



**HAL**  
open science

## Stable limit theorems on the Poisson space

Ronan Herry

► **To cite this version:**

| Ronan Herry. Stable limit theorems on the Poisson space. 2019. hal-02298552v1

**HAL Id: hal-02298552**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02298552v1>**

Preprint submitted on 26 Sep 2019 (v1), last revised 19 Nov 2020 (v3)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Public Domain

# Stable limit theorems on the Poisson space

Ronan Herry\*

Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Universität Bonn.

September 26, 2019

## Abstract

We prove limit theorems for functionals of a Poisson point process using the Malliavin calculus on the Poisson space. The target distribution is either a conditional Gaussian vector or a conditional Poisson random variable. The convergence is stable and our conditions are expressed in terms of the Malliavin operators. For conditionally Gaussian limits, we also obtain quantitative bounds, given for the Monge-Kantorovich transport distance in the univariate case; and for an other probabilistic variational distance in higher dimension. Our work generalizes several limit theorems on the Poisson space, including the seminal works by Peccati, Solé, Taqqu & Utzet [31] for Gaussian approximation; and by Peccati [32] for Poisson approximations, as well as the recently established fourth-moment theorems on the Poisson space of Döbler & Peccati [7]. Applications to stochastic processes are given.

**Keywords:** Limit theorems; Stable convergence; Malliavin-Stein; Poisson point process.

**MSC Classification:** 60F15; 60G55; 60H05; 60H07.

## Introduction

One of the celebrated contributions of Rényi [39, 40] is a refinement of the notion of convergence in law, commonly referred to as *stable convergence*. Stable convergence is tailored for studying conditional limits of sequences of random variables. Thus, stable limits are, typically, *mixtures*, that is, in our terminology: random variables whose law depends on a random parameter; for instance, centered Gaussian random variables with random variance or Poisson random variables with random mean. In the setting of semi-martingales, one book by Jacod & Shiryaev [14] summarized archetypal stable convergence results involving such mixtures. More recently, results by Nourdin & Nualart [24]; Harnett & Nualart [12]; and Nourdin, Nualart & Peccati [25] gave sufficient conditions and quantitative bounds for the stable convergence of functionals of an isonormal Gaussian process to a *Gaussian mixture*. The typical application of such results is the study of the limit of a sequence of quadratic functionals of a fractional Brownian motion. The three references [24, 12, 25] made a pervasive use of the Malliavin calculus to prove such limit theorems. This approach was initiated by Nualart & Ortiz-Latorre [28] and Nourdin & Peccati [27] in order to prove central limit theorems for iterated Itô integrals initially obtained by Nualart & Peccati [30] with different tools. These contributions form a milestone in the theory of limit theorems and have led to an independent field of research, known as the *Malliavin-Stein approach* (see the webpage of Nourdin [23] for a comprehensive list of contributions on the subject).

Following the trendsetting work of Peccati, Solé, Taqqu & Utzet [31], the Malliavin-Stein approach was extended, beyond the scope of Gaussian fields, to Poisson point processes. Despite being a very active field of research, the considered limit distributions were, most of the

---

\*Permanent contact: [ronan.herry@live.fr](mailto:ronan.herry@live.fr). ORCID: 0000-0001-6313-1372.

time, Gaussian [17, 16, 19, 38, 33, 36, 41, 7, 8, 5] or, sometimes, Poisson [32] or Gamma [34], and, to the best of our knowledge, mixtures, such as Gaussian mixtures, were never considered as limit distributions. The aim of this paper is to tackle this problem, by proving an array of new quantitative and stable limit theorems on the Poisson space, with a target distribution given either by a Gaussian mixture, that is the distribution of a centered Gaussian variable with random covariance; or a Poisson mixture, that is the distribution of a Poisson variable with random mean. We rely on two standard techniques to obtain our limit theorem: the *characteristic functional* method, to obtain qualitative results; and an interpolation approach, known as *smart path*, for the quantitative results. In the two cases, we build upon various tools from stochastic analysis for Poisson point processes, such as the Malliavin calculus for Poisson point processes, integration by parts for Poisson functionals, and a representation of the carré du champ on the Poisson space. Provided mild regularity assumptions on the functional under study, our approach allows us to deal, in [Theorems 3.1](#) and [3.5](#), with any target distribution of the form  $SN$ , where  $S$  is a matrix valued random variable (measurable with respect to the underlying Poisson point process) and  $N$  is a Gaussian vector independent of the underlying Poisson point process; as well as, in [Theorem 3.2](#), any target distribution of the form of a Poisson mixture, whose precise definition is given below.

Let us now give a more detailed sampler of the main results. Throughout the paper, we will be concerned with the asymptotic behaviour of a sequence  $\{F_n = f_n(\eta)\}$  of square-integrable functionals of a Poisson point process  $\eta$ . Here,  $\eta$  is a Poisson point process on an arbitrary  $\sigma$ -finite measured space  $(Z, \mathfrak{F}, \nu)$  (for the moment, we simply recall that  $\eta$  is a random integer-valued measure on  $Z$  satisfying some strong independence properties and such that  $\mathbb{E}\eta = \nu$ ). We will moreover assume that the  $F_n$ 's are of the form  $F_n = \delta u_n$ , where  $\delta$  is the Kabanov stochastic integral and  $u_n = \{u_n(z); z \in Z\}$  is a random function on  $Z$  (for the moment, one can think of the following slightly abusive definition of  $\delta$  as the following pathwise stochastic integral  $\delta u = \int u(z)(\eta - \nu)(dz)$ ). As we will see, assuming that  $F_n = \delta u_n$  is not restrictive, as, provided  $\mathbb{E}F_n = 0$ , this equation always admits infinitely many solutions. An important object in our study is the *Malliavin derivative* of  $F_n$  given by  $D_z F_n = f_n(\eta + \delta_z) - f_n(\eta)$ . The crucial tool to establish our results is a duality relation (also referred to as integration by parts) between the operators  $D$  and  $\delta$ :  $\mathbb{E}F\delta u = \mathbb{E}\nu(uDF)$ . This relation is at the heart of the Malliavin-Stein approach and can be used to obtain limit theorems both in a Gaussian [26, Chapter 5] and in a Poisson setting [31]. For instance, we have the following result in our Poisson setting.

**Theorem 0.1** ([31, Theorem 3.1]). *Let the previous notation prevails, and assume that:*

$$(0.1) \quad \nu(u_n F_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} \sigma^2,$$

and

$$(0.2) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |u_n(z)| |D_z^+ F_n|^2 \nu(dz) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Then<sup>1</sup>, we have that  $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{law} \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ .

By integration by parts, we see that  $\mathbb{E}\nu(u_n DF_n) = \mathbb{E}F_n^2$  and, at the heuristic level, the quantity  $\nu(u_n DF_n)$  controls the asymptotic variance of  $F_n$ . The condition (0.2) arises from the non-diffusive nature of the Poisson process. Following our heuristic, it is very natural to ask what happens to the conclusions of [Theorem 0.1](#) when  $\nu(u_n DF_n)$  converges to a non-negative random variable  $S^2$ . It will be the content of [Theorem 3.1](#) that in this case, provided (0.2) and some conditions of asymptotic independence hold,  $F_n$  converges stably to the Gaussian mixture  $\mathbf{N}(0, S^2)$ . In fact, in [Theorem 3.1](#), we are also able to deal with vector-valued random

<sup>1</sup>To be precise, the theorem of [31] chooses one particular solution of  $F_n = \delta u_n$  but we do not enter into too many technical details in this introduction.

variables. In the same fashion, [Theorem 3.2](#) gives sufficient conditions involving  $u_n$  and  $D_z F_n$  to ensure the convergence of  $(F_n)$  to a Poisson mixture (thus generalizing a result by Peccati [\[32\]](#) for convergence to Poisson random variables). When targeting Gaussian mixtures, we are also able to provide quantitative bounds in a variational distance between probability law ([Theorem 3.5](#) for the multivariate case, and [Theorem 3.8](#) for the univariate case).

Following the recent contribution by Döbler & Peccati [\[7\]](#), we are able to derive from our analysis a stable fourth moment theorem: a sequence of iterated Poisson integrals converges stably to a Gaussian (with deterministic variance) if and only if its second and fourth moment converge to those of Gaussian ([Proposition 4.1](#)). Regarding convergence of stochastic integrals to a mixture, we obtain sufficient conditions for the limit of a sequence of order 2 Poisson-Wiener stochastic integrals to be a Gaussian or Poisson mixture in terms of some analytical expression of the integrands ([Theorems 4.2](#) and [4.3](#)). We also apply our results to the study of the limit of a sequence of quadratic functionals of a rescaled Poisson process on the line ([Theorem 5.2](#)). Hence, adapting to the Poisson setting a theorem of Peccati & Yor [\[35\]](#) for a standard Brownian motion (generalized by [\[25\]](#) to the setting of a sufficiently regular fractional Brownian motion using Malliavin-Stein techniques; and generalized to any fractional Brownian motion by [\[37\]](#) using ad-hoc computations).

The paper is organized as follows. Each section starts with its own short introduction that presents its structure and that recalls, if necessary, the context and the definition of the main objects under study. [Section 1](#) fixes the notations for the rest of the paper; recalls the definitions of the probabilistic distance we will use and of the Poisson point process; and gives more informations on Gaussian and Poisson mixtures that will serve as target distributions in our limit theorems. Extended material about stochastic analysis for Poisson point processes with a focus on Poisson integrals, Malliavin operators, and Dirichlet forms is presented in [Section 2](#). Several intermediary results of independent interest regarding stochastic analysis for Poisson point processes are proved. In particular, [Proposition 2.2](#) establishes a complete representation of the carré du champ operator on the Poisson space (generalizing the one of [\[7\]](#)). We present in [Section 3](#), [Theorems 3.1](#), [3.2](#) and [3.5](#), that contain bounds and stable limit theorems for Poisson functionals and that are the main results of the paper. In [Section 3.2.2](#), we refine our results when  $(F_n)$  is univariate, and we establish in [Theorem 3.8](#) a bound in the Monge-Kantorovich transport distance. A detailed comparison of these results with the aforementioned works on the Gaussian space of [\[24, 12, 25\]](#), as well as with limit theorems on the Poisson space [\[17, 16, 31, 32\]](#) follows in [Section 3.3](#). A special attention to stochastic integrals is paid in [Section 4](#). From our main results, we deduce:

- [Proposition 4.1](#), that is a stable version of the recently proved fourth moment theorem on the Poisson space of [\[7, 8\]](#).
- [Theorems 4.2](#) and [4.3](#), those give analytical criterion for conditionally normal or Poisson limit for order 2 Itô-Wiener stochastic integrals.

[Section 5](#) contains the application to quadratic functionals of rescaled Poisson processes on the line.

## Acknowledgements

I am indebted to *Christian Döbler* and *Giovanni Peccati* for a careful reading of a preparatory version of this manuscript, and numerous helpful discussions and insightful comments during all the preparatory phase of this work. I am also thankful to *Matthias Reitzner* for an invitation to Osnabrück, and encouragements to study the case of a Poisson mixture. I gratefully acknowledge support by the European Union through the European Research Council Advanced Grant for *Karl-Theodor Sturm* “Metric measure spaces and Ricci curvature – analytic, geometric and probabilistic challenges”.

# Contents

<b>1 Preliminaries</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Notations . . . . .	4
1.2 Probabilistic approximations and limit theorems . . . . .	5
1.3 Definition of Poisson point processes . . . . .	6
1.4 Gaussian and Poisson mixtures . . . . .	7
<b>2 Further results on the Poisson space</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Stochastic analysis for Poisson point processes . . . . .	7
2.2 Chain rules and integration by parts formulae . . . . .	12
<b>3 Main abstract results</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 Main qualitative results . . . . .	16
3.1.1 Convergence to a Gaussian mixture . . . . .	16
3.1.2 Convergence to a Poisson mixture . . . . .	17
3.1.3 Proofs . . . . .	18
3.2 Main quantitative results for Gaussian mixtures . . . . .	20
3.2.1 General results in any dimension . . . . .	20
3.2.2 Bounds in the Monge-Kantorovich distance for the one-dimensional case	21
3.2.3 Proofs of the technical bounds . . . . .	23
3.3 Comparison with existing results . . . . .	25
<b>4 Convergence of stochastic integrals</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1 A stable fourth-moment theorem for normal approximation . . . . .	26
4.2 Convergence of order 2 Poisson-Wiener integrals to a mixture . . . . .	28
<b>5 Convergence of a quadratic functional of a Poisson process on the line</b>	<b>29</b>

## 1 Preliminaries

### 1.1 Notations

#### Sets

The symbols  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$ , and  $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$  will always designate the set of real numbers, of non-negative real numbers, of non-negative integers, of and positive integers respectively. For  $p$  and  $q \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$  with  $p \leq q$ , we write:  $[q] = \{1, \dots, q\}$ ,  $[p, q] = \{p, \dots, q\}$ , and  $[0] = \emptyset$ .

#### Norms

For  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we write  $\langle x, y \rangle_{\ell^2}$  for the standard scalar product of  $x$  and  $y$ , and  $|x|_{\ell^2}$  for the induced norm. We call  $p$ -tensor every  $p$ -linear form  $T: (\mathbb{R}^d)^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Recall that a tensor is canonically identified with an element of  $(\mathbb{R}^d)^p$  whose coordinate  $(i_1, \dots, i_p) \in [d]^p$  is given by  $T(e_{i_1}, \dots, e_{i_p})$ , where  $\{e_i; i \in [d]\}$  is the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . 1-tensors are vectors via the identification  $x \mapsto \langle x, \cdot \rangle_{\ell^2}$ ; 2-tensors are square matrices via the identification  $A \mapsto \langle \cdot, A \cdot \rangle_{\ell^2}$ . Consistently with the notation introduced before, we will use  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\ell^2}$  for tensors. In particular, given two matrices  $A$  and  $B$  of size  $d \times d$ , we write  $\langle A, B \rangle_{\ell^2}$  for  $\text{tr}(A^T B)$ , and  $|A|_{\ell^2}^2$  for  $\langle A, A \rangle_{\ell^2}$ .

## Derivatives

For  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ , the space of  $k$  times continuously differentiable functions from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . If, moreover, the derivatives up to  $k$  are bounded, we write  $\mathcal{C}_b^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . For  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we will write  $\nabla^k \phi$  for the  $k$ -th derivative that we identify with a  $k$ -form over  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . In particular, for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\nabla^k \phi(x)$  is a  $k$ -tensor whose coordinates (in the canonical basis) are written  $\{\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^k \phi(x), i_1, \dots, i_k \in [d]\}$ . We will write  $\nabla = \nabla^1$ . We let

$$(1.1) \quad |\nabla^k \phi|_{\ell^2, \infty} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla^k \phi(x)|_{\ell^2} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left( \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \leq d} |\partial_{i_1, \dots, i_k}^k \phi(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

## Lipschitz functions

We say that a function  $\phi: \mathbb{R}^{d_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  is *Lipschitz* if

$$(1.2) \quad Lip(\phi) := \sup_{x, y} \frac{|\phi(x) - \phi(y)|_{\ell^2}}{|x - y|_{\ell^2}} < \infty.$$

Recall that if  $\phi$  is differentiable,

$$(1.3) \quad Lip(\phi) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}} \frac{|\phi'(x)|_{\ell^2}}{\sqrt{d_1}}.$$

The space of Lipschitz functions from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  is denoted by  $Lip(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . The space of bounded Lipschitz functions from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{W}^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ; it is a Banach space for the norm

$$(1.4) \quad |\phi|_{\mathcal{W}^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = |\phi|_{\infty} + Lip(\phi),$$

where  $|\phi|_{\infty}$  is the supremum norm of  $\phi$ .

