



This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/copyright>



Quantitative Breuer–Major theorems

Ivan Nourdin^a, Giovanni Peccati^b, Mark Podolskij^{c,*}

^a *Laboratoire de Probabilités et Modèles Aléatoires, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Boîte courrier 188, 4 Place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 5, France*

^b *Faculté des Sciences, de la Technologie et de la Communication; UR en Mathématiques. 6, rue Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi, L-1359, Luxembourg*

^c *Department of Mathematics, ETH Zürich, HG G32.2, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland*

Received 12 July 2010; received in revised form 3 December 2010; accepted 15 December 2010
Available online 22 December 2010

Abstract

We consider sequences of random variables of the type $S_n = n^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^n \{f(X_k) - E[f(X_k)]\}$, $n \geq 1$, where $X = (X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a d -dimensional Gaussian process and $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function. It is known that, under certain conditions on f and the covariance function r of X , S_n converges in distribution to a normal variable S . In the present paper we derive several explicit upper bounds for quantities of the type $|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]|$, where h is a sufficiently smooth test function. Our methods are based on Malliavin calculus, on interpolation techniques and on the Stein's method for normal approximation. The bounds deduced in our paper depend only on $\text{Var}[f(X_1)]$ and on simple infinite series involving the components of r . In particular, our results generalize and refine some classic CLTs given by Breuer and Major, Giraitis and Surgailis, and Arcones, concerning the normal approximation of partial sums associated with Gaussian-subordinated time series.

© 2010 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

MSC: 60F05; 60H05; 60G15; 60H07

Keywords: Berry–Esseen bounds; Breuer–Major central limit theorems; Gaussian processes; Interpolation; Malliavin calculus; Stein's method

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: ivan.nourdin@upmc.fr (I. Nourdin), giovanni.peccati@gmail.com (G. Peccati), mpodolskij@creates.au.dk, mark.podolskij@math.ethz.ch (M. Podolskij).

1. Introduction

Fix $d \geq 1$ and consider a d -dimensional centered stationary Gaussian process $X = (X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$, $X_k = (X_k^{(1)}, \dots, X_k^{(d)})$, defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. For any $1 \leq i, l \leq d$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by

$$r^{(i,l)}(j) = \mathbb{E}[X_1^{(i)} X_{1+j}^{(l)}], \tag{1.1}$$

the covariance of $X_1^{(i)}$ and $X_{1+j}^{(l)}$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function and write

$$S_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \{f(X_k) - \mathbb{E}[f(X_k)]\}, \quad n \geq 1, \tag{1.2}$$

to indicate the sequence of *normalized partial sums* associated with the subordinated process $k \mapsto f(X_k)$. One crucial problem in Gaussian analysis is the following:

Problem P. Find conditions on f and on the covariance r in order to have that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, S_n converges in distribution to a Gaussian random variable.

Although easily stated, **Problem P** is in fact quite subtle. For instance, as observed e.g. in [8, p. 429], it is in general not possible to deduce a solution to **Problem P** by using standard central limit results for dependent random variables (for instance, by applying techniques based on mixing). More to the point, slight variations in the form of f and r may imply that either the normalization by the factor $n^{1/2}$ is inappropriate, or the limiting distribution is not Gaussian (or both apply): see Dobrushin and Major [15], Rosenblatt [31] and Taqqu [36,37] for several classic results connected with this phenomenon, as well as Breton and Nourdin [7] for recent developments.

It turns out that an elegant solution to **Problem P** can be deduced by using the notion of *Hermite rank*. Recall that the function f is said to have Hermite rank equal to q with respect to X , where $q \geq 1$ is an integer, if (a) $\mathbb{E}[(f(X) - \mathbb{E}[f(X)])p_m(X)] = 0$ for every polynomial p_m (on \mathbb{R}^d) of degree $m \leq q - 1$; and (b) there exists a polynomial p_q of degree q such that $\mathbb{E}[(f(X) - \mathbb{E}[f(X)])p_q(X)] \neq 0$.

Then, one has the following well-known statement:

Theorem 1.1 (*Breuer–Major Theorem for Stationary Vectors*). *Let $\mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)] < \infty$, and assume that the function f has Hermite rank equal to $q \geq 1$. Suppose that*

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |r^{(i,l)}(j)|^q < \infty, \quad \forall i, l \in \{1, \dots, d\}. \tag{1.3}$$

Then $\sigma^2 := \text{Var}[f^2(X_1)] + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{Cov}[f(X_1), f(X_{1+k})]$ is well-defined, and belongs to $[0, \infty)$. Moreover, one has that

$$S_n \xrightarrow{d} S \sim N(0, \sigma^2), \tag{1.4}$$

where $N(0, \sigma^2)$ indicates a centered Gaussian distribution with variance σ^2 , and \xrightarrow{d} stands for convergence in distribution.

In the case $d = 1$, **Theorem 1.1** was first proved by Breuer and Major in [8], whereas Theorem 4 in Arcones [2] proves the statement for a general d (both proofs in [2,8] are based on the method of cumulants and diagram formulae — see e.g. [29,34]). The reader is referred

to Sun [33] for an early statement in the case of a Hermite rank equal to 2, and to Giraitis and Surgailis [17] for some continuous-time analogues of [Theorem 1.1](#). Note that any central limit result involving Hermite ranks and series of covariance coefficients is customarily called a ‘Breuer–Major theorem’, in honor of the seminal paper [8].

[Theorem 1.1](#) and its variations have served as fundamental tools for Gaussian approximations in an impressive number of applications, of which we provide a representative (recent) sample: renormalization of fractional diffusions [1], power variations of Gaussian and Gaussian-related continuous-time processes [3,4,14,20,24], Gaussian fluctuations of heat-type equations [5], estimation of Hurst parameters of fractional processes [9,12,13], unit-root problems in econometrics [10], empirical processes of long-memory time series [22], level functionals of stationary Gaussian fields [19], variations of multifractal random walks [21], and stochastic programming [38]. See also Surgailis [34] for a survey of some earlier uses of Breuer–Major criteria.

Despite this variety of applications, until recently the only available techniques for proving results such as [Theorem 1.1](#) were those based on combinatorial cumulants/diagrams computations. These techniques are quite effective and flexible (see e.g. [23,32] for further instances of their applicability), but suffer from a fundamental drawback, namely they *do not* allow us to deduce Berry–Esseen relations of the type

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \leq \varphi(n), \quad n \geq 1, \quad (1.5)$$

where h is a suitable test function, and $\varphi(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. An upper bound such as (1.5) quantifies the error that one makes when replacing S_n with S for a fixed n .

In [25, Section 4], the first two authors of this paper proved that one can combine Malliavin calculus (see e.g. [28]) and Stein’s method (see e.g. [11]) to obtain relations such as (1.5) (for some explicit $\varphi(n)$) in the case where: (i) $d = 1$, (ii) $f = H_q$ is a Hermite polynomial of degree $q \geq 2$ (and thus has Hermite rank equal to q), (iii) X is obtained from the increments of a fractional Brownian motion of Hurst index $H < 1 - (2q)^{-1}$, and (iv) h is either an indicator of a Borel set or a Lipschitz function. Since under (iii) one has that $|r(j)| \sim j^{2H-2}$, these findings allow us to recover a very special case of [Theorem 1.1](#) (see [Example 2.5](#) below for more details on this point).

The aim of the present work is to extend the techniques initiated in [25] in order to deduce several complete *quantitative Breuer–Major theorems*, that is, statements providing explicit upper bounds such as (1.5) for any choice of f and r satisfying the assumptions of [Theorem 1.1](#). We stress now that we will *not* require that the functions f enjoy any additional smoothness property, so our results represent a genuine extension of the findings by Breuer and Major and by Arcones.

