

# BROWNIAN APPROXIMATION OF DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS BY STEIN'S METHOD

JUHO LEPPÄNEN<sup>†</sup>, YUTO NAKAJIMA<sup>†</sup>, AND YUSHI NAKANO<sup>‡</sup>

**ABSTRACT.** We adapt Stein's method of diffusion approximations, developed by Barbour, to the study of chaotic dynamical systems. We establish an error bound in the functional central limit theorem with respect to an integral probability metric of smooth test functions under a functional correlation decay bound. For systems with a sufficiently fast polynomial rate of correlation decay, the error bound is of order  $O(N^{-1/2})$ , under an additional condition on the linear growth of variance. Applications include a family of interval maps with neutral fixed points and unbounded derivatives, and two-dimensional dispersing Sinai billiards.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The functional central limit theorem (FCLT), also known as Donsker's invariance principle [13], asserts that for a sequence  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  of i.i.d. random variables with zero mean and unit variance, the random process

$$W_N(t) = N^{-1/2} \sum_{n=0}^{\lfloor Nt \rfloor - 1} X_n, \quad t \in [0, 1],$$

converges in distribution to a standard Brownian motion  $(Z(t))_{t \in [0,1]}$  with respect to the Skorokhod topology. Barbour [5] observed that Stein's method [42], initially developed for error estimation in the central limit theorem, can be adapted to obtain rates of convergence in the FCLT with respect to integral probability metrics of sufficiently smooth test functions.

Consider an integral probability metric of the form

$$d_{\mathfrak{G}}(\mu_N, \nu) := \sup_{g \in \mathfrak{G}} |\mu_N(g) - \nu(g)|, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathfrak{G}$  is some class of real-valued test functions,  $(\mu_N)_{N \geq 0}$  is a sequence of probability distributions, and  $\nu$  is a known target distribution used to approximate  $\mu_N$ . Here,  $\nu(g)$  denotes the expectation of  $g$  with respect to  $\nu$ . The core idea behind Stein's method can be summarized as follows: to estimate (1), a linear operator  $\mathcal{A}$ , called a Stein operator, together with a class of functions  $\mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{A})$  is constructed such that (a) the identity  $\nu(\mathcal{A}f) = 0$

<sup>†</sup>DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TOKAI UNIVERSITY, KANAGAWA, 259-1292, JAPAN

<sup>‡</sup>GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY, HOKKAIDO, 060-0810, JAPAN

*E-mail addresses:* leppanen.juho.heikki.g@tokai.ac.jp, jhr6676@tokai.ac.jp,

yushi.nakano@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp.

*Key words and phrases.* Stein's method, diffusion approximation, functional central limit theorem, weak invariance principle, dynamical systems.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60F17; 37A05, 37A50.

J. Leppänen and Y. Nakajima were supported by JSPS via the project LEADER. Y. Nakano was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K03188. J. Leppänen would like to thank Mikko Stenlund for helpful correspondence.

holds for each  $f \in \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{A})$ ; and (b) for each  $g \in \mathfrak{G}$ , there exists a solution  $f \in \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{A})$  to the Stein equation

$$\mathcal{A}f(w) = g(w) - \nu(g). \quad (2)$$

Taking expectations reformulates the original problem of estimating (1) into one of estimating  $\sup_{f \in \mathfrak{F}(\mathcal{A})} |\mu_N(\mathcal{A}f)|$ , for which various techniques have been developed in the extensive literature on Stein’s method. For continuous target distributions, these techniques commonly involve Taylor expansions, coupling methods, and Malliavin calculus. A notable feature of Stein’s method, particularly from the viewpoint of applications, is its flexibility in handling various dependence structures including local dependence [7, Chapter 9] and weak dependence [40, Chapter III]. For further background on Stein’s method and its applications in different probabilistic frameworks, we refer the reader to the monographs [7, 36] and the surveys [28, 41].

In the special case where the target distribution  $\nu$  is the Wiener measure, Barbour considered a class of test functions  $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined on the space  $D := D([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$  of càdlàg functions  $w : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  equipped with the sup-norm, where  $g$  is twice Fréchet differentiable with a Lipschitz continuous second derivative and satisfies appropriate growth constraints. To construct a Stein operator  $\mathcal{A}$ , Barbour used Markov generator theory, defining  $\mathcal{A}$  as the infinitesimal generator of a Markov process that solves an SDE with stationary distribution  $\nu$ . Using the transition semigroup associated with  $\mathcal{A}$ , he identified the solution to (2) and analyzed its properties. Employing Taylor expansions in combination with the leave-one-out approach, he derived an error bound of the form

$$|\mathbf{E}[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq CN^{-1/2} \|g\| (\sqrt{\log(N)} + \mathbf{E}[|X_1|^3]), \quad (3)$$

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant and  $\|g\|$  is a suitable norm of  $g$ . Recently, Kasprzak [19] extended Barbour’s results [5] to the approximation of vector-valued processes by multivariate correlated Brownian motion, where the covariance matrices can be non-identity and the approximated process is allowed to have certain dependence structure.

Our aim in this study is to adapt Barbour’s technique to extend error bounds such as (3) to cases where the process  $(X_n)$  is generated by a deterministic dynamical system with good mixing properties. We restrict our considerations to self-normed càdlàg paths  $W_N(t)$  (see (16)) and approximations by the univariate standard Brownian motion, with generalizations (such as those considered in [19]) left for future exploration<sup>1</sup>. Our study is, in spirit, a continuation of previous studies [18, 27] that dealt with Gaussian approximation of dynamical systems using Stein’s method. An observation from Barbour’s work [5] is that, a rate of convergence in Donsker’s theorem follows with little added effort to the Gaussian case, once Stein’s method for Brownian approximations has been properly set up. Based on results from the present study and those in [18, 27], we find that this observation continues to hold for a broad class of chaotic dynamical systems.

The problem of estimating the rate of convergence in FCLTs for dynamical systems has been addressed before, with martingale approximations as the primary technique [2, 17, 29, 30, 37]. Antoniou and Melbourne [2] derived convergence rates in the FCLT for both uniformly and nonuniformly expanding/hyperbolic dynamical systems with respect to the Prokhorov metric. For systems modeled by Young towers with exponential tails of return times, including planar periodic dispersing billiards and unimodal maps satisfying the Collet–Eckmann condition, their method yields rates of order  $O(N^{-1/4+\delta})$  where  $\delta > 0$  is arbitrarily small. In the case of Young towers with polynomial tails of return times, the obtained rates depend on the “degree of nonuniformity”. In a setting similar to

---

<sup>1</sup>This choice allows us to use the definition of the Stein equation from [5] without modification.

[2], Liu and Wang [29] derived rates for the Wasserstein- $p$  metrics, and Paviato [37] established rates in multidimensional FCLTs with respect to Prokhorov and Wasserstein-1 metrics, obtaining also certain improvements over the rates in [2, 29]. In [30], Liu and Wang obtained nearly optimal rates for Wasserstein- $p$  metrics in the FCLT for uniformly expanding nonautonomous dynamical systems described by concatenations  $T_n \circ \dots \circ T_1$  of varying maps  $T_i : X \rightarrow X$ , such as those in the setting of Conze and Raugi [11].

The primary contribution of our work is the method, which, under certain weak dependence criteria (see Definition 2.7) called functional correlation bounds, yields an error bound in a self-normed FCLT with respect to an integral probability metric of smooth test functions as in (1). The error bound decays at the rate  $O(N^{-1/2})$  provided that the decay rate of functional correlations associated to separately Lipschitz functions has a finite first moment, and that the variance of the partial sum  $\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} X_n$  grows linearly as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . We consider two types of applications: (1) stationary processes of the form  $X_n = f \circ T^n$  with  $T^n = T^{n-1} \circ T$ , where  $T : M \rightarrow M$  is a measure-preserving transformation of a probability space  $(M, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  and  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a suitably regular observable; and (2) nonstationary processes of the form  $X_n = f_n \circ T_n \circ \dots \circ T_1$ , where  $(T_n)$  is a deterministic/random sequence of transformations and  $(f_n)$  is a sequence of regular observables.

Prior to our work, Fleming [16] addressed the problem of estimating the rate of convergence in the FCLT for ergodic measure-preserving transformations satisfying weak dependence criteria also called functional correlation bounds, which are closely related yet different from those considered here (compare [16, Definition 3.2.2] with (FCB)). Using an approach based on Bernstein's blocking technique, he derived error bounds in the multivariate FCLT with respect to the Wasserstein-1 metric, at best of order  $O(N^{-1/4+\delta})$ , where the rate of convergence depends on the decay rate of the functional correlation bounds.

Previously, functional correlation bounds were derived in [24, 26, 27] for piecewise uniformly expanding interval maps, maps with neutral fixed points as in the Pomeau–Manneville scenario [39], and a class of dispersing Sinai billiards. By combining these bounds with our abstract theorem (Theorem 2.10), we deduce new error bounds in FCLTs satisfied by these systems. Additionally, we analyze an interval map  $T : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  introduced by Pikovsky [38], which features two neutral fixed points and an unbounded derivative. The neutrality of the fixed points and the degree of the singularity are governed by a single parameter  $\gamma \in (1, \infty)$ . By [10, 12], this map admits a Young tower with a first return map whose tails decay at the rate  $O(n^{-1/(\gamma-1)})$ . An immediate consequence (see e.g. [2, 32]) is that, for  $\gamma < 2$ , the process  $X_n = f \circ T^n$  where  $f$  is Lipschitz continuous satisfies the FCLT. We prove that  $(X_n)$  satisfies a functional correlation bound with a polynomial rate that matches the decay rate of usual auto-correlations from [12]. This leads to new error bounds in the FCLT for a certain range of parameters.

**Structure of the Paper.** In Section 2, we present our main result (Theorem 2.10) concerning the rate of convergence in the FCLT with respect to an integral probability metric of smooth test functions for sequences of uniformly bounded real-valued random variables. The proof, given in Section 5 and Appendix A, relies on Barbour's method [5] which is reviewed in Section 4. Our hypothesis, similar to [18, 27], is a functional correlation bound with a sufficiently fast polynomial rate of decay. Examples of dynamical systems that satisfy such bounds are discussed in Section 3. For the intermittent map of Pikovsky [38], we prove a polynomial functional correlation bound in Section 6.

## 2. ABSTRACT THEOREM

**2.1. Spaces of test functions  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$ , and  $\mathcal{M}_0$ .** Denote by  $D$  the space of all càdlàg functions  $w : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  equipped with the sup-norm  $\|w\|_\infty = \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |w(t)|$ . Given a function  $f : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , by  $f^{(k)}$  we mean the  $k$ th Fréchet derivative of  $f$ , which is a map  $f^{(k)} : D \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(D^k, \mathbb{R})$  from  $D$  to the space  $\mathcal{L}(D^k, \mathbb{R})$  of all continuous multilinear maps from  $D^k$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . The  $k$ -linear norm of  $A \in \mathcal{L}(D^k, \mathbb{R})$  is defined by

$$\|A\| = \sup_{\|w_i\|_\infty \leq 1 \forall i=1, \dots, k} |A[w_1, \dots, w_k]|,$$

where  $A[w_1, \dots, w_k]$  denotes  $A$  applied to the arguments  $w_1, \dots, w_k \in D$ .

Following [5], let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the Banach space of all continuous functions  $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  for which the norm

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{L}} := \sup_{w \in D} \frac{|g(w)|}{1 + \|w\|_\infty^3}$$

is finite. Let  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{L}$  be the subcollection of all twice Fréchet differentiable functions  $g \in \mathcal{L}$  that satisfy

$$\sup_{w, h \in D, h \neq 0} \frac{\|g''(w+h) - g''(w)\|}{\|h\|_\infty} < \infty. \quad (4)$$

A norm on  $\mathcal{M}$  can be defined as follows:

**Proposition 2.1** (See equation (2.7) in [5]). *For every  $g \in \mathcal{M}$ , define*

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} &= \sup_{w \in D} \frac{|g(w)|}{1 + \|w\|_\infty^3} + \sup_{w \in D} \frac{\|g'(w)\|}{1 + \|w\|_\infty^2} + \sup_{w \in D} \frac{\|g''(w)\|^2}{1 + \|w\|_\infty} \\ &\quad + \sup_{w, h \in D} \frac{\|g''(w+h) - g''(w)\|}{\|h\|_\infty} \end{aligned}$$

*Then, for all  $g \in \mathcal{M}$ , we have  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} < \infty$ .*

*Remark 2.2.* For a test function  $g \in \mathcal{M}$ , the solution  $\phi(g)$  to the Stein equation (SE), described in Section 4, satisfies  $\phi(g) \in \mathcal{M}$ ; see Lemma 4.3.

To facilitate the adaptation of Stein's method suitable for for Brownian approximations of dynamical systems, an additional regularity assumption is imposed on  $g \in \mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_0 = \mathcal{M}_0(C_0) \subset \mathcal{M}$  consist of all  $g \in \mathcal{M}$  that satisfy the following smoothness condition:

$$\sup_{w \in D} |g''(w)[J_r, J_s - J_t]| \leq C_0 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} |t - s|^{1/2} \quad \forall r, s, t \in [0, 1], \quad (5)$$

where

$$J_\alpha(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } t \geq \alpha, \\ 0, & \text{if } t < \alpha. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

*Remark 2.3.* Condition (5) is used in two places: Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 5.2. For Lemma 4.2, which concerns the definition of the Stein operator  $\mathcal{A}$ , the following weaker condition suffices:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 g''(w)[J_{[nt]/n}^{(2)}] dt = \int_0^1 g''(w)[J_t^{(2)}] dt \quad \forall w \in D.$$

The formulation of (5) is specifically tailored for Proposition 5.2, which is instrumental for obtaining the error bound in Theorem 2.10. Various relaxations of (5), such as weakening the modulus of continuity  $|t - s|^{1/2}$  or allowing  $|g''(w)[J_r, J_s - J_t]|$  to grow with  $\|w\|_\infty$

could be considered. However, these would affect the error bounds in Theorem 2.10 and the rates of convergence in the FCLTs discussed in Section 3.

*Example 2.4.* The collection  $\mathcal{M}$  contains functions of the form

$$g(w) = \int_0^1 \kappa(t, w(t)) dm(t)$$

where  $\kappa : [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a measurable function such that  $\kappa(t, \cdot) \in C^2$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\kappa(t, 0)| + \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\partial_2 \kappa(t, 0)| + \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\partial_2^2 \kappa(t, 0)| &\leq C_\kappa, \\ \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} |\partial_2^2 \kappa(t, x) - \partial_2^2 \kappa(t, y)| &\leq C_\kappa |x - y| \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and  $m$  is a probability measure on  $[0, 1]$ . If we further require that

$$m([t, s]) \leq C_m |t - s|^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{t \in [0, 1], x \in \mathbb{R}} |\partial_2^2 \kappa(t, x)| \leq C'_\kappa,$$

then  $\mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$  contains  $g$  for  $C_0 = 2C_m C'_\kappa$ . Indeed, the second Fréchet derivative of  $g$  is given by

$$g''(w)[h_1, h_2] = \int_0^1 \partial_2^2 \kappa(t, w(t)) h_1(t) h_2(t) dm(t).$$

Therefore,

$$|g''(w)[J_r, J_s - J_t]| \leq C'_\kappa m([s, t]) \leq C'_\kappa C_m |t - s|^{1/2} \leq \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} 2C'_\kappa C_m |t - s|^{1/2}.$$

*Example 2.5.* For  $t, s \in [0, 1]$ , the following function, which can be used to identify the covariance structure of the limiting process in the FCLT, belongs to  $\mathcal{M}$ :

$$g(w) = w(t)w(s).$$

However,  $g$  does not belong to  $\mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$  for any  $C_0$ , as it does not satisfy (5). On the other hand,  $\mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$  for suitably large  $C_0 = C_0(\varepsilon)$  does contain the following smooth approximation of  $g$ :

$$g_\varepsilon(w) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 K_\varepsilon(t - u) K_\varepsilon(s - v) w(u) w(v) dudv,$$

where  $K(x) = (2\pi)^{-1/2} e^{-x^2/2}$  is a Gaussian kernel and  $K_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-1} K(x/\varepsilon)$ . The second Fréchet derivative of  $g_\varepsilon$  is

$$g''_\varepsilon(w)[h_1, h_2] = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 K_\varepsilon(t - u) K_\varepsilon(s - v) h_1(u) h_2(v) dudv.$$

An elementary computation yields

$$|g''_\varepsilon(w)[J_r, J_s - J_t]| \leq C_\varepsilon \|g_\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{M}} |s - t|$$

for some constant  $C_\varepsilon > 0$  depending on  $\varepsilon$ .

