

# NEW RATES FOR EXPONENTIAL APPROXIMATION AND THE THEOREMS OF RÉNYI AND YAGLOM<sup>1</sup>

BY EROL A. PEKÖZ AND ADRIAN RÖLLIN<sup>2</sup>

*Boston University and National University of Singapore*

We introduce two abstract theorems that reduce a variety of complex exponential distributional approximation problems to the construction of couplings. These are applied to obtain new rates of convergence with respect to the Wasserstein and Kolmogorov metrics for the theorem of Rényi on random sums and generalizations of it, hitting times for Markov chains, and to obtain a new rate for the classical theorem of Yaglom on the exponential asymptotic behavior of a critical Galton–Watson process conditioned on nonextinction. The primary tools are an adaptation of Stein’s method, Stein couplings, as well as the equilibrium distributional transformation from renewal theory.

**1. Introduction.** The exponential distribution arises as an asymptotic limit in a wide variety of settings involving rare events, extremes, waiting times, and quasi-stationary distributions. As discussed in the preface of [Aldous \(1989\)](#), the tremendous difficulty in obtaining explicit bounds on the error of the exponential approximation in more than the most elementary of settings apparently has left a gap in the literature. The classical theorem of [Yaglom \(1947\)](#) describing the asymptotic exponential behavior of a critical Galton–Watson process conditioned on nonextinction, for example, has a large literature of extensions and embellishments [see [Lalley and Zheng \(2011\)](#), e.g.] but the complex dependencies between offspring have apparently not previously allowed for obtaining explicit error bounds. Stein’s method, introduced in [Stein \(1972\)](#), is now a well-established method for obtaining explicit bounds in distributional approximation problems in settings with dependence [see [Ross and Peköz \(2007\)](#) for an introduction]. Results for the normal and Poisson approximation, in particular, are extensive but also are currently very actively being further developed; see, for example, [Chatterjee \(2008\)](#) and [Chen and Röllin \(2009\)](#).

There have been a few attempts to apply Stein’s method to exponential approximation. [Weinberg \(2005\)](#) sketches a few potential applications but only tackles simple examples thoroughly, and [Bon \(2006\)](#) only considers geometric convolutions. [Chatterjee, Fulman and Röllin \(2006\)](#) breaks new ground by applying the

---

Received March 2010.

<sup>1</sup>Supported by the Institute for Mathematical Sciences at the National University of Singapore.

<sup>2</sup>Supported in part by NUS Grant R-155-000-098-133.

*AMS 2000 subject classifications.* Primary 60F05; secondary 60J10, 60J80.

*Key words and phrases.* Exponential approximation, geometric convolution, first passage times, critical Galton–Watson branching process, Stein’s method, equilibrium and size-biased distribution.

method to a challenging problem in spectral graph theory using exchangeable pairs, but the calculations involved are application-specific and far from elementary. In this article, in contrast, we develop a general framework that more conveniently reduces a broad variety of complex exponential distributional approximation problems to the construction of couplings. We provide evidence that our approach can be fruitfully applied to nontrivial applications and in settings with dependence—settings where Stein’s method typically is expected to shine.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present two abstract theorems formulated in terms of couplings. We introduce a distributional transformation (the “equilibrium distribution” from renewal theory) which has not yet been extensively explored using Stein’s method. We also make use of Stein couplings similar to those introduced in [Chen and Röllin \(2009\)](#). In Section 3, we give applications using these couplings to obtain exponential approximation rates for the theorem of Rényi on random sums and hitting times for Markov chains; our approach yields generalizations of these results not previously available in the literature. Furthermore, we consider the rate of convergence in the classical theorem of Yaglom on the exponential asymptotic behavior of a critical Galton–Watson process conditioned on nonextinction; this is the first place this latter result has appeared in the literature. In Section 4, we then give the postponed proofs for the main theorems.

**2. Main results.** In this section, we present the framework in abstract form that will subsequently be used in concrete applications in Section 3. This framework is comprised of two approaches that we will describe here and then prove in Section 4.

To define the probability metrics used in this article, we need the sets of test functions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_K &= \{[\cdot \leq z] \mid z \in \mathbb{R}\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_W &= \{h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid h \text{ is Lipschitz, } \|h'\| \leq 1\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{BW} &= \{h : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid h \text{ is Lipschitz, } \|h\| \leq 1 \text{ and } \|h'\| \leq 1\} \end{aligned}$$

and then the distance between two probability measures  $P$  and  $Q$  with respect to  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined as

$$(2.1) \quad d_{\mathcal{F}}(P, Q) := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} f dP - \int_{\mathbb{R}} f dQ \right|$$

if the corresponding integrals are well-defined. Denote by  $d_K$ ,  $d_W$  and  $d_{BW}$  the respective distances corresponding to the sets  $\mathcal{F}_K$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_W$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{BW}$ . The subscripts respectively denote the Kolmogorov, Wasserstein and bounded Wasserstein distances. We can use the following two relations:

$$(2.2) \quad d_{BW} \leq d_W, \quad d_K(P, \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 1.74 \sqrt{d_W(P, \text{Exp}(1))}.$$

The first relation is clear, as  $\mathcal{F}_{BW} \subset \mathcal{F}_W$ , and we refer to [Gibbs and Su \(2002\)](#) for the second relation. It is worthwhile noting that the second inequality can yield optimal bounds with respect to the  $d_K$  metric. This is in contrast to normal approximation where in fact  $d_W$  and  $d_K$  often exhibit the same order of convergence and hence the corresponding equivalent of (2.2) for the normal distribution does not yield optimal bounds on  $d_K$ ; cf. [Corollary 3.4](#).

Our first approach involves a coupling with the *equilibrium distribution* from renewal theory, and is related to the zero-bias coupling from [Goldstein and Reinert \(1997\)](#) used for normal approximation [see also [Bon \(2006\)](#), Lemma 6, [Goldstein \(2005, 2007\)](#) and [Ghosh \(2009\)](#)].

**DEFINITION 2.1.** Let  $X$  be a nonnegative random variable with finite mean. We say that a random variable  $X^e$  has the *equilibrium distribution w.r.t.  $X$*  if for all Lipschitz  $f$

$$(2.3) \quad \mathbb{E}f(X) - f(0) = \mathbb{E}X\mathbb{E}f'(X^e).$$

It is straightforward that this implies

$$(2.4) \quad \mathbb{P}(X^e \leq x) = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}X} \int_0^x \mathbb{P}[X > y] dy$$

and our first result below can be thought of as formalizing the notion that when  $\mathcal{L}(W)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(W^e)$  are approximately equal then  $W$  has approximately an exponential distribution.

**THEOREM 2.1.** Let  $W$  be a nonnegative random variable with  $\mathbb{E}W = 1$  and let  $W^e$  have the equilibrium distribution w.r.t.  $W$ . Then, for any  $\beta > 0$ ,

$$(2.5) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 12\beta + 2\mathbb{P}[|W^e - W| > \beta]$$

and

$$(2.6) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(W^e), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq \beta + \mathbb{P}[|W^e - W| > \beta].$$

If in addition  $W$  has finite second moment, then

$$(2.7) \quad d_W(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 2\mathbb{E}|W^e - W|$$

and

$$(2.8) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(W^e), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq \mathbb{E}|W^e - W|;$$

bound (2.8) also holds for  $d_W(\mathcal{L}(W^e), \text{Exp}(1))$ .

Our second approach involves an adaptation of the *linear Stein couplings* introduced in [Chen and Röllin \(2009\)](#).

DEFINITION 2.2. A triple  $(W, W', G)$  of random variables is called a *constant Stein coupling* if

$$(2.9) \quad \mathbb{E}\{Gf(W') - Gf(W)\} = \mathbb{E}f(W)$$

for all  $f$  with  $f(0) = 0$  and for which the expectations exist.

Let

$$r_1(\mathcal{F}) = \sup_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}, \\ f(0)=0}} |\mathbb{E}\{Gf(W') - Gf(W) - f(W)\}|$$

and  $r_2 = \mathbb{E}|\mathbb{E}^{W''}(GD) - 1|$ , where here and in the rest of the article  $D := W' - W$ . The random variable  $W''$  is defined on the same probability space as  $(W, W', G)$  and can be used to simplify the bounds (it is typically chosen so that  $r_2 = 0$ ); let  $D' := W'' - W$ . At first reading one may simply set  $W'' = W$  (in which case typically  $r_2 \neq 0$ ); we refer to [Chen and Röllin \(2009\)](#) for a more detailed discussion of Stein couplings. Our next result applies to general random variables, but useful bounds can only be expected if they are coupled together so that  $r_1(\mathcal{F}_W)$  is small.

