

Spatially adaptive density estimation by localised Haar projections

Florian Gach^a, Richard Nickl^a and Vladimir Spokoiny^{b,1}

^aStatistical Laboratory, Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, University of Cambridge, CB30WB, Cambridge, UK.

E-mail: rnickl@statslab.cam.ac.uk

^bWeierstrass Institute for Applied Analysis and Stochastics, Mohrenstrasse 39, 10117 Berlin, Germany, Humboldt University Berlin and Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology. E-mail: spokoiny@wias-berlin.de

Received 15 March 2011; revised 10 January 2012; accepted 21 February 2012

Abstract. Given a random sample from some unknown density $f_0: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ we devise Haar wavelet estimators for f_0 with variable resolution levels constructed from localised test procedures (as in Lepski, Mammen and Spokoiny (*Ann. Statist.* **25** (1997) 927–947)). We show that these estimators satisfy an oracle inequality that adapts to heterogeneous smoothness of f_0 , simultaneously for every point x in a fixed interval, in sup-norm loss. The thresholding constants involved in the test procedures can be chosen in practice under the idealised assumption that the true density is locally constant in a neighborhood of the point x of estimation, and an information theoretic justification of this practise is given.

Résumé. A partir d'un échantillon d'une loi de densité $f_0: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, nous construisons des estimateurs par ondelettes de Haar de f_0 , dont les niveaux de résolution varient et sont construits à partir de tests localisés (comme dans l'article Lepski (*Ann. Statist.* **25** (1997) 927–947)). Nous montrons que ces estimateurs satisfont une inégalité oracle adaptative par rapport à la régularité potentiellement hétérogène de f_0 , simultanément pour tout point x dans un intervalle donné, en norme infinie. Les constantes de seuillage utilisées dans les procédures de test peuvent être choisies en pratique en supposant de manière idéalisée que la vraie densité est localement constante dans un voisinage du point x considéré, pratique que nous justifions par un argument de théorie de l'information.

MSC: 62G05

Keywords: Spatial adaptation; Propagation condition

1. Introduction

One of the most enduring challenges in statistical function estimation is to devise procedures that adapt to the locally variable complexity of the unknown function. For example, if one observes a random sample X_1, \dots, X_n with density $f_0: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then f_0 may exhibit *spatially inhomogeneous smoothness*: The density could be infinitely-differentiable on most of its support except for a few points x_m where it behaves locally like $|x - x_m|^{\alpha_m}$ for some distinct numbers α_m . The location of the irregular points x_m will usually not be known, and neither the corresponding degree of smoothness α_m . Moreover f_0 could possess a so-called *multifractal* behavior, changing its Hölder exponents continuously on its domain of definition – in fact, as shown in Jaffard [9], ‘typical’ functions in the Besov spaces usually considered in

¹Supported in part by Laboratory for Structural Methods of Data Analysis in Predictive Modeling, MIPT, RF government grant, ag. 11.G34.31.0073. Financial support by the German Research Foundation (DFG) through the Collaborative Research Center 649 “Economic Risk” is also gratefully acknowledged.

nonparametric statistics are always multifractal. Donoho and Johnstone [1] and Donoho, Johnstone, Kerkyacharian, and Picard [2], [3] have suggested that methods based on wavelet shrinkage can, to a certain extent, adapt to spatially inhomogeneous complexity of the unknown function f_0 . Moreover, Lepski, Mammen, and Spokoiny [10] showed that this is not intrinsic to wavelet methods, and that similar spatial adaptation results can be proved for kernel methods based on locally variable bandwidth choices.

There are several ways in which one can measure spatial adaptivity of an estimator. A minimal requirement may be to devise a rule $\hat{f}_n(x)$ that estimates $f_0(x)$ in an optimal way at every point x , and the methods suggested in [1] and [10] meet this requirement. These procedures depend on the point x , and the natural question arises as to how a given procedure performs globally as an estimator for f_0 . To address this question, Donoho et al. [3] and Lepski et al. [10] considered global L^r -loss, $r < \infty$, and argued that taking L^r -loss over Besov-bodies $B(s, p, q)$ where smoothness is measured in L^p , $r > p$, gives a way to assess the spatial performance of an estimator. A probably more transparent approach to the spatial adaptation problem is to consider sup-norm loss for estimators with locally variable bandwidths: one aims to find an estimator $\hat{f}_n(x)$ that is locally optimal for estimating $f_0(x)$, and simultaneously so for all x . This approach was not considered in the literature so far – the results [5–8] address the spatially homogeneous setting only.

A first contribution of this article is to show that a dyadic histogram estimator with variable bin size spatially adapts to possibly inhomogeneous local Hölder smoothness of f_0 , in global sup-norm loss. More precisely, for $K(x, y)$ the Haar wavelet projection kernel, we shall construct

$$\hat{f}_n(x) = \frac{2^{\hat{J}_n(x)}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K(2^{\hat{J}_n(x)}x, 2^{\hat{J}_n(x)}X_i),$$

where $\hat{J}_n(x)$ is a variable resolution level that depends both on x and the sample, and show that the random variable

$$\sup_x \frac{1}{r(n, x, f_0)} |\hat{f}_n(x) - f_0(x)|$$

is stochastically bounded, where $r(n, x, f_0)$ is the optimal risk of an ‘oracle estimator’ for f_0 at the point x . We show moreover that this rate equals the pointwise minimax rate of adaptive estimation for $f_0(x)$ at every x , and that spatial adaptation occurs uniformly in x except near discontinuities of the Hölder exponent function $t(f, x)$, see after Theorem 3 for a detailed discussion.

While this result shows that spatial adaptation is indeed possible in a strong theoretical way, a drawback shared by most results in the literature on adaptive estimation remains: The theoretical findings give no indication whatsoever as to how to choose the numerical constants in the thresholds that feature in shrinkage- or Lepski-test-based methods. It has become a common practice that thresholding constants are chosen according to simulation results where simulations are drawn as if the true underlying signal is very simple (say, uniform or piecewise constant). This practise has not had any general theoretical corroboration until recently Spokoiny and Vial [11] gave, in a simple Gaussian regression model, a certain justification based on the idea of ‘propagation.’ The results in [11] are heavily tied to the simplicity of the model used, in particular to the strong Gaussianity assumption employed, and to the fact that pointwise loss is considered. In the present paper we show how the ideas of [11] generalise, subject to some nontrivial modifications, to nonparametric density estimation. A key idea in the proofs in [11], translated into the density estimation context, is to replace the sampling distribution by a locally constant product measure. The ‘transportation cost’ of this replacement is easy to control in the Gaussian setting of [11], but in the density estimation case the fluctuations of the likelihood ratios between the unknown sampling distribution and relevant locally constant product measures do not obey a Gaussian regime, but turn out to be of Poisson type, so that the ‘Gaussian intuitions’ of [11] could be entirely misleading. We show however that the main information theoretic idea of [11] remains sound in this Poissonian setting as well: We use a Lepski-type procedure to construct $\hat{J}_n(x)$, and we show that if we compute sharp thresholds for this procedure as if the true density f_0 belonged to a family \mathcal{F} of locally constant densities, then the resulting estimator is spatially adaptive in sup-norm loss. In contrast to the results in [11], the rates of convergence we obtain for the risk of the final estimator are *exact* rate-adaptive.

