

# Strong approximation of spatial random walk in random scenery

Pál Révész\* and Zhan Shi

*Technische Universität Wien & Université Paris VI*

**Summary.** We prove a strong approximation for the spatial Kesten–Spitzer random walk in random scenery by a Wiener process.

**Keywords.** Random walk in random scenery, strong approximation.

**2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.** 60J15; 60F15.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\{S_t, t = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  be a simple, symmetric random walk in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  (in this paper,  $d \geq 3$ ) and let  $Y(x)$  ( $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ) be an array of i.i.d.r.v.'s with

$$\mathbf{E}Y(x) = 0, \quad \mathbf{E}Y^2(x) = 1, \quad \mathbf{E}|Y(x)|^p < \infty, \quad p > 2.$$

We also assume that the processes  $\{S_t\}$  and  $\{Y(x)\}$  are independent.

The process

$$(1.1) \quad X(T) = \sum_{t=0}^T Y(S_t) \quad (T = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$$

is called *random walk in random scenery*. The study of this model was initiated by Kesten and Spitzer (1979). They investigated the case  $d = 1$ , and

---

\*Corresponding author

proved that in this case, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , non-Gaussian limit laws appear (see (1.5) of Kesten and Spitzer 1979) as limits of  $\{n^{-3/4}X(\lfloor nt \rfloor), t \geq 0\}$ . Moreover, in general, they studied the limiting behaviour of  $n^{-\delta}X(\lfloor nt \rfloor)$  with  $\delta = 1 - \alpha^{-1} + (\alpha\beta)^{-1}$ , in case of the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued random walk  $\{S_k\}$  being asymptotically stable of index  $\alpha \in (1, 2]$  and  $\{Y(x), x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$  being asymptotically stable of index  $\beta \in (0, 2]$ . They showed that with the indicated positive  $\delta$ ,  $n^{-\delta}X(\lfloor nt \rfloor)$  converges weakly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  to a self-similar process with stationary increments, which depends on  $(\alpha, \beta)$ . Recently, the weak convergence was strengthened into strong approximations by Khoshnevisan and Lewis (1998) for Gaussian sceneries, and by Csáki et al. (1999) for general sceneries.

Kesten and Spitzer (1979) also conjectured that in case of  $\{S_k\}$  being a simple random walk on the planar lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ , then  $(n \log n)^{-1/2}X(\lfloor nt \rfloor)$  converges weakly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  to a Brownian motion on  $[0, \infty)$ . This conjecture was proved by Bolthausen (1989) (see also Borodin 1980), and a strong approximation was obtained by Csáki et al. (2000). Bolthausen (1989) also noted that in dimensions greater than or equal to 3,  $T^{-1/2}X(T)$  is asymptotically normal. (Continuous-time analogues of these can be found in Rémillard and Dawson 1991).

The present paper is devoted to the case  $d \geq 3$ . We prove that, in this case,  $X(T)$  can be approximated with probability 1 by a Wiener process.

**THEOREM 1.1** *Let  $d \geq 3$ . Let  $\{S_t\}$  and  $\{Y(x)\}$  be defined on a rich enough probability space  $\{\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}\}$ . Then there exists a real-valued Wiener process  $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$  on  $\Omega$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have*

$$\left| X(T) - \left( \frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma} \right)^{1/2} W(T) \right| = o(T^{\vartheta+\varepsilon}) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where

$$\vartheta = \max\left(\frac{1}{p}, \frac{5}{12}\right)$$

and the constant  $\gamma = \gamma(d)$  is defined in Lemma 2.3.

Note that Theorem 1.1 readily implies

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \left( \frac{\gamma}{2-\gamma} \right)^{1/2} \frac{X(T)}{\sqrt{T}} < y \right\} = \Phi(y), \quad y \in \mathbb{R},$$

(where  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is the standard normal distribution function) and

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\gamma}{2 - \gamma} \right)^{1/2} (2T \log \log T)^{-1/2} X(T) = 1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Similar strong or weak laws can also be obtained.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 a few results on random walk are given. In Section 3 an invariance principle, strongly related to Theorem 1.1 is provided. Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 4.

Throughout the paper, we assume  $d \geq 3$ , and write  $\log x = \log \max(x, e)$ .

## 2 Random walk

Introduce the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(x, T) &= \#\{t : 0 < t \leq T, S_t = x\}, \quad (x \in \mathbb{Z}^d, 0 < T \leq \infty), \\ I(k, t) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } S_t \neq S_{t-j} \ (j = 1, 2, \dots, t) \text{ and } \xi(S_t, \infty) = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ A(k, T) &= \{x : \xi(x, T) > 0, \xi(x, \infty) = k\}, \\ a(k, T) &= \#\{x : x \in A(k, T)\} = \sum_{t=1}^T I(k, t) = \\ &= \#\{t : 0 < t \leq T, S_t \neq S_{t-j} \ (j = 1, 2, \dots, t), \xi(S_t, \infty) = k\}, \\ \gamma_t &= \gamma_t(d) = \mathbf{P}\{\xi(0, t-1) = 0\}, \\ N(t) &= \{S_t \neq S_{t-j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, t\}, \\ R(t, k) &= \{\xi(S_t, \infty) - \xi(S_t, t) = k\}, \\ V(u, v, \ell) &= \{\xi(S_u, v) - \xi(S_u, u) = \ell\}. \quad (0 \leq u < v) \end{aligned}$$

Now we recall a few known lemmas.