THEOREM 2.2. *Let  $W, W', W''$  and  $G$  be random variables with finite first moments such that also  $\mathbb{E}|GD| < \infty$  and  $\mathbb{E}|GD'| < \infty$ . Then with the above definitions,*

$$(2.10) \quad d_W(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq r_1(\mathcal{F}_W) + r_2 + 2r_3 + 2r'_3 + 2r_4 + 2r'_4,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_3 &= \mathbb{E}|GDI[|D| > 1]|, & r'_3 &= \mathbb{E}|(GD - 1)\mathbf{I}[|D'| > 1]|, \\ r_4 &= \mathbb{E}|G(D^2 \wedge 1)|, & r'_4 &= \mathbb{E}|(GD - 1)(|D'| \wedge 1)|. \end{aligned}$$

The same bound holds for  $d_{BW}$  with  $r_1(\mathcal{F}_W)$  replaced by  $r_1(\mathcal{F}_{BW})$ . Furthermore, for any  $\alpha, \beta$  and  $\beta'$ ,

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) & \\ & \leq 2r_1(\mathcal{F}_{BW}) + 2r_2 + 2r_5 + 2r'_5 + 22(\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' + 12\alpha\beta^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} r_5 &= \mathbb{E}|GDI[|G| > \alpha \text{ or } |D| > \beta]|, \\ r'_5 &= \mathbb{E}|(1 - GD)\mathbf{I}[|G| > \alpha \text{ or } |D| > \beta \text{ or } |D'| > \beta']|. \end{aligned}$$

2.1. *Couplings.* In this section, we present a way to construct the equilibrium distribution more explicitly and also discuss a few constant Stein couplings.

2.1.1. *Equilibrium distribution via size biasing.* Assume that  $\mathbb{E}W = 1$  and let  $W^s$  have the size bias distribution of  $W$ , that is,

$$\mathbb{E}\{Wf(W)\} = \mathbb{E}f(W^s)$$

for all  $f$  for which the expectation exist. Then, if  $U$  has the uniform distribution on  $[0, 1]$  independent of all else,  $W^e := UW^s$  has the equilibrium distribution w.r.t.  $W$ . Indeed, for any Lipschitz  $f$  with  $f(0) = 0$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}f(W) = \mathbb{E}f(W) - f(0) = \mathbb{E}\{Wf'(UW)\} = \mathbb{E}f'(UW^s) = \mathbb{E}f'(W^e).$$

We note that this construction was also considered by Goldstein (2009) and it has been observed by Pakes and Khattree (1992) that for a nonnegative random variable  $W$  with  $\mathbb{E}W < \infty$ , we have that  $\mathcal{L}(W) = \mathcal{L}(UW^s)$  if and only if  $W$  has exponential distribution.

2.1.2. *Exchangeable pairs.* Let  $(W, W')$  be an exchangeable pair. Assume that

$$\mathbb{E}^W(W' - W) = -\lambda + \lambda R \quad \text{on } \{W > 0\}.$$

Then, if we set  $G = (W' - W)/(2\lambda)$ , we have  $r_1(\mathcal{F}_{BW}) \leq \mathbb{E}|R|$  and  $r_1(\mathcal{F}_W) \leq \mathbb{E}|RW|$ .

This coupling was used by Chatterjee, Fulman and Röllin (2006) to obtain an exponential approximation for the spectrum of the Bernoulli–Laplace Markov chain. In order to obtain optimal rates, Chatterjee, Fulman and Röllin (2006) develop more application specific theorems than ours.

2.1.3. *Conditional distribution of  $W$  given  $E^c$ .* Let  $E$  be an event and let  $p = \mathbb{P}[E]$ , where  $p$  is small. Assume that  $W'$  and  $Y$  are defined on the same probability space and that  $\mathcal{L}(W') = \mathcal{L}(W|E^c)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(Y) = \mathcal{L}(W|E)$ . Then, for any Lipschitz  $f$  with  $f(0) = 0$ , and with  $G = (1 - p)/p$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\{Gf(W') - Gf(W)\} \\ &= \frac{1 - p}{p} \mathbb{E}f(W') - \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E}f(W) + \mathbb{E}f(W) \\ &= \frac{1 - p}{p} \mathbb{E}f(W') - \frac{1 - p}{p} \mathbb{E}(f(W)|E^c) - \mathbb{E}(f(W)|E) + \mathbb{E}f(W) \\ &= \frac{1 - p}{p} \mathbb{E}f(W') - \frac{1 - p}{p} \mathbb{E}f(W') - \mathbb{E}f(Y) + \mathbb{E}f(W) \\ &= \mathbb{E}f(W) - \mathbb{E}\{Yf'(UY)\}, \end{aligned}$$

so that  $r_1(\mathcal{F}_W) \leq \mathbb{E}Y$ . This coupling is used by Peköz (1996) for geometric approximation in total variation. The Stein operator used there is a discrete version of the Stein operator used in this article. Clearly, one will typically aim for an event  $E \supset \{W = 0\}$  in order to have  $Y = 0$ .

REMARK 2.1. The roles of  $W$  and  $W'$  from the previous coupling can be reversed. Let  $E$  and  $p$  be as before. However, assume now that  $\mathcal{L}(W) = \mathcal{L}(W'|E^c)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(Y) = \mathcal{L}(W'|E)$ . Then, it is again straightforward to see that  $(W, W', -1/p)$  is a constant Stein coupling.

### 3. Applications.

3.1. *Random sums.* A classical result of Rényi (1957) states that  $\mathcal{L}(p \times \sum_{i=1}^N X_i) \rightarrow \text{Exp}(1)$  as  $p \rightarrow 0$  when  $N$  has the  $\text{Ge}(p)$  distribution (independent of all else) and  $X_i$  are i.i.d. with  $\mathbb{E}X_i = 1$ . There have been some generalizations [see Brown (1990), Kalashnikov (1997) and the references therein]. Sugakova (1995), in particular, gives uniform error bounds for independent but nonidentically distributed summands with identical means. Our next result can be viewed as generalizing this to dependent summands and to nongeometric  $N$ . For a random variable  $X$ , we denote by  $F_X$  its distribution function and by  $F_X^{-1}$  its generalized inverse. We adopt the standard convention that  $\sum_a^b = 0$  if  $b < a$ .

THEOREM 3.1. *Let  $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots)$  be a sequence of square integrable, nonnegative random variables, independent of all else, such that, for all  $i \geq 1$ ,*

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbb{E}(X_i | X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}) = \mu_i < \infty \quad \text{almost surely.}$$

*Let  $N$  be a positive, integer valued random variable with  $\mathbb{E}N < \infty$  and let  $M$  be a random variable satisfying*

$$(3.2) \quad P(M = m) = \mu_m P(N \geq m) / \mu, \quad m = 1, 2, \dots$$

*with*

$$\mu = \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i = \sum_{m \geq 1} \mu_m P(N \geq m).$$

*Then, with  $W = \mu^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$ , we have*

$$(3.3) \quad d_W(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 2\mu^{-1} \left( \mathbb{E}|X_M - X_M^e| + \sup_{i \geq 1} \mu_i \mathbb{E}|N - M| \right),$$

*where each  $X_i^e$  is a random variable having the equilibrium distribution w.r.t.  $X_i$  given  $X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}$ . If, in addition,  $X_i \leq C$  for all  $i$  and  $|N - M| \leq K$ , then*

$$(3.4) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 12\mu^{-1} \left\{ \sup_{i \geq 1} \|F_{X_i}^{-1} - F_{X_i^e}^{-1}\| + CK \right\};$$

*if  $K = 0$ , the same bound also holds for unbounded  $X_i$ .*

PROOF. We first show that  $W^e := \mu^{-1}(\sum_{i=1}^{M-1} X_i + X_M^e)$  has the equilibrium distribution w.r.t.  $W$ . For a given Lipschitz  $f$ , we write  $g(m) = f(\mu^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^m X_i)$  and we have

$$\mu \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{g(M)}{\mu_M} - \frac{g(M-1)}{\mu_M} \right] = \sum_{m \geq 0} P(N \geq m)(g(m) - g(m-1)) = \mathbb{E}g(N)$$

and, for any integer  $m > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}f' \left( \mu^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} X_i + \mu^{-1} X_m^e \right) = \frac{\mu}{\mu_m} \mathbb{E}[g(m) - g(m-1)]$$