While the techniques and results of this paper generalise in principle to more complex estimation problems that involve in particular adaptation to higher degrees of smoothness, we prefer to stay within the simpler setting of Haar wavelets, which allows for a clean exposition of the main ideas.

2. Uniform spatial adaptation using propagation methods

We will use the symbol $\|g\|_T$ to denote the supremum $\sup_{t \in T} |g(t)|$ of a function g over some set T , but we will still use the symbol $\|g\|_\infty$ to denote $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |g(x)|$ if no confusion can arise.

For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we define a dyadic partition of $(0, 1]$ into 2^j -many disjoint subintervals by setting $I_{j,k} = (k2^{-j}, (k+1)2^{-j}]$, $k = 0, \dots, 2^j - 1$; and for $0 < x \leq 1$ we denote by $I_{j,k(x)}$ the unique interval containing x . For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $k = 1, \dots, 2^j - 1$, let $V_{j,k}$ be the space of all bounded density functions on \mathbb{R} that are constant on $I_{j,k}$. Via the local projections

$$K_{j,x}(f)(z) := \begin{cases} 2^j \int_{I_{j,k(x)}} f(y) dy & \text{if } z \in I_{j,k(x)}, \\ f(z) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we map any bounded density f onto $V_{j,k(x)}$. (Note that $K_{j,x}(f)$ is indeed a density since $K_{j,x}(f)$ and f assign the same probability to the interval $I_{j,k(x)}$.) For $f \in V_{j,k}$ and $j' \geq j$ we clearly have $K_{j',x}(f) = f$.

2.1. Estimation procedure

Let X, X_1, \dots, X_n be i.i.d. with bounded density $f_0: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $n > 1$. We wish to construct a single estimator which estimates $f_0(x)$ in an optimal way, uniformly so for points x in the interval $(a, b]$. We shall take without loss of generality $(a, b] = (0, 1]$, and we shall assume throughout that f_0 is bounded away from zero on $(0, 1]$. Let $K(x, y) = \sum_k \phi(x - k)\phi(y - k)$ be the projection kernel based on the Haar wavelet $\phi = 1_{(0,1]}$. We shall write $K_j(x, y) = 2^j K(2^j x, 2^j y)$, and the associated linear density estimator is the dyadic histogram estimator given by

$$f_n(j, x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_j(x, X_i).$$

We make the important observation that $E_f f_n(j, x) = 2^j P_f(I_{j,k(x)})$, which directly follows from the identity $K_j(x, y) = 2^j 1_{I_{j,k(x)}}(y)$. If f is constant on $I_{j,k(x)}$ this in particular implies $E_f f_n(j, x) = f(x)$. (In other words: for any locally (at x) constant density f the bias of $f_n(j, x)$ equals zero if the resolution level is chosen fine enough.)

We finally note that the estimator $f_n(j, x)$ by construction only depends on data points falling into $I_{j,k(x)}$. This amounts to $n2^{-j}$ being the ‘effective’ sample size for estimating f_0 at x .

2.2. Local choice of the resolution level

We fix $j_{\max} := j_{\max, n} \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $2^{-j_{\max}} \geq (\log n)^2/n$ for some $d > 0$. For thresholds ζ_n to be specified below, and for $J \in \mathbb{N}$, $J \leq j_{\max}$ and $0 < x \leq 1$, we define

$$\hat{j}_n(J, x) = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N}, J \leq j \leq j_{\max}: \sqrt{n2^{-j'}} |f_n(j', x) - f_n(j, x)| \leq \zeta_n \sqrt{f_n(j, x)} \text{ for all } j', j < j' \leq j_{\max}\} \tag{1}$$

as well as

$$\hat{j}_n(x) = \hat{j}_n(0, x). \tag{2}$$

(If the condition in (1) is not met for any j , $J \leq j \leq j_{\max}$, we set $\hat{j}_n(J, x) = j_{\max}$.) Given the locally variable resolution level \hat{j}_n , we define the family of nonlinear estimators

$$\hat{f}_n(J, x) := f_n(\hat{j}_n(J, x), x), \quad \hat{f}_n(x) := f_n(\hat{j}_n(x), x), \quad x \in [0, 1]. \tag{3}$$

These are estimators for $f_0(x)$ based on a locally variable resolution level depending on x , and they are density-analogues of the estimators introduced in [10] in the context of the Gaussian white noise model. Note that by construction $\hat{j}_n(x)$ is a step function in x . Introducing the parameter J will be useful in what follows – effectively, $\hat{f}_n(J, x)$ is a nonlinear estimator based on a search over the resolution levels $j \geq J$ that stops at j_{\max} .

2.3. Threshold choice by propagation

One of the main challenges for all adaptive procedures is the choice of the thresholds ζ_n used in the tests defined in (1). Define the standardisation

$$\frac{1}{s_n(j, x)} := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{f_n(j, x)}} & \text{if } f_n(j, x) > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We suggest to choose the thresholds in such a way that the following condition is satisfied:

Condition 1. Let $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}$ be any triangular array of subsets of $V_{j,k}$, $j \leq j_{\max}$, $k = 0, \dots, 2^j - 1$, and let $k(m)$ be the unique k such that $I_{j_{\max}, m} \subseteq I_{j,k}$. We say that the thresholds ζ_n satisfy the uniform propagation condition $\text{UP}(\alpha, \mathcal{F}_{j,k})$ for some fixed $\alpha > 0$ if for every n , every $j \leq j_{\max}$, every $m = 0, \dots, 2^{j_{\max}} - 1$, and every $f \in \mathcal{F}_{j, k(m)}$ we have that

$$E_f \left(\sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{j' \leq j \leq j_{\max}} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j'}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(j', x) - f_n(j', x)}{s_n(j', x)} \right| \right)^2 \leq \frac{\alpha}{n2^{2j_{\max}}}. \quad (4)$$

(Note that since $\hat{j}_n(j') \geq j'$ we have that $f_n(j', x) = 0$ implies $\hat{f}_n(j', x) = 0$ for the fully data-driven estimator $\hat{f}_n(j')$, and so the error $|\hat{f}_n(j', x) - f_n(j', x)|$ is then 0.) An interpretation of this condition can be given along the following lines: For $0 < x \leq 1$ the class $\mathcal{F}_{j, k(x)}$ contains only densities f that can be exactly reconstructed on $I_{j, k(x)}$ by $\int K_j(x, y) f(y) dy$, so that the bias of the linear estimator $f_n(j', x)$ equals zero locally. In particular, any choice of the resolution level finer than j' will only increase the variance without reducing the bias, and we would want $\hat{j}_n(j', x)$ to detect that and equal, with large probability, j' . This property of \hat{j}_n will then be mirrored in the fact that $\hat{f}_n(j', x) - f_n(j', x) = 0$ for every $j' \geq j$ on an event with large probability, in which case the l.h.s. of (4) is exactly equal to zero. The quantity $\alpha/(n2^{2j_{\max}})$ stands for the a priori expected tolerance for a probabilistic error of \hat{j}_n to detect the ‘correct’ resolution level on each interval $I_{j_{\max}, m}$ in this ‘no-bias’ situation.

