exp(sx)}{\int \exp(sx)d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x)} d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega, \quad (68)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,s}[g(W_n)|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) \equiv \int g(y) \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\exp(sy_i)}{\int \exp(sy_i)d\kappa_{in}(\omega, y_i)} \right) d\kappa_n(\omega, y), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega \quad (69)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We refer the guarantee of existence of RCD and the validity of the above definition for conditional expectation to Theorem 15 and 16.

C Equivalent definition of CSE distribution

In this section, we prove the equivalence of the definition of the CSE distribution (Definition 1) and a bound on CGF of the conditional distribution of $W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n$.

Lemma 17 (Equivalence of the definition of CSE distribution). *The following two statements are equivalent:*

1. there exists positive parameters (λ_{in}, γ) with $\lambda_{in} \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and constant λ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_1] = 1, \quad \mathcal{B}_1 \equiv \left\{ \mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \exp(\lambda_{in}s^2), \quad \forall s \in \left(-\frac{1}{\gamma}, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \right\}. \quad (70)$$

2. there exists positive parameters (θ_{in}, β) with $\theta_{in} \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and constant β such that

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_2] = 1, \quad \mathcal{B}_2 \equiv \{ \mathbb{P}[|W_{in}| \geq t | \mathcal{F}_n] \leq \theta_{in} \exp(-\beta t), \quad \forall t > 0 \}. \quad (71)$$

In particular, the suppose condition (71) holds, then we can choose (λ_{in}, γ) in (70) as

$$\lambda_{in} = \frac{\sqrt{6!4^6}(1 + \theta_{in})}{24\beta^2} + \frac{16(1 + \theta_{in})}{\beta^2}, \quad \gamma = \frac{4}{\beta}.$$

C.1 Proof of Lemma 17

Proof of Lemma 17. We prove two directions separately.

1 \Rightarrow 2: For any $\omega \in \mathcal{B}_1$, we know by definition (67) that

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) = \int \exp(sx)d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) < \infty, \quad \forall s \in \left(-\frac{1}{\gamma}, \frac{1}{\gamma}\right).$$

Then the Chernoff bound gives

$$\int \mathbb{1}(x \geq t)d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \leq \int \exp\left(\frac{x}{2\gamma}\right) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \exp\left(-\frac{t}{2\gamma}\right).$$

Applying a similar argument to $\mathbb{1}(-x \geq t)$, we conclude

$$\int \mathbb{1}(|x| \geq t)d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \leq \left(\int \exp\left(\frac{x}{2\gamma}\right) + \exp\left(\frac{-x}{2\gamma}\right) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x)\right) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{t}{2\gamma}\right).$$

Thus we know

$$\mathbb{P}[|W_{in}| \geq t|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq (\mathbb{E}[\exp(W_{in}/(2\gamma))|\mathcal{F}_n] + \mathbb{E}[\exp(-W_{in}/(2\gamma))|\mathcal{F}_n]) \cdot \exp(-t/(2\gamma)).$$

Thus $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{B}_2] = 1$ with

$$\theta_{in} = \mathbb{E}[\exp(W_{in}/(2\gamma))|\mathcal{F}_n] + \mathbb{E}[\exp(-W_{in}/(2\gamma))|\mathcal{F}_n], \quad \beta = \frac{1}{2\gamma}.$$

2 \Rightarrow 1: Fix a constant $a > 0$ and $T > 0$. For any $\omega \in \mathcal{B}_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\exp(a|W_{in}|)\mathbb{1}(\exp(a|W_{in}|) \leq \exp(aT))|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) \\ &= \int \exp(ax)\mathbb{1}(\exp(ax) \leq \exp(aT))d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\ &\leq \int \min\{\exp(ax), \exp(aT)\}d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\ &= \int \int_0^{e^{aT}} \mathbb{1}(\exp(ax) \geq t)dt d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\ &= \int_0^{e^{aT}} \int \mathbb{1}(\exp(ax) \geq t)d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x)dt \\ &\leq 1 + \int_1^{e^{aT}} \int \mathbb{1}(|x| \geq \log(t)/a)d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x)dt \end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality is due to Fubini's theorem. Then by the definition of \mathcal{B}_2 , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(a|W_{in}|)\mathbb{1}(\exp(a|W_{in}|) \leq \exp(aT))|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) &\leq 1 + \theta_{in}(\omega) \int_1^{e^{aT}} e^{-(\beta \log(t))/a} dt \\ &= 1 + \theta_{in}(\omega) \int_1^{e^{aT}} t^{-\beta/a} dt. \end{aligned}$$

For $a \in [0, \beta/2]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(a|W_{in}|)\mathbb{1}(\exp(a|W_{in}|) \leq \exp(aT))|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) &= 1 + \theta_{in}(\omega) \frac{1}{1 - \beta/a} t^{1-\beta/a} \Big|_1^{e^{aT}} \\ &\leq 1 + \theta_{in}(\omega) \frac{1}{\beta/a - 1} (1 - e^{(aT-\beta T)}) \\ &\leq 1 + \theta_{in}(\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Then by Fatou's lemma, we have for any $a \in [0, \beta/2]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(a|W_{in}|)|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) &= \int \exp(ax) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\ &\leq \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int \exp(ax) \mathbb{1}(e^{ax} \leq e^{aT}) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \leq 1 + \theta_{in}(\omega). \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Then by Taylor's expansion, for any $|s| \leq \beta/4$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) &= \int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\ &= \int \left(1 + sx + \frac{s^2 x^2}{2} + \frac{s^3 x^3}{6} \exp(y(x))\right) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x), \quad |y(x)| \leq |sx|. \end{aligned}$$

Then the assumption $\mathbb{E}[W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n] = 0$ implies for $|s| \leq \beta/4$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) &\leq 1 + \frac{s^2 \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega)}{2} + \frac{s^2 \beta}{24} \int |x|^3 \exp(y(x)) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{s^2 \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega)}{2} + \frac{s^2 \beta}{24} \int |x|^3 \exp(|sx|) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{s^2 \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega)}{2} + \frac{s^2 \beta}{24} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^6|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) \mathbb{E}[\exp(2|sW_{in}|)|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega)} \\ &\leq 1 + \left(\frac{\beta \sqrt{1 + \theta_{in}(\omega)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^6|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega)}}{12} + \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) \right) \frac{s^2}{2} \\ &\leq \exp \left(\left(\frac{\beta \sqrt{1 + \theta_{in}(\omega)} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^6|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega)}}{12} + \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) \right) \frac{s^2}{2} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where the second inequality is due to $|y(x)| \leq |sx|$, the third inequality is due to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the fourth inequality is due to conclusion (72) and the last inequality is due to the inequality $\exp(x) \geq 1 + x$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Now by Fubini's theorem, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(s|W_{in}|)|\mathcal{F}_n] = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{s^k}{k!} \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^k|\mathcal{F}_n], \quad \forall s \in [0, \beta/2].$$

Then by setting $s = \beta/4$ and conclusion (72), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2|\mathcal{F}_n] &\leq \frac{2!4^2}{\beta^2}\mathbb{E}[\exp(\beta|W_{in}|/4)|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \frac{2!4^2}{\beta^2}(1 + \theta_{in}), \\ \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^6|\mathcal{F}_n] &\leq \frac{6!4^6}{\beta^6}\mathbb{E}[\exp(\beta|W_{in}|/4)|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \frac{6!4^6}{\beta^6}(1 + \theta_{in})\end{aligned}$$

Then choosing

$$\lambda_{in} = \frac{\sqrt{6!4^6}(1 + \theta_{in})}{24\beta^2} + \frac{16(1 + \theta_{in})}{\beta^2} \geq \frac{\beta\sqrt{1 + \theta_{in}}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^6|\mathcal{F}_n]}}{24} + \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2|\mathcal{F}_n]}{2}, \quad \gamma = \frac{4}{\beta},$$

so that by bound (73), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) \leq \exp(\lambda_{in}(\omega)s^2), \quad \forall s \in \left(-\frac{1}{\gamma}, \frac{1}{\gamma}\right).$$

□

D Auxiliary lemmas

Lemma 18 (Niu et al., 2024a, Corollary 6). *Let W_{in} be a triangular array of random variables, such that W_{in} are independent for each n . If for some $\kappa > 0$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{n^{1+\delta}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^{1+\kappa}] \rightarrow 0, \quad (74)$$

then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in}]) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

Lemma 19 (Gaussian tail probability estimate). *For $x > 0$, we have*

$$1 - \Phi(x) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}x} \exp(-x^2/2) \left(1 - \frac{1}{x^2}\right) = - \int_x^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{3t^4} dt.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\left|1 - \Phi(x) - \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}x} \exp(-x^2/2) \left(1 - \frac{1}{x^2}\right)\right)\right| \leq \frac{\phi(x)}{x^3}$$

and

$$\left|x \exp\left(\frac{x^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(x)) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\right| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{x^2}.$$

Lemma 20 (Lower bound on the Gaussian tail probability). *For any $x \geq 0$, we have*

$$1 - \Phi(x) > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{x}{x^2 + 1} \exp(-x^2/2).$$

Before stating the next lemma, we will keep the way to define a version of conditional expectation using regular conditional distribution as in (67).

Lemma 21. *Consider the probability space $(\mathbb{P}, \Omega, \mathcal{F})$ and the σ -algebras $\mathcal{F}_n \subset \mathcal{F}$. Suppose the sequence of random variable W_n satisfies there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P} [\mathbb{E}[|W_n|^p \exp(sW_n)|\mathcal{F}_n] < \infty, \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \forall n, p \in \mathbb{N}] = 1$$

Then defining $H_n(s) \equiv \mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_n)|\mathcal{F}_n]$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} [H_n(s) \text{ has } p\text{-th order derivative at the open neighborhood } (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \forall n, p \in \mathbb{N}] = 1,$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} [H_n^{(p)}(s) = \mathbb{E}[W_n^p \exp(sW_n)|\mathcal{F}_n], \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \forall n, p \in \mathbb{N}] = 1.$$

Lemma 22 (Chen et al., 2011, Theorem 3.6). *Suppose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\xi_{1n}, \dots, \xi_{nn}$ are independent random variables, satisfying for any $1 \leq i \leq n$*

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_{in}] = 0, \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\xi_{in}^2] = 1.$$

Then

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{in} \leq t \right] - \Phi(t) \right| \leq 9.4 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|\xi_{in}|^3].$$

E Proofs of lemmas in Appendix D

E.1 Proof of the Lemma 19

Proof of Lemma 19. Applying integration by parts, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \Phi(x) &= \int_x^\infty \phi(t) dt \\ &= \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{t} \frac{t}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp(-t^2/2) dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp(-t^2/2) \Big|_x^\infty - \int_x^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{t^2} dt \\ &= \frac{\phi(x)}{x} + \frac{1}{t^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp(-t^2/2) \Big|_x^\infty - \int_x^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{3t^4} dt \\ &= \frac{\phi(x)}{x} - \frac{\phi(x)}{x^3} - \int_x^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{3t^4} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can bound for $x > 0$

$$\left| \int_x^\infty \frac{\phi(t)}{3t^4} dt \right| \leq \phi(x) \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{3t^4} dt \leq \frac{\phi(x)}{x^3}.$$