[using (2.3), (3.1) and the assumptions on  $X_i^e$ ] that together give  $\mathbb{E}f'(W^e) = \mathbb{E}f(W)$ . Then using

$$(3.5) \quad W^e - W = \mu^{-1} \left\{ (X_M^e - X_M) + \text{sgn}(M - N) \sum_{i=(M \wedge N)+1}^{N \vee M} X_i \right\}$$

we obtain (3.3) from (2.7). Letting  $\beta = \mu^{-1} \{ \sup_{i \geq 1} \|F_{X_i}^{-1} - F_{X_i^e}^{-1}\| + CK \}$ , and using Strassen’s theorem we obtain (3.4) from (2.5); the remark after (3.4) follows similarly.  $\square$

REMARK 3.1. Let  $N \sim \text{Ge}(p)$  and assume that the  $\mu_i$  are bounded from above and bounded away from 0. This implies in particular that  $\mu \asymp 1/p$  as  $p \rightarrow 0$ . Using

$$(3.6) \quad d_W(\mathcal{L}(N), \mathcal{L}(M)) = \inf_{(N,M)} \mathbb{E}|N - M|$$

from Kantorovič and Rubinštejn (1958) [see also Vallander (1973)], where the infimum ranges over all possible couplings of  $N$  and  $M$ , we can replace  $\mathbb{E}|N - M|$  in (3.3) by the left-hand side of (3.6). To bound this quantity note first that from (3.2) we have  $\mathbb{E}h(M) = \mathbb{E}\{\frac{\mu_N}{\mu p} h(N)\}$  for every function  $h$  for which the expectations exist. Note also that  $\mathbb{E}(\mu_N) = \mu p$ . Let  $h$  now be Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant 1 and assume without loss of generality that  $h(0) = 0$ , so that  $|h(N)| \leq N$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}\{h(M) - h(N)\}| &= \left| \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left( \frac{\mu_N}{\mu p} - 1 \right) h(N) \right\} \right| \leq \mathbb{E} \left| \left\{ \frac{\mu_N}{\mu p} - 1 \right\} N \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\mu_N) \mathbb{E}N^2}}{\mu p} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2 \text{Var}(\mu_N)}}{\mu p^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, under the assumptions of this remark,  $\mu^{-1} \sup_i \mu_i \mathbb{E}|N - M|$  is at most of order  $\text{Var}(\mu_N)$  as  $p \rightarrow 0$ .

Next, we have an immediate corollary by coupling stochastically ordered random variables.

COROLLARY 3.1. *In the setting in Theorem 3.1, assume either  $N \leq_{st} M$  or  $N \geq_{st} M$  holds as well as that the  $X_i$  are independent and, for each  $i$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}X_i = 1$  and either  $X_i \leq_{st} X_i^e$  or  $X_i \geq_{st} X_i^e$ . Then*

$$(3.7) \quad d_W(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 2\mu^{-1} \sup_{i \geq 1} \left| \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}X_i^2 - 1 \right| + 2 \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}N^2}{2\mu^2} + \frac{1}{2\mu} - 1 \right|$$

and, furthermore, if  $N$  has a  $\text{Ge}(p)$  distribution then

$$(3.8) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 2.47 \left( p \sup_{i \geq 1} \left| \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}X_i^2 - 1 \right| \right)^{1/2}.$$

REMARK 3.2. A nonnegative random variable  $X$  with finite mean is said to be NBUE (new better than used in expectation) if  $X^e \leq_{st} X$  or NWUE (new worse than used in expectation) if  $X^e \geq_{st} X$  [see Shaked and Shanthikumar (2007) and Sengupta, Chatterjee and Chakraborty (1995) for other sufficient conditions]. A result similar to (3.8) appears as Theorem 6.1 in Brown and Ge (1984) with a larger constant, though Brown (1990) and Daley (1988) subsequently derived significant improvements.

EXAMPLE 3.1 (Geometric convolution of i.i.d. random variables). Assume that  $N \sim \text{Ge}(p)$  and that  $\mathbb{E}X_1 = 1$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}(M) = \mathcal{L}(N)$ , we can set  $M = N$ . Denote by  $\delta(\mathcal{F})$  the distance between  $\mathcal{L}(X_1)$  and  $\text{Exp}(1)$  as defined in (2.1) with respect to the set of test functions  $\mathcal{F}$ ; define  $\delta^e(\mathcal{F})$  analogously but between  $\mathcal{L}(X)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(X^e)$ . In this case, the estimates of Theorem 3.1 reduce to

$$(3.9) \quad d_W(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 2p\delta^e(\mathcal{F}_W),$$

$$(3.10) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 12p \|F_{X_1}^{-1} - F_{X_1^e}^{-1}\|$$

which can be compared with the (slightly simplified)

$$(3.11) \quad d_W(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq p\delta(\mathcal{F}_W) + 2p\delta(\mathcal{F}_2),$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = \{f \in C^1(\mathbb{R}) \mid f' \in \mathcal{F}_W\},$$

from Kalashnikov (1997), Theorem 3.1 for  $s = 2$ , page 151.

Noting  $\delta(\mathcal{F}_W) \leq 2\delta^e(\mathcal{F}_W)$  (using the Kantorovich–Rubinstein theorem), let  $Z \sim \text{Exp}(1)$  and let  $h$  be a differentiable function with  $h(0) = 0$ . Then, recalling that  $\mathcal{L}(Z^e) = \mathcal{L}(Z)$ , we have from (2.3) that  $\mathbb{E}h(Z) = \mathbb{E}h'(Z)$  and, using again (2.3) for  $X$  and  $X^e$ ,

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbb{E}h(X) - \mathbb{E}h(Z) = \mathbb{E}h'(X^e) - \mathbb{E}h'(Z).$$

This implies

$$(3.13) \quad \delta(\mathcal{F}_2) = d_W(\mathcal{L}(X_1^e), \text{Exp}(1))$$



and hence, from (2.8), we have  $\delta(\mathcal{F}_2) \leq \delta^e(\mathcal{F}_W)$ , so that (3.11) gives a bound which is not as good as (3.9) if the bound is to be expressed in terms of  $\delta^e(\mathcal{F}_W)$ .

On the other hand, from (3.13) and the triangle inequality,

$$\delta^e(\mathcal{F}_W) \leq \delta(\mathcal{F}_W) + d_W(\mathcal{L}(X_1^e), \text{Exp}(1)) = \delta(\mathcal{F}_W) + \delta(\mathcal{F}_2).$$

Hence, although much broader in applicability, our Theorem 3.1 yields results comparable to those in the literature when specialized to the setting of geometric convolutions.

**THEOREM 3.2.** *Let  $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots)$  be a sequence of random variables with  $\mathbb{E}X_i = \mu_i$  and  $\mathbb{E}X_i^2 < \infty$ . Let  $N, N'$  and  $N''$  be nonnegative, square integrable, integer valued random variables independent of the sequence  $X$ . Assume that*

$$p := \mathbb{P}[N = 0] > 0, \quad \mathcal{L}(N') = \mathcal{L}(N|N > 0), \quad N'' \leq N \leq N'.$$

Define  $S(k, l) := X_{k+1} + \dots + X_l$  for  $k < l$  and  $S(k, l) = 0$  for  $k \geq l$ . Let  $\mu = \mathbb{E}S(0, N)$  and  $W = S(0, N)/\mu$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & d_W(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \\ & \leq \frac{qs}{p\mu} + \frac{4q\mathbb{E}\{S(N, N')(1 + S(N'', N))\}}{p\mu^2} + \frac{4\mathbb{E}S(N'', N)}{\mu}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $q = 1 - p$ ,  $s^2 = \text{Var} \mathbb{E}(S(N, N')|\mathcal{F}_{N''})$  and  $\mathcal{F}_k := \sigma(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ . If, in addition,

$$(3.14) \quad X_i \leq C, \quad N' - N \leq K_1, \quad N - N'' \leq K_2,$$

for positive constants  $C, K_1$  and  $K_2$ , then

$$(3.15) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq \frac{qs}{p\mu} + \frac{22CK_2}{\mu} + \frac{2C^2K_1(11K_2 + 6K_1)}{p\mu^2}.$$

