

From Isotonic to Lipschitz Regression: A New Interpolative Perspective on Shape-restricted Estimation

Kenta Takatsu, Tianyu Zhang, and Arun Kumar Kuchibhotla

Department of Statistics and Data Science, Carnegie Mellon University

Abstract

This manuscript seeks to bridge two seemingly disjoint paradigms of nonparametric regression estimation based on smoothness assumptions and shape constraints. The proposed approach is motivated by a conceptually simple observation: Every Lipschitz function is a sum of monotonic and linear functions. This principle is further generalized to the higher-order monotonicity and multivariate covariates. A family of estimators is proposed based on a sample-splitting procedure, which inherits desirable methodological, theoretical, and computational properties of shape-restricted estimators. Our theoretical analysis provides convergence guarantees of the estimator under heteroscedastic and heavy-tailed errors, as well as adaptive properties to the complexity of the true regression function. The generality of the proposed decomposition framework is demonstrated through new approximation results, and extensive numerical studies validate the theoretical properties and empirical evidence for the practicalities of the proposed estimation framework.

Keywords— Nonparametric regression, Approximation theory, Shape-restricted method, Oracle inequality, Model selection, Heavy-tailed data

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Literature review	5
3	Estimation procedure	6
4	Rate of convergence and oracle inequalities	8
4.1	Main results	8
4.2	Oracle inequalities	10
4.3	Sketch of the proof	12

5	Generalization to multivariate and k-monotonicity	13
5.1	Decomposition spaces based on shape-restricted components	13
5.1.1	Approximate decomposition for function spaces of non-integer orders	15
5.2	Generalization to multivariate settings	16
5.3	Generic algorithms for nonparametric regression estimation	18
5.4	Minimax rates in the literature	19
6	Numerical studies	20
6.1	Univariate nonparametric regression	21
6.2	Multivariate regression under additive structure	24
7	Conclusions	26
Supplement A Proofs of oracle inequalities		32
A.1	Proof of Theorem 4	32
A.2	Proofs of Theorems 2 and 3	33
A.3	Proof of Theorem 9	34
Supplement B Oracle inequality for model selection under heavy-tailed errors		36
B.1	Proof of Theorem 5	37
B.2	Application of the model selection result	44
Supplement C Supporting lemmas for oracle inequalities		47
C.1	Proof of Lemma 17	47
C.2	Proofs of Lemma 18 and Lemma 19	48
C.3	Proofs of Lemmas 21 and 22	55
C.4	Proof of Lemma 23	58
C.5	Stochastic boundedness of the estimator	59
Supplement D Decomposition and approximation results		63
Supplement E Additional proofs for multivariate decomposition		67
Supplement F Additional details for additive models		68
F.1	Estimation procedure	68
F.2	Oracle property of the additive estimator	69
Supplement G Additional numerical studies		70
G.1	Robustness of the proposed procedures	70
G.2	Additional results on adaptive rates	72
Supplement H Extension to density estimation		73

1 Introduction

The present manuscript investigates the nonparametric estimation of the conditional mean function based on observed covariates and response variables, without assuming the true function taking any specific parametric forms. Specifically, we consider n independent and identically distributed (IID) observations $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \sim P_0$, where the predictive covariate variable vector X_i takes values in

some measurable space Ω , often a subset of \mathbb{R}^d , and the response Y_i is a numerical random variable. We are interested in estimating the unknown conditional mean function $f_0(x) := \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]$ that minimizes the mean-squared prediction error of the response among all the square-integrable functions of X . Defining the “error variables” as $\xi_i := Y_i - f_0(X_i)$, we can write the relationship between the covariates and the response as

$$Y_i = f_0(X_i) + \xi_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (1)$$

In our view, there are two primary perspectives in nonparametric regression function estimation: one based on notions of smoothness assumption and the other in “qualitative” properties such as shapes. The former approach posits that the true signal f_0 resides within function spaces, often characterized by the degree of smoothness inherent in their functions. Examples of such spaces include Hölder, Sobolev, Besov, and bounded variation spaces. See, for instance, Chapter 4 of [Giné and Nickl \(2021\)](#). Various estimation procedures have been tailored to these spaces, ranging from series estimators, convolution-based methods, the k -nearest neighbor and Nadaraya-Watson estimators, local polynomial estimators, smoothing splines, RKHS methods, and so on. Many of them are proven rate-optimal within a minimax framework. On the other hand, the latter approach imposes more qualitative structures on f_0 , such as monotonicity, convexity, and unimodality, often motivated by specific scientific insights. This has led to a significant body of literature on shape-restricted methodology, which seeks to approximate f_0 with a function that adheres to predefined shape constraints.

The central argument of this manuscript is that these seemingly independent methodologies, rooted in smoothness-based function spaces and shape constraints, can be related within a simple framework. This approach gives rise to a new family of estimators that take advantage of the properties of shape-restricted methodologies while also operating within classical nonparametric function spaces based on the notion of smoothness.

The key concept underlying our framework can be summarized by the following observations: For any univariate L -Lipschitz function f , there exists a function g such that

$$f(x) = g(x) - Lx \text{ and } g \text{ is non-decreasing.} \quad (2)$$

We will discuss this decomposition with greater generality in Section 5 beyond the context of Lipschitz functions. The decomposition (2) suggests that nonparametric regression problems can be decomposed into two subproblems: (1) estimating the shape-restricted regression function g , and (2) selecting the parameter L . The first estimation problem is typically more challenging as it involves the estimation of a function under shape constraints, which is an infinite-dimensional object. Therefore, the properties of the proposed class of estimators are expected to resemble those of shape-restricted regression estimators, as we demonstrate in this manuscript.

Recent literature has revealed intriguing properties of shape-restricted estimators, which traditional nonparametric methods based on smoothness often lack. These properties have prompted us to question whether we can extend the benefits of shape-restricted estimators to a broader context. Firstly, unlike many popular estimators including kernel smoothing, local polynomials, or orthogonal series estimators, shape-restricted estimators are often tuning parameter free, eliminating the need for model selection procedures. Secondly, despite their nonparametric nature, shape-restricted estimators can often be computed efficiently. For instance, the least squares estimator over the monotone function class can be solved efficiently by the Pool Adjacent Violators Algorithm (PAVA). In addition to their computational advantages, shape-restricted estimators often exhibit the property of *adaptive* risk bounds. This implies that the estimator converges at a faster rate than the minimax rate when the true function is “simple.” Let us consider the

case of univariate monotonic f_0 . In this case, the least squares estimator does not only converge at the minimax rate of $n^{-2/3}$ in terms of the squared risk in the worst case but also converges at the parametric n^{-1} rate, ignoring a logarithmic term, if f_0 is monotonic piecewise constant. Remarkably, the estimator automatically achieves this faster convergence rate without any preconceived knowledge of the underlying function, and hence, is called adaptive. It has been shown that estimators under other shape constraints also possess this adaptive property (Han and Wellner, 2018; Guntuboyina and Sen, 2018). Finally, recent works have extended shape-restricted methods to multivariate covariates (Han, Wang, Chatterjee, and Samworth, 2019; Deng and Zhang, 2020). Combining them with our proposed framework, shape-restricted methods can also handle nonparametric regression over general dimensions.

Summary of contributions. In summary, the proposed estimators possess the following methodological advantages:

1. *Optimal and adaptive convergence rates:* The estimators achieve the minimax optimal rate of convergence for the studied function classes. They are also adaptive such that their risk automatically converges at a faster rate when f_0 is “simple”.
2. *Computational advantages:* The estimators can often be computed efficiently using quadratic programming. Additionally, the procedure can be regarded as almost tuning parameter free as the model selection process can be automated via the use of the standard optimizer.
3. *Support for multivariate covariates:* Although the presented theoretical results primarily focus on univariate covariates, we propose multiple schemes to generalize the procedure to multivariate settings ($d > 1$), which is more relevant to the application.

Our theoretical contributions are detailed in Section 4 where we establish the behavior of the estimator under general assumptions on the error variables $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Specifically, we analyze the convergence rate of the proposed estimator to the best projection of the true signal f_0 onto our working class of functions. We obtain these results under two cases of heteroscedastic and heavy-tailed error variables: (1) with a finite q th moment and (2) with exponentially heavy-tailed, or sub-Weibull, variables (Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty, 2022). The corresponding results indeed confirm the adaptive property of the proposed method as summarized in Table 1 in Section 4. Moreover, Theorem 5 extends the existing model selection results (Massart, 2000; Giné, Koltchinskii, and Wellner, 2003; van der Vaart, Dudoit, and Laan, 2006; Koltchinskii, 2011) to the heteroscedastic and heavy-tailed settings. We present this result in a self-contained form, as the model selection can be of independent interest to the readers.

Organization. This manuscript is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a literature review, situating our work within the current literature. Section 3 defines the estimator whose theoretical properties are detailed in Section 4. Section 5 discusses the generality of the decomposition framework, listing numerous extensions to higher-order monotonicity and multivariate covariates. This section also provides new inclusion and approximation results of the decomposition space, establishing connections to traditional functional spaces. Section 6 provides numerical studies to confirm theoretical properties of the proposed estimator, along with empirical evidence for other estimators constructed within our general framework. Finally, we conclude the manuscript by presenting remarks on future investigations in Section 7.

Notation. Below, we present the glossary of notations we frequently refer to. For any $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ with $d \geq 1$, we denote by e_j the d -dimensional vector of zeroes with one at the j th position. For a univariate function f , $f^{(k)}$ with a positive integer k denotes the k th derivative of f . We denote the marginal distribution X as P_X . For each P_X -square integrable function g , we denote its $L_2(P_X)$ -norm as $\|g\|_{L_2(P_X)} := (\int g^2(x) dP_X(x))^{1/2}$. For a real-valued function $f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, its supremum norm is denoted by $\|f\|_\infty := \sup_{x \in \Omega} |f(x)|$. For any deterministic sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{r_n\}$, we denote $x_n = O(r_n)$ if there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that $|x_n| \leq C|r_n|$ for large n . For a sequence of random variables X_n , we denote $X_n = O_P(r_n)$ if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $M > 0$ such that $P(|X_n/r_n| > M) < \varepsilon$ for large n . In particular, $X_n = O_P(1)$ means that the random variable X_n is bounded in probability. For a vector $X := (X_{[1]}, \dots, X_{[d]})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we use $X_{[j]} \in \mathbb{R}$ to denote its j th entry. The ceiling of x , denoted by $\lceil x \rceil$, rounds a number up to the nearest integer.