## Lebesgue spaces

Let  $Z$  be a measurable space with its  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{Z}$ . Given a measure  $\nu$  and a non-negative (or  $\nu$ -integrable) function  $f$ , we write  $\nu(f)$  or  $\int_Z f(x) \nu(dx)$  to designate the Lebesgue integral of  $f$  with respect to  $\nu$ . For  $p \in [1, \infty]$ , the space of (equivalence classes of  $\nu$ -almost everywhere equal) measurable functions  $f$  such that  $\nu(|f|^p) < \infty$  (or  $esssup(|f|) < \infty$ , when  $p = \infty$ ) is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}^p(Z, \mathfrak{Z}, \nu)$  and is equipped with its standard Banach structure. We will commonly abbreviate this notation to  $\mathcal{L}^p(Z)$  or  $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathfrak{Z})$  or  $\mathcal{L}^p(\nu)$ . Identities between elements of some  $\mathcal{L}^p(\nu)$  will always be understood in an  $\nu$ -almost everywhere sense. We will simply write  $\nu^q$  for the  $q$ -th tensor power of  $\nu$ .

## Symmetric functions

For  $f \in \mathcal{L}^p(\nu^q)$ , we denote by  $f_{\sigma}$  the symmetrization of  $f$ , that is:

$$(1.5) \quad f_{\sigma}(x_1, \dots, x_q) = q!^{-1} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_q} f(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(q)}),$$

where  $\Sigma_q$  is the group of permutations of  $[q]$ . We say that  $f \in \mathcal{L}_{\sigma}^p(\nu^q)$  if  $f \in \mathcal{L}^p(\nu^q)$  and  $f_{\sigma} = f$ .

## Probability space

Every random element is defined on a sufficiently big probability space  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{D}, \mathbb{P})$ . Unless otherwise specified, equality between random objects is always understood in an almost sure sense. By convention, we reserve the term *random variable* to designate a random object with value in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

## 1.2 Probabilistic approximations and limit theorems

### Stable convergence

(See [14, § VIII.5c].) Let  $\mathfrak{W}$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathfrak{D}$ . A sequence of  $\mathfrak{W}$ -random variables  $(F_n)$  is said to *converge stably* to a  $\mathfrak{D}$ -random variable  $F_\infty$  whenever, for all  $Z \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathfrak{W})$ :

$$(1.6) \quad (F_n, Z) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{law} (F_\infty, Z).$$

This convergence is denoted by

$$(1.7) \quad F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{stably} F_\infty.$$

Of course, stable convergence implies convergence in law but the reverse implication does not hold. In practice, we will use the following characterisation of stable convergence.

**Proposition 1.1.** *Let  $(F_n)$  be a sequence of  $\mathfrak{W}$ -measurable random variables, and  $F_\infty$  be  $\mathfrak{D}$ -measurable. Let  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{L}^1(\mathfrak{W})$  be a linear space, and  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathfrak{W})$ . Assume that  $\sigma(\mathcal{I}) = \sigma(\mathcal{G}) = \mathfrak{W}$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{stably} F_\infty$ ;
- (ii) for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ :  $\phi(F_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\sigma(\mathcal{L}^1(\mathfrak{W}); \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathfrak{W}))} \mathbb{E}[\phi(F_\infty) | \mathfrak{W}]$ ;
- (iii) for all  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  and for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ :  $\mathbb{E} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n \rangle_{\ell^2}} G \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbb{E} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_\infty \rangle_{\ell^2}} G$ ;
- (iv) for all  $I \in \mathcal{I}^d$  and for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ :  $\mathbb{E} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n + I \rangle_{\ell^2}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbb{E} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_\infty + I \rangle_{\ell^2}}$ .

*Proof.* That stable convergence is equivalent to (ii) is the content of [14, Proposition VIII.5.33.v]. We thus obtain equivalence with (iii) since  $\mathcal{G}$  generates  $\mathfrak{W}$ . By linearity of  $\mathcal{I}$ , (iv) implies that for all  $J \in \mathcal{I}$ , all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbb{E} e^{itJ} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n \rangle_{\ell^2}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbb{E} e^{itJ} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_\infty \rangle_{\ell^2}}$ . Since  $(1 - e^{itJ})t^{-1} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow 0]{} iJ$ , we thus have  $\mathbb{E} J e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n \rangle_{\ell^2}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbb{E} J e^{i\langle \lambda, F_\infty \rangle_{\ell^2}}$ . Since  $\mathcal{I}$  generates  $\mathfrak{W}$ , we conclude that (iv) implies stable convergence. The converse implication is immediate.  $\square$

### Probabilistic variational distances

The *Monge-Kantorovich distance* between two  $\mathbb{R}^d$  random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  is defined by

$$(1.8) \quad d_1(X, Y) = \inf \left\{ \mathbb{E} |\tilde{X} - \tilde{Y}|_{\ell^2}, \tilde{X} \sim X, \tilde{Y} \sim Y \right\}.$$

Due to the Kantorovich duality, the Monge-Kantorovich distance (see [11, Theorem 2.1]) between the laws of two integrable  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  can be rewritten:

$$(1.9) \quad d_1(X, Y) = \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E} \phi(X) - \mathbb{E} \phi(Y), \phi \in Lip(\mathbb{R}^d), Lip(\phi) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

In the same spirit, the *Fortet-Mourier distance* between the laws of two  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  is

$$(1.10) \quad d_0(X, Y) = \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E} \phi(X) - \mathbb{E} \phi(Y), \phi \in \mathcal{W}^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d), |\phi|_{\mathcal{W}^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq 1 \right\}.$$

For Poisson functionals, the Malliavin-Stein methods typically yield bounds in a distance weaker than the Monge-Kantorovich or the Fortet-Mourier distance. In this paper, we will



consider the distance first considered by Peccati & Zheng [36], whose variational formulation for two integrable  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued random variables  $X$  and  $Y$  is given by

$$(1.11) \quad d_3(X, Y) = \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E}\phi(X) - \mathbb{E}\phi(Y), \phi \in \mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{R}^d), \phi \in \mathcal{F}_3 \right\},$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_3$  is the space of functions  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with the second and third derivatives bounded by 1.

### Link with the convergence in law

Observe that these three distances depend on  $X$  and  $Y$  only through their laws. If  $Y \sim \nu$ , we will sometimes write  $d_i(X, \nu)$  for  $d_i(X, Y)$  ( $i \in \{0, 1, 3\}$ ). The Monge-Kantorovich distance induces a topology on the space of probability measures that corresponds to the convergence in law together with the convergence of the first moment [43, Theorem 6.9]. The Peccati-Zheng distance induces a topology on the space of probability measures which is strictly stronger than the topology of the convergence in law. The Fortet-Mourier distance induces, on the space of probability measures, the topology of the convergence in law [9, Theorem 11.3.3].

### 1.3 Definition of Poisson point processes

Given some measurable space  $(Z, \mathfrak{Z})$ , we define  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z)$  to be the space of all countable sums of  $\mathbb{N}$ -valued measures on  $(Z, \mathfrak{Z})$ . The space  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z)$  is endowed with the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z)$ , generated by the *cylindrical mappings*

$$(1.12) \quad \xi \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z) \mapsto \xi(B) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}, \quad B \in \mathfrak{Z}.$$

Let  $\nu$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure on  $(Z, \mathfrak{Z})$ . A random variable  $\eta = \eta_\nu$  with values in  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z)$  is a *Poisson point process* (or *Poisson random measure*) with intensity  $\nu$  if the following two properties are satisfied:

1. for all  $B_1, \dots, B_n \in \mathfrak{Z}$  pairwise disjoint,  $\eta(B_1), \dots, \eta(B_n)$  are independent;
2. for  $B \in \mathfrak{Z}$  with  $\nu(B) < \infty$ ,  $\eta(B)$  is a Poisson random variable with mean  $\nu(B)$ .

Poisson processes with  $\sigma$ -finite intensity exist [20, Theorem 3.6]. We let  $\mathfrak{W}$  be the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\eta$ . Our definition of  $\eta$  implies that  $\mathfrak{W} \subset \mathfrak{D}$ , and we will often tacitly assume that  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{D}, \mathbb{P})$  also supports random objects (such as a Brownian motion) independent of  $\eta$ . The stable convergence introduced above will always be understood with respect to  $\mathfrak{W}$ . However, for simplicity, unless otherwise specified, we will assume that random variables are  $\mathfrak{W}$ -measurable. In particular, we write  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$  for  $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega, \mathfrak{W}, \mathbb{P})$ . The *compensated Poisson measure* is defined as the mapping

$$(1.13) \quad A \mapsto \hat{\eta}(A) = \eta(A) - \nu(A), \quad \forall A \in \mathfrak{Z}, \text{ such that } \nu(A) < \infty.$$

### 1.4 Gaussian and Poisson mixtures

As anticipated, we shall be interested in the stable convergence (with respect to  $\mathfrak{W}$ ) of a sequence of Poisson functionals  $(F_n)$  to conditionally Gaussian and Poisson random variables. Informally, we will refer to such objects as *Gaussian mixture* and *Poisson mixture*. Let  $N$  be standard Gaussian vector independent of  $\eta$  and  $S \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathfrak{W})$ . The law of the Gaussian mixture  $SN$  will be denoted  $\mathbf{N}(0, S^2)$ . Similarly, let  $N$  be a Poisson process on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  (with intensity the Lebesgue



measure) independent of  $\eta$  and  $M \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathfrak{W})$  non-negative, the law of the (compensated) Poisson mixture  $N(1_{[0,M]}) - M$  will be denoted  $\mathbf{Po}(M)$ . We have a characterisation of these two laws in term of their conditional Fourier transforms:  $F \sim \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)$  if and only if

$$(1.14) \quad \mathbb{E}[e^{i\lambda F} | \eta] = \exp\left(-S^2 \frac{\lambda^2}{2}\right);$$

while  $F \sim \mathbf{Po}(M)$  if and only if

$$(1.15) \quad \mathbb{E}[e^{i\lambda F} | \eta] = \exp\left(M(e^{i\lambda} - i\lambda - 1)\right).$$

## 2 Further results on the Poisson space

### Outline

In this section, we recall basic definitions regarding Poisson point process on an arbitrary measured space. We then carry out an extensive review of different tools about stochastic analysis on the Poisson space: the Itô-Poisson stochastic integrals; the Malliavin derivative; the Skorokhod-Kabanov divergence; the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck generator; the Dirichlet form on the Poisson space; and the energy bracket, a object that we invented. Several lemmas are established in the process. We end the section by deriving some rules of calculus for the Malliavin derivative and Kabanov-Skorokhod divergence. Using the formalism of the Dirichlet form and the energy bracket, we can derive some integration by parts formula on the Poisson space that we will use in [Section 3](#). In particular, a complete description of the carré du champ on the Poisson space is given in [Proposition 2.2](#). The reader can refer to the three monographs by Kingman [[15](#)]; Peccati & Reitzner [[33](#)]; and Last & Penrose [[20](#)] for more informations about Poisson point processes.

### 2.1 Stochastic analysis for Poisson point processes

#### The Mecke formula

According to [[20](#), Theorem 4.1], we have for all measurable  $f: \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z) \times Z \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ :

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbb{E} \int f(\eta, z) \eta(dz) = \int \mathbb{E} f(\eta + \delta_z, z) \nu(dz).$$

If  $f$  is replaced by a measurable function with value in  $\mathbb{R}$  the previous formula still holds provided both sides of the identity are finite when we replace  $f$  by  $|f|$ .

#### Proper measures and their factorial power

A measure  $m \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z)$  is *proper* whenever there exists  $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  and  $z_i \in Z$  ( $i \in I$ ) such that  $m = \sum_{i \in I} \delta_{z_i}$ . As we will only be concerned with properties in law of  $\eta$ , according to [[20](#), Corollary 3.7], without loss of generality, we assume that our Poisson point process  $\eta$  is almost surely proper. Given  $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , we define its *factorial power* of order  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ , noted  $I^{(q)}$ , by

$$(2.2) \quad I^{(q)} = \{(i_1, \dots, i_q) \in I^q, \text{ such that } i_l \neq i_{l'}, \forall l \neq l' \in [q]\}.$$

Note that  $I^{(q)} = \emptyset$ , for all  $q > |I|$ . Given  $m = \sum_{i \in I} \delta_{x_i}$  a proper element of  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z)$ , we define the  $q$ -th factorial power of  $m$ , noted  $m^{(q)}$ , as

$$(2.3) \quad m^{(q)} = \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_q) \in I^{(q)}} \delta_{(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_q})}.$$

In the previous formula and in the rest of this article, summation over the empty set is understood as the zero measure. According to [[20](#), Proposition 4.3],  $\eta^{(q)}$  is also a random variable (with respect to  $\mathfrak{W}$ ).

## Stochastic integrals

The stochastic integrals with respect to a Poisson measure were introduced by Itô [13] (see also [42]). We follow here the presentation of [20, Chapter 12]. For  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  and a function  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(\nu^q)$ , the *multiple Wiener-Itô Poisson stochastic integral* of order  $q$ , or, for short, *Poisson integral* of order  $q$ , noted  $I_q(f)$ , is defined pointwise as

$$(2.4) \quad I_q(f) = \sum_{J \subset [q]} (-1)^{q-|J|} \int f(x) \eta^{(|J|)}(dx_J) \nu^{q-|J|}(dx_{[q] \setminus J}).$$

Here,  $x_J$  is the ordered vector of  $\mathbb{R}^{|J|} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  given by  $(x_j)_{j \in J}$ , where the order is inherited from  $[q]$ . The mapping  $I_q$  (restricted to  $\mathcal{L}^2(\nu^q) \cap \mathcal{L}^1(\nu^q)$ ) can be extended to  $\mathcal{L}^2(\nu^q)$  and (2.4) holds on a dense subset of  $\mathcal{L}^2(\nu^q)$ . Whenever  $f \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu^q)$  and  $g \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu^{q'})$ , we have the following isometry property

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbb{E} I_q(f) I_{q'}(g) = q! \langle f_\sigma, g_\sigma \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2(\nu^q)} \mathbf{1}_{q=q'},$$

where  $f_\sigma$  is the symmetrized version of  $f$ .

## The representative of a functional

Every random variable  $F$  measurable with respect to  $\eta$  can be written as  $F = f(\eta)$ , for a measurable  $f: \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  uniquely defined  $\mathbb{P} \circ \eta^{-1}$ -almost surely on  $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z), \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z))$ . Such  $f$  is called a *representative* of  $F$ . In this section,  $F$  denotes a random variable, measurable with respect to  $\sigma(\eta)$ , and  $f$  denotes one of its representatives.

## The add and drop operators

Given  $z \in Z$ , we let

$$(2.6) \quad D_z^+ F = f(\eta + \delta_z) - f(\eta);$$

$$(2.7) \quad D_z^- F = (f(\eta) - f(\eta - \delta_z)) \mathbf{1}_{z \in \eta}.$$

The operator  $D^+$  (resp.  $D^-$ ) is called the *add operator* (resp. *drop operator*). Due to the Mecke formula (2.1), these operations are well-defined on every random variable (that is,  $D^+$  and  $D^-$  do not depend on the choice of the representative of  $F$ ).