□

E.2 Proof of Lemma 20

Proof of Lemma 20. Define

$$g(x) \equiv 1 - \Phi(x) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{x}{x^2 + 1} \exp(-x^2/2).$$

Computing the derivative we obtain

$$g'(x) = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{e^{-x^2/2}}{(x^2 + 1)^2} < 0.$$

Also notice $g(0) = 1/2 > 0$ and $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} g(x) = 0$. This completes the proof. \square

E.3 Proof of Lemma 21

Proof of Lemma 21. Consider the regular conditional distribution $W_n | \mathcal{F}_n$ to be κ_{W_n} . We use induction to prove the existence of the p -th derivative of $H_n(s)$. Suppose

$$\mathbb{P} [H_n^{(p)}(s) = \mathbb{E}[W_n^p \exp(sW_n) | \mathcal{F}_n], \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)] = 1 \quad (75)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} [\mathbb{E}[|W_n|^{p+1} \exp(sW_n) | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty, \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)] = 1. \quad (76)$$

According to the definition of derivative, we write

$$H_n^{(p+1)}(s) \equiv \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{H_n^{(p)}(s+h) - H_n^{(p)}(s)}{h}. \quad (77)$$

Then on the event in hypothesis (75), we have for any $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$

$$H_n^{(p)}(s) = \mathbb{E}[W_n^p \exp(sW_n) | \mathcal{F}_n] = \int x^p \exp(sx) d\kappa_{W_n}(\cdot, x).$$

Fix any $s_0 \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ and find $r_0 \in (s_0, \varepsilon)$ such that $|r_0| > |s_0|$. We find small enough h such that $|h| < \min\{|r_0| - s_0, |r_0| + s_0\}$. Thus we have

$$-\varepsilon < -|r_0| = s_0 - |r_0| - s_0 < s_0 + h < s_0 + |r_0| - s_0 = |r_0| < \varepsilon. \quad (78)$$

Also we notice, $|s_0| < |r_0|$ so that $s_0x \in (-|r_0x|, |r_0x|)$. Then the derivation in (78) informs $(s_0 + h)x$ belong to the interval $(-|r_0x|, |r_0x|)$. Therefore, both s_0x and $(s_0 + h)x$ belong to $(-|r_0x|, |r_0x|)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\exp((s_0 + h)x) - \exp(s_0x)| &= \left| \int_{s_0x}^{(s_0+h)x} e^y dy \right| \\ &\leq |hx| \sup_{y \in [-|r_0x|, |r_0x|]} \exp(y) \\ &\leq |hx| \{\exp(r_0x) + \exp(-r_0x)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

By the definition (77), we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_n^{(p+1)}(s_0) &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[W_n^p \frac{\exp((s_0 + h)W_n) - \exp(s_0 W_n)}{h} \middle| \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \int x^p \frac{\exp((s_0 + h)x) - \exp(s_0 x)}{h} d\kappa_{W_n}(\cdot, x). \end{aligned}$$

Then we can bound by (79)

$$\left| x^p \frac{\exp((s_0 + h)x) - \exp(s_0 x)}{h} \right| \leq |x|^{p+1} \exp(r_0 x) + |x|^{p+1} \exp(-r_0 x).$$

Notice the RHS is independent of h and integrable with respect to measure $\kappa_{W_n}(\omega, \cdot)$ for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, by the induction hypothesis (76) since $r_0 \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$. By dominated convergence theorem, we know on the event in hypothesis (76),

$$\begin{aligned} H_n^{(p+1)}(s_0) &= \int \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} x^p \frac{\exp((s_0 + h)x) - \exp(s_0 x)}{h} d\kappa_{W_n}(\cdot, x) \\ &= \int x^{p+1} \exp(s_0 x) d\kappa_{W_n}(\cdot, x) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[W_n^{p+1} \exp(s_0 W_n) | \mathcal{F}_n]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the arbitrary choice of $s_0 \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, we know on the event in hypothesis (76), $H^{(p+1)}(s)$ is well-defined on the interval $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ and takes the form

$$H^{(p+1)}(s) = \mathbb{E}[W_n^{p+1} \exp(s_0 W_n) | \mathcal{F}_n].$$

Thus we have proved for the case $p+1$ so that we complete the induction and conclude the proof. \square

F Proof of Proposition 1

From (14), it suffices to prove

$$\frac{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}}{\exp\left(\frac{\lambda_n^2 - r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(\lambda_n))} = 1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

On the event $\hat{s}_n = 0$, we know the claim is correct. Therefore, we only need to consider the event $\hat{s}_n \neq 0$. Equivalently, it suffices to show

$$\mathbb{1}(\hat{s}_n \neq 0) \left(\frac{\exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n))}{\exp\left(\frac{\lambda_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(\lambda_n))} - 1 \right) \equiv \mathbb{1}(\hat{s}_n \neq 0) \left(\frac{h(r_n)}{h(\lambda_n)} - 1 \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \quad (80)$$

and

$$\mathbb{1}(\hat{s}_n \neq 0) \frac{\frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n}}{\exp(\lambda_n^2/2)(1 - \Phi(\lambda_n))} = \mathbb{1}(\hat{s}_n \neq 0) \frac{1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (81)$$

We prove the statements (80)-(81) subsequently.

F.1 Proof of statement (80)

Since $h(x) = \exp(x^2/2)(1 - \Phi(x))$ is smooth, then by Taylor's expansion, we have

$$\frac{h(r_n)}{h(\lambda_n)} = \frac{h(\lambda_n) + h'(\tilde{r}_n)(r_n - \lambda_n)}{h(\lambda_n)} = 1 + \frac{h'(\tilde{r}_n)(r_n - \lambda_n)}{h(\lambda_n)}$$

where \tilde{r}_n is the point between r_n and λ_n . Now we investigate $h'(x)$. We compute

$$h'(x) = x \exp(x^2/2)(1 - \Phi(x)) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

By Lemma 19, we know

$$|h'(x)| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{x^2} \leq \frac{1}{x^2}.$$

Then since both event $r_n < 0, \lambda_n > 0$ and event $r_n > 0, \lambda_n < 0$ happen with probability zero, we have $1/\tilde{r}_n^2 \in [\min\{1/r_n^2, 1/\lambda_n^2\}, \max\{1/r_n^2, 1/\lambda_n^2\}]$. Therefore, we have

$$\left| \frac{h'(\tilde{r}_n)(r_n - \lambda_n)}{h(\lambda_n)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_n^2} \left| \frac{r_n - \lambda_n}{h(\lambda_n)} \right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{r_n^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \right) \left| \frac{r_n - \lambda_n}{h(\lambda_n)} \right| = \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_n^2}{r_n^2} \right) \left| \frac{1 - \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} \right|.$$

Thus in order to prove (80), it suffices to show, by the sign condition (Sign3),

$$\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \neq 0) \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_n^2}{r_n^2} \right) \frac{1 - \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

The following lemma shows that the above statement is correct:

Lemma 23. *Under conditions (Rate2) and (Rate4), we have*

$$\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \neq 0) \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_n^2}{r_n^2} \right) \frac{1 - \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

F.2 Proof of statement (81)

By the sign condition (Sign3), it suffices to prove

$$\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \neq 0) \frac{1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

The following lemma shows that the above statement is correct:

Lemma 24. *Under conditions (Rate1) and (Rate2), we have*

$$\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \neq 0) \frac{1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

G Proof of Theorem 2

The proof follows by applying Theorem 1 with

$$W_{in} = \tilde{X}_{in}, \quad w_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}, \quad \mathcal{F}_n = \mathcal{G}_n, \quad \varepsilon = 2.$$

Thus it suffices to verify the assumptions required in Theorem 1 with these realizations. In particular, we will verify $W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n$ in this case satisfies **CCS condition**. Notice

$$\mathbb{P}[W_{in} \in [-|X_{in}|, |X_{in}|]|\mathcal{F}_n] = 1, \text{ almost surely.}$$

Then by Theorem 1, it suffices to verify the following lemma:

Lemma 25. *Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 2 hold. Then*

$$\frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2|\mathcal{F}_n] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}^2 = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}^4 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

The proof is postponed to Appendix G.1.

G.1 Proof of Lemma 25

Proof of Lemma 25. We will apply Lemma 18 to prove the claims.

Proof of $\sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}^4/n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$: We will apply Lemma 18 with $W_{in} = X_{in}^4$ and $\kappa = \delta/4$. If we can verify,

$$\frac{1}{n^{1+\delta/4}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_{in}^4|^{1+\delta/4}] = \frac{1}{n^{1+\delta/4}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_{in}|^{4+\delta}] \rightarrow 0.$$

then applying Lemma 18, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{in}^4 - \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^4]) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

It suffices to show

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^4] < \infty, \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_{in}|^{4+\delta}] < \infty. \quad (82)$$

By Lemma (31), it suffices to just show the $4 + \delta$ moment condition in (30). In fact, using the inequality $(|a| + |b|)^p \leq 2^p(|a|^p + |b|^p)$ for $p > 0$, we can bound

$$|X_{in}|^{4+\delta} = |\mu_n + \varepsilon_{in}|^{4+\delta} \leq 2^{4+\delta} |\mu_n|^{4+\delta} + 2^{4+\delta} |\varepsilon_{in}|^{4+\delta}$$

so that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|X_{in}|^{4+\delta}] \leq 2^{4+\delta} |\mu_n|^{4+\delta} + \frac{2^{4+\delta}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|\varepsilon_{in}|^{4+\delta}].$$

By condition (31) and condition (30), we know the claim is true. Therefore, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}^4 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{in}^4 - \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^4]) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^4] = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Proof of $\sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}^2/n = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$: We will apply Lemma 18 with $W_{in} = X_{in}^2$ and $\kappa = 1$. In other words, we need to verify

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^4] \rightarrow 0.$$

This is true by claim (82) that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^4]/n < \infty$. Therefore applying Lemma 18, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{in}^2 - \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^2]) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Thus in order to prove $\sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}^2/n = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, it suffices to show $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^2]/n > 0$. Indeed,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^2] = \mu_n^2 + \frac{2\mu_n}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{in}] + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{in}^2] \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{in}^2].$$

where the second inequality is true because $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{in}] = 0$ due to the symmetric distribution assumption. By condition (29), we know

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^2] \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{in}^2] > 0.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{in}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{in}^2 - \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^2]) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{in}^2] = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

□

H Proofs of supporting lemmas for Theorem 1

In this section, we first state two lemmas that reduce the condition of Theorem 1 to several conditions on the CGF. Then we prove the supporting lemmas for Theorem 1 based on the reduced conditions.