2 Literature review

The proposed method in this manuscript is closely related to the extensive body of literature on nonparametric shape-restricted regression estimation. The problem is particularly well-studied in the univariate covariate setting, where popular shape constraints include monotonicity and convexity. A common approach is calculating the least squares estimator (LSE) using the observed samples over the function class of interest (Guntuboyina and Sen, 2018). Under the monotonicity, the LSE is commonly known as the isotonic regression, which can be efficiently computed using the *Pool Adjacent Violators Algorithm* (PAVA) (Ayer, Brunk, Ewing, Reid, and Silverman, 1955). The univariate regression estimator under the convexity has also been studied in the literature (Groeneboom, Jongbloed, and Wellner, 2001; Guntuboyina and Sen, 2015; Ghosal and Sen, 2017). Recently, there has been a surge in theoretical analysis associated with the convergence rate of shape-restricted LSEs. The literature often emphasizes the remarkable adaptive property of LSEs, where the estimator demonstrates a faster convergence rate depending on the local structure around the true regression function (Zhang, 2002; Chatterjee, Guntuboyina, and Sen, 2015; Guntuboyina and Sen, 2018; Bellec, 2018).

Existing results are typically derived under strong assumptions regarding the error distribution of ξ , such as sub-Gaussianity; Zhang (2002) is an exception as the errors here are only assumed to have a finite second moment. Recent works have focused on relaxing such assumptions and explored the behavior of LSEs in the presence of heavy-tailed errors (Han and Wellner, 2018, 2019; Kuchibhotla and Patra, 2022), which is also one of the aims of this work.

Multivariate applications of shape-restricted methods have been investigated particularly in recent years although a comprehensive understanding of theoretical behaviors is still under development (Guntuboyina and Sen, 2018). Han et al. (2019) studied the LSE estimator for the multivariate isotonic regression while Han and Zhang (2020) proved that an alternative method must be considered to achieve minimax optimal adaptivity for all dimensions. The multivariate convex estimators have been studied in Seregin and Wellner (2010) and Seijo and Sen (2011). Finally, additivity is a common structural assumption in regression analysis. In this context, studying shape constraints in conjunction with additivity helps maintain the theoretical properties of shape-restricted methods. Some recent developments can be found in the works of Mammen and Yu (2007); Chen and Samworth (2016) and Han and Wellner (2018).

As outlined earlier, the proposed estimator leverages a decomposition that separates a nonparametric function, adhering to certain smoothness properties, into shape-restricted and parametric components. The concept of decomposing certain smooth functions into parametric components

has been explored in the field of semiparametric regression. In particular, the literature has investigated two-stage estimation procedures that aim to improve the initial parametric estimator through nonparametric methods. This approach has been adopted to the context of density and regression estimation (Hjort and Glad, 1995; Hjort and Jones, 1996; Eguchi, Yoon Kim, and Park, 2003), conditional distribution functions (Veraverbeke, Gijbels, and Omelka, 2014), and additive models (Lin, Cui, and Zhu, 2009). These methods often exhibit a faster rate of convergence when the initial parametric estimator is correctly specified. However, this differs from the notion of adaptivity in the shape-restricted LSE literature. In this case, adaptivity is *not* automatic and often relies on the correct specification of the true data-generating distribution to attain a faster convergence rate. We do not make such an assumption in this manuscript. Finally, the key decomposition we leverage has been studied in the optimization literature. In particular, Zlobec (2006) analyzes functions with Lipschitz derivatives, which can be represented as the sum of a convex and a quadratic function. This corresponds precisely to the second-order decomposition result, presented in Section 5 of this manuscript. See Proposition 6 with $k = 2$.

3 Estimation procedure

In this section, we define our estimator based on the basic decomposition (2), and discuss some details of its implementation in practice. Its theoretical properties are developed in the successive section. For any $L \geq 0$, we define the function space

$$\mathcal{F}(L) := \left\{ f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \exists g \in \mathcal{C} \text{ such that } f(x) = g(x) - Lx \text{ for all } x \in [0, 1] \right\} \quad (3)$$

where the convex cone \mathcal{C} is the set of all non-decreasing functions from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} . We propose an estimator that belongs to this class, and the estimand of the interest is the $L_2(P_X)$ -projection of the regression function f_0 onto $\mathcal{F}(L)$:

$$f_L^* := \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}(L)} \int (f_0(x) - f(x))^2 dP_X(x) \quad (4)$$

where P_X is the true marginal distribution of X . Section 5 is dedicated to the formal properties of $\mathcal{F}(L)$ and the generalization thereof. To elucidate the motivation for estimating f_L^* and the role of the constant L in the present section, we state the following proposition:

Proposition 1. *Any L -Lipschitz function $f : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that,*

$$|f(x_2) - f(x_1)| \leq L|x_2 - x_1| \quad \text{for all } x_1, x_2 \in [0, 1], \quad (5)$$

is contained in $\mathcal{F}(L)$. Furthermore, the space $\mathcal{F}(L)$ forms a nested set in L such that $\mathcal{F}(L) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(L')$ for any $L \leq L'$.

This result is a special case of Proposition 6 in Section 5. Proposition 1 states that $f_L^* \equiv f_0$ for any $L' \geq L$ when f_0 is an L -Lipschitz function; hence, the proposed method can be effectively regarded as a Lipschitz function estimator. For any $L' \geq L$, an L -Lipschitz function is also L' -Lipschitz by definition. In this manuscript, the “true” Lipschitz parameter of f_0 refers to the smallest value of L such that (5) holds. We now define the estimator of f_L^* as the projection based on the empirical distribution of the data.

Suppose we observe IID random vectors $D := \{(X_i, Y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ taking values in $[0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}$. When the “true” constant L for $\mathcal{F}(L)$ is known, we may consider the following estimator:

$$\widehat{f}_L(x; D) := \widehat{g}_L(x; D) - Lx \quad \text{where} \quad \widehat{g}_L(\cdot; D) := \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{i=1}^n \{Y_i + LX_i - g(X_i)\}^2. \quad (6)$$

The intuition behind this construction is as follows: Since any function in $\mathcal{F}(L)$ can be represented as the difference between a monotonic and the linear function $x \mapsto Lx$, we add the linear function to the response variable, i.e., $Y + LX$; use any tool to estimate the monotonic function; and subtract the linear function back to obtain the final estimator. In particular, we considered the isotonic LSE for constructing \widehat{g}_L , which provides a left-continuous, piecewise-constant monotonic function based on the following closed-form formula (see Theorem 1.4.4 of [Robertson, Wright, and Dykstra \(1988\)](#), for instance):

$$\widehat{g}_L(x; D) := \min_{X_{(u)} \geq x} \max_{X_{(l)} \leq x} \frac{1}{u-l+1} \sum_{i=l}^u Y_{(i)} + LX_{(i)}. \quad (7)$$

Here, we denote by $X_{(1)} \leq X_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq X_{(n)}$ the order statistics and by $Y_{(1)}, Y_{(2)}, \dots, Y_{(n)}$ the corresponding sequence of Y without breaking the original pairs (X_i, Y_i) for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

In practice, however, the true constant L is often unknown and needs to be estimated. At first, it can be tempting to construct an LSE by minimizing $\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - f(X_i))^2$ over all functions $f \in \{\mathcal{F}(L) : L \geq 0\}$ jointly. This is not an effective strategy in practice. This follows since any finite set of sample points can be perfectly interpolated using a Lipschitz function with a sufficiently large, but mis-specified, constant L . As a result, this class of functions can always achieve zero training error for any observed data set. In short, we need some protective measure from selecting arbitrarily large L .

We propose the following model selection procedure based on the sample splitting. First, we define \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 as disjoint index sets such that $\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with cardinalities corresponding to n_1 and n_2 . From this, two datasets are obtained: $D_1 := \{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_1\}$ and $D_2 := \{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_2\}$. We also define a candidate set $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}$. This can, for instance, be an interval $[0, L_+]$ where L_+ is allowed to diverge with n . The estimator of L is defined as the minimizer of the empirical risk computed over D_2 :

$$\widehat{L} \equiv \widehat{L}(D_1, D_2) := \arg \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} \{Y_i - \widehat{f}_L(X_i; D_1)\}^2 \quad (8)$$

where $\widehat{f}_L(\cdot; D_1)$ is an estimator of f_L^* constructed from D_1 , given by the expressions (6) and (7). The final estimator is given by $\widehat{f}_n \equiv \widehat{f}_{\widehat{L}}(\cdot; D_1)$.

While the proposed procedure can be interpreted as performing cross-validation over the parameter L , it also possesses some unique and desirable properties. Firstly, the core decomposition based on Proposition 1 holds for any $L' \geq L$ without requiring $L' = L$. This means that a “reasonable” estimate of the regression function f_0 , in terms of mean squared errors, can be obtained without precisely identifying the true value of L . As we will demonstrate later, the performance of the estimators is robust with over-specified L (see Figure 7 in Supplementary Material). This stands in contrast to many other nonparametric estimators such as Gaussian kernel ridge regression of orthogonal basis estimators where critical tuning parameters depend on sample size and often require to be precisely determined. Secondly, the optimization (8) can be implemented using a numerical optimization program such as the Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (BFGS) algorithm

(Byrd and Nocedal, 1989). In practice, the only restriction for the set \mathcal{L} is that it must contain some element L' such that $L' \geq L$. This is satisfied, for instance, when \mathcal{L} is an interval $[0, L_+]$ for some arbitrarily large end-point L_+ . These details are almost always automatically handled by the standard optimizer, such as `optim` in R, and thus the proposed algorithm is effectively tuning parameter free.

Finally, the optimization problem given by (8) essentially performs model selection over uncountably infinite candidates. This is in contrast with standard cross-validation where the number of candidate models is typically treated as finite or at least countable (van der Vaart et al., 2006). Hence, there remains a theoretical justification for whether this minimization is prone to some form of over-fitting. Our general model selection result (Theorem 5) states that \hat{L} is close to the optimal choice when the set \mathcal{L} satisfies some metric entropy conditions, which is easily satisfied when \mathcal{L} is an interval.

4 Rate of convergence and oracle inequalities

This section presents the oracle inequalities associated with the estimator defined in Section 3. The oracle inequality is a prevalent theoretical statement in the LSE literature, providing a risk bound without requiring the working statistical model to be correctly specified.

The current theoretical results in the literature are often stated under strong assumptions on the error variable $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$, defined in (1). This includes, for instance, independence between ξ and X and sub-Gaussian or sub-exponential tails of ξ . Here, we present the results under weaker assumptions on the error variable, which guarantees the performance of the proposed procedure in heavy-tailed and heteroscedastic noise settings. These assumptions are placed as follows:

(A1) There exists a constant $C_q \in (0, \infty)$ such that $(\mathbb{E}[|\xi_i|^q | X_i])^{1/q} \leq C_q$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

(A2) For some $\beta > 0$, there exists $C_\beta \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$(\mathbb{E}[|\xi_i|^q | X_i])^{1/q} \leq C_\beta q^{1/\beta} \text{ for all } 1 \leq q \leq \lceil \beta \log n \rceil \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

In the sequel, we provide the convergence rate of the studied estimator under one of the above conditions.