**PROOF.** We make use of the coupling construction from Section 2.1.3. Let  $E = \{N = 0\}$ , let  $Y = 0$ , let  $W' = \mu^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N'} X_i$  and likewise  $W'' = \mu^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N''} X_i$ . Then the conditions of Section 2.1.3 are satisfied with  $G = q/p$  and we can apply Theorem 2.2, in particular (2.11). We have  $r_1(\mathcal{F}_{BW}) = 0$  as proved in Section 2.1.3. Note now that  $D = S(N, N')$  and  $D' = S(N'', N)$ . Hence,  $r_2 = \mathbb{E}|1 - q(p\mu)^{-1}\mathbb{E}(S(N, N')|\mathcal{F}_{N''})|$ . As (2.9) implies that  $\mathbb{E}(GD) = \mathbb{E}W = 1$ , the variance bound of  $r_2$  follows. The  $d_W$ -bound follows from (2.10), using the rough estimates  $r_3 + r_4 \leq \mathbb{E}|GD^2|$  and  $r'_3 + r'_4 \leq 2\mathbb{E}|D'| + 2\mathbb{E}|GDD'|$  as we assume bounded second moments. To obtain the  $d_K$ -bound choose  $\alpha = G = q/p$ ,  $\beta = CK_1/\mu$  and  $\beta' = CK_2/\mu$ ; then  $r_5 = r'_5 = 0$ . Hence, (2.11) yields

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq r_2 + 22(\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' + 12\alpha\beta^2.$$

Plugging in the value for  $r_2$  and the constants, the theorem is proved.  $\square$

EXAMPLE 3.2 (Geometric convolution under local dependence). If  $N + 1 \sim \text{Ge}(p)$  (that is,  $N$  is a geometric distribution starting at 0) we can choose  $N' = N + 1$ , as  $\mathcal{L}(N|N > 0) = \mathcal{L}(N + 1)$  due to the well-known lack-of-memory property; hence  $K_1 = 1$ . Assume now there is a nonnegative integer  $m$  such that, for each  $i$ ,  $(X_1, \dots, X_i)$  is independent of  $(X_{i+m+1}, X_{i+m+2}, \dots)$ . We can set  $N'' = \max(N - m, 0)$ , hence  $s^2 \leq \text{Var} \mu_{N+1}$ , where  $\mu_i := \mathbb{E}X_i$ . Assume also that  $\mu_i \geq \mu_0$  for some  $\mu_0 > 0$ , so that  $\mu \geq \mu_0/p$ . Hence, Theorem 3.2 yields

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\mu_{N+1})}}{\mu_0} + \frac{22Cpm}{\mu_0} + \frac{2C^2p(11m + 6)}{\mu_0^2}.$$

Again, convergence is obtained if  $\text{Var}(\mu_{N+1}) \rightarrow 0$  as  $p \rightarrow 0$ ; cf. Remark 3.1.

3.2. *First passage times.* Approximately exponential hitting times for Markov chains have been widely studied; see Aldous (1989), Aldous and Brown (1992) and Aldous and Brown (1993) for entry points to this literature. Let  $X_0, X_1, \dots$  be a stationary ergodic Markov chain with a countable state space  $\mathcal{X}$ , transition probability matrix  $P = (P_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathcal{X}}$  and stationary distribution  $\pi = (\pi_i)_{i \in \mathcal{X}}$  and let

$$\mathcal{L}(T_{\pi,i}) = \mathcal{L}(\inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = i\}) \quad \text{starting with } \mathcal{L}(X_0) = \pi$$

be the hitting time on state  $i$  started according to the stationary distribution  $\pi$  and let

$$\mathcal{L}(T_{i,j}) = \mathcal{L}(\inf\{t > 0 : X_t = j\}) \quad \text{starting with } X_0 = i$$

be the hitting time on state  $j$  starting from state  $i$ . We also say a stopping time  $T_{i,\pi}$  is a stationary time starting from state  $i$  if  $\mathcal{L}(X_{T_{i,\pi}} | X_0 = i) = \pi$ .

COROLLARY 3.2. *With the above definitions, we have*

$$(3.16) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(\pi_i T_{\pi,i}), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 2\pi_i + \min\{\pi_i \mathbb{E}|T_{\pi,i} - T_{i,i}|, \mathbb{P}(T_{\pi,i} \neq T_{i,i})\}.$$

PROOF. Using a renewal argument to obtain  $\mathbb{P}(T_{\pi,i} = k) = \pi_i \mathbb{P}(T_{i,i} > k)$ , it is then straightforward to see that  $\mathcal{L}(T_{i,i}^e) = \mathcal{L}(T_{\pi,i} + U)$  when  $U$  is a uniform random variable on  $[0, 1]$ , independent of all else: with  $f(0) = 0$  and using (2.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}f'(T_{\pi,i} + U) &= \mathbb{E}f(T_{\pi,i} + 1) - f(T_{\pi,i}) \\ &= \pi_i \sum_k \mathbb{P}(T_{i,i} > k)(f(k + 1) - f(k)) \\ &= \pi_i \sum_k \sum_{j>k} \mathbb{P}(T_{i,i} = j)(f(k + 1) - f(k)) \\ &= \pi_i \sum_j \sum_{0 \leq k < j} \mathbb{P}(T_{i,i} = j)(f(k + 1) - f(k)) \\ &= \pi_i \sum_j \mathbb{P}(T_{i,i} = j)f(j) = \pi_i \mathbb{E}f(T_{i,i}). \end{aligned}$$

We then have

$$(3.17) \quad \begin{aligned} d_K(\mathcal{L}(\pi_i T_{\pi,i}), \text{Exp}(1)) &\leq \pi_i + d_K(\mathcal{L}(\pi_i(T_{\pi,i} + U)), \text{Exp}(1)) \\ &= \pi_i + d_K(\mathcal{L}(\pi_i T_{i,i}^e), \text{Exp}(1)), \end{aligned}$$

where we use  $d_K(\mathcal{L}(T_{\pi,i}), \mathcal{L}(T_{\pi,i} + U)) \leq \pi_i$  in the first line and  $\mathcal{L}(T_{i,i}^e) = \mathcal{L}(T_{\pi,i} + U)$  in the second line. We obtain inequality (3.16) from (3.17) and (2.8), and then using

$$\mathbb{E}|T_{\pi,i} + U - T_{i,i}| \leq \mathbb{E}U + \mathbb{E}|T_{\pi,i} - T_{i,i}| \leq 0.5 + \mathbb{E}|T_{\pi,i} - T_{i,i}|$$

along with (3.17) and (2.6) using  $\beta = \pi_i$  (since  $\{|T_{\pi,i} + U - T_{i,i}| > 1\}$  implies  $\{T_{\pi,i} \neq T_{i,i}\}$ ).  $\square$

Below, whenever  $T_{i,i}$  and  $T_{i,\pi}$  are used together in an expression it assumed they are both based on a single copy of the Markov chain.

COROLLARY 3.3. *With the above definitions and  $\rho = \mathbb{P}[T_{i,i} < T_{i,\pi}]$ ,*

$$(3.18) \quad \begin{aligned} d_K(\mathcal{L}(\pi_i T_{\pi,i}), \text{Exp}(1)) \\ \leq 2\pi_i + \min \left\{ \pi_i \left( \mathbb{E}T_{i,\pi} + \rho \sup_j \mathbb{E}T_{j,i} \right), \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |P_{i,i}^{(n)} - \pi_i| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Letting  $X_0 = i$ ,  $T_{\pi,i} = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_{T_{i,\pi}+t} = i\}$ ,  $T_{i,i} = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t = i\}$  and  $A = \{T_{i,i} < T_{i,\pi}\}$  we have

$$|T_{\pi,i} - T_{i,i}| \leq (T_{\pi,i} + T_{i,\pi})I_A + T_{i,\pi}I_{A^c} \leq T_{i,\pi} + T_{\pi,i}I_A$$

and the first argument in the minimum of (3.18) follows from (3.16) after noting  $\mathbb{E}[T_{\pi,i}|A] \leq \sup_j \mathbb{E}T_{j,i}$ .