**2.2. Functional correlation bound.** Let  $X_0, \dots, X_{N-1}$ ,  $N \geq 1$ , be real-valued random variables defined on a probability space  $(M, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  such that

$$\|X_n\|_\infty \leq L \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(X_n) = 0, \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq n < N, \quad (7)$$

for some constant  $L > 0$ , where  $\mu(X_n)$  denotes the expectation of  $X_n$  with respect to  $\mu^2$ . For a finite non-empty subset

$$I = \{i_1, \dots, i_n\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+ \cap [0, N - 1]$$

---

<sup>2</sup>The assumption  $\mu(X_n) = 0$  will not be restrictive because  $\mu(\tilde{X}_n) = 0$  holds for  $\tilde{X}_n := X_n - \mu(X_n)$  and  $X_n$  is integrable by the other assumption  $\|X_n\|_\infty \leq L$ .

of indices  $i_1 < \dots < i_n$ , we denote by  $\nu_I$  the joint distribution of the subsequence  $(X_i)_{i \in I}$ . That is,  $\nu_I$  is a probability measure on  $[-L, L]^n$  characterized by the identity

$$\int_{[-L, L]^n} h d\nu_I = \int_M h(X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_n}) d\mu$$

for bounded measurable  $h : [-L, L]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . In what follows, we consider unions  $I = \cup_{1 \leq k \leq K} I_k$  of index sets  $I_k = \{i_{p_{k-1}+1}, \dots, i_{p_k}\}$  with  $i_{p_{k-1}+1} < \dots < i_{p_k}$ . We will always assume that the sets are disjoint and ordered, in the sense that the gap between  $I_k$  and  $I_{k+1}$  satisfies

$$g_k = i_{p_{k+1}} - i_{p_k} > 0 \quad \forall k = 1, \dots, K-1.$$

For brevity, we shall henceforth write  $I_1 < \dots < I_K$  to express these conventions.

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $\vartheta \in (0, 1]$ . Given a function  $F : [-L, L]^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , where  $k \geq 1$ , we define

$$[F]_{\vartheta} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sup_{x \in [-L, L]^k} \sup_{a \neq a'} \frac{|F(x(a/i)) - F(x(a'/i))|}{|a - a'|^{\vartheta}}.$$

Here,  $x(a/i) \in [-L, L]^k$  denotes the vector obtained from  $x \in [-L, L]^k$  by replacing the  $i$ th component  $x_i$  with  $a \in [-L, L]$ . We say that  $F$  is separately Hölder continuous with exponent  $\vartheta$  if  $[F]_{\vartheta} < \infty$ , and we define  $\|F\|_{\vartheta} = \|F\|_{\infty} + [F]_{\vartheta}$ . Moreover, if  $[F]_{\vartheta} < \infty$  holds with  $\vartheta = 1$ , we say that  $F$  is separately Lipschitz continuous and write  $\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} = \|F\|_1$ .

**Definition 2.7.** We say that  $(X_n)_{0 \leq n < N}$  satisfies a functional correlation bound with rate function  $R : \{1, 2, \dots\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and constant  $C_*$ , if the following holds. Whenever  $I \subset \mathbb{Z}_+ \cap [0, N-1]$  and  $I_1 < I_2$  are such that  $I = I_1 \cup I_2$ , and  $F : [-L, L]^{|I|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a separately Lipschitz continuous function,

$$\left| \int F d\nu_I - \int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_2}) \right| \leq C_* \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} R(g_1). \quad (\text{FCB})$$

By induction, (FCB) readily extends to the case of  $K$  index sets ( $K-1$  gaps) as follows.

**Proposition 2.8.** If  $(X_n)_{0 \leq n < N}$  satisfies the functional correlation bound with rate function  $R : \{1, 2, \dots\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and constant  $C_*$ , then the following holds for all  $K \geq 2$ : Whenever  $I \subset \mathbb{Z}_+ \cap [0, N-1]$  and  $I_1 < \dots < I_K$  are such that  $I = \cup_{k=1}^K I_k$ , and  $F : [-L, L]^{|I|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a separately Lipschitz continuous function,

$$\left| \int F d\nu_I - \int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \nu_{I_K}) \right| \leq C_* \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} R(g_k). \quad (\text{FCB}')$$

*Proof.* This is done by induction with respect to  $K \geq 2$ . The base case  $K = 2$  is given by the assumption that (FCB) holds. We now suppose that (FCB') holds for  $K-1$  where  $K > 2$ . Since (FCB) holds for  $K = 2$ , we have

$$\left| \int F d\nu_I - \int F d(\nu_{\cup_{i=1}^{K-1} I_i} \otimes \nu_{I_K}) \right| \leq C_* \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} R(g_{K-1}). \quad (8)$$

Note that

$$\int F d(\nu_{\cup_{i=1}^{K-1} I_i} \otimes \nu_{I_K}) = \int \tilde{F} d\nu_{\cup_{i=1}^{K-1} I_i},$$

where  $\tilde{F} : [-L, L]^{|I|-|I_K|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined by

$$\tilde{F}(y_1, \dots, y_{p_{K-1}}) = \int_M F(y_1, \dots, y_{p_{K-1}}, X_{i_{p_{K-1}+1}}(x_K), \dots, X_{i_{p_K}}(x_K)) d\mu(x_K).$$

Since  $\tilde{F}$  is separately Lipschitz continuous with

$$\|\tilde{F}\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq \|F\|_{\text{Lip}},$$

it follows from the induction hypothesis that

$$\left| \int \tilde{F} d\nu_{\cup_{i=1}^{K-1} I_i} - \int \tilde{F} d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \nu_{I_{K-1}}) \right| \leq C_* \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \sum_{i=1}^{K-2} R(g_i). \quad (9)$$

Combining (8) and (9) yields (FCB') for  $K$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 2.9.* Correlation decay conditions such as (FCB) arise quite naturally in applications of Stein's method to distributional approximations of dynamical systems. Let us illustrate this in the context of normal approximations. In the case of the standard normal distribution  $N(0, 1)$ , the Stein equation is given by

$$f'(w) - wf(w) = h(w) - \Phi(h), \quad (10)$$

where  $\Phi(h)$  denotes the expectation of  $h$  with respect to  $N(0, 1)$ . Let  $(T, M, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$  be a measure-preserving transformation, and let  $\varphi : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a bounded measurable observable with  $\mu(\varphi) = 0$ . Consider the partial sum  $V = b^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} X_n$ , where  $X_n = \varphi \circ T^n$ ,  $b = \sqrt{\text{Var}_\mu(V)}$ , and it is assumed that  $b > 0$ . Here,  $T^n = T \circ T^{n-1}$  with  $T^0$  being the identity map. Solving (10) for a given test function  $h$  and taking expectations, we have that

$$|\mu[h(V)] - \Phi(h)| \leq |\mu[f'(V) - Vf(V)]|.$$

It is well known (see [7]) that for a Lipschitz continuous  $h$ , the solution  $f$  to (10) has bounded derivatives up to second order. Introducing the punctured sums  $V_{n,K} := \sum_{0 \leq i < N, |i-n| > K} X_i$ , we can decompose  $\mu[f'(V) - Vf(V)]$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu[Vf(V) - f'(V)] \\ &= b^{-1} \mu \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} X_n (f(V) - f(V_{n,K}) - f'(V)(V - V_{n,K})) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$+ \mu \left[ \left( b^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{0 \leq m < N, |n-m| \leq K} X_n X_m - 1 \right) f'(V) \right] \quad (12)$$

$$+ b^{-1} \mu \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} X_n f(V_{n,K}) \right). \quad (13)$$

Controlling (11) and (12) involves Taylor expansions, along with mixing properties of the dynamics. For simplicity, let us focus on (13). Observe that, if  $(X_n)$  in (13) is replaced with a sequence of centered and independent random variables, then (13) vanishes as soon as  $K \geq 1$ . However, for a dependent sequence, (13) can be large. Using  $\mu(X_n) = \mu(\varphi) = 0$ , we can write

$$\mu(X_n f(V_{n,K})) = \int F d\nu_I - \int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_2} \otimes \nu_{I_3}),$$

where  $I = \cup_{i=1}^3 I_i$  with

$$I_1 = \{0 \leq i < N : i < n - K\}, \quad I_2 = \{n\}, \quad I_3 = \{0 \leq i < N : i > n + K\},$$

and  $F : [-\|\varphi\|_\infty, \|\varphi\|_\infty]^{|I|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a separately Lipschitz continuous function with  $\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq C \|\varphi\|_\infty \|f\|_{\text{Lip}}$  for some absolute constant  $C > 0$ . Assuming (FCB'), we find that

$$|(13)| \leq Nb^{-1} C_* \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} 2R(K+1) \leq Nb^{-1} C C_* \|\varphi\|_\infty \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} 2R(K+1),$$

where it is natural to expect that  $R(n)$  decays rapidly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  if  $T$  is a suitably chaotic dynamical system and  $\varphi$  is sufficiently regular.

**2.3. Main result: Brownian approximation under (FCB).** Let  $X_0, \dots, X_{N-1}$  be real-valued random variables as in (7). Define the following quantities:

$$\sigma_{i,j} = \mu(X_i X_j), \quad \beta_i = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{i,j}, \quad B_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \beta_i = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{i,j},$$

where we adopt the conventions  $\beta_0 = B_0 = 0$ . Note that

$$B := B_N = \text{Var}_\mu \left( \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} X_i \right). \quad (14)$$

We assume that  $B > 0$ . As noted in Section 3, in the case that  $X_n$  is generated by a chaotic dynamical system, it typically holds that

$$\inf_{N \geq N_0} \tilde{B} > 0, \quad \tilde{B} := B/N$$

with some integer  $N_0$ .

For  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $0 \leq n < N$ , let

$$\theta_n(t) = J_{B_n/B}(t), \quad (15)$$

and define a random element  $S_N \in D$  by

$$S_N(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \theta_n(t) X_n = \sum_{n=0}^{\kappa(t)} X_n,$$

where  $\kappa(t) = \max\{0 \leq i < N : B_i/B \leq t\}$ .

Let  $Z$  be a standard Brownian motion. By adapting Barbour's approach [5], we establish the following error bound in approximating the law of

$$W_N = B^{-1/2} S_N \quad (16)$$

by the law of  $Z$  with respect to an integral probability metric of smooth test functions.

**Theorem 2.10.** *Assume that  $(X_n)_{0 \leq n < N}$  satisfies the functional correlation bound (FCB) with rate function  $R$  and constant  $C_*$ . Then, for any  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$ ,*

$$|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq CC_N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-3/2} N = CC_N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{B}^{-3/2} N^{-1/2}, \quad (17)$$

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant,

$$C_N = L^3 + (C_* + 1)(L + 1)^3 \hat{R}_3(N) + C_0 L^3 C_*^{3/2} \hat{R}_1(N)^{1/2} (\hat{R}_1(N) + \hat{R}_2(N)),$$

and

$$\hat{R}_1(N) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \hat{R}(j), \quad \hat{R}_2(N) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} j^{1/2} \hat{R}(j), \quad \hat{R}_3(N) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} j \hat{R}(j)$$

with  $\hat{R}(n) = \max_{n \leq j \leq N} R(j)$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

*Remark 2.11.* Notice that,

$$C_N \leq C(C_0 + 1)(C_* + 1)^{3/2} (L + 1)^3 (1 + \hat{R}_1(N))^{3/2} (1 + \hat{R}_3(N))$$

where  $C$  is an absolute constant and  $\hat{R}_1(N) \leq \hat{R}(0) + \hat{R}_3(N)$ . Hence, if  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is a sequence of real-valued random variables such that, for all  $N \geq 1$ , (FCB) holds with a rate function  $R$  that satisfies  $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m \hat{R}(m) < \infty$ , and if  $B^{-1/2} = O(N^{-1/2})$ , then we obtain  $|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| = O(N^{-1/2})$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0$ .



*Remark 2.12.* We will establish (17) under a set of correlation decay conditions weaker than (FCB). Specifically, Theorem 5.1 shows that, to obtain (17) for a particular test function  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0$ , it suffices to verify (FCB) for a subclass of separately Lipschitz functions associated with  $g$ . However, the expressions for the functions in this subclass are complicated, resulting in conditions that are seemingly more technical than (FCB).

*Remark 2.13.* Although the family of test functions  $\mathcal{M}_0$  is significantly smaller than the collection of all bounded Skorohod-continuous functions, it is known that a sufficiently fast decay of  $|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]|$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0$  implies weak convergence of  $(W_N)$  to  $Z$  in the usual sense. More precisely, let

$$\tau_N = C_N B^{-3/2} N,$$

where  $C_N$  is as in Theorem 2.10. Then, the conclusion of Theorem 2.10 can be expressed as

$$|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq C \tau_N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}}.$$

Assume that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tau_N (\log r_N)^2 = 0, \quad (18)$$

where  $r_N > 0$  are such that the intervals of constancy of  $S_N(t)$  are of length at least  $r_N$ . If  $\{B_{\varphi(i)}/B\}_{i=0}^N$  is a reordering of  $\{B_i/B\}_{i=0}^N$  into an increasing sequence, then  $r_N$  can be chosen as

$$r_N = \frac{\min\{|B_{\varphi(i+1)} - B_{\varphi(i)}| : |B_{\varphi(i+1)} - B_{\varphi(i)}| > 0, 0 \leq i < N\}}{B}.$$

Theorem 2 in [5] ensures that, under (18), there exist two sequences of random elements  $(\hat{W}_N)$  and  $(\hat{Z}_N)$  defined on the same probability space, such that  $\hat{W}_N \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} W_N$ ,  $\hat{Z}_N \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} Z$ , and  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{W}_N - \hat{Z}_N\|_{\infty} = 0$  almost surely.

### 3. APPLICATIONS

In this section, we apply Theorem 2.10 to four concrete examples of dynamical systems: (1) Pikovsky maps, (2) Liverani–Saussol–Vaienti maps, (3) Lasota–Yorke maps, and (4) dispersing Sinai billiards. Among these, our primary contribution lies in establishing a functional correlation bound for Pikovsky maps, which is done in Section 6. For the other models, Theorem 2.10 is directly applicable due to functional correlation bounds that have already been established in prior works: [24] for model (2), [27] for model (3), and [26] for model (4). Additionally, for models (2) and (3), we give results for nonautonomous compositions – sequential compositions for (2) and random compositions for (3) – these cases also follow directly from earlier results.

**3.1. Application 1: Pikovsky maps.** Following [38], for  $\gamma > 1$ , let  $T : M \rightarrow M$  be a map on  $M = [-1, 1]$  with graph as in Figure 1, defined implicitly by the relations

$$x = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2^\gamma}(1 + T(x))^\gamma, & 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2^\gamma}, \\ T(x) + \frac{1}{2^\gamma}(1 - T(x))^\gamma, & \frac{1}{2^\gamma} \leq x \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

and by letting  $T(x) = -T(-x)$  for  $x \in [-1, 0]$ . The map has neutral fixed points at  $x = 1, -1$ , while at  $x = 0$  its derivative becomes infinite. The parameter  $\gamma > 1$  controls

both the neutrality of the fixed points and the degree of the singularity:

$$\begin{aligned} T'(x) &\approx C_\gamma x^{1/\gamma-1} \quad \text{as } x \downarrow 0, \\ T'(x) &\approx 1 + \frac{1}{2}(1-x)^{\gamma-1} \quad \text{as } x \uparrow 1, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_\gamma > 0$  is a constant depending on  $\gamma$ , and  $A \approx B$  indicates  $A/B \rightarrow 1$ . Note that  $T$  reduces to the angle doubling map at the limit  $\gamma \downarrow 1$ .