Remark 1 (On heavy-tail assumptions). *Neither (A1) nor (A2) requires $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ to be independent and in general, (A2) implies (A1). The assumption (A1) only requires the finite q -th conditional moments, and the assumption (A2) resembles the assumption that the error variable follows so-called sub-Weibull distributions (Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty, 2022). In fact, (A2) becomes equivalent to assuming conditional sub-Weibull distributions as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Sub-Weibull distributions generalize light tail conditions such as sub-Gaussian and sub-exponential tails. When $\beta = 1$, this corresponds to assuming the distribution of ξ is sub-exponential, and $\beta = 2$ corresponds to a sub-Gaussian tail. The case where $\beta < 1$ corresponds to the (exponentially) heavy-tailed distributions.*

4.1 Main results

We now present the convergence results of the proposed estimator. First, we state a simplified result under the assumption that $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}(L_0)$ for some unknown L_0 . This assumption is relaxed

in the oracle inequality presented shortly after. All results in this section adopts the notation $\|\cdot\| \equiv \|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_X)}$.

Theorem 2 (Worst case). *Consider the regression model (1) and assume $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}(L_0)$ for some unknown L_0 , $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^2|X_i] \leq \sigma^2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and either (A1) or (A2) holds. Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $L_0 \in \mathcal{L}$. We denote by $|\mathcal{L}|$ the diameter of the set, or the width when \mathcal{L} is an interval, and L_+ be the element in \mathcal{L} with the largest absolute value. We assume that the estimator \widehat{f}_n , defined in Section 3, is obtained from $|D_1| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$.*

Then, there exists a constant N_ε only depending on $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $n \geq N_\varepsilon$, with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$, we have

$$\|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|^2 \leq C_\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{(\log n)^{4/3}}{n^{2/3}} + \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(\frac{L_+}{n^{1-1/q}} + \frac{L_+^2}{n} \right) \right\}$$

under (A1). With the same probability, we have

$$\|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|^2 \leq C_\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{(\log n)^{4/3}}{n^{2/3}} + \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(\frac{L_+(\log n)^{1/\beta} + L_+^2}{n} \right) \right\}$$

under (A2). Here, $C_\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ is a constant depending on $\varepsilon, L_0, \|f_0\|_\infty, \sigma^2$ as well as q, C_q under (A1) and β, C_β under (A2).

Under the favorable situation where f_0 is of “low complexity”, we can obtain a faster rate of convergence. We introduce additional notation. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathcal{F}_{m,L}$ a set of any m -piecewise function, taking the following form:

$$\mathcal{F}_{m,L} := \left\{ f_{m,L} : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R} \mid f_{m,L}(x) := \sum_{j=1}^m a_j 1(x \in I_j) - Lx \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where $a_i < a_j$ for $i < j$ and $\{I_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is any non-overlapping partition of $[0, 1]$ such that $\cup_{j=1}^m I_j = [0, 1]$. This result can be directly extended to the case where $a_i > a_j$ for $i < j$. See Remark 2 below. This is a prevalent property of LSEs under some shape constraints, frequently referred to as local adaptivity in the literature (Guntuboyina and Sen, 2018).

Theorem 3 (Low complexity). *Under the identical setting as in Theorem 2, but now we further assume $f_0 = f_{m,L_0} \in \mathcal{F}_{m,L_0}$. It holds with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$ that*

$$\|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|^2 \leq C_\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{m(\log n)^2}{n} + \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(\frac{L_+}{n^{1-1/q}} + \frac{L_+^2}{n} \right) \right\}$$

under (A1) and

$$\|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|^2 \leq C_\varepsilon \left\{ \frac{m(\log n)^2}{n} + \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(\frac{L_+(\log n)^{1/\beta} + L_+^2}{n} \right) \right\}$$

under (A2). Here, $C_\varepsilon > 0$ is a constant depending on $\varepsilon, L_0, \|f_0\|_\infty, \sigma^2$ as well as q, C_q under (A1) and β, C_β under (A2).

Theorem 3 becomes relevant when the true signal f_0 is a linear function ($m = 1$), a monotone piecewise constant function ($L = 0$), or the sum of monotone piecewise constant and linear functions. We emphasize that both results allow for a diverging L_+ with n . For instance, by considering $\mathcal{L} := [0, \log n]$, we can assert that $L_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ for some n large enough hence $L_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ is satisfied under a large sample size. Table 1 below summarizes the convergence rates of the estimator, up to a logarithmic factor, under four regimes according to the complexity of the true signal and the assumptions on the error variable. With the choice $L_+ = O(\log n)$, we summarized the convergence rates in Table 1:

Error distribution	Worst case	Low complexity
(A1)	$n^{-2/3} \vee n^{-1+1/q}$	$n^{-1+1/q}$
(A2)	$n^{-2/3}$	mn^{-1}

Table 1: The convergence rates of the estimator under four different regimes, logarithm terms omitted. The estimator exhibits different rates of convergence depending on the complexity of f_0 and the distribution of the error variables.

Adaptation to the unknown signal f_0 with low complexity is one of the intriguing characteristics of shape-restricted estimators that our estimator also possesses (Zhang, 2002; Chatterjee et al., 2015; Guntuboyina and Sen, 2018; Bellec, 2018). The proposed estimator achieves adaptivity simultaneously with respect to a wider class of “simple structures”, including both linear and piecewise constant f_0 , which is more favorable than traditional shape-restricted estimators. The numerical studies in Section 6 demonstrate that the estimator indeed achieves the faster convergence rate without the preconceived knowledge of f_0 .

Remark 2 (Adaptation to non-increasing piecewise functions). *Our definition of the function space $\mathcal{F}(L)$ is motivated by the fact that any univariate L -Lipschitz function can be decomposed as the difference between non-decreasing and linear functions. Following the proof of Proposition 1, one can also decompose an L -Lipschitz function as the difference between non-increasing and linear functions. All the methods and results discussed can be extended to the complementary function class $-\mathcal{F}(L)$. The resulting estimators adapt to non-increasing functions, piecewise constant non-increasing functions, and linear functions with positive slopes. Moreover, there is no reason to restrict to $L \geq 0$ in the definition of $\mathcal{F}(L)$ and all the results continue to hold if L is allowed to vary in a bounded interval around zero.*

4.2 Oracle inequalities

Theorems 2 and 3 assumed the model was well-specified for ease of presentation. Below, we present the oracle inequality that allows $f_0 \notin \mathcal{F}(L)$. Theorems 2 and 3 are, in fact, special cases of the following theorem.

Theorem 4 (Oracle inequality). *Consider the regression model (1) and assume $\mathbb{E}[\xi^2|X_i] \leq \sigma^2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and either (A1) or (A2) holds. Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}$ whose diameter is denoted by $|\mathcal{L}|$ and the largest element is denoted by L_+ . We assume that the estimator \hat{f}_n , defined in Section 3, is obtained from $|D_1| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$. Then, there exist constants C_ε and N_ε only depending on $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$*

such that for any $n \geq N_\varepsilon$, it holds for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|^2 \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \left[(1 + \delta) \|f_L^* - f_0\|^2 + C(1 + 1/\delta) \left\{ \mathbf{R}_{n,L}^{(1)} + \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(\mathbf{R}_n^{(2)} L_+ + \frac{L_+^2}{\delta n} \right) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the constant C depends on $C_q, C_\beta, \|f_0\|_\infty, q, \beta$ and σ^2 ,

$$\mathbf{R}_{n,L}^{(1)} := ((L \vee 1) \log n)^2 \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\frac{m \log^2 \{n(\log n + L)\}}{n} + \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{m,L}} \|f - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \right), \quad (10)$$

and

$$\mathbf{R}_n^{(2)} := \begin{cases} n^{-1+1/q} & \text{when } \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n \text{ satisfies (A1)} \\ n^{-1}(\log n)^{1/\beta} & \text{when } \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n \text{ satisfies (A2)}. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

The assumption $|D_1| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ is not of theoretical significance and is placed only for ease of notation. Importantly, Theorem 4 accounts for the case when the working model $\mathcal{F}(L)$ is misspecified, that is, $f_0 \notin \mathcal{F}(L)$ for any L . In such cases, the performance of the estimator \widehat{f}_n is expressed by the sum of approximation and estimation error terms.

With the choice of $L_+ = O(\log n)$, the above result can be simplified to

$$\|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \lesssim (1 + \delta) \|f_L^* - f_0\|^2 + (1 + 1/\delta) \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \left\{ \mathbf{R}_{n,L}^{(1)} + \mathbf{R}_n^{(2)} \right\}$$

with all logarithm terms suppressed. It then becomes evident that the convergence rate of the estimator is driven by two terms: $\mathbf{R}_{n,L}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{R}_n^{(2)}$. The first term corresponds to the oracle inequality for estimating the projection f_L^* for fixed L . The second term is due to the oracle inequality for model selection whose behavior depends on the distribution of the error variable.

Theorem 4 reflects the non-standard adaptivity behavior of the proposed estimator, which differs from the oracle inequality in the literature (See, for instance, Theorem 3 of Han and Wellner (2018)). Specifically, the estimator exhibits adaptivity on two levels: the first level involves selecting the appropriate statistical model $\mathcal{F}(L)$ for a data-driven choice of L , while the second level pertains to the low complexity of f_0 manifested through the infimum over m . Hence, the corresponding result can be regarded as a generalization of oracle inequalities involving only m .

Remark 3 (Rates under known L_0). *Theorem 4 also implies the case when L_0 for $\mathcal{F}(L_0)$ is pre-specified. In such case, we can define \mathcal{L} as a singleton set $\{L_0\}$ and thus $|\mathcal{L}| = 0$. Theorem 4 then implies with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$,*

$$\|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|^2 \lesssim C_\varepsilon \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \left\{ (1 + \delta) \|f_L^* - f_0\|^2 + (1 + 1/\delta) \mathbf{R}_{n,L}^{(1)} \right\}.$$

Since the remainder term $\mathbf{R}_n^{(2)}$ is no longer involved, this result does not require (A1) or (A2); The only requirement is $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^2 | X_i] \leq \sigma^2$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. We note that the constant $(1 + \delta)$ can be improved to 1, but requires a separate result tailored for known L_0 (See Lemma 17 in Section C of Supplementary Material). This result follows since the class of estimators for any fixed L is a convex class, corresponding to the result in the literature known as a sharp oracle inequality. See Bellec (2018) for more discussion. Our result includes $(1 + \delta)$ as we perform model selection over a possibly non-convex class of estimators. See the difference between Theorems 5.1 and 5.2 of Koltchinskii (2011).

Remark 4 (Theorem 4 under expectation). *One can also strengthen the results in Theorem 4 to “convergence in mean” as follows;*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|^2 \\ & \leq \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \left[(1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \|f_L^* - f_0\|^2 + C(1 + 1/\delta) \left\{ R_{n,L}^{(1)} + \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(R_n^{(2)} L_+ + \frac{L_+^2}{\delta n} \right) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Section C.5 of Supplementary Material provides the bound on the expectation of the estimator. Using this result, the above strengthening can be achieved under minimal modifications to the proof of Theorem 4.