As anticipated, our techniques are based on the use of Malliavin operators on a Gaussian space, that we combine both with Stein’s method and with an interpolation technique (already applied in [27,30]) which is reminiscent of the ‘smart path method’ in spin glasses — see e.g. Talagrand [35]. In particular, the use of Stein’s method allows us to deal with functions h that are either Lipschitz or indicators of the type $h = \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, z]}$, whereas the use of interpolations requires test functions that are twice differentiable and with bounded derivatives. Note that this implies that the convergence (1.4) does indeed take place in the stronger topologies of the Kolmogorov and Wasserstein distances.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. [Section 2](#) contains the statements of our main results, some examples and applications. [Section 3](#) presents some notions and results that are needed to prove our main [Theorem 2.1](#). [Section 4](#) is devoted to proofs.

2. Statement of the main results

We keep the assumptions and notation of the previous section. For the sake of notational simplicity, in the following we shall assume that $\mathbb{E}[f(X_1)] = 0$. Also, we shall assume that $X_1 \sim N_d(0, I_d)$, implying that $X_k^{(1)}, \dots, X_k^{(d)}$ are independent $N(0, 1)$ random variables for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that this last assumption is not restrictive: indeed, by reduction of variables and at the cost of possibly decreasing the value of d , we may always assume that $X_k \sim N_d(0, \Sigma)$ for an invertible matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and by a linear transformation we can further restrict ourselves to the case $X_k \sim N_d(0, I_d)$. Observe that, if $f(x)$ has Hermite rank q with respect to X_1 , then $f(Lx)$ has the same Hermite rank q with respect to $L^{-1}X_1$, for every invertible matrix L — see also [2, p. 2249].

Now, let Λ denote the set of all vectors $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For any multi-index $\alpha \in \Lambda$, we introduce the notation $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i$ and $\alpha! = \prod_{i=1}^d \alpha_i!$. When $\mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)] < \infty$, the function f possesses the unique *Hermite expansion*

$$f(x) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda} a_\alpha \prod_{i=1}^d H_{\alpha_i}(x_i), \quad a_\alpha = (\alpha!)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[f(X_1) \prod_{i=1}^d H_{\alpha_i}(X_1^{(i)}) \right], \quad (2.6)$$

where $(H_j)_{j \geq 0}$ is the sequence of Hermite polynomials, recursively defined as follows: $H_0 = 1$, and

$$H_j = \delta H_{j-1}, \quad j \geq 1,$$

where $\delta f(x) = xf(x) - f'(x)$ (for instance: $H_1(x) = x$, $H_2(x) = x^2 - 1$, and so on). When f has Hermite rank $q \geq 1$ we introduce the decomposition

$$f(x) = \sum_{m=q}^{\infty} f_m(x), \quad f_m(x) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda: |\alpha|=m} a_\alpha \prod_{i=1}^d H_{\alpha_i}(x_i). \quad (2.7)$$

Notation. Fix a function f such that $\mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)] < \infty$ and f has Hermite rank $q \geq 1$. Our main results are expressed in terms of the following collection of coefficients (2.8)–(2.12):

$$\theta(j) = \max_{1 \leq i, l \leq d} |r^{(i,l)}(j)| \quad (2.8)$$

$$K = \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \{ \theta(j) \leq d^{-1}, \forall |j| \geq k \} \quad (\text{with } \inf \emptyset = \infty), \quad (2.9)$$

$$\theta = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta(j)^q, \quad (2.10)$$

$$\sigma_m^2 = \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)] + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[f_m(X_1) f_m(X_{1+k})] \quad (\text{for } m \geq q), \quad (2.11)$$

$$\gamma_{n,m,e} = \sqrt{2\theta n^{-1} \sum_{|j| \leq n} \theta(j)^e \sum_{|l| \leq n} \theta(j)^{m-e}} \quad (\text{for } m \geq q \text{ and } 1 \leq e \leq m-1). \quad (2.12)$$

The coefficients $\theta(j)$, K , θ , σ_m^2 and $\gamma_{n,m,e}$ will also be combined into the following expressions (2.13)–(2.17):

$$A_{1,n} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)]}{2} \left[\frac{2K^2}{n} + d^q \left(\sum_{|j| \leq n} \theta(j)^q \frac{|j|}{n} + \sum_{|j| > n} \theta(j)^q \right) \right] \quad (2.13)$$

$$A_{2,N} = 2(2K + d^q \theta) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)] \sum_{m=N+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)]} \tag{2.14}$$

$$A_{3,n,N} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)]}{2} \sum_{m=q}^N \left(\frac{d^m}{mm!} \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} ll! \binom{m}{l}^2 \sqrt{(2m-2l)!} \gamma_{n,m,l} \right) \tag{2.15}$$

$$A_{4,n,N} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)](2K + d^q \theta)^{1/2}}{2} \times \sum_{q \leq p < s \leq N} d^{s/2} \sqrt{\frac{p!}{s!} \frac{p+s}{p}} \binom{s-1}{p-1} \sqrt{(s-p)!} \gamma_{n,s,s-p}^{1/2} \tag{2.16}$$

$$A_{5,n,N} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)]}{2\sqrt{2}} \sum_{q \leq p < s \leq N} (p+s) \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} (l-1)! \binom{p-1}{l-1} \binom{s-1}{l-1} \sqrt{(p+s-2l)!} \times \left(\frac{d^s}{s!} \gamma_{n,s,s-l} + \frac{d^p}{p!} \gamma_{n,p,p-l} \right). \tag{2.17}$$

Note that the coefficients K, θ and σ_m can in general be infinite, and also that, if $\mathbb{E}[f(X_1)^2] < \infty$, if f has Hermite rank q , and if (1.3) is in order, then

$$\sigma^2 = \sum_{m=q}^{\infty} \sigma_m^2 < \infty, \tag{2.18}$$

where σ^2 is defined in Theorem 1.1.

The next statement, which is the main result of the paper, asserts that the quantities defined above can be used to write explicit bounds of the type (1.5).

Theorem 2.1 (Quantitative Breuer–Major Theorem). *Let the notation and assumptions of this section prevail (in particular, $\mathbb{E}[f(X_1)] = 0$ and $X_1 \sim N_d(0, I_d)$), and assume that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Then, the coefficients appearing in formulae (2.8)–(2.17) are all finite. Moreover, the following three bounds are in order.*

(1) For any function $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ (that is, h is twice continuously differentiable) with bounded second derivative, and for every $n > K$,

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \leq \|h''\|_{\infty} (A_{1,n} + \inf_{N \geq q} \{A_{2,N} + A_{3,n,N} + A_{4,n,N} + A_{5,n,N}\}). \tag{2.19}$$

(2) For any Lipschitz function h , and for every $n > K$,

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \leq \frac{\|h'\|_{\infty}}{2} \left\{ A_{2,n} \left[\frac{1}{\sigma} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2K + d^q \theta) \mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)]}} \right] + 4 \inf_{N \geq q} \frac{A_{1,n} + A_{3,n,N} + A_{4,n,N} + A_{5,n,N}}{\sqrt{\sum_{m=q}^N \sigma_m^2}} \right\}. \tag{2.20}$$

(3) For any $z \in \mathbb{R}$, and for every $n > K$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |[\mathbb{P}(S_n \leq z)] - \mathbb{P}(S \leq z)| &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sigma} \\
 &\times \sqrt{A_{2,n} \left[\frac{1}{\sigma} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2K + d^q \theta) \mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)]}} \right] + 4 \inf_{N \geq q} \frac{A_{1,n} + A_{3,n,N} + A_{4,n,N} + A_{5,n,N}}{\sqrt{\sum_{m=q}^N \sigma_m^2}}}. \quad (2.21)
 \end{aligned}$$