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $F \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ , then  $D^+ F \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$ .*

*Proof.* First of all, observe that  $\delta: Z \ni z \mapsto \delta_z \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{N}}(Z)$  is measurable (if  $A$  is of the form  $\{\eta(B) = k\}$  for some  $B \in \mathfrak{Z}$ , then the pre-image by  $\delta$  of  $A$  is  $B$ , if  $k = 1$ ; and the pre-image is empty, if  $k > 1$ ). Hence,  $D^+ F$  is bi-measurable. Now let

$$(2.8) \quad U = \{t \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ such that } \mathbb{P}(F \geq t) = 0\};$$

$$(2.9) \quad V = \{t \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ such that } (\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)(F + D_z^+ F \geq t) = 0\}.$$

By assumption  $U \neq \emptyset$ , and we want to show that  $V \neq \emptyset$ . Take  $t \in U$ , by the Mecke formula (2.1), we have that

$$(2.10) \quad \mathbb{E} \int \mathbf{1}_{\{F + D_z^+ F \geq t\}} \nu(dz) = \mathbb{E} \int \mathbf{1}_{\{F \geq t\}} \eta(dz) = 0.$$

Hence  $t \in V$ , this concludes the proof.  $\square$

Based on (2.4), it is easy to check (see also [18, Theorem 3]) that, for all  $h \in \mathcal{L}_\sigma^2(\nu^q)$  and  $z \in Z$ :  $D_z^+ I_q(h) = q I_{q-1}(h(z, \cdot))$ .

## The Itô-Poisson isometry

In [21, Theorem 1.3], it is proved that, for  $F \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ , the mapping  $T_q F: Z^q \ni (z_1, \dots, z_q) \mapsto \mathbb{E} D_{z_1}^+ \dots D_{z_q}^+ F$  belongs to  $\mathcal{L}^2(\nu^q)$ , and that

$$(2.11) \quad F = \sum_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{q!} I_q(T_q F).$$

Together with Itô's isometry (2.5), this implies the isometric orthogonal decomposition

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \simeq \bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{L}_\sigma^2(\nu^q).$$

## Malliavin derivative

For a random variable  $F$ , we write  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D^q$  whenever:  $F \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$  and

$$(2.13) \quad |F|_p := \int_{Z^p} \mathbb{E}(D_{z_1 \dots z_p}^+ F)^2 \nu^p(dz) < \infty, \quad \forall p \in [q].$$

In view of what precedes, we have that  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$  if and only if  $\sum_{q \in \mathbb{N}} q I_{q-1}(T_q F) \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$ . The space  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } D^q$  is Hilbert when endowed with the norm

$$(2.14) \quad |\cdot|_{\mathcal{D}\text{om } D^q} = |\cdot|_{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} + \sum_{i=1}^p |\cdot|_p.$$

Given  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D^q$ , we write  $D^q F$  to denote the random mapping  $D^q F: Z^q \ni (z_1, \dots, z_q) \mapsto D_{z_1}^+ \dots D_{z_q}^+ F$ . We set  $D = D^1$  for simplicity. We regard  $D^q$  as an unbounded operator  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu^q)$  with domain  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } D^q$ .

## The divergence operator

We consider the *divergence operator*  $\delta = D^*: \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^2(\nu)$ , that is the unbounded adjoint of  $D$ . Its domain  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$  is composed of random functions  $u \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$  such that there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that

$$(2.15) \quad \left| \mathbb{E} \int D_z^+ F u(z) \nu(dz) \right| \leq c \sqrt{\mathbb{E} F^2}, \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D.$$

For  $u \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$ , the quantity  $\delta u \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu)$  is completely characterised by the duality relation

$$(2.16) \quad \mathbb{E} G \delta u = \mathbb{E} \int u(z) D_z F \nu(dz), \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D.$$

If  $h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu)$ , then  $h \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$  and  $\delta h = I_1(h)$ . From [18, Theorem 5], we have following Skorokhod isometry. For  $u \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$ ,  $u \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$  if and only if  $\mathbb{E} \int (D_z^+ u(z'))^2 \nu(dz) \nu(dz') < \infty$  and, in that case:

$$(2.17) \quad \mathbb{E}(\delta u)^2 = \mathbb{E} \int u(z)^2 \nu(dz) + \mathbb{E} \int D_z^+ u(z') D_z^+ u(z) \nu(dz) \nu(dz').$$

The Skorokhod isometry implies the following Heisenberg commutation relation. For all  $u \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$ , and all  $z \in Z$  such that  $z' \mapsto D_z^+ u(z') \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$ :

$$(2.18) \quad D_z \delta u = u(z) + \delta D_z^+ u.$$

From [18, Theorem 6], we have the following pathwise representation of the divergence: if  $u \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta \cap \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$ , then

$$(2.19) \quad \delta u = \int (1 - D_z^-) u(z) \eta(dz) - \int u(z) \nu(dz).$$

Note that  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta \cap \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$  is dense in  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$ .

## The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck generator

The Ornstein-Uhlenbeck generator  $L$  is the unbounded self-adjoint operator on  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$  verifying

$$(2.20) \quad \mathcal{D}\text{om } L = \{F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D, \text{ such that } DF \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta\} \quad \text{and} \quad L = -\delta D.$$

Classically,  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } L$  is endowed with the Hilbert norm  $\mathbb{E}F^2 + \mathbb{E}(LF)^2$ . The eigenvalues of  $L$  are the non-positive integers and for  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  the eigenvectors associated to  $-q$  are exactly the random variables of the form  $I_q(h)$  for some  $h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu^q)$ . This yields for  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } L$ :

$$(2.21) \quad LF = - \sum_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{q}{q!} I_q(\mathbb{E}D^q F) = - \sum_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{(q-1)!} I_q(\mathbb{E}D^q F).$$

The kernel of  $L$  coincides with the set of constants and the *pseudo-inverse* of  $L$  is defined on the quotient  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P}) \setminus \ker L$ , that is the space of centered square integrable random variables. For such  $F$ , we have that

$$(2.22) \quad L^{-1}F = - \sum_{q \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}} \frac{1}{q!q} I_q(\mathbb{E}D^q F).$$

For  $F \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$  with  $\mathbb{E}F = 0$ , we have  $LL^{-1}F = F$ . Moreover, if  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } L$ , we have  $L^{-1}LF = F$ . As a consequence of (2.17),  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } D^2 = \mathcal{D}\text{om } L$ . In particular, if  $F$  has a vanishing expectation, then  $L^{-1}F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D^2$ .

## The Dirichlet form

We refer to [3, Chapter 1] for more details about the formalism of Dirichlet forms. The introduction of [1] also provides an overview of the subject. For every  $F, G \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ , we let  $\mathcal{E}(F, G) = \mathbb{E} \int D_z^+ F D_z^+ G \nu(dz)$ . Since by [18, Lemma 3], the operator  $D$  is closed,  $\mathcal{E}$  is a Dirichlet form with domain  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ . Moreover in view of the integration by parts (2.16), the generator of  $\mathcal{E}$  is given by  $L$ . By [3, Chapter I Section 3],  $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{D}\text{om } D \cap \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$  is an algebra with respect to the pointwise multiplication;  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } D$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  are stable by composition with Lipschitz functions;  $\mathcal{A}$  is stable by composition with  $\mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$  functions ( $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ).

## The carré du champ operator

For every  $F \in \mathcal{A}$ , we define the *functional carré du champ* of  $F$  as the linear form  $\Gamma(F)$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ , defined by

$$(2.23) \quad \Gamma(F)[\Phi] = \mathcal{E}(F, F\Phi) - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}(F^2, \Phi), \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in \mathcal{A}.$$

From [3, Proposition I.4.1.1],

$$(2.24) \quad 0 \leq \Gamma(F)[\Phi] \leq |\Phi|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})} \mathcal{E}(F), \quad \text{for all } F, \Phi \in \mathcal{A}.$$

This allows us to extend the definition of the linear form  $\Gamma(F)$  to all  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \mathcal{E}$ . For  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \mathcal{E}$ , we write that  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \Gamma$  if the linear form  $\Gamma(F)$  can be represented by a measure absolutely continuous with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$  whose density is denoted by  $\Gamma(F)$ . In other words,  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \Gamma$  if and only if there exists a non-negative  $\Gamma(F) \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$  such that

$$(2.25) \quad \Gamma(F)[\Phi] = \mathbb{E}\Gamma(F)\Phi, \quad \text{for all } \Phi \in \mathcal{A}.$$

From the general theory, we know that  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \Gamma$  is a closed sub-linear space of  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \mathcal{E}$ . In the Poisson case, the following representation of the carré du champ will be a consequence of Lemma 2.7.

**Proposition 2.2.** *We have that  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \Gamma = \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$  and, for all,  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ :*

$$(2.26) \quad \Gamma(F) = \frac{1}{2} \int (D_z^+ F)^2 \nu(dz) + \frac{1}{2} \int (D_z^- F)^2 \eta(dz).$$

*Remark 1.* This representation of  $\Gamma$  in terms of the add-one and drop-one operators is, at the formal level, well-known in the literature: it appears without a proof in the seminal paper [2, p. 191]. One of the main assumption of [2] is the existence of an algebra of functions contained in  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } L$ , the so called *standard algebra*. In the case of a Poisson point process, it is not clear what to choose for the standard algebra (note that  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{D}\text{om } \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$  is *not* included in  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } L$ ). [7] derived the formula without relying on the notion of standard algebra. However, since they follow the strategy of [2] they have to assume a restrictive assumptions on  $F$ :  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } L$  and  $F^2 \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } L$ . In particular, the authors of [7] did not obtain that  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \Gamma = \mathcal{D}\text{om } \mathcal{E}$ . This is why we follow the formalism of Dirichlet forms to compute the carré du champ as introduced by [3] and obtain a representation for the carré du champ under minimal assumptions.

We extend  $\Gamma$  to a bilinear map

$$(2.27) \quad \Gamma(F, G) = \frac{1}{2} \int D_z^+ F D_z^+ G \nu(dz) + \frac{1}{2} \int D_z^+ F D_z^+ G \eta(dz), \quad \forall F, G \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D.$$

### The energy bracket

Given two elements  $u \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu \otimes \mathbb{P})$  and  $v \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu \otimes \mathbb{P})$  (possibly vector valued), the *energy bracket* of  $u$  and  $v$  is the random matrix defined by

$$(2.28) \quad [u, v]_\Gamma = \frac{1}{2} \int u(z) \otimes v(z) \nu(dz) + \frac{1}{2} \int (1 - D_z^-) u(z) \otimes (1 - D_z^-) v(z) \eta(dz).$$

In the paper, we will also consider the two other related objects:

$$(2.29) \quad [u, v]_\nu = \int u(z) \otimes v(z) \nu(dz);$$

$$(2.30) \quad [u, v]_\eta = \int (1 - D_z^-) u(z) \otimes (1 - D_z^-) v(z) \eta(dz).$$

If  $u$  and  $v$  are real-valued then  $[u, v]_\nu$  is simply the scalar product of  $u$  and  $v$  in  $\mathcal{L}^2(\nu)$ . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality  $[u, v]_\nu \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$ , and by the Mecke formula:

$$(2.31) \quad \mathbb{E}[u, v]_\Gamma = \mathbb{E}[u, v]_\nu = \mathbb{E}[u, v]_\eta.$$

Moreover, if  $F$  and  $G \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ , we have that

$$(2.32) \quad \Gamma(F, G) = [DF, DG]_\Gamma.$$

This identity is our main motivation for introducing the energy bracket. We will denote by  $\widetilde{[u, v]}_\beta$  the symmetrization of the matrix  $[u, v]_\beta$  ( $\beta \in \{\Gamma, \nu, \eta\}$ ).

### Test functions

We say that a measurable function  $\psi: Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $\nu(\psi > 0) < \infty$  is a *test function*. We let  $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$  be the linear span of the random variables of the form  $e^{-\eta(\psi)}$ , where  $\psi$  is a test function. Observe that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a sub-algebra of  $\mathcal{A}$  and that  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } D$  is stable by multiplication by elements of  $\mathcal{G}$ . In view of [21, Lemma 2.2] and its proof, we have that

**Proposition 2.3.** *The set  $\mathcal{G}$  is dense in every  $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathbb{P})$ , for  $1 \leq p < \infty$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , moreover the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{G}$  coincides with  $\mathfrak{M}$ .*

## Extended Malliavin operators

As mentioned above, we will assume that  $\mathfrak{D}$  is bigger than  $\mathfrak{W}$ . However, every  $\mathfrak{D}$ -random variable  $F$  can be written  $F = f(\eta, \Xi)$ , where  $\Xi$  is an additional randomness independent of  $\eta$ . We define for every such  $F$  the quantity  $D_z^+ F = f(\eta + \delta_z, \Xi) - f(\eta, \Xi)$ . It is an (easy) exercise to check that we can modify all the operators and functional spaces we defined above accordingly and that their properties are left unchanged. Remark that our definition implies that, if  $F$  is independent of  $\eta$ , then  $D^+ F = 0$ , and that, if  $F = ab$  with  $a$  independent of  $\mathfrak{W}$  and  $b$  measurable with respect to  $\mathfrak{W}$ ,  $D^+ F = aD^+ b$ .

## 2.2 Chain rules and integration by parts formulae

### Substitute for the chain rule

The Markov generator  $L$  is not a diffusion (see [22, Equation 1.3]). Likewise, the add operator  $D^+$  and drop operator  $D^-$  are not derivation (see [4, Chapter III Section 10] for details on derivations). In particular, the classical chain rule does not apply. However, writing  $D_z^+ \phi(F) = \phi(F + D_z^+ F) - \phi(F)$  and applying the fundamental theorem of calculus we obtain the following substitute for the chain rule.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . For  $F \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$  and  $z \in Z$ , we define for all  $i$  and  $j \in [d]$ :*

$$(2.33) \quad \hat{R}_{i,j}(F, z, \phi) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \alpha \partial_{ij} \phi(F + \alpha\beta D_z^+ F) d\alpha d\beta;$$

$$(2.34) \quad \check{R}_{i,j}(F, z, \phi) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \alpha \partial_{ij} \phi(F - \alpha\beta D_z^- F) d\alpha d\beta.$$

We have that

$$(2.35) \quad D_z^+ \phi(F) = \langle \nabla \phi(F), D_z^+ F \rangle_{\ell^2} + \left\langle \hat{R}(F, z, \phi), (D_z^+ F)^{\otimes 2} \right\rangle_{\ell^2};$$

$$(2.36) \quad D_z^- \phi(F) = \langle \nabla \phi(F), D_z^- F \rangle_{\ell^2} - \left\langle \check{R}(F, z, \phi), (D_z^- F)^{\otimes 2} \right\rangle_{\ell^2}.$$

In particular (taking  $\phi: \mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto x^2 \in \mathbb{R}$ ), we have that

$$(2.37) \quad D_z^+ F^2 = 2FD_z^+ F + (D_z^+ F)^2;$$

$$(2.38) \quad D_z^- F^2 = 2FD_z^- F - (D_z^- F)^2.$$

*Proof.* Simply write the Taylor expansion up to order 2 of  $D_z^+ \phi(F) = \phi(F + D_z^+ F) - \phi(F)$  and similarly for  $D_z^- \phi(F)$ . Details are left to the reader.  $\square$

### Taylor formula for difference operators

An other application of Taylor's formula gives us the following discrete counterpart of the chain rule.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R})$ . For  $F \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ , we have that*

$$(2.39) \quad D^+ \phi(F) = D^+ F(\phi(F+1) - \phi(F)) + D^+ F(D^+ F - 1) \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \alpha \phi''(F + \alpha\beta(D^+ F - 1)) d\alpha d\beta.$$

*Remark 2.* It is also possible to obtain a similar formula for  $D^-$  or on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  but we will not use it.