The following lemma shows that Condition 1 is not empty and that thresholds ζ_n satisfying the uniform propagation condition exist. It shows furthermore that the thresholds can be taken to be of order $\sqrt{\log n}$ and independent of f , which will be crucial in understanding the adaptive properties of \hat{f}_n below.

Lemma 1. Let $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}$ equal $V_{j,k}$ intersected with the set

$$\left\{ f: 0 < \delta \leq \inf_{0 < x \leq 1} f(x), \|f\|_{\infty} \leq M \right\}$$

for some fixed $0 < \delta, M < \infty$. Then for every given $\alpha > 0$ there exists a numerical constant $\kappa > 0$ that depends only on α such that for any threshold choice

$$\zeta_n \geq \kappa \sqrt{\log n}$$

the uniform propagation condition $\text{UP}(\alpha, \mathcal{F}_{j,k})$ is at least satisfied for n larger than some index that only depends on δ and M .

While Lemma 1 proves the existence of thresholds of the order $\sqrt{\log n}$ under the uniform propagation condition – a fact that will be seen to imply adaptivity of \hat{f}_n below – it does not suggest a practical choice of ζ_n . Instead, this choice can be made by direct evaluation of (4), as follows: Condition 1 only concerns the local error bounds over small intervals $I_{j_{\max}, m}$ on which the function f is constant, which effectively means that it suffices to check this condition only for classes of densities which are constant on the interval of interest. The particular choice of the interval $I_{j_{\max}, m}$ is unimportant. Secondly, all quantities in Condition 1 depend on known quantities after f is chosen. By construction of the estimators f_n and \hat{f}_n the random variable featuring in (4) – we call it T – only depends on the number of data points falling into each of the (uniquely determined) j' -fine intervals containing $I_{j_{\max}, m}$. This observation allows for an easy computation of the l.h.s. of (4) along the following lines: Fix $0 \leq p \leq 1$. Then, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_{j, k(m)}$ satisfying $2^{-j} f = p$ on $I_{j, k(m)}$, the number Z of observations falling into the interval $I_{j, k(m)}$ is binomial $B(n, p)$.

Conditionally on $Z = k$, take k -many independent random variables that are uniform on $I_{j,k(m)}$ and count the number of observations $V_{j'}$ in each of the j' -fine intervals. Then compute f_n, \hat{f}_n ; and T . This shows that T does only depend on $V_{j'}, j \leq j' \leq j_{\max}$, and that the l.h.s. of (4) is therefore equal to $E[E[T(V_j, \dots, V_{j_{\max}})|Z]]$.

The practical choice of ζ_n can then be obtained via a Monte Carlo simulation of (4) by choosing ζ_n as the smallest threshold for which (4) is satisfied in the simulation for one specific interval $I_{j_{\max},m}$ uniformly over the class of all densities constant on this interval. Given j_{\max} and α , this procedure has to be performed only for one fixed interval $I_{j_{\max},m}$, and then applies for every m simultaneously.

2.4. Local small bias condition

The idea behind Condition 1 is that we take ‘idealised’ classes of densities \mathcal{F} for which we compute sharp thresholds ζ_n . The danger arises that the true density f_0 may be very different from the elements in \mathcal{F} , which may lead to wrong thresholds (and inference). We have to assess the error that comes from replacing f_0 by an element from \mathcal{F} , in a neighborhood of a given point x . This can be fundamentally quantified in terms of the log-likelihood ratio between f_0 and its local (at x) approximand in \mathcal{F} . As we shall see, one of the deeper reasons behind the fact that propagation methods imply adaptation results is that this error can be related to the usual bias term in linear estimation.

Condition 2. Given real numbers $\Delta_{j,x}, 0 < x \leq 1, j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ satisfying $\Delta_{l',x} \leq \Delta_{l,x}$ for every $l' > l$, we say that f_0 satisfies the local small bias condition at $x \in (0, 1]$ and with $\Delta_{j,x} \equiv \Delta_{j,x}(f_0)$ if

$$\text{Var}_{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \log \frac{f_0}{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \leq \Delta_{j,x}(f_0)$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

The local ‘cost’ of transporting a product measure $\prod_{i=1}^n f_0(x_i)$ to $\prod_{i=1}^n K_{j,x}(f_0)(x_i)$ can be quantified by n times the variance featuring in the above condition, and we shall have to restrict ourselves to resolution levels j for which this transportation cost is at most a fixed constant times the logarithm of the sample size n . The smallest resolution level for which this is still the case will be defined as $j^*(x)$: More precisely, for some fixed positive constant Δ , define the local resolution level

$$j^*(x) := j^*(x, n, \Delta, f_0) = \min\{j \in \mathbb{N}: j \leq j_{\max}, n \Delta_{j,x}(f_0) \leq \Delta \log n\}. \tag{5}$$

While this is an information-theoretic definition of j^* , a key observation of this subsection is that it has the classical ‘bias-variance’ tradeoff generically built into it for suitable choices of $\Delta_{j,x}(f_0)$.