FIGURE 1. Graph of the Pikovsky map (19)

Let  $\lambda$  denote the Lebesgue measure on  $M$  normalized to probability. It follows from (19) that the transfer operator  $\mathcal{L}_T : L^1(\lambda) \rightarrow L^1(\lambda)$  associated with  $(T, \lambda)$ , defined by the duality relation

$$\int_0^1 g \circ T \cdot f \, d\lambda = \int_0^1 g \cdot \mathcal{L}_T(f) \, d\lambda \quad \forall f \in L^1(\lambda), \forall g \in L^\infty(\lambda),$$

fixes the constant function 1, so that  $\lambda$  is invariant under  $T$ . (For properties of transfer operators of non-singular measurable maps, we refer to [3, 4].) Given a function  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define

$$X_n = f \circ T^n,$$

where  $T^n = T^{n-1} \circ T$  for  $n \geq 1$  and  $T^0$  is the identity map. We consider  $(X_n)$  as a random process on  $(M, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel sets and  $\mu = \lambda$ . By [12, Proposition 5], we have

$$\mu(f \cdot f \circ T^n) - \mu(f) \cdot \mu(f) = O(n^{-1/(\gamma-1)}), \quad (20)$$

whenever  $f$  is Hölder continuous. By [12, Proposition 7],  $(X_n)$  satisfies a central limit theorem if  $\gamma < 2$ , and the associated FCLT follows from [10, 12, 32].

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\gamma > 1$ , and let  $f$  be Lipschitz continuous. Then, for all  $N \geq 1$ , (FCB) holds with*

$$C_* = (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + 1)C_\gamma, \quad R(n) = n^{-1/(\gamma-1)},$$

where  $C_\gamma$  is a constant depending only on  $\gamma$ .

We postpone proving Lemma 3.1 until Section 6 and proceed to describe an application of Theorem 2.10. The quantities  $W_N$ ,  $B$ , and  $Z$  appearing below are defined as in Section 2.3.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Assume that  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz continuous with  $\mu(f) = 0$ . If  $\gamma < 2$  and  $f$  is not a coboundary<sup>3</sup>, there exists  $N_0 \geq 1$  such that  $\tilde{B} := \inf_{N \geq N_0} N^{-1} B_N > 0$ . Moreover, for any  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$  and  $N \geq N_0$ ,*

$$|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq CC_\# \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} (\rho_\gamma(N) + 1) \tilde{B}^{-3/2} N^{-1/2},$$

<sup>3</sup>We say that  $f$  is a coboundary if there exists  $g \in L^2(\mu)$  such that  $f = g - g \circ T$ . It is known that for expanding maps  $T$ , the non-coboundary condition is a generic condition (cf. [33]).

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant,

$$C_{\#} = (C_0 + 1)(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{2-\gamma})^{3/2}(C_{\gamma} + 1)^{3/2}(\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + 1)^{9/2}$$

with  $C_{\gamma}$  is as in Lemma 3.2, and

$$\rho_{\gamma}(N) = \begin{cases} 1 - c_{\gamma}^{-1} & (\gamma < 3/2) \\ 1 + \log N & (\gamma = 3/2) \\ 1 + c_{\gamma}^{-1}N^{c_{\gamma}} & (\gamma > 3/2) \end{cases}$$

with  $c_{\gamma} = (2\gamma - 3)/(\gamma - 1)$ . In particular,  $|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]|$  converges to zero as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  when  $\gamma < 5/3$ .

*Proof.* By (20),  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\mu(f \cdot f \circ T^n)| < \infty$  if  $\gamma < 2$ . It is then standard that, if  $f$  is not a coboundary,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1}B_N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1}\text{Var}_{\mu}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} X_n\right) = \mu(f^2) + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(f \cdot f \circ T^n) > 0.$$

Therefore,  $\tilde{B} > 0$  for a sufficiently large  $N_0$ . For  $N \geq N_0$ , an application of Theorem 2.10 combined with Lemma 3.1 yields the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \\ & \leq CC_{\#}\|g\|_{\mathcal{M}}(1 + \hat{R}_3(N))(1 + \hat{R}_1(N))^{3/2}\|g\|_{\mathcal{M}}\tilde{B}^{-3/2}N^{-1/2} \\ & \leq CC_{\#}\|g\|_{\mathcal{M}}\left(1 + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} n^{-1/(\gamma-1)}\right)^{3/2}\left(1 + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} n^{1-1/(\gamma-1)}\right)\|g\|_{\mathcal{M}}\tilde{B}^{-3/2}N^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Further,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n^{1-1/(\gamma-1)} \leq \begin{cases} 1 + (\gamma - 1)/(3 - 2\gamma) & (\gamma < 3/2) \\ 1 + \log N & (\gamma = 3/2) \\ 1 - (\gamma - 1)/(3 - 2\gamma)N^{2-1/(\gamma-1)} & (\gamma > 3/2), \end{cases}$$

and  $\sum_{n=1}^{N-1} n^{-1/(\gamma-1)} \leq 1 + (\gamma - 1)/(2 - \gamma)$ .  $\square$

**3.2. Application 2: (Non)autonomous Liverani–Saussol–Vaienti maps.** For  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , consider the map  $T : M \rightarrow M$  on  $M = [0, 1]$  defined by

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} x(1 + 2^{\alpha}x^{\alpha}) & x \in [0, 1/2), \\ 2x - 1 & x \in [1/2, 1]. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Let  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  and  $a_{\beta} > 2^{\beta}(\beta + 2)$ . Following [31], we define the convex and closed cone

$$\mathcal{C}_{*}(\beta) = \{f \in C((0, 1]) \cap L^1(\lambda) : f \geq 0, f \text{ decreasing,} \\ x^{\beta+1}f \text{ increasing, } f(x) \leq a_{\beta}x^{-\beta}\lambda(f)\},$$

where  $\lambda$  denotes the Lebesgue measure on  $M$ . It follows from [1, 31] that  $\mathcal{C}_{*}(\beta)$  contains densities of invariant absolutely continuous probability measures for maps (21) with parameters  $\alpha \in (0, \beta]$ .

3.2.1. *Nonautonomous compositions.* We begin by giving a result for nonautonomous compositions of maps in (21) with time-dependent parameters. From this, we deduce a corresponding result for conventional measure preserving systems. We suppose that  $T_1, T_2, \dots$  are maps in (21) with corresponding parameters  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$ , and that  $f_n : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are functions such that:

$$\alpha_* := \sup_{n \geq 1} \alpha_n < 1/2, \quad \sup_{n \geq 1} \|f_n\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq L, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(f_n \circ T_n \circ \dots \circ T_1) = 0 \quad \forall n \geq 0, \quad (22)$$

where  $\mu$  is a probability measure whose density belongs to  $\mathcal{C}_*(\alpha_*)$ . We define

$$X_n = f_n \circ T_{1,n}, \quad T_{1,n} = T_n \circ \dots \circ T_1, \quad (23)$$

and consider  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  as a random process on  $(M, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ . Central limit theorems and associated weak/strong invariance principles for nonstationary processes generated by intermittent maps have been studied in several previous works including [25, 34, 35, 44]. Here, we complement these results by providing an error bound in a self-normed FCLT.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Assume (22). Then, for all  $N \geq 1$ , (FCB) holds with*

$$C_* = C_{\alpha_*}(L + 1), \quad R(n) = \begin{cases} n^{1-1/\alpha_*} (\log n)^{1/\alpha_*}, & \text{if } n \geq 2, \\ 1, & \text{if } n = 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $C_{\alpha_*} > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $\alpha_*$ .

*Proof.* Let  $F, I, I_1, I_2$  be as in Definition 2.7. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int F d\nu_I - \int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_2}) \\ &= \int_M F(X_{i_1}(x), \dots, X_{i_n}(x)) d\mu(x) \\ & - \iint_{M^2} F(X_{i_1}(x), \dots, X_{i_{p_1}}(x), X_{i_{p_1+1}}(y), \dots, X_{i_n}(y)) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_M \tilde{F}(T_{1,i_1}(x), \dots, T_{1,i_n}(x)) d\mu(x) \\ & - \iint_{M^2} \tilde{F}(T_{1,i_1}(x), \dots, T_{1,i_{p_1}}(x), T_{1,i_{p_1+1}}(y), \dots, T_{1,i_n}(y)) d\mu(x) d\mu(y), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where

$$\tilde{F}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = F(f_{i_1}(x_1), \dots, f_{i_n}(x_n)).$$

Since  $\|\tilde{F}\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}(L + 1)$ , (FCB) corresponds to a special case of [24, Theorem 1.1], which implies the upper bound

$$\left| \int F d\nu_I - \int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_2}) \right| \leq C_{\alpha_*}(L + 1) \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} R(i_{p_1+1} - i_{p_1}),$$

where  $C_{\alpha_*} > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $\alpha_*$  and  $R(n) = n^{1-1/\alpha_*} (\log n)^{1/\alpha_*}$  for  $n \geq 2$  and  $R(1) = 1$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $N \geq 1$ . Assume that, in addition to (22),  $B > 0$ . Then, there exists a constant  $C_{\alpha_*} > 0$  depending only on  $\alpha_*$  such that for any  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$ ,*

$$|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq C_{\alpha_*} C_{\#} \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} (\rho_\gamma(N) + 1) B^{-3/2} N, \quad (25)$$

where  $C_{\#} = (C_0 + 1)(L + 1)^{9/2}$  and

$$\rho(N) = \begin{cases} 1 & (\alpha_* < 1/3) \\ 1 + (\log N)^4 & (\alpha_* = 1/3) \\ N^{3-1/\alpha_*} (\log N)^3 & (\alpha_* > 1/3) \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

In particular,  $|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]|$  converges to zero as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  provided that  $B \gg (\rho(N)N)^{2/3}$ . Further, assuming  $B^{-1} = O(N^{-1})$ , convergence of  $|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]|$  to zero holds if  $\alpha_* < 2/5$ .

*Proof.* The result follows by applying Theorem 2.10 together with Lemma 3.3 as in the proof of Theorem 3.2.  $\square$

**3.2.2. Autonomous compositions.** Suppose that  $X_n = f \circ T^n$ , where  $T$  denotes the map (21) with parameter  $\alpha < 1/2$ , and  $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz continuous. Suppose that  $\mu(f) = 0$ , where  $\mu$  is the unique absolutely continuous invariant probability measure of  $T$  (see [31] for the existence of such a measure). This setting is a special case of (23), obtained by taking  $f_n = f$ ,  $T_n = T$  for each  $n \geq 1$ , and  $\mu$  as the invariant measure. As a consequence Theorem 3.4 we obtain the following result:

**Corollary 3.5.** *Assume that  $f$  is not a coboundary. Then, there exists  $N_0 \geq 1$  such that  $\tilde{B} := \inf_{N \geq N_0} N^{-1} B_N > 0$ . Moreover,*

$$|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq C_{\alpha} C_{\#} \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} (\rho_{\gamma}(N) + 1) \tilde{B}^{-3/2} N^{-1/2},$$

where  $C_{\alpha}$  is a constant depending only on  $\alpha$ ,  $C_{\#} = (C_0 + 1)(\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + 1)^{9/2}$ , and  $\rho(N)$  is defined as in (26) for  $\alpha_* = \alpha$ .

*Proof.* Since the correlations  $\mu(f \cdot f \circ T^n)$  are summable for  $\alpha < 1/2$  (cf. [31]), we have that  $\tilde{B} > 0$  for a sufficiently large  $N_0$ , as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Thus, the result follows directly from Theorem 3.4.  $\square$

**3.3. Application 3: Random Lasota–Yorke maps.** We consider random dynamical systems of piecewise expanding interval maps, as studied in [6, 14] among others. To specify the model, let  $\mathcal{E}$  denote the collection of all maps  $T : M \rightarrow M$  on  $M = [0, 1]$  such that there exists a finite partition  $\mathcal{A}(T)$  of  $M$  into subintervals satisfying the following conditions for every  $I \in \mathcal{A}(T)$ :

- (1)  $T|_I$  extends to a  $C^2$  map in a neighborhood of  $I$ ;
- (2)  $\delta(T) := \min_{I \in \mathcal{A}(T)} \inf |(T|_I)'| > 1$ .

The map  $T$  is monotonic on each element  $I \in \mathcal{A}(T)$ . From now on, we take  $\mathcal{A}(T)$  to be the minimal partition of monotonicity and define  $n_0(T) := |\mathcal{A}(T)|$ .

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P})$  be a probability space, and let  $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  be a measurably invertible transformation. We consider a map  $\omega \mapsto T_{\omega}$  from  $\Omega$  into  $\mathcal{E}$ . Random compositions of maps are denoted by  $T_{\omega}^n = T_{\tau^{n-1}\omega} \circ \cdots \circ T_{\omega}$ . Moreover, let  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega}^n = \mathcal{L}_{\tau^{n-1}\omega} \cdots \mathcal{L}_{\omega}$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_{\omega} : L^1(\lambda) \rightarrow L^1(\lambda)$  is the transfer operator associated with  $T_{\omega}$  and  $\lambda$ , with  $\lambda$  being the Lebesgue measure on  $M$ . We assume the following conditions.

**Conditions (RLY):**

- (i)  $\tau : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -preserving and ergodic.

- (ii) The map  $(\omega, x) \mapsto (\mathcal{L}_\omega H(\omega, \cdot))(x)$  is measurable for every measurable function  $H : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $H(\omega, \cdot) \in L^1(\lambda)$ .
- (iii)  $n_0 := \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} n_0(T_\omega) < \infty$ ;  $\delta := \inf_{\omega \in \Omega} \delta(T_\omega) > 1$ ;  $D := \sup_{\omega \in \Omega} |T_\omega''| < \infty$ .
- (iv) There exists  $n \geq 1$  such that  $\delta^n > 2$  and  $\text{ess inf}_{\omega \in \Omega} \min_{J \in \mathcal{A}(T_\omega^n)} \lambda(J) > 0$ .
- (v) For every subinterval  $J \subset M$  there is  $k = k(J) \geq 1$  such that  $T_\omega^k(J) = M$  holds for almost every  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

By [14, Proposition 1], assuming (RLY), there exists a unique measurable and non-negative function  $h : \Omega \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $h_\omega := h(\omega, \cdot)$  satisfies  $\lambda(h_\omega) = 1$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_\omega(h_\omega) = h_{\tau(\omega)}$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost every  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Moreover,  $\text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|h_\omega\|_{BV} < \infty$ . Here,  $\|h\|_{BV} = \|h\|_{L^1(m)} + V(h)$  where  $V(h)$  denotes the total variation of a function  $h : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . In addition, the skew product  $\varphi(\omega, x) = (\tau(\omega), T_\omega(x))$  preserves the measure  $\nu$  on  $\Omega \times M$ , defined by

$$\nu(A \times B) = \int_{A \times B} h d(\mathbb{P} \otimes m), \quad A \in \mathcal{B}, B \in \mathcal{F},$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $M$ . Denote by  $(\nu_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$  the disintegration of  $\nu$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $(f_{n,\omega})_{n \geq 0, \omega \in \Omega}$  be a family of functions  $f_{n,\omega} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that, for all  $n \geq 0$ ,*

$$\text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|f_{n,\omega}\|_\vartheta \leq L$$

*for some  $\vartheta \in (0, 1]$ . Consider the random process  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  on  $(M, \mathcal{F}, \nu_\omega)$  defined by*

$$X_n = f_{n,\omega} \circ T_\omega^n.$$

*Then, for all  $N \geq 1$  and for  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost every  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $(X_n)_{0 \leq n < N}$  satisfies (FCB) with  $\mu = \nu_\omega$  and*

$$C_* = C(L + 1)\|h_\omega\|_{BV}, \quad R(n) = \theta^n,$$

*where  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and  $C > 0$  are constants depending only on  $\vartheta$  and the random dynamical system  $(T_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ .*

*Proof.* Given a separately Lipschitz continuous function  $F : [-L, L]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and index sets  $I, I_1, I_2$  as in (FCB), the function  $\tilde{F}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = F(f_{i_1,\omega}(x_1), \dots, f_{i_n,\omega}(x_n))$  satisfies

$$\text{ess sup}_{\omega \in \Omega} \|\tilde{F}\|_\vartheta \leq (L + 1)\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}.$$

By rewriting  $\int F d\nu_I - \int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_2})$  as in (24), we find that the result is a direct consequence of [27, Proposition 3.5].  $\square$

Now, given a measurable bounded function  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we set

$$f_{n,\omega} = f - \nu_\omega(f \circ T_\omega^n), \quad X_n = f_{n,\omega} \circ T_\omega^n.$$

We consider  $(X_n)_{n \geq 0}$  as a random process on  $(M, \mathcal{F}, \nu_\omega)$  and define the quantities  $W$ ,  $B$ , and  $Z$  as in Section 2.3.