4.3 Sketch of the proof

The proof of Theorem 4 proceeds in two steps; First, conditioning on D_1 , we invoke a new oracle inequality for model selection associated with the data-dependent \widehat{L} (See equation (8)); Then, the final result is obtained by invoking a sharp oracle inequality for estimating f_L^* for each fixed L . While the model selection under heavy-tailed errors has been studied in the literature, for instance by Brownlees, Joly, and Lugosi (2015), the corresponding statement for the LSEs under either (A1) or (A2) is still new in the literature to the best of our knowledge. It is, hence, of independent interest. Below, we present the corresponding model selection result in a self-contained form.

For a class of functions \mathcal{F} , a probability measure Q and any $\varepsilon > 0$, the ε -covering number $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(Q))$ of \mathcal{F} relative to the $L_2(Q)$ -metric is defined as the minimal number of $L_2(Q)$ balls of radius less than or equal to ε required for covering \mathcal{F} . In the sequel, we denote by \mathbb{P}_n the empirical distribution of the observation. We first present the oracle inequality in the general settings; Its concrete relationship to the model selection in the context of this manuscript will be discussed shortly after.

Theorem 5 (Model selection). *Consider the regression model in (1) where $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^2 | X_i] \leq \sigma^2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and either (A1) or (A2) holds. Let \mathcal{F} be a set of functions and $F := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_\infty$. Consider the empirical risk minimizer:*

$$\widehat{f}_n := \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - f(X_i))^2. \quad (12)$$

It then holds for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 & \leq (1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \|f - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \\ & \quad + C \inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \left\{ \log(1 + \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))) \left(R_n F + \frac{2F^2}{n\delta} \right) + \varepsilon F \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_n := \begin{cases} n^{-1+1/q} & \text{when } \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n \text{ satisfies (A1)} \\ n^{-1}(\log n)^{1/\beta} & \text{when } \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n \text{ satisfies (A2)} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

and C is a universal constant depending on $C_q, C_\beta, \|f_0\|_\infty, q, \beta$ and σ^2 .

When \mathcal{F} is a finite set of functions with the cardinality $|\mathcal{F}|$, Theorem 5 still holds by replacing $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)) = |\mathcal{F}|$ and $\varepsilon = 0$. We note that Theorem 5 is an extension of the existing oracle

inequalities for model selection to the heavy-tailed and heteroscedastic noise settings (Massart, 2000; Giné et al., 2003; van der Vaart et al., 2006; Koltchinskii, 2011).

In the context of model selection, the set \mathcal{F} usually depends on data, and hence is random. This is the case, for instance, when \mathcal{F} consists of different estimators, all constructed from the same training data. In our case, the set of functions corresponds to:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}} := \left\{ \widehat{f}_L := \widehat{g}_L(x; D_1) - Lx; L \in \mathcal{L} \right\}, \quad (14)$$

where $\widehat{g}_L(x; D_1)$ is given by (7). Each L is mapped to a function \widehat{f}_L and this mapping depends on samples in D_1 . Conditioning on D_1 , Theorem 5 can be applied to the following selection process:

$$\widehat{f}_n := \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}} n^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} (Y_i - f(X_i))^2$$

where the remaining randomness of this process comes from D_2 .

Remark 5 (Further refinements of Theorem 5). *Theorem 5 is sufficient to derive the optimal convergence rate for the proposed estimators in this work. Nevertheless, further improvements seem plausible. For instance, more refined approach becomes necessary for the optimal result when analyzing the model selection over the class of functions with higher complexity, such as the VC-major class. Furthermore, we conjecture that the analogous result can be obtained under the weaker entropy condition with $L_2(P)$, instead of $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ metric. These improvements require further analysis and do not apply to the class of estimators proposed in this manuscript. We present a full account of model selection under the general assumptions on ξ and \mathcal{F} in future work.*

5 Generalization to multivariate and k -monotonicity

Thus far, we have discussed the application of the univariate, Lipschitz-monotonic decomposition (Proposition 1) in nonparametric regression. In this section, we will generalize this basic relationship to higher-order monotonicity and multivariate covariates, and we will establish corresponding estimators.

5.1 Decomposition spaces based on shape-restricted components

Nonparametric regression methods usually begin by assuming that true signal f_0 belongs to certain function space. These function spaces often impose constraints on the smoothness properties of the contained functions. One common generalization of univariate Lipschitz functions is the Hölder space. Formally, let $k = (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_d)$ be a d -dimensional index set where each k_i is a non-negative integer and $|k| = \sum_{i=1}^d k_i$. For each $f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ where $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d) \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, differentiable up to the order $k \geq 1$, we define the differential operator D^k as

$$D^k f := \frac{\partial^{|k|} f(x)}{\partial^{k_1} x_1 \dots \partial^{k_d} x_d} \text{ and } D^0 f := f.$$

For $s, L > 0$, the Hölder class $\Sigma_d(s, L)$ on Ω consists of functions that satisfy the following condition:

$$\Sigma_d(s, L) := \left\{ f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R} \left| \sum_{0 \leq |m| \leq \lfloor s \rfloor} \|D^m f\|_{\infty} + \sum_{|k| = \lfloor s \rfloor} \sup_{x \neq y, x, y \in \Omega} \frac{|D^k f(y) - D^k f(x)|}{\|x - y\|^{s - |k|}} \leq L \right. \right\}.$$

For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$, all functions in $\Sigma_1(s, L)$ are required by definition to be s -times differentiable with a bounded s th derivative. This implies that not all Lipschitz functions belong to $\Sigma_1(1, L)$; for example, $f(x) = |x|$ does not belong to $\Sigma_1(1, L)$. To close this gap, we define bounded Lipschitz spaces (Giné and Nickl, 2021, Equation (4.113)), which coincides with the class of L -Lipschitz functions. A bounded Lipschitz space for $s \in \mathbb{N}$ is defined as

$$\text{BL}_d(s, L) := \left\{ f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \sum_{0 \leq |m| \leq s-1} \|D^m f\|_\infty + \sum_{|k|=s-1} \sup_{x \neq y, x, y \in \Omega} \frac{|D^k f(y) - D^k f(x)|}{\|x - y\|} \leq L \right\}.$$

For $s \notin \mathbb{N}$, we set $\text{BL}_d(s, L) \equiv \Sigma_d(s, L)$.

The key concept behind the proposed methodology is the general decomposition of a nonparametric function into its shape-restricted and parametric components (Proposition 6 below). In this section, we will restrict ourselves to bounded domains and without loss of generality take the bounded domain to be $[0, 1]$. For any function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, an integer $r \geq 1$, and $h \in [0, 1 - rh]$, we define

$$\Delta_h^r(f, x) := \sum_{m=0}^r \binom{r}{m} (-1)^{r-m} f(x + mh).$$

Now we define the class of real-valued univariate k -monotone functions (Chatterjee et al., 2015) as

$$\mathcal{C}(k) := \left\{ g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \Delta_h^k(g, x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in [0, 1] \right\}.$$

In particular, all univariate functions whose $(k - 1)$ th derivative is non-decreasing belong to $\mathcal{C}(k)$. The concept of k -monotonicity generalizes the common shape constraints such as monotonicity ($k = 1$) and convexity ($k = 2$). Note that the definition of k -monotonicity here differs from that used in nonparametric density estimation (Gao and Wellner, 2009; Balabdaoui and Wellner, 2010).

Let us also define the decomposition function spaces that become particularly important for our discussion. For any $L \geq 0$ and integer $k \geq 1$, we define

$$\mathcal{F}(k, L) := \left\{ f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \exists g \in \mathcal{C}(k) \text{ such that } f(x) = g(x) - (L/k!)x^k \text{ for all } x \in [0, 1] \right\}. \quad (15)$$

It is now evident that the function space defined in (3) is a special case of $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ when $k = 1$.

The decomposition space $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ is introduced as it is relevant to our estimating procedure. According to the following inclusion statements, this class can be understood in relation to the classical function spaces.

Proposition 6 (High-order decomposition). *Let k be a fixed positive integer. For any $(k - 1)$ -times differentiable function $f : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ with an L -Lipschitz $(k - 1)$ th derivative, there exists a k -monotone function $g_L : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$f(x) = g_L(x) - (L/k!)x^k. \quad (16)$$

Therefore,

$$\Sigma_1(k, L) \subsetneq \text{BL}_1(k, L) \subsetneq \mathcal{F}(k, L) \quad \text{for all } L > 0 \quad \text{and } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Furthermore, the space $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ forms a nested set in L such that $\mathcal{F}(k, L) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(k, L')$ for any $L \leq L'$.

The proof of this proposition is provided in Section D of Supplementary Material. Proposition 1 is a special case of this result when $k = 1$. Since $\text{BL}_1(1, L)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{F}(1, L)$ as stated in Proposition 6, the estimator from Section 3 is a consistent estimator for any f_0 that belongs to $\text{BL}_1(1, L)$ while adapting to unknown parameter L .

We now demonstrate that $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ can be regarded as a strict subset of the k th bounded variation class, previously studied in Mammen and van de Geer (1997); Tibshirani (2014). The total variation of a function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as

$$\text{TV}(f) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p |f(z_{i+1}) - f(z_i)| : z_1 < \dots < z_p \text{ is a partition of } [0, 1] \right\}$$

where the supremum is taken over the partition. Given this definition, the k th bounded variation space for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is defined as

$$\text{BV}(k, L) := \left\{ f : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R} \mid f \text{ is } k - 1 \text{ times weakly differentiable and } \text{TV}(f^{(k-1)}) \leq L \right\}.$$

Recall that a univariate real-valued function is weakly differentiable if there exists an absolutely continuous function D such that

$$f(y) - f(x) = \int_x^y D(t) dt$$

holds for all x, y in the domain of f . The function D is referred to as the weak derivative of f . We now state the following:

Proposition 7. *With an abuse of notation, let $D^k f$ denote the k th weak derivative of f . The following inclusion property holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$\mathcal{F}^\dagger(k, L) := \mathcal{F}(k, L) \cap \left\{ f : \|D^{k-1} f\|_\infty \leq L \right\} \subsetneq \text{BV}(k, L). \quad (17)$$

The proof of this proposition is provided in Section D of Supplementary Material. In particular, this result implies that minimax optimal estimators for $\text{BV}(k, L)$ class, such as those in Mammen and van de Geer (1997) and Tibshirani (2014), provide the minimax risk upper bound for our class $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$, further assuming that the $(k - 1)$ th weak derivative is uniformly bounded. In summary, we have obtained the following chain of inclusion properties:

$$\Sigma_1(k, L) \subsetneq \text{BL}_1(k, L) \subsetneq \mathcal{F}^\dagger(k, L) \subsetneq \text{BV}(k, L) \quad \text{for all } L > 0 \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

5.1.1 Approximate decomposition for function spaces of non-integer orders

Decomposition results in Proposition 6 are stated only for integer-order spaces since k -monotone functions $\mathcal{C}(k)$ are only intuitively defined for integer k 's. Fortunately, we can still approximate $\text{BL}_1(s, L)$ for non-integer s with $\text{BL}_1(\lceil s \rceil, L')$ for some $L' > L$ since the space $\text{BL}_1(\lceil s \rceil, L')$ is dense in $L_2([0, 1])$. Since each function in an integer-order BL space admits an exact decomposition (16), we can derive some ‘‘approximate-decompositions’’ for functions in general BL spaces. In this regard, we have the following result:

Proposition 8. *There exists a universal constant $\mathfrak{C} > 1$ such that for any $\varepsilon, s, L > 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{f \in \text{BL}_1(s, L)} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\lceil s \rceil, \bar{L}_\varepsilon)} \|f - g\|_{L_2([0, 1])} \leq \sup_{f \in \text{BL}_1(s, L)} \inf_{g \in \text{BL}_1(\lceil s \rceil, \bar{L}_\varepsilon)} \|f - g\|_{L_2([0, 1])} \leq \varepsilon,$$

where $\bar{L}_\varepsilon = \mathfrak{C}L^{\lceil s \rceil/s} \varepsilon^{1 - \lceil s \rceil/s}$. Here, the domain of the functions in $\text{BL}_1(s, L)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\lceil s \rceil, \bar{L}_\varepsilon)$ are assumed to be $[0, 1]$.