We will now demonstrate that **Theorem 2.1** implies a stronger version of **Theorem 1.1**, namely that the convergence (1.4) takes place with respect to topologies that are stronger than the one of convergence in distribution. To prove this claim, we need to show in particular that, under the assumptions of **Theorem 1.1**, $\gamma_{n,m,e} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any choice of $m \geq q$ and $1 \leq e \leq m - 1$. This is a consequence of the next **Lemma 2.2**. In what follows, given positive sequences $b_n, c_n, n \geq 1$, we shall write $b_n \lesssim c_n$ whenever b_n/c_n is bounded, and $b_n \sim c_n$ if $b_n \lesssim c_n$ and $c_n \lesssim b_n$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers such that $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} a_k^m < \infty$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If $1 \leq e \leq m - 1$, then*

$$n^{-1+\frac{e}{m}} \sum_{|k| \leq n} a_k^e \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Fix $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and decompose the sum as $\sum_{k=1}^n = \sum_{k=1}^{[n\delta]} + \sum_{k=[n\delta]+1}^n$. By the Hölder inequality we obtain (recall that $\sum_{k=1}^\infty a_k^m$ is finite)

$$n^{-1+e/m} \sum_{k=1}^{[n\delta]} a_k^e \leq n^{-1+e/m} (n\delta)^{1-e/m} \left(\sum_{k=1}^\infty a_k^m \right)^{e/m} \leq c\delta^{1-e/m},$$

where c is some constant, as well as

$$n^{-1+e/m} \sum_{k=[n\delta]+1}^n a_k^e \leq \left(\sum_{k=[n\delta]+1}^n a_k^m \right)^{e/m}.$$

The first term converges to 0 as δ goes to zero (because $1 \leq e \leq m - 1$), and the second also converges to 0 for fixed δ and $n \rightarrow \infty$. This proves the claim. \square

Now recall that, if X, Y are two real-valued random variables, then the *Kolmogorov distance* between the law of X and the law of Y is given by

$$d_{Kol}(X, Y) = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} |\mathbb{P}(X \leq z) - \mathbb{P}(Y \leq z)|. \quad (2.22)$$

If $\mathbb{E}|X|, \mathbb{E}|Y| < \infty$, one can also meaningfully define the *Wasserstein distance*

$$d_W(X, Y) = \sup_{f \in \text{Lip}(1)} |\mathbb{E}[f(X)] - \mathbb{E}[f(Y)]|, \quad (2.23)$$

where $\text{Lip}(1)$ indicates the collection of all Lipschitz functions with Lipschitz constant ≤ 1 . Finally, if X, Y have finite second moments, for every constant $C > 0$ one can define the distance

$$d_C(X, Y) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}_C^2} |\mathbb{E}[f(X)] - \mathbb{E}[f(Y)]|, \quad (2.24)$$

where \mathcal{D}_C^2 stands for the class of all functions that are twice continuously differentiable and have a second derivative bounded by C . Note that the topologies induced by d_{Kol} , d_W and d_C , on the probability measures on \mathbb{R} , are strictly stronger than the topology of convergence in distribution (see e.g. [16, Ch. 11]).

The next consequence of Theorem 2.1 provides the announced refinement of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 2.3 (Breuer–Major, Strong Version). *Let the notation and assumptions of this section prevail (in particular, $\mathbb{E}[f(X_1)] = 0$ and $X_1 \sim N_d(0, I_d)$), and assume that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 are satisfied. Then, the convergence (1.4) takes place with respect to the three distances d_{Kol} , d_W and d_C (for all $C > 0$), namely*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{Kol}(S_n, S) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_W(S_n, S) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_C(S_n, S) = 0.$$

Proof. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.1, one has that $A_{1,n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (because $\theta < \infty$, $\sum_{|j| \leq n} \theta(j)^q \frac{|j|}{n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by bounded convergence). On the other hand, because of (2.18) and since $\mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)] < \infty$, one has that $A_{2,N} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, since $\gamma_{n,m,e} \rightarrow 0$ for any $m \geq q$ and $1 \leq e \leq m - 1$ (due to Lemma 2.2), one has that $A_{j,n,N} \rightarrow 0$, $j = 3, 4, 5$, for any fixed N as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We deduce that $\inf_{N \geq q} \{A_{2,N} + A_{3,n,N} + A_{4,n,N} + A_{5,n,N}\} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To conclude the proof, it remains to apply (2.19)–(2.21). \square

Next, we present a simplified version of Theorem 2.1 for $d = 1$ and $f = H_q$, where H_q is the q th Hermite polynomial. Notice that in this case $K = 0$ and the constants $A_{1,n}$ and $A_{3,n,N} = A_{3,n}$ are given by

$$A_{1,n} = \frac{q!}{2} \theta \left(\sum_{|j| \leq n} |r(j)|^q \frac{|j|}{n} + \sum_{|j| > n} |r(j)|^q \right), \tag{2.25}$$

$$A_{3,n} = \frac{1}{2q} \sum_{l=1}^{q-1} l! \binom{q}{l}^2 \sqrt{(2q - 2l)!} \gamma_{n,q,l}, \tag{2.26}$$

with $\gamma_{n,q,l}$ defined by (2.12).

Corollary 2.4 (Hermite Subordination). *Assume that $d = 1$, $f = H_q$ and $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |r(j)|^q < \infty$, and let $A_{1,n}$, $A_{3,n}$ be given by (2.25)–(2.26).*

(1) *For any function $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ with bounded second derivative it holds that*

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \leq \|h''\|_\infty (A_{1,n} + A_{3,n}). \tag{2.27}$$

(2) *For any Lipschitz function h it holds that*

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \leq \frac{2\|h'\|_\infty}{\sigma} (A_{1,n} + A_{3,n}). \tag{2.28}$$

(3) *For any $z \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that*

$$|\mathbb{P}(S_n \leq z) - \mathbb{P}(S \leq z)| \leq \frac{2\|s'_z\|_\infty}{\sigma} (A_{1,n} + A_{3,n}), \tag{2.29}$$

where s_z is the solution of the Stein's equation associated with the function $h(x) = 1_{(-\infty, z]}(x)$, i.e. s_z solves the differential equation

$$1_{(-\infty, z]}(x) - \Phi(z) = s'_z(x) - x s_z(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

with Φ being the distribution function of $N(0, 1)$. Furthermore, we have that $\|s'_z\|_\infty \leq 1$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. From Theorem 3.1 in [25] and Theorem 3.2 in Section 3.3 we obtain the estimate

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \leq c_h \mathbb{E}|\sigma^2 - \langle DF, -DL^{-1}F \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}|,$$

where $c_h = \frac{\|h''\|_\infty}{2}$ in (1), $c_h = \frac{\|h'\|_\infty}{\sigma}$ in (2) and $c_h = \frac{\|s'_z\|_\infty}{\sigma}$ in (3). We readily deduce the assertion since $\mathbb{E}|\sigma^2 - \langle DF, -DL^{-1}F \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}| \leq 2(A_{1,n} + A_{3,n})$, which follows from the proof of Theorem 2.1. \square

We remark that the upper bound in (2.29) of Corollary 2.4 is more efficient than the general upper bound obtained in (2.21) of Theorem 2.1 as the latter one converges to 0 more slowly.

Next, we apply Corollary 2.4 to some particular classes of covariance functions r .