Lemma 2. Suppose f_0 is bounded by some finite number $M > 0$ and that

$$\inf_{0 < x \leq 1} f_0(x) \geq \delta > 0.$$

Then f_0 satisfies Condition 2 with

$$\Delta_{j,x}(f_0) = \frac{M}{\delta^2} 2^{-j} \|f_0 - K_{j,x}(f_0)\|_{\infty}^2.$$

Proof. First, observe that $K_{j,x}(f_0)$ is bounded by M and bounded below by $\delta > 0$. Then, using that $K_{j,x}(f_0)$ coincides with f_0 outside of $I_{j,k(x)}$ and the inequality $|\log x - \log y| \leq \max(x^{-1}, y^{-1})|x - y|$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var}_{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \log \frac{f_0}{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \\ & \leq \int \left(\log \frac{f_0(y)}{K_{j,x}(f_0)(y)} \right)^2 K_{j,x}(f_0)(y) dy \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\leq \int \max(f_0(y)^{-2}, K_{j,x}(f_0)(y)^{-2}) (f_0(y) - K_{j,x}(f_0)(y))^2 K_{j,x}(f_0)(y) \, dy \\
 &\leq \frac{M}{\delta^2} \int (f_0(y) - K_{j,x}(f_0)(y))^2 \, dy \leq \frac{M}{\delta^2} 2^{-j} \|K_{j,x}(f_0) - f_0\|_\infty^2. \quad \square
 \end{aligned}$$

The lemma shows that the quantity $(n/\log n)\Delta_{j,x}(f_0)$ can be viewed as the square of the ‘bias divided by the variance’ of linear projection estimators for $f_0(x)$. Hence, to choose the smallest $j \leq j_{\max}$ such that $(n/\log n)\Delta_{j,x}(f_0)$ is still bounded by a fixed constant Δ means to locally balance the ‘variance’ and ‘bias’ term in the nonparametric setting.

To be more concrete, let us briefly discuss what this means in the classical situation where the bias is bounded by local regularity properties of the unknown density f_0 . Since we are interested in spatial adaptation, we wish to take locally inhomogeneous smoothness into account by appealing to local Hölder conditions: Let $0 < t \leq 1$ and let us say that a function $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is locally t -Hölder at $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if for some $\eta > 0$

$$\sup_{0 < |m| \leq \eta} \frac{|g(x+m) - g(x)|}{|m|^t} < \infty.$$

Define further a ‘local’ Hölder ball of bounded functions

$$\mathcal{C}(t, x, L, \eta) := \left\{ g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \max\left(\|g\|_\infty, \sup_{0 < |m| \leq \eta} \frac{|g(x+m) - g(x)|}{|m|^t}\right) \leq L \right\}.$$

Condition 2 then has the following more classical interpretation in terms of local smoothness properties of f_0 :

Lemma 3. *If $f_0 \in \mathcal{C}(t, x, L, \eta)$ for some $0 < t \leq 1$, then the local bias $\|f_0 - K_{j,x}(f_0)\|_\infty$ is bounded by $c2^{-jt}$ for some constant $c \equiv c(t, L, \eta)$. Furthermore, if*

$$\inf_{0 < x \leq 1} f_0(x) \geq \delta > 0,$$

then Condition 2 is satisfied with

$$\Delta_{j,x}(f_0) = c^2 \frac{L}{\delta^2} 2^{-j(2t+1)}. \quad (6)$$

Proof. Let $y \in I_{j,k(x)}$ be arbitrary. Then, using the substitution $2^j z = 2^j y - u$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |f_0(y) - K_{j,x}(f_0)(y)| &= \left| 2^j \int_{I_{j,k(x)}} (f_0(y) - f_0(z)) \, dz \right| \\
 &\leq \int_{-1}^1 |f_0(y) - f_0(x) + f_0(x) - f_0(y - 2^{-j}u)| \, du \\
 &\leq 2|f_0(y) - f_0(x)| + \int_{-1}^1 |f_0(x) - f_0(y - 2^{-j}u)| \, du.
 \end{aligned}$$

By definition of $x, y, I_{j,k(x)}$ we have $|y - x| \leq 2^{-j}$, and also $|y - 2^{-j}u - x| \leq 2^{-j+1}$ by the triangle inequality, so that for $2^{-j+1} \leq \eta$ the last quantity is bounded by $c_0 2^{-jt}$ in view of $f_0 \in \mathcal{C}(t, x, L, \eta)$. If $2^{-j} > \eta/2$, then the quantity in the last display can still be bounded by $6\|f_0\|_\infty \leq 6L$, so that choosing $c_1 = 6L(2/\eta)^t$ establishes the desired bound for $c = \max(c_0, c_1)$. To prove the second claim, apply Lemma 2. \square

Using the bound from the last lemma to verify Condition 2, we see that, by definition of $j^*(x)$ and for $f_0 \in \mathcal{C}(t, x, L, \eta)$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} \sim \left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right)^{t/(2t+1)} \quad (7)$$

is the locally (at x) optimal adaptive rate of convergence, so that the local small bias condition constructs a minimax optimal resolution level $j^*(x)$ at every $x \in [0, 1]$.

2.5. Main results

We now state the main results, starting with the following ‘oracle’ inequality. Note that the oracle $f_n(j^*(x), x)$ is not an estimator in itself as it depends on unknown quantities.

Theorem 1. *Let $\hat{f}_n(\cdot)$ be the density estimator defined in (3) with thresholds ζ_n that satisfy the uniform propagation condition $\text{UP}(\alpha, \mathcal{F}_{j,k})$ for some $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}$. Suppose f_0 satisfies Condition 2 for every $0 < x \leq 1$, and let $j^*(x)$ be as in (5). Then we have*

$$E_{f_0} \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(x) - f_n(j^*(x), x)}{s_n(j^*(x), x)} \right| \leq \frac{\zeta_n}{\sqrt{\log n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{n}} n^{\Delta e^{4U}} \tag{8}$$

for any U satisfying

$$U \geq \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \left\| \log \frac{f_0}{K_{j^*(x),x}(f_0)} \right\|_{\infty}. \tag{9}$$

If $\zeta_n = O(\sqrt{\log n})$ – as follows under the conditions of Lemma 1 – and if one chooses $\Delta < 1/2$, U as in the remark below, then the r.h.s. of (8) is $O(1)$ as n tends to infinity. Theorem 1 thus implies that the estimator \hat{f}_n with resolution levels chosen by the propagation approach is close to the linear ‘oracle estimator’ evaluated at the locally optimal resolution level $j^*(x)$, and this uniformly so on $(0, 1]$.

Remark 1. *If $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}$ is as in Lemma 1 and f_0 is bounded by M and bounded below by δ , we may apply Lemma 2 (using $2^{-j_{\max}} \geq d(\log n)^2/n$) to obtain the bound*

$$\log \frac{f_0}{K_{j^*(x),x}(f_0)} = \log \left(1 + \frac{f_0 - K_{j^*(x),x}(f_0)}{K_{j^*(x),x}(f_0)} \right) \leq \log \left(1 + \frac{\Delta}{dM \log n} \right),$$

which tends to zero as n tends to infinity.