For the second argument in the minimum, let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be the stationary Markov chain and let  $Y_0, Y_1, \dots$  be a coupled copy of the Markov chain started in state  $i$  at time 0, but let  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots$  be coupled with  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  according to the maximal coupling of Griffeath (1974/75) so that we have  $\mathbb{P}(X_n = Y_n = i) = \pi_i \wedge P_{i,i}^{(n)}$ . Let  $T_{\pi,i}$  and  $T_{i,i}$  be hitting times respectively defined on these two Markov chains. Then

$$\mathbb{P}(T_{\pi,i} \neq T_{i,i}) \leq \sum_n \mathbb{P}(X_n = i, Y_n \neq i) + \mathbb{P}(Y_n = i, X_n \neq i)$$

and since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X_n = i, Y_n \neq i) &= \pi_i - \mathbb{P}(X_n = i, Y_n = i) \\ &= \pi_i - \pi_i \wedge P_{i,i}^{(n)} \\ &= [\pi_i - P_{i,i}^{(n)}]^+, \end{aligned}$$

and a similar calculation yields  $\mathbb{P}(Y_n = i, X_n \neq i) = [P_{i,i}^{(n)} - \pi_i]^+$ , and then we obtain (3.18).  $\square$

EXAMPLE 3.3. With the above definitions and further assuming  $X_n$  is an  $m$ -dependent Markov chain, we can let  $T_{i,\pi} = m$  and we thus have

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(\pi_i T_{\pi,i}), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 2\pi_i + \min \left\{ \pi_i \left( m + \mathbb{P}(T_{i,i} < m) \sup_j \mathbb{E}T_{j,i} \right), \sum_{n=1}^{m-1} |P_{i,i}^{(n)} - \pi_i| \right\}.$$

If we consider flipping a biased coin repeatedly, let  $T$  be the number of flips required until the beginning of a given pattern (that cannot overlap with itself) of heads and tails of length  $k$  first appears as a run. The current run of  $k$  flips can be encoded in the state space of a  $k$ -dependent Markov chain and then applying the second result above we obtain

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(\pi_i T_{\pi,i}), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq \pi_i(k + 1).$$

Using the “de-clumping” trick of counting the flips  $T$  preceding the first appearance of tails followed by  $k$  heads in row we have

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(qp^k T_{\pi,i}), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq (k + 2)p^k,$$

where  $p = 1 - q$  is the probability of heads. Similar results are obtained using Poisson and geometric approximations respectively in [Barbour, Holst and Janson \[\(1992\), page 164\]](#) and [Peköz \(1996\)](#).

Recall the definitions of NBUE and NWUE from Remark 3.2 and, as discussed in [Aldous and Fill \(2010\)](#), that stationary reversible continuous-time Markov chain hitting times are NWUE. The next results are immediate consequences of Theorem 2.1 and (2.2). While (3.21) appears to be new, inequality (3.19) appears in [Brown \(1990\)](#), Lemma 2.3. Inequality (3.20) with a larger constant of 3.119 appears in [Brown and Ge \[\(1984\), Theorem 3.6\]](#) for the NBUE case and in [Brown and Ge \[\(1984\), equation \(5.3\)\]](#) for the NWUE case; this constant was later improved in both cases to 1.41 for small  $\rho$  in [Daley \(1988\)](#), equation (1.7).

COROLLARY 3.4. *If  $W$  is either NBUE or NWUE with  $\mathbb{E}W = 1$ , finite second moment and letting  $\rho = |\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}W^2 - 1|$ , we have*

$$(3.19) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(W^e), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq \rho,$$

$$(3.20) \quad d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 2.47\rho^{1/2}$$

and

$$(3.21) \quad d_W(\mathcal{L}(W^e), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq \rho, \quad d_W(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1)) \leq 2\rho.$$

3.3. *Critical Galton–Watson branching process.* Let  $Z_0 = 1, Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  be a Galton–Watson branching process with offspring distribution  $\nu = \mathcal{L}(Z_1)$ . A theorem due to [Yaglom \(1947\)](#) states that, if  $\mathbb{E}Z_1 = 1$  and  $\text{Var} Z_1 = \sigma^2 < \infty$ , then  $\mathcal{L}(n^{-1}Z_n | Z_n > 0)$  converges to an exponential distribution with mean  $\sigma^2/2$ . We give a rate of convergence for this asymptotic under finite third moment of the offspring distribution using the idea from Section 2.1.1. Though exponential limits in this context are an active area of research [see, e.g., [Lalley and Zheng \(2011\)](#)], the question of rates does not appear to have been previously studied in the literature. To this end, we make use the of construction from [Lyons, Pemantle and Peres \(1995\)](#); we refer to that article for more details on the construction and only present what is needed for our purpose.

**THEOREM 3.3.** *For a critical Galton–Watson branching process with offspring distribution  $\nu = \mathcal{L}(Z_1)$  such that  $\mathbb{E}Z_1^3 < \infty$  we have*

$$d_W(\mathcal{L}(2Z_n/(\sigma^2 n) | Z_n > 0), \text{Exp}(1)) = O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right).$$

**PROOF.** First, we construct a size-biased branching tree as in [Lyons, Pemantle and Peres \(1995\)](#). We assume that this tree is labeled and ordered, in the sense that, if  $w$  and  $v$  are vertices in the tree from the same generation and  $w$  is to the left of  $v$ , then the offspring of  $w$  is to the left of the offspring of  $v$ , too. Start in generation 0 with one vertex  $v_0$  and let it have a number of offspring distributed according to the size-bias distribution of  $\nu$ . Pick one of the offspring of  $v_0$  uniformly at random and call it  $v_1$ . To each of the siblings of  $v_1$ , attach an independent Galton–Watson branching process with offspring distribution  $\nu$ . For  $v_1$  proceed as for  $v_0$ , that is, give it a size-biased number of offspring, pick one at uniformly at random, call it  $v_2$ , attach independent Galton–Watson branching process to the siblings of  $v_2$  and so on. It is clear that this will always give an infinite tree as the “spine”  $v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots$  of the tree will never die out.

We next need some notation. Denote by  $S_n$  the total number of particles in generation  $n$ . Denote by  $L_n$  and  $R_n$ , respectively, the number of particles to the left (exclusive  $v_n$ ) and to the right (inclusive  $v_n$ ), respectively, of vertex  $v_n$ , so that  $S_n = L_n + R_n$ . We can describe these particles in more detail, according to the generation at which they split off from the spine. Denote by  $S_{n,j}$  the number of particles in generation  $n$  that stem from any of the siblings of  $v_j$  (but not  $v_j$  itself). Clearly,  $S_n = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n S_{n,j}$ , where the summands are independent. Likewise, let  $L_{n,j}$  and  $R_{n,j}$ , respectively, be the number of particles in generation  $n$  that stem from the siblings to the left and right, respectively, of  $v_j$  (note that  $L_{n,n}$  and  $R_{n,n}$  are just the number of siblings of  $v_n$  to the left and to the right, respectively). We have the relations  $L_n = \sum_{j=1}^n L_{n,j}$  and  $R_n = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n R_{n,j}$ . Note that, for fixed  $j$ ,  $L_{n,j}$  and  $R_{n,j}$  are in general not independent, as they are linked through the offspring size of  $v_{j-1}$ .

Now let  $R'_{n,j}$  be independent random variables such that

$$\mathcal{L}(R'_{n,j}) = \mathcal{L}(R_{n,j} | L_{n,j} = 0)$$

and, with  $A_{n,j} = \{L_{n,j} = 0\}$ , define

$$(3.22) \quad R_{n,j}^* = R_{n,j} I_{A_{n,j}} + R'_{n,j} I_{A_{n,j}^c} = R_{n,j} + (R'_{n,j} - R_{n,j}) I_{A_{n,j}^c}.$$

Define also  $R_n^* = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n R_{n,j}^*$ . Let us collect a few facts which we will then use to give the proof of the theorem:

- (i) for any nonnegative random variable  $X$  the size-biased distribution of  $\mathcal{L}(X)$  is the same as the size-biased distribution of  $\mathcal{L}(X | X > 0)$ ;
- (ii)  $S_n$  has the size-biased distribution of  $Z_n$ ;
- (iii) given  $S_n$ , the vertex  $v_n$  is uniformly distributed among the particles of the  $n$ th generation;
- (iv)  $\mathcal{L}(R_n^*) = \mathcal{L}(Z_n | Z_n > 0)$ ;
- (v)  $\mathbb{E}\{R'_{n,j} I_{A_{n,j}^c}\} \leq \sigma^2 \mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c]$ ;
- (vi)  $\mathbb{E}\{R_{n,j} I_{A_{n,j}^c}\} \leq \gamma \mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c]$ , where  $\gamma = \mathbb{E}Z_1^3$ ;
- (vii)  $\mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c] \leq \sigma^2 \mathbb{P}[Z_{n-j} > 0] \leq C(v)/(n - j + 1)$  for some absolute constant  $C(v)$ .