Lemma 26. *Suppose Assumption 1 or Assumption 2 holds. Then, the following statements hold:*

$$\sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (K_{in}''(s))^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \tag{83}$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}'''(0) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \tag{84}$$

$$\sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}''''(s) \right| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \tag{85}$$

Lemma 27. *Suppose Assumption 1 or Assumption 2 holds. Then condition (12) implies*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K''_{in}(0) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (86)$$

H.1 Proof of Lemma 1

We prove claim (6) and (7) separately.

Proof of claim (6): We consider two cases: CSE distribution and CCS distribution.

Case 1: CSE distribution By Lemma 17, we know

$$\mathbb{P} \left[K_{in}(s) \leq \lambda_n s^2, \forall s \in \left(-\frac{1}{\gamma}, \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \right] = 1$$

where

$$\lambda_n \equiv \frac{\sqrt{6!4^6}(1 + \theta_n)}{24\beta^2} + \frac{16(1 + \theta_n)}{\beta^2}, \quad \gamma = \frac{4}{\beta}.$$

Since $\theta_n < \infty$ almost surely, we know condition (6) holds with $\varepsilon = 1/(2\gamma) = \beta/8$.

Case 2: CCS distribution By the definition of CCS distribution and the definition of regular conditional distribution, we have

$$\mathbb{P} [\text{Supp}(\kappa_{in}(\omega, \cdot)) \in [-\nu_{in}(\omega), \nu_{in}(\omega)]] = 1.$$

Then we have for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n](\omega) = \int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \leq \exp(\nu_{in}) < \infty, \quad \forall s \in (-1, 1)$$

where the last inequality is due to the assumption $\nu_{in} < \infty$ almost surely. Therefore, condition (6) holds with $\varepsilon = 1$.

Proof of claim (7): By Lemma 21, it suffices to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 28. *On the event \mathcal{A} ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p \exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n] < \infty, \quad \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, n \geq 1 \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof of Lemma 28 is postponed to Appendix H.18.

H.2 Proof of Lemma 2

The claim (33) holds because by equation (52), on the event \mathcal{A} we have, for each $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$,

$$K_n''(s) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}''(s) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}_{n,s}[W_{in} \mid \mathcal{F}_n] \geq 0.$$

Next, we verify claim (34). To this end, fix $\delta > 0$. By assumptions (86), (84), and (85), there exist $\eta, M > 0$ and $N \geq 1$ be such that for all $n \geq N$,

$$\mathbb{P}[K_n''(0) < 2\eta] < \delta/3, \quad \mathbb{P}[|K_n'''(0)| > M] < \delta/3, \quad \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} |K_n''''(s)| > M\right] < \delta/3.$$

Define

$$s_* \equiv \min(\eta/(2M), \sqrt{\eta/M}, \varepsilon/2).$$

On the event \mathcal{A} , Lemma 1 guarantees that we can Taylor expand $K_n''(s)$ around $s = 0$ to obtain

$$K_n''(s) = K_n''(0) + sK_n'''(0) + \frac{1}{2}s^2K_n''''(\bar{s})$$

for some $|\bar{s}| \leq |s|$. Therefore, for all $n \geq N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \delta &< \mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{A}, K_n''(0) \geq 2\eta, |K_n'''(0)| \leq M, \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} |K_n''''(s)| \leq M\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{s \in [-s_*, s_*]} K_n''(s) \geq 2\eta - s_*M - \frac{1}{2}s_*^2M \geq \eta\right], \end{aligned}$$

which verifies the claim (34) and completes the proof.

H.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof of (39): Suppose $|S_n| = 1$. Because K_n' is almost surely nondecreasing on $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ (33) and $K_n'(0) = 0$ (37), the identity $K_n'(\hat{s}_n) = w_n$ implies that $\text{sgn}(\hat{s}_n) = \text{sgn}(w_n)$. When $|S_n| \neq 1$, by the definition of \hat{s}_n (9), we have $\text{sgn}(\hat{s}_n) = \text{sgn}(w_n)$. This completes the proof.

Proof of (40): Fix $\gamma, \delta > 0$. By Lemma 2, there $\eta > 0$, $s_* \in (0, \varepsilon/2)$, and $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{s \in [-s_*, s_*]} K_n''(s) \geq \eta\right] \geq 1 - \delta/2 \quad \text{for all } n \geq N.$$

By increasing N if necessary, the fact that $w_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ implies that

$$\mathbb{P}[|w_n| \leq \eta \min(\gamma, s_*)] \geq 1 - \delta/2 \quad \text{for all } n \geq N.$$

Define the event

$$\mathcal{E}'_n \equiv \left\{ \inf_{s \in [-s_*, s_*]} K_n''(s) \geq \eta, |w_n| \leq \eta \min(\gamma, s_*) \right\}$$

On the event $\mathcal{E}'_n \cap \mathcal{A}$, the Taylor expansion (36) gives

$$|K'_n(s)| \geq |s|\eta \quad \text{for all } s \in [-s_*, s_*] \text{ and all } n \geq N.$$

Hence, $|w_n| \leq \eta s_* \leq \min(-K'_n(-s_*), K'_n(s_*))$, implying $w_n \in [K'_n(-s_*), K'_n(s_*)]$, so the saddlepoint equation has a solution \hat{s}_n such that $K'_n(\hat{s}_n) = w_n$ and $|\hat{s}_n| \leq s_*$. Therefore, on the event $\mathcal{E}'_n \cap \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$|\hat{s}_n|\eta \leq |K'_n(\hat{s}_n)| = |w_n| \leq \eta\gamma \quad \implies |\hat{s}_n| \leq \gamma.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}[|\hat{s}_n| \leq \gamma] \geq \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}'_n \cap \mathcal{A}] \geq 1 - \delta \quad \text{for all } n \geq N,$$

which shows that $\hat{s}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$, as desired.

Proof of (41): By the argument following the statement of Lemma 2, for any δ there is an $\eta > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $\mathbb{P}[K''_n(\hat{s}_n) \geq \eta] \geq 1 - \delta$ for all $n \geq N$. This shows that $K''_n(\hat{s}_n) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, as desired.

H.4 Proof of Lemma 4

Proof of Lemma 4. We prove the claims separately.

Verification of (Finite). Since $w_n \in (-\infty, \infty)$, together with Lemma 1 guaranteeing that $K_n(s), K'_n(s), K''_n(s) \in (-\infty, \infty), \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ almost surely and definition of \hat{s}_n such that $|\hat{s}_n| < \varepsilon$, we have

$$\lambda_n^2 = |n\hat{s}_n K''_n(\hat{s}_n)| < n\varepsilon |K''_n(\hat{s}_n)| < \infty, \quad r_n^2 \leq \max\{1, |2n(\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n))|\} < \infty.$$

Verification of (Sign1). This claim follows from conclusion (39) of Lemma 3 and the definitions of r_n and λ_n in equation (10).

Verification of (Sign4). This is true by definition of r_n and λ_n . This completes the proof.

Verification of (Sign2), (Sign3), (Rate1), (Rate2), (Rate3), (Rate4) and (Rate5): We present a useful lemma.

Lemma 29 (Asymptotic estimate of λ_n and r_n). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, the followings are true*

$$\frac{r_n^2}{n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (87)$$

$$\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} = 1 + \hat{s}_n O_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (88)$$

$$\frac{r_n}{\lambda_n} = 1 + \hat{s}_n O_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (89)$$

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (90)$$

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \frac{1}{r_n} \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (91)$$

$$\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \neq 0) \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \left(\frac{r_n}{\lambda_n} - 1 \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (92)$$

$$\mathbb{P}[w_n > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n \leq 0] \rightarrow 0. \quad (93)$$

$$\mathbb{P}[\hat{s}_n \neq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n \leq 0] \rightarrow 0. \quad (94)$$

Verification of (Sign2): (93) verifies (Sign2).

Verification of (Sign3): (94) verifies (Sign3).

Verification of (Rate1): (90) verifies (Rate1).

Verification of (Rate2): Since $\hat{s}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$, we know (88) implies

$$\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} = 1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

which verifies (Rate2).

Verification of (Rate3): (91) verifies (Rate3).

Verification of (Rate4): (92) verifies (Rate4).

Verification of (Rate5): (87) verifies (Rate5). □

H.5 Proof of Lemma 5

We can apply the theorem to the triangular array $\widetilde{W}_{in} \equiv -W_{in}$ and set of cutoffs $\widetilde{w}_n \equiv -w_n$, since the theorem assumptions are invariant to the signs of W_{in} and x_{in} . Therefore, we get the result

$$\mathbb{1}(\widetilde{w}_n > 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \widetilde{W}_{in} \geq \widetilde{w}_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(\widetilde{r}_n) + \phi(\widetilde{r}_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0,$$

where we claim that $\tilde{r}_n = -r_n$ and $\tilde{\lambda}_n = -\lambda_n$. To see this, we define

$$\tilde{K}_{in}(s) \equiv \log \mathbb{E} \left[\exp(s\tilde{W}_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n \right], \quad \tilde{K}_n(s) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{K}_{in}(s) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}(-s) = K_n(-s).$$

Then, consider the saddlepoint equation for \tilde{w}_n :

$$\tilde{K}'_n(s) = \tilde{x}_n. \quad (95)$$

Furthermore, we define

$$\tilde{S}_n \equiv \{s \in [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2] : \tilde{K}'_n(s) = \tilde{x}_n\}.$$

Then we write the solution \tilde{s}_n to the saddlepoint equation (95) according to the definition of \hat{s}_n as in (9)

$$\tilde{s}_n = \begin{cases} \text{the single element of } \tilde{S}_n & \text{if } |\tilde{S}_n| = 1; \\ \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \text{sgn}(\tilde{x}_n) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then we argue that $\tilde{s}_n = -\hat{s}_n$. This is because given \hat{s}_n uniquely solves (8), we know $-\hat{s}_n$ uniquely solves (95). Similarly, whenever \tilde{s}_n uniquely solves (95), we know $-\tilde{s}_n$ uniquely solves (8). Therefore, we have $\tilde{s}_n = -\hat{s}_n$. Then recall the definition

$$\tilde{\lambda}_n \equiv \sqrt{n\tilde{s}_n\tilde{K}''_n(\tilde{s}_n)}, \quad \tilde{r}_n \equiv \begin{cases} \text{sgn}(\tilde{s}_n) \sqrt{2n(\tilde{s}_n\tilde{w}_n - \tilde{K}_n(\tilde{s}_n))} & \text{if } \tilde{s}_n\tilde{w}_n - \tilde{K}_n(\tilde{s}_n) \geq 0; \\ \text{sgn}(\tilde{s}_n) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

Since $\tilde{K}''_n(-s) = K''_n(s)$, $\tilde{K}_n(-s) = K_n(s)$ and $\tilde{x}_n = -w_n$, we know $\tilde{\lambda}_n = -\lambda_n$ and $\tilde{r}_n = -r_n$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{1}(\tilde{w}_n > 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{W}_{in} \geq \tilde{w}_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(\tilde{r}_n) + \phi(\tilde{r}_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_n} - \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_n} \right\}} - 1 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \leq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(-r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{r_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \right\}} - 1 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \left(\frac{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\} - \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} > w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{\Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{r_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \right\}} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Note the demoninator in (96) is not what we want and we would like to change it to $1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}$. Now, we need the following lemma to proceed.