Our results then imply the following uniform spatial adaptation result:

Theorem 2. *Assume that f_0 is bounded by M and satisfies $\inf_{0 < x \leq 1} f_0(x) \geq \delta > 0$. Let $\hat{f}_n(\cdot)$ be the density estimator from (3) with thresholds $\zeta_n = O(\sqrt{\log n})$ that satisfy the uniform propagation condition $\text{UP}(\alpha, \mathcal{F}_{j,k})$ for $\mathcal{F}_{j,k}$ as in Lemma 1. Let $j^*(x)$ be as in (5) with $\Delta < 1/2$ and with $\Delta_{j,x}$ as in Lemma 2. Then*

$$\sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} |\hat{f}_n(x) - f_0(x)| = O_{\text{Pr}_{f_0}}(1). \tag{10}$$

Thus the fully data-driven estimator \hat{f}_n for f_0 achieves the locally optimal risk of the ‘oracle’ based on $j^*(x)$, uniformly at all points in $(0, 1]$. If $j^*(x)$ – with $\Delta < 1/2$ – is based on $\Delta_{j,x}$ as in Lemma 3, then (10) holds true and the ‘oracle’ rate is the adaptive locally minimax rate of convergence at every $0 < x \leq 1$ where f_0 is locally t -Hölder with $0 < t \leq 1$, see the discussion in Section 2.4 surrounding (7). This means that at any given point x our estimator is rate-adaptive to local Hölder smoothness (with the usual $\log n$ penalty for adaptation).

One may ask further if spatial adaptation in the minimax sense occurs *uniformly* for every $x \in (0, 1]$. A consequence of Theorem 2 is the following.

Theorem 3. *Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied and that the true density f_0 lies in $\mathcal{C}(t(x), x, L(x), \eta(x))$, $0 < x \leq 1$, for some $t(\cdot)$, $L(\cdot)$, $\eta(\cdot)$ that are bounded and uniformly bounded away from zero on $(0, 1]$. Let $j^*(x)$ be as in (5) with $\Delta < 1/2$ and with $\Delta_{j,x}$ as in Lemma 3. Then*

$$\sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{t(x)/(2t(x)+1)} |\hat{f}_n(x) - f_0(x)| = \mathbf{O}_{\text{Pr}_{f_0}}(1).$$

The assumptions on the functions t , L , η need discussion. For densities that locally look like $|x - x_m|^{\alpha_m}$ we would wish to choose $t(x)$ equal to their pointwise Hölder exponents $t(x_m) = \alpha_m$ and $t(x) = 1$ otherwise, but then η is not uniformly bounded away from zero for points $x \rightarrow x_m$. However, Theorem 3 holds for *any* choice of the functions t , L , η for which f_0 satisfies $f_0 \in \mathcal{C}(t(x), x, L(x), \eta(x))$, $0 < x \leq 1$. In other words, in the above example we can choose $t(x) = \alpha_m$ on the interval $(x_m - \eta_0, x_m + \eta_0)$ and $t(x) = 1$ otherwise, where η_0 is some arbitrary lower bound for $\eta(x)$. This comes at the expense of not being adaptive near x_m , i.e., for $x \in (x_m - \eta_0, x_m + \eta_0) \setminus \{x_m\}$, which is sensible as we cannot expect adaptation for points x arbitrarily close to x_m from a finite sample. Inspection of the proofs (particularly the dependence on η in Lemma 3) shows that, for fixed n , the above theorem holds for densities $\mathcal{C}(t(x), x, L(x), \eta_{(n)})$, $0 < x \leq 1$, where $\eta_{(n)}$ can be taken of order $n^{-1/3}$, the binwidth corresponding to the maximal smoothness $t = 1$ one wants to adapt to in our setting, and this is again reasonable: Hölder smoothness of f_0 in an interval $[x \pm r_n]$ where $r_n = o(n^{-1/3})$ does not allow to control the bias at x with the locally optimal binwidth of order $n^{-1/3}$. By the same arguments multifractal densities f_0 which change their Hölder exponent continuously can be handled by taking $t(x)$ piecewise constant on a partition of $(0, 1]$ into bins of size of order $n^{-1/3}$, the estimator achieving the local uniform minimax rate on each bin of the partition.

3. Proofs

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1

A first idea is to use a moment bound, localised at any point x of estimation, on the log-likelihood ratio between f_0 and its approximand in $V_{j,k}$.

Lemma 4. *If, for fixed $0 < x \leq 1$,*

$$\text{Var}_{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \log \frac{f_0}{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \leq \frac{D \log n}{n} \tag{11}$$

for some $0 < D < \infty$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E_{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{f_0(X_i)}{K_{j,x}(f_0)(X_i)} \right)^2 \leq n^{2De^{4U}}$$

holds for any U satisfying

$$U \geq \left\| \log \frac{f_0}{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \right\|_{\infty}.$$

Proof. Since the Kullback–Leibler distance

$$\mathcal{K}(f_0, K_{j,x}(f_0)) = -E_{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \log \frac{f_0}{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \geq 0$$

is nonnegative, we have

$$E_{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{f_0(X_i)}{K_{j,x}(f_0)(X_i)} \right)^2 \leq (E_{K_{j,x}(f_0)} e^{2(\log(f_0/K_{j,x}(f_0)) - E_{K_{j,x}(f_0)} \log(f_0/K_{j,x}(f_0)))})^n$$

by the i.i.d. assumption. Using the power series expansion of the exponential function and that the variables in the exponent are centered, one easily bounds the previous display by

$$\left(1 + \frac{2De^{4U} \log n}{n}\right)^n \leq e^{2De^{4U} \log n} = n^{2De^{4U}}. \quad \square$$

Here is the proof of Theorem 1: We first note that Condition 2 allows us to take $\Delta_{j,x}(f_0)$ to be constant on the intervals $I_{j,k}$. Consequently, $j^*(\cdot)$ from (5) is then constant on every interval $I_{j_{\max},m}$, and we set

$$j_m^* = \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max},m}} j^*(x).$$

To prove the theorem, we split

$$\begin{aligned} E_{f_0} \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(x) - f_n(j^*(x), x)}{s_n(j^*(x), x)} \right| &\leq E_{f_0} \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(x) - f_n(j^*(x), x)}{s_n(j^*(x), x)} \right| \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{j}_n(x) < j^*(x)\}} \\ &\quad + E_{f_0} \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(x) - f_n(j^*(x), x)}{s_n(j^*(x), x)} \right| \mathbb{1}_{\{\hat{j}_n(x) \geq j^*(x)\}} \\ &=: I + II \end{aligned}$$

according to whether $\hat{j}_n(x)$ comes to lie below the local resolution level $j^*(x)$ or not. By definition of $\hat{j}_n(x)$ in (1) one immediately has

$$I \leq \frac{\zeta_n}{\sqrt{\log n}}.$$

About II: Define

$$S_m = \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max},m}} \max_{j_m^* \leq j \leq j_{\max}} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(j, x) - f_n(j, x)}{s_n(j, x)} \right|. \tag{12}$$