**LEMMA 2.1** (Pólya 1921)

$$\mathbf{P}\{S_{2t} = 0\} \sim 2 \left( \frac{d}{4t\pi} \right)^{d/2} \quad (t \rightarrow \infty).$$

**LEMMA 2.2** (Dvoretzky and Erdős 1951)

$$\mathbf{P}\{N(t)\} = \gamma_t.$$

**LEMMA 2.3** (Dvoretzky and Erdős 1951)  $\{\gamma_t\}$  is a decreasing sequence with

$$0 < \gamma_t - \gamma = O(t^{1-d/2})$$

where

$$\gamma = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_t.$$

**LEMMA 2.4** (Erdős and Taylor 1960)

$$\mathbf{P}\{\xi(0, \infty) = k\} = (1 - \gamma)^k \gamma.$$

The next lemmas are simple consequences of the above presented lemmas.

**LEMMA 2.5**

$$\mathbf{P}\{\xi(0, \infty) - \xi(0, T) > 0\} \leq O(T^{1-d/2}).$$

**Proof.** Clearly

$$\mathbf{P}\{\xi(0, \infty) - \xi(0, T) > 0\} \leq \sum_{t=T+1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{S_t = 0\}.$$

Hence we have Lemma 2.5 by Lemma 2.1. □

**LEMMA 2.6**

$$\mathbf{P}\{\xi(0, T) = k\} \leq \mathbf{P}\{\xi(0, \infty) = k\} + O(T^{1-d/2}) = \gamma(1 - \gamma)^k + O(T^{1-d/2}).$$

**Proof.** Since

$$\{\xi(0, T) = k\} \subset \{\xi(0, \infty) = k\} \cup \{\xi(0, \infty) - \xi(0, T) > 0\},$$

we have Lemma 2.6 by Lemmas 2.5 and 2.4. □

**LEMMA 2.7**

$$\mathbf{P}\{I(k, t) = 1\} = \mathbf{E}I(k, t) = \gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1} + (1 - \gamma)^{k-1}O(t^{1-d/2})$$

where  $O(\cdot)$  does not depend on  $k$ .

**Proof.** Observe that

$$\{I(k, t) = 1\} = N(t) \cap \{\xi(S_t, \infty) = k\}$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}\{N(t) \cap \xi(S_t, \infty) = k\} = \mathbf{P}\{N(t)\}\mathbf{P}\{\xi(0, \infty) = k - 1\}.$$

Hence we have Lemma 2.7 by Lemmas 2.2–2.4.  $\square$

**LEMMA 2.8** *For any  $0 < u < v$  and  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{I(k, u)I(k, v) = 1\} &= \gamma^4(1 - \gamma)^{2k-2} + (1 - \gamma)^{2k-2}O(u^{1-d/2}) + \\ &\quad + (1 - \gamma)^{k-1}O((v - u)^{1-d/2}). \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** Write  $r = r(u, v) = \lfloor (u + v)/2 \rfloor$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \{I(k, u)I(k, v) = 1\} &= N(u)R(u, k - 1)N(v)R(v, k - 1), \\ R(u, k - 1) &\subset V(u, r, k - 1) \cup \{\xi(S_u, \infty) - \xi(S_u, r) > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by Lemmas 2.2, 2.5, 2.4 and 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\{I(k, u)I(k, v) = 1\} &\leq \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\{N(u)V(u, r, k - 1)\}\mathbf{P}\{\{S_v \neq S_j, r \leq j \leq v - 1\} \cap R(v, k - 1)\} + \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}\{\{\xi(S_u, \infty) - \xi(S_u, r) > 0\} \cap R(v, k - 1)\} \leq \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\{N(u)V(u, r, k - 1)\}\gamma_{v-r}(1 - \gamma)^{k-1}\gamma + \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P}\{\xi(0, \infty) - \xi(0, r - u) > 0\}(1 - \gamma)^{k-1}\gamma = \\ &= \mathbf{P}\{N(u)V(u, r, k - 1)\}\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1} + (1 - \gamma)^{k-1}O((v - u)^{1-d/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we have Lemma 2.8 by Lemmas 2.2, 2.3 and 2.6.  $\square$

The following lemma is a trivial consequence of Lemma 2.7.

**LEMMA 2.9**

$$\mathbf{E}a(k, T) = T\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1} + (1 - \gamma)^{k-1}M(T)$$

where

$$M(T) = M_d(T) = \begin{cases} O(T^{1/2}) & \text{if } d = 3, \\ O(\log T) & \text{if } d = 4, \\ O(1) & \text{if } d \geq 5. \end{cases}$$

**LEMMA 2.10**

$$\text{Var } a(k, T) \leq (1 - \gamma)^{k-1} T M(T).$$

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.8 we have

$$\sum_{0 < u < v \leq T} \mathbf{E} I(k, u) I(k, v) \leq \binom{T}{2} \gamma^4 (1 - \gamma)^{2k-2} + (1 - \gamma)^{k-1} T M(T).$$

By Lemma 2.9

$$(\mathbf{E} a(k, T))^2 = T^2 \gamma^4 (1 - \gamma)^{2k-2} + (1 - \gamma)^{2k-2} T M(T).$$

Hence we have Lemma 2.10. □

Let

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha) = \{|a(k, T) - T\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1}| \geq T^{3/4+\alpha}(1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/4}\},$$

$$(2.2) \quad \mathcal{B}(T, \alpha) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha).$$

Then we have

**LEMMA 2.11**

$$\mathbf{P}\{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)\} \leq c_1 (1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/2} T^{-2\alpha} \quad (0 < \alpha < 1/4),$$

where  $c_1 = c_1(d)$  is a constant depending only on  $d$ .