Example 2.5 (Covariance Functions with Polynomial Decay). Assume that $d = 1$ and $f = H_q$ with $q \geq 2$, and consider a covariance function r which is regularly varying with parameter $a < 0$. That is, for all $|k| \geq 1$, $|r(k)| = |k|^a l(|k|)$, where l is a slowly varying function. Recall that for any regularly varying function r with parameter $\alpha < 0$, we have the following discrete version of Karamata's theorem (see e.g. [6]):

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha > -1 : \quad & \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n |r(k)|}{n^{a+1}l(n)} \rightarrow 1/(\alpha + 1), \\ \alpha < -1 : \quad & \frac{\sum_{k=n}^\infty |r(k)|}{n^{a+1}l(n)} \rightarrow -1/(\alpha + 1), \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Assume now that $a < -\frac{1}{q}$, which implies that the conditions of Theorem 2.1 are satisfied, and $ae \neq -1$ for any $e = 1, \dots, q - 1$. By the aforementioned convergence results we immediately deduce the following estimates ($1 \leq e \leq q - 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|j| \leq n} |r(j)|^q \frac{|j|}{n} &\lesssim n^{-1} + n^{aq+1}l(n), \\ \sum_{|j| > n} |r(j)|^q &\lesssim n^{aq+1}l(n), \\ \gamma_{n,q,e} &\lesssim n^{-1/2} + n^{a/2}l(n) + n^{(aq+1)/2}l^2(n). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all three cases of Corollary 2.4 we conclude that

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \lesssim \begin{cases} n^{-1/2} : & a < -1 \\ n^{a/2}l(n) : & a \in \left(-1, -\frac{1}{q-1}\right) \\ n^{\frac{aq+1}{2}}l^2(n) : & a \in \left(-\frac{1}{q-1}, -\frac{1}{q}\right). \end{cases}$$

Clearly, the same estimates hold for $d(S_n, S)$, where $d = d_{Kol}$, $d = d_W$ or $d = d_C$.

Example 2.6 (The Fractional Brownian Motion Case). Let $d = 1$, $f = H_q$ with $q \geq 2$ and consider the fractional Gaussian noise $X_i = B_i^H - B_{i-1}^H$, where B^H is a fractional Brownian

motion with parameter $H \in (0, 1)$. Recall that $B^H = (B_t^H)_{t \geq 0}$ is a centered Gaussian process (with stationary increments) with covariance structure given by

$$\mathbb{E}[B_t B_s] = \frac{1}{2}(|t|^{2H} + |s|^{2H} - |t + s|^{2H}).$$

It is well-known that the correlation function r of the fractional Brownian noise has the following form:

$$|r(k)| = |k|^{2H-2} l(|k|), \quad k \geq 1,$$

with $l(|k|) \rightarrow 2H|2H - 1|$ as $|k| \rightarrow \infty$ when $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$, and $l(|k|) = 0$ for $|k| \geq 1$ when $H = \frac{1}{2}$. As in the previous example we immediately deduce that

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \lesssim \begin{cases} n^{-1/2} : & H \in \left(0, \frac{1}{2}\right] \\ n^{H-1/2} : & a \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2q-3}{2q-2}\right] \\ n^{(2qH-2q+1)/2} : & a \in \left[\frac{2q-3}{2q-2}, \frac{2q-1}{2q}\right) \end{cases}$$

and the same estimates hold for $d(S_n, S)$ with $d = d_{Kol}$, $d = d_W$ or $d = d_C$. Let us remark that these upper bounds coincide with those derived in Theorem 4.1 in [25].

We finally remark that the rate $n^{-1/2}$ for $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ has been proved to be optimal in [26], i.e. $|\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \sim n^{-1/2}$. For the other two cases the optimality question is still an open problem.

3. The toolbox

3.1. Malliavin calculus on a Gaussian space

We shall now provide a short introduction to the tools of Malliavin calculus that are needed in the proof of our main Theorem 2.1. The reader is referred to [28] for any unexplained definition or result. Let \mathfrak{H} be a real separable Hilbert space. We denote by $W = \{W(h) : h \in \mathfrak{H}\}$ an *isonormal Gaussian process* over \mathfrak{H} , that is, W is a centered Gaussian family indexed by the elements of \mathfrak{H} and such that, for every $g_1, g_2 \in \mathfrak{H}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[W(g_1)W(g_2)] = \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}. \tag{3.30}$$

In what follows, we shall use the notation $L^2(W) = L^2(\Omega, \sigma(W), \mathbb{P})$. For every $q \geq 1$, we write $\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes q}$ to indicate the q th tensor power of \mathfrak{H} ; the symbol $\mathfrak{H}^{\odot q}$ indicates the q th *symmetric* tensor power of \mathfrak{H} , equipped with the norm $\sqrt{q!} \|\cdot\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes q}}$. We denote by I_q the isometry between $\mathfrak{H}^{\odot q}$ and the q th Wiener chaos of X . It is well-known (see again [28, Ch. 1]) that any random variable F belonging to $L^2(W)$ admits the *chaotic expansion*:

$$F = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} I_q(f_q), \tag{3.31}$$

where $I_0(f_0) := E[F]$, the series converges in L^2 and the kernels $f_q \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot q}$, $q \geq 1$, are uniquely determined by F . In the particular case where $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$, with (A, \mathcal{A}) a measurable

space and μ a σ -finite and non-atomic measure, one has that $\mathfrak{H}^{\odot q} = L^2_{\mathfrak{S}}(A^q, \mathcal{A}^{\otimes q}, \mu^{\otimes q})$ is the space of symmetric and square integrable functions on A^q . Moreover, for every $f \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot q}$, $I_q(f)$ coincides with the multiple Wiener–Itô integral (of order q) of f with respect to W (see [28, Ch. 1]). It is well-known that a random variable of the type $I_q(f)$, $f \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot q}$, has finite moments of all orders (see [18, Ch. VI]). For every $q \geq 0$, we write J_q to indicate the orthogonal projection operator on the q th Wiener chaos associated with W , so, if $F \in L^2(W)$ is as in (3.31), then $J_q F = I_q(f_q)$ for every $q \geq 0$.

Let $\{e_k, k \geq 1\}$ be a complete orthonormal system in \mathfrak{H} . Given $f \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot p}$ and $g \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot q}$, for every $r = 0, \dots, p \wedge q$, the r th contraction of f and g is the element of $\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes(p+q-2r)}$ defined as

$$f \otimes_r g = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_r=1}^{\infty} \langle f, e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_r} \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes r}} \otimes \langle g, e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_r} \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes r}}. \tag{3.32}$$

In the particular case where $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ (with μ non-atomic), one has that

$$f \otimes_r g = \int_{A^r} f(t_1, \dots, t_{p-r}, s_1, \dots, s_r) \times g(t_{p-r+1}, \dots, t_{p+q-2r}, s_1, \dots, s_r) d\mu(s_1) \dots d\mu(s_r).$$

Moreover, $f \otimes_0 g = f \otimes g$ equals the tensor product of f and g while, for $p = q$, $f \otimes_p g = \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes p}}$. Note that, in general, the contraction $f \otimes_r g$ is *not* a symmetric element of $\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes(p+q-2r)}$. The canonical symmetrization of $f \otimes_r g$ is written as $f \tilde{\otimes}_r g$. The following multiplication formula is also very useful: if $f \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot p}$ and $g \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot q}$, then

$$I_p(f)I_q(g) = \sum_{r=0}^{p \wedge q} r! \binom{p}{r} \binom{q}{r} I_{p+q-2r}(f \tilde{\otimes}_r g). \tag{3.33}$$

Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all smooth cylindrical random variables of the form

$$F = g(W(\phi_1), \dots, W(\phi_n)),$$

where $n \geq 1$, $g : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function with compact support and $\phi_i \in \mathfrak{H}$. The Malliavin derivative of F with respect to W is the element of $L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{H})$ defined as

$$DF = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i}(W(\phi_1), \dots, W(\phi_n))\phi_i.$$

Also, $DW(\phi) = \phi$ for every $\phi \in \mathfrak{H}$. As usual, $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ denotes the closure of \mathcal{S} with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{1,2}$, defined by the relation

$$\|F\|_{1,2}^2 = \mathbb{E}[F^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|DF\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2].$$

Note that, if F is equal to a finite sum of multiple Wiener–Itô integrals, then $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. The Malliavin derivative D verifies the following *chain rule*: if $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in \mathcal{C}_b^1 (that is, the collection of continuously differentiable functions with bounded partial derivatives) and if $\{F_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ is a vector of elements of $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$, then $\varphi(F_1, \dots, F_n) \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and

$$D\varphi(F_1, \dots, F_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}(F_1, \dots, F_n) DF_i.$$

We denote by δ the adjoint of the operator D , also called the *divergence operator*. A random element $u \in L^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{H})$ belongs to the domain of δ , denoted as $\text{Dom}\delta$, if and only if it verifies

$$|\mathbb{E}\langle DF, u \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}| \leq c_u \|F\|_{L^2} \quad \text{for any } F \in \mathcal{S},$$

where c_u is a constant depending only on u . If $u \in \text{Dom}\delta$, then the random variable $\delta(u)$ is defined by the duality relationship (sometimes called the ‘integration by parts formula’)

$$\mathbb{E}[F\delta(u)] = \mathbb{E}\langle DF, u \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}, \tag{3.34}$$

which holds for every $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$.