**Theorem 3.7.** *Suppose that  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies  $\|f\|_\vartheta \leq L/2$  for some  $\vartheta \in (0, 1]$ , and that the function  $\tilde{f}(\omega, x) = \tilde{f}_\omega(x) := f(x) - \nu_\omega(f)$  is not a coboundary<sup>4</sup>. Then, there exists  $N_0 = N_0(\omega) \geq 1$  such that  $\tilde{B} := \inf_{N \geq N_0} N^{-1} B_N > 0$  for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Moreover, for any  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$  and  $N \geq N_0$ , the following estimate holds for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ .*

$$|\nu_\omega[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq CC_\# \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{B}^{-3/2} N^{-1/2}.$$

<sup>4</sup>I.e.,  $\tilde{f}$  cannot be written as  $v - v \circ \varphi$  for any  $v \in L^2(\Omega \times M, \nu)$ .

Here,  $C > 0$  is a constant depending only on  $\vartheta$  and the random dynamical system  $(T_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ , and

$$C_\# = (L + 1)^{9/2} (\|h_\omega\|_{BV} + 1)^{3/2} (1 + C_0).$$

*Proof.* It follows from [14] that the non-coboundary condition implies that there exists a nonrandom  $\sigma^2 > 0$  such that, for  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.e.  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \nu_\omega \left[ \left( \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} X_n \right)^2 \right] = \sigma^2.$$

Therefore,  $\tilde{B} = \inf_{N \geq N_0} N^{-1} B_N > 0$  for a sufficiently large  $N_0$ , and the result follows by applying Theorem 2.10 together with Lemma 3.6.  $\square$

**3.4. Application 4: Dispersing billiards.** Let  $\mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{Z}^2$  be the two-torus equipped with finitely many scatterers  $S_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, I$ , which are pairwise disjoint closed convex sets such that the boundary  $\partial S_i$  of each  $S_i$  is a  $C^3$  curve with strictly positive curvature. The billiard flow is defined by the motion of a point particle moving linearly at unit speed on the billiard table  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathbb{T}^2 \setminus \cup_{i=1}^I S_i$ , undergoing specular reflections at collisions with the boundaries  $\partial S_i$  of the scatterers. We assume the finite horizon condition, which ensures a finite uniform upper bound on the time between consecutive collisions in  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

The billiard flow induces a discrete-time billiard map  $T : M \rightarrow M$ , also known as the collision map, which keeps track of the collisions only. We adopt standard coordinates at collisions,  $x = (r, \varphi)$ , where  $r$  represents the position of the billiard particle on the boundary  $\cup_{i=1}^I \partial S_i$ , parametrized by arc length, and  $\varphi$  is the angle between the particle's post-collision velocity vector and the normal pointing into the domain  $\mathcal{Q}$ . The two-dimensional phase space  $M$  is a disjoint union of cylinders,  $M = \cup_{i=1}^I \partial S_i \times [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ , and for a pair  $x = (r, \varphi) \in M$ ,  $T(x) = (r', \varphi')$  is defined as the corresponding pair after the next collision. The map  $T$  is invertible and preserves a smooth probability measure  $\mu$  on  $M$ , namely  $d\mu = C_\mu^{-1} \cdot \cos r \, dr \, d\varphi$  where  $C_\mu = \int_M \cos r \, dr \, d\varphi$  is the normalizing factor [9, Section 2.12]. Given a bounded measurable function  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we set  $X_n = f \circ T^n$  and consider  $(X_n)$  as a random process on  $(M, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ , where the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  consists of all Borel subsets of  $M$ .

To describe our application, we recall a few standard constructions from the theory of dispersing billiards, with full details provided in [9]. Each cylinder  $M_i = \partial S_i \times [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$  is divided into countably many connected components  $M_{i,k} = \partial S_i \times \{b_k < \varphi < b_{k+1}\}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , called homogeneity strips [9, Section 5.4], where the numbers  $b_k$  satisfy  $b_{k+1} - b_k = O(k^{-3})$ . These strips  $M_{i,k}$  accumulate near the boundary  $\partial M_i = \partial S_i \times \{\cos(\varphi) = 0\}$  corresponding to tangential collisions. For  $x, y \in M$ , the future separation time  $s_+(x, y)$  is defined as the smallest integer  $n \geq 0$  such that  $T^n(x)$  and  $T^n(y)$  lie in different components. The past separation time is defined identically, using the inverse  $T^{-1}$  instead of  $T$ . A local stable manifold  $W^s(x)$  of a point  $x \in M$  is a maximal  $C^2$  curve  $W^s(x)$  such that for each  $n \geq 0$  there exist  $i, k$  with  $T^n W^s(x) \subset M_{i,k}$ . Almost every  $x \in M$  has a nontrivial local stable manifold, and the (uncountable) family of all local stable manifolds forms a measurable partition of  $M$ . Local unstable manifolds are defined similarly, replacing  $T$  with  $T^{-1}$ .

We use the definition of dynamical Hölder continuity from [43], stated below, which is a variant of a corresponding definition in [8]. The fact that this property is dynamically closed in the sense of [43, Lemma 4] is used in the proof of the functional correlation bound [26, Theorem 2.3], upon which our application is based.

**Definition 3.8.** A function  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be dynamically Hölder continuous on local unstable manifolds with rate  $\vartheta_f \in (0, 1)$  and constant  $c_f \geq 0$  if it satisfies

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq c_f \vartheta_f^{s_+(x,y)}$$

whenever  $x$  and  $y$  belong to the same local unstable manifold. Define  $\mathcal{H}_+(c_f, \vartheta_f)$  as the family of all such functions. Similarly, a function  $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is said to be dynamically Hölder continuous on local stable manifolds if it satisfies

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq c_f \vartheta_f^{s_-(x,y)}$$

whenever  $x$  and  $y$  belong to the same local stable manifold. Define  $\mathcal{H}_-(c_f, \vartheta_f)$  as the family of all such functions.

*Remark 3.9.* If  $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Hölder continuous with exponent  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and constant  $[f]_\alpha$ , then  $f \in \mathcal{H}_-(c, \vartheta) \cap \mathcal{H}_+(c, \vartheta)$ , where  $c = [f]_\alpha$ , and  $\vartheta = \vartheta(\alpha)$  is determined by  $\alpha$  and system constants.

**Lemma 3.10.** Suppose that  $f \in \mathcal{H}_-(c_f, \vartheta_f) \cap \mathcal{H}_+(c_f, \vartheta_f)$ . Then, for all  $N \geq 1$ ,  $(X_N)$  satisfies **(FCB)** with

$$C_* = C \left( \frac{c_f}{1 - \vartheta_f} + 1 \right), \quad R(n) = \theta^n,$$

where  $\theta = \max\{\vartheta_f, \theta_0\}^{1/4}$ , and  $C > 0$ ,  $\theta_0 \in (0, 1)$  are system constants.

*Proof.* Let  $I, I_1, I_2$ , and  $F$  be as in Definition 2.7. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3, define the function

$$\tilde{F}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = F(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n)).$$

For each  $x \in M^n$  and each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the function  $\varphi_i : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\varphi_i(y) = F(x(y/i))$ , satisfies  $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{H}_-([F]_1 c_f, \vartheta_f) \cap \mathcal{H}_+([F]_1 c_f, \vartheta_f)$ . Hence, the result follows as a direct consequence of [26, Theorem 2.4].  $\square$

**Theorem 3.11.** Suppose that  $f \in \mathcal{H}_-(c_f, \vartheta_f) \cap \mathcal{H}_+(c_f, \vartheta_f)$  satisfies  $\mu(f) = 0$ . If  $f$  is not a coboundary, there exists an integer  $N_0 \geq 1$  such that  $\tilde{B} := \inf_{N \geq N_0} N^{-1} B_N > 0$ . Moreover, for any  $N \geq N_0$  and  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$ ,

$$|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq C C_\theta C_\# \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \tilde{B}^{-3/2} N^{-1/2},$$

where  $C$  is a system constant,  $C_\theta$  is a constant depending only on  $\theta$  in Lemma 3.10, and

$$C_\# = \left( \frac{c_f}{1 - \vartheta_f} + 1 \right)^{3/2} (1 + C_0) (\|f\|_\infty + 1)^3.$$

*Proof.* The result follows by applying Theorem 2.10 together with Lemma 3.10.  $\square$

#### 4. REVIEW OF STEIN'S METHOD FOR BROWNIAN APPROXIMATIONS

In this section, we briefly review Stein's method in the context of diffusion approximations. We refer the reader to [5, 19] for more details. Since the results of our paper concern approximation by the standard univariate Brownian motion, we shall review Stein's method in this case.

Throughout this section,  $C$  denotes an absolute constant, the value of which may vary between different expressions.



**4.1. Stein's method for diffusion approximations.** Recall the spaces of test functions  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  from Section 2.1.

A consequence of Proposition 2.1 and Taylor's theorem is that, for each  $g \in \mathcal{M}$  and each  $w, h \in D$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|g'(w)\| &\leq K_g(1 + \|w\|_\infty^2), & \|g''(w)\| &\leq K_g(1 + \|w\|_\infty), \\ |g(w+h) - g(w) - g'(w)[h] - \frac{1}{2}g^{(2)}(w)[h^{(2)}]| &\leq K_g\|h\|_\infty^3, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where  $K_g = C\|g\|_{\mathcal{M}}$ .

Let  $Z$  be a standard Brownian motion on  $[0, 1]$ . In [5], Barbour derived a Stein equation for approximation by  $Z$  as  $\mathcal{A}f = g - \mathbf{E}(g(Z))$  where  $g \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  is the generator of a Markov process whose stationary law is the Wiener measure. The construction of Brownian motion by Schauder functions was used to define the appropriate process. Below, we recall the construction of  $\mathcal{A}$  from [5], along with some of its properties, which will be used in the sequel.

Let  $\{(\hat{X}_k(u), u \geq 0) : k = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  be an i.i.d. collection of Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes on  $[0, \infty)$  with stationary law  $N(0, 1)$ , i.e. independent processes such that each  $\hat{X}_k$  weakly solves the stochastic differential equation

$$dx_t = -x_t dt + \sqrt{2} dZ_t, \quad x_0 \sim N(0, 1), \quad t \geq 0.$$

Define

$$\hat{W}(t, u) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \hat{X}_k(u) S_k(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1, \quad u \geq 0,$$

where the Schauder functions  $S_k$  are given by

$$S_0(t) = t, \quad S_k(t) = \int_0^t H_k(u) du, \quad k \geq 1,$$

and, for  $2^n \leq k < 2^{n+1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} H_k(u) = 2^{n/2} \bigg\{ &\mathbf{I}[2^{-n}k - 1 \leq u \leq 2^{-n}(k + 1/2) - 1] \\ &- \mathbf{I}[2^{-n}(k + 1/2) - 1 \leq u \leq 2^{-n}(k + 1) - 1] \bigg\}. \end{aligned}$$

The function  $(t, u) \mapsto \hat{W}(t, u)$  is almost surely continuous, and for each  $u$ ,  $\hat{W}(\cdot, u)$  is distributed according to the Wiener measure. The following two equations correspond to [5, equation (2.9)] and [5, equation (2.11)], respectively. We provide a sketch of the proof following [5].

**Lemma 4.1.** *The infinitesimal generator  $\mathcal{A}$  of the process  $(\hat{W}(\cdot, u))_{u \geq 0}$  acts on any  $f \in \mathcal{M}$  in the following way:*

$$\mathcal{A}f(w) = -f'(w)[w] + \mathbf{E}f''(w)[Z^{(2)}] = -f'(w)[w] + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f''(w)[S_k^{(2)}]. \quad (28)$$

Here,  $f''(w)[z^{(2)}]$  denotes  $f''(w)[z, z]$  for  $z \in D$ .

*Sketch of proof.* The semigroup  $(T_u)_{u \geq 0}$  of  $(\hat{W}(\cdot, u))_{u \geq 0}$  acting on  $\mathcal{L}$  is given by the formula

$$(T_u f)(w) = \mathbf{E}[f(we^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z)], \quad (29)$$

where  $\sigma^2(u) = 1 - e^{-2u}$ . For  $u, v \geq 0$ , we have (see [5, equation (2.3)] or [19, Lemma 5.4])

$$\hat{W}(\cdot, u+v) - e^{-v}\hat{W}(\cdot, u) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} \sigma(v)Z(\cdot).$$

Using the bilinearity of  $f^{(k)}$  along with  $1 - e^{-u} = u + O(u^2)$  and (27), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & (T_u f)(w) - f(w) + u f'(w)[w] - u \mathbf{E}\{f''(w)[Z^{(2)}]\} \\ &= R + O(u^2 K_f(1 + \|w\|_\infty^2) + u^2 K_f(1 + \|w\|_\infty) + u^2 K_f(1 + \|w\|_\infty^3)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $K_f = C\|f\|_{\mathcal{M}}$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} R &= (T_u f)(w) - f(w) \\ &+ \mathbf{E}\left\{f'(w)[w(1 - e^{-u})] - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2(u)f''(w)[Z^{(2)}] - (1 - e^{-u})^2 f''(w)[w^{(2)}]\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, from the representation

$$Z(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} Z_k S_k(t), \tag{30}$$

where  $Z_k \sim N(0, 1)$  are i.i.d., we see that  $\mathbf{E}\{f'(w)[Z]\} = 0 = \mathbf{E}\{f''(w)[w, Z]\}$ . Therefore, by (27) and the inequality  $1 - e^{-u} \leq u$  for  $u \geq 0$ , it follows that for any  $u \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |R| &= \left| (T_u f)(w) - f(w) - \mathbf{E}\left\{f'(w)[\sigma(u)Z - w(1 - e^{-u})] \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{2}f''(w)[(\sigma(u)Z - w(1 - e^{-u}))^{(2)}]\right\} \right| \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{E}[\|\sigma(u)Z - w(1 - e^{-u})\|_\infty^3] \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{\mathcal{M}} \mathbf{E}[(\sqrt{2u}|Z| + u\|w\|_\infty)^3] \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{\mathcal{M}}(1 + \|w\|_\infty^3)u^{3/2}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the first equality in (28):

$$\mathcal{A}f(w) = \lim_{u \downarrow 0} \frac{(T_u f - f)(w)}{u} = -f'(w)[w] + \mathbf{E}f''(w)[Z^{(2)}].$$

The second equality is a straightforward consequence of (30).  $\square$

For any  $g \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mathbf{E}[g(Z)] = 0$ , the Stein equation is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}f = g, \tag{SE}$$

where  $\mathcal{A}$  is as in (28).

Let

$$Z_n(t) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor nt \rfloor} Z_k, \tag{31}$$

where  $Z_k \sim N(0, 1)$  are independent random variables. Further, let

$$\hat{W}_n(t, u) = \sum_{k=1}^n \hat{X}_k(u) J_{k/n}(t),$$

where  $\hat{X}_k$  are as above and  $J_{k/n}$  are defined as in (6). Then, the stationary distribution of  $(\hat{W}_n(\cdot, u))_{u \geq 0}$  is the distribution of  $Z_n$ , and similar to Lemma 4.2 it can be shown

(see [19, Proposition 5.1]) that the infinitesimal generator  $\mathcal{A}_n$  of  $(\hat{W}_n(\cdot, u))_{u \geq 0}$  acts on any  $f \in \mathcal{M}$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_n f(w) = -f'(w)[w] + \mathbf{E} f''(w)[Z_n^{(2)}].$$

Let  $\mathcal{M}'$  consist of all  $f \in \mathcal{M}$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 f''(w)[J_{\lfloor nt \rfloor / n}^{(2)}] dt = \int_0^1 f''(w)[J_t^{(2)}] dt \quad \forall w \in D. \quad (32)$$

The following equation corresponds to [5, equation (2.18)]. We include a proof for completeness, as it was omitted from [5].