**Proof.** By Lemmas 2.9, 2.10 and the Chebyshev inequality we have

$$\mathbf{P}\{|a(k, T) - T\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1}| \geq \lambda(1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/2} T^{3/4}\} \leq \frac{c_2}{\lambda^2},$$

for some  $c_2 = c_2(d)$ . Choosing

$$\lambda = T^\alpha (1 - \gamma)^{-(k-1)/4}$$

we have Lemma 2.11. □

Lemma 2.11 easily implies

**LEMMA 2.12**

$$\mathbf{P}\{\mathcal{B}(T, \alpha)\} \leq c_1 (1 - (1 - \gamma)^{1/2})^{-1} T^{-2\alpha}.$$

**LEMMA 2.13** *There exists a sufficiently large constant  $c_3 = c_3(d)$  such that for all  $k \geq c_3 \log T$ ,*

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)} \subset \{a(k, T) = 0\},$$

where  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  denotes the complement of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Proof.** Trivial. □

Now, we present the main result of this section.

**THEOREM 2.1** *Among the events  $\mathcal{B}(T, \alpha)$  ( $T = 1, 2, \dots$ ) only finitely many might occur with probability 1 if  $1/12 < \alpha < 1/4$ .*

**Proof.** Let

$$T_j = \lfloor j^K \rfloor, \quad 2K\alpha > 1, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

Then by Lemma 2.12 among the events  $\mathcal{B}(T_j, \alpha)$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots$ ) only finitely many might occur with probability 1. Let  $T_j \leq t < T_{j+1}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} a(k, t) &\leq a(k, T_{j+1}) \leq T_{j+1} \gamma^2 (1 - \gamma)^{k-1} + T_{j+1}^{3/4+\alpha} (1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/4} \leq \\ &\leq T_j \gamma^2 (1 - \gamma)^{k-1} + T_j^{3/4+\alpha+\varepsilon} (1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/4} \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  if  $j$  is big enough and

$$(2\alpha)^{-1} < K < \left(\frac{1}{4} - \alpha\right)^{-1}.$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} a(k, t) &\geq a(k, T_j) \geq T_j \gamma^2 (1 - \gamma)^{k-1} - T_j^{3/4+\alpha} (1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/4} \geq \\ &\geq T_{j+1} \gamma^2 (1 - \gamma)^{k-1} - T_j^{3/4+\alpha+\varepsilon} (1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/4} \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  if  $j$  is big enough and  $K$  satisfies the above inequality. Hence we have Theorem 2.1. □

### 3 An invariance principle

Throughout this section,  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  denote a sequence of i.i.d.r.v.'s with

$$\mathbf{E}Z_1 = 0, \quad \mathbf{E}Z_1^2 = 1, \quad \mathbf{E}|Z_1|^p < \infty, \quad p > 2.$$

We first recall two useful results.

**LEMMA 3.1** (Komlós et al. 1976, Major 1976) *Let  $\{Z_n\}$  be defined on a rich enough probability space. Then there exists a Wiener process  $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$  such that*

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k Z_i - W(k) \right| > z \right\} < Cnz^{-p}$$

if

$$0 < z < (n \log n)^{1/2}$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant depending only on the distribution of  $Z_1$ .

**LEMMA 3.2** (Csörgő and Révész 1981, p. 24) *Let  $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$  be a standard Wiener process. For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a constant  $c_4 = c_4(\varepsilon)$  such that for all  $v > 0$  and all  $h \in (0, 1)$ ,*

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sup_{0 \leq s, t \leq 1, |t-s| < h} |W(s) - W(t)| \geq v\sqrt{h} \right) \leq \frac{c_4}{h} \exp \left( -\frac{v^2}{2 + \varepsilon} \right).$$

The condition “ $z < (n \log n)^{1/2}$ ” in Lemma 3.1 can be removed, as long as we replace  $Cnz^{-p}$  by a larger term. Indeed, when  $n > z^2$ , we have  $z < (n \log n)^{1/2}$ , thus Lemma 3.1 applies. On the other hand, if  $n \leq z^2$ , then  $n \leq n^*$  where  $n^* = \lfloor z^2 \rfloor + 1$ . Since  $z < (n^* \log n^*)^{1/2}$ , we can apply the lemma to  $(n^*, z)$  in place of  $(n, z)$ , to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k Z_i - W(k) \right| > z \right\} &\leq \mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq n^*} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k Z_i - W(k) \right| > z \right\} \leq \\ &\leq \frac{Cn^*}{z^p} \leq \frac{C(z^2 + 1)}{z^p}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, whenever  $n \geq 1$  and  $z > 0$ ,

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k Z_i - W(k) \right| > z \right\} \leq c_5 \frac{\max(n, z^2)}{z^p}.$$

So we arrive at the following form of Lemme 3.1 which is more appropriate for applications later.

**LEMMA 3.3** *After possible redefinitions of variables, there exists a Wiener process  $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$  such that for all  $n \geq 1$  and all  $z > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k Z_i - W(k) \right| > z \right\} \leq c_5 \frac{n + z^2}{z^p},$$

where  $c_5$  is a finite constant depending on the law of  $Z_1$ .

Now we turn to the study of  $X(T) = \sum_{t=0}^T Y(S_t)$ , the random walk in random scenery which was introduced in (1.1). We recall that the simple random walk  $\{S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  is independent of the random scenery  $\{Y(x), x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ .

We first look at  $\sum_{x \in A(k, T)} Y(x)$  (for the definition of  $A(k, T)$ , see Section 2). According to Lemma 3.3, conditionally on  $\{S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , there exists a sequence of independent Wiener processes (depending on  $S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ ), denoted by  $\{W_k(\cdot)\}_{k \geq 1}$ , such that for all  $y > 0$ ,

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left| \sum_{x \in A(k, t)} Y(x) - W_k(a(k, t)) \right| > y \mid S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots \right\} \leq \leq c_5 \frac{a(k, T) + y^2}{y^p}.$$

We mention that both  $A(k, t)$  and  $a(k, t)$  are measurable with respect to  $\sigma\{S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ .

Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1/4)$ . Recall  $\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)$  from (2.1) in Section 2, and write  $\mathcal{B}(T, \alpha) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)$  as before.

Fix  $r > 1/p$  and let

$$B_k = \left\{ \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left| \sum_{x \in A(k, t)} Y(x) - W_k(a(k, t)) \right| > T^r \right\}.$$

It is clear that

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k \right\} \leq \mathbf{P}\{\mathcal{B}(T, \alpha)\} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\{\overline{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)} \cap B_k\}.$$

By Lemma 2.13, when  $k \geq c_3 \log T$ , on  $\overline{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)}$  we have  $a(k, T) = 0$  (thus  $A(k, t) = \emptyset$  for any  $t \leq T$ ), which implies  $B_k = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\overline{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)} \cap B_k = \emptyset$  for all  $k \geq c_3 \log T$ . On the other hand, Lemma 2.12 guarantees  $\mathbf{P}\{\mathcal{B}(T, \alpha)\} \leq c_6/T^{2\alpha}$ . Accordingly,

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbf{P} \left\{ \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k \right\} \leq \frac{c_6}{T^{2\alpha}} + \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor c_3 \log T \rfloor} \mathbf{P}\{\overline{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)} \cap B_k\}.$$

Observe that each  $\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)$  is measurable with respect to  $\sigma\{S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . Moreover, on  $\overline{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)}$ , we have

$$a(k, T) \leq T\gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{k-1} + T^{3/4+\alpha}(1-\gamma)^{(k-1)/4} \leq 2T(1-\gamma)^{(k-1)/4}.$$

In view of the inequality (3.1), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}\{\overline{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)} \cap B_k \mid S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\} \leq \\ & \leq c_5 \frac{2T(1-\gamma)^{(k-1)/4} + T^{2r}}{T^{rp}} = \\ & = \frac{2c_5(1-\gamma)^{(k-1)/4}}{T^{rp-1}} + \frac{c_5}{T^{r(p-2)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Going back to (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k \right\} & \leq \frac{c_6}{T^{2\alpha}} + \frac{2c_5}{T^{rp-1}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1-\gamma)^{(k-1)/4} + \frac{c_5 c_3 \log T}{T^{r(p-2)}} \leq \\ & \leq \frac{c_6}{T^{2\alpha}} + \frac{c_7}{T^{rp-1}} + \frac{c_8 \log T}{T^{r(p-2)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $r > 1/p$ , we can choose a constant  $b$  such that

$$b > \max \left( \frac{1}{2\alpha}, \frac{1}{rp-1}, \frac{1}{r(p-2)} \right).$$

Take  $T = T_\ell = \lfloor \ell^b \rfloor$  (for  $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$ ). By the Borel–Cantelli lemma, almost surely for all large  $\ell$  and all  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq T_\ell} \left| \sum_{x \in A(k,t)} Y(x) - W_k(a(k,t)) \right| \leq (T_\ell)^r.$$

Let  $T \in [T_\ell, T_{\ell+1}]$ . For large  $T$  and all  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \left| \sum_{x \in A(k,t)} Y(x) - W_k(a(k,t)) \right| \leq \\ & \leq \max_{1 \leq t \leq T_{\ell+1}} \left| \sum_{x \in A(k,t)} Y(x) - W_k(a(k,t)) \right| \leq (T_{\ell+1})^r \leq 2T^r. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\{W_k(\cdot)\}_{k \geq 1}$  are independent Wiener processes under the conditional probability  $\mathbf{P}\{\cdot | S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ , they are also independent Wiener processes under the absolute probability  $\mathbf{P}$ . As  $r > 1/p$  is arbitrary, we have succeeded in proving the following: for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , when  $T$  goes to infinity,

$$(3.3) \quad \sup_{k \geq 1} \left| \sum_{x \in A(k,T)} Y(x) - W_k(a(k,T)) \right| = o\left(T^{1/p+\varepsilon}\right) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Now we need to control the increment  $W_k(a(k,T)) - W_k(T\gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{k-1})$ . Fix any  $1/12 < \alpha < 1/4$ . On  $\overline{\mathcal{B}(T, \alpha)}$ ,  $|a(k,T) - T\gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{k-1}| < T^{3/4+\alpha}$ , which yields

$$|W_k(a(k,T)) - W_k(T\gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{k-1})| \leq \Delta_k(T),$$

where

$$\Delta_k(T) = \sup_{0 \leq s, t \leq 2T, |t-s| < T^{3/4+\alpha}} |W_k(s) - W_k(t)|.$$

Now using the scaling property of the Wiener process, and applying Lemma 3.2 to  $h = T^{\alpha-1/4}/2$ ,  $\varepsilon = 1$  and  $v = 3\sqrt{\log T}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P}\left(\Delta_k(T) \geq 3T^{\alpha/2+3/8}(\log T)^{1/2}\right) = \\ & = \mathbf{P}\left(\sup_{0 \leq s, t \leq 1, |t-s| < T^{\alpha-1/4}/2} |W_k(s) - W_k(t)| \geq \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}T^{\alpha/2-1/8}(\log T)^{1/2}\right) \leq \\ & \leq c_9 T^{-\alpha-11/4}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c_9$  is an absolute constant. As a consequence,

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \Delta_k(T) \geq 3T^{\alpha/2+3/8}(\log T)^{1/2} \right) \leq c_9 T^{-\alpha-7/4},$$

which, by virtue of the Borel–Cantelli lemma, yields that, for any  $1/12 < \alpha < 1/4$ ,

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \Delta_k(T) = O \left( T^{\alpha/2+3/8}(\log T)^{1/2} \right) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since  $|W_k(a(k, T)) - W_k(T\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1})| \leq \Delta_k(T)$  on  $\overline{\mathcal{B}(T, \alpha)}$ , and since by Theorem 2.1 almost surely only finitely many events among  $\{\mathcal{B}(T, \alpha)\}_{T=1,2,\dots}$  can occur, we can go back to (3.3) to see that, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , with probability one,

$$(3.4) \quad \max_{1 \leq k \leq T} \left| \sum_{x \in A(k, T)} Y(x) - W_k(T\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1}) \right| = o \left( T^{\vartheta+\varepsilon} \right),$$

where  $\vartheta = \max(1/p, 5/12)$ .