The operator L , acting on square integrable random variables of the type (3.31), is defined through the projection operators $\{J_q\}_{q \geq 0}$ as $L = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} -qJ_q$, and is called the *infinitesimal generator of the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck semigroup*. It verifies the following crucial property: a random variable F is an element of $\text{Dom}L$ ($=\mathbb{D}^{2,2}$) if, and only if, $F \in \text{Dom}\delta D$ (i.e. $F \in \mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and $DF \in \text{Dom}\delta$), and in this case, $\delta DF = -LF$. Note that a random variable F as in (3.31) is in $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ if and only if

$$\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} (q+1)! \|f_q\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes q}}^2 < \infty,$$

and also $\mathbb{E}[\|DF\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2] = \sum_{q \geq 1} qq! \|f_q\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes q}}^2$. If $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ (with μ non-atomic), then the derivative of a random variable F as in (3.31) can be identified with the element of $L^2(A \times \Omega)$ given by

$$D_a F = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q I_{q-1}(f_q(\cdot, a)), \quad a \in A. \tag{3.35}$$

We also define the operator L^{-1} , which is the *pseudo-inverse* of L , as follows: for every $F \in L^2(W)$, we set $L^{-1}F = \sum_{q \geq 1} \frac{1}{q} J_q(F)$. Note that L^{-1} is an operator with values in $\mathbb{D}^{2,2}$ and that $LL^{-1}F = F - \mathbb{E}[F]$ for all $F \in L^2(W)$.

3.2. Assessing norms and scalar products

The following statement plays a crucial role in the proof of [Theorem 2.1](#).

Lemma 3.1. *Let $F = I_p(h)$ and $G = I_s(g)$ with $h \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot p}$, $g \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot s}$ and $p < s$ ($p, s \geq 1$). Then*

$$\text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{s} \|DG\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 \right] = \frac{1}{s^2} \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} l^2 l!^2 \binom{s}{l}^4 (2s-2l)! \|g \tilde{\otimes}_l g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2s-2l}}^2, \tag{3.36}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{s} \langle DF, DG \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \right)^2 \right] \leq p! \binom{s-1}{p-1}^2 (s-p)! \mathbb{E}[F^2] \|g \otimes_{s-p} g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2p}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \frac{p^2}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{p-1} (l-1)!^2 \binom{p-1}{l-1}^2 \binom{s-1}{l-1}^2 (p+s-2l)! \\
 & \times (\|h \otimes_{p-l} h\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2l}}^2 + \|g \otimes_{s-l} g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2l}}^2).
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

Proof of 3.36. We have $DG = sI_{s-1}(g)$, and so, by using (3.33),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{1}{s} \|DG\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 & = s \|I_{s-1}(g)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2 = s \sum_{l=0}^{s-1} l! \binom{s-1}{l}^2 I_{2s-2-2l}(g \tilde{\otimes}_{l+1} g) \\
 & = s \sum_{l=1}^s (l-1)! \binom{s-1}{l-1}^2 I_{2s-2l}(g \tilde{\otimes}_l g) \\
 & = s! \|g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes s}}^2 + s \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} (l-1)! \binom{s-1}{l-1}^2 I_{2s-2l}(g \tilde{\otimes}_l g) \\
 & = \mathbb{E}[G^2] + s \sum_{l=1}^{s-1} (l-1)! \binom{s-1}{l-1}^2 I_{2s-2l}(g \tilde{\otimes}_l g).
 \end{aligned}$$

The orthogonality property of multiple integrals leads to (3.36).

Proof of 3.37. Thanks once again to (3.33), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
 \langle DF, DG \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} & = ps \langle I_{p-1}(h), I_{s-1}(g) \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \\
 & = ps \sum_{l=0}^{p \wedge s - 1} l! \binom{p-1}{l} \binom{s-1}{l} I_{p+s-2-2l}(h \tilde{\otimes}_{l+1} g) \\
 & = ps \sum_{l=1}^{p \wedge s} (l-1)! \binom{p-1}{l-1} \binom{s-1}{l-1} I_{p+s-2l}(h \tilde{\otimes}_l g).
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{s} \langle DF, DG \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \right)^2 \right] & = p^2 \sum_{l=1}^p (l-1)!^2 \\
 & \times \binom{p-1}{l-1}^2 \binom{s-1}{l-1}^2 (p+s-2l)! \|h \tilde{\otimes}_l g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes (p+s-2l)}}^2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

If $l < p$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|h \tilde{\otimes}_l g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes (p+s-2l)}}^2 & \leq \|h \otimes_l g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes (p+s-2l)}}^2 = \langle h \otimes_{p-l} h, g \otimes_{s-l} g \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2l}} \\
 & \leq \|h \otimes_{p-l} h\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2l}} \|g \otimes_{s-l} g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2l}} \\
 & \leq \frac{1}{2} (\|h \otimes_{p-l} h\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2l}}^2 + \|g \otimes_{s-l} g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2l}}^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

If $l = p$, then

$$\|h \tilde{\otimes}_p g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes (s-p)}}^2 \leq \|h \otimes_p g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes (s-p)}}^2 \leq \|h\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes p}}^2 \|g \otimes_{s-p} g\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2p}}.$$

By plugging these last expressions into (3.38), we deduce immediately (3.37). \square

3.3. Estimates via interpolations and Stein’s method

The forthcoming **Theorem 3.2** contains two bounds on normal approximations, that are expressed in terms of Malliavin operators. As anticipated, the proof of Point (1) uses an interpolation technique already applied in [27,30], which is close to the ‘smart path method’ of spin glasses [35]. Point (2) uses estimates from [25].

Theorem 3.2. *Let F be a centered element of $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ and let $Z \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, $\sigma > 0$.*

(1) *Suppose that $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is twice continuously differentiable and has a bounded second derivative. Then,*

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(F)] - \mathbb{E}[h(Z)]| \leq \frac{\|h''\|_\infty}{2} \mathbb{E}|\sigma^2 - \langle DF, -DL^{-1}F \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}|. \tag{3.39}$$

(2) *Suppose that $h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz. Then,*

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(F)] - \mathbb{E}[h(Z)]| \leq \frac{\|h'\|_\infty}{\sigma} \mathbb{E}|\sigma^2 - \langle DF, -DL^{-1}F \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}|. \tag{3.40}$$

Proof. (1) Without loss of generality, we may assume that F and Z are independent and defined on the same probability space. Fix h as in the statement, and define the function $\Psi(t) = \mathbb{E}[h(\sqrt{1-t}F + \sqrt{t}Z)]$, $t \in [0, 1]$. Standard results imply that Ψ is differentiable for every $t \in (0, 1)$, and that

$$\Psi'(t) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{t}} \mathbb{E} \left[h' \left(\sqrt{1-t}F + \sqrt{t}Z \right) Z \right] - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-t}} \mathbb{E} \left[h' \left(\sqrt{1-t}F + \sqrt{t}Z \right) F \right].$$