The proof of this proposition is also provided in Section D of Supplementary Material.

Remark 6 (Application to the Sobolev space). *Although all the results in this section are presented in terms of Lipschitz continuous k th derivatives, they can be extended to the Sobolev space using the Sobolev imbedding theorem (See, for instance, Proposition 4.3.9 of [Giné and Nickl \(2021\)](#)). Assume Ω is an open subset of \mathbb{R}^d and $L^p(\Omega)$ is a standard L^p space under the Lebesgue integrals. For a multi-index k , the Sobolev space $W^{s,p}(\Omega)$ consists of functions f in $L^p(\Omega)$ such that for every multi-index k with $|k| \leq s$ the weak derivative $D^k f$ belongs to $L^p(\Omega)$. Formally,*

$$W^{s,p}(\Omega) := \left\{ f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R} \mid f \in L^p(\Omega) \quad \text{and} \quad D^k f \in L^p(\Omega) \quad \text{for all} \quad |k| \leq s \right\}.$$

The Sobolev space does not require pointwise differentiability of the functions it contains, but instead characterizes them based on the integrability of their weak derivatives. The Sobolev embedding theorem establishes that a function in the Sobolev space is a subset of a suitably chosen Hölder space, which allows us to extend the results of Proposition 6 with the corresponding k . The theorem states

$$W^{s,p}(\Omega) \subsetneq \Sigma_d(s - d/p, L) \quad \text{when } ps > d.$$

As a limiting case, we simply have $W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d) \equiv \Sigma_d(1, L)$, equivalently the space of L -Lipschitz functions.

5.2 Generalization to multivariate settings

While our main results and Propositions 6 and 8 are presented for univariate function classes, analogous results also hold for certain multivariate functions. This section provides three possible extensions: coordinate-wise k -monotonicity, k -monotone gradients, and additive k -monotone models.

To begin, we define coordinate-wise k -monotone functions. Given the index set $k := (k_1, \dots, k_d)$ of non-negative integers and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, a function $g : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is coordinate-wise k -monotone if for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and for all $x \in \Omega$, the $(k_j - 1)$ th derivative of the univariate mapping $t \mapsto g(x + te_j)$ is non-decreasing in $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We now extend Proposition 6 to the context of multivariate covariates in the following result:

Example 1 (Coordinate-wise Lipschitz derivatives). *Suppose we have a function $f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. For each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, $x = (x_{[1]}, \dots, x_{[d]})^\top \in \Omega$, and an index set $k = (k_1, \dots, k_d)$ of non-negative integers, we define a univariate mapping*

$$t \mapsto f_{j,x}(t) = \frac{\partial^{k_j}}{\partial t^{k_j}} f(x + te_j), \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (18)$$

For each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, suppose $f_{j,x}$ is Lipschitz continuous with the Lipschitz constant L_j such that

$$|f_{j,x}(t) - f_{j,x}(0)| \leq L_j |t| \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \quad \text{and } t \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (19)$$

Then for any sequence (L'_1, \dots, L'_d) such that $L'_j \geq L_j$, there exists a coordinate-wise $(k + 1)$ -monotone function $g_{L'}$ such that

$$f(x) = g_{L'}(x) - \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{L'_i}{(k_i + 1)!} x_{[i]}^{k_i + 1}.$$

The proof is presented in Section E of Supplementary Material. In particular, we take $k_1 = \dots = k_d = 0$ in Example 1 and obtain the following result:

Example 2 (Coordinate-wise Lipschitz functions). *Suppose $f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ for $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a coordinate-wise Lipschitz function with a Lipschitz constant $L := (L_1, \dots, L_d)$ where*

$$|f(x) - f(x + e_j h)| \leq |h| L_j \quad \text{for any } h \in \mathbb{R}.$$

There exists a coordinate-wise monotone function $g_{L'} : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x) = g_{L'}(x) - L'^\top x$ for any $L' = (L'_1, \dots, L'_d)^\top$ satisfying $L'_i \geq L_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$.

A similar result to Example 1 holds when the gradient of $f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz continuous in L_2 -norm. The following result is reminiscent of multivariate convex functions.

Example 3 (Multivariate function with a Lipschitz continuous gradient). *Suppose $f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ for $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ has a Lipschitz continuous gradient in L_2 -norm such that*

$$\|D^1 f(y) - D^1 f(x)\|_2 \leq L \|x - y\|_2$$

for some $L > 0$, i.e., $f \in \text{BL}_d(2, L)$. Then there exists a multivariate convex function $g_{L'} : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ for $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $f(x) = g_{L'}(x) - L'x^\top$ for any L' satisfying $L' \geq L$.

The proof is also presented in Section E of Supplementary Material. We note that the parameter L is a d -dimensional vector in Example 1 while it is a scalar constant in Example 3.

Finally, Mammen and Yu (2007) and Chen and Samworth (2016) studied the generalized additive index model under shape constraints. In this model, the multivariate function admits the additive decomposition: $f(x_{[1]}, x_{[2]}, \dots, x_{[d]}) = \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(s_i^\top x)$ for some $s_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since each f_i is a univariate function, we can extend Proposition 6 to the context of the additive model in the following examples:

Example 4 (Shape-restricted multi-index model). *Suppose $f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ where $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and there exists $s_i \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that $f(x_{[1]}, x_{[2]}, \dots, x_{[d]}) = \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(s_i^\top x)$ for all $x \in \Omega$. If f_i is k_i -times differentiable function with an L_i -Lipschitz k_i th derivative for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, then for any $L'_i \geq L_i$, there exists $(k_i + 1)$ -monotone function*

$$f(x_{[1]}, \dots, x_{[d]}) = \sum_{i=1}^m g_{i, L'_i}(s_i^\top x) - \sum_{i=1}^m \{L'_i / (k_i + 1)!\} (s_i^\top x)^{k_i + 1}$$

where g_{i, L'_i} is a $(k_i + 1)$ -monotone function. In particular, if $k_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, then, for any $L'_i \geq L_i$, there exists non-decreasing functions $g_{i, L'_i}(\cdot)$ such that

$$f(x_{[1]}, \dots, x_{[d]}) = \sum_{i=1}^d g_{i, L'_i}(s_i^\top x) - \ell^\top x,$$

where $\ell := \sum_{i=1}^d L'_i s_i$.

The “standard” additive model is a special case of Example 4 as follows:

Example 5 (Shape-restricted additive model). *Taking $s_i = e_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m = d$ in Example 4 implies the decomposition of the following additive model:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^d f_i(x_{[i]}) = \sum_{i=1}^d g_{i, L'_i}(x_{[i]}) - \sum_{i=1}^d \{L'_i / (k_i + 1)!\} x_{[i]}^{k_i + 1} \quad (20)$$

where g_{i, L'_i} is a $(k_i + 1)$ -monotone function.

5.3 Generic algorithms for nonparametric regression estimation

In this section, we present a general estimation procedure for conditional mean functions that admit the decomposition described in Sections 5.1 and 5.2. The following algorithm is a strict generalization of the estimation procedure defined in Section 3.

Algorithm 1 Nonparametric Function Estimation using Shape-restricted Estimators

Input: Observation sequence $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$, set of candidate vectors $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Output: An estimator of $f_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]$ assuming f_0 has coordinate-wise Lipschitz $(k - 1)$ th derivative.

1. Randomly split $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into two disjoint subsets: \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 .
2. For each $L \in \mathcal{L}$, we define a multivariate k -monotone estimator $\widehat{g}_L(x; D_1)$ based on $D_1 := \{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_1\}$ by regressing $Y_i + L^\top X_i^k/k!$ on X_i for $i \in \mathcal{I}_1$.
3. The estimator for f_L^* is given by

$$\widehat{f}_L(x; D_1) := \widehat{g}_L(x; D_1) - L^\top x^k/k!$$

4. Find the vector \widehat{L} that minimizes the empirical loss based on $D_2 := \{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_2\}$:

$$\widehat{L} := \arg \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} (Y_i - \widehat{f}_L(X_i; D_1))^2.$$

5. Return the final estimator $\widehat{f}_n \equiv \widehat{f}_{\widehat{L}}(x) := \widehat{g}_{\widehat{L}}(x; D_1) - \widehat{L}^\top x^k/k!$.
-

Algorithm 1 outlines our proposed estimation procedure based on sample-splitting. This general algorithm is agnostic to the choice of the shape-restricted method used in step 2. When $k = 1$ for instance, the isotonic estimator can be the LSE (Guntuboyina and Sen, 2018), the monotone spline estimator (Meyer, 2008), or the smoothed monotone estimator (Mammen, 1991; Dette, Neumeier, and Pilz, 2006) for univariate cases. One can consider the block min-max estimator of Han and Zhang (2020) or the Bayesian monotone estimator (Wang and Ghosal, 2023) for multivariate cases. When $k = 2$, a multivariate convex function estimator can be considered.

Below, we present the oracle inequality for Algorithm 1. We define the oracle estimator for the k -monotone component as

$$g_L^* := \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{C}(k)} \int (f_0(x) + L^\top x^k/k! - g(x))^2 dP_X(x).$$

We then state the result analogous to Theorem 4:

Theorem 9 (Oracle inequality for Algorithm 1). *Consider the regression model (1) and assume $\mathbb{E}[\xi^2|X_i] \leq \sigma^2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and either (A1) or (A2) holds. Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For simplicity, we assume the set \mathcal{L} is contained in a hypercube $\mathcal{L} \subseteq |\mathcal{L}_*|^d$ where $|\mathcal{L}_*|$ denotes the width of the cube. We assume that the estimator \widehat{f}_n is obtained from $|D_1| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ and $\widehat{f}_L = O_P(F)$. Further assume that a multivariate k -monotone estimator \widehat{g}_L constructed from D_1 in step 2 satisfies the following “Lipschitz in parameter” property: for any $L_1, L_2 \in \mathcal{L}$,*

$$\|\widehat{g}_{L_1} - \widehat{g}_{L_2}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \leq \|L_1 - L_2\|_\infty \tag{21}$$

where \mathbb{P}_n is an empirical distribution corresponding to D_2 . Then, there exist constants C_ε and N_ε only depending on $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $n \geq N_\varepsilon$, it holds for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{f}_n - f_0\|^2 &\leq C_\varepsilon \inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \left[(1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \|f_L^* - f_0\|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C(1 + 1/\delta) \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{g}_L - g_L^*\|^2 + d \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}_*|) \left(R_n F + \frac{F^2}{\delta n} \right) \right\} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where R_n is defined by (13) in the statement of Theorem 5 and C is a constant depending on $C_q, C_\beta, \|f_0\|_\infty, q, \beta$ and σ^2 .