Using that on the event $\hat{j}_n(x) \geq j^*(x)$ we necessarily have $\hat{f}_n(x) = \hat{f}_n(j^*(x), x)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} II &\leq E_{f_0} \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(j^*(x), x) - f_n(j^*(x), x)}{s_n(j^*(x), x)} \right| \\ &\leq E_{f_0} \max_m \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max},m}} \max_{j_m^* \leq j \leq j_{\max}} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(j, x) - f_n(j, x)}{s_n(j, x)} \right| \\ &\leq 2^{j_{\max}} \max_m E_{f_0} S_m. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We use the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality to bound

$$\begin{aligned} E_{f_0} S_m &= \int \cdots \int S_m(x_1, \dots, x_n) \prod_{i=1}^n f_0(x_i) dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\ &= \int \cdots \int S_m(x_1, \dots, x_n) \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{f_0(x_i)}{K_{j_m^*,x}(f_0)(x_i)} \prod_{i=1}^n K_{j_m^*,x}(f_0)(x_i) dx_1 \cdots dx_n \\ &\leq \sqrt{E_{K_{j_m^*,x}(f_0)} S_m^2} \sqrt{E_{K_{j_m^*,x}(f_0)} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{f_0(X_i)}{K_{j_m^*,x}(f_0)(X_i)} \right)^2} \end{aligned}$$

by the square-root of the second moment of S_m under the ‘idealised’ density $K_{j_m^*,x}(f_0)$ times the square-root of the second moment of the likelihood ratio. (Here, x is any point in $I_{j_{\max},m}$.) Using Condition 1 and Lemma 4, we obtain a bound for the last term in (13) of order

$$2^{j_{\max}} \max_m E_{f_0} S_m \leq \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{n}} n^{\Delta e^{4U}},$$

which concludes the proof of the theorem.

3.2. Proofs of Theorems 2 and 3

We first prove Theorem 2: Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} |\hat{f}_n(x) - f_0(x)| &\leq \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(x) - f_n(j^*(x), x)}{s_n(j^*(x), x)} \right| \sqrt{f_n(j^*(x), x)} \\ &\quad + \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} |f_n(j^*(x), x) - f_0(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

The first factor of the first summand is bounded in probability in view of Theorem 1 and of Lemma 1 and the hypothesis $\zeta_n = O(\sqrt{\log n})$. The second factor of the first summand is also bounded in probability since

$$\sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \max_{j \leq j_{\max}} |f_n(j, x) - E_{f_0} f_n(j, x)| = o_{P_{f_0}}(1)$$

by Proposition 2, using $2^{-j_{\max}} \geq d(\log n)^2/n$, and since $\sup_{x,j} |E_{f_0} f_n(j, x)| \leq \|f_0\|_{\infty} < \infty$. It remains to prove that the second summand is bounded in probability, and we achieve this by bounding the moment

$$\begin{aligned} E_{f_0} \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} |f_n(j^*(x), x) - E_{f_0} f_n(j^*(x), x)| \\ + \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} |E_{f_0} f_n(j^*(x), x) - f_0(x)| \\ \leq E_{f_0} \sup_{0 < x \leq 1} \max_{j \leq j_{\max}} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j}}{\log n}} |f_n(j, x) - E_{f_0} f_n(j, x)| \\ + \max_m \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max},m}} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j^*(x)}}{\log n}} |E_{f_0} f_n(j^*(x), x) - f_0(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by a fixed constant using Proposition 2 below. Recalling the definition of j_m^* from the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1 and choosing $\Delta_{j,x}(f_0)$ from Lemma 2, the second term is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \max_m \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j_m^*}}{\log n}} \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max},m}} |E_{f_0} f_n(j_m^*, x) - f_0(x)| &\leq \max_m \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j_m^*}}{\log n}} \|K_{j_m^*,x}(f_0) - f_0\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \delta \sqrt{\frac{\Delta}{M}}, \end{aligned}$$

where x is any point in $I_{j_{\max},m}$, and this completes the proof.

We next prove Theorem 3: Using the hypotheses on $t(\cdot)$, $L(\cdot)$, $\eta(\cdot)$, the proof of Lemma 3 shows that f_0 satisfies Condition 2 with

$$\Delta_{j,x}(f_0) = c' 2^{-j(2t(x)+1)}, \tag{14}$$

$0 < c' < \infty$, where c' does not depend on x . Using that $t(\cdot)$ is bounded below by some positive number implies that

$$\Delta_{j_{\max}, x}(f_0) = c' 2^{-j_{\max}(2t(x)+1)} \leq \frac{\Delta \log n}{n}$$

holds for n large enough (independent of $x \in (0, 1]$), so that $j^*(x)$, when based on $\Delta_{j, x}(f_0)$ as in (14), is asymptotically equivalent to the minimax optimal locally adaptive rate, uniformly so for all x .

3.3. Proof of Lemma 1

The proof relies on Propositions 1 and 2 which are given below. Recall first from Section 2.1 that for $f \in V_{j, k}$ and $j' \geq j$ we necessarily have $E_f f_n(j', x) - f(x) = 0$ for every $x \in I_{j, k}$, so the bias at $x \in I_{j, k}$ is exactly zero, a fact we shall use repeatedly below without separate mentioning. Write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{j' \geq j} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j'}}{\log n}} \left| \frac{\hat{f}_n(j', x) - f_n(j', x)}{s_n(j', x)} \right| \\ &= \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{j' \geq j} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j'}}{\log n}} \sum_{l > j'} \left| \frac{f_n(l, x) - f_n(j', x)}{s_n(j', x)} \right| \mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{j}_n(j', x) = l\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

To treat the indicator, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\hat{j}_n(j', x) = l\} \\ & \subseteq \left\{ \sqrt{n2^{-l'}} |f_n(l', x) - f_n(l-1, x)| > \zeta_n \sqrt{f_n(l-1, x)} \text{ for some } l' \geq l \right\} \\ & \subseteq \left\{ \sqrt{n2^{-l'}} |f_n(l', x) - E_f f_n(l', x) + E_f f_n(l-1, x) - f_n(l-1, x)| > \zeta_n \frac{\sqrt{f(x)}}{2} \text{ for some } l' \geq l \right\} \\ & \cup \left\{ \min_{\ell \geq j} \sqrt{f_n(\ell, x)} \leq \frac{\sqrt{f(x)}}{2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the first set is a subset of

