



HAL
open science

A CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM FOR FIELDS OF MARTINGALE DIFFERENCES

Dalibor Volný

► **To cite this version:**

Dalibor Volný. A CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM FOR FIELDS OF MARTINGALE DIFFERENCES. Comptes rendus hebdomadaires des séances de l'Académie des sciences. Série A, Sciences mathématiques, 2015, 353 (12), pp.1159-1163. 10.1016/j.crma.2015.09.017 . hal-02386840

HAL Id: hal-02386840

<https://hal.science/hal-02386840>

Submitted on 29 Nov 2019

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.

A CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM FOR FIELDS OF MARTINGALE DIFFERENCES

DALIBOR VOLNÝ

Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphaël Salem,
UMR 6085, Université de Rouen, France

ABSTRACT. We prove a central limit theorem for stationary random fields of martingale differences $f \circ T_{\underline{i}}$, $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, where $T_{\underline{i}}$ is a \mathbb{Z}^d action and the martingale is given by a commuting filtration. The result has been known for Bernoulli random fields; here only ergodicity of one of commuting transformations generating the \mathbb{Z}^d action is supposed.

INTRODUCTION

In study of the central limit theorem for dependent random variables, the case of martingale difference sequences has played an important role, cf. Hall and Heyde, [HaHe]. Limit theorems for random fields of martingale differences were studied for example by Basu and Dorea [BD], Morkvenas [M], Nahapetian [N], Poghosyan and Roelly [PR], Wang and Woodroffe [WaW]. Limit theorems for martingale differences enable a research of much more complicated processes and random fields. The method of martingale approximations, often called Gordin's method, originated by Gordin's 1969 paper [G1]. The approximation is possible for random fields as well, for most recent results cf. e.g. [WaW] and [VWa]. Remark that another approach was introduced by Dedecker in [D] (and is being used since); it applies both to sequences and to random fields.

For random fields, the martingale structure can be introduced in several different ways. Here we will deal with a stationary random field $f \circ T_{\underline{i}}$, $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, where f is a measurable function on a probability space $(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{A})$ and $T_{\underline{i}}$, $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is a group of commuting probability preserving transformations of $(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{A})$ (a \mathbb{Z}^d action). By $e_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we denote the vector $(0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$ having 1 on the i -th place and 0 at all other places, $1 \leq i \leq d$.

$\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}}$, $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is an invariant commuting filtration (cf. D. Khosnevisan, [K]) if

- (i) $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}} = T^{-\underline{i}}\mathcal{F}_{\underline{0}}$ for all $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,
- (ii) $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\underline{j}}$ for $\underline{i} \leq \underline{j}$ in the lexicographic order, and
- (iii) $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\underline{j}} = \mathcal{F}_{\underline{i} \wedge \underline{j}}$, $\underline{i}, \underline{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and $\underline{i} \wedge \underline{j} = (\min\{i_1, j_1\}, \dots, \min\{i_d, j_d\})$.

If, moreover, $E(E(f|\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}})|\mathcal{F}_{\underline{j}}) = E(f|\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i} \wedge \underline{j}})$, for every integrable function f , we say that the filtration is *completely commuting* (cf. [G2], [VWa]).

By $\mathcal{F}_l^{(q)}$, $1 \leq q \leq d$, $l \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote the σ -algebra generated by the union of all

$\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}}$ with $i_q \leq l$. For $d = 2$ we by $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j} = \mathcal{F}_j^{(2)}$ denote the σ -algebra generated by the union of all $\mathcal{F}_{i,j}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and in the same way we define $\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty}$.

We sometimes denote $f \circ T_{\underline{i}}$ by $U_{\underline{i}}f$; f will always be from \mathcal{L}^2 .

We say that $U_{\underline{i}}f$, $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is a *field of martingale differences* if f is $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{0}}$ -measurable and whenever $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is such that $i_q \leq 0$ for all $1 \leq q \leq d$ and at least one inequality is strict then $E(f | \mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}}) = 0$.

Notice that $U_{\underline{i}}f$ is then $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}}$ -measurable, $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and if $\underline{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is such that $j_k \leq i_k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq d$ and at least one inequality is strict, $E(U_{\underline{i}}f | \mathcal{F}_{\underline{j}}) = 0$.