Statement (i) is easy to verify, (ii) follows from Lyons, Pemantle and Peres (1995), equation (2.2), (iii) follows from Lyons, Pemantle and Peres (1995), comment after (2.2), (iv) follows from Lyons, Pemantle and Peres (1995), proof of Theorem C(i). Using independence,

$$\mathbb{E}\{R'_{n,j} I_{A_{n,j}^c}\} = \mathbb{E}R'_{n,j} \mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c] \leq \sigma^2 \mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c],$$

where the second inequality is due to Lyons, Pemantle and Peres (1995), proof of Theorem C(i), which proves (v). If  $X_j$  denotes the number of siblings of  $v_j$ , having the size bias distribution of  $Z_1$  minus 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{R_{n,j} I_{A_{n,j}^c}\} &\leq \mathbb{E}\{X_j I_{A_{n,j}^c}\} \leq \sum_k k \mathbb{P}[X_j = k, A_{n,j}^c] \\ &\leq \sum_k k \mathbb{P}[X_j = k] \mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c | X_j = k] \\ &\leq \sum_k k^2 \mathbb{P}[X_j = k] \mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c] \leq \gamma \mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c], \end{aligned}$$

hence (vi). Finally,

$$\mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c] = \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{P}[A_{n,j}^c | X_j]\} \leq \mathbb{E}\{X_j \mathbb{P}[Z_{n-j} > 0]\} \leq \sigma^2 \mathbb{P}[Z_{n-j} > 0].$$

Using Kolmogorov's estimate [see Lyons, Pemantle and Peres (1995), Theorem C(i)], we have  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \mathbb{P}[Z_n > 0] = 2/\sigma^2$ , which implies (vii).

We are now in the position to prove the theorem using (2.5) of Theorem 2.1. Let  $c = 2/\sigma^2$ . Due to (iv) we can set  $W = cR_n^*/n$ . Due to (i) and (ii),  $S_n$  has the size bias distribution of  $R_n^*$ . Let  $U$  be an independent and uniform random variable on  $[0, 1]$ . Now,  $R_n - U$  is a continuous random variable taking values on  $[0, S_n]$  and, due to (iii), has distribution  $\mathcal{L}(US_n)$ ; hence we can set  $W^e = c(R_n - U)/n$ . It remains to bound  $\mathbb{E}|W - W^e|$ . From (3.22) and using (v)–(vii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} nc^{-1}\mathbb{E}|W - W^e| &\leq \mathbb{E}U + \mathbb{E}|R_n^* - R_n| \leq 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}\{R'_{n,j}I_{A_{n,j}^c} + R_{n,j}I_{A_{n,j}^c}\} \\ &\leq 1 + C(\nu) \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\sigma^2 + \gamma}{n - j + 1} \leq 1 + C(\nu)(\sigma^2 + \gamma)(1 + \log n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for a possibly different constant  $C(\nu)$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}|W - W^e| \leq \frac{C(\nu) \log n}{n}.$$

Plugging this into (2.7) yields the final bound.  $\square$

**4. Proofs of main results.** Our results are based on the Stein operator

$$(4.1) \quad Af(x) = f'(x) - f(x)$$

and the corresponding Stein equation

$$(4.2) \quad f'(w) - f(w) = h(w) - \mathbb{E}h(Z), \quad w \geq 0$$

previously studied (independently of each other and, in the case of the first two, independent of the present work) by Weinberg (2005), Bon (2006) and Chatterjee, Fulman and Röllin (2006). It is straightforward that the solution  $f$  to (4.2) can be written as

$$(4.3) \quad f(w) = -e^w \int_w^\infty (h(x) - \mathbb{E}h(Z))e^{-x} dx.$$

We next need some properties of the solution (4.3). Some preliminary results can be found in Weinberg (2005), Bon (2006), Chatterjee, Fulman and Röllin (2006) and Daly (2008). We give self-contained proofs of the following bounds.

LEMMA 4.1 (Properties of the solution to the Stein equation). *Let  $f$  be the solution to (4.2). If  $h$  is bounded, we have*

$$(4.4) \quad \|f\| \leq \|h\|, \quad \|f'\| \leq 2\|h\|.$$

*If  $h$  is Lipschitz, we have*

$$(4.5) \quad |f(w)| \leq (1 + w)\|h'\|, \quad \|f'\| \leq \|h'\|, \quad \|f''\| \leq 2\|h'\|.$$

For any  $a > 0$  and any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let

$$(4.6) \quad h_{a,\varepsilon}(x) := \varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^\varepsilon \mathbb{I}[x + s \leq a] ds.$$

Define  $f_{a,\varepsilon}$  as in (4.3) with respect to  $h_{a,\varepsilon}$ . Define  $h_{a,0}(x) = \mathbb{I}[x \leq a]$  and  $f_{a,0}$  accordingly. Then, for all  $\varepsilon \geq 0$ ,

$$(4.7) \quad \|f_{a,\varepsilon}\| \leq 1, \quad \|f'_{a,\varepsilon}\| \leq 1,$$

$$(4.8) \quad |f_{a,\varepsilon}(w + t) - f_{a,\varepsilon}(w)| \leq 1, \quad |f'_{a,\varepsilon}(w + t) - f'_{a,\varepsilon}(w)| \leq 1$$

and, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$(4.9) \quad |f'_{a,\varepsilon}(w + t) - f'_{a,\varepsilon}(w)| \leq (|t| \wedge 1) + \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{t \wedge 0}^{t \vee 0} \mathbb{I}[a - \varepsilon \leq w + u \leq a] du.$$

PROOF. Write  $\tilde{h}(w) = h(w) - \mathbb{E}h(Z)$ . Assume now that  $h$  is bounded. Then

$$|f(w)| \leq e^w \int_w^\infty |\tilde{h}(x)| e^{-x} dx \leq \|h\|.$$

Rearranging (4.2) we have  $f'(w) = f(w) + \tilde{h}(w)$ , hence

$$|f'(w)| \leq |f(w)| + |\tilde{h}(w)| \leq 2\|h\|.$$

This proves (4.4). Assume now that  $h$  is Lipschitz. We can further assume without loss of generality that  $h(0) = 0$  as  $f$  will not change under shift; hence we may assume that  $|h(x)| \leq x\|h'\|$ . Thus,

$$|f(w)| \leq e^w \int_w^\infty x\|h'\| e^{-x} dx = (1 + w)\|h'\|,$$

which is the first bound of (4.5). Now, differentiate both sides of (4.2) to obtain

$$(4.10) \quad f''(w) - f'(w) = h'(w),$$

hence, analogous to (4.3), we have

$$f'(w) = -e^w \int_w^\infty h'(x) e^{-x} dx.$$

The same arguments as before lead to the second and third bound of (4.5).

We now look at the properties of  $f_{a,\varepsilon}$ . It is easy to check that

$$(4.11) \quad f_{a,0}(x) = (e^{x-a} \wedge 1) - e^{-a}, \quad f'_{a,0}(x) = e^{x-a} \mathbb{I}[x \leq a]$$

is the explicit solution to (4.10) with respect to  $h_{a,0}$ . Now, it is not difficult to see that, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can write

$$f_{a,\varepsilon}(x) = \varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^\varepsilon f_{a,0}(x + s) ds$$



and this  $f_{a,\varepsilon}$  satisfies (4.2). These representations immediately lead to the bounds (4.7) and (4.8) for  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  from the explicit formulas (4.11). Now let  $\varepsilon > 0$ ; observe that, from (4.10),

$$f'(x+t) - f'(x) = (f(x+t) - f(x)) + (h(x+t) - h(x)).$$

Again from (4.11), we deduce that  $|f_{a,\varepsilon}(x+t) - f_{a,\varepsilon}(x)| \leq (|t| \wedge 1)$ , which yields the first part of the bound (4.9). For the second part, assume that  $t > 0$  and write

$$h_{a,\varepsilon}(x+t) - h_{a,\varepsilon}(x) = \int_0^t h'_{a,\varepsilon}(x+s) ds = -\varepsilon^{-1} \int_0^t \mathbb{I}[a - \varepsilon \leq x+u \leq a] du.$$

Taking the absolute value this gives the second part of the bound (4.9) for  $t > 0$ ; a similar argument yields the same bound for  $t < 0$ .  $\square$

The following lemmas are straightforward and hence given without proof.

LEMMA 4.2 (Smoothing lemma). *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \mathcal{L}(Z)) \leq \varepsilon + \sup_{a>0} |\mathbb{E}h_{a,\varepsilon}(W) - \mathbb{E}h_{a,\varepsilon}(Z)|,$$

where  $h_{a,\varepsilon}$  are defined as in Lemma 4.1.