*Proof.* Apply the fundamental theorem of calculus on  $\phi(x+h) - \phi(x) - h(\phi(x+1) - \phi(x))$  and take  $x = F$  and  $h = D^+ F$ .  $\square$

### A formula for the divergence

Since the operator  $D$  is not a derivation, [29, Proposition 1.3.3] (obtained in the setting of Malliavin calculus for Gaussian processes) does not hold. We however have the following Poisson counterpart.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$  and  $u \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$  such that  $Fu \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$ . Then,*

$$(2.40) \quad \delta(Fu) = F\delta u - [DF, u]_\eta.$$

*Proof.* Let  $G \in \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{D}\text{om } D \cap \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ , and assume moreover that  $u \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$ . By integration by parts and the Mecke formula, we find that

$$(2.41) \quad \mathbb{E}G\delta(Fu) = \mathbb{E} \int Fu_z D_z G \nu(dz) = \mathbb{E}G \int (1 - D_z^-)(Fu_z) \eta(dz) - \mathbb{E}G \int Fu_z \nu(dz).$$

Using that  $(1 - D_z^-)(Fu_z) = F(1 - D_z^-)u_z - D_z^- F(1 - D_z^-)u_z$ , we conclude by (2.19) that

$$(2.42) \quad \mathbb{E}G\delta(Fu) = \mathbb{E}GF\delta u - \mathbb{E}G[DF, u]_\eta.$$

We conclude by density. □

### An integrated chain rule for the energy

Recall that we write  $\mathcal{A}$  for the algebra  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ . We now remark that even if  $D$  is not a derivation, the Dirichlet energy  $\mathcal{E}$  acts as a derivation.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $F$  and  $G \in \mathcal{A}$ , and  $u \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$ . Then,*

$$(2.43) \quad \mathbb{E}[D(FG), u]_\Gamma = \mathbb{E}F[DG, u]_\Gamma + \mathbb{E}G[DF, u]_\Gamma.$$

*In particular, with  $H \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ :*

$$(2.44) \quad \mathcal{E}(FG, H) = \mathbb{E}F[DG, DH]_\Gamma + \mathbb{E}G[DF, DH]_\Gamma.$$

*This establishes Proposition 2.2.*

*Remark 3.* The formula (2.44) for  $\mathcal{E}$  cannot be iterated. In particular, consistently with the fact that  $L$  is not a diffusion, (2.44) does not imply  $\mathcal{E}(\phi(F), G) = \mathbb{E}\phi'(F)[DF, DG]_\Gamma$ .

*Proof.* Since  $F \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})$ , by Lemma 2.1, we have that  $DF \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$ ; and by assumption,  $DF \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$ . A similar result holds for  $G$ , and we find that  $DF \otimes DG$  is square integrable. By the Mecke formula, and (2.37) and (2.38), we can write:

$$(2.45) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[D(FG), u]_\Gamma &= \mathbb{E}F[DG, u]_\Gamma + \mathbb{E}G[DF, u]_\Gamma \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int D_z^+ F \otimes DG \otimes u(z) \nu(dz) \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int (1 - D_z^-) F (1 - D_z^-) G (1 - D_z^-) u(z) \eta(dz). \end{aligned}$$

By the Mecke formula, the two terms on the two last lines cancel out. This proves the first part of the claim. To establish Proposition 2.2, we simply write, for  $F$  and  $\Phi \in \mathcal{A}$ :

$$(2.46) \quad \mathcal{E}(F, F\Phi) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{E}(F^2, \Phi) = \mathbb{E}F[DF, D\Phi]_\Gamma + \mathbb{E}\Phi[DF, DF]_\Gamma - \mathbb{E}F[DF, D\Phi]_\Gamma.$$

This shows that  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \Gamma \supset \mathcal{A}$  and that

$$(2.47) \quad \mathbf{\Gamma}(F)[\Phi] = \mathbb{E}[DF, DF]_\Gamma \Phi.$$

This expression can be extended to  $\mathcal{D}\text{om } \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ . This concludes the proof. □



## Integration by parts formulae

Most of our analysis relies on integration by parts formulae at the level of the Poisson space based on Malliavin calculus.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_d) \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$  and let  $u = (u_1, \dots, u_d) \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$ . Let  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ . Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . We write  $\hat{R}(F, z, \nabla\phi)$  for the (non-symmetric) 3-tensor whose coordinate  $(i, j, k)$  is given by  $\hat{R}_{jki}(F, z, \partial_i\phi)$ , and we do the same for  $\check{R}$ . Assume that, for  $l \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\int |u(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z^+ F|_{\ell^2}^l \nu(dz) < \infty$ . Then:*

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.48) \quad \mathbb{E}\langle \nabla\phi(F)G, \delta u \rangle_{\ell^2} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}G \langle \nabla^2\phi(F), [u, DF]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}\langle \nabla\phi(F), [u, DG]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2} \\
&+ \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}G \int \left\langle u(z) \otimes (D_z^+ F)^{\otimes 2}, \hat{R}(F, z, \nabla\phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \nu(dz) \\
&- \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}G \int \left\langle (1 - D_z^-)u(z) \otimes (D_z^- F)^{\otimes 2}, \check{R}(F, z, \nabla\phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \eta(dz).
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We write  $A = \langle \nabla\phi(F), \delta u \rangle_{\ell^2}$ , and

$$(2.49) \quad B = \frac{1}{2} G \langle \nabla^2\phi(F), [u, DF]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2}.$$

Write  $C = \langle \nabla\phi(F), [u, DG]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2}$  and

$$(2.50) \quad R^+ = \frac{1}{4} G \int \left\langle u(z) \otimes (D_z^+ F)^{\otimes 2}, \hat{R}(F, z, \nabla\phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \nu(dz);$$

$$(2.51) \quad R^- = \frac{1}{4} G \int \left\langle (1 - D_z^-)u(z) \otimes (D_z^- F)^{\otimes 2}, \check{R}(F, z, \nabla\phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \eta(dz).$$

First, let us check that every term is well defined. Since  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $\nabla\phi$  is Lipschitz. Since  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ , we find that  $\nabla\phi(F) \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$  and  $G\nabla\phi(F) \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ . Since  $u \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$ , we have that  $\delta u \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$  and, then,  $A \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$ . Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the Mecke formula, we find, in view of the assumptions

$$(2.52) \quad \mathbb{E}|B| \leq |\nabla^2\phi|_{\ell^2, \infty} |G|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})} \mathbb{E} \int |u(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z^+ F|_{\ell^2} < \infty;$$

$$(2.53) \quad \mathbb{E}|C| \leq |\nabla\phi|_{\ell^2, \infty} \mathbb{E} \int |u(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z^+ G|_{\ell^2} \nu(dz) < \infty;$$

$$(2.54) \quad \mathbb{E}|R^+| + \mathbb{E}|R^-| \leq |\nabla^3\phi(F)|_{\ell^2, \infty} |G|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})} \mathbb{E} \int |u(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z^+ F|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz) < \infty.$$

Remark that these estimates will also justify the use of the Mecke formula on non-necessarily non-negative quantities that we will do in the rest of the proof. Now, we prove the equality (2.48). Let  $D = B + C + R^+ - R^-$ . By integration by parts (2.16), we find

$$(2.55) \quad \mathbb{E}A = \mathbb{E} \int \langle D_z^+ (\nabla\phi(F)G), u(z) \rangle_{\ell^2} \nu(dz).$$

By the Mecke formula (2.1), we get

$$(2.56) \quad 2\mathbb{E}A = \mathbb{E}[D(\nabla\phi(F)G), u]_{\Gamma}.$$

Applying Lemmas 2.4 and 2.7, in the previous identity immediately yields  $\mathbb{E}A = \mathbb{E}B$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

When  $G = 1$ , we can directly apply [Lemma 2.4](#) in [\(2.55\)](#), this yields the following integration by parts involving  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\nu$  rather than  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\Gamma$ .

**Lemma 2.9.** *Under the same assumptions as for [Lemma 2.8](#), it holds*

$$(2.57) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla \phi(F), \delta u \rangle_{\ell^2} &= \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 \phi(F), [u \otimes DF]_\nu \rangle_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \int \left\langle u(z) \otimes (D_z^+ F)^{\otimes 2}, \hat{R}(F, z, \nabla \phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \nu(dz). \end{aligned}$$

### 3 Main abstract results

#### Outline

[Theorem 3.1](#) gives sufficient conditions for the stable convergence of a sequence of Poisson functionals to a Gaussian mixture. While [Theorem 3.2](#) gives sufficient conditions for the stable convergence of a sequence of Poisson functionals to a Poisson mixture. [Theorem 3.5](#) is the quantitative counterpart of the previous theorems and provides bounds on the distance  $d_3$  between the distribution of a Poisson functional and that of a Gaussian mixture. We are not able to obtain a quantitative estimates for the convergence to a Poisson mixture. [Theorem 3.8](#) is an improvement of our bound from the  $d_3$  distance to the  $d_1$  distance, when  $(F_n)$  is a sequence of univariate random variables.

#### 3.1 Main qualitative results

Thanks to our integration by parts formulae, we will derive sufficient conditions to ensure that a sequence of Kabanov integrals converges to a Gaussian mixture or a Poisson mixture. In [Section 3.2](#), we will derive quantitative bounds for Gaussian mixture only. However, in the case of Gaussian mixture, obtaining a quantitative estimates will require to control additional terms. This is why we treat first the simple qualitative bound both for Gaussian and Poisson mixtures.

##### 3.1.1 Convergence to a Gaussian mixture

Recall that we study asymptotic for (possibly multivariate) random variables of the form  $F_n = \delta u_n$ . In this setting, let us state the multivariate equivalent of [\(0.2\)](#):

$$(R_3) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |u_n(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z^+ F_n|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

We will also consider

$$(R_4) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |D_z^+ F_n|_{\ell^2}^4 \nu(dz) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Observe that provided  $(u_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$ , by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality [\(R\\_4\)](#) implies [\(R\\_3\)](#). Conditions such as [\(R\\_3\)](#) and [\(R\\_4\)](#) were already considered in the Poisson setting when considering normal approximation of Poisson variables, that is when taking  $S$  deterministic (see [\[31, 17, 16, 38\]](#)). It is always possible to choose  $u_n = -DL^{-1}F_n$  to solve the equation  $\delta u_n = F_n$  (other choices are possible). Following [\[31, Theorem 3.1\]](#) or [\[7, Theorem 4.1\]](#), let us consider

$$(3.1) \quad -\nu(L^{-1}F_n, F_n) = [u_n, DF_n]_\nu \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} \sigma^2;$$

or

$$(3.2) \quad -\Gamma(L^{-1}F_n, F_n) = [u_n, DF_n]_\Gamma \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} \sigma^2.$$

Then, we have that  $(R_3)$  with either  $(3.1)$  or  $(3.2)$  imply that  $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{law} \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ . In our setting of random variance it is thus very natural to consider one of the following condition:

$$(S_\nu) \quad [u_n, DF_n]_\nu \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} SS^T;$$

or

$$(S_\Gamma) \quad [u_n, DF_n]_\Gamma \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} SS^T;$$

for some  $S \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ . Since we deal with stable convergence we need a condition that provides some form of asymptotic independence. It has one of the following form

$$(W_\nu) \quad [u_n, h]_\nu \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} 0, \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu);$$

or

$$(W_\Gamma) \quad [u_n, DG]_\Gamma \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} 0, \quad \forall G \in \mathcal{G}.$$

Our first statement regarding stable limit theorems on the Poisson space is the following qualitative generalization of the results of [31, 7] to the setting of Gaussian mixtures.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\{F_n = (F_n^{(1)}, \dots, F_n^{(d)}); n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset \mathcal{D}om D$ . Assume that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $u_n \in \mathcal{D}om \delta$  such that  $F_n = \delta u_n$  and that  $(R_3)$  hold. Let  $S = (S_1, \dots, S_d) \in \mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ . Assume that either  $(W_\nu)$  and  $(S_\nu)$  hold; either  $(W_\Gamma)$  and  $(S_\Gamma)$  hold. Then  $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{stably} \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)$ .*

*Remark 4.* The condition  $(S_\Gamma)$  is a priori more involved than  $(S_\nu)$ : indeed integrating with respect to  $\eta$  adds some randomness to the object. However, we will see in Section 4.1 that the result involving  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\Gamma$  is required in order to obtain a stable version of the fourth moment theorem of [7]. On the other hand for the practical applications of Section 5, we will see that the conditions of type  $(S_\nu)$  and  $(W_\nu)$  are easier to manipulate.

### 3.1.2 Convergence to a Poisson mixture

Here we only consider univariate random variables. An other archetypal limit theorem obtained on the Poisson space is convergence to a Poisson distribution. In the setting of the Malliavin-Stein method, it was proved by [32] that the two conditions:

$$(3.3) \quad -\nu(D^+ L^{-1} F_n D^+ F_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} m,$$

and

$$(3.4) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |D_z^+ L^{-1} F_n D_z^+ F_n (D_z^+ F_n - 1)| \nu(dz) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0,$$

imply that  $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{law} \mathbf{Po}(m)^2$ . It is thus very natural to replace  $(R_3)$  by the following asymptotic conditions for  $F_n = \delta u_n$  (here we only considered scalar-valued random variables):

$$(P_3) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |u_n(z) D_z^+ F_n (D_z^+ F_n - 1)| \nu(dz) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

We will also consider the Poisson version of  $(R_4)$ :

$$(P_4) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |D_z^+ F_n|^2 |D_z^+ F_n - 1|^2 \nu(dz) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Again, provided  $(u_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ , we see that  $(P_4)$  implies  $(P_3)$ . With this notation, we have the following qualitative result for convergence to a Poisson mixture.

<sup>2</sup>[32] works with non-centered random variables but the result is equivalent.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $(F_n) \subset \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ . Let  $M \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$  with  $M \geq 0$ . Assume that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists  $u_n \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$  such that  $F_n = \delta u_n$  and that  $(P_3)$  and  $(W_\nu)$  hold, and moreover assume that

$$(M_\nu) \quad [u_n, DF_n]_\nu = \langle u_n, DF_n \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2(\nu)} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} M.$$

Then  $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} \mathbf{Po}(M)$ .

*Remark 5.* Observe that  $(M_\nu)$  is formally equivalent to  $(S_\nu)$  (we can always write  $S^2 = M$ ). However, it is important to note that our theorem cannot be true if we replace the scalar product by the energy bracket in  $(M_\nu)$ , that is that we work with the condition:

$$(M_\Gamma) \quad [u_n, DF_n]_\Gamma \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} M.$$

Indeed take  $F = \eta(A) - \nu(A)$ , with  $A \in \mathfrak{Z}$ ,  $\nu(A) < \infty$ . We can write  $F = \delta 1_A$ , and  $DF = 1_A$ , hence  $(P_3)$  is satisfied, since we have

$$(3.5) \quad \int_A |1_A - 1| d\nu = 0.$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$(3.6) \quad [1_A, 1_A]_\Gamma = \frac{1}{2}(\nu(A) + \eta(A)) = M.$$

Let  $F \sim \mathbf{Po}(M)$ , then

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} e^{i\lambda F} &= \mathbb{E} \exp(M(e^{i\lambda} - i\lambda - 1)) \\ &= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\nu(A)(e^{i\lambda} - i\lambda - 1)\right) \exp\left(\frac{\nu(A)}{2}\left(\exp(e^{i\lambda} - i\lambda - 1) - 1\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we see that the law of  $F$  is not the one of  $\eta(A) - \nu(A)$ . Remark that  $(S_\Gamma)$  and  $(M_\Gamma)$  are also formally equivalent. At a more structural level, the following was proven in [6]. If a sequence of Poisson stochastic integrals satisfies a deterministic reinforcement of  $(S_\Gamma)$ , that is:

$$(3.8) \quad [u_n, DF_n]_\Gamma = -\Gamma(L^{-1}F_n, F_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} \sigma^2,$$

where  $u_n = -DL^{-1}F_n$ , then, without further assumptions, the sequence converges in law to a Gaussian.