By using independence and integration by parts, we obtain immediately that

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{t}} \mathbb{E} \left[h' \left(\sqrt{1-t}F + \sqrt{t}Z \right) Z \right] = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[h'' \left(\sqrt{1-t}F + \sqrt{t}Z \right) \right].$$

On the other hand, the relation $F = LL^{-1}F = -\delta DL^{-1}F$ and (3.34) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-t}} \mathbb{E} \left[h' \left(\sqrt{1-t}F + \sqrt{t}S \right) F \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1-t}} \mathbb{E} \left[h' \left(\sqrt{1-t}F + \sqrt{t}Z \right) \delta(-DL^{-1}F) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[h'' \left(\sqrt{1-t}F + \sqrt{t}Z \right) \langle DF, -DL^{-1}F \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows from the fact that

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(F)] - \mathbb{E}[h(Z)]| = |\Psi(1) - \Psi(0)| \leq \int_0^1 |\Psi'(t)| dt.$$

(2) Here we follow the arguments contained in the proof of Theorem 3.1 in [25]. Define $h_\sigma(x) = h(\sigma x)$, $F_\sigma = \sigma^{-1}F$, and $Z_\sigma = \sigma^{-1}Z \sim N(0, 1)$. Let s be the solution of the Stein equation associated with h_σ , i.e. s solves the differential equation

$$h_\sigma(x) - \mathbb{E}[h_\sigma(Z_\sigma)] = s'(x) - xs(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It is well-known that such a solution is given by $s(x) = \frac{1}{\varphi(x)} \int_{-\infty}^x (h_\sigma(t) - \Phi(t))\varphi(t)dt$, where φ and Φ are the density and the distribution function of $N(0, 1)$, respectively, and $\|s'\|_\infty \leq \|h'_\sigma\|_\infty$.

Since F_σ is a centered element of $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$ it holds that $F_\sigma = LL^{-1}F_\sigma = -\delta DL^{-1}F_\sigma$. By the integration by parts formula (3.34) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[h(F)] - \mathbb{E}[h(Z)]| &= |\mathbb{E}[h_\sigma(F_\sigma)] - \mathbb{E}[h_\sigma(Z_\sigma)]| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}[s'(F_\sigma) - F_\sigma s(F_\sigma)]| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}[s'(F_\sigma)(1 - \langle DF_\sigma, -DL^{-1}F_\sigma \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}})]| \\ &\leq \|s'\|_\infty \mathbb{E}|1 - \langle DF_\sigma, -DL^{-1}F_\sigma \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}| \\ &\leq \|h'_\sigma\|_\infty \mathbb{E}|1 - \langle DF_\sigma, -DL^{-1}F_\sigma \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}|. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude by using the relations $\|h'_\sigma\|_\infty = \sigma \|h'\|_\infty$ and

$$\langle DF_\sigma, -DL^{-1}F_\sigma \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} = \sigma^{-2} \langle DF, -DL^{-1}F \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}. \quad \square$$

When applied to the special case of a Gaussian random variable F , Theorem 3.2 yields the following neat estimates.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $F \sim N(0, \gamma^2)$ and $Z \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$, $\gamma, \sigma > 0$.*

(1) *For every h twice continuously differentiable and with a bounded second derivative,*

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(F)] - \mathbb{E}[h(Z)]| \leq \frac{\|h''\|_\infty}{2} |\sigma^2 - \gamma^2|. \tag{3.41}$$

(2) *For every Lipschitz function h ,*

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(F)] - \mathbb{E}[h(Z)]| \leq \frac{\|h'\|_\infty}{\sigma \vee \gamma} |\sigma^2 - \gamma^2|. \tag{3.42}$$

4. Proof of Theorem 2.1

4.1. Preparation

First, let us remark that the process $X = (X_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ can always be regarded as a subset of an isonormal Gaussian process $\{W(u) : u \in \mathfrak{H}\}$, where \mathfrak{H} is a separable Hilbert space with scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}$. More precisely, we shall assume (without loss of generality) that, for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and every $1 \leq l \leq d$, there exists $u_{k,l} \in \mathfrak{H}$ such that

$$X_k^{(l)} = W(u_{k,l}), \quad \text{and consequently } \langle u_{k,l}, u_{k',l'} \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} = r^{(l,l')}(k - k'),$$

for every $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and every $1 \leq l, l' \leq d$. Observe also that \mathfrak{H} can be taken of the form $\mathfrak{H} = L^2(A, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$, where μ is σ -finite and non-atomic.

Using the Hermite expansion (2.6) of the function f we obtain the Wiener chaos representation

$$S_n = \sum_{m=q}^{\infty} I_m(g_m^n), \quad g_m^n \in \mathfrak{H}^{\odot m},$$

where the kernels g_m^n have the form

$$g_m^n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{t \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m} b_t u_{k,t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes u_{k,t_m} \tag{4.43}$$

for certain coefficients b_t such that the mapping $t \mapsto b_t$ is symmetric on $\{1, \dots, d\}^m$. One also has the identities

$$\mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)] = m! \sum_{t \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m} b_t^2, \quad m \geq q, \quad \mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)] = \sum_{m=q}^{\infty} m! \sum_{t \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m} b_t^2.$$

Here is a useful preliminary result.

Lemma 4.1. *For the kernels g_m^n defined in (4.43) and any $1 \leq e \leq m-1$ we obtain the inequality, valid for every n ,*

$$\|g_m^n \otimes_e g_m^n\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2(m-e)}} \leq \frac{d^m}{m!} \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)] \gamma_{n,m,e}, \tag{4.44}$$

where $\gamma_{n,m,e}$ is defined by (2.12). Furthermore, we have that, for every n ,

$$m! \|g_m^n\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes m}}^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)] (2K + d^q \theta), \tag{4.45}$$

where the constants K and θ are defined, respectively, in (2.9) and (2.10).

Proof of 4.44. Fix $1 \leq e \leq m-1$. Observe that

$$g_m^n \otimes_e g_m^n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^n \sum_{t, s \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m} b_t b_s \prod_{j=1}^e r^{(t_j, s_j)}(k_1 - k_2) \\ \times u_{k_1, t_{p+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes u_{k_1, t_m} \otimes u_{k_2, s_{p+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes u_{k_2, s_m}.$$

We obtain

$$\|g_m^n \otimes_e g_m^n\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 2(m-e)}}^2 \leq \left(\frac{d^m}{m!} \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)] \right)^2 \\ \times n^{-2} \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_4=1}^n \theta(k_1 - k_2)^e \theta(k_3 - k_4)^e \theta(k_1 - k_3)^{m-e} \theta(k_2 - k_4)^{m-e},$$

where $\theta(j)$ is defined in (2.8). Since $\theta(k_3 - k_4)^e \theta(k_1 - k_3)^{m-e} \leq \theta(k_3 - k_4)^m + \theta(k_1 - k_3)^m$ we deduce that

$$n^{-2} \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_4=1}^n \theta(k_1 - k_2)^e \theta(k_3 - k_4)^e \theta(k_1 - k_3)^{m-e} \theta(k_2 - k_4)^{m-e} \\ \leq 2n^{-1} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta(k)^m \sum_{|k| \leq n} \theta(k)^e \sum_{|k| \leq n} \theta(k)^{m-e} \leq \gamma_{n,m,e}^2.$$

Hence, we obtain (4.44). \square

Proof of 4.45. By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we have

$$m! \left| \left\langle \sum_{t \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m} b_t u_{k, t_1} \otimes \dots \otimes u_{k, t_m}, \sum_{t \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m} b_t u_{k+l, t_1} \otimes \dots \otimes u_{k+l, t_m} \right\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes m}} \right| \\ \leq \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)].$$

We deduce, for any $m \geq q$,

$$\begin{aligned} m! \|g_m^n\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes m}}^2 &= \frac{m!}{n} \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^n \sum_{t, s \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m} b_t b_s \prod_{j=1}^m r^{(t_j, s_j)}(k_1 - k_2) \\ &\leq \left(2H \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)] + m! \sum_{|k| \geq K} \theta(k)^m \left(\sum_{t \in \{1, \dots, d\}^m} |b_t| \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)] \left(2K + \sum_{|k| \geq K} (d\theta(k))^m \right) \leq \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)](2K + d^q \theta), \end{aligned}$$

which implies (4.45). \square

The proofs of Point 1 and Point 2 in Theorem 2.1 are similar, and are detailed in the subsequent two sections.