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \sqrt{n2^{-l'}} |f_n(l', x) - E_f f_n(l', x)| \geq \frac{\zeta_n \sqrt{f(x)}}{4} \text{ for some } l' \geq l \right\} \\ & \cup \left\{ \sqrt{n2^{-(l-1)}} |f_n(l-1, x) - E_f f_n(l-1, x)| > \frac{\zeta_n \sqrt{f(x)}}{4} \right\} \\ & \subseteq \left\{ \max_{\ell \geq j} \sqrt{n2^{-\ell}} \|f_n(\ell) - E_f f_n(\ell)\|_{I_{j_{\max}, m}} > \frac{\zeta_n \sqrt{\|f\|_{I_{j, k(m)}}}}{4} \right\} =: B_1 \end{aligned}$$

and that, using $y \geq \sqrt{\delta y}$ for $y \geq \delta$, the second set is contained in

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \max_{\ell \geq j} |f_n(\ell, x) - E_f f_n(\ell, x)| > \frac{f(x)}{2} \right\} \\ & \subseteq \left\{ \max_{\ell \geq j} |f_n(\ell, x) - E_f f_n(\ell, x)| > \frac{\sqrt{\delta f(x)}}{2} \right\} \\ & \subseteq \left\{ \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}, \ell \geq j} |f_n(\ell, x) - E_f f_n(\ell, x)| > \frac{\sqrt{\delta \|f\|_{I_{j, k(m)}}}}{2} \right\} =: B_2; \end{aligned}$$

so that $\{\hat{j}_n(j', x) = l\} \subseteq B_1 \cup B_2 =: B$, a set which does not depend on j', x or l . Hence, $\mathbf{1}_{\{\hat{j}_n(j', x) = l\}} \leq 1_B$ uniformly in j', x, l , so that the quantity in (15) is bounded from above by

$$1_B \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{j' \geq j} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j'}}{\log n}} \sum_{l > j'} \left| \frac{f_n(l, x) - f_n(j', x)}{s_n(j', x)} \right|,$$

and therefore the second moment of (15) is bounded, using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, by

$$\Pr_f(B)^{1/2} \left\| \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{j' \geq j} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j'}}{\log n}} \sum_{l > j'} \left| \frac{f_n(l, x) - f_n(j', x)}{s_n(j', x)} \right| \right\|_{4, \Pr_f}^2 =: I \times II.$$

We first bound II : By the triangle inequality and since the bias is exactly zero, this term is less than or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \left\| \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{j' \geq j} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j'}}{\log n}} \sum_{l > j'} \left| \frac{f_n(l, x) - E_f f_n(l, x)}{s_n(j', x)} \right| \right\|_{4, \Pr_f}^2 \\ & + 2 \left\| \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{j' \geq j} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j'}}{\log n}} \sum_{l > j'} \left| \frac{f_n(j', x) - E_f f_n(j', x)}{s_n(j', x)} \right| \right\|_{4, \Pr_f}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Define now $S = \{\sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \min_{j' \geq j} f_n(j', x) \geq \delta/2\}$. Note that, by definition of $f_n(j')$, $f_n(j', x) > 0$ implies $f_n(j', x) \geq 2^{j'}/n$. Then, for every $1 \leq p < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & E_f \left(\sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{j' \geq j} \frac{1}{s_n(j', x)} \right)^p \\ & = E_f \left(\sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{j' \geq j} \frac{1}{s_n(j', x)} (1_S + 1_{S^c}) \right)^p \\ & \leq \frac{2^{3p/2-1}}{\delta^{p/2}} + 2^{p-1} n^{p/2} E_f \mathbf{1} \left\{ \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \min_{j' \geq j} |f_n(j', x) - E_f f_n(j', x) + f(x)| < \frac{\delta}{2} \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{2^{3p/2-1}}{\delta^{p/2}} + 2^{p-1} n^{p/2} \Pr_f \left\{ \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}, j' \geq j} |f_n(j', x) - E_f f_n(j', x)| > \frac{\delta}{2} \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{2^{3p/2-1}}{\delta^{p/2}} + 2^{p-1} n^{p/2} \Pr_f \left\{ \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}, j' \geq j} \sqrt{n2^{-j'}} |f_n(j', x) - E_f f_n(j', x)| > \frac{\delta \sqrt{d} \log n}{2} \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{2^{3p/2-1}}{\delta^{p/2}} + 2^{p-1} n^{p/2} c n^{-(\delta^2 d / (4c)) \log n} \end{aligned}$$

for large n in view of Proposition 1 (using that $2^{-j_{\max}} \geq d(\log n)^2/n$), so that this expectation is bounded uniformly in n by some constant $c_1(p, \delta, M)$. Using this, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Proposition 2, the square of the first term in (16) is less than or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & c_2 2^{2j_{\max}} j_{\max}^4 E_f \left(\sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{l \geq j} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-l}}{\log n}} |f_n(l, x) - E_f f_n(l, x)| \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{l \geq j} \frac{1}{s_n(j', x)} \right)^4 \\ & \leq c_2 2^{2j_{\max}} j_{\max}^4 \left(E_f \left(\sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{l \geq j} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-l}}{\log n}} |f_n(l, x) - E_f f_n(l, x)| \right)^8 \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \times \left(E_f \left(\sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}} \max_{l \geq j} \frac{1}{s_n(l, x)} \right)^8 \right)^{1/2} \\ & \leq c_3 2^{2j_{\max}} j_{\max}^4; \end{aligned}$$

and the same reasoning also implies that the second term in (16) is less than or equal to some constant, so that we can conclude, using the lower bound of $2^{-j_{\max}}$, that

$$II \leq c_4 n \tag{17}$$

for some fixed constant c_4 that depends only on δ and M .

To bound I , we have the following: First, using Proposition 1 below, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_f(B_1) &= \Pr_f \left\{ \max_{\ell \geq j} \sqrt{n2^{-\ell}} \|f_n(\ell) - E_f f_n(\ell)\|_{I_{j, k(m)}} > \frac{\zeta_n \sqrt{\|f\|_{I_{j, k(m)}}}}{4} \right\} \\ &\leq Dn^{-\kappa^2 \delta / (4D)} \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for large n , with D only depending on M . Furthermore, using $2^{-j_{\max}} \geq d(\log n)^2/n$ and Proposition 1 below,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_f(B_2) &\leq \Pr_f \left\{ \sup_{x \in I_{j_{\max}, m}, \ell \geq j} \sqrt{n2^{-\ell}} |f_n(\ell, x) - E_f f_n(\ell, x)| > \frac{\sqrt{d\delta \|f\|_{I_{j, k(m)}} \log n}}{2} \right\} \\ &\leq Dn^{-(d\delta^2/(4D)) \log n} \end{aligned}$$

for large n . Thus, choosing κ large enough but finite depending on the choice of α , we obtain for n large enough

$$I \times II \leq c_4 Dn \left(n^{-(\kappa^2 \delta / (4D))} + n^{-(d\delta^2/(4D)) \log n} \right) \leq \frac{\alpha}{n2^{2j_{\max}}}.$$

This completes the proof.