For large  $k$ , it is easy to estimate the difference between  $\sum_{x \in A(k, T)} Y(x)$  and  $W_k(T\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1})$ . More precisely, we now prove that both terms are very small when  $k$  is a large constant multiple of  $\log T$ . We first look at  $\sum_{x \in A(k, T)} Y(x)$ . Let  $1/12 < \alpha < 1/4$ . Again, thanks to Theorem 2.1, we only have to work on the set  $\overline{\mathcal{B}(T, \alpha)} = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \overline{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)}$ . Recall that by Lemma 2.13, for  $k \geq c_3 \log T$ , on  $\overline{\mathcal{A}(k, T, \alpha)}$ , we have  $a(k, T) = 0$ , i.e.,  $A(k, T) = \emptyset$ . Consequently, with probability one, for all large  $T$ ,

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{x \in A(k, T)} Y(x) = 0, \quad k \geq c_3 \log T.$$

On the other hand, we can choose  $c_{10} = c_{10}(d)$  sufficiently large so that  $(1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/12} \leq 1/T$  for all  $k \geq c_{10} \log T$ . Accordingly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} \left( \sup_{k \geq c_{10} \log T} \frac{|W_k(T\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1})|}{(1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/4}} \geq 1 \right) \leq \\ & \leq \mathbf{P} \left( \sup_{k \geq c_{10} \log T} \frac{|W_k(T\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1})|}{T(1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/3}} \geq 1 \right) \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{k \geq c_{10} \log T} \mathbf{P} \left( |W_k(T\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{k-1})| > T(1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/3} \right) \leq \\ & \leq \sum_{k \geq c_{10} \log T} \exp \left( -\frac{T}{2\gamma^2(1 - \gamma)^{(k-1)/3}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is summable for  $T \geq 1$ . By the Borel–Cantelli lemma, uniformly for all  $k \geq c_{10} \log T$ ,

$$W_k(T\gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{k-1}) = O\left((1-\gamma)^{(k-1)/4}\right) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Let  $c_{11} = c_{10} + c_3$ . Taking (3.5) into account, we obtain: uniformly for  $k \geq c_{11} \log T$ ,

$$\sum_{x \in A(k,T)} Y(x) - W_k(T\gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{k-1}) = O\left((1-\gamma)^{(k-1)/4}\right) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

This, jointly considered with (3.4), yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \sum_{x \in A(k,T)} Y(x) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} kW_k(T\gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{k-1}) = o\left(T^{\vartheta+\varepsilon}\right) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Take

$$W(T) = \left(\frac{\gamma}{2-\gamma}\right)^{1/2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} kW_k(T\gamma^2(1-\gamma)^{k-1}), \quad T \geq 0,$$

which is again a standard Wiener process. We have therefore proved the following

**THEOREM 3.1** *There exists a Wiener process  $\{W(t), t \geq 0\}$  such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \sum_{x \in A(k,T)} Y(x) - \left(\frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma}\right)^{1/2} W(T) = o(T^{\vartheta+\varepsilon}) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where  $\vartheta = \max(1/p, 5/12)$ .

We call your attention to the following corollary of Theorems 1.1 and 3.1.

**COROLLARY.** *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$X(T) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \sum_{x \in A(k,T)} Y(x) = o(T^{\vartheta+\varepsilon}) \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where  $\vartheta$  is as in Theorem 1.1 and

$$A(k,T) = \{x : \xi(x,T) > 0, \xi(x,\infty) = k\}.$$

## 4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let  $\{S_t, t = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  be a simple, symmetric random walk in  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  ( $d \geq 3$ ), independent of the scenery  $\{Y(x), x \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$  which is an array of i.i.d.r.v.'s with

$$\mathbf{E}Y(x) = 0, \quad \mathbf{E}Y^2(x) = 1, \quad \mathbf{E}|Y(x)|^p < \infty, \quad \text{for some } p > 2.$$

To prove Theorem 1.1, we assume  $p \leq 12/5$  without loss of generality (otherwise, we replace  $p$  by  $\min(p, 12/5)$ ).

Introduce the following notations:

$$\begin{aligned} J_T(k, t) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } S_t \neq S_{t-j} \ (j = 1, 2, \dots, t) \text{ and } \xi(S_t, T) = k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ B(k, T) &= \{x : \xi(x, T) = k\}, \\ \xi^*(T) &= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \xi(x, T), \\ V(T) &= \sum_{i,j=0}^T \mathbf{1}_{\{S_i=S_j\}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_A$  is the indicator of  $A$ . Note that  $T \leq V(T) \leq T\xi^*(T)$ .