Notice that by commutativity, if $U_{\underline{i}}f$ are martingale differences then

$$E(f | \mathcal{F}_{-\underline{1}}^{(q)}) = 0$$

for all $1 \leq q \leq d$. $(f \circ T_{e_q}^j)_j$ is thus a sequence of martingale differences for the filtration of $\mathcal{F}_j^{(q)}$. In particular, for $d = 2$, $(f \circ T_{e_2}^j)$ is a sequence of martingale differences for the filtration of $\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j} = \mathcal{F}_j^{(2)}$.

Recall that a measure preserving transformation T of $(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{A})$ is said to be *ergodic* if for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $T^{-1}A = A$, $\mu(A) = 0$ or $\mu(A) = 1$. Similarly, a \mathbb{Z}^d action $(T_{\underline{i}})_{\underline{i}}$ is ergodic if for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $T_{-\underline{i}}A = A$, $\mu(A) = 0$ or $\mu(A) = 1$.

A classical result by Billingsley and Ibragimov says that if $(f \circ T^i)_i$ is an ergodic sequence of martingale differences, the central limit theorem holds. The result does not hold for random fields, however.

Example. As noticed in paper by Wang, Woodroffe [WaW], for a 2-dimensional random field $Z_{i,j} = X_i Y_j$ where X_i and Y_j , $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, are mutually independent $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variables, we get a convergence towards a non normal law. The random field of $Z_{i,j}$ can be represented by a non ergodic action of \mathbb{Z}^2 :

Let $(\Omega, \mu, \mathcal{A})$ be a product of probability spaces $(\Omega', \mu', \mathcal{A}')$ and $(\Omega'', \mu'', \mathcal{A}'')$ equipped with ergodic measure preserving transformations T' and T'' . On Ω we then define a measure preserving \mathbb{Z}^2 action $T_{i,j}(x, y) = (T'^i x, T''^j y)$. The σ -algebras $\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}''$ are generated by $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ iid sequences of random variables $(e' \circ T'^i)_i$ and $(e'' \circ T''^i)_i$ respectively. The dynamical systems $(\Omega', \mu', \mathcal{A}', T')$ and $(\Omega'', \mu'', \mathcal{A}'', T'')$ are then Bernoulli hence ergodic (cf. [CSF]). On the other hand, for any $A' \in \mathcal{A}'$, $A' \times \Omega''$ is $T_{0,1}$ -invariant hence $T_{0,1}$ is not an ergodic transformation. Similarly we get that $T_{1,0}$ is not an ergodic transformation either. By ergodicity of $T', T'', A' \times \Omega'', A' \in \mathcal{A}'$, are the only $T_{0,1}$ -invariant measurable subsets of Ω and $A'' \times \Omega', A'' \in \mathcal{A}''$, are the only $T_{1,0}$ -invariant measurable subsets of Ω (modulo measure μ). Therefore, the only measurable subsets of Ω which are invariant both for $T_{0,1}$ and for $T_{1,0}$ are of measure 0 or of measure 1, i.e. the \mathbb{Z}^2 action $T_{i,j}$ is ergodic.

On Ω we define random variables X, Y by $X(x, y) = e'(x)$ and $Y(x, y) = e''(y)$. The random field of $(XY) \circ T_{i,j}$ then has the same distribution as the random field of $Z_{i,j} = X_i Y_j$ described above. The natural filtration of $\mathcal{F}_{i,j} = \sigma\{(XY) \circ T_{i',j'} : i' \leq i, j' \leq j\}$ is commuting and $((XY) \circ T_{i,j})_{i,j}$ is a field of martingale differences.

A very important particular case of a \mathbb{Z}^d action is the case when the σ -algebra \mathcal{A} is generated by iid random variables $U_{\underline{i}}e$, $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. The σ -algebras $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{j}} = \sigma\{U_{\underline{i}} : i_k \leq j_k, k = 1, \dots, d\}$ are then a completely commuting filtration and if $U_{\underline{i}}f$, $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a

martingale difference random field, the central limit theorem takes place (cf. [WW]). This fact enabled to prove a variety of limit theorems by martingale approximations (cf. e.g. [WaW], [VWa]).

For Bernoulli random fields, other methods of proving limit theorems have been used, cf. e.g. [ElM-V-Wu], [Wa], [BiDu].