3.4. Uniform-in-bandwidth bounds for Haar wavelet density estimators and some consequences

The following exponential inequality was used repeatedly in the proofs.

Proposition 1. *Let $j_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2^{-j_{\max}} \geq d(\log n)^2/n$. Let $I = (2^{-j}k, 2^{-j}(k+1)]$ for some $j \leq j_{\max}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and suppose $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a density that satisfies $\|f\|_I \leq M$ and*

$$\inf_{x \in I} f(x) \geq \delta > 0.$$

There exist constants $C_1(d)$, $C_2(d)$ and an index $n(\delta, M)$ such that for all $n \geq n(\delta, M)$ and all $C_3 \geq C_2(d)$, if

$$C_1(d) \sqrt{\|f\|_I \log n} \leq u \leq C_3 \|f\|_I \sqrt{n2^{-j_{\max}}}, \tag{19}$$

then

$$\Pr_f \left\{ \sup_{x \in I} \max_{j \leq j' \leq j_{\max}} \sqrt{n2^{-j'}} |f_n(j', x) - E_f f_n(j', x)| \geq u \right\} \leq D e^{-u^2/D},$$

where D only depends on C_3 and M .

Proof. Writing

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n2^{-j'}} |f_n(j', x) - E_f f_n(j', x)| \\ &= 2\sqrt{\frac{2^{j_{\max}}}{n}} \frac{\sqrt{2^{j'-j_{\max}}}}{2} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (K(2^{j'}x, 2^{j'}X_i) - E_f K(2^{j'}x, 2^{j'}X_i)) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

we have to consider the supremum

$$2\sqrt{\frac{2^{j_{\max}}}{n}} \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (h(X_i) - E_f h(X_i)) \right|$$

of the (scaled) empirical processes indexed by the class of functions

$$\mathcal{H} := \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{2^{j'-j_{\max}}}}{2} K(2^{j'}x, 2^{j'}(\cdot)): x \in I, j' \geq j \right\}.$$

This class has constant envelope $1/2$ since $j' \leq j_{\max}$ and since $\sup_{x,y} |K(x, y)| = 1$. Furthermore, noting that $K^2(x, y) = K(x, y)$ for every x, y , we have for $h \in \mathcal{H}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} E_f h^2(X) &= \frac{2^{j'-j_{\max}}}{4} \int K^2(2^{j'}x, 2^{j'}y) f(y) dy \\ &= \frac{2^{j'-j_{\max}}}{4} \int_{2^{-j'k(x)}}^{2^{-j'(k(x)+1)}} f(y) dy \leq \frac{2^{-j_{\max}}}{4} \|f\|_I. \end{aligned}$$

Note further that \mathcal{H} is a VC-type class of functions by using Lemma 2 in [6] and a simple computation on covering numbers (including an obvious covering of the set $[2^{-j_{\max}}, 1] \subseteq [0, 1]$). Rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_f \left\{ \sup_{x \in I} \max_{j \leq j' \leq j_{\max}} \sqrt{n2^{-j'}} |f_n(j', x) - E_f f_n(j', x)| \geq u \right\} \\ &= \Pr_f \left\{ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n (h(X_i) - E_f h(X_i)) \right| \geq \frac{u\sqrt{n2^{-j_{\max}}}}{2} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and apply expression (21) in [7], with

$$\sigma^2 := \frac{2^{-j_{\max}} \|f\|_I}{4} \wedge \frac{1}{4}$$

and

$$\lambda := \begin{cases} c_1(d) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{\|f\|_I \log(n/\|f\|_I)}} & \text{if } \|f\|_I \leq 1, \\ c_2(d) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for appropriate constants $c_1(d), c_2(d)$ that only depend on d . □

Proposition 2. *Let j_{\max}, I and f be as in Proposition 1. Then there exists a constant $D(d, \delta, M)$ such that for every $1 \leq p < \infty$ we have*

$$E_f \left(\sup_{x \in I} \max_{j \leq j' \leq j_{\max}} \sqrt{\frac{n2^{-j'}}{\log n}} |f_n(j', x) - E_f f_n(j', x)| \right)^p \leq D^p. \quad (20)$$

Proof. The proof follows from considering the same empirical process as in the proof of Proposition 1, and using bounds for p th moments of empirical processes indexed by uniformly bounded VC-classes of functions, e.g., the bound in the display following (21) in [7], with σ^2 and λ as in the proof of Proposition 1, together with Proposition 3.1 in [4]. \square

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank an anonymous referee for critical remarks, particularly on Theorem 3.

References

- [1] D. L. Donoho and I. M. Johnstone. Ideal spatial adaptation by wavelet shrinkage. *Biometrika* **81** (1994) 425–455. [MR1311089](#)
- [2] D. L. Donoho, I. M. Johnstone, G. Kerkyacharian and D. Picard. Wavelet shrinkage: Asymptopia? *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **57** (1995) 301–369. [MR1323344](#)
- [3] D. L. Donoho, I. M. Johnstone, G. Kerkyacharian and D. Picard. Density estimation by wavelet thresholding. *Ann. Statist.* **24** (1996) 508–539. [MR1394974](#)
- [4] E. Giné, R. Latala and J. Zinn. Exponential and moment inequalities for U -statistics. In *High Dimensional Probability II* 13–38. E. Giné, D. Mason and J. A. Wellner (Eds). Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2000. [MR1857312](#)
- [5] E. Giné and R. Nickl. An exponential inequality for the distribution function of the kernel density estimator, with applications to adaptive estimation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **143** (2009) 569–596. [MR2475673](#)
- [6] E. Giné and R. Nickl. Uniform limit theorems for wavelet density estimators. *Ann. Probab.* **37** (2009) 1605–1646. [MR2546757](#)
- [7] E. Giné and R. Nickl. Adaptive estimation of a distribution function and its density in sup-norm loss by wavelet and spline projections. *Bernoulli* **16** (2010) 1137–1163. [MR2759172](#)
- [8] A. Goldenshluger and O. Lepski. Structural adaptation via \mathbb{L}_p -norm oracle inequalities. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **143** (2009) 41–71. [MR2449122](#)
- [9] S. Jaffard. On the Frisch–Parisi conjecture. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **79** (2000) 525–552. [MR1770660](#)
- [10] O. V. Lepski, E. Mammen and V. Spokoiny. Optimal spatial adaptation to inhomogeneous smoothness: An approach based on kernel estimates with variable bandwidth selectors. *Ann. Statist.* **25** (1997) 929–947. [MR1447734](#)
- [11] V. Spokoiny and C. Vial. Parameter tuning in pointwise adaptation using a propagation approach. *Ann. Statist.* **37** (2009) 2783–2807. [MR2541447](#)