### 3.1.3 Proofs

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* We first prove the theorem under  $(W_\Gamma)$  and  $(S_\Gamma)$ . By  $(S_\Gamma)$ , we have that

$$(3.9) \quad \mathbb{E}F_n F_n^T = \mathbb{E}[u_n, DF_n]_\Gamma \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \mathbb{E}SS^T < \infty.$$

So  $(F_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ . Let  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ . For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we let  $\xi_n = (F_n, G)$ . Since  $(F_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ ,  $(\xi_n)$  is tight. We can extract a subsequence (still denoted  $(\xi_n)$ ) such that  $(\xi_n)$  converges in law to  $(F_\infty, G)$ . Let  $\psi_n(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}G e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n \rangle_{\ell^2}}$ , and  $\psi_\infty(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}G e^{i\langle \lambda, F_\infty \rangle_{\ell^2}}$ . By convergence in law, we have that  $\psi_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{C}^0(0,1)} \psi_\infty$ . But in fact since  $(\xi_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$  it is also uniformly integrable, and we find that

$$(3.10) \quad \nabla \psi_n(\lambda) = i\mathbb{E}F_n G e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n \rangle_{\ell^2}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} i\mathbb{E}F_\infty G e^{i\langle \lambda, F_\infty \rangle_{\ell^2}} = \nabla \psi_\infty(\lambda).$$

By [Lemma 2.8](#), we also have that

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \nabla \psi_n(\lambda) &= i\mathbb{E}G \left[ u_n, D \left( e^{i\lambda F_n} \right) \right]_{\Gamma} + i\mathbb{E} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n \rangle_{\ell^2}} [u_n, DG]_{\Gamma} \\ &= -\lambda \mathbb{E}G e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n \rangle_{\ell^2}} [u_n, DF_n]_{\Gamma} + i\mathbb{E} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n \rangle_{\ell^2}} [u_n, DG]_{\Gamma} + R_n, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.12) \quad |R_n| \leq \lambda^2 \mathbb{E} \int |u_n(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z^+ F_n|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz).$$

We thus see that [\(S<sub>Γ</sub>\)](#), [\(R<sub>3</sub>\)](#) and [\(W<sub>Γ</sub>\)](#) imply that

$$(3.13) \quad \nabla \psi_n(\lambda) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} -\lambda \mathbb{E}SS^T e^{i\langle \lambda, F_{\infty} \rangle}.$$

All in all, we proved that

$$(3.14) \quad \frac{d}{d\lambda} \psi_{\infty}(\lambda) = i\mathbb{E}GF_{\infty} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_{\infty} \rangle_{\ell^2}} = -\lambda \mathbb{E}GSS^T e^{i\langle \lambda, F_{\infty} \rangle_{\ell^2}}.$$

Thus, we obtain the following differential equation for the conditional characteristic function:

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{d}{d\lambda} \mathbb{E}[e^{i\lambda F_{\infty}} | \eta] = -\lambda SS^T \mathbb{E}[e^{i\lambda F_{\infty}} | \eta].$$

The only solution of this equation with  $\psi(0) = 1$  is the one given in [\(1.14\)](#) and this concludes the proof in view of [\(iii\)](#) in [Proposition 1.1](#). For the proof under [\(W<sub>ν</sub>\)](#) and [\(S<sub>ν</sub>\)](#), we only briefly explain what to modify; the details can be found in the proof of [Theorem 3.2](#) where this strategy is used to obtain convergence to a Poisson mixture. In this case, we rather introduce  $\psi_n(\lambda) = \mathbb{E} e^{i\langle \lambda, F_n + I_1(h) \rangle_{\ell^2}}$  for some  $h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu)$ . Instead of [Lemma 2.8](#), we have to use [Lemma 2.9](#). The rest of the proof is similar.  $\square$

*Proof of [Theorem 3.2](#).* Let  $h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu)$ . Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , and consider  $\psi_n(\lambda) = \mathbb{E} e^{i\lambda(F_n + I_1(h))}$ , and  $\psi_{\infty}(\lambda) = \mathbb{E} e^{i\lambda(F_{\infty} + I_1(h))}$ . Since  $\mathbb{E}F_n^2 = \mathbb{E}\langle u_n, DF_n \rangle$ , using [\(M<sub>ν</sub>\)](#), we see that  $F_n + I_1(h)$  is tight and uniformly integrable. Up to extraction, we can find some  $F_{\infty}$ , such that  $F_n + I_1(h) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} F_{\infty} + I_1(h)$ , and that

$$(3.16) \quad \psi'_n(\lambda) = i\mathbb{E}\langle F_n + I_1(h), e^{i\lambda(F_n + I_1(h))} \rangle \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} i\mathbb{E}\langle F_{\infty} + I_1(h), e^{i\lambda(F_{\infty} + I_1(h))} \rangle = \psi'_{\infty}(\lambda).$$

On the other hand, by [Lemma 2.5](#), we have that

$$(3.17) \quad \psi'_n(\lambda) = i\mathbb{E}\langle u_n, DF_n + h \rangle e^{i\lambda(F_n + I_1(h))} (e^{i\lambda} - 1) + i\mathbb{E}I_1(h) e^{i\lambda(F_n + I_1(h))} + R_n,$$

where

$$(3.18) \quad |R_n| \leq \lambda^2 \int |u_n(z)| (D_z F_n - 1) D_z F_n \nu(dz).$$

Thus, under [\(M<sub>ν</sub>\)](#), [\(P<sub>3</sub>\)](#) and [\(W<sub>Γ</sub>\)](#):

$$(3.19) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi'_n(\lambda) = i\mathbb{E}(e^{i\lambda} - 1) M e^{i\lambda F_{\infty}} + i\mathbb{E}I_1(h) e^{i\lambda(F_{\infty} + I_1(h))}.$$

Equating, [\(3.16\)](#) and [\(3.19\)](#) we obtain that

$$(3.20) \quad \mathbb{E} e^{i\lambda I_1(h)} F_{\infty} e^{i\lambda F_{\infty}} = \mathbb{E} e^{i\lambda I_1(h)} M (e^{i\lambda} - 1) e^{i\lambda F_{\infty}}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \forall h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu).$$

Arguing, by linearity of  $I_1$ , as in the proof of (iv) of Proposition 1.1, we find that:

$$(3.21) \quad \mathbb{E}I_1(h)F_\infty e^{i\lambda F_\infty} = \mathbb{E}I_1(h)M(e^{i\lambda} - 1)e^{i\lambda F_\infty}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \forall h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu).$$

That is to say, we proved the following differential equation for the conditional characteristic function:

$$(3.22) \quad \frac{d}{d\lambda} \mathbb{E}[e^{i\lambda F_\infty} | \eta] = i(e^{i\lambda} - 1)M\mathbb{E}[e^{i\lambda F_\infty} | \eta].$$

The unique solution of this equation satisfying  $\psi(0) = 1$  is the function given in (1.15). This concludes the proof by (iv) in Proposition 1.1.  $\square$

## 3.2 Main quantitative results for Gaussian mixtures

### 3.2.1 General results in any dimension

As [25] on the Gaussian space, we will use the integration by parts formulae to obtain quantitative Malliavin-Stein bounds between a Poisson functional and a Gaussian mixture. Our results crucially rely on the two following bounds, proved at the end of the section, that are obtained via the so-called *Talagrand's smart path interpolation* method. We obtain two bounds since, as for Theorem 3.1 we can either work with  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\nu$  or with  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\Gamma$ . Results involving  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\nu$  are a priori easier to handle in applications. However, we state the two bounds for completeness. For short, for  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , let us write  $\Phi_k = |\nabla^k \phi|_{\ell^2, \infty}$ , and  $S \in \mathcal{C}ov$  whenever  $S \in \mathcal{D}om D$  with  $SS^T \in \mathcal{D}om D$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_d) \in \mathcal{D}om D$ ,  $S \in \mathcal{C}ov$ , and  $N$  be a standard  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian vector independent of  $\eta$ . Assume that there exists  $u \in \mathcal{D}om \delta$  such that  $F = \delta u$ . Then, for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and all  $I = I_1(h)$ ,  $h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu)$ :*

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}\phi(F + I) - \mathbb{E}\phi(SN + I)| &\leq \frac{1}{4}\Phi_2 \mathbb{E} \left| [u, \widetilde{DF}]_\nu - SS^T \right|_{\ell^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{3}\Phi_3 \mathbb{E} | [u, (DS)S^T]_\nu |_{\ell^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6}\Phi_3 \mathbb{E} \int |h(z) + u(z)|_{\ell^2} \left( |D_z^+ F|_{\ell^2}^2 + |DS|_{\ell^2}^2 \right) \nu(dz). \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_d) \in \mathcal{D}om D$ ,  $S \in \mathcal{C}ov$ , and  $N$  be a standard  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian vector independent of  $\eta$ . Assume that there exists  $u \in \mathcal{D}om \delta$  such that  $F = \delta u$ . Then, for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and all  $G \in \mathcal{G}$ :*

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}\phi(F)G - \mathbb{E}\phi(SN)G| &\leq \frac{1}{4}\Phi_2 |G|_\infty \mathbb{E} \left| [u, \widetilde{DF}]_\Gamma - SS^T \right|_{\ell^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{3}\Phi_3 |G|_\infty \mathbb{E} | [u, (DS)S^T]_\Gamma |_{\ell^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6}\Phi_3 |G|_\infty \mathbb{E} \int |u(z)|_{\ell^2} \left( |D_z^+ F|_{\ell^2}^2 + |DS|_{\ell^2}^2 \right) \nu(dz) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\Phi_1 \mathbb{E} | [u, DG]_\Gamma |_{\ell^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where for short, we write  $|G|_\infty = |G|_{\mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P})}$ .

We are now in position to state our bound in the  $d_3$  distance of a Poisson functional to a Gaussian mixture.

**Theorem 3.5.** . Let  $\beta \in \{\nu, \Gamma\}$ . Let  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ , and  $S \in \mathcal{C}\text{ov}$ . Then,

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} d_3(F, \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)) &\leq \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E} \left| [\widetilde{u, DF}]_\beta - SS^T \right|_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{E} \left| [u, (DS)S^T]_\beta \right|_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{6} \mathbb{E} \int |u(z)| (|D_z F|_{\ell^2}^2 + |DS|_{\ell^2}^2) \nu(dz). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We simply use either [Proposition 3.3](#) with  $h = 0$  and  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_3$ ; or [Proposition 3.4](#) with  $G = 1$  and  $\phi \in \mathcal{F}_3$ .  $\square$

In [Theorem 3.1](#),  $(S_\nu)$  will enforce that the asymptotic covariance  $S$  is measurable with respect to  $\eta$ . Thanks to [Proposition 3.3](#), when  $S_n^2 = [\widetilde{u_n, DF_n}]_\nu$  is non-negative, we can deduce sufficient conditions for the stable convergence of a Poisson functional that involves stable convergence of  $S_n$  to some  $S$  (not necessarily measurable with respect to  $\eta$ ). This weaker form of convergence can allow, for instance,  $S$  to be independent of  $\eta$ .

**Theorem 3.6.** Let  $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$ , and  $S \in \mathcal{L}^2(\Omega)$  (not necessarily measurable with respect to  $\eta$ ). Let  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$  such that  $F_n = \delta u_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $(W_\nu)$  and  $(R_4)$  holds. Assume, moreover, that for  $n$  sufficiently big  $[\widetilde{u_n, DF_n}]_\nu = C_n + \epsilon_n$ , where  $C_n = S_n S_n^T$  is a symmetric non-negative random matrix, and:

$$(C.st) \quad C_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} SS^T;$$

$$(\epsilon) \quad \epsilon_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} 0;$$

$$(RS) \quad [u_n, (DS_n)S_n]_\nu \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} 0;$$

$$(S_4) \quad \int |D_z^+ S_n|_{\ell^2}^4 \nu(dz) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} 0.$$

Then  $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)$ .

*Remark 6.* We formulated our result with  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\nu$ ; we could do the same for  $[\cdot, \cdot]_\Gamma$  but we will not use it.

*Proof.* Let  $h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu)$ , and  $N \sim \mathbf{N}(0, id_{\mathbb{R}^d})$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we write:

$$(3.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\phi(F_n + I_1(h)) - \mathbb{E}\phi(SN + I_1(h)) &= \mathbb{E}\phi(F_n + I_1(h)) - \mathbb{E}\phi(S_n N + I_1(h)) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}\phi(S_n N + I_1(h)) - \mathbb{E}\phi(SN + I_1(h)). \end{aligned}$$

From [Proposition 3.3](#), we have that under  $(W_\Gamma)$ ,  $(R_3)$ ,  $(\epsilon)$  and  $(RS)$

$$(3.27) \quad \mathbb{E}\phi(F_n + I_1(h)) - \mathbb{E}\phi(S_n N + I_1(h)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

On the other hand, under  $(C.st)$ ,  $S_n N \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} SN$ , consequently

$$(3.28) \quad \mathbb{E}\phi(S_n N + I_1(h)) - \mathbb{E}\phi(SN + I_1(h)) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

We conclude using [Proposition 1.1](#).  $\square$



### 3.2.2 Bounds in the Monge-Kantorovich distance for the one-dimensional case

The results of the previous section are stated in the rather abstract distance  $d_3$ . When  $F$  is univariate, one can use the following regularization lemma in order to turn the estimate of [Proposition 3.4](#) into a quantitative bound for the Monge-Kantorovich distance  $d_1$ . In this section, all the random variables are implicitly univariate.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $F$  and  $F' \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$  such that there exists  $a, b$ , and  $c \geq 0$  such that for all  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^3(\mathbb{R})$ :*

$$(3.29) \quad \mathbb{E}\phi(F) - \mathbb{E}\phi(F') \leq a|\phi'|_\infty + b|\phi''|_\infty + c|\phi'''|_\infty.$$

Then,

$$(3.30) \quad d_1(F, F') \leq a + \max\left(\left(2^{\frac{1}{3}} + 2^{-\frac{2}{3}}\right) \Delta_1^{\frac{2}{3}} \Delta_2^{\frac{1}{3}}, \Delta_1 \Delta_2\right)$$

where

$$(3.31) \quad \Delta_1 = 2\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{E}|F| + \mathbb{E}|G|;$$

$$(3.32) \quad \Delta_2 = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} b + 2^{\frac{1}{2}} c.$$

*Proof.* This result is well-known at different levels of generality. We follow here the proof of [\[25, Theorem 3.4\]](#) (where the reader is referred to for details). For  $t \in (0, 1)$ , we define  $\phi_t(x) = \int \phi(t^{\frac{1}{2}}y + (1-t)^{\frac{1}{2}}x)\gamma(dy)$ , with  $\gamma = \mathbf{N}(0, 1)$ . Then, we have that

$$(3.33) \quad |\phi'_t|_\infty \leq |\phi'|_\infty;$$

$$(3.34) \quad |\phi''_t|_\infty \leq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{|\phi''|_\infty}{t};$$

$$(3.35) \quad |\phi'''_t|_\infty \leq 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{|\phi'''|_\infty}{t}.$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$(3.36) \quad \mathbb{E}\phi(F) - \mathbb{E}\phi_t(F) \leq t^{\frac{1}{2}}|\phi'|_\infty \left(\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \mathbb{E}|F|\right).$$

Combining all the estimates and optimizing in  $t$  yields the desired result.  $\square$

We can now state our main quantitative result for univariate random variables.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $F \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } D$  such that  $F = \delta u$  for some  $u \in \mathcal{D}\text{om } \delta$ , and let  $S \in \mathcal{C}\text{ov}$ . Consider*

$$(3.37) \quad \Delta_1 = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (2 + \mathbb{E}|S|) + \mathbb{E}|F|;$$

$$(3.38) \quad \Delta_2 = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}|\nu(uDF) - S^2| + 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{3} \mathbb{E}|S\nu(uDS)| + \frac{1}{6} \mathbb{E}\nu(|u|(|DF|^2 + |DS|^2))\right).$$