It is now evident that the analysis of general k -monotone estimator requires the assertion of two properties: (1) the estimator \widehat{g}_L is bounded in probability and (2) the class of estimators is ‘‘Lipschitz in parameter’’ as defined in (21). In the case of the isotonic regression, the proof of these two properties becomes feasible owing to the explicit formula given by (7). We leave the result for the arbitrary k and d for the future work.

Remark 7 (Extension to $BL_1(s, L)$ with non-integer s). *Algorithm 1 constructs an LSE of the projection of f_0 onto the space $\mathcal{F}(s, L)$ for $s \in \mathbb{N}$. This procedure can be extended to the estimation under the model misspecification, that is, $f_0 \notin \mathcal{F}(s, L)$. For instance, when $f_0 \in BL_1(s, L)$ for non-integer s , we can approximate the space $BL_1(s, L)$ with by $\mathcal{F}(\lceil s \rceil, L)$ by taking $L \rightarrow \infty$ in view of Proposition 8. This corresponds to the estimator $\widehat{f}_{\lceil s \rceil, L_n}$ with a diverging parameter L_n , which is an LSE over the function space $\mathcal{F}(\lceil s \rceil, L_n)$. Applying oracle inequalities such as Theorem 4 from Section 4, one may deduce the optimal trade-off for L_n .*

Section F of Supplementary Material outlines the estimation procedure under the additive model given by Example 4. While the general idea remains identical to Algorithm 1, coordinate descent is performed to obtain \widehat{g}_L for each dimension of the covariate.

5.4 Minimax rates in the literature

In this section, we outline the minimax lower bounds for the general procedures from the previous section. All results are already known and we do not claim any theoretical contributions in the section. We also note that further developments on theoretical properties for multivariate shape-restricted estimators or general k -monotone estimators remain ongoing efforts in the literature. This subsection is purposed to highlight the minimax optimality of the procedure from Section 3 and to illustrate some open problems in this field.

First, we discuss the case with univariate covariates. The minimax lower bounds with respect to the L_2 -norm for nonparametric regression problems, that is,

$$\inf_{\widehat{f}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} \left[(\widehat{f}(x) - f(x))^2 \right]$$

are well-known and the rate is given by $n^{-2s/(2s+1)}$ with the true function belonging to $\mathcal{F} \equiv \Sigma_1(s, L)$. See, for instance Stone (1982) and Ibragimov and Khas’minskii (1984). In view of this well-known result, as well as, the series of inclusion properties (Propositions 6 and 7), we deduce the following minimax rates:

Theorem 10 (Minimax rates for $\mathcal{F}^\dagger(k, L)$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$). *Assuming that k and L are fixed and denoting by $\mathcal{F}^\dagger \equiv \mathcal{F}^\dagger(k, L)$ as defined in (17), it follows that*

$$cn^{-2k/(2k+1)} \leq \inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}^\dagger} \mathbb{E} \left[(\hat{f}(x) - f(x))^2 \right] \leq Cn^{-2k/(2k+1)}$$

where C and $c > 0$ are constants not depending on n . The lower bound also holds for \mathcal{F}^\dagger replaced with $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$.

The lower bound is the consequence of the inclusion property (Proposition 6) and the well-known minimax bounds for the Hölder class indexed by an integer smoothness. The upper bound is due to another inclusion property (Proposition 7) and the minimax rate associated with BV spaces, which is attained by some estimators in the literature. See, for instance, Theorem 10 of Mammen and Yu (2007) and Theorem 1 of Tibshirani (2014). (Proposition 6 holds without taking the intersection with functions with uniformly bounded $(k - 1)$ th weak derivative.) In particular, Mammen and Yu (2007) and Tibshirani (2014) analyze their estimators under the assumption that the error is sub-Gaussian whereas the results in this manuscript are stated under heavy-tailed errors.

Theorem 10 implies that the proposed estimator from Section 3 under (A1) for $q \geq 3$ or (A2) is (almost) minimax optimal, which attains the convergence rate of $n^{-2/3}$ up to a logarithmic term. To the best of our knowledge, we are unaware of the general minimax lower bound under (A1) with $q < 3$, particularly for the decomposition space $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$.

The risk upper bound of the generic estimator suggested by Algorithm 1 for $k \geq 2$ is underdeveloped. When $k = 2$, Theorem 3.1 of Kuchibhotla and Patra (2022) and Theorem 3 of Han and Wellner (2018) together suggest that analogous results to Theorem 4 may be obtained.

For the multivariate function class corresponding to Example 1, we no longer have the luxury of deducing minimax rates from inclusion properties alone since the optimality of function estimation in the k th bounded variation class on general d -dimensional covariates is currently less understood; See Sadhanala, Wang, Sharpnack, and Tibshirani (2017) and Hu, Green, and Tibshirani (2022) on current developments in this direction. When $k = 1$, it is known that the LSEs do not adapt to the low complexity truth at the minimax optimal rate in L_2 for $d \geq 3$ (Han et al., 2019). Hence, an alternative approach such as the block max-min estimator must be considered to recover minimax optimal adaptivity (Han and Zhang, 2020). We anticipate that the minimax rate of the block max-min estimator proved by Han and Zhang (2020) can be extended to our setting. A similar phenomenon is studied for convex regression in Kur, Rakhlin, and Guntuboyina (2020), which showed that LSEs are not globally minimax optimal for $d \geq 6$. See their Corollary 2 for further details. The general statements for arbitrary k and any d are largely unknown.

6 Numerical studies

We conduct numerical studies to assess the finite-sample properties of the proposed procedures. The aim of this section is twofold: First, we confirm the theoretical results based on Theorems 2 and 3 such that the estimator attains the minimax rate for the worst case and the faster rate for the low complexity case. Second, we implement the generalized procedures for convex functions and additive models. The aim is to highlight the flexibility of our methodological framework and present preliminary empirical evidence for the general theory that one may expect.

6.1 Univariate nonparametric regression

We first consider univariate covariates where X follows a uniform distribution $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$. The response variables are generated according to $Y_i = f(X_i) + \xi_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ with several different regression functions f defined below. The error terms ξ_i 's are IID, normally distributed $N(0, 0.1^2)$ variables across all scenarios. The sample sizes vary from 10^2 to 10^4 . For each scenario, we replicate the experiment 300 times. Below, we discuss the convergence rates in terms of the mean-squared error under the marginal distribution of covariates $X \sim P_X$. Formally, we define the converge rate r_n of an estimator \hat{f}_n as

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f_0\|_{L_2(P_X)}^2 := O_P(r_n) \quad \text{where} \quad \|\hat{f}_n - f_0\|_{L_2(P_X)}^2 := \int |\hat{f}_n(x) - f_0(x)|^2 dP_X(x). \quad (22)$$

This manuscript provides results for the settings where $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}(\beta, L)$ for $\beta = 1, 2$.

For the proposed method, we split the index set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into two disjoint subsets \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 such that $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_2\}$ contains $n/2$ observations. Throughout, the proposed method is referred to as **LSE+Parameteric**. We also compare our method with other nonparametric estimators in the literature:

1. Kernel ridge regression (KRR): The kernel function is given by $K(x, z) := 1 + \min(x, z)$, which corresponds to the first-order Sobolev space (see, for instance, Example 12.16 of [Wainwright \(2019\)](#)). We select the penalty parameter of ridge regression among 10 candidates. Due to the computationally intensive nature of KRR, we do not explore finer choices of the tuning parameters.
2. Gradient boosting machines (GBM): The shrinkage parameter is set to 0.01, and we choose the maximum depth of each tree from the set $\{2, 5\}$. The total number of trees is selected from $\{100, 1000, 2000, 4000, 8000\}$. The remaining parameters are set to their default values according to the GBM library in R.
3. Random forest regression (RF): The number of trees is selected from $\{50, 100, 500, 1000, 5000\}$. We use the estimator implemented by R package `randomForest` ([Liaw and Wiener, 2002](#)).
4. Penalized sieve estimator with cosine basis: We employ 50 basis functions and select the penalization tuning parameter from (approximately) 100 default grids. The estimators are realized using R package `Sieve` ([Zhang and Simon, 2022](#)).

The replication of the results is available at <https://github.com/Kenta426/sim-npparam>. For sample sizes exceeding 2000, we omit the results obtained from KRR and RF due to computational limitations. We consider the following four ‘‘true’’ regression functions. Their plots are presented in Figure 1.

Scenario 1 We examine a Lipschitz function defined as:

$$f_1(x) := (1 - 3x) \times 1(x \in [0, 1/3]) + (-1 + 3x) \times 1(x \in [1/3, 2/3]) + (3 - 3x) \times 1(x \in [2/3, 1]). \quad (23)$$

The proposed estimator, along with other nonparametric regression estimators, is expected to converge at a rate of $n^{-2/3}$ in terms of MSE.




Figure 1: Estimated regression functions based on 500 observations from $Y = f_j(X) + \xi$ where $X \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$ and $\xi|X \sim N(0, 0.1^2)$ for $1 \leq j \leq 4$. Scenarios 1 and 2 correspond to the estimator based on an isotonic regression plus a linear function. Scenarios 3 and 4 correspond to the estimator based on convex regression plus a quadratic function.

Scenario 2 We consider a low complexity case where our proposed estimators are expected to be adaptive, converging at a parametric rate of n^{-1} (up to a logarithmic term). Define an m -piecewise constant function $M_m(x) := \sum_{i=1}^m i \times 1(x \in [(i-1)/m, i/m])$. The proposed estimator is anticipated to achieve an adaptive rate when the true function is

$$f_2(x; m, \beta) := M_m(x) + \beta x. \quad (24)$$

We choose $m = 3$ and $\beta = 1$.

Scenario 3 The next two scenarios focus on the application of the convex regression. We implement Algorithm 1 to estimate these functions with $k = 2$ and $d = 1$. The estimator for the 2-monotone function is simply a convex regression estimator, which we use the implementation based on the `cobs` library in R. The following example is a smooth function, defined as:


$$f_3(x; \gamma) := \sin(\gamma(2x - 1)).$$

We select $\gamma = 4$. The proposed estimator is anticipated to converge at a rate of $n^{-4/5}$ in view of Theorem 3.1 of [Kuchibhotla and Patra \(2022\)](#) and Theorem 3 of [Han and Wellner \(2018\)](#).