**LEMMA 4.1** *There exists a constant  $c_{12} = c_{12}(d) \in (0, \infty)$ , depending only on  $d$ , such that for all  $T \geq 1$  and  $y \geq 1$ ,*

$$(4.1) \quad \mathbf{P}\{\xi^*(T) \geq y\} \leq T \exp(-c_{12}y).$$

**Proof.** This was implicitly proved in Erdős and Taylor (1951). For any  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ,  $\xi(x, T)$  is stochastically smaller than or equal to  $\xi(0, T)$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbf{P}\{\xi^*(T) \geq y\} \leq T \sup_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbf{P}\{\xi(0, T) \geq y\}.$$

Now (4.1) follows from Lemma 2.4. □

**LEMMA 4.2** *Let  $0 < t \leq T$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{P}\{I(k, t) \neq J_T(k, t)\} = (1 - \gamma)^{k/2} O\left((T - t)^{1-d/2}\right),$$

where as before  $O(\cdot)$  does not depend on  $k$ .

**Proof.** Let

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_1 &= \nu_1(t, T) = \max \left\{ m : t \leq m \leq \frac{T+t}{2}, S_m = S_t \right\}, \\ \nu_2 &= \nu_2(t, T) = \min \left\{ m : m > \frac{T+t}{2}, S_m = S_t \right\},\end{aligned}$$

with the usual convention that  $\min \emptyset = \infty$ . Note that  $\nu_2 = \infty$  with positive probability. We have

$$(4.2) \quad \{I(k, t) \neq J_T(k, t)\} = E_1 \cup E_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}E_1 &= \left\{ I(k, t) \neq J_T(k, t), \xi(S_t, \nu_1) \geq \frac{k}{2} \right\}, \\ E_2 &= \left\{ I(k, t) \neq J_T(k, t), \xi(S_t, \nu_1) < \frac{k}{2} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We call  $S_t$  to be a new site if  $S_t \neq S_{t-j}$  for all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, t$ . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}E_1 &\subseteq \left\{ S_t \text{ is a new site, } \xi(S_t, \nu_1) \geq \frac{k}{2}, \exists u \geq T, S_u = S_{\nu_1} = S_t \right\} \subseteq \\ &\subseteq \left\{ S_t \text{ is a new site, } S_t \text{ is visited at least } (k/2) \text{ times up to } \nu_1, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{and the random walk returns to } S_{\nu_1} \text{ at least once after } T \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

By the strong Markov property and Lemmas 2.5 and 2.7 (noting that  $T - \nu_1 \geq (T - t)/2$ ), we get

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbf{P}(E_1) = (1 - \gamma)^{k/2} O\left((T - t)^{1-d/2}\right).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}E_2 &\subseteq \left\{ \nu_2 < \infty, \xi(S_t, \infty) - \xi(S_t, \nu_2) \geq \frac{k}{2} \right\} \subseteq \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \text{the random walk returns to } S_t \text{ at } \nu_2 < \infty, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \text{the site } S_t = S_{\nu_2} \text{ is visited at least } (k/2) \text{ times after } \nu_2 \right\},\end{aligned}$$

which, in view of the strong Markov property and Lemmas 2.5 and 2.4 (noting that  $\nu_2 - t \geq (T - t)/2$ ), yields

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbf{P}(E_2) = O\left((T - t)^{1-d/2}\right) (1 - \gamma)^{k/2}.$$

Combining (4.2), (4.3) and (4.4) implies Lemma 4.2.  $\square$

**LEMMA 4.3** *Let*

$$Z(k, T) = \sum_{x \in A(k, T)} Y(x) - \sum_{x \in B(k, T)} Y(x) = \sum_{t=1}^T Y(S_t)(I(k, t) - J_T(k, t)).$$

*Then we have*

$$\mathbf{E}(Z(k, T))^2 = (1 - \gamma)^{k/2} O(M(T)),$$

*where  $M(T)$  is as in Lemma 2.9.*

**Proof.** Write

$$\begin{aligned} C(k, T) &= \{t : 0 < t \leq T, I(k, t) = 1, J_T(k, t) = 0\}, \\ D(k, T) &= \{t : 0 < t \leq T, I(k, t) = 0, J_T(k, t) = 1\}, \\ c(k, T) &= \#\{t : t \in C(k, T)\}, \\ d(k, T) &= \#\{t : t \in D(k, T)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$Z(k, T) = \sum_{t \in C(k, T)} Y(S_t) - \sum_{t \in D(k, T)} Y(S_t).$$

Hence by Lemma 4.2

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(Z(k, T))^2 &= \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}\left\{(Z(k, T))^2 \mid S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\right\} = \\ &= \mathbf{E}(c(k, T) + d(k, T)) = \\ &= O\left((1 - \gamma)^{k/2} \sum_{t=1}^T (T - t)^{1-d/2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which, in turn, implies Lemma 4.3.  $\square$

**LEMMA 4.4** *Let  $X(T)$  be the random walk in random scenery defined in (1.1), and let  $r > 0$ . If  $T_n = \lfloor n^r \rfloor$ , then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,*

$$X(T_n) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \sum_{x \in A(k, T_n)} Y(x) = o\left(T_n^{1/4+1/(2r)+\varepsilon}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

**Proof.** We can write  $X(T)$  as

$$X(T) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \sum_{x \in B(k, T)} Y(x).$$

According to Lemma 4.3,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \left( X(T) - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k \sum_{x \in A(k, T)} Y(x) \right)^2 \right] = O(M(T)).$$

Since  $M(T) = O(T^{1/2})$ , an application of Chebyshev's inequality and the Borel–Cantelli lemma immediately yields the desired result.  $\square$

Now we recall two known results. The first (Lemma 4.5), which can be found in Lewis (1993), is a maximal inequality for  $X(T)$ . See also Bolthausen (1989) for a detailed proof, formulated for dimension  $d = 2$  though valid for any dimension. The second result, borrowed from p. 849 of Shorack and Wellner (1986), is a refinement of the classical Berry–Esseen inequality.