**Lemma 4.2.** *For  $f \in \mathcal{M}'$ , the generator  $\mathcal{A}$  in (28) satisfies*

$$(\mathcal{A}f)(w) = -f'(w)[w] + \int_0^1 f''(w)[J_t^{(2)}] dt. \quad (33)$$

*Proof.* Recalling (30), it suffices to verify that

$$\int_0^1 f''(w)[J_t^{(2)}] dt = \mathbf{E} f''(w)[Z^{(2)}] \quad \forall w \in D.$$

Define

$$G_n(t) = Z(\ell/n) \quad \forall t \in [\ell/n, (\ell+1)/n],$$

where  $Z$  is a standard Brownian motion. Observe that  $G_n$  has the same distribution as  $Z_n$  in (31). By the bilinearity of  $f''(w)$  and Proposition 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbf{E} f''(w)[Z^{(2)}] - \mathbf{E} f''(w)[G_n^{(2)}]| \\ &= |\mathbf{E}[f''(w)[Z - G_n, Z] + f''(w)[G_n, Z - G_n]]| \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{M}} (1 + \|w\|_\infty) \mathbf{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |Z(t) - Z(\lfloor nt \rfloor / n)| \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |Z(t)| \right] \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{M}} (1 + \|w\|_\infty) \left\{ \mathbf{E} \left[ \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |Z(t) - Z(\lfloor nt \rfloor / n)|^2 \right] \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{\mathcal{M}} (1 + \|w\|_\infty) \log(n)^{1/2} n^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from [15, Lemma 3]. Using (31), we now obtain

$$\mathbf{E} f''(w)[Z^{(2)}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} f''(w)[G_n^{(2)}] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 f''(w)[J_{\lfloor nt \rfloor / n}^{(2)}] dt.$$

Since  $f \in \mathcal{M}'$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 f''(w)[J_{\lfloor nt \rfloor / n}^{(2)}] dt = \int_0^1 f''(w)[J_t^{(2)}] dt.$$

□

**4.2. On the existence and properties of the solution to (SE).** In [20, Lemma 3.1], an explicit counterexample is given to show that the semigroup  $(T_u)_{u \geq 0}$  in (29) is not strongly continuous on  $(\mathcal{L}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}})$ . Nevertheless, it is established that  $\phi(g) := -\int_0^\infty T_u g du$  solves (SE) for any  $g \in \mathcal{M}$ :

**Lemma 4.3** (Lemma 4.1 and Proposition 4.4 in [20]).

- (1) For any  $g \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mathbf{E}[g(Z)] = 0$ ,  $f = \phi(g) = -\int_0^\infty T_u g du$  exists and satisfies  $\phi(g) \in \mathcal{M}$ . In particular,  $\phi(g)$  is in the domain of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Moreover, for  $k = 1, 2$ ,

$$(\phi(g))^{(k)}(w) = -\mathbf{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-ku} g^{(k)}(we^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z) du. \quad (34)$$

- (2) For any  $g \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\mathbf{E}[g(Z)] = 0$ ,  $f = \phi(g)$  solves (SE):  $\mathcal{A}f = g$ .

From (34) it follows that

$$\|\phi(g)\|_{\mathcal{M}} \leq C\|g\|_{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (35)$$

The following result, which is taken from [5], is a straightforward consequence of (34). We include a proof for completeness, as it was omitted from [5].

**Lemma 4.4.** Recall from (5) that  $\mathcal{M}_0$  is defined as the class of all  $g \in \mathcal{M}$  that satisfy the smoothness condition

$$\sup_{w \in D} |g''(w)[J_r, J_s - J_t]| \leq C_0 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} |t - s|^{1/2} \quad \forall r, s, t \in [0, 1].$$

If  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0$ , then  $\phi(g) \in \mathcal{M}'$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f = \phi(g)$ . By (34),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 f''(w)[J_t^{(2)}] - f''(w)[J_{\lfloor nt \rfloor/n}^{(2)}] dt \\ &= -\int_0^1 \mathbf{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} \left\{ g''(we^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z)[J_t^{(2)}] - g''(we^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z)[J_{\lfloor nt \rfloor/n}^{(2)}] \right\} du dt \end{aligned}$$

Since  $f''(w)$  is symmetric, we can apply (5) twice to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^1 f''(w)[J_t^{(2)}] - f''(w)[J_{\lfloor nt \rfloor/n}^{(2)}] dt \right| \\ & \leq \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} \cdot 2C_0 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} |t - \lfloor nt \rfloor/n|^{1/2} du dt \\ & \leq CC_0 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} n^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**4.3. Conclusion of abstract Barbour's method.** Suppose that  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0$ . Then,  $h := g - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)] \in \mathcal{M}_0$  satisfies  $\mathbf{E}[h(Z)] = 0$ . By Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4, for any  $D$ -valued random variable  $X$  on  $(M, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ ,

$$\mu[g(X)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)] = \mu[h(X)] = \mu[\mathcal{A}f(X)],$$

where  $f = \phi(h) \in \mathcal{M}'$ . Therefore, by Lemma 4.2,

$$\mu[g(X)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)] = \mu \left\{ -f'(X)[X] + \int_0^1 f''(X)[J_t^{(2)}] dt \right\}. \quad (36)$$

Notice that, in this step, we do not use any concrete property for  $X$ .

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.10

Recall the definition of  $W_N$  from (16). In this section, we write  $W = W_N$ , omitting the subscript for brevity. To prove Theorem 2.10, we will estimate the right-hand side of (36) with  $X = W$ . We begin by formulating a preliminary version of Theorem 2.10 that reveals the exact class of test functions  $F$  for which the bound (FCB) is required.

**5.1. A preliminary result.** Recall the definition of  $\theta_n(t)$  from (15). For  $0 \leq n, m < N$ , define the following auxiliary random elements:

$$S_{n,m}(t) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i < N \\ |i-n| > m}} \theta_i(t) X_i \quad \text{and} \quad T_{n,m}(t) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i < N \\ |i-n|=m}} \theta_i(t) X_i. \quad (37)$$

Let  $Z$  be a standard Brownian motion independent from  $(X_n)$ . Given  $g \in \mathcal{M}$ , for any  $s, t, u \in [0, 1]$  and  $0 \leq i, n < N$  define

$$\begin{aligned} & H_g(w_1, w_2; s, t, u, i, n) \\ &= \mathbf{E} \left\{ g''(sB^{-1/2}w_1 + tB^{-1/2}w_2 + uZ)[\theta_i, \theta_n] - g''(sB^{-1/2}w_1 + uZ)[\theta_i, \theta_n] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where  $\mathbf{E}$  denotes expectation with respect to  $Z$ .

For a real-valued random variable  $X$  defined on  $(M, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ , let  $\bar{X} = X - \mu(X)$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $N \geq 1$  and  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$ . Suppose there exist a function  $\rho: \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and constants  $C_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , such that the following conditions hold for all  $0 \leq n, m < N$  and all  $s, t, u \in [0, 1]$ :*

$$(A1) \quad |\mu(X_n X_m)| \leq C_1 \rho(|n - m|).$$

$$(A2) \quad \text{Whenever } |i - n| = m, \ 0 \leq i < N, \text{ and } m \leq k < N,$$

$$\left| \mu \left\{ X_n X_i H_g(S_{n,k}, T_{n,k}; s, t, u, i, n) \right\} \right| \leq C_2 B^{-1/2} \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \rho(m).$$

$$(A3) \quad \text{Whenever } |i - n| = m, \ 0 \leq i < N, \text{ and } 2m + 1 \leq k < N$$

$$\left| \mu \left\{ X_n X_i \overline{H_g(S_{n,k}, T_{n,k}; s, t, u, i, n)} \right\} \right| \leq C_3 B^{-1/2} \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \rho(k - m).$$

Then,

$$|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq CC_N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-3/2} N,$$

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant,

$$C_N = L^3 + (C_1 L + C_2 + C_3) \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \rho(m) + C_0 C_1^{3/2} C_\rho^{1/2} \left[ C_\rho + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} j^{1/2} \rho(j) \right],$$

$$\text{and } C_\rho = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \rho(j).$$

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is provided in the following section. In the proof of Proposition 5.6, we verify that the conditions in Theorem 5.1 can be described as instances of (FCB') with at most three blocks of  $X_n$ 's (namely, (FCB') with  $K = 2$  and 3 suffices for (A1)-(A3)). Using Proposition 2.8, we then conclude that (A1)-(A3) follow from (FCB). Compare also (A1)-(A3) with the corresponding conditions (B1)-(B3) in [27, Theorem 2.3] for normal approximations for chaotic systems.

## 5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.1.

5.2.1. *Decomposition of  $\mu[\mathcal{A}f(W)]$ .* Recall that, by (36), for each  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0$ ,

$$\mu[g(W)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)] = \mu[\mathcal{A}f(W)] = \mu\left\{-f'(W)[W] + \int_0^1 f''(W)[J_t^{(2)}] dt\right\},$$

where  $f = \phi(h) \in \mathcal{M}'$  with  $h = g - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]$ . Thus, we obtain the decomposition

$$\mu[g(W)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)] = I + II \tag{39}$$

where

$$I = \mu\left\{-f'(W)[W] + B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{n,m} f''(W)[\theta_n, \theta_m]\right\},$$

and

$$II = \mu\left\{-B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{n,m} f''(W)[\theta_n, \theta_m] + \int_0^1 f''(W)[J_t^{(2)}] dt\right\}.$$

Below, we estimate  $I$  and  $II$  to establish the bound in Theorem 5.1. Note that  $I$  corresponds to approximating  $\mu(f'(W)[W])$  by  $\mu(f'(W)[Y])$ , where  $Y = B^{-1/2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \tilde{Z}_n \theta_n$  is independent of  $W$ , and  $\tilde{Z}_n$  are Gaussian random variables with the same covariance structure as  $(X_n)$ :

$$\mathbf{E}(\tilde{Z}_i \tilde{Z}_j) = \mu(X_i X_j) \quad \forall i, j \geq 0.$$

5.2.2. *Estimate on  $II$ .* In the rest of the proof we write  $A \lesssim B$  if there exists an absolute constant  $C > 0$  such that  $A \leq CB$ . Below we estimate  $II$  using (A1). Note that (A2) and (A3) are not required for this estimate.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Assuming (A1),*

$$|II| \lesssim \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-3/2} N C_0 C_1^{3/2} C_\rho^{1/2} \left[ C_\rho + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} j^{1/2} \rho(j) \right], \tag{40}$$

where  $C_\rho = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho(k)$ .

*Proof.* Recall that  $B = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \beta_n = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{n,m}$  and decompose  $II = -R_1 - R_2$ , where

$$R_1 = \mu\left\{B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{n,m} \left(f''(W)[\theta_n, \theta_m] - f''(W)[\theta_n, \theta_n]\right)\right\}$$

and

$$R_2 = \mu\left\{B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \beta_n f''(W)[\theta_n, \theta_n] - \int_0^1 f''(W)[J_t^{(2)}] dt\right\}.$$

We use (34) to compute  $f''$  and then apply (5) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|R_1| &= \left| \mu \left\{ B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{n,m} \mathbf{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} g''(W e^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z)[\theta_n, \theta_m] \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - e^{-2u} g''(W e^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z)[\theta_n, \theta_n] du \right\} \right| \\
&\leq B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} |\sigma_{n,m}| \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} du \cdot C_0 \|g\|_{\mathcal{A}} |(B_n - B_m)/B|^{1/2} \\
&\leq C_0 \|g\|_{\mathcal{A}} B^{-3/2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} |\sigma_{n,m}| |B_n - B_m|^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using  $\beta_n = B_{n+1} - B_n$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
R_2 &= \mu \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{B_n/B}^{B_{n+1}/B} f''(W)[J_{B_n/B}^{(2)}] dt - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{B_n/B}^{B_{n+1}/B} f''(W)[J_t^{(2)}] dt \right\} \\
&= \mu \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{B_n/B}^{B_{n+1}/B} \mathbf{E} \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} g''(W e^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z)[J_{B_n/B}^{(2)}] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - e^{-2u} g''(W e^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z)[J_t, J_t] du dt \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by applying (5) twice together with the symmetricity of  $g''(w)$ , we arrive at the estimate

$$|R_2| \lesssim \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} C_0 \|g\|_{\mathcal{A}} |B_n/B - B_{n+1}/B|^{3/2} \leq C_0 \|g\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} |\beta_n/B|^{3/2}.$$

Finally, using (A1), we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} |\beta_n/B|^{3/2} &= B^{-3/2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left| \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{n,m} \right|^{3/2} \leq C_1^{3/2} B^{-3/2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \rho(|n-m|) \right)^{3/2} \\
&\lesssim C_1^{3/2} B^{-3/2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho(k) \right)^{3/2} = C_1^{3/2} B^{-3/2} N \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho(k) \right)^{3/2}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} |\sigma_{n,m}| |B_n - B_m|^{1/2} &\lesssim C_1 \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \rho(|n-m|) |B_n - B_m|^{1/2} \\
&= C_1 \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \rho(|n-m|) \left| \sum_{p=\min\{n,m\}}^{\max\{n,m\}-1} \sum_{q=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{p,q} \right|^{1/2} \\
&\lesssim C_1^{3/2} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho(k) \right)^{1/2} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} |n-m|^{1/2} \rho(|n-m|) \\
&\lesssim C_1^{3/2} N \left( \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho(k) \right)^{1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} j^{1/2} \rho(j).
\end{aligned}$$

□

5.2.3. *Estimate on I.* For brevity, denote

$$\tilde{X}_n = B^{-1/2}X_n, \quad \text{and} \quad Y_n = \tilde{X}_n\theta_n.$$

*Remark 5.3.* The specific form of  $\theta_n$  plays no role in what follows. Indeed, all of the results in this section continue to hold if  $\theta_n$  are replaced with arbitrary  $\theta_n^* \in D$  such that  $\|\theta_n^*\|_\infty \leq 1$ , provided that (A2) and (A3) hold with  $\theta_n^*$  in place of  $\theta_n$ .

Given integers  $0 \leq n < N$  and  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let  $W_{n,m} = B^{-1/2}S_{n,m}$  and  $Y_{n,m} = B^{-1/2}T_{n,m}$  where  $S_{n,m}$  and  $T_{n,m}$  are defined as in (37). Note that

$$W_{n,N-1} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad W_{n,-1} = W.$$

We will estimate  $I$  using (A1)-(A3) together with the following decomposition, which is a counterpart of [45, Proposition 4]:

**Proposition 5.4.** *For  $s \in [0, 1]$ ,  $0 \leq i, n < N$ , and  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , define*

$$\xi_{i,n,m}(s) = f''(W_{n,m} + sY_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n] - f''(W_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n]$$

and

$$\xi_{i,n,m} = \xi_{i,n,m}(1) = f''(W_{n,m-1})[\theta_i, \theta_n] - f''(W_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n].$$

Then,  $I = \sum_{i=1}^7 E_i$ , where  $E_i = E_i(f)$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \int_0^1 \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i \xi_{i,n,m}(s)) ds, & E_2 &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_0^1 \mu(\tilde{X}_n^2 \xi_{n,n,0}(s)) ds, \\ E_3 &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2m} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i \overline{\xi_{i,n,k}}), & E_4 &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i \overline{\xi_{i,n,k}}), \\ E_5 &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \mu(\tilde{X}_n^2 \overline{\xi_{n,n,k}}), & E_6 &= - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_m) \mu(\xi_{i,n,k}), \\ E_7 &= - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu(\tilde{X}_n^2) \mu(\xi_{n,n,0}). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Recall that

$$-I = \mu \left\{ f'(W)[W] - B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{n,m} f''(W)[\theta_n, \theta_m] \right\}.$$

By linearity,  $\mu(f'(W)[W]) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu(\tilde{X}_n f'(W)[\theta_n])$ . Since  $\mu(\tilde{X}_n) = 0$ , we have

$$\mu(\tilde{X}_n f'(W_{n,N-1})[\theta_n]) = \mu(\tilde{X}_n f'(0)[\theta_n]) = f'(0)[\theta_n] \mu(\tilde{X}_n) = 0.$$

Hence, we can express  $\mu(f'(W)[W])$  as the following telescopic sum:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(f'(W)[W]) &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu(\tilde{X}_n f'(W)[\theta_n]) = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n \left( f'(W_{n,-1})[\theta_n] - f'(W_{n,N-1})[\theta_n] \right) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n \left( f'(W_{n,m-1})[\theta_n] - f'(W_{n,m})[\theta_n] \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$