4.2. Proof of Theorem 2.1-(1)

First of all, we remark that $\theta(j) \rightarrow 0$ as $|j| \rightarrow \infty$, because $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \theta(j)^q < \infty$. This implies that $K < \infty$, where the constant K is defined in (2.9). Moreover, the asymptotic variance σ^2 is finite. Indeed we have that $\sigma^2 = \sum_{m=q}^{\infty} m! \|g_m^n\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes m}}^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[f^2(X_1)](2K + d^q \theta)$ due to (4.45).

The main proof is composed of several steps.

(a) *Reduction to a finite chaos expansion.* We start by approximating S_n by a finite sum of multiple integrals. Define

$$S_{n,N} = \sum_{m=q}^N I_m(g_m^n).$$

Now, let $h \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ be a function with bounded second derivative. Since

$$|h(x) - h(y) - h'(0)(x - y)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|h''\|_{\infty} (y - x)^2 + \|h''\|_{\infty} |x||y - x|$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, we immediately obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S_{n,N})]| &\leq \|h''\|_{\infty} \\ &\times \left(\frac{1}{2} \|S_n - S_{n,N}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2 + \|S_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \|S_n - S_{n,N}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By inequality (4.45) we deduce that

$$\|S_n\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2 \leq (2K + d^q \theta) \|f(X_1)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_n - S_{n,N}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2 &\leq (2K + d^q \theta) \sum_{m=N+1}^{\infty} \|f_m(X_1)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2 \\ &\leq (2K + d^q \theta) \|f(X_1)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \left(\sum_{m=N+1}^{\infty} \|f_m(X_1)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where θ is defined by (2.10). We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S_{n,N})]| &\leq \frac{3(2K + d^q\theta)}{2} \|h''\|_\infty \|f(X_1)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \\ &\times \left(\sum_{m=N+1}^\infty \|f_m(X_1)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.46}$$

which completes the first step. \square

(b) *Bounds based on the interpolation inequality (3.39).* Let Z_N be a centered Gaussian random variable with variance $\sum_{m=q}^N \sigma_m^2$. By using (3.39) in the special case $F = S_{n,N}$, $Z = Z_N$ and by applying e.g. (3.35), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[[h(Z_N)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S_{n,N})]] &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|h''\|_\infty \left\| \sum_{m=q}^N \sigma_m^2 - \langle DS_{n,N}, -DL^{-1}S_{n,N} \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}} \right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|h''\|_\infty \sum_{p,s=q}^N \|\delta_{ps}\sigma_p^2 - s^{-1}\langle DI_p(g_p^n), DI_s(g_s^n) \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.47}$$

where δ_{ps} is the Kronecker symbol. This completes the second step. \square

(c) *The final estimates.* Here we give the approximation of the term on the right-hand side of (4.47). By (4.45) and the dominating convergence theorem we immediately deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}[s^{-1} \|DI_s(g_s^n)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2] = s! \|g_s^n\|_{\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes s}}^2 \rightarrow \sigma_s^2 = s! \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sum_{t,l \in \{1, \dots, d\}^s} b_t b_l \prod_{j=1}^m r^{(t_j, l_j)}(k).$$

As in the proof of (4.45) we conclude that (recall that we assumed $n > K$)

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[s^{-1} \|DI_s(g_s^n)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2] - \sigma_s^2| &\leq s! \sum_{|k| < K} \left| \sum_{t,l \in \{1, \dots, d\}^s} b_t b_l \prod_{j=1}^m r^{(t_j, l_j)}(k) \right| \frac{|k|}{K} \\ &\quad + s! \sum_{K \leq |k| < n} \left| \sum_{t,l \in \{1, \dots, d\}^s} b_t b_l \prod_{j=1}^m r^{(t_j, l_j)}(k) \right| \frac{|k|}{K} \\ &\quad + s! \sum_{|k| \geq n} \left| \sum_{t,l \in \{1, \dots, d\}^s} b_t b_l \prod_{j=1}^m r^{(t_j, l_j)}(k) \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f_s^2(X_1)] \left\{ \frac{2K^2}{n} + d^q \left(\sum_{|j| \leq n} \theta(j)^q \frac{|j|}{n} + \sum_{|j| > n} \theta(j)^q \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{s=q}^N \|\sigma_s^2 - s^{-1} \|DI_s(g_s^n)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \\ &\leq \sum_{s=q}^N \left(|\mathbb{E}[s^{-1} \|DI_s(g_s^n)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2] - \sigma_s^2| + \sqrt{\text{Var}[s^{-1} \|DI_s(g_s^n)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2]} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathbb{E}[f_s^2(X_1)] \left\{ \frac{2H^2}{n} + d^q \left(\sum_{|j| \leq n} \theta(j)^q \frac{|j|}{n} + \sum_{|j| > n} \theta(j)^q \right) \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=q}^N \sqrt{\text{Var}[s^{-1} \|DI_s(g_s^n)\|_{\mathfrak{H}}^2]} \\ &\leq 2(A_{1,n} + A_{3,n,N}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows directly from Lemmas 3.1 and 4.1. On the other hand, using the approximation (4.45) and Lemmas 3.1 and 4.1 once again we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{q \leq p < s \leq N} \|s^{-1} \langle DI_p(g_p^n), DI_s(g_s^n) \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} + \sum_{q \leq s < p \leq N} \|s^{-1} \langle DI_p(g_p^n), DI_s(g_s^n) \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \\ &= \sum_{q \leq p < s \leq N} \frac{p+s}{p} \|s^{-1} \langle DI_p(g_p^n), DI_s(g_s^n) \rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq 2(A_{4,n,N} + A_{5,n,N}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[h \left(\sum_{m=q}^N \sigma_m Y_m \right) - h(S_{n,N}) \right] \right| \leq \|h''\|_{\infty} (A_{1,n} + A_{3,n,N} + A_{4,n,N} + A_{5,n,N}), \tag{4.48}$$

which finishes this step. \square

(d) *Putting things together.* We have the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| &\leq |\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S_{n,N})]| + |\mathbb{E}[h(S_{n,N})] - \mathbb{E}[h(Z_N)]| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}[h(Z_N)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]|. \end{aligned} \tag{4.49}$$

We are left with the derivation of a bound for the third term. By using (3.41) in the special case $F = Z_N$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}[h(Z_N)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)] \right| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \|h''\|_{\infty} \sum_{m=N+1}^{\infty} \sigma_m^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2H + d^q \theta}{2} \|h''\|_{\infty} \sum_{m=N+1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[f_m^2(X_1)], \end{aligned} \tag{4.50}$$

where the last inequality is deduced by Lemma 4.1. The latter is smaller than $\frac{1}{4} \|h''\|_{\infty} A_{2,N}$, which together with (4.46)–(4.48) completes the proof of Theorem 2.1-(1). \square

4.3. Proof of Theorem 2.1-(2)

Take h Lipschitz and write the inequality (4.49). Like for (4.46), standard computations yield