Scenario 4 The final example illustrates another scenario where the proposed estimator is expected to be adaptive. See [Guntuboyina and Sen \(2015\)](#); [Han and Wellner \(2018\)](#) on the low complexity adaption of the convex LSE. Specifically, the estimator is designed to adapt to any function that can be decomposed as a sum of a convex m -piecewise linear function and a quadratic function. We define $C_m(x)$ as a convex m -piecewise linear function with $1/m$ equally sized segments over X , and the slopes are $(-1, 0, 1, \dots, m-2)$. Additionally, we enforce the condition $C_m(0) = 0$, thereby defining a unique convex m -piecewise linear function. We generate observations from one such regression defined as:

$$f_4(x; m, \beta) := C_m(x) + \beta x^2.$$

We consider the case $m = 3$ and $\beta = 1$.



(a) Average MSEs across 300 replications for different sample sizes. The solid black line represents the expected convergence rate of the proposed method.



(b) Boxplot of MSEs across 300 replications for sample sizes $n = 100, 1000,$ and 10000 .

Figure 2: Performance comparison over five different methods for univariate covariates. The X -axis represents the sample sizes and the Y -axis corresponds to the empirical mean squared errors. Both axes are on the logarithmic scales. For scenarios 1 and 3, most methods converge at similar rates. Our estimator performs particularly well for scenarios 2 and 4, which is when the estimator is expected to be adaptive.

Figure 1 displays a single realization of observations from each scenario along with the estimated regression function using a sample size of $n = 500$. The estimator appears to be consistent with the true curves, including the regression functions that contain non-differentiable points (Scenario 1) as well as discontinuities (Scenario 2).

Next, we study the convergence rate of mean squared errors (MSE) for various methods as the sample sizes vary. To estimate the MSEs, we generate additional 10^5 sample paths to approximate $\|\hat{f}_n - f_0\|_{L_2(P_X)}^2$. Figure 2a displays the average MSEs for various sample sizes, while Figure 2b displays box plots representing the MSE distributions specifically for sample sizes of $n = 100, 1000,$ and 10000 . The solid black lines in Figure 2a represent the expected rates of convergence for the proposed method, namely $n^{-2/3}$ for Scenario 1, $n^{-4/5}$ for Scenario 3, and n^{-1} (ignoring a logarithmic rate) for Scenarios 2 and 4. Additionally, Table 2 presents the estimated slope for each method based on linear regression using $(\log_{10} n, \log_{10} \text{MSE})$ from the Figure 2a with sample sizes $n \geq 2000$.

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Theoretical rate	-0.667	-1	-0.8	-1
LSE + parametric	-0.738	-1.201	-0.799	-0.895
Sieve	-0.449	-0.276	-0.349	-0.710
GBM	-0.568	-0.720	-0.590	-0.645

Table 2: Estimated slopes of Figure 2a for each method. The displayed values are the estimated exponent r of the convergence rate n^r . The values in this table are computed by linear regression using $(\log_{10} n, \log_{10} \text{MSE})$ from the points in Figure 2a. Only the points for sample sizes $n \geq 2000$ are considered.

We observe that in the small-sample regimes, the proposed method slightly deviates from the theoretical rate of convergence. However, as the sample size increases, the method aligns more closely with the expected rate of convergence. In Scenario 1, most of the nonparametric regression methods demonstrate comparable performance, with the proposed method performing particularly well for larger sample sizes. Similar conclusions can be drawn for Scenario 3, with the performance of the proposed method being especially pronounced. In the two scenarios where the proposed method is expected to be adaptive, and hence to converge at a near parametric rate, it outperforms all other methods for sample sizes larger than 1000. These findings highlight the practical effectiveness of the proposed method as the sample size increases.

6.2 Multivariate regression under additive structure

In this section, we consider the multivariate covariates assuming an additive structure of the underlying regression functions, as discussed in Example 5 from Section 5.1. The implementation is based on Algorithm 2 presented in Section F of Supplementary Material. For this set of numerical studies, we also include the results based on the Generalized Additive Model (GAM). We use the implementation based on R package `mgcv` (Wood, 2011) with the number of the basis of each smoothing spline is set to 30. We first consider two examples with 2-dimensional covariates $x = (x_{[1]}, x_{[2]})$:


- Scenario 1 (2d): $f(x) := f_1(x_{[1]}) - f_1(x_{[2]})$,
- Scenario 2 (2d): $f(x) := f_2(x_{[1]}; 3, 1) - f_2(x_{[2]}; 3, 1)$,

where the component functions f_1, f_2 are defined in (23) and (24). Similar to the univariate cases, we anticipate that our proposed method will converge essentially at a rate of $n^{-2/3}$ for Scenario 1 and n^{-1} for Scenario 2. We discuss the justification behind this argument in Section F.2 of Supplementary Material.


We also consider two 5-dimensional examples:

- Scenario 3 (5d): $f(x) := f_1(x_{[1]}) - f_1(x_{[2]}) + x_3 - x_4 + 1$,
- Scenario 4 (5d): $f(x) := f_2(x_{[1]}; 1, 0) + f_2(1 - x_{[2]}; 3, 3) + f_2(x_{[3]}; 3, 3) + f_2(1 - x_{[4]}; 1, 3) + f_2(x_{[5]}; 1, 3)$.

We also expect our proposed method to converge at a rate of $n^{-2/3}$ for Scenario 3 and n^{-1} for Scenario 4. Again, refer to Section F.2 of Supplementary Material for the justification.



(a) Average MSEs across 300 replications. The solid black line represents the expected convergence rate of the proposed method.



(b) Boxplot of MSEs across 300 replications for sample sizes $n = 100, 1000,$ and 10000 .

Figure 3: Performance comparison over five different methods for multivariate covariates under additive models. The x-axis represents the sample sizes and the y-axis corresponds to the empirical mean squared errors. Both axes are on the logarithmic scales. For scenarios 1 and 3, most methods converge at similar rates. While most methods converge at similar rates, the generalized additive model performs particularly well for Scenarios 1 and 3. Our method converges at comparable rates as other methods and performs particularly well for Scenarios 2 and 4.

In the case of additive functions, Figure 3a displays the average MSEs while Figure 3b displays box plots representing the distribution of observed MSEs. Additionally, Table 3 presents the estimated slope based on linear regression using linear regression using $(\log_{10} n, \log_{10} \text{MSE})$ from the Figure 3a with sample sizes $n \geq 2000$. Similar to the univariate case, the theoretical rate of convergence aligns with the empirical behavior for larger sample sizes. We observe that `gam` performs well for regression functions even with non-differentiable points (Scenarios 1 and 3). For these scenarios, most methods share the same convergence rates but the constant is better for `gam`. However, it struggles to accurately estimate functions with discontinuities (Scenarios 2 and 4). In contrast, our proposed method performs well when each additive component is a non-decreasing piecewise constant function plus a linear term.

	Scenario 1 (2d)	Scenario 2 (2d)	Scenario 3 (5d)	Scenario 4 (5d)
Theoretical rate	-0.667	-1	-0.667	-1
LSE + parametric	-0.717	-0.885	-0.828	-0.814
Sieve	-0.553	-0.528	-0.577	-0.571
GBM	-0.068	-0.633	-0.107	-0.563
GAM	-0.738	-0.089	-0.780	-0.104

Table 3: Estimated slopes of Figure 3a for each method. The displayed values are the estimated exponent r of the convergence rate n^r . The values in this table are computed by linear regression using $(\log_{10} n, \log_{10} \text{MSE})$ from the points in Figure 3a. Only the points for sample sizes $n \geq 2000$ are considered.

7 Conclusions

This manuscript introduces a new approach to nonparametric regression estimation, leveraging existing shape-restricted regression methods. The proposed method takes advantage of some decompositions of nonparametric functions into shape-restricted and parametric components. We propose an estimation procedure based on sample-splitting, which practically eliminates the burden of tuning hyperparameters. The proposed method inherits favorable properties from shape-restricted regression estimators, including optimal convergence rate, adaptivity, and efficient computation.

Although this manuscript focuses on nonparametric regression problems, the proposed shape-restricted decomposition is general and allows for further methodological advances beyond regression settings. They include but are not limited to, density estimation, quantile regression, instrumental variables regression, and classification. As a proof of concept, we extend the proposed framework to the estimation of “log-Lipschitz” density, that is, the logarithm of true density admits the decomposition given by (2). We implement the nonparametric maximum likelihood estimator for the density based on this decomposition, and the estimated functions under two different scenarios, Laplace and exponential distributions, are displayed in Figure 4. We refer to Section H of Supplementary Material for further details.

In practice, uncertainty quantification is crucial in regression analysis, and constructing valid confidence intervals is also desired. When the parameter component L is known, we anticipate that existing confidence sets for shape-restricted regression (Dümbgen, 2003; Bellec, 2016; Yang and Barber, 2019) are directly applicable. These methods provide uniform confidence bands for the regression function whose width shrinks at the adaptive rates. Extending this idea to our general $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ class is of great interest. Constructing confidence sets including the uncertainty from selecting L will be more challenging. We anticipate that the recently developed HulC procedure (Kuchibhotla, Balakrishnan, and Wasserman, 2023) can be applicable in this setting.

Several properties for the $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ class are of interest. First, Theorem 10 only provides the minimax rate of $\mathcal{F}^\dagger(k, L)$, but not of $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$. The minimax rates without the uniform boundedness of weak derivatives, as well as its multivariate generalization, require further analyses. Additionally, minimax-optimal estimator for $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ in a general dimension is not generally available—Although Algorithm 1 provides a general framework for constructing estimators in some multivariate $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ classes, there is currently no universal solutions for the k -monotone estimation in the literature. Most often considered cases are $k = 1, 2$ and they are more straightforward to implement in practice. Significant additional efforts is required to implement the proposal for general orders.

Finally, Remark 7 hints at the application of the proposed estimation procedure to the BL class with a non-integer smoothness parameter. One may hope to establish convergence guarantees




Figure 4: Estimated density functions based on 500 observations generated from two scenarios. The left panel corresponds to the data drawn from a Laplace distribution where the estimator is expected to converge at the minimax rate. The right panel corresponds to the data drawn from an exponential distribution where the estimator is expected to converge at the adaptive rate. The figure serves as a proof of concept. We refer to Section H of Supplementary Material for further details.

under general assumptions, as well as local adaptivity, for the resulting estimators. Present results in this manuscript, however, do not immediately indicate the optimal rates of the said procedure. The sharp analysis requires a new oracle inequality for model selection (Theorem 5) as well as the refined entropy result for the class $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$, with the optimal dependency on the envelope of the contained functions.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge support from NSF DMS-2210662.