Then, we have that

$$(3.39) \quad d_1(F, \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)) \leq \max\left(\left(2^{\frac{1}{3}} + 2^{-\frac{2}{3}}\right) \Delta_1^{\frac{2}{3}} \Delta_2^{\frac{1}{3}}, \Delta_1 \Delta_2\right).$$

*Proof.* We just combine [Proposition 3.3](#) (with  $h = 0$ ) and [Lemma 3.7](#).  $\square$

This theorem is particularly useful since it allows us to prove a quantitative version of [Theorem 3.6](#) in the univariate case.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let the assumptions and the notations of in [Theorem 3.6](#) prevail. Consider*

$$(3.40) \quad \Delta_{1,n} = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (2 + \mathbb{E}|S_n|) + \mathbb{E}|F_n|;$$

$$(3.41) \quad \Delta_{2,n} = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}|\epsilon_n| + 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{1}{3} \mathbb{E}|S_n \nu(u_n D S_n)| + \frac{1}{6} \mathbb{E} \nu \left( |u_n| \left( |D F_n|^2 + |D S_n|^2 \right) \right) \right).$$

Then,

$$(3.42) \quad d_1(F_n, \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)) \leq \max \left( \left( 2^{\frac{1}{3}} + 2^{-\frac{2}{3}} \right) \Delta_{1,n}^{\frac{2}{3}} \Delta_{2,n}^{\frac{1}{3}}, \Delta_{1,n} \Delta_{2,n} \right) + \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d_1(S_n, S).$$

*Proof.* By the triangle inequality, we write

$$(3.43) \quad d_1(F_n, \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)) \leq d_1(F_n, \mathbf{N}(0, S_n^2)) + d_1(\mathbf{N}(0, S_n^2), \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)).$$

By [Theorem 3.8](#), we have that

$$(3.44) \quad d_1(F_n, \mathbf{N}(0, S_n^2)) \leq \max \left( \left( 2^{\frac{1}{3}} + 2^{-\frac{2}{3}} \right) \Delta_{1,n}^{\frac{2}{3}} \Delta_{2,n}^{\frac{1}{3}}, \Delta_{1,n} \Delta_{2,n} \right).$$

Hence, the proof will be complete once we prove that

$$(3.45) \quad a_n := d_1(\mathbf{N}(0, S_n^2), \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)) \leq \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d_1(S_n, S).$$

Let  $A_n \sim S_n$  and  $A \sim S$ . Let  $N \sim \mathbf{N}(0, 1)$  independent of  $A$  and  $A_n$ . Then  $(A_n N, A N)$  is a coupling of  $(\mathbf{N}(0, S_n^2), \mathbf{N}(0, S^2))$ . Hence, by the formulation of the Monge-Kantorovich distance as an infimum over couplings, we find that:

$$(3.46) \quad a_n \leq \mathbb{E}|(A - A_n)N| = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}|A - A_n|.$$

Minimizing over all couplings  $(A, A_n)$  proves the claim. This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Remark 7.* From the proof, we see that working with the Monge-Kantorovich distance is crucial. For instance, we do not know if  $d_3(\mathbf{N}(0, S^2), \mathbf{N}(0, T^2)) \leq c d_3(S, T)$ , for some  $c > 0$ .

### 3.2.3 Proofs of the technical bounds

We start by proving in details the bounds involving  $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\Gamma}$  that is more involved, then we explain how to adapt the proof for  $[\cdot, \cdot]_{\nu}$ .

*Proof of [Proposition 3.4](#).* By the assumptions on  $u$  and  $F$ , we have that  $\int |u(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z^+ F|_{\ell^2} \nu(dz) < \infty$ , and we can assume that  $\int |u(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z^+ F|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz) < \infty$  (otherwise there is nothing to prove). Let  $(s_t)_{t \in [0,1]}$  be a smooth  $[0, 1]$ -valued path such that  $s_0 = 0$  and  $s_1 = 1$ , and define

$$(3.47) \quad F_t = s_t F + s_{1-t} S N.$$

Let  $g(t) = \mathbb{E} \phi(F_t) G$ . Then,

$$(3.48) \quad \mathbb{E} \phi(F) G - \mathbb{E} \phi(S N) G = \int_0^1 \dot{g}_t dt.$$

An explicit computation yields

$$(3.49) \quad \dot{g}_t = \mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla \phi(F_t), (\dot{s}_t F - \dot{s}_{1-t} SN)G \rangle_{\ell^2}].$$

Since  $\mathcal{D}om D$  is a linear space, in view of the assumptions,  $F_t \in \mathcal{D}om D$ . Since  $\nabla \phi$  is Lipschitz,  $\nabla \phi(F_t) \in \mathcal{D}om D$ . Using the integration by part formula [Lemma 2.8](#), we find that

$$(3.50) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla \phi(F_t)G, F \rangle_{\ell^2} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} G \langle \nabla^2 \phi(F_t), s_t [u, DF]_{\Gamma} + s_{1-t} [u, (DS)N]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla \phi(F_t), [u, DG]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E} G \int \left\langle u(z) \otimes (D_z^+ F_t)^{\otimes 2}, \hat{R}(F_t, z, \nabla \phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \nu(dz) \\ &- \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E} G \int \left\langle (1 - D_z^-)u(z) \otimes (D_z^- F_t)^{\otimes 2}, \check{R}(F_t, z, \nabla \phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \eta(dz). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that, by integration by parts,  $\mathbb{E} N \psi(N) = \mathbb{E} \nabla \psi(N)$ , for all smooth  $\psi$ . Let

$$(3.51) \quad \psi(x) = G \partial_{ij} \phi(s_t F + s_{1-t} Sx).$$

Then,

$$(3.52) \quad \partial_k \psi(x) = s_{1-t} G \sum_l S_{lk} \partial_{ijl} (s_t F + s_{1-t} Sx).$$

As a consequence, by the previous Gaussian integration by parts:

$$(3.53) \quad \mathbb{E} G \langle \nabla^2 \phi(F_t), [u, (DS)N]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2} = s_{1-t} \mathbb{E} G \langle \nabla^3 \phi(F_t), [u, (DS)S^T]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2}.$$

Also by Gaussian integration by parts, we obtain that

$$(3.54) \quad \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla \phi(F_t), SN \rangle_{\ell^2} = s_{1-t} \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla^2 \phi(F_t), SS^T \rangle_{\ell^2}.$$

Combining [\(3.49\)](#), [\(3.50\)](#), [\(3.53\)](#) and [\(3.54\)](#), we find that

$$(3.55) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{g}_t &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} G \left\langle \nabla^2 \phi(F_t), \left( s_t \dot{s}_t [\widetilde{u, DF}]_{\Gamma} - s_{1-t} \dot{s}_{1-t} SS^T \right) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \dot{s}_t s_{1-t}^2 \mathbb{E} G \langle \nabla^3 \phi(F_t), [u, (DS)S^T]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \dot{s}_t \mathbb{E} \langle \nabla \phi(F_t), [u, DG]_{\Gamma} \rangle_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \dot{s}_t \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E} G \int \left\langle u(z) \otimes (D_z^+ F_t)^{\otimes 2}, \hat{R}(F_t, z, \nabla \phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \nu(dz) \\ &- \dot{s}_t \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E} G \int \left\langle (1 - D_z^-)u(z) \otimes (D_z^- F_t)^{\otimes 2}, \check{R}(F_t, z, \nabla \phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \eta(dz). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $|\hat{R} + \check{R}|_{\ell^2} \leq \Phi_3$ , and that, if we take the absolute value of the integrands in the two last lines then the expectation become equals (by the Mecke formula [\(2.1\)](#)). Hence, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we find that

$$(3.56) \quad \begin{aligned} |\dot{g}_t| &\leq \frac{1}{2} |G|_{\infty} \Phi_2 s_t \dot{s}_t \left\langle \nabla^2 \phi(F_t), \left( s_t \dot{s}_t [\widetilde{u, DF}]_{\Gamma} - s_{1-t} \dot{s}_{1-t} SS^T \right) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \Phi_3 \dot{s}_t s_{1-t}^2 |G|_{\infty} \mathbb{E} |[u, (DS)S^T]_{\Gamma}|_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \Phi_1 \dot{s}_t \mathbb{E} |[u, DG]_{\Gamma}|_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \dot{s}_t |G|_{\infty} \Phi_3 \mathbb{E} \int |u(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z^+ F_t|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz). \end{aligned}$$

By expanding the square in  $|D_z^+ F_t|_{\ell^2}^2$  the cross term will vanish (by the fact that  $N$  is centered and independent of  $\eta$ ). By the fact that  $N$  is a normal vector independent of  $\eta$ , we also find that  $\mathbb{E}[|(D_z^+ S)N|_{\ell^2}^2 | \eta] = |(D_z^+ S)|_{\ell^2}^2$ . Following these observations, the results is obtained by selecting  $s_t = t^{\frac{1}{2}}$  (other choices of  $s$  could possibly yield better constants). The reader can immediately verify that with this choice for  $s$ , we have that

$$(3.57) \quad \int_0^1 \dot{s}_t dt = 1;$$

$$(3.58) \quad \int_0^1 s_t \dot{s}_t dt = \int_0^1 s_{1-t} \dot{s}_{1-t} = \frac{1}{2};$$

$$(3.59) \quad \int_0^1 \dot{s}_t s_{1-t}^2 = \int_0^1 s_t^2 \dot{s}_t = \frac{2}{3}.$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.3.* The strategy of proof is the same and we simply highlight the differences with the previous proof. We have to consider instead  $g(t) = \mathbb{E}\phi(F_t + I_1(h))$  for some  $h \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu)$ . Then, using Lemma 2.9, we find that

$$(3.60) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\langle \nabla \phi(F_t + I_1(h)), F \rangle_{\ell^2} &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}G \langle \nabla^2 \phi(F_t), s_t[u, DF]_{\nu} + s_{1-t}[u, (DS)N]_{\nu} \rangle_{\ell^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{E}G \int \left\langle (u(z) + h(z)) \otimes (D_z^+ F_t)^{\otimes 2}, \hat{R}(F_t, z, \nabla \phi) \right\rangle_{\ell^2} \nu(dz) \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is identical to the previous one.  $\square$

### 3.3 Comparison with existing results

First, on the Gaussian space, the authors of [24, 12, 25] work with iterated Skorokhod integrals of any order  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ . That is, given a Gaussian functional  $F$  and given  $u$  such that  $F = \delta^q u$ , they give probabilistic conditions in terms of  $u$  and  $F$  for stable convergence of  $F$  to a Gaussian mixture. Our theorems can be seen as the case  $q = 1$  of their results for the Poisson space. Let us point out that, due to the lack of diffusiveness on the Poisson space, it does not seem possible to reach a result involving iterated Kabanov integrals, via our method of proof, that is, via integration by parts.

Second, from (S $_{\Gamma}$ ), we see that the asymptotic covariance is determined by the convergence of  $C_{\Gamma} = [u, DF]$  (or its symmetrized version). The comparison of  $C_{\Gamma}$  and  $SS^T$  is similar to the Gaussian case [24]: the quantity  $\langle DF, u \rangle$  (where  $D$  is the Malliavin derivative on the Gaussian space) controls the asymptotic variance of the functional  $F = \delta u$ . In this respect, let us refer to [26, Theorem 5.3.1] for deterministic variance (for the choice  $u = -DL^{-1}F$ ), to [24, Theorem 3.1], to [12, Theorem 3.2] and to [25, Theorem 5.1] for random asymptotic variances. However, we see from (S $_{\nu}$ ) that another relevant quantity to consider is  $C_{\nu} = [DF_n, u_n]_{\nu}$ . The matrix  $C_{\nu}$  would also correspond in the Gaussian setting to  $\langle u, DF \rangle$  since  $\Gamma(F)$  and  $|DF|^2$  coincide on the Gaussian space. As already observed by [7], working with  $C_{\Gamma}$  rather than  $C_{\nu}$  is critical to obtain a fourth moment theorem. We will also work with  $C_{\Gamma}$  to obtain our stable version of their fourth moment theorem. When working with deterministic covariances one can choose  $C_{\nu}$  and still obtain sufficient conditions for convergence of Poisson functionals to a Gaussian (see, for instance [17, 16, 38]). For our applications to order 2 stochastic integrals in Section 4.2 and to stochastic processes in Section 5, we will work with  $C_{\nu}$  rather than  $C_{\Gamma}$  since the latter adds some extra randomness via integration with respect to  $\eta$ .

Our condition  $(W_\nu)$  is the exact counterpart to the condition  $\langle u_n, h \rangle \rightarrow 0$  (see [24, Remark 3.2]) in the Gaussian setting, enforcing some form of asymptotic independence. When working with the energy bracket, we have  $(W_\Gamma)$  that can be also seen as asymptotic independence condition.  $(RS)$  plays the same role, in our setting of, as  $\langle u, DS^2 \rangle \rightarrow 0$  in [25]. On the Gaussian space, by the chain rule,  $DS^2 = 2SDS$ . In our case we cannot have this simplification, so that our condition has to be expressed in terms of  $SDS$ . This adds an extra difficulty because, in practice, the convergence of  $C_\nu$  or  $C_\Gamma$  only provides information on  $SS^T$  but not on  $S$ . As the condition with  $DS^2$  is already present in the Gaussian setting [25], we do not expect that the condition  $(RS)$  could disappear in general. The condition  $(R_3)$  is specific to the Poisson setting. Controlling quantities of the form  $\int |D_z^+ L^{-1} F| |D_z^+ F|^2 \nu(dz)$  is standard in the theory of limit theorems for Poisson functionals and already appeared in the first result on the Malliavin-Stein method on the Poisson space [31, Theorem 3.1], as well as in the proof of the fourth moment theorem on the Poisson space [7, Equation 4.2]. This corresponds to the choice  $u = -DL^{-1}F$  in  $(R_3)$ . In our case we have an extra term of the form  $\int |u(z)| |D_z^+ S|^2 \nu(dz)$ . This term is also due to the lack of a chain rule and we do not expect it could be removed.

Also, the authors of [24, 12, 25] only considered results involving the convergence in  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$  of the Stein matrix  $C_\nu$ , thus imposing the limit covariance to be measurable with respect to the underlying Gaussian process. In our case, when the limiting covariance is non-negative, we can replace the condition of convergence in  $\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})$  by the weaker form of stable convergence to obtain [Theorem 3.6](#). This modification relies on our quantitative bounds, this is why, in this case we need to check  $(RS)$  while [Theorem 3.1](#) does not need to enforce this condition. Being quantitative, the results of [25] could also be modified in order to obtain a result similar to [Theorem 3.6](#) with the same proof that the one we gave in the Poisson setting.

Lastly, in the multidimensional case, our bound in [Theorem 3.5](#) holds for every symmetric covariance random matrix  $C = SS^T$ , while in [25], the authors are limited to the case of a diagonal matrix. In [12], the authors were also able to deal with generic matrices but their method relies on the so-called method of the characteristic function that is not known to provide quantitative bounds. Also, in [12], as in our [Theorem 3.1](#), one works with a non-symmetrized version of  $C_\nu$ . Namely, we work with the possibly non-symmetric random matrix  $C$  whose coefficient  $(i, j)$  is given by  $\langle u_i, DF_j \rangle$ . In this case, for  $d = 2$  with  $F_1 = I_q(f)$  and  $F_2 = I_p(f)$  with  $p \neq q$  then  $M_{12} = p/q M_{21}$ . Thus,  $C$  cannot be symmetric, hence an acceptable covariance matrix, unless it is diagonal. In many cases, the result of [12] and our [Theorem 3.1](#) have the same limitation one the asymptotic covariance as the one of [25] and that our result [Theorem 3.5](#) does not have. For deterministic target covariances, this remark does not apply, as stochastic integrals living in different chaoses are uncorrelated.