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[h(S_n)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S_{n,N})]| &\leq \|h'\|_{\infty} \|S_n - S_{n,N}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \leq \|h'\|_{\infty} (2K + d^q \theta)^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \sqrt{\sum_{m=N+1}^{\infty} \|f_m(X_1)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By applying inequality (3.40) in the case $F = S_{n,N}$, $Z = Z_N$, one has that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}[h(S_{n,N})] - \mathbb{E}[h(Z_N)]| &\leq \frac{\|h'\|_\infty}{\left(\sum_{m=q}^N \sigma_m^2\right)^{1/2}} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{p,s=q}^N \|\delta_{ps}\sigma_p^2 - s^{-1}\langle DI_p(g_p^n), DI_s(g_s^n)\rangle_{\mathfrak{H}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{P})} \\ &\leq \frac{\|h'\|_\infty}{\left(\sum_{m=q}^N \sigma_m^2\right)^{1/2}} 2(A_{1,n} + A_{3,n,N} + A_{4,n,N} + A_{5,n,N}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is obtained by reasoning as in Part (c) of Section 4.2. Finally, an application of inequality (3.42) in the case $F = Z_N$ yields (since $\theta \geq 1$)

$$|\mathbb{E}[h(Z_N)] - \mathbb{E}[h(S)]| \leq \frac{\|h'\|_\infty}{\sigma} \sum_{m=N+1}^\infty \sigma_m^2 \leq \frac{\|h'\|_\infty}{2\sigma} A_{2,N}.$$

Putting the above estimates together yields the desired conclusion. \square

4.4. Proof of Theorem 2.1-(3)

From [11, Theorem 3.1], one can deduce that

$$d_{Kol}(S_n, S) \leq 2\sqrt{d_W(S_n/\sigma, S/\sigma)}.$$

Hence, we get the desired conclusion by combining this inequality with (2.20). \square

Acknowledgement

We warmly thank Arnaud Guillin for pointing out to us an inaccuracy in a previous version.

References

- [1] V.V. Anh, N.N. Leonenko, Renormalization and homogenization of fractional diffusion equations with random data, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 124 (3) (2002) 381–408.
- [2] M.A. Arcones, Limit theorems for nonlinear functionals of a stationary Gaussian sequence of vectors, *Ann. Probab.* 22 (4) (1994) 2242–2274.
- [3] O.E. Barndorff-Nielsen, J.M. Corcuera, M. Podolskij, Power variation for Gaussian processes with stationary increments, *Stochastic Process Appl.* 119 (2009) 1845–1865.
- [4] O.E. Barndorff-Nielsen, J.M. Corcuera, M. Podolskij, Multipower variation for Brownian semi-stationary processes, *Bernoulli* (2009) (in press).
- [5] L. Beghin, V.P. Knopova, N.N. Leonenko, E. Orsingher, Gaussian limiting behavior of the rescaled solution to the linear Korteweg–de Vries equation with random initial conditions, *J. Stat. Phys.* 99 (3–4) (2000) 769–781.
- [6] N.H. Bingham, C.M. Goldie, J.L. Teugels, *Regular Variation*, Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [7] J.-C. Breton, I. Nourdin, Error bounds on the non-normal approximation of Hermite power variations of fractional Brownian motion, *Electron. Comm. Probab.* 13 (2008) 482–493 (electronic).
- [8] P. Breuer, P. Major, Central limit theorems for nonlinear functionals of Gaussian fields, *J. Multivariate Anal.* 13 (3) (1983) 425–441.
- [9] C. Berzin, J. León, Estimating the Hurst parameter, *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.* 10 (1) (2007) 49–73.

- [10] B. Buchmann, N.-H. Chan, Integrated functionals of normal and fractional processes, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 19 (1) (2009) 49–70.
- [11] L. Chen, Q.-M. Shao, Stein's method for normal approximation, in: *An Introduction to Stein's Method*, in: *Lect. Notes Ser. Inst. Math. Sci. Natl. Univ. Singap.*, vol. 4, Singapore Univ. Press, Singapore, 2005, pp. 1–59.
- [12] J.-F. Coeurjolly, Identification of multifractional Brownian motion, *Bernoulli* 11 (6) (2005) 987–1008.
- [13] J.-F. Coeurjolly, Hurst exponent estimation of locally self-similar Gaussian processes using sample quantiles, *Ann. Statist.* 36 (3) (2008) 1404–1434.
- [14] J.M. Corcuera, D. Nualart, J.H.C. Woerner, Power variation of some integral fractional processes, *Bernoulli* 12 (4) (2006) 713–735.
- [15] R.L. Dobrushin, P. Major, Non-central limit theorems for nonlinear functionals of Gaussian fields, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verwandte Geb.* 50 (1) (1979) 27–52.
- [16] R.M. Dudley, *Real Analysis and Probability*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [17] L. Giraitis, D. Surgailis, CLT and other limit theorems for functionals of Gaussian processes, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verwandte Geb.* 70 (1985) 191–212.
- [18] S. Janson, *Gaussian Hilbert Spaces*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [19] M.F. Kratz, J.R. León, Central limit theorems for level functionals of stationary Gaussian processes and fields, *J. Theoret. Probab.* 14 (3) (2001) 639–672.
- [20] J. León, C. Ludeña, Limits for weighted p -variations and likewise functionals of fractional diffusions with drift, *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 117 (3) (2007) 271–296.
- [21] C. Ludeña, L^p -variations for multifractal fractional random walks, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* 18 (3) (2008) 1138–1163.
- [22] D. Marinucci, The empirical process for bivariate sequences with long memory, *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.* 8 (2) (2002) 205–223.
- [23] D. Marinucci, A Central limit theorem and higher order results for the angular bispectrum, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 141 (2007) 389–409.
- [24] I. Nourdin, D. Nualart, C.A. Tudor, Central and non-central limit theorems for weighted power variations of fractional Brownian motion, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* 46 (4) (2008) 1055–1079.
- [25] I. Nourdin, G. Peccati, Stein's method on Wiener chaos, *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 145 (1) (2009) 75–118.
- [26] I. Nourdin, G. Peccati, Stein's method and exact Berry–Esseen asymptotics for functionals of Gaussian fields, *Ann. Probab.* 37 (6) (2010) 2231–2261.
- [27] I. Nourdin, G. Peccati, G. Reinert, Invariance principles for homogeneous sums: universality of Gaussian Wiener chaos, *Ann. Probab.* 38 (5) (2010) 1947–1985.
- [28] D. Nualart, *The Malliavin Calculus and Related Topics*, 2nd ed., Springer, Berlin, 2006.
- [29] G. Peccati, M.S. Taqqu, *Wiener Chaos: Moments, Cumulants and Diagrams*, Springer, Berlin, 2010.
- [30] G. Peccati, C. Zheng, Multi-dimensional Gaussian fluctuations on the Poisson space, *Electron. J. Probab.* 15 (48) (2010) 1487–1527.
- [31] M. Rosenblatt, Independence and dependence, in: *Proc. 4th Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Prob.*, vol. II, Univ. California Press, Berkeley, Calif, 1961, pp. 431–443.
- [32] M. Sodin, B. Tsirelson, Random complex zeroes. I. Asymptotic normality, *Israel J. Math.* 144 (2004) 125–149.
- [33] T.-C. Sun, Some further results on central limit theorems for nonlinear functions of a normal stationary process, *J. Math. Mech.* 14 (1965) 71–85.
- [34] D. Surgailis, CLTs for polynomials of linear sequences: diagram formulae with applications, in: *Long Range Dependence*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000, pp. 111–128.
- [35] M. Talagrand, *Spin Glasses: a Challenge for Mathematicians. Cavity and Mean Fields*, Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [36] M.S. Taqqu, Weak convergence to fractional Brownian motion and to the Rosenblatt process, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verwandte Geb.* 31 (1975) 287–302.
- [37] M.S. Taqqu, Convergence of integrated processes of arbitrary Hermite rank, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheor. Verwandte Geb.* 50 (1) (1979) 53–83.
- [38] L. Wang, Asymptotics of statistical estimates in stochastic programming problems with long-range dependent samples, *Math. Methods Oper. Res.* 55 (1) (2002) 37–54.