Lemma 30. *Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 1 hold. Then (Finite), (Sign1), (Sign4), (Rate1) conditions are true by Lemma 4. Furthermore, we have*

1.

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \left| \frac{\Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{r_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \right\}}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} \right| \leq 1 + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1); \quad (97)$$

2.

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (98)$$

Now, guaranteed by (97) in Lemma 30, we multiply both sides of the last statement as in (96) by $\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \frac{\Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{r_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \right\}}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}}$ and rearrange to obtain that

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} > w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

This is almost what we want (43), except the inequality in the numerator is strict. To address this, we note we have proved (98) in Lemma 30 that

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

Putting together the preceding two displays, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} - 1 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \left(\frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} > w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} - 1 + \frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} \right) \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0. \end{aligned}$$

H.6 Proof of Lemma 7

Proof of Lemma 7. We first prove the first claim.

Proof of (47): We apply Lemma 6 to prove the result. It suffices to show

1.

$$\text{Var}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty;$$

2.

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n]|^3 | \mathcal{F}_n] = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad K_n''(0) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

For the first claim, we know

$$\text{Var}[W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n] = K_{in}''(0) < \infty$$

almost surely by Lemma 1. For the second claim, we claim it suffices to prove

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n]|^4|\mathcal{F}_n] = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad K_n''(0) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

This is because, intuitively, we can upper bound the lower moment by the higher moment. We provide a formal result for such intuition.

Lemma 31 (Dominance of higher moment). *For any $1 < p < q < \infty$, the following inequality is true:*

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p|\mathcal{F}_n]}{n} \leq \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^q|\mathcal{F}_n]}{n} \right)^{p/q}.$$

Applying Lemma 31 with $p = 3, q = 4$ we know the claim is true. By the expression of the fourth central moment in terms of the second and fourth cumulant, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n]|^4|\mathcal{F}_n] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{K_{in}''''(0) + 3(K_{in}''(0))^2\} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

guaranteed by assumptions (83) and (85). $K_n''(0) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ is guaranteed by assumption (86). Thus by Lemma 6, we know

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK_n''(0)}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \leq t | \mathcal{F}_n \right] - \Phi(t) \right| \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

Proof of (48): Fix $\delta > 0$. Then we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK_n''(0)}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = y_n | \mathcal{F}_n \right] &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK_n''(0)}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \in (y_n - \delta, y_n + \delta) | \mathcal{F}_n \right] \\ &\equiv P((y_n - \delta, y_n + \delta]) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$P(A) \equiv \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK_n''(0)}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \in A | \mathcal{F}_n \right], \quad A \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

Furthermore we have

$$\begin{aligned} P((y_n - \delta, y_n + \delta]) &\leq |P((-\infty, y_n + \delta]) - \Phi(y_n + \delta)| + |P((-\infty, y_n - \delta]) - \Phi(y_n - \delta)| \\ &\quad + |\Phi(y_n + \delta) - \Phi(y_n - \delta)|. \end{aligned}$$

By (47) and the Lipschitz continuity of $\Phi(x)$, we can bound

$$\begin{aligned} P((y_n - \delta, y_n + \delta]) &\leq 2 \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK_n''(0)}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] - \Phi(t) \right| + \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \phi(x) 2\delta \\ &= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \phi(x) 2\delta + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \phi(x) \leq 1/\sqrt{2\pi}$, we know

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK_n''(0)}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = y_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \leq P((y_n - \delta, y_n + \delta]) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + \frac{2\delta}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.$$

We can take δ arbitrarily small so that we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{nK_n''(0)}} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = y_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

□

H.7 Proof of Lemma 8

Proof of Lemma 8. To prove the statement (51), note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{n,s_n}[A_n] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(A_n) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\exp(s_n W_{in})}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(A_n) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\exp(s_n W_{in})}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(A_n) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]} \right] = \mathbb{P}[A_n]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we compute for each $A_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and $B_1, \dots, B_n \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}_{n,s_n}[W_{1n} \in B_1, \dots, W_{nn} \in B_n, A_n] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(W_{1n} \in B_1, \dots, W_{nn} \in B_n, A_n) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\exp(s_n W_{in})}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1}(A_n) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(W_{in} \in B_i) \exp(s_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]} \right], \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

from which it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}_{n,s_n}[W_{1n} \in B_1, \dots, W_{nn} \in B_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n] = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(W_{in} \in B_i) \exp(s_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_n W_{in}) \mid \mathcal{F}_n]}$$

This verifies the claim that under \mathbb{P}_{n,s_n} , (W_{1n}, \dots, W_{nn}) are still independent conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n . Furthermore, this shows that the marginal distribution of each W_{in} is

exponentially tilted by s_n , conditionally on \mathcal{F}_n . From this, we can derive the conditional mean and variance of W_{in} under the measure \mathbb{P}_{n,s_n} . We write

$$\mathbb{E}_{n,s_n}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n] = \mathbb{E} \left[W_{in} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\exp(s_n W_{in})}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_n W_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n]} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_{in} \exp(s_n W_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_n W_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n]}.$$

Then by Lemma 35, we have,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{T}] = 1, \quad \mathcal{T} \equiv \{K'_{in}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n], \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)\}.$$

Then we know $\forall \omega \in \mathcal{T} \cap \{|s_n| < \varepsilon\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} K'_{in}(s_n)(\omega) &= \mathbb{E}_{in,s_n}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) = \int x \frac{\exp(s_n x)}{\int \exp(s_n x) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x)} d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{n,s_n}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega), \end{aligned}$$

so that by the assumption $\mathbb{P}[s_n \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)] = 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}[K'_{in}(s_n) = \mathbb{E}_{n,s_n}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n]] = 1.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[K''_{in}(s_n) = \text{Var}_{n,s_n}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n]] = 1.$$

□

H.8 Proof of Lemma 9

Proof of Lemma 9. Define

$$F_n(t, \omega) \equiv \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{S_n \sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n]) \leq t \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] (\omega)$$

and

$$S_n(\omega) \equiv \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n])^2 | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) \right)^{1/2}.$$

We prove the result by recalling the notion of regular conditional distribution defined in Appendix A. Define $W_n \equiv (W_{1n}, \dots, W_{nn})$. Suppose $\kappa_{W_n, \mathcal{F}_n}$ is a regular conditional distribution of W_n given \mathcal{F}_n . Then for every $\omega \in \Omega$, we know $\kappa_{W_n, \mathcal{F}_n}(\omega, \cdot)$ is a probability measure. We draw $(\widetilde{W}_{1n}(\omega), \dots, \widetilde{W}_{nn}(\omega)) \sim \kappa_{W_n, \mathcal{F}_n}(\omega, \cdot)$. Define

$$\tilde{S}_n(\omega) \equiv \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega)])^2] \right)^{1/2}, \quad \mathcal{D}_n \equiv \{S_n > 0\}.$$

In order to apply Lemma 22 to almost every $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_n \subset \Omega$, we need to verify that for those ω it is true that $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{(\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega)])^2}{\widetilde{S}_n^2(\omega)} \right] = 1, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega)]}{\widetilde{S}_n(\omega)} \right] = 0 \quad (100)$$

and $\widetilde{S}_n(\omega) > 0$. Both claims are true by applying Lemma 16, such that for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$, we have for any positive integer p ,

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^p | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) = \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{W}_{in}^p(\omega)], \quad \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) = \mathbb{E}[|\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega)|^p], \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Together with the assumption imposed in the lemma, we know conditions in (100) are satisfied for any $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_n \cap \mathcal{N}^c$, where \mathcal{N} is a null set with probability measure 0. Then we apply Lemma 22 to obtain that for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists a universal constant, that is independent of ω , such that $\forall \omega \in \mathcal{D}_n \cap \mathcal{N}^c$

$$\left| \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega)])}{\widetilde{S}_n(\omega) \sqrt{n}} \leq t \right] - \Phi(t) \right| \leq C \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega) - \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{W}_{in}(\omega)]|^3]}{\widetilde{S}_n^3(\omega) n^{3/2}}$$

Then fixing any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we again apply Lemma 16 such that for almost every $\omega \in \mathcal{C}_n \cap \mathcal{D}_n$,

$$|F_n(t, \omega) - \Phi(t)| \leq C \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n]|^3 | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega)}{S_n(\omega) n^{3/2}}.$$

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By the continuity of the normal CDF, there exists points $-\infty = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_k = \infty$ with $\Phi(x_i) = i/k$. By monotonicity, we have, for $x_{i-1} \leq t \leq x_i$,

$$F_n(t, \omega) - \Phi(t) \leq F_n(x_i, \omega) - \Phi(x_{i-1}) = F_n(x_i, \omega) - \Phi(x_i) + \frac{1}{k}$$

and

$$F_n(t, \omega) - \Phi(t) \geq F_n(x_{i-1}, \omega) - \Phi(x_i) = F_n(x_{i-1}, \omega) - \Phi(x_{i-1}) - \frac{1}{k}.$$

Thus for fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we can bound for almost every $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_n$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |F_n(t, \omega) - \Phi(t)| &\leq \sup_i |F_n(x_i, \omega) - \Phi(x_i)| + \frac{1}{k} \\ &\leq C \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n]|^3 | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega)}{S_n(\omega) n^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Then taking the supremum on $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we have almost every $\omega \in \mathcal{D}_n$,

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(t, \omega) - F(t)| \leq C \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n]|^3 | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega)}{S_n^3(\omega) n^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{k}.$$

Letting k go to infinity, we have

$$\mathbb{1}(\omega \in \mathcal{D}_n) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(t, \omega) - F(t)| \leq C \mathbb{1}(\omega \in \mathcal{D}_n) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n]|^3 | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega)}{S_n^3(\omega) n^{3/2}}. \quad (101)$$

Now we decompose

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(t, \omega) - F(t)| \\ &= \sqrt{n} \mathbb{1}(\omega \notin \mathcal{D}_n) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(t, \omega) - F(t)| + \sqrt{n} \mathbb{1}(\omega \in \mathcal{D}_n) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(t, \omega) - F(t)|. \end{aligned}$$

We first show that $\mathbb{1}(\omega \notin \mathcal{D}_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. We only need to prove

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{D}_n^c] = \mathbb{P}[S_n \leq 0] \rightarrow 0.$$

This is obvious since $S_n = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Then we have $\mathbb{1}(\omega \notin \mathcal{D}_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ such that

$$\sqrt{n} \mathbb{1}(\omega \notin \mathcal{D}_n) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(t, \omega) - F(t)| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (102)$$

By (101) and

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in} - \mathbb{E}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n]|^3 | \mathcal{F}_n]}{n} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), S_n = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1),$$

we know there exists $M > 0$ such that for any $m \geq M$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sqrt{n} \mathbb{1}(\omega \in \mathcal{D}_n) \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(t, \omega) - F(t)| > m \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

This, together with (102), implies for any $m \geq M$ we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sqrt{n} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(t, \omega) - F(t)| > m \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

□

H.9 Proof of Lemma 10

The statement (53) can be verified using a Taylor expansion, guaranteed by Lemma 1, of $K_n''(s)$ around $s = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}_{n, \hat{s}_n}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n] &= K_n''(\hat{s}_n) \\ &= K_n''(0) + \hat{s}_n K_n'''(0) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{s}_n^2 K_n''''(\tilde{s}_n) \\ &= \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) + o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\ &= \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $|\tilde{s}_n| \leq |\hat{s}_n|$. The statement $K_n''(0) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ is by assumption (86), the statement $\hat{s}_n K_n'''(0)$ is by the convergence $\hat{s}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ (40) and the finiteness of $K_n'''(0)$ (7), and the statement $\hat{s}_n^2 K_n''''(\tilde{s}_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ is by the convergence $\hat{s}_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$ and the assumption (85).