Since  $f' \in C^2$ , we have

$$f'(x+h)[\cdot] - f'(x)[\cdot] = \int_0^1 f''(x+sh)[h, \cdot] ds, \quad x, h \in D,$$

where the integral is defined as a Bochner integral. Using the relation  $W_{n,m} + Y_{n,m} = W_{n,m-1}$ , we find that

$$f'(W_{n,m-1})[\theta_n] - f'(W_{n,m})[\theta_n] = \int_0^1 f''(W_{n,m} + sY_{n,m})[Y_{n,m}, \theta_n] ds. \quad (42)$$

Substituting (42) into (41),

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(f'(W)[W]) &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n \int_0^1 f''(W_{n,m} + sY_{n,m})[Y_{n,m}, \theta_n] ds \right\} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n \int_0^1 f''(W_{n,m} + sY_{n,m})[Y_{n,m}, \theta_n] - f''(W_{n,m})[Y_{n,m}, \theta_n] ds \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n f''(W_{n,m})[Y_{n,m}, \theta_n] \right\} \\ &= E_1 + E_2 + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i f''(W_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling  $\sigma_{n,m} = \mu(X_n X_m)$ , we see that

$$\mu \left\{ B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sigma_{n,m} f''(W)[\theta_n, \theta_m] \right\} = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu \left\{ \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i) f''(W)[\theta_i, \theta_n] \right\}.$$

Thus, what remains from  $-I$  after subtracting  $E_1 + E_2$  is

$$\begin{aligned} &-I - E_1 - E_2 \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i f''(W_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n] - \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i) f''(W)[\theta_i, \theta_n] \right\} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i \overline{f''(W_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n]} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

$$- \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_m) \left( \mu(f''(W)[\theta_i, \theta_n]) - \mu(f''(W_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n]) \right). \quad (44)$$

Since  $\overline{f''(W_{n,N-1})[\theta_i, \theta_n]} = 0$ , we can write (43) as a telescopic sum:

$$\begin{aligned}
(43) &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i \left( \overline{f''(W_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n]} - \overline{f''(W_{n,N-1})[\theta_i, \theta_n]} \right) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu \left\{ \tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i \left( \overline{f''(W_{n,k-1})[\theta_i, \theta_n]} - \overline{f''(W_{n,k})[\theta_i, \theta_n]} \right) \right\} \\
&= E_3 + E_4 + E_5.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by writing

$$f''(W)[\theta_i, \theta_n] - f''(W_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n] = \sum_{k=0}^m (f''(W_{n,k-1})[\theta_i, \theta_n] - f''(W_{n,k})[\theta_i, \theta_n]),$$

we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
(44) &= - \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_m) \left( \mu(f''(W_{n,k-1})[\theta_i, \theta_n]) - \mu(f''(W_{n,k})[\theta_i, \theta_n]) \right) \\
&= E_6 + E_7.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Applying (A1)-(A3) to estimate each  $E_i$  separately for  $1 \leq i \leq 7$ , we obtain the following:

**Proposition 5.5.** *For any  $g \in \mathcal{M}$ ,*

$$I \leq \sum_{i=1}^7 |E_i| \lesssim B^{-3/2} N L^3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} + (C_1 L + C_2 + C_3) B^{-3/2} N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \rho(m). \quad (45)$$

The proof of Proposition 5.5 is similar to [27, Theorem 2.1] and therefore is deferred until Appendix A.

5.2.4. *Estimate on  $\mu[g(W)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]$ .* Combining (39), (40), and (45), we arrive at the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mu[g(W)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| &\leq I + II \\
&\lesssim B^{-3/2} N L^3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} + (C_1 L + C_2 + C_3) B^{-3/2} N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \rho(m) \\
&\quad + \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} C_0 C_1^{3/2} B^{-3/2} N C_\rho^{1/2} \left[ C_\rho + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} j^{1/2} \rho(j) \right] \\
&\lesssim B^{-3/2} N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \left[ L^3 + (C_1 L + C_2 + C_3) \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \rho(m) + C_0 C_1^{3/2} C_\rho^{1/2} \left[ C_\rho + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} j^{1/2} \rho(j) \right] \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where  $C_\rho = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \rho(j)$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

**5.3. Verification of the conditions of Theorem 5.1 under (FCB).** We derive the final upper bound in Theorem 2.10 by verifying that (FCB) implies (A1)-(A3).

Note that, using (4) and the definition of  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{M}}$  in Proposition 2.1, we obtain the following bounds for any  $w_1, w_2, \hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2 \in D$ ,  $s, t, u \in [0, 1]$  and  $0 \leq i, n < N$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |H_g(w_1, w_2; s, t, u, i, n)| &\lesssim \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-1/2} \|w_2\|_{\infty}, \\ |H_g(w_1, w_2; s, t, u, i, n) - H_g(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2; s, t, u, i, n)| & \\ \lesssim \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-1/2} (\|w_1 - \hat{w}_1\|_{\infty} + \|w_2 - \hat{w}_2\|_{\infty}). & \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

**Proposition 5.6.** *Assume that  $(X_n)_{0 \leq n < N}$  satisfies (FCB). Then, (A1)-(A3) in Theorem 5.1 hold with*

$$\rho(n) = \hat{R}(n), \quad C_1 = CC_*L^2, \quad C_i = C(C_* + 1)(L + 1)^3, \quad i = 2, 3,$$

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant,  $\hat{R}(n) = \max_{n \leq j \leq N} R(j)$  for  $n \geq 1$ , and  $\hat{R}(0) = 1$ . Consequently, for any  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0(C_0)$ ,

$$|\mu[g(W_N)] - \mathbf{E}[g(Z)]| \leq CC_N B^{-3/2} N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}},$$

where  $C > 0$  is an absolute constant,

$$C_N = L^3 + (C_* + 1)(L + 1)^3 \hat{R}_3(N) + C_0 L^3 C_*^{3/2} \hat{R}_1(N)^{1/2} (\hat{R}_1(N) + \hat{R}_2(N)),$$

and

$$\hat{R}_1(N) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \hat{R}(j), \quad \hat{R}_2(N) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} j^{1/2} \hat{R}(j), \quad \hat{R}_3(N) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} j \hat{R}(j).$$

*Proof.* (A1): Given integers  $0 \leq n < m < N$ , define:

$$I = \{n, m\}, \quad I_1 = \{n\}, \quad I_2 = \{m\}, \quad F(x, y) = xy.$$

Then,  $\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \lesssim L^2$  and, since  $\mu(X_n) = 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(X_n X_m) &= \int_M F(X_n(x), X_m(x)) d\mu(x) - \iint_{M \times M} F(X_n(x), X_m(y)) d\mu(x) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int F d\nu_I - \int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows from (FCB) that

$$|\mu(X_n X_m)| \lesssim C_* L^2 R(n - m).$$

for all  $0 \leq n, m < N$  with  $R(0) := 1$ .

(A2): In what follows, for any subset  $J \subset \mathbb{Z}_+$ , we denote by  $x_J$  a general vector  $(x_{n_1}, \dots, x_{n_{|J|}})$  in  $[-L, L]^{|J|}$  where  $n_1 < \dots < n_{|J|}$  is an enumeration of the elements of  $J$  in increasing order.

Let  $0 \leq i, k, n, m < N$  be integers with  $|i - n| = m > 0$  and  $m \leq k < N$ . Given  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0$ ,  $s, t, u \in [0, 1]$ , we define

$$F(x_I) = \varphi(x_i, x_n) G(x_{J_{0, n-k}}, x_{J_{n+k, N-1}}), \quad (47)$$

where  $I = \{i, n\} \cup J_{0, n-k} \cup J_{n+k, N-1}$ ,  $J_{i_1, i_2} = [i_1, i_2] \cap \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,

$$\varphi(x_i, x_n) = x_i x_n \quad \text{and} \quad G(x_{J_{0, n-k}}, x_{J_{n+k, N-1}}) = H_g \left( \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i < N \\ |i-n| > k}} \theta_i(t) x_i, \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i < N \\ |i-n|=k}} \theta_i(t) x_i; s, t, u, i, n \right).$$

Using (46), we find that

$$\|G\|_{\text{Lip}} \lesssim \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-1/2} L + \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-1/2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \lesssim (L+1)^3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-1/2}. \quad (48)$$

Suppose  $i = n + m$ . Recall that (FCB) implies (FCB') corresponding to a functional correlation bound with an arbitrary number of index sets  $K$ . In this case, we set

$$K = 3, \quad I_1 = J_{0,n-k}, \quad I_2 = \{n\}, \quad I_3 = \{i\} \cup J_{n+k,N-1}.$$

Since  $\mu(X_n) = 0$ , we have

$$\int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_2} \otimes \nu_{I_3}) = 0.$$

Now, an application of (FCB') yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mu \left\{ X_n X_i H_g(S_{n,k}, T_{n,k}; s, t, u, i, n) \right\} \right| &= \left| \int F d\nu_I - \int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_2} \otimes \nu_{I_3}) \right| \\ &\lesssim C_* (L+1)^3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-1/2} (R(k) + R(m)) \\ &\lesssim (C_* + 1) (L+1)^3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-1/2} \hat{R}(m). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

If  $i = n - m$ , we set

$$K = 3, \quad I_1 = J_{0,n-k} \cup \{i\}, \quad I_2 = \{n\}, \quad I_3 = J_{n+k,N-1}$$

and again obtain (49) by an application of (FCB'). Finally, if  $m = 0$ , (49) follows directly from  $\|F\|_{\infty} \lesssim (L+1)^3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-1/2}$ .

(A3): The verification of (A3) is similar to that of (A2), so we only provide an outline. Let  $0 \leq i, k, n, m < N$  be integers with  $|i - n| = m$ ,  $2m + 1 \leq k < N$ . Given  $g \in \mathcal{M}_0$ ,  $s, t, u \in [0, 1]$ , we define  $F$  as in (47). Further, let

$$I = \{i, n\} \cup J_{0,n-k} \cup J_{n+k,N-1}, \quad I_1 = J_{0,n-k}, \quad I_2 = \{i, n\}, \quad I_3 = J_{n+k,N-1}.$$

Then,

$$\mu \left\{ X_n X_i \overline{H_g(S_{n,k}, T_{n,k}; s, t, u, i, n)} \right\} = \int F d\nu_I - \int \varphi d\nu_{I_2} \int G d\nu_{I_1 \cup I_3} = R_1 + R_2,$$

where

$$R_1 = \int F d\nu_I - \int \varphi d\nu_{I_2} \int G d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_3}),$$

and

$$R_2 = \int \varphi d\nu_{I_2} \left( \int G d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_3}) - \int G d\nu_{I_1 \cup I_3} \right).$$

Since

$$\int \varphi d\nu_{I_2} \int G d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_3}) = \int F d(\nu_{I_1} \otimes \nu_{I_2} \otimes \nu_{I_3}),$$

we can apply (FCB') separately to  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ , resulting in the bound

$$|R_i| \lesssim (C_* + 1) (L+1)^3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} B^{-1/2} \hat{R}(k - m), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

□

## 6. PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1

Let  $T$  be the map defined in (19) with parameter  $\gamma > 1$ . Recall that  $\lambda$  denotes the Lebesgue measure on  $M = [-1, 1]$  normalized to probability. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  denote the transfer operator associated with  $(T, \lambda)$ .

**Convention:** Throughout this section,  $C_\gamma$  denotes a generic positive constant depending only on  $\gamma$ . The value of  $C_\gamma$  may change from one display to the next.

**6.1. Preliminary.** In this section, we gather some basic (well-known) properties of Pikovsky maps that will be used in the proof of Lemma 3.1. In particular, we will rely on the distortion bounds and mixing estimates stated in (51) and (57), respectively.

Denote by  $g_- : (-1, 1) \rightarrow M_-$  and  $g_+ : (-1, 1) \rightarrow M_+$  the left and right inverse branches of  $T$ , respectively, where  $M_- = (-1, 0)$  and  $M_+ = (0, 1)$ .

Following [10], for each  $n \geq 1$ , define

$$\Delta_n^- = T^{-1}(\Delta_{n-1}^-) \cap M_- \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_n^+ = T^{-1}(\Delta_{n-1}^+) \cap M_+,$$

where

$$\Delta_0^- = (g_-(0), 0) = T^{-1}(M_+) \cap M_- \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_0^+ = (0, g_+(0)) = T^{-1}(M_-) \cap M_+.$$

Then,  $\{\Delta_n^-\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a (mod  $\lambda$ ) partition of  $M_-$ ,  $\{\Delta_n^+\}_{n \geq 1}$  is a (mod  $\lambda$ ) partition of  $M_+$ , and  $T$  maps  $\Delta_n^\pm$  bijectively onto  $\Delta_{n-1}^\pm$ . Moreover, we have  $\Delta_\ell^+ = (x_\ell^+, x_{\ell+1}^+)$  and  $\Delta_\ell^- = (x_{\ell+1}^-, x_\ell^-)$ , where  $x_\ell^+ = g_+^\ell(0)$  and  $x_\ell^- = g_-^\ell(0)$ .

Next, for each  $n \geq 1$  define

$$\delta_n^- = T^{-1}(\Delta_{n-1}^+) \cap \Delta_0^- \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_n^+ = T^{-1}(\Delta_{n-1}^-) \cap \Delta_0^+.$$

Then,  $\{\delta_n^-\}_{n \geq 1}$  and  $\{\delta_n^+\}_{n \geq 1}$  are (mod  $\lambda$ ) partitions of  $\Delta_0^-$  and  $\Delta_0^+$ , respectively. Moreover,  $\delta_n^- = (y_{n-1}^-, y_n^-)$  and  $\delta_n^+ = (y_n^+, y_{n-1}^+)$  where  $y_n^- = g_-(x_{n-1}^+)$  and  $y_n^+ = g_+(x_{n-1}^-)$ . Note that the following maps are all bijective:

$$\begin{aligned} T : \delta_n^- &\rightarrow \Delta_{n-1}^+, & T : \delta_n^+ &\rightarrow \Delta_{n-1}^-, \\ T^n : \delta_n^- &\rightarrow \Delta_0^+, & T^n : \delta_n^+ &\rightarrow \Delta_0^-. \end{aligned}$$

By [12, Lemma 2], the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - x_n^+ &\leq C_\gamma n^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, & x_n^- + 1 &\leq C_\gamma n^{-\frac{1}{\gamma-1}}, \\ |\Delta_n^\pm| &\leq C_\gamma n^{-\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}, & |y_n^\pm| &\leq C_\gamma n^{-\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}, \\ |\delta_n^\pm| &\leq |y_n^\pm| + |y_{n+1}^\pm| \leq C_\gamma n^{-\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Set  $Y = \Delta_0^- \cup \Delta_0^+$ , and define the return time function

$$\tau(x) = \inf\{n \geq 1 : T^n(x) \in Y\}, \quad x \in M.$$

Define a partition of  $M$  by

$$\mathcal{P} = \{\delta_n^-\}_{n \geq 1} \cup \{\Delta_n^+\}_{n \geq 1},$$

where  $\delta_n := \delta_n^- \cup \delta_n^+$  and  $\Delta_n := \Delta_n^- \cup \Delta_n^+$ . For each  $a \in \mathcal{P}$ , the restriction  $\tau|_a$  is a constant function whose value we denote by  $\tau(a) \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ . Let  $F_a : a \rightarrow Y$  be the first return map  $F_a := T^{\tau(a)}$ , and let  $m$  denote Lebesgue measure on  $Y$ , normalized to probability.

**Lemma 6.1.** *There exists a constant  $\mathfrak{D} > 0$  depending only on  $\gamma$  such that the following holds for all  $0 \leq m < n$ : Let  $a \in \mathcal{P}$  with  $\tau(a) = n$ . Then, for all  $x, x' \in a$ :*

$$|\log(T^{n-m})'(T^m)(x) - \log(T^{n-m})'(T^m)(x')| \leq \mathfrak{D}|T^n(x) - T^n(x')|. \quad (51)$$

*Proof.* There are two cases: (1)  $x, x' \in \delta_n^\sigma$  or  $x, x' \in \Delta_n^\sigma$  where  $\sigma \in \{-, +\}$ ; (2)  $x \in \delta_n^{\sigma_1}, x' \in \delta_n^{\sigma_2}$  or  $x \in \Delta_n^{\sigma_1}, x' \in \Delta_n^{\sigma_2}$  where  $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2 \in \{-, +\}$ . The first case follows directly from [10, Proposition 3.10]. The second case can be treated as in [12, Remark 1], by exploiting symmetricity of the map (19).  $\square$

For a map  $\psi : Y \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , define

$$|\psi|_{\text{LL}} = \sup_{y \neq y' \in Y} \frac{|\log \psi(y) - \log \psi(y')|}{|y - y'|},$$

where we adopt the conventions  $\log 0 = -\infty$  and  $\log 0 - \log 0 = 0$ . In the sequel, for a non-negative measure  $\mu$  on  $Y$ , we often write  $|\mu|_{\text{LL}}$  to denote  $|d\mu/dm|_{\text{LL}}$ , with the convention that the density of  $\mu$  is fixed.