On the other hand, the convergence to Poisson mixtures was not considered for Gaussian functionals (recall that by [26, Theorem 2.10.1] random variables in a fixed Wiener chaos are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure). Several authors have applied the Malliavin-Stein approach on the Poisson space to consider convergence to a Poisson random variable with deterministic mean. The first results in that direction appeared in the work of Peccati [32]. Selecting  $u_n = -DL^{-1}F_n$  and  $M = \mathbb{E}M = c$  in  $(M_\nu)$  exactly yields the condition of [32, Proposition 3.3]:  $\langle -DL^{-1}F_n, DF_n \rangle_{\mathcal{L}^2(\nu)} \rightarrow c$  (remark that [32] works with non centered random variables). For Poisson approximation, the above discussion on the difference between  $S_D$  and  $S_\Gamma$  does not apply as we are only able to obtain a condition involving  $S_D$  (see [Remark 5](#)). Our condition  $(P_3)$  is similar to the one in [32].

Also, contrary to [32], we cannot obtain quantitative bounds for Poisson approximation. In fact, we do not know how to adapt the methods in [Section 3.2](#) to reach estimates for the distance of a Poisson functional to a Poisson mixture. Indeed, contrary to the qualitative results, our approach relies on the fact that we can compute the Malliavin derivative of a Gaussian mixture, since they always can be written in the form  $SN$  with  $N$  independent of  $\eta$ , and in this case  $D(SN) = (DS)N$ . However, if  $N$  is a Poisson process on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  independent of  $\eta$  and  $M \geq 0$ , the

Malliavin derivative of the Poisson mixture writes:

$$(3.61) \quad D_z N(M) = N(1_{[0, M+D_z M]}) - N(1_{[0, M]}) - D_z M.$$

The computations with this quantity seem not tractable, and new techniques seem to be needed in this case; we retain exploring this direction of research for future works.

## 4 Convergence of stochastic integrals

### Outline

We apply the abstract convergence results of [Section 3](#) to stochastic integrals. In particular, we deduce [Proposition 4.1](#), that is a stable version of the fourth moment theorem of Döbler & Peccati [\[7\]](#), and Döbler, Vidotto & Zheng [\[8\]](#); and [Theorems 4.2](#) and [4.3](#) that give sufficient conditions for a Itô-Poisson integral of order 2 to converge to a Gaussian or Poisson mixture.

### 4.1 A stable fourth-moment theorem for normal approximation

In a recent reference, [\[8\]](#) proved a multidimensional fourth-moment theorem on the Poisson space, thus refining and generalizing the previous findings of [\[7\]](#). It is worth noting that taking  $G = 0$  and  $S$  deterministic in [\(3.24\)](#) yields the same bound as [\[7, Equation 4.2\]](#). In fact, as a first application of [Theorem 3.6](#), we deduce a stable fourth-moment theorem on the Poisson space.

**Proposition 4.1** (Stable fourth-moment theorem). *Let  $q_1, \dots, q_d \in \mathbb{N}$ . For  $n \geq 1$ , let  $(f_n^i) \subset \mathcal{L}^2(\mu^{q_i})$  and let  $F_n = (I_{q_1}(f_n^1), \dots, I_{q_d}(f_n^d))$ . Assume that  $(F_n)$  is bounded in  $\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$ . Then, the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $F_n$  converges stably to a Gaussian vector.
- (ii) For all  $i \in [d]$ ,  $F_n^i$  converges in law to a Gaussian random variable.
- (iii) For all  $i \in [d]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(F_n^i)^4 - 3(\mathbb{E}(F_n^i)^2)^2 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ .
- (iv)  $\text{Var} \Gamma(L^{-1}F_n, F_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0$ .

*Remark 8.* If either of the conditions of the theorem is satisfied then  $\Gamma(L^{-1}F_n, F_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} \sigma \sigma^T$ , where  $\sigma$  is some deterministic matrix. The covariance of the limit Gaussian vector is  $\sigma \sigma^T$ .

*Remark 9.* [Proposition 4.1](#) is very close to [\[5, Theorem 2.22\]](#). However, one condition of their theorem requires that the norms of each of the individual star-contractions vanish. This is strictly stronger than a vanishing fourth-moment as, by the product formula, this condition translate in vanishing properly chosen linear combinations of the star-contractions (see [\[6\]](#)).

*Proof.* It is clear that (i) implies (ii). That (ii) implies (and in fact is equivalent to) (iii) is the main finding of [\[7\]](#). That (iii) implies (iv) is a consequence of [\[8, Equation 4.3, Lemma 4.1\]](#). Let us prove (iv) implies (i). Under (iv),  $-\Gamma(L^{-1}F, F) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{P})} \sigma \sigma^T$ . We will apply [Theorem 3.1](#) with  $S = \sigma$  and

$$(4.1) \quad u_n(z) = -\left(I_{q_1-1}(f_n^1(z, \cdot)), \dots, I_{q_d-1}(f_n^d(z, \cdot))\right) = -D_z L^{-1}F_n.$$

We have that  $\delta u_n = -\delta D L^{-1}F_n = F_n$ , and that  $[u_n, F_n]_\Gamma = -\Gamma(L^{-1}F_n, F_n)$ . Thus, [\(S<sub>Γ</sub>\)](#) is satisfied. From [\[19, Lemma 3.4\]](#), we have that

$$(4.2) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |D_z L^{-1}F_n|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz) \leq \mathbb{E} \int |D_z F_n|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz).$$

Hence, applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we find that

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |u_n(z)|_{\ell^2} |D_z F_n|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz) \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \int |D_z F_n|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz) \mathbb{E} \int |D_z F_n|_{\ell^2}^4 \nu(dz)}.$$

By Hölder's inequality, we find that (recall  $DG \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{P} \otimes \nu)$  by [Lemma 2.1](#)):

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbb{E}|[u_n, DG]| \leq |DG|_\infty \left( \mathbb{E} \int |DF_n|_{\ell^2}^4 \right)^{1/4}.$$

The quantity

$$(4.5) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |D_z F_n|_{\ell^2}^2 \nu(dz) = \sum_{i \in [d]} q_i! \nu^{q_i}(|f_n^i|^2),$$

is bounded by assumption. Hence it will be sufficient to show that under [\(iv\)](#),

$$(4.6) \quad \mathbb{E} \int |D_z F_n|_{\ell^2}^4 \nu(dz) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

This follows from [\[7, Lemma 3.2\]](#) and [\[8, Remark 5.2\]](#). The proof is complete.  $\square$

*Remark 10.* Let  $\Sigma = (\Sigma_{ij})$  be a random matrix sufficiently integrable. If we assume that

$$(4.7) \quad -\Gamma(L^{-1}F_n, F_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^1(\mathbb{P})} \Sigma \Sigma^T;$$

$$(4.8) \quad \mathbb{E}(F_n^i)^4 \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 3(\mathbb{E}(\Sigma \Sigma^T)_{ii})^2, \forall i = 1, \dots, d.$$

Then, from the previous computations,  $\Sigma = \sigma$  is deterministic. This shows that fourth-moment theorems cannot capture phenomena with asymptotic random variances.

## 4.2 Convergence of order 2 Poisson-Wiener integrals to a mixture

We derive an analytic statement for the convergence of a sequence of random variables of the form  $F = I_2(g)$  for some  $g \in \mathcal{L}_\sigma^2(\nu^2)$ . In this case, with  $u_0(z) = -D_z L^{-1}F = I_1(g(z, \cdot))$ , we have  $F = \delta u_0$ . However, for every  $\hat{g} \in \mathcal{L}^2(\nu^2)$  such that the symmetrization of  $\hat{g}$  is  $g$ , we also have that  $u(z) = I_1(\hat{g}(z, \cdot))$  is a solution to  $\delta u = F$ . Having made this observation, we can thus specify our [Theorems 3.1](#) and [3.2](#) to the particular case where  $F$  is an Poisson-Wiener stochastic integral of order 2.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Consider the sequence of random variables  $\{F_n = I_2(g_n); n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  for some  $(g_n) \subset \mathcal{L}_\sigma^2(\nu^2)$ . Suppose that there exists  $(\hat{g}_n) \subset \mathcal{L}^2(\nu^2)$  such that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the symmetrization of  $\hat{g}_n$  is  $g_n$ . Assume, moreover, that:*

$$(KS_\nu) \quad \begin{cases} g_n \star_1 \hat{g}_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^2(\nu^2)} g_{2,\infty}, \\ \nu^2(g_n \hat{g}_n) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty} g_{0,\infty}; \end{cases}$$

$$(KR_4) \quad \begin{cases} g_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^4(\nu^2)} 0, \\ g_n \star_2 \hat{g}_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^2(\nu)} 0; \end{cases}$$

$$(KW) \quad \hat{g}_n \star_1 h \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^2(\nu)} 0.$$

Assume that  $S^2 = I_2(g_{2,\infty}) + g_{0,\infty} \geq 0$ . Then  $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} \mathbf{N}(0, S^2)$ .



*Remark 11.* Following [Theorem 3.8](#), it is of course possible to write conditions for the convergence in the Monge-Kantorovich distance  $d_1$  in terms of the norms of the kernels. However, this task seems tedious and not particularly useful in this abstract setting.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Consider the sequence of random variables  $\{F_n = I_2(g_n); n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  for some  $(g_n) \subset \mathcal{L}_\sigma^2(\nu^2)$ . Suppose that there exists  $(\hat{g}_n) \subset \mathcal{L}^2(\nu^2)$  such that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the symmetrization of  $\hat{g}_n$  is  $g_n$ . Assume that [\(KS \$\_\nu\$ \)](#) and [\(KW\)](#) hold and that*

$$(KP_4) \quad \begin{cases} \nu^2 \left( g_n^2 \left( g_n - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0, \\ g_n \star_{\frac{1}{2}} g_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{L}^2(\nu)} 0. \end{cases}$$

Assume that  $M = I_2(g_{2,\infty}) + g_{0,\infty} \geq 0$ . Then  $F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} \mathbf{Po}(M)$ .

*Proof of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3.* We will prove the two theorems at once. We simply apply [Theorems 3.1](#) and [3.2](#) to our data. For simplicity, we drop the dependence in  $n$ . Let  $u = I_1(\hat{g})$ . Let us compute  $[DF, u]_\nu = \nu(DFu)$  in that case. By the product formula [??](#), we have that

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} [DF, u]_\nu &= \nu(uDF) = \int I_1(g(z, \cdot)) I_1(\hat{g}(z, \cdot)) \nu(dz) \\ &= \int I_2(g(z, \cdot) \otimes \hat{g}(z, \cdot)) + I_1(g(z, \cdot) \hat{g}(z, \cdot)) + \nu(g(z, \cdot) \hat{g}(z, \cdot)). \end{aligned}$$

By linearity of  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , we thus find

$$(4.10) \quad \nu(uDF) = I_2(g \star_{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{g}) + I_1(g \star_{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{g}) + \nu^2(g\hat{g}).$$

Hence, we see that [\(KS \$\_\nu\$ \)](#) will imply either [\(S \$\_\nu\$ \)](#) or [\(M \$\_\nu\$ \)](#) with  $S^2$  or  $M$  as given in the statement. On the one hand, we have that

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{E} \int |D_z F|^4 \nu(dz) &= \int \mathbb{E} I_1(g(z, \cdot))^4 \nu(dz) \\ &= 3 \int \left( \int g(y, z)^2 \nu(dy) \right)^2 \nu(dz) + \int \int g(y, z)^4 \nu(dy) \nu(dz) \\ &= 3\nu \left( (g \star_{\frac{1}{2}} g)^2 \right) + \nu^2(g^4). \end{aligned}$$

So that [\(KR \$\_4\$ \)](#) readily implies [\(R \$\_4\$ \)](#). On the other hand:

$$(4.12) \quad \frac{1}{16} \mathbb{E} \int |D_z F (D_z F - 1)|^2 \nu(dz) = \nu^2 \left( g^2 \left( g - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right) + 3\nu \left( (g \star_{\frac{1}{2}} g)^2 \right).$$

We thus also see that [\(KP \$\_4\$ \)](#) implies [\(P \$\_4\$ \)](#). Finally, we find that

$$(4.13) \quad \nu(uh) = I_1(\hat{g} \star_{\frac{1}{2}} h).$$

Consequently, by Itô's isometry [\(2.5\)](#), we find that [\(KW\)](#) implies [\(W \$\_\nu\$ \)](#). □

## 5 Convergence of a quadratic functional of a Poisson process on the line

In this section, we apply our abstract result in order to study the asymptotic of a particular quadratic functional. Let us recall one of the main applications of [\[24, 25\]](#), refining a result of [\[35\]](#).

**Theorem 5.1** ([24, Example 4.2] and [25, Theorems 3.7]). *Let  $W$  be a standard Brownian motion on  $[0, 1]$  and let*

$$(5.1) \quad F_n = \frac{n^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \int_0^1 t^{n-1} (W_1^2 - W_t^2) dt, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then,

$$(5.2) \quad F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} \mathbf{N}(0, W_1^2).$$

Moreover, there exists  $c > 0$  such that, for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$(5.3) \quad d_1(F_n, \mathbf{N}(0, W_1^2)) \leq cn^{-\frac{1}{6}}.$$

Let  $\eta$  be a Poisson point process on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  with intensity the Lebesgue measure; and  $\hat{N}_t = \eta([0, t]) - t$ , for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . The process  $\hat{N}$  is a martingale called a *compensated Poisson process on the line*. We will extend **Theorem 5.1** in a way that can be seen as a *thermo-dynamical limit* of the previous example and that will yield convergence to a Gaussian mixture. At the end of the section, we discuss why a naive extension of **Theorem 5.1** that could be considered in order to obtain a Poisson mixture in the limit is not a good candidate.

Let us start with the Gaussian result. Recall that from Dynkin & Mandelbaum [10], we have that

$$(5.4) \quad \{n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{N}_{nt}; t \geq 0\} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} W,$$

where the convergence holds in a rather strong sense that we do not detail here. Having made this remark the following result appears quite natural.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let*

$$(5.5) \quad F_n = \frac{n^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\sqrt{2}} \int_0^1 t^{n-1} \left( \left( n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{N}_n \right)^2 - \left( n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{N}_{nt} \right)^2 \right) dt, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then,

$$(5.6) \quad F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} \mathbf{N}(0, W_1^2).$$

Moreover, there exists  $c > 0$ , such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$(5.7) \quad d_1(F_n, \mathbf{N}(0, W_1^2)) \leq cn^{-\frac{1}{6}}.$$

*Remark 12.* We cannot apply **Theorem 3.5** in order to obtain the quantitative part of our theorem. Indeed, the Gaussian variable  $W_1$  is a priori not measurable with respect to the underlying Poisson point process (and we do not know how to measurably construct a normal random variable from a Poisson point process), and the assumption that  $S$  is measurable with respect to  $\eta$  is crucial in **Theorem 3.5**. This is why we need **Theorem 3.9**.