To verify the moment condition (54), by Lemma 31 with $p = 3, q = 4$, it suffices to verify a stronger fourth moment statement

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n}[(W_{in} - \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n}[W_{in}])^4 | \mathcal{F}_n] = O_{\mathbb{P}_{n, \hat{s}_n}}(1). \quad (103)$$

To this end, we combine an expression for the fourth central moment of W_{in} in terms of the second and fourth cumulants and the assumptions (83) and (85):

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n}[(W_{in} - \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n}[W_{in}])^4 | \mathcal{F}_n] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{K_{in}''''(\hat{s}_n) + 3(K_{in}''(\hat{s}_n))^2\} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

H.10 Proof of Lemma 11

For any $A_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \right) \mathbb{1}(A_n) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \right) \mathbb{1}(A_n) \frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{P}_{n, \hat{s}_n}} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \right) \mathbb{1}(A_n) \frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{P}_{n, \hat{s}_n}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \right) \frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{P}_{n, \hat{s}_n}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \mathbb{1}(A_n) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n, \hat{s}_n} \left[\mathbb{1} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} \geq w_n \right) \frac{d\mathbb{P}}{d\mathbb{P}_{n, \hat{s}_n}} \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \mathbb{1}(A_n) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The equality is due to Lemma 8, since the random variable inside the expectation is measurable with respect to \mathcal{F}_n .

H.11 Proof of Lemma 12

Proof of Lemma 12. Recall the notion of regular conditional distribution introduced in Appendix A. We know $Z_n | \mathcal{F}_n$ must admit the regular conditional distribution $\kappa_n(\omega, B)$ for $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$. We define $F_n(\cdot, \omega)$ to be the CDF of $Z_n | \mathcal{F}_n$ for the probability measure $\kappa_n(\omega, \cdot)$. We apply Lemma 16 and the integration by parts formula to obtain, for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}(Z_n \geq 0) \exp(-\lambda_n Z_n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n] (\omega) \\
&= \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z) dF_n(z, \omega) \\
&= -\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) F_n(0, \omega) + \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \int_0^\infty \lambda_n \exp(-\lambda_n z) F_n(z, \omega) dz. \tag{104}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, apply integration by parts so that we have

$$\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z) \phi(z) dz = \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \left(-\Phi(0) + \int_0^\infty \lambda_n \exp(-\lambda_n z) \Phi(z) dz \right). \tag{105}$$

Then combining (104) and (105), we can bound

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \left| \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{1}(Z_n \geq 0) \exp(-\lambda_n Z_n) | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) - \int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z) \phi(z) dz \right| \\
&= \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \left| \Phi(0) - F_n(0, \omega) + \int_0^\infty \lambda_n \exp(-\lambda_n z) (F_n(z, \omega) - \Phi(z)) dz \right| \\
&\leq \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \sup_{z \geq 0} |F_n(z, \omega) - \Phi(z)| \left(1 + \int_0^\infty \lambda_n \exp(-\lambda_n z) dz \right) \\
&= 2\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \sup_{z \geq 0} |F_n(z, \omega) - \Phi(z)| \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(z, \omega) - \Phi(z)| \\
&= 2\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \geq 0) \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}[Z_n \leq z | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) - \Phi(z)|
\end{aligned}$$

almost surely. For the last equality, we use Lemma 16 together with the density argument to prove the equality. Indeed, fixing any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, by the continuity of the normal CDF, there exists points $-\infty = x_0 < x_1 \cdots < x_k = \infty$ with $\Phi(x_i) = i/k$. By monotonicity, we have for $x_{i-1} \leq t \leq x_i$

$$F_n(t, \omega) - \Phi(t) \leq F_n(x_i, \omega) - \Phi(x_{i-1}) = \mathbb{P}[Z_n \leq x_i | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) - \Phi(x_i) + \frac{1}{k}$$

and

$$F_n(t, \omega) - \Phi(t) \geq F_n(x_{i-1}, \omega) - \Phi(x_i) = \mathbb{P}[Z_n \leq x_{i-1} | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) - \Phi(x_{i-1}) - \frac{1}{k}$$

for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$. Then we have for almost every $\omega \in \Omega$

$$\begin{aligned}
|F_n(t, \omega) - \Phi(t)| &\leq \sup_i |\mathbb{P}[Z_n \leq x_i | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) - \Phi(x_i)| + \frac{1}{k} \\
&\leq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}[Z_n \leq t | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) - \Phi(t)| + \frac{1}{k}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by the arbitrary choice of k so that we have

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(t, \omega) - \Phi(t)| \leq \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}[Z_n \leq t | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega) - \Phi(t)|$$

almost surely. By interchanging the $F_n(t, \omega)$ and $\mathbb{P}[Z_n \leq t | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega)$, we have shown the desired result. \square

H.12 Proof of Lemma 13

Proof of statement (63). We consider the events $r_n = 0$ and $r_n > 0$ separately. First, define $\mathcal{U}_n \equiv \{U_n \neq 0\}$.

On the event $r_n = 0$: We further divide this case into two cases.

1. When $\lambda_n = 0$: this implies $|U_n| = 1/2 > 0$;
2. When $\lambda_n \neq 0$: this implies $|U_n| = \infty$.

This implies \mathcal{U}_n happens.

On the event $r_n > 0$: By (Sign4) condition, this implies $\lambda_n \geq 0$. We divide the case to $\lambda_n > 0$ and $\lambda_n = 0$.

1. When $\lambda_n = 0$: this implies $|U_n| = \infty$;
2. When $\lambda_n > 0$: we discuss when $r_n - \lambda_n > 0, r_n - \lambda_n < 0$ and $r_n - \lambda_n = 0$.

When $r_n - \lambda_n \geq 0$: By the formula of U_n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_n &= \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\} \\ &\geq \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)). \end{aligned}$$

By (Finite), we know $r_n \in (-\infty, \infty)$ almost surely, so that $U_n > 0$ almost surely.

When $r_n - \lambda_n < 0$: In order to proceed the proof, we present a lemma to relate the U_n with the Gaussian integral estimate via integration by parts.

Lemma 32. *Suppose (Finite) condition is true. Define*

$$R_n \equiv \int_{r_n}^{\lambda_n} y \exp(y^2/2) (1 - \Phi(y)) - \frac{1 - y^{-2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dy. \quad (106)$$

Recall the definition of U_n as in (60). If $\lambda_n, r_n \neq 0$ almost surely, then we have

$$R_n = \int_0^{\infty} \exp(-\lambda_n y) \phi(y) dy - U_n, \text{ almost surely.}$$

Since in this case, $\lambda_n > r_n > 0$ and (Finite) is assumed in the lemma statement, then by Lemma 32 we have

$$U_n = \int_0^{\infty} \exp(-\lambda_n y) \phi(y) dy - R_n, \text{ almost surely.}$$

By Lemma 19, we can write

$$R_n = \int_{r_n}^{\lambda_n} \left(-y \int_y^{\infty} \frac{\phi(t)}{3t^4} dt \right) dy < 0,$$

which implies $U_n > 0$. Thus \mathcal{U}_n happens.

On the event $r_n < 0$: By (Sign4) condition, we know $\lambda_n \leq 0$. We divide the case to $\lambda_n < 0$ and $\lambda_n = 0$.

1. When $\lambda_n < 0$: we can lower bound

$$U_n = \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\} \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right|$$

By (Rate1), we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P} [\mathcal{U}_n^c \text{ and } r_n < 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n < 0] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[U_n \geq \frac{1}{4} \text{ and } r_n < 0 \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

2. When $\lambda_n = 0$: we know $|U_n| = \infty$. Thus \mathcal{U}_n happens. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of statement (64). We write

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 0) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}U_n} = \mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1) \frac{1}{r_n U_n} \frac{r_n}{\sqrt{n}} + \mathbb{1}(r_n \in [0, 1)) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}U_n}.$$

Now we present an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 33 (Convergence rate of $1/U_n$). *Suppose (Rate1) and (Rate2) hold. Then we have*

$$\frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1)}{r_n U_n} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \tag{107}$$

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \in [0, 1)) \frac{1}{U_n} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \tag{108}$$

Intuition of Lemma 33: The intuition behind this is when r_n is small, we expect $|U_n|$, is lower bounded with high probability since $1/\lambda_n - 1/r_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and thus the dominant term is $\exp(r_n^2/2)(1 - \Phi(r_n))$, which is lower bounded when r_n is small. When r_n is large, $|U_n|$ will go to zero but with a rate that is slower than $1/r_n$. The latter case needs a finer analysis with (Rate1) and (Rate2) conditions involved.

Then by Lemma 33, we know

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1) \frac{1}{r_n U_n} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \mathbb{1}(r_n \in [0, 1)) \frac{1}{U_n} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Since $r_n/\sqrt{n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, we conclude

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 0) \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}U_n} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

This completes the proof. \square

H.13 Proof of Lemma 14

Proof of Lemma 14. Define

$$O_n \equiv \frac{|r_n - \lambda_n|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{r_n^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \right).$$

We first present an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 34 (Upper bound of Gaussian integral). *Under conditions (Finite) and (Sign4), the following inequality is true almost surely:*

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \left| \frac{\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z) \phi(z) dz}{U_n} - 1 \right| \leq \mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \left| \frac{1}{U_n} \right| \cdot O_n.$$

By Lemma 34, we can bound

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \left| \frac{\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n z) \phi(z) dz}{U_n} - 1 \right| \leq \left| \mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \frac{O_n}{U_n} \right|$$

almost surely. Then we can further decompose

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \frac{O_n}{U_n} = \frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1, \lambda_n > 0)}{r_n U_n} \cdot r_n O_n + \mathbb{1}(r_n \in (0, 1), \lambda_n > 0) \frac{O_n}{U_n}$$

By Lemma 33, we know

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1) \frac{1}{r_n U_n} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \mathbb{1}(r_n \in (0, 1)) \frac{1}{U_n} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Thus it suffices to show

$$r_n O_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \tag{109}$$

and

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) O_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \tag{110}$$

Proof of (109): We compute

$$r_n O_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| 1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} \right| \cdot \left| 1 + \frac{r_n^2}{\lambda_n^2} \right|.$$

Thus by (Rate2) we know

$$\left| \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \frac{r_n^2}{\lambda_n^2} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Thus we have $\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1, \lambda_n > 0) r_n O_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$.