LEMMA 4.3 (Concentration inequality). *For any random variable  $V$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}[a \leq V \leq b] \leq (b - a) + 2d_K(\mathcal{L}(V), \text{Exp}(1)).$$

For the rest of the article, write  $\kappa = d_K(\mathcal{L}(W), \text{Exp}(1))$ .

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1. Let  $\Delta := W - W^e$ . Define  $I_1 := \mathbb{I}[|\Delta| \leq \beta]$ ; note that  $W^e$  may not have finite first moment. With  $f$  as in (4.2) with respect to (4.6), the quantity  $\mathbb{E}f'(W^e)$  is well defined as  $\|f'\| < \infty$ , and we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\{f'(W) - f(W)\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{I_1(f'(W) - f'(W^e))\} + \mathbb{E}\{(1 - I_1)(f'(W) - f'(W^e))\} =: J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.7),  $|J_2| \leq \mathbb{P}[|\Delta| > \beta]$ . Now, using (4.10) and in the last step Lemma 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= \mathbb{E}\left\{I_1 \int_0^\Delta f''(W+t) dt\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\{I_1 \int_0^\Delta (f'(W+t) - \varepsilon^{-1}\mathbb{I}[a - \varepsilon \leq W+t \leq a]) dt\right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}|I_1\Delta| + \int_{-\beta}^0 \mathbb{P}[a - \varepsilon \leq W+t \leq a] dt \leq 2\beta + 2\beta\varepsilon^{-1}\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$J_1 \geq -\mathbb{E}|I_1 \Delta| - \int_0^\beta \mathbb{P}[a - \varepsilon \leq W + t \leq a] dt \geq -2\beta - 2\beta\varepsilon^{-1}\kappa,$$

hence  $|J_1| \leq 2\beta + 2\beta\varepsilon^{-1}\kappa$ . Using Lemma 4.2 and choosing  $\varepsilon = 4\beta$ ,

$$\kappa \leq \varepsilon + \mathbb{P}[|\Delta| > \beta] + 2\beta + 2\beta\varepsilon^{-1}\kappa \leq \mathbb{P}[|\Delta| > \beta] + 6\beta + 0.5\kappa.$$

Solving for  $\kappa$  proves (2.5).

To obtain (2.6), write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\{f'(W^e) - f(W^e)\} &= \mathbb{E}\{f(W) - f(W^e)\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\{I_1(f(W) - f(W^e))\} + \mathbb{E}\{(1 - I_1)(f(W) - f(W^e))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using Taylor's expansion along with the bounds (4.7) for  $\varepsilon = 0$ ,

$$|\mathbb{E}f'(W^e) - f(W^e)| \leq \|f'\| \mathbb{E}|I_1 \Delta| + \mathbb{P}[|\Delta| > \beta] \leq \beta + \mathbb{P}[|\Delta| > \beta],$$

which gives (2.6).

Assume now in addition that  $W$  has finite variance so that  $W^e$  has finite mean. Then

$$|\mathbb{E}\{f'(W) - f(W)\}| = |\mathbb{E}\{f'(W) - f'(W^e)\}| \leq \|f''\| \mathbb{E}|\Delta|.$$

From the bound (4.5), (2.7) follows. Also,

$$|\mathbb{E}\{f'(W^e) - f(W^e)\}| \leq \|f'\| \mathbb{E}|\Delta|$$

which yields (2.8) from (4.7) with  $\varepsilon = 0$ ; the remark after (2.8) follows from (4.5).  $\square$

**PROOF THEOREM 2.2.** Let  $f$  be the solution (4.2) to (4.3), hence  $f(0) = 0$ , and assume that  $f$  is Lipschitz. From the fundamental theorem of calculus, we have

$$f(W') - f(W) = \int_0^D f'(W + t) dt.$$

Multiplying both sides by  $G$  and comparing it with the left-hand side of (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f'(W) - f(W) &= Gf(W') - Gf(W) - f(W) \\ &\quad + (1 - GD)f'(W'') \\ &\quad + (1 - GD)(f'(W) - f'(W'')) \\ &\quad - G \int_0^D (f'(W + t) - f'(W)) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we can take expectation component-wise due to the moment assumptions. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}h(W) - \mathbb{E}h(Z) = R_1(f) + R_2(f) + R_3(f) - R_4(f),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(f) &= \mathbb{E}\{Gf(W') - Gf(W) - f(W)\}, \\ R_2(f) &= \mathbb{E}\{(1 - GD)f'(W'')\}, \\ R_3(f) &= \mathbb{E}\{(1 - GD)(f'(W) - f'(W''))\}, \\ R_4(f) &= \mathbb{E}\left\{G \int_0^D (f'(W + t) - f'(W)) dt\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that  $h \in \mathcal{F}_{BW}$  and  $f$  the solution to (4.2). Then from (4.4) and (4.5) we obtain  $\|f\| \leq 1$ ,  $\|f'\| \leq 1$  and  $\|f''\| \leq 2$ . Hence,  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{BW}$ ,  $|R_1(f)| \leq r_1(\mathcal{F}_{BW})$  and  $|R_2(f)| \leq r_2$ . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} |R_3(f)| &\leq \mathbb{E}|(1 - GD)(f'(W'') - f'(W))| \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\{|1 - GD|\mathbb{I}[|D'| > 1]\} + 2\mathbb{E}\{|1 - GD|(|D'| \wedge 1)\} \\ &= 2r'_3 + 2r'_4 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |R_4(f)| &\leq \mathbb{E}\left|G \int_0^D (f'(W + t) - f'(W)) dt\right| \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}|GD\mathbb{I}[|D| > 1]| + 2\mathbb{E}|G(D^2 \wedge 1)| \\ &= 2r_3 + 2r_4. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the  $d_{BW}$  results. Now let  $h \in \mathcal{F}_W$  and  $f$  the solution to (4.2). Then, from (4.4) and (4.5), we have  $|f(x)| \leq (1 + x)$ ,  $\|f'\| \leq 1$  and  $\|f''\| \leq 2$ , hence the bounds on  $R_2(f)$ ,  $R_3(f)$  and  $R_4(f)$  remain, whereas now  $f \in \mathcal{F}_W$  and, thus,  $|R_1(f)| \leq r_1(\mathcal{F}_W)$ . This proves the  $d_W$  estimate.

Now let  $f$  be the solution to (4.2) with respect to  $h_{a,\varepsilon}$  as in (4.6). Then, from (4.7), we have  $\|f\| \leq 1$  and  $\|f'\| \leq 1$ , hence  $f \in \mathcal{F}_{BW}$ ,  $|R_1(f)| \leq r_1(\mathcal{F}_{BW})$  and  $|R_2(f)| \leq r_2$ . Let  $I_1 = \mathbb{I}[|G| \leq \alpha, |D| \leq \beta', |D'| \leq \beta']$ . Write

$$\begin{aligned} R_3(f) &= \mathbb{E}\{(1 - I_1)(1 - GD)(f'(W'') - f'(W))\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\{I_1(1 - GD)(f'(W'') - f'(W))\} =: J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned}$$

Using (4.7),  $|J_1| \leq r'_5$  is immediate. Using (4.9) and Lemma 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} |J_2| &\leq \mathbb{E}|(GD - 1)I_1(f'(W'') - f'(W))| \\ &\leq (\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' + (\alpha\beta + 1)\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{-\beta'}^{\beta'} \mathbb{P}[a - \varepsilon \leq W + u \leq a] du \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq (\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' + (\alpha\beta + 1)\varepsilon^{-1} \int_{-\beta'}^{\beta'} (\varepsilon + 2\kappa) du \\ &= 3(\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' + 4(\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' \varepsilon^{-1}\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, let  $I_2 = \mathbb{I}[|G| \leq \alpha, |D| \leq \beta]$  and write

$$\begin{aligned} R_4(f) &= \mathbb{E} \left\{ G(1 - I_2) \int_0^D (f'(W + t) - f'(W)) dt \right\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left\{ GI_2 \int_0^D (f'(W + t) - f'(W)) dt \right\} =: J_3 + J_4. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.7),  $|J_3| \leq r_5$ . Using again (4.9) and Lemma 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} |J_4| &\leq \mathbb{E} \left\{ GI_2 \int_{D \wedge 0}^{D \vee 0} |f'(W + t) - f'(W)| dt \right\} \\ &\leq \alpha \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{-\beta}^{\beta} \left[ (|t| \wedge 1) + \varepsilon^{-1} \int_{t \wedge 0}^{t \vee 0} \mathbb{I}[a - \varepsilon \leq W + u \leq a] du \right] dt \right\} \\ &\leq \alpha\beta^2 + \alpha\varepsilon^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \int_{-\beta}^{\beta} \int_{t \wedge 0}^{t \vee 0} (\varepsilon + 2\kappa) du dt \right\} = 2\alpha\beta^2 + 2\alpha\beta^2\varepsilon^{-1}\kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 4.2 and collecting the bounds above, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa &\leq \varepsilon + r_1(\mathcal{F}_{\text{BW}}) + r_2 + |J_1| + |J_2| + |J_3| + |J_4| \\ &\leq \varepsilon + r_1(\mathcal{F}_{\text{BW}}) + r_2 + r_5 + r'_5 + 3(\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' + 2\alpha\beta^2 \\ &\quad + (4(\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' + 2\alpha\beta^2)\varepsilon^{-1}\kappa \end{aligned}$$

so that, setting  $\varepsilon = 8(\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' + 4\alpha\beta^2$ ,

$$\kappa \leq \varepsilon + r_1(\mathcal{F}_{\text{BW}}) + r_2 + r_5 + r'_5 + 11(\alpha\beta + 1)\beta' + 6\alpha\beta^2 + 0.5\kappa.$$