The aim of this paper is to show that for a martingale difference random field, the CLT can hold under assumptions weaker than Bernoullicity.

MAIN RESULT

Let $T_{\underline{i}}, \underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, be a \mathbb{Z}^d action of measure preserving transformations on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$, $(\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}})_{\underline{i}, \underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, be a commuting filtration. By $e_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we denote the vector $(0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$ having 1 on the i -th place and 0 at all other places, $1 \leq i \leq d$.

Theorem. *Let $f \in L^2$, be such that $(f \circ T_{\underline{i}})_{\underline{i}}$ is a field of martingale differences for a completely commuting filtration $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}}$. If at least one of the transformations T_{e_i} , $1 \leq i \leq d$, is ergodic then the central limit theorem holds, i.e. for $n_1, \dots, n_d \rightarrow \infty$ the distributions of*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1 \dots n_d}} \sum_{i_1=1}^{n_1} \dots \sum_{i_d=1}^{n_d} f \circ T_{(i_1, \dots, i_d)}$$

weakly converge to $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ where $\sigma^2 = \|f\|_2^2$.

Remark 1. The results from [VoWa] remain valid for \mathbb{Z}^d actions satisfying the assumptions of the Theorem, Bernoullicity thus can be replaced by ergodicity of one of the transformations T_{e_i} . Under the assumptions of the Theorem we thus also get a weak invariance principle. [VoWa] implies many earlier results, cf. references therein and in [WaW].

Proof.

We prove the theorem for $d = 2$. Proof of the general case is similar. We suppose that the transformation $T_{0,1}$ is ergodic and $\|f\|_2 = 1$. To prove the central limit theorem for the random field it is sufficient to prove that for $m_k, n_k \rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(1) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_k n_k}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} f \circ T_{i,j} \quad \text{converge in distribution to } \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Recall the central limit theorem by D.L. McLeish (cf. [M]) saying that if $X_{n,i}$, $i = 1, \dots, k_n$, is an array of martingale differences such that

- (i) $\max_{1 \leq i \leq k_n} |X_{n,i}| \rightarrow 0$ in probability,
- (ii) there is an $L < \infty$ such that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq k_n} X_{n,i}^2 \leq L$ for all n , and
- (iii) $\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{n,i}^2 \rightarrow 1$ in probability,

then $\sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{n,i}$ converge to $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ in law.

Next, we will suppose $k_n = n$; we will denote $U_{i,j} f = f \circ T_{i,j}$. For a given positive integer v and positive integers u, n define

$$F_{i,v} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \sum_{j=1}^v U_{i,j} f, \quad X_{n,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} F_{i,v}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Clearly, $X_{n,i}$ are martingale differences for the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{i,\infty})_i$. We will verify the assumptions of McLeish's theorem.

The conditions (i) and (ii) are well known to follow from stationarity. For reader's convenience we recall their proofs.

(i) For $\epsilon > 0$ and any integer $v \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |X_{n,i}| > \epsilon\right) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(|X_{n,i}| > \epsilon) = n\mu\left(\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{nv}} \sum_{j=1}^v U_{0,j}f\right| > \epsilon\right) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} E\left(\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \sum_{j=1}^v U_{0,j}f\right)^2 1_{\left|\sum_{j=1}^v U_{0,j}f\right| \geq \epsilon\sqrt{nv}}\right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$; this proves (i). Notice that that the convergence is uniform for all v .

To see (ii) we note

$$\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |X_{n,i}|\right)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n X_{n,i}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \sum_{j=1}^v U_{i,j}f\right)^2$$

which implies $E\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |X_{n,i}|\right)^2 \leq 1$.

[WaW]

It remains to prove (iii).

Let us fix a positive integer m and for constants a_1, \dots, a_m consider the sums

$$\sum_{i=1}^m a_i \sum_{j=1}^v U_{i,j}f, \quad v \rightarrow \infty.$$

Then $(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i U_{i,j}f)_j$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$, are martingale differences for the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{\infty,j})_j$ and by the central limit theorem of Billingsley and Ibragimov [Bil], [I] (we can also prove using the McLeish's theorem)

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \sum_{j=1}^v \left(\sum_{i=1}^m a_i U_{i,j}f\right)$$

converge in law to $\mathcal{N}(0, \sum_{i=1}^m a_i^2)$. Notice that that here we use the assumption of ergodicity of $T_{0,1}$.