Proof of (110): We can write

$$O_n = \frac{|r_n - \lambda_n|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{r_n^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{r_n} \right| \cdot \left| 1 + \frac{r_n^2}{\lambda_n^2} \right|.$$

Then by (Rate3), we know

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \left| \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{r_n} \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

and by (Rate2), we have $r_n^2/\lambda_n^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Thus we have $O_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. \square

H.14 Proof of Lemma 23

Proof of Lemma 23. By the rate condition (Rate2), we know

$$1 + \frac{\lambda_n^2}{r_n^2} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Thus we only need to show

$$\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n \neq 0) \frac{1 - \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

We decompose the magnitude of $|\lambda_n|$ to two parts: $|\lambda_n| > 1$ and $|\lambda_n| \in (0, 1]$. It suffices to prove

$$\mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| \in (0, 1]) \frac{1 - \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| > 1) \frac{1 - \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (111)$$

For the first term in (111), we know $h(x)$ is uniformly lower bounded for $x \in [-1, 1]$ so that $h(\lambda_n)$ is uniformly lower bounded for $|\lambda_n| \in (0, 1]$. Then by the rate condition (Rate4), we know

$$\mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| \in (0, 1]) \frac{1 - \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

For the second term in (111), we have by Lemma 20 that for $|\lambda_n| > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)| &= |\lambda_n| \exp(\lambda_n^2/2)(1 - \Phi(\lambda_n)) \geq |\lambda_n| \exp(\lambda_n^2/2)(1 - \Phi(|\lambda_n|)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\lambda_n^2}{\lambda_n^2 + 1} > \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the rate condition (Rate2), we know

$$\mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| > 1) \frac{|1 - \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n}|}{|\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)|} \leq 2\sqrt{2\pi} \mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| > 1) \left| 1 - \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n} \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

\square

H.15 Proof of Lemma 24

Proof of Lemma 24. We decompose the magnitude of $|\lambda_n|$ to two parts $|\lambda_n| > 1$ and $|\lambda_n| \in (0, 1]$. It suffices to prove

$$\mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| \in (0, 1]) \frac{1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1), \quad \mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| > 1) \frac{1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (112)$$

For the first term in (112), we know $h(x)$ is uniformly bounded for $x \in [-1, 1]$ so that $h(\lambda_n)$ is uniformly bounded for $|\lambda_n| \in (0, 1]$. Then by the rate condition (Rate1), we know

$$\mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| \in (0, 1]) \frac{1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n}}{\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)} = \mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| \in (0, 1]) \frac{\frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n}}{h(\lambda_n)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

For the second term in (112), we have by Lemma 20 that for $|\lambda_n| > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)| &= |\lambda_n| \exp(\lambda_n^2/2)(1 - \Phi(\lambda_n)) \geq |\lambda_n| \exp(\lambda_n^2/2)(1 - \Phi(|\lambda_n|)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{\lambda_n^2}{\lambda_n^2 + 1} > \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by the rate condition (Rate2), we know

$$\mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| > 1) \frac{|1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n}|}{|\lambda_n h(\lambda_n)|} \leq 2\sqrt{2\pi} \mathbb{1}(|\lambda_n| > 1) \left| 1 - \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

□

H.16 Proof of Lemma 26

Proof of Lemma 26. The following lemma states how the derivatives of $K_{in}(s)$ are related to the conditional moments of $W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n$ under measure $\kappa_{in,s}$.

Lemma 35. *On the event \mathcal{A} as in Lemma 1, we have*

$$K'_{in}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n], \quad \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \quad (113)$$

$$K''_{in}(s) = \text{Var}_{in,s}[W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n], \quad \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \quad (114)$$

$$K_{in}^{(4)}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[(W_{in} - \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n])^4|\mathcal{F}_n] - 3\text{Var}_{in,s}^2[W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n], \quad \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon). \quad (115)$$

We first show with Lemma 35, in order to show condition (83)-(85), it suffices to show there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}] = 1$ and for the given $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in}^4|\mathcal{F}_n] = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (116)$$

Suppose $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}] = 1$ and the assumption (116) holds. Now we verify condition (83)-(85) subsequently.

Verification of condition (83): By conclusion (114), Jensen's inequality and statement (116), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (K_{in}''(s))^2 &\leq \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in}^2 | \mathcal{F}_n])^2 \\
&= \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int x^2 d\kappa_{in,s}(\omega, x) \right)^2 \\
&\leq \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int x^4 d\kappa_{in,s}(\omega, x) \\
&= \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in}^4 | \mathcal{F}_n] \\
&= O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Verification of condition (84): It suffices to prove

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}'''(0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^3 | \mathcal{F}_n] = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

By Lemma 31 with $p = 3, q = 4$, we can bound

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^3 | \mathcal{F}_n] \right| \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^3 | \mathcal{F}_n] \leq \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^4 | \mathcal{F}_n]}{n} \right)^{3/4}.$$

Then by statement (116), we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}'''(0) \right| \leq \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^4 | \mathcal{F}_n]}{n} \right)^{3/4} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Verification of condition (85): By conclusion (115) and (114),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}''''(s) \right| \\
& \leq \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[(W_{in} - \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in}|\mathcal{F}_n])^4|\mathcal{F}_n] + \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{3}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (K_{in}''(s))^2 \\
& = \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int \left(x - \int x d\kappa_{in,s}(\cdot, x) \right)^4 d\kappa_{in,s}(\cdot, x) + O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\
& \leq \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{16}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int x^4 d\kappa_{in,s}(\cdot, x) + \left(\int x d\kappa_{in,s}(\cdot, x) \right)^4 \right) + O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\
& \leq \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{32}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int x^4 d\kappa_{in,s}(\cdot, x) + O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\
& = \sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{32}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in}^4|\mathcal{F}_n] + O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \\
& = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)
\end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality is due to power inequality $(|a| + |b|)^p \leq 2^p(|a|^p + |b|^p)$ and the proved condition (83), the fourth inequality is due to Jensen's inequality and the last equality is due to statement (116). Now we show there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that statement (116) holds for both cases.

Case 1: CSE distribution Consider the power-series expansion

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n] &= \int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\
&= \int \left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{s^k}{k!} x^k \right) d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\
&= 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{s^k}{k!} \int x^k d\kappa_{in}(\omega, x) \\
&= 1 + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{s^k}{k!} \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^k|\mathcal{F}_n] \tag{117}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last inequality is due to Fubini's theorem and the last inequality is due to the definition of conditional expectation (67). We first can bound using Lemma 17 and Assumption 1 that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \exp(\lambda_n s^2), \forall s \in (-\beta/4, \beta/4) \right] = 1 \tag{118}$$

where

$$\lambda_n = \frac{\sqrt{6!4^6}(1 + \theta_n)}{24\beta^2} + \frac{16(1 + \theta_n)}{\beta^2}.$$

Then we can bound by setting $s = \beta/16$ in the identity (117) and conclusion (118) so that

$$\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^{12}|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \frac{12!16^{12}}{\beta^{12}} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{\beta}{16} W_{in} \right) | \mathcal{F}_n \right] \leq \frac{12!16^{12}}{\beta^{12}} \exp \left(\frac{\lambda_n \beta^2}{256} \right) \quad (119)$$

almost surely. Then we can bound for $|s| < \beta/8$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in}^4|\mathcal{F}_n] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^4 \exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in})|\mathcal{F}_n]} \\ &= \frac{\int x^4 \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x)}{\int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x)} \\ &\leq \int x^4 \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x) \\ &\leq \left(\int x^{12} d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x) \right)^{1/3} \left(\int \exp \left(\frac{3sx}{2} \right) d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x) \right)^{2/3} \\ &= (\mathbb{E}[W_{in}^{12}|\mathcal{F}_n])^{1/3} (\mathbb{E}[\exp(3sW_{in}/2)|\mathcal{F}_n])^{2/3} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{12!16^{12}}{\beta^{12}} \right)^{1/3} \exp \left(\frac{\lambda_n \beta^2}{768} \right) \cdot \exp \left(\frac{3\lambda_n \beta^2}{128} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the third and fourth inequality is due to Jensen's inequality and Hölder's inequality, respectively and the last inequality is due to bound (119) and bound (118). By the assumption $\lambda_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, we have

$$\sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{in,s}[W_{in}^4|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \left(\frac{12!16^{12}}{\beta^{12}} \right)^{1/3} \exp \left(\frac{\lambda_n \beta^2}{768} \right) \cdot \exp \left(\frac{3\lambda_n \beta^2}{128} \right) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Case 2: CCS distribution By Lemma 1, we know $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}] = 1$ with $\varepsilon = 1$. Since $\mathbb{P}[\text{Supp}(\kappa_{in}(\omega, \cdot)) \in [-\nu_{in}(\omega), \nu_{in}(\omega)]] = 1$, we can bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{in,s} [W_{in}^4|\mathcal{F}_n] &= \int x^4 \frac{\exp(sx)}{\int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x)} d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x) \\ &\leq \frac{\nu_{in}^4 \int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x)}{\int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x)} = \nu_{in}^4, \quad \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) = (-1, 1) \end{aligned}$$

almost surely. Thus we have

$$\sup_{s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{in,s} [W_{in}^4|\mathcal{F}_n] \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{in}^4 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad \square$$

H.17 Proof of Lemma 27

Proof of Lemma 27. By conclusion (114) in Lemma 35, we know on the event \mathcal{A} ,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}''(0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[W_{in}^2|\mathcal{F}_n].$$

By Lemma 1, we know $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{A}] = 1$ and together with the condition (12), the claim is true. \square

H.18 Proof of Lemma 28

Proof of Lemma 28. Define

$$A_{in,s} \equiv \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p \exp(sW_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n].$$

Fix any $s_0 \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ and suppose $a_0 \in (1, \varepsilon/|s_0|)$. We have by Hölder's inequality

$$A_{in,s_0} \leq \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[|W_{in}|^{\frac{pa_0}{a_0-1}} | \mathcal{F}_n \right] \right\}^{(a_0-1)/a_0} \left\{ \mathbb{E} [\exp(a_0 s_0 W_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n] \right\}^{1/a_0}.$$

We first show that on the event \mathcal{A} , all the conditional moments for $W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n$ are finite almost surely.