*Proof.* By Itô's formula (see, for instance [14, Chapter I Theorem 4.57]), we have that

$$(5.8) \quad \hat{N}_t^2 = 2 \int_0^t \hat{N}_{s-} d\hat{N}_s + \sum_{s \leq t} \left( \hat{N}_s - \hat{N}_{s-} \right)^2.$$

Since, a Poisson process only has jumps of size 1, we find that

$$(5.9) \quad \hat{N}_t^2 = 2 \int_0^t \hat{N}_{s-} d\hat{N}_s + N_t.$$

Hence, we can write

$$(5.10) \quad F_n = \sqrt{2}G_n + H_n,$$

where

$$(5.11) \quad G_n = n^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^1 t^{n-1} \int_{nt}^n \hat{N}_s - d\hat{N}_s dt;$$

$$(5.12) \quad H_n = \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^1 t^{n-1} (N_n - N_{nt}) dt.$$

Recalling that  $N$  is a non-decreasing process and that  $\mathbb{E}N_t = t$ , we find that

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|H_n| &= 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{3}{2}} \int_0^1 t^{n-1} (1-t) dt \\ &= 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{3}{2}} \left( \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n+1} \right) \\ &= 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{n+1} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we will study the random variable

$$(5.14) \quad G_n = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^n \hat{N}_s - \left(\frac{s}{n}\right)^n d\hat{N}_s = \delta u_n,$$

where

$$(5.15) \quad u_n(s) = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{N}_s 1_{[0,n]}(s) \left(\frac{s}{n}\right)^n.$$

By the Heisenberg commutation relation, we find that

$$(5.16) \quad D_s G_n = u_n(s) + n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \int_s^n \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^n d\hat{N}_t.$$

Consequently, we write:

$$(5.17) \quad \int_0^1 u_n(s) D_s G_n ds = n^{-1} \int_0^n \hat{N}_s^2 \left(\frac{s}{n}\right)^{2n} ds + n^{-1} \int_0^n \hat{N}_s \left(\frac{s}{n}\right)^n \int_s^n \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^n d\hat{N}_t ds.$$

Following the notations of [Theorem 3.6](#), let us write:

$$(5.18) \quad C_n = \frac{\hat{N}_n^2}{2n+1};$$

$$(5.19) \quad \epsilon_{1,n} = -2n^{-(2n+1)} \int_0^n \frac{s^{2n+1}}{2n+1} \hat{N}_s - d\hat{N}_s;$$

$$(5.20) \quad \epsilon_{2,n} = -n^{-(2n+1)} \int_0^n \frac{s^{2n+1}}{2n+1} dN_s;$$

$$(5.21) \quad \epsilon_{3,n} = n^{-1} \int_0^n \hat{N}_s \left(\frac{s}{n}\right)^n \int_s^n \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^n d\hat{N}_t ds.$$

Using the integration by parts for Stieltjes integrals and by Itô's formula, we find that

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{aligned} n^{-1} \int_0^n \hat{N}_s^2 \left(\frac{s}{n}\right)^{2n} ds &= \frac{\hat{N}_n^2}{2n+1} - n^{-(2n+1)} \int_0^n \frac{s^{2n+1}}{2n+1} d\hat{N}_s^2 \\ &= C_n + \epsilon_{1,n} + \epsilon_{2,n}. \end{aligned}$$

By the Skorokhod isometry, the variance of the second term is given by

$$(5.23) \quad \mathbb{E}\epsilon_{1,n}^2 = 4n^{-(4n+2)} \int_0^n \frac{s^{4n+2}}{(2n+1)^2} ds = \frac{n^2}{(2n+1)^2(n+1)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

To show that  $(\epsilon_{2,n})$  vanishes, we write  $dN_s = d\hat{N}_s + ds$  and we remark that

$$(5.24) \quad \mathbb{E}|\epsilon_{2,n}| = n^{-(2n+1)} \int_0^n \frac{s^{2n+1}}{2n+1} ds = \frac{n}{(2n+1)(2n+2)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Now, let us show that  $(\epsilon_{3,n})$  vanishes. Recall that  $\hat{N}_s$  and  $\hat{N}_n - \hat{N}_s$  are independent. Hence, by Jensen's inequality:

$$(5.25) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\epsilon_{3,n}^2 &\leq n^{-1} \int_0^n s^{2n+1} n^{-2n} \int_s^n \left(\frac{t}{n}\right)^{2n} dt ds \\ &= n^2(2n+1)^{-1}((4n+2)^{-1} - (4n+3)^{-1}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Overall, we proved that

$$(5.26) \quad \int_0^1 u_n(s) D_s G_n ds \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} \frac{\hat{N}_1^2}{2}.$$

Let  $S_n = (2n+1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{N}_n$ . We have that  $D_s S_n = 1_{[0,n]}(s)(2n+1)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Hence,

$$(5.27) \quad b_n := S_n \int u_n(s) D_s S_n ds = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{N}_n (2n+1)^{-1} n^{-n} \int_0^n s^n \hat{N}_s ds.$$

Now, we compute

$$(5.28) \quad (2n+1)^{-2} n^{-2n} \mathbb{E} \int_0^n s^{2n} \hat{N}_s^2 ds = \frac{n^2}{(2n+1)^3} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Since  $\mathbb{E}n^{-1} \hat{N}_n^2 = 1$ , we proved that

$$(5.29) \quad \mathbb{E}|b_n| \leq \frac{n^2}{(2n+1)^3} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Similarly, we find that

$$(5.30) \quad a_n := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |u_n(s)| |D_s S_n|^2 ds = (2n+1)^{-1} n^{-\frac{1}{2}-n} \int_0^n |\hat{N}_s| s^n ds.$$

By Jensen's inequality and Itô's isometry, we find that:

$$(5.31) \quad \mathbb{E}a_n^2 \leq (2n+1)^{-2} n^{-(2n+1)} n \int s^{2n+1} ds = \frac{n^2}{(2n+1)^3} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Applying [Theorem 3.6](#) thus shows that

$$(5.32) \quad F_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{stably}} \mathbf{N}(0, W_1^2).$$

In order to derive the quantitative bounds, we observe that with the notations of [Theorem 3.9](#), the previous computations show that  $\Delta_2^{(n)} \sim n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Since  $\mathbb{E}|F_n|$  and  $\mathbb{E}|S_n|$  are bounded we have that  $\Delta_2^{(n)} = O(1)$ . Hence, by [Theorem 3.9](#):

$$(5.33) \quad d_1(F_n, \mathbf{N}(0, W_1^2)) \leq d_1(2^{\frac{1}{2}} G_n, \mathbf{N}(0, W_1^2)) + \mathbb{E}|H_n| = O(n^{-\frac{1}{6}} + d_1(n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{N}_n, W_1)).$$

By [7, Theorem 1.3], we find that

$$(5.34) \quad d_1(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\hat{N}_n, W_1) = O(n^{-1}((\mathbb{E}\hat{N}_n^4) - 3n^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}).$$

We easily compute that

$$(5.35) \quad \mathbb{E}\hat{N}_n^4 = 3n^2 + n.$$

Overall, we proved, as announced, that

$$(5.36) \quad d_1(F_n, \mathbf{N}(0, W_1^2)) = O(n^{-\frac{1}{6}}).$$

□

## References

- [1] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli & G. Savaré. “Bakry-Émery curvature-dimension condition and Riemannian Ricci curvature bounds”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 43.1 (2015), pp. 339–404. DOI: [10.1214/14-AOP907](https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AOP907).
- [2] D. Bakry & M. Émery. “Diffusions hypercontractives”. In: *Séminaire de probabilités, XIX, 1983/84*. Vol. 1123. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 1985, pp. 177–206. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0075847](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0075847).
- [3] N. Bouleau & F. Hirsch. *Dirichlet forms and analysis on Wiener space*. Vol. 14. De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1991, pp. x+325. DOI: [10.1515/9783110858389](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110858389).
- [4] N. Bourbaki. *Algèbre. Chapitres 1 à 3*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. XIII + 636. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-33850-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-33850-5).
- [5] S. Bourguin & G. Peccati. “Portmanteau inequalities on the Poisson space: mixed regimes and multidimensional clustering”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 19 (2014), no. 66, 42. DOI: [10.1214/EJP.v19-2879](https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v19-2879).
- [6] C. Döbler & G. Peccati. “Fourth moment theorems on the Poisson space: analytic statements via product formulae”. In: *Electron. Commun. Probab.* 23 (2018), Paper No. 91, 12. DOI: [10.1214/18-ECP196](https://doi.org/10.1214/18-ECP196).
- [7] C. Döbler & G. Peccati. “The fourth moment theorem on the Poisson space”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 46.4 (2018), pp. 1878–1916. DOI: [10.1214/17-AOP1215](https://doi.org/10.1214/17-AOP1215).
- [8] C. Döbler, A. Vidotto & G. Zheng. “Fourth moment theorems on the Poisson space in any dimension”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 23 (2018), 27 pp. DOI: [10.1214/18-EJP168](https://doi.org/10.1214/18-EJP168).
- [9] R. M. Dudley. *Real analysis and probability*. Vol. 74. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002, pp. x+555. DOI: [10.1017/CBO9780511755347](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511755347).
- [10] E. B. Dynkin & A. Mandelbaum. “Symmetric statistics, Poisson point processes, and multiple Wiener integrals”. In: *Ann. Statist.* 11.3 (1983), pp. 739–745. DOI: [10.1214/aos/1176346241](https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176346241).
- [11] N. Gozlan & C. Léonard. “Transport inequalities. A survey”. In: *Markov Process. Related Fields* 16.4 (2010), pp. 635–736.
- [12] D. Harnett & D. Nualart. “Central limit theorem for a Stratonovich integral with Malliavin calculus”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 41.4 (2013), pp. 2820–2879. DOI: [10.1214/12-AOP769](https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOP769).

- [13] K. Itô. “Spectral type of the shift transformation of differential processes with stationary increments”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 81 (1956), pp. 253–263. DOI: [10.2307/1992916](https://doi.org/10.2307/1992916).
- [14] J. Jacod & A. N. Shiryaev. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*. Second. Vol. 288. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003, pp. xx+661. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-662-05265-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-05265-5).
- [15] J. F. C. Kingman. *Poisson processes*. Vol. 3. Oxford Studies in Probability. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1993, pp. viii+104.
- [16] R. Lachièze-Rey & G. Peccati. “Fine Gaussian fluctuations on the Poisson space II: rescaled kernels, marked processes and geometric  $U$ -statistics”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 123.12 (2013), pp. 4186–4218. DOI: [10.1016/j.spa.2013.06.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2013.06.004).
- [17] R. Lachièze-Rey & G. Peccati. “Fine Gaussian fluctuations on the Poisson space, I: contractions, cumulants and geometric random graphs”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 18 (2013), no. 32, 32. DOI: [10.1214/EJP.v18-2104](https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v18-2104).
- [18] G. Last. “Stochastic analysis for Poisson processes”. In: *Stochastic analysis for Poisson point processes*. Vol. 7. Bocconi Springer Ser. Bocconi Univ. Press, [place of publication not identified], 2016, pp. 1–36. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-05233-5\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05233-5_1).
- [19] G. Last, G. Peccati & M. Schulte. “Normal approximation on Poisson spaces: Mehler’s formula, second order Poincaré inequalities and stabilization”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 165.3-4 (2016), pp. 667–723. DOI: [10.1007/s00440-015-0643-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-015-0643-7).
- [20] G. Last & M. D. Penrose. *Lectures on the Poisson process*. IMS Textbooks, 2017.
- [21] G. Last & M. D. Penrose. “Poisson process Fock space representation, chaos expansion and covariance inequalities”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 150.3-4 (2011), pp. 663–690. DOI: [10.1007/s00440-010-0288-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-010-0288-5).
- [22] M. Ledoux. “The geometry of Markov diffusion generators”. In: *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math.* (6) 9.2 (2000), pp. 305–366. URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AFST\\_2000\\_6\\_9\\_2\\_305\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AFST_2000_6_9_2_305_0).
- [23] I. Nourdin. *Malliavin-Stein approach*. URL: <https://sites.google.com/site/malliavinstein/home>.
- [24] I. Nourdin & D. Nualart. “Central limit theorems for multiple Skorokhod integrals”. In: *J. Theoret. Probab.* 23.1 (2010), pp. 39–64. DOI: [10.1007/s10959-009-0258-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10959-009-0258-y).
- [25] I. Nourdin, D. Nualart & G. Peccati. “Quantitative stable limit theorems on the Wiener space”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 44.1 (2016), pp. 1–41. DOI: [10.1214/14-AOP965](https://doi.org/10.1214/14-AOP965).
- [26] I. Nourdin & G. Peccati. *Normal approximations with Malliavin calculus*. Vol. 192. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012, pp. xiv+239. DOI: [10.1017/CBO9781139084659](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139084659).
- [27] I. Nourdin & G. Peccati. “Stein’s method on Wiener chaos”. In: *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 145.1-2 (2009), pp. 75–118. DOI: [10.1007/s00440-008-0162-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-008-0162-x).
- [28] D. Nualart & S. Ortiz-Latorre. “Central limit theorems for multiple stochastic integrals and Malliavin calculus”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 118.4 (2008), pp. 614–628. DOI: [10.1016/j.spa.2007.05.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2007.05.004).
- [29] D. Nualart. *Malliavin calculus and its applications*. Vol. 110. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009, pp. viii+85. DOI: [10.1090/cbms/110](https://doi.org/10.1090/cbms/110).
- [30] D. Nualart & G. Peccati. “Central limit theorems for sequences of multiple stochastic integrals”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 33.1 (2005), pp. 177–193. DOI: [10.1214/009117904000000621](https://doi.org/10.1214/009117904000000621).

- [31] G. Peccati, J. L. Solé, M. S. Taqqu & F. Utzet. “Stein’s method and normal approximation of Poisson functionals”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 38.2 (2010), pp. 443–478. DOI: [10.1214/09-AOP477](https://doi.org/10.1214/09-AOP477).
- [32] G. Peccati. “The Chen-Stein method for Poisson functionals”. Apr. 2012. URL: <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00654235>.
- [33] G. Peccati & M. Reitzner, eds. *Stochastic analysis for Poisson point processes*. Vol. 7. Bocconi & Springer Ser. Bocconi Univ. Press, 2016, pp. xv+346. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-05233-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05233-5).
- [34] G. Peccati & C. Thäle. “Gamma limits and  $U$ -statistics on the Poisson space”. In: *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* 10.1 (2013), pp. 525–560.
- [35] G. Peccati & M. Yor. “Four limit theorems for quadratic functionals of Brownian motion and Brownian bridge”. In: *Asymptotic methods in stochastics*. Vol. 44. Fields Inst. Commun. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004, pp. 75–87.
- [36] G. Peccati & C. Zheng. “Multi-dimensional Gaussian fluctuations on the Poisson space”. In: *Electron. J. Probab.* 15 (2010), no. 48, 1487–1527. DOI: [10.1214/EJP.v15-813](https://doi.org/10.1214/EJP.v15-813).
- [37] L. Pratelli & P. Rigo. “Total variation bounds for Gaussian functionals”. In: *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 129.7 (2019), pp. 2231–2248. DOI: [10.1016/j.spa.2018.07.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2018.07.005).
- [38] M. Reitzner & M. Schulte. “Central limit theorems for  $U$ -statistics of Poisson point processes”. In: *Ann. Probab.* 41.6 (2013), pp. 3879–3909. DOI: [10.1214/12-AOP817](https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOP817).
- [39] A. Rényi. “On mixing sequences of sets”. In: *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* 9 (1958), pp. 215–228. DOI: [10.1007/BF02023873](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02023873).
- [40] A. Rényi. “On stable sequences of events”. In: *Sankhyā Ser. A* 25 (1963), p. 293–302.
- [41] M. Schulte. “A central limit theorem for the Poisson-Voronoi approximation”. In: *Adv. in Appl. Math.* 49.3-5 (2012), pp. 285–306. DOI: [10.1016/j.aam.2012.08.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aam.2012.08.001).
- [42] D. Surgailis. “On multiple Poisson stochastic integrals and associated Markov semi-groups”. In: *Probab. Math. Statist.* 3.2 (1984), pp. 217–239.
- [43] C. Villani. *Optimal transport*. Vol. 338. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009, pp. xxii+973. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-71050-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-71050-9).