Solving for  $\kappa$  yields the final bound.  $\square$

**Acknowledgments.** The authors would like to express gratitude for the gracious hospitality of Louis Chen and Andrew Barbour during a visit to the National University of Singapore in January 2009, where a portion of this work was completed. We also thank the referees for their helpful comments. We are indebted to Nathan Ross for many valuable suggestions and for pointing out an error (and its elegant solution) in an early version of this paper. We also thank Mark Brown, Fraser Daly and Larry Goldstein for inspiring discussions.

### REFERENCES

ALDOUS, D. (1989). *Probability Approximations via the Poisson Clumping Heuristic*. Applied Mathematical Sciences 77. Springer, New York. MR969362

- ALDOUS, D. J. and BROWN, M. (1992). Inequalities for rare events in time-reversible Markov chains. I. In *Stochastic Inequalities* (Seattle, WA, 1991). *Institute of Mathematical Statistics Lecture Notes—Monograph Series* **22** 1–16. IMS, Hayward, CA. [MR1228050](#)
- ALDOUS, D. J. and BROWN, M. (1993). Inequalities for rare events in time-reversible Markov chains. II. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **44** 15–25. [MR1198660](#)
- ALDOUS, D. J. and FILL, J. A. (2010). *Reversible Markov Chains and Random Walks on Graphs*. Preprint. Available at [stat-www.berkeley.edu/users/aldous/RWG/book.html](http://stat-www.berkeley.edu/users/aldous/RWG/book.html).
- BARBOUR, A. D., HOLST, L. and JANSON, S. (1992). *Poisson Approximation*. *Oxford Studies in Probability* **2**. Oxford Univ. Press, New York. [MR1163825](#)
- BON, J. L. (2006). Error bounds for exponential approximation of large-system reliability. *J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.)* **138** 5366–5376. [MR2261586](#)
- BROWN, M. (1990). Error bounds for exponential approximations of geometric convolutions. *Ann. Probab.* **18** 1388–1402. [MR1062073](#)
- BROWN, M. and GE, G. P. (1984). Exponential approximations for two classes of aging distributions. *Ann. Probab.* **12** 869–875. [MR744241](#)
- CHATTERJEE, S. (2008). A new method of normal approximation. *Ann. Probab.* **36** 1584–1610. [MR2435859](#)
- CHATTERJEE, S., FULMAN, J. and RÖLLIN, A. (2006). Exponential approximation by exchangeable pairs and spectral graph theory. Preprint. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0605552>.
- CHEN, L. H. Y. and RÖLLIN, A. (2009). Stein couplings for normal approximation. Preprint. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1003.6039>.
- DALEY, D. J. (1988). Tight bounds on the exponential approximation of some aging distributions. *Ann. Probab.* **16** 414–423. [MR920282](#)
- DALY, F. (2008). Upper bounds for Stein-type operators. *Electron. J. Probab.* **13** 566–587. [MR2399291](#)
- GHOSH, S. (2009).  $L^p$  bounds for a combinatorial central limit theorem with involutions. Preprint.
- GIBBS, A. L. and SU, F. E. (2002). On choosing and bounding probability metrics. *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique* **70** 419–435.
- GOLDSTEIN, L. (2005). Berry-Esseen bounds for combinatorial central limit theorems and pattern occurrences, using zero and size biasing. *J. Appl. Probab.* **42** 661–683. [MR2157512](#)
- GOLDSTEIN, L. (2007).  $L^1$  bounds in normal approximation. *Ann. Probab.* **35** 1888–1930. [MR2349578](#)
- GOLDSTEIN, L. (2009). Personal communication and unpublished notes. Stein workshop, January 2009, Singapore.
- GOLDSTEIN, L. and REINERT, G. (1997). Stein’s method and the zero bias transformation with application to simple random sampling. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **7** 935–952. [MR1484792](#)
- GRIFFEATH, D. (1974/75). A maximal coupling for Markov chains. *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **31** 95–106. [MR0370771](#)
- KALASHNIKOV, V. (1997). *Geometric Sums: Bounds for Rare Events with Applications: Risk Analysis, Reliability, Queueing*. *Mathematics and Its Applications* **413**. Kluwer, Dordrecht. [MR1471479](#)
- KANTOROVIČ, L. V. and RUBINŠTEĪN, G. Š. (1958). On a space of completely additive functions. *Vestnik Leningrad. Univ.* **13** 52–59. [MR0102006](#)
- LALLEY, S. P. and ZHENG, X. (2011). Occupation statistics of critical branching random walks in two or higher dimensions. *Ann. Probab.* **39** 327–368.
- LYONS, R., PEMANTLE, R. and PERES, Y. (1995). Conceptual proofs of  $L \log L$  criteria for mean behavior of branching processes. *Ann. Probab.* **23** 1125–1138. [MR1349164](#)
- PAKES, A. G. and KHATTREE, R. (1992). Length-biasing, characterizations of laws and the moment problem. *Austral. J. Statist.* **34** 307–322. [MR1193781](#)
- PEKÓZ, E. A. (1996). Stein’s method for geometric approximation. *J. Appl. Probab.* **33** 707–713. [MR1401468](#)

- RÉNYI, A. (1957). A characterization of Poisson processes. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl.* **1** 519–527. [MR0094861](#)
- ROSS, S. and PEKÖZ, E. (2007). *A Second Course in Probability*. Available at [www.ProbabilityBookstore.com](http://www.ProbabilityBookstore.com).
- SENGUPTA, D., CHATTERJEE, A. and CHAKRABORTY, B. (1995). Reliability bounds and other inequalities for discrete life distributions. *Microelectronics and Reliability* **35** 1473–1478.
- SHAKED, M. and SHANTHIKUMAR, J. G. (2007). *Stochastic Orders. Springer Series in Statistics*. Springer, New York. [MR2265633](#)
- STEIN, C. (1972). A bound for the error in the normal approximation to the distribution of a sum of dependent random variables. In *Proc. Sixth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Probab. Vol. II: Probability Theory* 583–602. Univ. California Press, Berkeley, CA. [MR0402873](#)
- SUGAKOVA, E. V. (1995). Estimates in the Rényi theorem for differently distributed summands. *Ukrain. Mat. Zh.* **47** 984–989. [MR1367955](#)
- VALLANDER, S. (1973). Calculations of the Wasserstein distance between probability distributions on the line. *Teory Probab. Appl.* **18** 784–786. [MR0328982](#)
- WEINBERG, G. V. (2005). Stein’s method and its application in radar signal processing. DSTO Formal Reports (DSTO-TR-1735). Electronic Warfare & Radar Division, Dept. Defence (Australian Government). Available at [dspace.dsto.defence.gov.au/dspace/handle/1947/4064](http://dspace.dsto.defence.gov.au/dspace/handle/1947/4064).
- YAGLOM, A. M. (1947). Certain limit theorems of the theory of branching random processes. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)* **56** 795–798. [MR0022045](#)

SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT  
BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
595 COMMONWEALTH AVENUE  
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02215  
E-MAIL: [pekoz@bu.edu](mailto:pekoz@bu.edu)

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS  
AND APPLIED PROBABILITY  
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE  
6 SCIENCE DRIVE 2  
SINGAPORE 117546  
E-MAIL: [staar@nus.edu.sg](mailto:staar@nus.edu.sg)