Lemma 36. *On the event \mathcal{A} ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^m | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty, \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By Lemma 36, on the event \mathcal{A} , we have $\mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^{\lceil pa_0/(a_0-1) \rceil} | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty$. We can show $a_0 s_0 < \varepsilon$ so that on the same event, $\mathbb{E}[\exp(a_0 s_0 W_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty$. Therefore we have proved on the event \mathcal{A} ,

$$\mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p \exp(sW_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty, \quad \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon), \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad \forall n, p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

□

H.19 Proof of Lemma 29

Proof of Lemma 29. We first present several auxiliary results.

Auxiliary results:

$$\mathbb{P}[\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n) \leq 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0] \rightarrow 0; \quad (120)$$

$$\mathbb{P}[\lambda_n r_n \leq 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0] \rightarrow 0; \quad (121)$$

$$r_n^2 = 2n(\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n)) = n\hat{s}_n^2 (K_n''(0) + \hat{s}_n O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)); \quad (122)$$

$$\lambda_n^2 = n\hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(\hat{s}_n) = n\hat{s}_n^2 (K_n''(0) + \hat{s}_n O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)). \quad (123)$$

Proofs of Auxiliary results:

Proof of (120) Guaranteed by Lemma 1, we Taylor expand, for $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_n(s) &= K_n(0) + sK_n'(0) + \frac{1}{2}s^2 K_n''(0) + \frac{s^3}{6} K_n'''(0) + \frac{s^4}{24} K_n''''(\bar{s}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}s^2 K_n''(0) + \frac{s^3}{6} K_n'''(0) + \frac{s^4}{24} K_n''''(\bar{s}(s)). \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

where $\bar{s}(s) \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ and the last equality is due to $K_n(0) = 0$ and $K_n'(0) = 0$. Similarly, we obtain for $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} sK_n'(s) &= sK_n'(0) + K_n''(0)s^2 + \frac{s^3}{2} K_n'''(0) + \frac{s^4}{6} K_n''''(\tilde{s}) \\ &= K_n''(0)s^2 + \frac{s^3}{2} K_n'''(0) + \frac{s^4}{6} K_n''''(\tilde{s}(s)) \end{aligned} \quad (125)$$

where $\tilde{s}(s) \in [-s, s] \subset (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$. Then subtracting the expansion (125) from the expansion (124) and setting $s = \hat{s}_n$ since $\hat{s}_n \in [-\varepsilon/2, \varepsilon/2]$, we get

$$\hat{s}_n K'_n(\hat{s}_n) - K_n(\hat{s}_n) = \frac{\hat{s}_n^2}{2} K''_n(0) + \frac{\hat{s}_n^3}{3} K'''_n(0) + \frac{\hat{s}_n^4}{6} \left(K''''_n(\tilde{s}(\hat{s}_n)) - \frac{1}{4} K''''_n(\bar{s}(\hat{s}_n)) \right). \quad (126)$$

Notice (126) is similar to our target but still differs. To account such difference, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n) \\ &= (\hat{s}_n K'_n(\hat{s}_n) - K_n(\hat{s}_n)) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) = w_n) + (\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n)) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) \neq w_n) \\ &= \frac{\hat{s}_n^2}{2} K''_n(0) - \frac{\hat{s}_n^2}{2} K''_n(0) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) \neq w_n) + \frac{\hat{s}_n^3}{3} K'''_n(0) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) = w_n) \\ &\quad + \frac{\hat{s}_n^4}{6} (K''''_n(\tilde{s}(\hat{s}_n)) - K''''_n(\bar{s}(\hat{s}_n))/4) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) = w_n) + (\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n)) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) \neq w_n) \\ &\equiv \frac{\hat{s}_n^2}{2} K''_n(0) + \hat{s}_n^3 M_n \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

where M_n is a random variable that is $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. This is true because the following claims are true:

$$\frac{\hat{s}_n^3}{3} K'''_n(0) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) = w_n) = \hat{s}_n^3 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \quad (128)$$

$$\frac{\hat{s}_n^4}{6} (K''''_n(\tilde{s}(\hat{s}_n)) - K''''_n(\bar{s}(\hat{s}_n))/4) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) = w_n) = \hat{s}_n^3 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \quad (129)$$

$$\frac{\hat{s}_n^2}{2} K''_n(0) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) \neq w_n) = \hat{s}_n^3 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \quad (130)$$

$$(\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n)) \mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) \neq w_n) = \hat{s}_n^3 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (131)$$

Now we prove the claims (128)-(131). For claim (128), by condition (84), we know it is true. For claim (129), from condition (85) and $\tilde{s}(\hat{s}_n), \bar{s}(\hat{s}_n) \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, we have

$$|K''''_n(\tilde{s}(\hat{s}_n))| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1), |K''''_n(\bar{s}(\hat{s}_n))| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Then together with $\hat{s}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ For claim (130), we know it is true since $\mathbb{1}(K'_n(\hat{s}_n) \neq w_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Similar argument applies to (131). Now define the event

$$\mathcal{P}_n \equiv \{\hat{s}_n \neq 0\} \cap \{K''_n(0) \leq -2\hat{s}_n M_n\}. \quad (132)$$

By condition (86), we know there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}[K''_n(0) > \eta] \rightarrow 1$. For such η since $M_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and $\hat{s}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ by Lemma 3, we have $\mathbb{P}[-2\hat{s}_n M_n < \eta] \rightarrow 1$. Together we conclude $\mathbb{P}[K''_n(0) \leq -2\hat{s}_n M_n] \rightarrow 0$. This implies $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{P}_n] \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, on the event \mathcal{P}_n we know $\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n) \leq 0$ and $\hat{s}_n \neq 0$ happen. Therefore we conclude the proof.

Proof of (121) We compute

$$r_n \lambda_n = \begin{cases} |\hat{s}_n| \sqrt{n K''_n(\hat{s}_n)} \sqrt{2n(\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n))} & \text{if } \hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n) \geq 0 \\ |\hat{s}_n| \sqrt{n K''_n(\hat{s}_n)} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 10 implies that $K_n''(\hat{s}_n) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. By (120), we know $\mathbb{P}[\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n) \leq 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0] \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, $K_n''(\hat{s}_n) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ can further imply $\mathbb{P}[K_n''(\hat{s}_n) = 0] \rightarrow 0$. Collecting all these, we reach

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[r_n \lambda_n \leq 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0] &= \mathbb{P}[r_n \lambda_n = 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[\{K_n''(\hat{s}_n) = 0 \text{ or } \hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n) = 0\} \text{ and } \{\hat{s}_n \neq 0\}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}[K_n''(\hat{s}_n) = 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0] + \mathbb{P}[\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n) = 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0] \\ &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of (122) For r_n^2 , we can write, according to (127),

$$r_n^2 = 2n(\hat{s}_n w_n - K_n(\hat{s}_n)) = 2n \left(\frac{1}{2} \hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(0) + \hat{s}_n^3 M_n \right) = n \hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(0) + n \hat{s}_n^3 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \quad (133)$$

Proof of (123) We expand $K_n''(s)$ in the neighborhood $(-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$:

$$K_n''(s) = K_n''(0) + s K_n'''(0) + \frac{s^2}{2} K_n''''(\dot{s}(s)), \quad \dot{s}(s) \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon).$$

Then plugging \hat{s}_n into above formula and observing $K_n''''(\dot{s}(\hat{s}_n)) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ ensured by condition (85) and $\dot{s}(\hat{s}_n) \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_n^2 &= n \hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(\hat{s}_n) = n \hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(0) + n \hat{s}_n^3 K_n'''(0) + n \frac{\hat{s}_n^4}{2} K_n''''(\dot{s}(\hat{s}_n)) \\ &= n \hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(0) + n \hat{s}_n^3 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1). \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

Proof of main results in Lemma 29: Now we come to prove the main results in Lemma 29 using the auxiliary results proved above.

Proof of (87) This can be directly obtained by (122) that

$$\frac{r_n^2}{n} = \hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(0) + \hat{s}_n^3 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

since $\hat{s}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and by condition (83) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$K_n''(0) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{in}''(0) \leq \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (K_{in}''(0))^2 \right)^{1/2} = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Proof of (88) Since $\lambda_n, r_n \in (-\infty, \infty)$, we need to divide the proof into several cases. When $\hat{s}_n = 0$, we know $\lambda_n = r_n = 0$ so that $\lambda_n/r_n = 1$ by convention. Now we consider when $\hat{s}_n \neq 0$.

• **When $\lambda_n r_n \leq 0$:** observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\mathbb{1}(\hat{s}_n \neq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n \leq 0)}{|\hat{s}_n|} \left| \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right| > \delta \right] &\leq \mathbb{P}[\lambda_n r_n \leq 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0] \\ &\rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\mathbb{1}(\hat{s}_n \neq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n \leq 0) \left| \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right| = \hat{s}_n O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

- **When $\lambda_n r_n > 0$:** It requires to compute λ_n^2/r_n^2 . By (133) and (134), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\lambda_n^2}{r_n^2} &= \frac{\hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(0) + \hat{s}_n^3 K_n'''(0) + \frac{\hat{s}_n^4}{2} K_n''''(\dot{s}(\hat{s}_n))}{\hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(0) + \hat{s}_n^3 M_n} \\ &= 1 + \hat{s}_n \frac{K_n'''(0) - \hat{s}_n M_n + \frac{\hat{s}_n}{2} K_n''''(\dot{s}(\hat{s}_n))}{K_n''(0) + \hat{s}_n M_n} \\ &\equiv 1 + \hat{s}_n \cdot F_n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we know

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \lambda_n > 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0) \left(\frac{\lambda_n^2}{r_n^2} - 1 \right) = \mathbb{1}(r_n \lambda_n > 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0) \hat{s}_n \cdot F_n.$$

To further proceed the proof, we observe

$$F_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

since $\hat{s}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, $M_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and conditions (86), (84) and (85) guarantee respectively $K_n''(0) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, $K_n'''(0) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and $K_n''''(\dot{s}(\hat{s}_n)) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}(r_n \lambda_n > 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0) \left| \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right| &\leq \mathbb{1}(r_n \lambda_n > 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0) \left| \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right| \left| \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} + 1 \right| \\ &= \mathbb{1}(r_n \lambda_n > 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0) \left| \frac{\lambda_n^2}{r_n^2} - 1 \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}(r_n \lambda_n > 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n \neq 0) |\hat{s}_n F_n| \\ &= \hat{s}_n O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \end{aligned}$$

Collecting all the results, we have

$$\left| \frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right| = \hat{s}_n O_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Proof of (89) The proof is similar to (88) so we omit the proof.

Proof of (90) When $\hat{s}_n = 0$, we know $\lambda_n = r_n = 0$ so that $1/\lambda_n - 1/r_n = 0$ by the convention $1/0 - 1/0 = 1$. Now we consider the case when $\hat{s}_n \neq 0$. We divide the proof into several cases. By result (88) and claim (134),

$$\left(\frac{1}{r_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right)^2 = \frac{\hat{s}_n^2 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{n \hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(0) + n \hat{s}_n^3 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)} = \frac{O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{n K_n''(0) + n \hat{s}_n O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$$

where the last equality is due to $\hat{s}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and $K_n''(0) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$.