From this it follows that the random vectors $(F_{1,v}, \dots, F_{m,v})$ where

$$F_{u,v} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{v}} \sum_{j=1}^v U_{u,j}f, \quad u = 1, \dots, m,$$

converge in law to a vector (W_1, \dots, W_m) of m mutually independent and $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ distributed random variables. For a given $\epsilon > 0$, if $m = m(\epsilon)$ is sufficiently big then we have $\left\|1 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{u=1}^m F_{u,v}^2\right\|_1 < \epsilon/2$. Using a truncation argument we can from the convergence in law of $(F_{u,v}, \dots, F_{m,v})$ towards (W_1, \dots, W_m) deduce that for $m = m(\epsilon)$ sufficiently big and v bigger than some $v(m, \epsilon)$,

$$\left\|1 - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{u=1}^m F_{u,v}^2\right\|_1 < \epsilon.$$

Any positive integer N can be expressed as $N = pm + q$ where $0 \leq q \leq m - 1$. Therefore

$$(2) \quad 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N F_{i,v}^2 = \frac{m}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=km+1}^{(k+1)m} F_{i,v}^2 - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=mp+1}^N F_{i,v}^2 - \frac{q}{N}.$$

There exists an N_ϵ such that for $N \geq N_\epsilon$ we have $\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=mp+1}^N F_{i,v}^2 - \frac{q}{N} \right\|_1 < \epsilon$ hence if $v \geq v(m, \epsilon)$ and $N \geq N_\epsilon$ then

$$(3) \quad \left\| 1 - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N F_{i,v}^2 \right\|_1 = \left\| 1 - \frac{1}{Nv} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^v U_{i,j} f \right)^2 \right\|_1 < 2\epsilon.$$

This proves that for $\epsilon > 0$ there are positive integers $v(m, \epsilon/2)$ and N_ϵ such that for $M \geq v(m, \epsilon/2)$ and $n \geq N_\epsilon$, for $X_{n,i} = (1/\sqrt{n})F_{i,M}$

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n X_{n,i}^2 - 1 \right\|_1 = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{nM}} \sum_{j=1}^M U_{i,j} f \right)^2 - 1 \right\|_1 < \epsilon.$$

In the general case we can suppose that T_{e_d} is ergodic (we can permute the coordinates). Instead of $T_{i,j}$ we will consider transformations $T_{\underline{i},j}$ where $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d-1}$ and in (3), instead of segments $\{km + 1, \dots, km + m\}$ we take boxes of $(k_1m + i_1, \dots, k_{d-1}m + i_{d-1})$, $i_1, \dots, i_{d-1} \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.

This finishes the proof of the Theorem.

□

Remark 2. For any positive integer d there exists a random field of martingale differences $(f \circ T_{\underline{i}})$ for a commuting filtration of $\mathcal{F}_{\underline{i}}$ where $T_{\underline{i}}$, $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is a non Bernoulli \mathbb{Z}^d action and all T_{e_i} , $1 \leq i \leq d$, are ergodic.

To show this we take a Bernoulli \mathbb{Z}^d action $T_{\underline{i}}$, $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ generated by iid random variables $(e \circ T_{\underline{i}})$ as defined e.g. in [WaW] or [VWa].

Then we take another \mathbb{Z}^d action of irrational rotations on the unit circle (identified with the interval $[0, 1)$) generated by $\tau_{e_i} = \tau_{\theta_i}$, $\tau_{\theta_i} x = x + \theta_i \pmod{1}$; θ_i , $1 \leq i \leq d$, are linearly independent irrational numbers. The unit circle is equipped with the Borel σ -algebra \mathcal{B} and the (probability) Lebesgue measure λ .

On the product $\Omega \times [0, 1)$ with the product σ -algebra and the product measure we define the product \mathbb{Z}^d action $(T_{\underline{i}} \times \tau_{\underline{i}})(x, y) = (T_{\underline{i}}x, \tau_{\underline{i}}y)$. Because the product of ergodic transformations is ergodic, for every e_i , $1 \leq i \leq d$, $T_{e_i} \times \tau_{e_i}$ is ergodic. The product \mathbb{Z}^d action is not Bernoulli (it has irrational rotations for factors).

