

## 18.1 Introduction

Recall from last time,

$$\begin{aligned} f_0 &= 0 \\ f_1 &= Lh_n^\beta K(x - x_0/h_n), \quad x \in [0, 1] \\ h_n &= c_o n^{\frac{1}{2\beta+1}} \end{aligned}$$

We needed to choose the parameter that adds enough smoothness but still remains in the function class. So we chose

$$d(f_0, f_1) \geq 2s = cn^{\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}} \text{ with } \phi_n = n^{\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}} \text{ and } K(P_0, P_1) \leq \alpha < \infty.$$

We saw previously that  $\alpha = \mathcal{O}(nh_n^{2\beta+1}) \Rightarrow h_n = \mathcal{O}(n^{\frac{1}{2\beta+1}})$ .

What if, instead of considering a particular point, we want to use the  $L_2$  distance between these functions.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} d(f_0, f_1) &= \left( \int f_1^2(x) dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &= Lh_n^\beta \left( \int K^2\left(\frac{x-x_0}{h_n}\right) dx \right)^{1/2} \\ &= Lh_n^{\beta+1/2} \left( \int K^2(u) du \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \mathcal{O}(h_n^{\beta+1/2}) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2}) \\ &\Rightarrow \phi_n = n^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

goes to zero more quickly than the upper bound. No known estimator achieves this l.b., so either a better estimator exists, or this technique is not tight enough.

In particular, it is not sufficient to use 2 hypotheses  $\max\{f_0, f_1\}$  as a proxy for  $\sup \Theta$ . This motivates the following technique.

## 18.2 Main result (KL version)

If  $m \geq 2, \theta_0, \dots, \theta_m \in \Theta$ , then

1.  $d(\theta_i, \theta_k) \geq 2s > 0 \forall j, k$
2.  $P_j \ll P_0$  (always true if, e.g., every msr has a density wrt Lebesgue measure)

3.  $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m K(P_j, P_0) \leq \alpha \log m$  and
4.  $0 < \alpha < 1/8$ ,

using parameter 0 as the base case.

Then  $\inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} P_{\theta}(d(\hat{\theta}, \theta) \geq s) \geq C_1(m)C_2(\alpha) > 0 \forall m$

**Theorem 18.1** (McDonald). *Minimax nonparametric KDE, but allowing the dimension to increase. Let  $X_1, \dots, X_n \sim \text{iid} f$  and define*

1.  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$
2.  $f \in \mathcal{N}_p(\beta, c)$ , the Nikolsky class:
  - (a)  $D^s f$  exists if  $|s| \leq \lfloor \beta \rfloor$
  - (b)  $\int (D^s f(x+t) - D^s f(x))^p dx \leq C^p \|t\|_1^{p(\beta-|s|)}$
  - (c)  $\int f = 1$

Then

$$\inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{n^{\beta}}{d^d} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\beta+d}} \|f - \hat{f}\|_p \right] \geq c$$

Unlike the previous result, this holds when both  $n, d \rightarrow \infty$ .

## Ingredients

1. Need to find  $m+1$  densities in  $\mathcal{N}_p(\beta, c)$
2. Then show  $\|f_i - f_j\|_p \geq 2c\phi_{nd} \forall i, j$
3.  $\phi_{nd} = \left( \frac{d^d}{n^{\beta}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\beta+d}}$
4. show  $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m K(P_j, P_0) \leq \alpha \log m$

## Proof Sketch

What are these densities? Have to be a bit more careful than previous case (in which  $f_1$  was just a slight perturbation of the null distribution) to ensure the perturbed functions are still densities AND smooth enough to be in the Nikolsky class.

$$\Gamma_0 \in W^{\beta, 1/2} \cap C^{\infty}(\mathbb{R})$$

This is the key difference:

$$\Gamma(u) = dC \prod_{i=1}^d \Gamma_0(u_i)$$

We need this  $d$  factor to get the right rate! And for any integer  $m \geq 2$ ,  $\gamma_{m,j}(x) = m^{-\beta} \Gamma(mx - j)$ , a  $d$ -dim vector  $j \in J = \{1, \dots, m\}^d$ .

The distributions are:

$$f_0 = \mathcal{N}_d(0, \sigma I)$$

$$f_{\omega}(x) = f_0(x) + \sum_{j \in J} \omega(j) \gamma_{m,j}(x)$$

$\omega$  is a binary vector of size  $m^d$ ,  $\omega(j) \in \{0, 1\}$

For details, see ?

**Example 18.2.**  $m = 4, d = 2, J = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (2, 1), \dots, (4, 4)\}$ .

$\Rightarrow f_\omega$  has 0 to 16  $\Rightarrow 2^{16}$  densities

**Note** In general, for  $m$  hypotheses we will always choose elements according to the vertices of binary hypercube, then apply Lemma 18.3.

1. Can show  $f_\omega$  is smooth enough if  $m > [dC(C)^d]^{1/\beta}$  (if  $m$  too small, the edges of the hypercube are too small to get useful perturbations)
2. to show appropriate separation, need to look at

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_\omega - f_{\omega'}\|_p &= \left\| \sum_{j \in J} (\omega(j) - \omega'(j)) \gamma_{m,j} \right\|_p \\ &= m^{-\beta-d/p} H^{1/2}(\omega, \omega') \|\Gamma\|_p \end{aligned}$$

, where  $H$  is the Hamming dist. (Hamming dist separation is a generic part of all  $m$ -hypothesis proofs.)

**Lemma 18.3** (Varshamov-Gilbert). *Let  $m \geq 8$ . Then  $\exists D \subseteq \{\omega\}$  s. t.  $\forall \omega, \omega' \in D, H(\omega, \omega') \geq \frac{m^d}{8}$  and  $|D| \geq \exp(m^d/8)$*

[Q: is 18.3 related to isoperimetric ineqs?

We will shrink class to  $D$ , throwing away alternatives that are “too close”. Then

$$m^{-\beta-d/p} H^{1/2}(\omega, \omega') \|\Gamma\|_p \geq m^{-\beta-d/p} \left(\frac{m^d}{8}\right)^{1/p} dC \|\Gamma_0\|_p^d = 8^{-1/p} d m^{-\beta} C \|\Gamma_0\|_p^d$$

3.  $K(P_\omega, P_0) \leq \dots \leq C^d n d^2 m^{-2\beta}$ . Need to choose  $m$  to annihilate  $n$  if we want the  $\alpha \log m$  bound (and satisfy the many other conds): Choose  $m$  s. t.

$$nC^d d^2 m^{-2\beta} \leq \alpha \log |D| \Rightarrow m \leq [C_1 d^2 n C_2^d]^{\frac{1}{2\beta+d}}$$

**Combine:** set

$$m = \|\Gamma_0\|_p^{\frac{d+1}{\beta}} \kappa(d^2 n)^{\frac{1}{2\beta+d}}.$$

Plug in  $m$  to get

$$\geq 2C \phi_{nd}, \phi_{nd} = (d^d n^{-\beta})^{\frac{1}{2\beta+d}}.$$