Proof of (91) On the event $r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0$, we know $\hat{s}_n > 0$. Then by (88) and (133) we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}(r_n > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n > 0) \frac{1}{r_n^2} \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right)^2 &= \frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n > 0) \hat{s}_n^2 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{n \hat{s}_n^2 K_n''(0) + n \hat{s}_n^3 O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n > 0) O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}{n K_n''(0) + n \hat{s}_n O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then since $\hat{s}_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ and $K_n''(0) = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, we know

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n > 0) \frac{1}{r_n} \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{r_n} - 1 \right) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Proof of (92) The proof is similar to the proof of (91) so we omit it.

Proof of (93) Since $\mathbb{P}[\hat{s}_n > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n \leq 0] \rightarrow 0$ by (121) and $\text{sgn}(w_n) = \text{sgn}(\hat{s}_n)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[w_n > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n \leq 0] = \mathbb{P}[w_n > 0 \text{ and } \hat{s}_n > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n \leq 0] \rightarrow 0$$

Proof of (94) Since $\mathbb{P}[\hat{s}_n \neq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n \leq 0] \rightarrow 0$ by (121), we have

$$\mathbb{P}[\hat{s}_n \neq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n = 0] \leq \mathbb{P}[\hat{s}_n \neq 0 \text{ and } \lambda_n r_n \leq 0] \rightarrow 0.$$

□

H.20 Proof of Lemma 30

Proof of Lemma 30. We prove the statements (97)-(98) in order.

Proof of (97): It suffices to prove that for any $\kappa > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left[\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \frac{\Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{r_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \right\}}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} \in [0, 1 + \kappa] \right] \\ &\equiv \mathbb{P}[\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) A(r_n, \lambda_n) \in [0, 1 + \kappa]] \\ &\rightarrow 1. \end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

We decompose

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) A(r_n, \lambda_n) = \mathbb{1}(w_n < 0, r_n > 0) A(r_n, \lambda_n) + \mathbb{1}(w_n < 0, r_n \leq 0) A(r_n, \lambda_n).$$

By condition (Sign1), we know $\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0, r_n > 0) = 0$. Moreover, by the statement of (63) in Lemma 13, we know

$$\mathbb{P} \left[1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\} = 0 \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} [|\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0, r_n > 0)A(r_n, \lambda_n)| > \delta] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\} = 0 \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus we know $\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0, r_n > 0)A(r_n, \lambda_n) = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Then we only need to consider behavior of $\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0, r_n \leq 0)A(r_n, \lambda_n)$. Then we know $1 - \Phi(r_n) \geq 1/2$ when $r_n \leq 0$. Then by condition (Rate1), we know

$$|M_n| \equiv \left| \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\} \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Fix $\eta > 0, \delta \in (0, 0.1)$. Then for large enough $n, \mathbb{P}[|M_n| < \delta] \geq 1 - \eta$. Then on the event $|M_n| < \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \frac{\delta}{1 - \delta} = \frac{1}{1 - \delta} - 1 < A(r_n, \lambda_n) &= \frac{1}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} - 1 \quad (136) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2} - \delta} - 1 = 1 + \frac{2\delta}{1 - 2\delta} < 1 + 4\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we know

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} [\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0, r_n \leq 0)A(r_n, \lambda_n) \in [0, 1 + 4\delta]] \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[|M_n| < \delta] > 1 - \eta.$$

Then by the arbitrary choice of η , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} [\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0)A(r_n, \lambda_n) \in [0, 1 + 4\delta]] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} [\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0 \text{ and } r_n \leq 0)A(r_n, \lambda_n) \in [0, 1 + 4\delta]] = 1. \quad (137) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we complete the proof for claim (135) by choosing $\kappa = 4\delta$.

Proof of (98): We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \frac{\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \cdot \frac{\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0)}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \cdot (\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0)A(r_n, \lambda_n) + \mathbb{1}(w_n < 0)) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] \cdot O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is due to the decomposition of $A(r_n, \lambda_n)$ in (136) and the last equality is due to result (137) that $\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0)A(r_n, \lambda_n) = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$. Now applying claim (48) with $y_n = w_n \sqrt{n/K_n''(0)}$, we know

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n \right] = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Therefore we conclude

$$\mathbb{1}(w_n < 0) \frac{\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{in} = w_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n\right]}{1 - \Phi(r_n) + \phi(r_n) \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}} = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

□

H.21 Proof of Lemma 31

By Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p \mid \mathcal{F}_n]}{n} &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p \mid \mathcal{F}_n])^{q/p} \right)^{p/q} n^{1-p/q} \\ &= \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p \mid \mathcal{F}_n])^{q/p}}{n} \right)^{p/q}. \end{aligned}$$

We invoke Jensen's inequality for conditional expectation to conclude the proof.

Lemma 37 (Conditional Jensen inequality, Davidson, 1994, Theorem 10.18). *Let W be a random variable and let ϕ be a convex function, such that W and $\phi(W)$ are integrable. For any σ -algebra \mathcal{F} , we have the inequality*

$$\phi(\mathbb{E}[W \mid \mathcal{F}]) \leq \mathbb{E}[\phi(W) \mid \mathcal{F}].$$

Applying Lemma 37 with $\phi(x) = x^{q/p}$, we obtain

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p \mid \mathcal{F}_n]}{n} \leq \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^p \mid \mathcal{F}_n])^{q/p}}{n} \right)^{p/q} \leq \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^q \mid \mathcal{F}_n]}{n} \right)^{p/q}.$$

H.22 Proof of Lemma 32

Proof of Lemma 32. We apply integration by parts to the following integral on the event $\lambda_n, r_n \in (-\infty, \infty)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n y) \phi(y) dy \\ &= \exp(\lambda_n^2/2) (1 - \Phi(\lambda_n)) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) + \int_{r_n}^{\lambda_n} y \exp(y^2/2) (1 - \Phi(y)) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dy \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) - \int_{r_n}^{\lambda_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} y^2} dy + R_n \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right) + R_n. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

H.23 Proof of Lemma 33

Proof of Lemma 33. We prove the two claims separately.

Proof of (107): We can write (107) as

$$\frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1)}{r_n U_n} = \frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1)}{\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1) r_n \exp(\frac{1}{2} r_n^2) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left\{ \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n} - 1 \right\}}.$$

Notice by (Rate2),

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \frac{r_n}{\lambda_n} - 1 \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

Then it suffices to prove there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1) r_n \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) \geq C \mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1).$$

To prove this, we apply Lemma 20 such that

$$r_n \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{r_n^2}{r_n^2 + 1} \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{when } r_n \geq 1.$$

Thus we have

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1) r_n \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) \geq \frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n \geq 1)}{2}.$$

Therefore we have proved (107).

Proof of (108): Similarly, we can write (108) as

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \in [0, 1]) \frac{1}{U_n} = \frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n \in [0, 1])}{\mathbb{1}(r_n \in [0, 1]) \exp(\frac{1}{2} r_n^2) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right\}}.$$

By (Rate1),

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left| \frac{1}{\lambda_n} - \frac{1}{r_n} \right| = o_{\mathbb{P}}(1).$$

We only need to prove there exists a universal constant $C \geq 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n \in [0, 1]) \exp\left(\frac{r_n^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(r_n)) \geq C \mathbb{1}(r_n \in [0, 1]).$$

Indeed, we can set C to be

$$\inf_{z \in [0, 1]} \exp\left(\frac{z^2}{2}\right) (1 - \Phi(z)).$$

Therefore we proved claim (108). □

H.24 Proof of Lemma 34

Proof of Lemma 34. Using Lemma 32, we obtain for any $\lambda_n, r_n > 0$,

$$\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n y) \phi(y) dy = R_n + U_n \quad (138)$$

almost surely. By statement (63) of Lemma 13, we know $\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0)/U_n \in (-\infty, \infty)$ almost surely and thus $\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0)/U_n \in (-\infty, \infty)$ almost surely. Then multiplying both sides in (138) with $\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0)/U_n$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \frac{\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n y) \phi(y) dy}{U_n} = \mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) (1 + R_n/U_n)$$

almost surely. This implies

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \left| \frac{\int_0^\infty \exp(-\lambda_n y) \phi(y) dy}{U_n} - 1 \right| = \mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \left| \frac{1}{U_n} \right| \cdot |R_n|$$

almost surely. Thus it suffices to bound $\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) |R_n/U_n|$. Define

$$R_{\min} \equiv \min\{r_n, \lambda_n\}, \quad R_{\max} \equiv \max\{r_n, \lambda_n\}.$$

Therefore the absolute value of R_n can be bounded as, using Lemma 19,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) |R_n| \\ &= \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n > 0, r_n > 0) |R_n| \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n > 0, r_n > 0) |r_n - \lambda_n| \sup_{y \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]} \left| y \exp(y^2/2) (1 - \Phi(y)) - \frac{1 - y^{-2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{1}(\lambda_n > 0, r_n > 0) |r_n - \lambda_n| \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sup_{y \in [R_{\min}, R_{\max}]} \frac{1}{y^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{1}(\lambda_n > 0, r_n > 0) |r_n - \lambda_n|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{r_n^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) |R_n| \leq \frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) |r_n - \lambda_n|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{r_n^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \right).$$

Then this implies

$$\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) \left| \frac{R_n}{U_n} \right| \leq \left| \frac{1}{U_n} \right| \cdot \frac{\mathbb{1}(r_n > 0, \lambda_n > 0) |r_n - \lambda_n|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{r_n^2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \right)$$

almost surely. Therefore we complete the proof. \square

H.25 Proof of Lemma 35

Proof of Lemma 35. Then by Lemma 21 and Lemma 28, we have,

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{T}] = 1, \quad \mathcal{T} \equiv \left\{ K'_{in}(s) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_{in} \exp(sW_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n]}, \quad \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \right\}.$$

Then we know,

$$K'_{in}(s)(\omega) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[W_{in} \exp(sW_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n]}{\mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n]}(\omega) = \mathbb{E}_{n,s}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n](\omega), \quad \forall \omega \in \mathcal{T}.$$

so that $\mathbb{P}[K'_{in}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{n,s}[W_{in} | \mathcal{F}_n], \quad \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)] = 1$. The other two claims follow similarly. \square

H.26 Proof of Lemma 36

Proof of Lemma 36. We use the definition of conditional expectation (67) to prove the claim:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[|W_{in}|^m | \mathcal{F}_n]}{m!} |s|^m &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^m}{m!} \int x^m d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x) \\ &= \int \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^m}{m!} x^m d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x) \\ &= \int \exp(sx) d\kappa_{in}(\cdot, x) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is due to Fubini's theorem. Thus we have proved the claim. Then for the inequality $\mathbb{E}[\exp(|sW_{in}|) | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty$, we can bound, on the event \mathcal{A} ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(|sW_{in}|) | \mathcal{F}_n] \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(sW_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n] + \mathbb{E}[\exp(-sW_{in}) | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty, \quad \forall s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon).$$

Thus we have proved the claim. \square