**LEMMA 4.5** *For  $T \geq 1$  and  $a > \sqrt{2}$ ,*

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} X(t) > a\sqrt{V(T)} \right\} \leq 2\mathbf{P} \left\{ X(T) > (a - \sqrt{2})\sqrt{V(T)} \right\}.$$

**LEMMA 4.6** *Let  $\{\eta_i\}_{i \geq 1}$  be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with  $\mathbf{E}(\eta_1) = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{E}(\eta_1^2) = 1$  and  $\mathbf{E}(|\eta_1|^p) < \infty$  for some  $2 < p \leq 3$ . Then there exists a constant  $c_{13} = c_{13}(p) \in (0, \infty)$ , depending only on  $p$ , such that for all  $x \neq 0$  and all  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$\left| \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i > \sqrt{n} x \right\} - \mathbf{P} \{ \mathcal{N}(0, 1) > x \} \right| \leq c_{13} \frac{n}{(\sqrt{n}|x|)^p},$$

where  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  denotes a standard Gaussian variable.

We present a few preliminary estimates.

**LEMMA 4.7** For  $T \geq 1$ ,  $v > 0$  and  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{x \in B(k, T)} Y(x) \right| > v \right\} \leq \exp \left( -\frac{v^2}{2T} \right) + 2c_{13} \frac{T}{v^p}.$$

**Proof.** According to Lemma 4.6, for any  $x > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \right| > \sqrt{n} x \right\} &\leq \mathbf{P} \{ |\mathcal{N}(0, 1)| > x \} + 2c_{13} \frac{n}{(\sqrt{n} |x|)^p} \\ &\leq \exp \left( -\frac{x^2}{2} \right) + 2c_{13} \frac{n}{(\sqrt{n} |x|)^p}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $b(k, T) = \#B(k, T)$ . Conditioning on the random walk  $\{S_i, i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ ,  $\sum_{x \in B(k, T)} Y(x)$  is the sum of  $b(k, T)$  random variables which are i.i.d. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{x \in B(k, T)} Y(x) \right| > v \right\} \leq \mathbf{E} \exp \left( -\frac{v^2}{2b(k, T)} \right) + 2c_{13} \mathbf{E} \frac{b(k, T)}{v^p}.$$

This yields Lemma 4.7 by virtue of the fact that  $b(k, T) \leq T$ .  $\square$

**LEMMA 4.8** If  $T \geq 1$ ,  $\lambda > 0$  and  $y \geq 1$ , then

$$\mathbf{P} \{ |X(T)| > \lambda \} \leq T e^{-c_{12} y} + y \exp \left( -\frac{\lambda^2}{2y^2 T} \right) + 2c_{13} \frac{y^{p+1} T}{\lambda^p}.$$

**Proof.** We have

$$X(T) = \sum_{k=1}^{\xi^*(T)} k \sum_{x \in B(k, T)} Y(x).$$

Applying Lemma 4.1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \{ |X(T)| > \lambda \} &\leq \mathbf{P} \{ \xi^*(T) > y \} + \mathbf{P} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^y k \left| \sum_{x \in B(k, T)} Y(x) \right| > \lambda \right\} \\ &\leq T e^{-c_{12} y} + \sum_{k=1}^y \mathbf{P} \left\{ \left| \sum_{x \in B(k, T)} Y(x) \right| > \frac{\lambda}{y} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the desired estimate by applying Lemma 4.7 to  $v = \lambda/y$ .  $\square$

**LEMMA 4.9** For  $T \geq 1$ ,  $z > 0$ ,  $y \geq 1$  and  $a \geq \sqrt{2}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X(t)| > z \right\} &\leq 4T e^{-c_{12} y} + 4y \exp \left( -\frac{a^2}{2y^2} \right) + \\ &\quad + \frac{8c_{13} y^{p+1}}{a^p T^{(p-2)/2}} + 2T \exp \left( -\frac{c_{12} z^2}{4T a^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

**Proof.** Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} X(t) > z \right\} &\leq \mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} X(t) > (a + \sqrt{2}) \sqrt{V(T)} \right\} + \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P} \left\{ V(T) > \frac{z^2}{(a + \sqrt{2})^2} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which, in view of Lemma 4.5 and the fact that  $T \leq V(T) \leq T \xi^*(T)$ , is

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 2\mathbf{P} \left\{ X(T) > a\sqrt{V(T)} \right\} + \mathbf{P} \left\{ \xi^*(T) > \frac{z^2}{T(a + \sqrt{2})^2} \right\} \leq \\ &\leq 2\mathbf{P} \left\{ X(T) > a\sqrt{T} \right\} + \mathbf{P} \left\{ \xi^*(T) > \frac{z^2}{4T a^2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.8,

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ X(T) > a\sqrt{T} \right\} \leq T e^{-c_{12} y} + y \exp \left( -\frac{a^2}{2y^2} \right) + \frac{2c_{13} y^{p+1}}{a^p T^{(p-2)/2}},$$

whereas by Lemma 4.1,

$$\mathbf{P} \left\{ \xi^*(T) > \frac{z^2}{4T a^2} \right\} \leq T \exp \left( -\frac{c_{12} z^2}{4T a^2} \right).$$

Assembling these pieces gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} X(t) > z \right\} &\leq 2T e^{-c_{12} y} + 2y \exp \left( -\frac{a^2}{2y^2} \right) + \\ &\quad + \frac{4c_{13} y^{p+1}}{a^p T^{(p-2)/2}} + T \exp \left( -\frac{c_{12} z^2}{4T a^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The same estimate holding for  $\mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T} (-X(t)) > z \right\}$ , we have proved the lemma.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Fix an arbitrary  $\vartheta_1 > \vartheta = \max(1/p, 5/12) = 1/p$  (recalling that we assume  $p \leq 12/5$ ). Let

$$r := \frac{2p}{4-p},$$

which satisfies

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2r} < \vartheta_1.$$

Let  $\beta > 0$  be such that

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{8-3p}{2(4-p)} < \beta < \frac{(2\vartheta_1-1)r+1}{2}.$$