On $\Omega \times [0, 1)$ we define a filtration $\mathcal{F}_{(i_1, \dots, i_d)} = \sigma\{U_{(i'_1, \dots, i'_d)} e \circ \pi_1, i'_1 - 1 \leq i_1, \dots, i'_d \leq i_d, \pi_2^{-1}\mathcal{B}\}$ where π_1, π_2 are the coordinate projection of $\Omega \times [0, 1)$.

The filtration defined above is commuting and we can find a random field of martingale differences satisfying the assumptions of the Theorem.

Remark 3. In the one dimensional central limit theorem, non ergodicity implies a convergence towards a mixture of normal laws. This comes from the fact that using a decomposition of the measure μ into ergodic components, we get the “ergodic

case” for each of the components (cf. [V]); the variance is given by the limit of $(1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n U^i f^2$ which by the Birkhoff Ergodic Theorem exists a.s. and in L^1 and is T -invariant. In the case of a \mathbb{Z}^2 action (taking $d = 2$ for simplicity), the limit for $T_{0,1}$ need not be $T_{1,0}$ -invariant. This is exactly the case described in the Example and eventually we got there a convergence towards a law which is not normal.

Acknowledgement. I am very thankful to Jérôme Dedecker for his remarks, comments, and encouragement. I am also thankful to Zemer Kosloff; the idea/conjecture that it is the ergodicity of coordinate factors of the \mathbb{Z}^d action which can imply the central limit theorem came out first in our discussion after my lecture in April 2014.

REFERENCES

- [BD] Basu, A.K. and Dorea, C.C.Y., *On functional central limit theorem for stationary martingale random fields*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **33(3-4)** (1979), 307-316.
- [BiDu] Biermé, H. and Durieu, O., *Invariance principles for self-similar set-indexed random fields*, Transactions Amer. Math. Soc. **366** (2014), 5963-5989.
- [Bil] Billingsley, P., *On the Lindeberg-Lévy theorem for martingales*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (1961), 788-792.
- [CSF] Cornfeld, I.P., Fomin, S.V., and Sinai, Ya.G., *Ergodic Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.
- [ELM-V-Wu] El Machkouri, M., Volný, D., and Wu, W.B., *A central limit theorem for stationary random fields*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **123(1)** (2013), 1-14.
- [D] Dedecker, J., *A central limit theorem for stationary random fields*, Probab. Theory and Rel. Fields **110** (1998), 397-426.
- [G1] Gordin, M.I., *The central limit theorem for stationary processes*, Dokl. Acad. Nau SSSR **188** (1969), 739-741.
- [G2] Gordin, M.I., *Martingale c -boundary representation for a class of stationary random fields*, 364 (Veroyatnost i Statistika 14.2) 88-108, 236, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Petersburg Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) (2009).
- [HaHe] Hall, P. and Heyde, C., *Martingale Limit Theory and its Application*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.
- [I] Ibragimov, I.A., *A central limit theorem for a class of dependent random variables*, Theory Probab. Appl. **8** (1963), 83-89.
- [K] Khosnevisan, D., *Multiparameter processes, an introduction to random fields*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [Mc] McLeish, D.L., *Dependent central limit theorems and invariance principles*, Ann. Probab. **2** (1974), 620-628.
- [M] Morkvenas, R., *The invariance principle for martingales in the plane*, Litovsk. Mat. Sb. **24(4)** (1984), 127-132.
- [N] Nahapetian, B., *Billingsley-Ibragimov theorem for martingale-difference random fields and its applications to some models of classical statistical physics*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **320(12)** (1995), 1539-1544.
- [PR] Poghosyan S. and Roelly, S., *Invariance principle for martingale-difference random fields*, Stat. Probab. Lett. **38(3)** (1998), 235-245.
- [VWa] Volný, D. and Wang, Y., *An invariance principle for stationary random fields under Hannan’s condition*, Stoch. Proc. Appl. **124** (2014), 4012-4029.
- [Wa] Wang, Y., *An invariance principle for fractional Brownian sheets*, J. Theor. Probab. **27(4)** (2014), 1124-1139.
- [WaW] Wang, Y. and Woodroffe, M., *A new condition on invariance principles for stationary random fields*, Statist. Sinica **23(4)** (2013), 1673-1696.