**Proposition 6.2.** *The first return map  $F_a$  is a full-branch mixing Gibbs–Markov map. More precisely, the following hold for some constants  $\Lambda > 1$  and  $K, \delta_\# > 0$  depending only on  $\gamma$ .*

(i)  $F_a$  is bijective, and

$$d(F_a(y), F_a(y')) \geq \Lambda d(y, y') \quad \forall y, y' \in a, \quad a \subset Y, a \in \mathcal{P}. \quad (52)$$

Further,  $F_a$  is non-singular with log-Lipschitz Jacobian:

$$\zeta = \frac{d(F_a)_*(m|_a)}{dm} \quad \text{satisfies} \quad |\zeta|_{\text{LL}} \leq K. \quad (53)$$

(ii)  $(T^n)_*m(Y) \geq \delta_\#$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

In addition,  $\tau$  is integrable with respect to  $m$ .

*Proof.* (i): (52) is easy to see by inspecting the definition (19), while (53) is a direct consequence of (51).

(ii): By (50), for each  $j, N \geq 1$ , we have

$$(T^j)_*m(\tau \geq N) \leq \frac{(T^j)_*\lambda(\tau \geq N)}{\lambda(Y)} = \frac{\lambda(\tau \geq N)}{\lambda(Y)} \leq C_\gamma N^{-1/(\gamma-1)}.$$

Moreover,  $m(\tau = 1) \geq m(\delta_1^-) \geq C_\gamma > 0$ . Thus, (ii) follows<sup>5</sup> by [23, Proposition 2.1].

Finally, using (50), we compute

$$\int \tau dm = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(\tau \geq n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m\left(\bigcup_{\ell \geq n} \delta_\ell^\pm\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (|y_n^-| + |y_n^+|) < \infty.$$

$\square$

It follows from Proposition 6.2 (see [22, Proposition 3.4] and [21, Proposition 3.1]) that there exist constants  $0 < K_1 < K_2$  depending only on  $\gamma$ , such that whenever  $\mu$  is a nonnegative measure on  $Y$  with  $|\mu|_{\text{LL}} \leq K_2$ , then for each  $a \in \mathcal{P}$ ,  $a \subset Y$ ,

$$|(F_a)_*(\mu|_a)| \leq K_1. \quad (54)$$

<sup>5</sup>This result is applied in the case of the constant sequence  $T_1 = T_2 = \dots = T$ .

Moreover,  $K_1, K_2$  can be chosen arbitrarily large. Fix such  $K_1, K_2$ . Then, we have the following mixing estimate:

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $\mu$  be a probability measures on  $M$  with density  $h = d\mu/d\lambda$ . Suppose that the following hold:*

$$|(T^n)_*(\mu|_{\{\tau=n\}})|_{LL} \leq K_1 \quad \forall n \geq 1, \quad (55)$$

and

$$\mu(\tau \geq n) \leq C_\beta n^{-\beta} \quad \forall n \geq 1, \quad (56)$$

where  $\beta \leq \gamma/(\gamma - 1)$ . Then,

$$\|\mathcal{L}^n(h) - 1\|_{L^1(\lambda)} \leq Cn^{-\beta}, \quad (57)$$

where  $C$  is a constant depending only on  $K_1, K_2, C_\beta$  and  $\gamma, \beta$ .

*Proof.* The desired estimate follows as an immediate consequence of [23, Theorem 2.6], applied in the special case  $T_1 = T_2 = \dots = T$ . To see this, it suffices to observe the following:

- In the terminology of [23], (55) and (56) together mean that that  $\mu$  is a regular measure with tail bound  $r(n) := C_\beta n^{-\beta}$ .
- Assumptions (NU:1-5) in [23, Section 2.1] are satisfied by Proposition 6.2.
- By (50),  $m(\tau \geq n) \leq C_\gamma n^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)}$ .

□

**6.2. Cylinders.** Define

$$L(n) = \#\{1 \leq j \leq n : \tau^j \leq n\},$$

where  $\tau^j = \tau^{j-1} \circ \tau$ . This quantity represents the number of returns to  $Y$  by time  $n$ . Given  $n \geq 1$ , we consider the (mod  $\lambda$ ) partition of  $M$  into the cylinder sets

$$C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p) = \{\tau^1 = \ell_0, \dots, \tau^{p+1} = \ell_p\} \cap \{L(n) = p\}, \quad (58)$$

where  $1 \leq \ell_0 < \dots < \ell_{p-1} \leq n < \ell_p$  if  $1 \leq p \leq n$ , and  $\ell_0 > n$  if  $p = 0$ . Here,  $\ell_0 < \dots < \ell_{p-1}$  enumerate returns to  $Y$  by time  $n$ , and  $\ell_p$  is the first return time after  $n$ . By definition, we have  $\tau^{L(n)} \leq n < \tau^{L(n)+1}$ . We can express  $C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)$  using elements of the partition  $\mathcal{P}$  as follows:

$$C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p) = (\delta_{\ell_0} \cup \Delta_{\ell_0}) \cap \bigcap_{j=0}^{p-1} T^{-\ell_j} \delta_{\ell_{j+1} - \ell_j}, \quad \text{for } p > 0,$$

$$C_n(\ell_0) = \delta_{\ell_0} \cup \Delta_{\ell_0}, \quad \text{for } p = 0.$$

Using (50) and (51), we can control the size of cylinder sets:

**Proposition 6.4.** *For all  $p \geq 1$ :*

$$\lambda(C_n(\ell_0)) \leq C_\gamma \ell_0^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)},$$

$$\lambda(C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) \leq \min\{\Lambda^{-1}, C_\gamma \ell_0^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)}\} \prod_{j=0}^{p-1} \min\{\Lambda^{-1}, C_\gamma (\ell_{j+1} - \ell_j)^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)}\}. \quad (59)$$

In particular, for all  $p \geq 0$ ,

$$\lambda(C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) \leq Cn^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)}. \quad (60)$$

*Proof.* The first upper bound in (59) follows readily from (50). To show the second bound in (59), let  $x, x' \in C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)$ ,  $p \geq 1$ . For  $-1 \leq j < p$  with  $\ell_{-1} = 0$ , we have

$$|T^{\ell_j}(x) - T^{\ell_j}(x')| \leq \sup_{\xi \in Y} \frac{1}{(T^{\ell_{j+1}-\ell_j})' \circ (T^{\ell_{j+1}-\ell_j}|_{\delta_{\ell_{j+1}-\ell_j}})^{-1}(\xi)} |T^{\ell_{j+1}}(x) - T^{\ell_{j+1}}(x')|.$$

Combining (52), (51), we find that

$$\sup_{\xi \in Y} \frac{1}{(T^{\ell_{j+1}-\ell_j})' \circ (T^{\ell_{j+1}-\ell_j}|_{\delta_{\ell_{j+1}-\ell_j}})^{-1}(\xi)} \leq \min\{\Lambda^{-1}, C_\gamma \lambda(\delta_{\ell_{j+1}-\ell_j})\}.$$

Further, by (50), we have that  $\lambda(\delta_{\ell_{j+1}-\ell_j}) \leq C_\gamma(\ell_{j+1} - \ell_j)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & |T^{\ell_j}(x) - T^{\ell_j}(x')| \\ & \leq \min\{\Lambda^{-1}, C_\gamma(\ell_{j+1} - \ell_j)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}\} |T^{\ell_{j+1}}(x) - T^{\ell_{j+1}}(x')|. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

The second upper bound in (59) follows by iterating (61)  $p + 1$  times.

It remains to verify (60). For  $p = 0$ , this follows from the first bound in (59), since  $\ell_p > n$ . If  $p > 0$ , observe that for a given cylinder  $C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)$ , we must have either  $\ell_0 \geq n/(p+1)$  or  $\ell_{j+1} - \ell_j \geq n/(p+1)$  for some  $0 \leq j < p$ . Thus, by the second upper bound in (59),

$$\lambda(C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) \leq C_\gamma \Lambda^{-(p-1)} (p+1)^{1/(\gamma-1)} n^{-1/(\gamma-1)} \leq C_\gamma n^{-1/(\gamma-1)}.$$

□

**Proposition 6.5.** *If  $0 \leq \ell < n$ , then*

$$\lambda(T^\ell(C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p))) \leq C_\gamma (n - \ell)^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)}. \quad (62)$$

*Proof.* The case  $\ell = 0$  is clear from (60). If  $p = 0$  and  $\ell > 0$ , we have  $T^\ell(C_n(\ell_0)) \subset \Delta_{\ell_0-\ell}$ , so the desired bound follows from (50). Now, consider the case  $p > 0$ . We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & T^\ell(C_n(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) \\ & \subset \begin{cases} \{\tau^1 = \ell_{j+1} - \ell, \dots, \tau^{p+1-j} = \ell_p - \ell\}, & \ell_j \leq \ell < \ell_{j+1}, 0 \leq j < p, \\ \{\tau^1 = \ell_0 - \ell, \dots, \tau^{p+1} = \ell_p - \ell\}, & \ell < \ell_0, \end{cases} \\ & = \begin{cases} C_{n-\ell}(\ell_{j+1} - \ell, \dots, \ell_p - \ell), & \ell_j \leq \ell < \ell_{j+1}, 0 \leq j < p, \\ C_{n-\ell}(\ell_0 - \ell, \dots, \ell_p - \ell), & \ell < \ell_0, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\ell_{p-1} - \ell \leq n - \ell$  and  $\ell_p - \ell > n - \ell$ . Therefore, (62) follows by (60). □

**6.3. Verification of (FCB).** We are now in a position to prove Lemma 3.1. Let  $0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_n$  and  $1 \leq m < n$  be integers. Let  $F : [-\|f\|_\infty, \|f\|_\infty]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a separately Lipschitz continuous function, and define  $H : M^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$H(x, y) = F(X_{i_1}(x), \dots, X_{i_m}(x), X_{i_{m+1}}(y), \dots, X_{i_n}(y)).$$

Set

$$i_* = \lfloor (i_{m+1} - i_m)/3 \rfloor + i_m,$$

and, without loss of generality, assume that  $i_{m+1} - i_m > 6$ . To establish Lemma 3.1, we need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_M H(x, x) d\lambda(x) - \int \int_{M^2} H(x, y) d\lambda(x) d\lambda(y) \right| \\ & \leq C_\gamma (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + 1) \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

The proof consists of three steps.



**Step 1:** We decompose

$$M = \bigcup_{p=0}^{i_*} \bigcup_{\ell_0 < \dots < \ell_p} C_{i_*}(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p),$$

and approximate  $x \mapsto H(x, y)$  by a constant function on each cylinder. Here, the second union is taken over all integers  $\ell_0 < \dots < \ell_p$  as in (58). For simplicity, in the sequel we omit the subscript  $i_*$  and write  $C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p) = C_{i_*}(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)$ .

For any  $x, x' \in C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)$ ,  $y \in M$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |H(x, y) - H(x', y)| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} |f(T^{i_j} x) - f(T^{i_j} x')| \\ &\leq C_\gamma \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{i_m} \lambda(T^\ell C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) \\ &\leq C_\gamma \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \sum_{\ell=1}^{i_m} (i_* - \ell)^{-\gamma/(\gamma-1)} \\ &\leq C_\gamma \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}, \end{aligned}$$

where (62) was used in the second-to-last inequality. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_M H(x, x) d\lambda(x) - \iint_{M^2} H(x, y) d\lambda(x) d\lambda(y) \\ &= \sum_{p=0}^{i_*} \sum_{\ell_0 < \dots < \ell_p} \int_{C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)} \left[ H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, x) - \int H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, y) d\lambda(y) \right] d\lambda(x) \\ &+ O(\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}), \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where the constant in the error term depends only on  $\gamma$ .

**Step 2:** We discard from the sum (64) cylinders that are very small and approximate the error. To this end, note that for any  $\ell > i_*$ ,

$$\{\tau^{L(i_*)+1} > \ell\} \subset \{\tau(T^{i_*}) > \ell - i_*\} = T^{-i_*} \{\tau > \ell - i_*\}.$$

Let

$$\ell_\# = i_m + \lfloor 2(i_{m+1} - i_m)/3 \rfloor.$$

Since  $T$  preserves  $\lambda$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{p=0}^{i_*} \sum_{\ell_0 < \dots < \ell_p, \ell_p > \ell_\#} \lambda(C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) = \lambda(\{\tau^{L(i_*)+1} > \ell_\#\}) \\ &\leq (T^{n_*})_* \lambda(\tau > \ell_\# - i_*) \\ &= \lambda(\tau > \lfloor 2(i_{m+1} - i_m)/3 \rfloor - \lfloor (i_{m+1} - i_m)/3 \rfloor) \\ &\leq C_\gamma (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where (50) was used in the last inequality.

Combining (64) and (65), we arrive at the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_M H(x, x) d\lambda(x) - \iint_{M^2} H(x, y) d\lambda(x) d\lambda(y) \\ &= \sum_{p=0}^{i_*} \sum_{\ell_0 < \dots < \ell_p, \ell_p \leq \ell_{\#}} \int_{C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)} \left[ H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, x) - \int H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, y) d\lambda(y) \right] d\lambda(x) \\ &+ O(\|F\|_{\text{Lip}}(\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + 1)(i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}). \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

**Step 3:** Fix  $0 < \ell_0 < \dots < \ell_{p-1} \leq i_* < \ell_p$  where  $\ell_p \leq \ell_{\#}$ . (If  $p = 0$ , then  $\ell_0 \leq \ell_{\#}$ .) We replace  $\lambda|_{C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)}/\lambda(C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p))$  with  $\lambda$  in the remaining integral and control the error using (57). Set

$$h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p} = \frac{\mathbf{1}_{C(\ell_0 \dots \ell_p)}}{\lambda(C(\ell_0 \dots \ell_p))},$$

and denote by  $\tilde{H}(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, x)$  the function that satisfies  $\tilde{H}(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, T^{i_{m+1}}x) = H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, x)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &:= \int_{C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)} \left[ H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, x) - \int_M H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, y) d\lambda(y) \right] d\lambda(x) \\ &= \lambda(C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) \int_M \left[ \tilde{H}(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, x) - \int_M H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, y) d\lambda(y) \right] \circ T^{i_{m+1}} \cdot h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}(x) d\lambda(x) \\ &= \lambda(C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) \int_M \left[ \tilde{H}(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, x) - \int_M H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, y) d\lambda(y) \right] \circ T^{i_{m+1}} \cdot (h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p} - 1)(x) d\lambda(x) \\ &= \lambda(C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) \int_M \left[ \tilde{H}(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, x) - \int_M H(c_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, y) d\lambda(y) \right] \cdot \mathcal{L}^{i_{m+1}}(h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p} - 1)(x) d\lambda(x). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathcal{I} \leq \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \lambda(C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) \|\mathcal{L}^{i_{m+1}-\ell_p} \mathcal{L}^{\ell_p}(h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}) - 1\|_{L^1(\lambda)}.$$