Since  $2\beta p + (r-1)(p-2) > 2$ , it is possible to choose  $0 < \delta < \beta$  such that

$$(4.7) \quad \beta p + \frac{(r-1)(p-2)}{2} - (p+1)\delta > 1.$$

Let  $T_n = \lfloor n^r \rfloor$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $T_{n+1} - T_n \sim rn^{r-1}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Applying Lemma 4.9 to  $T = T_{n+1} - T_n$ ,  $z = T_n^{\vartheta_1}$ ,  $y = n^\delta$  and  $a = n^\beta$  gives:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{0 \leq t \leq T_{n+1} - T_n} |X(t)| > T_n^{\vartheta_1} \right\} \leq \\ & \leq c_{14} n^{r-1} \exp(-c_{12} n^\delta) + 4n^\delta \exp\left(-\frac{n^{2(\beta-\delta)}}{2}\right) + \\ & \quad + \frac{c_{15}}{n^{\beta p + (r-1)(p-2)/2 - (p+1)\delta}} + c_{16} n^{r-1} \exp\left(-c_{17} n^{(2\vartheta_1-1)r+1-2\beta}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which, in view of (4.7) and (4.6), is summable in  $n$ . Since  $\max_{T_n \leq t \leq T_{n+1}} |X(t) - X(T_n)|$  is distributed as  $\max_{0 \leq t \leq T_{n+1} - T_n} |X(t)|$ , we obtain:

$$\sum_n \mathbf{P} \left\{ \max_{T_n \leq t \leq T_{n+1}} |X(t) - X(T_n)| > T_n^{\vartheta_1} \right\} < \infty.$$

By the Borel–Cantelli lemma, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\max_{T_n \leq t \leq T_{n+1}} |X(t) - X(T_n)| = O\left(T_n^{\vartheta_1}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

This, jointly considered with Lemma 4.4, (4.5) and Theorem 3.1, yields

$$\max_{T_n \leq t \leq T_{n+1}} \left| X(t) - \left( \frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma} \right)^{1/2} W(T_n) \right| = O\left(T_n^{\vartheta_1}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

On the other hand, the usual Brownian increment result (see Theorem 1.2.1 of Csörgő and Révész 1981, p. 30) tells us that, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\max_{T_n \leq t \leq T_{n+1}} |W(t) - W(T_n)| = O\left(T_n^{(r-1)/(2r)+\varepsilon}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Since  $(r-1)/(2r) < \vartheta_1$ , we have proved that, when  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$X(T) - \left( \frac{2-\gamma}{\gamma} \right)^{1/2} W(T) = O\left(T^{\vartheta_1}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

This yields Theorem 1.1, as  $\vartheta_1 > \vartheta$  is arbitrary. □

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to an anonymous referee for a careful reading of the original manuscript and for helpful suggestions.

## References

- Bolthausen, E., 1989. A central limit theorem for two-dimensional random walks in random sceneries. *Ann. Probab.* 17, 108–115.
- Borodin, A.N., 1980. Limit theorems for sums of independent random variables defined on a two-dimensional random walk. LOMI Preprint E-6-80, Steklov Institute, St Petersburg.
- Csáki, E., König, W., Shi, Z., 1999. An embedding for the Kesten–Spitzer random walk in random scenery. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.* 82, 283–292.
- Csáki, E., Révész, P., Shi, Z., 2000. A strong invariance principle for two-dimensional random walk in random scenery. Preprint.
- Csörgő, M., Révész, P., 1981. *Strong Approximations in Probability and Statistics*. Academic Press, New York.

Dvoretzky, A., Erdős, P., 1951. Some problems on random walk in space. Proc. Second Berkeley Symp. Statist. Probab., 353–368.

Erdős, P., Taylor, S.J., 1960. Some problems concerning the structure of random walk path. Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. 11, 137–162.

Kesten, H., Spitzer, F., 1979. A limit theorem related to a new class of self similar processes. Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete 50, 5–25.

Khoshnevisan, D., Lewis, T.M., 1998. A law of the iterated logarithm for stable processes in random scenery. Stoch. Proc. Appl. 74, 89–121.

Komlós, J., Major, P., Tusnády, G., 1976. An approximation of partial sums of independent R.V.'s and the sample DF II. Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete 34, 33–58.

Lewis, T.M., 1993. A law of the iterated logarithm for random walk in random scenery with deterministic normalizers. J. Theoretical Probab. 6, 209–230.

Major, P., 1976. The approximation of partial sums of independent R.V.'s. Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete 35, 213–220.

Pólya, G., 1921. Über eine Aufgabe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung betreffend der Irrfahrt im Strassennetz. Math. Annalen 84, 149–160.

Rémillard, B., Dawson, D.A., 1991. A limit theorem for Brownian motion in a random scenery. Canad. Math. Bull. 34, 385–391.

Shorack, G.R., Wellner, J.A., 1986. Empirical Processes with Applications to Statistics. Wiley, New York.

Pál Révész  
Institut für Statistik und Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie  
Technische Universität Wien  
Wiedner Hauptstrasse 8-10/107  
A-1040 Vienna, Austria  
`revesz@ci.tuwien.ac.at`

Zhan Shi  
Laboratoire de Probabilités UMR 7599  
Université Paris VI  
4 Place Jussieu  
F-75252 Paris Cedex 05, France  
`zhan@proba.jussieu.fr`