The density  $\mathcal{L}^{\ell_p} h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}$  is supported on  $Y$ , and

$$\mathcal{L}^{\ell_p} h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}(y) = \frac{1}{\lambda(C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p))} \frac{1}{(T^{\ell_p})' y_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}},$$

where  $y_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}$  is the unique preimage of  $y \in Y$  in  $C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)$  under  $T^{\ell_p}$ . Let  $y, z \in Y$ . Using the chain rule, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\log \mathcal{L}^{\ell_p} h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}(y) - \log \mathcal{L}^{\ell_p} h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}(z)| \\ & \leq |\log(T^{\ell_0})' y_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p} - \log(T^{\ell_0})' z_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}| \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=1}^p |\log(T^{\ell_j - \ell_{j-1}})'(T^{\ell_{j-1}} y_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}) - \log(T^{\ell_j - \ell_{j-1}})'(T^{\ell_{j-1}} z_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p})|, \end{aligned}$$

where the sum vanishes if  $p = 0$ . For  $x \in \{y_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}, z_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}\}$ , we have that  $T^{\ell_j - 1}x \in \delta_{\ell_j - \ell_{j-1}}$  if  $1 \leq j \leq p$ , and  $x \in \Delta_{\ell_0} \cup \delta_{\ell_0}$ . Therefore, using (51) and (52), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & |\log \mathcal{L}^{\ell_p} h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}(y) - \log \mathcal{L}^{\ell_p} h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}(z)| \\ & \leq C_{\gamma} \sum_{j=0}^p |T^{\ell_j}(y_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}) - T^{\ell_j}(z_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p})| \leq C_{\gamma} \sum_{j=0}^p \Lambda^{-p+j} |y - z| \leq C_{\gamma} |y - z|. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that for sufficiently large  $K_2 > 0$  depending only on  $\gamma$ , the measure

$$\mu := (T^{\ell_p})_*(\lambda|_{C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)})/C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)$$

satisfies  $|\mu|_{\text{LL}} \leq K_2$ . Since  $d\mu/dm$  is bounded, (50) implies the tail bound

$$\mu(\tau \geq n) \leq C_\gamma m(\tau \geq n) \leq C_\gamma n^{-1/(\gamma-1)}.$$

Now, by (57),

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathcal{L}^{i_{m+1}-\ell_p} \mathcal{L}^{\ell_p}(h_{\ell_0 \dots \ell_p}) - 1\|_{L^1(\lambda)} \leq C_\gamma (i_{m+1} - \ell_p)^{-1/(\gamma-1)} \\ & \leq C_\gamma (i_{m+1} - \ell_\#)^{-1/(\gamma-1)} \leq C_\gamma (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

We arrive at the upper bound

$$|\mathcal{I}| \leq \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \lambda(C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) C_\gamma (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}. \quad (67)$$

**Conclusion:** Assembling (65) and (67),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_M H(x, x) d\lambda(x) - \iint_{M^2} H(x, y) d\lambda(x) d\lambda(y) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{p=0}^{i_*} \sum_{\ell_0 < \dots < \ell_p, \ell_p \leq \ell_\#} \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} \lambda(C(\ell_0, \dots, \ell_p)) C_\gamma (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)} \\ & + C_\gamma (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)} \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + 1) (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)} \\ & \leq C_\gamma \|F\|_{\text{Lip}} (\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} + 1) (i_{m+1} - i_m)^{-1/(\gamma-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (63).

#### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.5

(E<sub>1</sub>): Let  $|i - n| = m$ ,  $0 \leq i < N$ ,  $0 \leq n, m < N$ ,  $s \in [0, 1]$ . By (34),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu(X_n X_i \xi_{i,n,m}(s)) \\ & = \mu \left\{ X_n X_i (f''(W_{n,m} + sY_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n] - f''(W_{n,m})[\theta_i, \theta_n]) \right\} \\ & = - \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} \mu \left\{ X_n X_i \mathbf{E} \left( g''((W_{n,m} + sY_{n,m})e^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z)[\theta_i, \theta_n] \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - g''(W_{n,m}e^{-u} + \sigma(u)Z)[\theta_i, \theta_n]) \right\} du \\ & = - \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} \mu \left\{ X_n X_i H_g(S_{n,m}, T_{n,m}; e^{-u}, se^{-u}, \sigma(u), n) \right\} du \end{aligned}$$

where  $H_g$  is defined as in (38). Hence, by (A2),

$$\begin{aligned} |E_1| & = \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \int_0^1 \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i \xi_{i,n,m}(s)) ds \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \int_0^1 B^{-1} \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} \left| \mu \left\{ X_n X_i H_g(S_{n,m}, T_{n,m}; e^{-u}, se^{-u}, \sigma(u), n) \right\} \right| du ds \\ & \lesssim C_2 B^{-3/2} N \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \rho(m). \end{aligned}$$

( $E_2$ ): Recalling (35), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |E_2| &= \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_0^1 \mu(|\tilde{X}_n^2 \xi_{n,n,0}(s)|) ds \right| \\ &\leq B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_0^1 \mu(|X_n^2 (f''(W_{n,0} + sY_n)[\theta_n, \theta_n] - f''(W_{n,0})[\theta_n, \theta_n])|) ds \\ &\lesssim B^{-3/2} NL^3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}}. \end{aligned}$$

( $E_3$ ): As in the case of  $E_1$ , using (34) we see that

$$\mu(X_n X_i \overline{\xi_{i,n,k}}) = - \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} \mu \left\{ X_n X_i \overline{H_g(S_{n,k}, T_{n,k}; e^{-u}, e^{-u}, \sigma(u), i, n)} \right\} du. \quad (68)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |E_3| &= \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2m} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i \overline{\xi_{i,n,k}}) \right| \\ &\leq B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2m} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} \left| \mu \left\{ X_n X_i H_g(S_{n,k}, T_{n,k}; e^{-u}, e^{-u}, \sigma(u), i, n) \right\} \right| du \\ &+ B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=m+1}^{2m} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} \left| \mu \left\{ H_g(S_{n,k}, T_{n,k}; e^{-u}, e^{-u}, \sigma(u), i, n) \right\} \mu \left\{ X_n X_i \right\} \right| du \\ &= E_{3,1} + E_{3,2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (A2),

$$E_{3,1} \lesssim C_2 B^{-3/2} N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \rho(m).$$

Further,

$$E_{3,2} \lesssim B^{-3/2} L \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} |\mu\{X_n X_i\}| \lesssim C_1 B^{-3/2} NL \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \rho(m),$$

where (46) and (A1) were used to obtain the first and second inequality, respectively. Consequently,

$$|E_3| \lesssim (C_1 L + C_2) B^{-3/2} N \|g\|_{\mathcal{M}} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \rho(m).$$

( $E_4$ ): Combining (68) with (A3) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 |E_4| &= \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_i \overline{\xi_{i,n,k}}) \right| \\
 &\leq B^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2m+1}^{N-1} \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \int_0^\infty e^{-2u} \left| \mu \left\{ X_n X_i \overline{H_g(S_{n,k}, T_{n,k}; e^{-u}, e^{-u}, \sigma(u), i, n)} \right\} \right| du \\
 &\lesssim B^{-3/2} N C_3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=2m+1}^{N-1} \rho(k-m) \lesssim B^{-3/2} N C_3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \rho(m).
 \end{aligned}$$

( $E_5$ ), ( $E_6$ ), ( $E_7$ ): Similarly, we derive the following estimates for the remaining three terms. Their verification is left to the reader.

$$\begin{aligned}
 |E_5| &= \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \mu(\tilde{X}_n^2 \overline{\xi_{n,n,k}}) \right| \lesssim B^{-3/2} N C_3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \rho(k), \\
 |E_6| &= \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} \sum_{k=0}^m \sum_{\substack{|i-n|=m \\ 0 \leq i < N}} \mu(\tilde{X}_n \tilde{X}_m) \mu(\xi_{i,n,k}) \right| \lesssim C_1 B^{-3/2} N L \|g\|_{\mathcal{A}} \sum_{m=1}^{N-1} m \rho(m), \\
 |E_7| &= \left| \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \mu(\tilde{X}_n^2) \mu(\xi_{n,n,0}) \right| \lesssim B^{-3/2} N L^3 \|g\|_{\mathcal{A}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The desired estimate in Proposition 5.5 follows by combining the above estimates on  $E_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 7$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Romain Aimino, Huyi Hu, Matthew Nicol, Andrei Török, and Sandro Vaienti. Polynomial loss of memory for maps of the interval with a neutral fixed point. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 35(3):793–806, 2015. doi:10.3934/dcds.2015.35.793.
- [2] Marios Antoniou and Ian Melbourne. Rate of convergence in the weak invariance principle for deterministic systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 369(3):1147–1165, 2019. doi:10.1007/s00220-019-03334-6.
- [3] Viviane Baladi. *Positive transfer operators and decay of correlations*, volume 16. World Scientific, 2000. doi:10.1142/9789812813633.
- [4] Viviane Baladi. *Dynamical zeta functions and dynamical determinants for hyperbolic maps*, volume 68. Springer, 2018. A functional approach. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-77661-3.
- [5] A. D. Barbour. Stein’s method for diffusion approximations. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 84(3):297–322, 1990. doi:10.1007/BF01197887.
- [6] Jérôme Buzzi. Exponential decay of correlations for random Lasota-Yorke maps. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 208(1):25–54, 1999. doi:10.1007/s002200050746.
- [7] Louis H. Y. Chen, Larry Goldstein, and Qi-Man Shao. *Normal approximation by Stein’s method*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer, Heidelberg, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-15007-4.
- [8] N. Chernov. Advanced statistical properties of dispersing billiards. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 122(6):1061–1094, 2006. doi:10.1007/s10955-006-9036-8.
- [9] Nikolai Chernov and Roberto Markarian. *Chaotic billiards*, volume 127 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006. doi:10.1090/surv/127.
- [10] Douglas Coates, Stefano Luzzatto, and Mubarak Muhammad. Doubly intermittent full branch maps with critical points and singularities. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 402(2):1845–1878, 2023. doi:10.1007/s00220-023-04766-x.

- [11] Jean-Pierre Conze and Albert Raugi. Limit theorems for sequential expanding dynamical systems on  $[0, 1]$ . In *Ergodic theory and related fields*, volume 430 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 89–121. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007. doi:10.1090/comm/430/08253.
- [12] Giampaolo Cristadoro, Nicolai Haydn, Philippe Marie, and Sandro Vaienti. Statistical properties of intermittent maps with unbounded derivative. *Nonlinearity*, 23(5):1071–1095, 2010. doi:10.1088/0951-7715/23/5/003.
- [13] Monroe D. Donsker. An invariance principle for certain probability limit theorems. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 6:12, 1951.
- [14] D. Dragičević, G. Froyland, C. González-Tokman, and S. Vaienti. Almost sure invariance principle for random piecewise expanding maps. *Nonlinearity*, 31(5):2252–2280, 2018. doi:10.1088/1361-6544/aaaf4b.
- [15] Markus Fischer and Giovanna Nappo. On the moments of the modulus of continuity of Itô processes. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.*, 28(1):103–122, 2010. doi:10.1080/07362990903415825.
- [16] Nicholas Fleming. *Functional correlation bounds and deterministic homogenisation of fast-slow systems*. PhD thesis, University of Warwick, May 2023. URL: <https://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/id/eprint/181829/>.
- [17] Yeor Hafouta. Convergence rates in the functional CLT for  $\alpha$ -mixing triangular arrays. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 161:242–290, 2023. doi:10.1016/j.spa.2023.04.008.
- [18] Olli Hella, Juho Leppänen, and Mikko Stenlund. Stein’s method of normal approximation for dynamical systems. *Stoch. Dyn.*, 20(4):2050021, 50, 2020. doi:10.1142/S0219493720500215.
- [19] Mikołaj J. Kasprzak. Stein’s method for multivariate Brownian approximations of sums under dependence. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 130(8):4927–4967, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.spa.2020.02.006.
- [20] Mikołaj J. Kasprzak, Andrew B. Duncan, and Sebastian J. Vollmer. Note on A. Barbour’s paper on Stein’s method for diffusion approximations. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 22:Paper No. 23, 8, 2017. doi:10.1214/17-ECP54.
- [21] A. Korepanov, Z. Kosloff, and I. Melbourne. Explicit coupling argument for non-uniformly hyperbolic transformations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 149(1):101–130, 2019. doi:10.1017/S0308210518000161.
- [22] Alexey Korepanov and Juho Leppänen. Loss of memory and moment bounds for non-stationary intermittent dynamical systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 385(2):905–935, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00220-021-04071-5.
- [23] Alexey Korepanov and Juho Leppänen. Improved polynomial rates of memory loss for nonstationary intermittent dynamical systems, 2024. Preprint. arXiv:2410.20994.
- [24] Juho Leppänen. Functional correlation decay and multivariate normal approximation for non-uniformly expanding maps. *Nonlinearity*, 30(11):4239–4259, 2017. doi:10.1088/1361-6544/aa85d0.
- [25] Juho Leppänen. Intermittent quasistatic dynamical systems: weak convergence of fluctuations. *Nonauton. Dyn. Syst.*, 5(1):8–34, 2018. doi:10.1515/msds-2018-0002.
- [26] Juho Leppänen and Mikko Stenlund. A note on the finite-dimensional distributions of dispersing billiard processes. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 168(1):128–145, 2017. doi:10.1007/s10955-017-1790-2.
- [27] Juho Leppänen and Mikko Stenlund. Sunklodas’ approach to normal approximation for time-dependent dynamical systems. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 181(5):1523–1564, 2020. doi:10.1007/s10955-020-02636-7.
- [28] Christophe Ley, Gesine Reinert, and Yvik Swan. Stein’s method for comparison of univariate distributions. *Probab. Surv.*, 14:1–52, 2017. doi:10.1214/16-PS278.
- [29] Zhenxin Liu and Zhe Wang. Wasserstein convergence rates in the invariance principle for deterministic dynamical systems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 44(4):1172–1191, 2024. doi:10.1017/etds.2023.40.
- [30] Zhenxin Liu and Zhe Wang. Wasserstein convergence rates in the invariance principle for sequential dynamical systems. *Nonlinearity*, 37(12):Paper No. 125019, 27, 2024.
- [31] Carlangelo Liverani, Benoît Saussol, and Sandro Vaienti. A probabilistic approach to intermittency. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19(3):671–685, 1999. doi:10.1017/S0143385799133856.
- [32] Ian Melbourne and Matthew Nicol. Almost sure invariance principle for nonuniformly hyperbolic systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 260(1):131–146, 2005. doi:10.1007/s00220-005-1407-5.
- [33] Yushi Nakano, Masato Tsujii, and Jens Wittsten. The partial captivity condition for  $U(1)$  extensions of expanding maps on the circle. *Nonlinearity*, 29(7):1917–1925, 2016. doi:10.1088/0951-7715/29/7/1917.

- [34] Matthew Nicol, Felipe Perez Pereira, and Andrew Török. Large deviations and central limit theorems for sequential and random systems of intermittent maps. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 41(9):2805–2832, 2021. doi:10.1017/etds.2020.90.
- [35] Matthew Nicol, Andrew Török, and Sandro Vaienti. Central limit theorems for sequential and random intermittent dynamical systems. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 38(3):1127–1153, 2018. doi:10.1017/etds.2016.69.
- [36] Ivan Nourdin and Giovanni Peccati. *Normal approximations with Malliavin calculus*, volume 192 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. From Stein’s method to universality. doi:10.1017/CB09781139084659.
- [37] Nicolo Paviato. Rates for maps and flows in a deterministic multidimensional weak invariance principle, 2024. Preprint. arXiv:2406.06123.
- [38] Arkady S. Pikovsky. Statistical properties of dynamically generated anomalous diffusion. *Phys. Rev. A*, 43:3146–3148, Mar 1991. doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.43.3146.
- [39] Yves Pomeau and Paul Manneville. Intermittent transition to turbulence in dissipative dynamical systems. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 74(2):189–197, 1980. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.cmp/1103907981>.
- [40] Yu. V. Prokhorov and V. Statulevičius, editors. *Limit theorems of probability theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-04172-7.
- [41] Nathan Ross. Fundamentals of Stein’s method. *Probab. Surv.*, 8:210–293, 2011. doi:10.1214/11-PS182.
- [42] Charles Stein. A bound for the error in the normal approximation to the distribution of a sum of dependent random variables. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability (Univ. California, Berkeley, Calif., 1970/1971), Vol. II: Probability theory*, pages 583–602. Univ. California Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1972. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.bsmsp/1200514239>.
- [43] Mikko Stenlund. A strong pair correlation bound implies the CLT for Sinai billiards. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 140(1):154–169, 2010. doi:10.1007/s10955-010-9987-7.
- [44] Yaofeng Su. Vector-valued almost sure invariance principles for (non)stationary and random dynamical systems. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 375(7):4809–4848, 2022. doi:10.1090/tran/8609.
- [45] J. Sunklodas. On normal approximation for strongly mixing random variables. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 97(1-3):251–260, 2007. doi:10.1007/s10440-007-9122-1.