References

- Anevski, D. and P. Soulier (2011). Monotone spectral density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* 39(1), 418 – 438.
- Ayer, M., H. D. Brunk, G. M. Ewing, W. T. Reid, and E. Silverman (1955). An empirical distribution function for sampling with incomplete information. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 26(4), 641–647.
- Balabdaoui, F. and J. A. Wellner (2010). Estimation of a k-monotone density: characterizations, consistency and minimax lower bounds. *Statistica Neerlandica* 64, 45–70.
- Bellec, P. C. (2016). Adaptive confidence sets in shape restricted regression. *Bernoulli* 27(1), 66–92.
- Bellec, P. C. (2018). Sharp oracle inequalities for least squares estimators in shape restricted regression. *The Annals of Statistics* 46(2), 745–780.

- Brownlees, C., E. Joly, and G. Lugosi (2015). Empirical risk minimization for heavy-tailed losses. *The Annals of Statistics* 43(6), 2507 – 2536.
- Byrd, R. H. and J. Nocedal (1989). A tool for the analysis of quasi-newton methods with application to unconstrained minimization. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* 26(3), 727–739.
- Chatterjee, S., A. Guntuboyina, and B. Sen (2015). On risk bounds in isotonic and other shape restricted regression problems. *The Annals of Statistics* 43(4), 1774–1800.
- Chen, Y. and R. J. Samworth (2016). Generalized additive and index models with shape constraints. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 78(4), 729–754.
- Deng, H. and C.-H. Zhang (2020). Isotonic regression in multi-dimensional spaces and graphs. *The Annals of Statistics* 48(6), 3672–3698.
- Dette, H., N. Neumeyer, and K. F. Pilz (2006). A simple nonparametric estimator of a strictly monotone regression function. *Bernoulli* 12(3), 469–490.
- DeVore, R. A. and G. G. Lorentz (1993). *Constructive approximation*, Volume 303. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Dümbgen, L. (2003). Optimal confidence bands for shape-restricted curves. *Bernoulli* 9(3), 423–449.
- Eguchi, S., T. Yoon Kim, and B. U. Park (2003). Local likelihood method: a bridge over parametric and nonparametric regression. *Nonparametric Statistics* 15(6), 665–683.
- Gao, F. and J. A. Wellner (2009). On the rate of convergence of the maximum likelihood estimator of ak-monotone density. *Science in China Series A: Mathematics* 52(7), 1525–1538.
- Ghosal, P. and B. Sen (2017). On univariate convex regression. *Sankhya A* 79(2), 215–253.
- Giné, E., V. Koltchinskii, and J. A. Wellner (2003). Ratio limit theorems for empirical processes. In *Stochastic inequalities and applications*, pp. 249–278. Springer.
- Giné, E. and R. Nickl (2021). *Mathematical foundations of infinite-dimensional statistical models*. Cambridge university press.
- Groeneboom, P., G. Jongbloed, and J. A. Wellner (2001). Estimation of a convex function: characterizations and asymptotic theory. *The Annals of Statistics* 29(6), 1653–1698.
- Guntuboyina, A. and B. Sen (2015). Global risk bounds and adaptation in univariate convex regression. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 163(1-2), 379–411.
- Guntuboyina, A. and B. Sen (2018). Nonparametric shape-restricted regression. *Statistical Science* 33(4), 568–594.
- Han, Q., T. Wang, S. Chatterjee, and R. J. Samworth (2019). Isotonic regression in general dimensions. *The Annals of Statistics* 47(5), 2440–2471.
- Han, Q. and J. A. Wellner (2018). Robustness of shape-restricted regression estimators: An envelope perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.02542*.

- Han, Q. and J. A. Wellner (2019). Convergence rates of least squares regression estimators with heavy-tailed errors. *The Annals of Statistics* 47(4), 2286–2319.
- Han, Q. and C.-H. Zhang (2020). Limit distribution theory for block estimators in multiple isotonic regression. *The Annals of Statistics* 48(6), 3251–3282.
- Hjort, N. L. and I. K. Glad (1995). Nonparametric density estimation with a parametric start. *The Annals of Statistics* 23(3), 882–904.
- Hjort, N. L. and M. C. Jones (1996). Locally parametric nonparametric density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics* 24(4), 1619–1647.
- Hu, A. J., A. Green, and R. J. Tibshirani (2022). The voronoigram: Minimax estimation of bounded variation functions from scattered data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14514*.
- Ibragimov, I. and R. Khas'minskii (1984). Asymptotic bounds on the quality of the nonparametric regression estimation in L_p . *Journal of Soviet Mathematics* 24, 540–550.
- Johnstone, I. (2017). Gaussian estimation: Sequence and wavelet models. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Koltchinskii, V. (2011). *Oracle inequalities in empirical risk minimization and sparse recovery problems: École D'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXXVIII-2008*, Volume 2033. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Kopotun, K. A. (1998). Approximation of k-monotone functions. *Journal of approximation theory* 94(3), 481–493.
- Kuchibhotla, A. K., S. Balakrishnan, and L. Wasserman (2023). The hulc: Confidence regions from convex hulls. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, qkad134.
- Kuchibhotla, A. K. and A. Chakraborty (2022). Moving beyond sub-gaussianity in high-dimensional statistics: Applications in covariance estimation and linear regression. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA* 11(4), 1389–1456.
- Kuchibhotla, A. K. and R. K. Patra (2022). On least squares estimation under heteroscedastic and heavy-tailed errors. *The Annals of Statistics* 50(1), 277–302.
- Kur, G., A. Rakhlin, and A. Guntuboyina (2020). On suboptimality of least squares with application to estimation of convex bodies. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 2406–2424. PMLR.
- Ledoux, M. and M. Talagrand (1991). *Probability in Banach Spaces: isoperimetry and processes*, Volume 23. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Liaw, A. and M. Wiener (2002). Classification and regression by randomforest. *R News* 2(3), 18–22.
- Lin, L., X. Cui, and L. Zhu (2009). An adaptive two-stage estimation method for additive models. *Scandinavian journal of statistics* 36(2), 248–269.
- Mammen, E. (1991). Estimating a smooth monotone regression function. *The Annals of Statistics* 19(2), 724–740.

- Mammen, E. and S. van de Geer (1997). Locally adaptive regression splines. *The Annals of Statistics* 25(1), 387–413.
- Mammen, E. and K. Yu (2007). Additive isotone regression. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series* 55, 179–195.
- Massart, P. (2000). Some applications of concentration inequalities to statistics. In *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques*, Volume 9, pp. 245–303.
- Merlevède, F. and M. Peligrad (2013). Rosenthal-type inequalities for the maximum of partial sums of stationary processes and examples.
- Meyer, M. C. (2008). Inference using shape-restricted regression splines. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 2(3), 1013–1033.
- Roberts, A. W. (1993). Convex functions. In *Handbook of convex geometry*, pp. 1081–1104. Elsevier.
- Robertson, T., F. Wright, and R. Dykstra (1988). *Order Restricted Statistical Inference*. Probability and Statistics Series. Wiley.
- Sadhanala, V., Y.-X. Wang, J. L. Sharpnack, and R. J. Tibshirani (2017). Higher-order total variation classes on grids: Minimax theory and trend filtering methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30.
- Seijo, E. and B. Sen (2011). Nonparametric least squares estimation of a multivariate convex regression function. *The Annals of Statistics* 39(3), 1633–1657.
- Sen, B. (2018). A gentle introduction to empirical process theory and applications. *Lecture Notes, Columbia University* 11, 28–29.
- Seregin, A. and J. A. Wellner (2010). Nonparametric estimation of multivariate convex-transformed densities. *The Annals of Statistics* 38(6), 3751–3781.
- Stone, C. J. (1982). Optimal global rates of convergence for nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics* 10(4), 1040–1053.
- Tibshirani, R. J. (2014). Adaptive piecewise polynomial estimation via trend filtering. *The Annals of Statistics* 42(1), 285–323.
- van der Vaart, A. W., S. Dudoit, and M. J. v. d. Laan (2006). Oracle inequalities for multi-fold cross validation. *Statistics & Decisions* 24(3), 351–371.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and J. A. Wellner (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. Springer.
- Veraverbeke, N., I. Gijbels, and M. Omelka (2014). Preadjusted non-parametric estimation of a conditional distribution function. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B: Statistical Methodology* 76(2), 399–438.
- Wainwright, M. J. (2019). *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, Volume 48. Cambridge university press.
- Wang, K. and S. Ghosal (2023). Posterior contraction and testing for multivariate isotonic regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 17(1), 798–822.

- Wood, S. N. (2011). Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood estimation of semiparametric generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B: Statistical Methodology* 73(1), 3–36.
- Yang, F. and R. F. Barber (2019). Contraction and uniform convergence of isotonic regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 13(1), 646–677.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2002). Risk bounds in isotonic regression. *The Annals of Statistics* 30(2), 528–555.
- Zhang, T. and N. Simon (2022). Regression in tensor product spaces by the method of sieves. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 17(2), 3660–3727.
- Zlobec, S. (2006). Characterization of convexifiable functions. *Optimization* 55(3), 251–261.

Supplement A Proofs of oracle inequalities

We first present the proof of our main result Theorem 4. The proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 are then provided as special instances of Theorem 4.

A.1 Proof of Theorem 4

We first recall the notation to which we frequently refer. Given n IID observations, we construct two data sets: $D_1 := \{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_1\}$ and $D_2 := \{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_2\}$ based on two disjoint index sets $\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with cardinalities corresponding to n_1 and n_2 . For each $L \in \mathcal{L} = [0, L_+]$, we denote by \hat{f}_L the *fixed- L estimator* constructed from D_1 :

$$\hat{f}_L(x; D_1) := \hat{g}_L(x; D_1) - Lx \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{g}_L(\cdot; D_1) := \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \{Y_i + LX_i - g(X_i)\}^2. \quad (25)$$

We denote by \hat{L} the data-adaptive estimator of the linear parameter based on D_2 :

$$\hat{L} := \arg \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} \{Y_i - \hat{f}_L(X_i; D_1)\}^2$$

The *data-adaptive estimator* of f_0 is then defined as $\hat{f}_{\hat{L}}$. Throughout the proof, we adopt the notation $\hat{f}_{\hat{L}}$ and \hat{f}_L in order to distinguish the data-adaptive- L from the fixed- L estimator.

The proof now proceeds in three steps. Firstly, we split the analysis based on the event where the estimator is bounded by a constant or not. Secondly, on the event that the estimator is bounded and conditioning on the training set D_1 , we invoke Theorem 5 to derive the oracle inequality for model selection in choosing $L \in \mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}$. Finally, we take the expectation over the training set, invoking Lemma 17 in Section C.1, and obtain the oracle inequality for data-adaptive L .

We denote by $|\mathcal{L}|$ the width of the interval and by L_+ the largest element in \mathcal{L} . We define a constant $\mathfrak{B} := \|f_0\|_\infty + \sigma^2 + 2L_+$ and an event where the estimators are uniformly bounded over \mathcal{L} such that $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}} := \{\sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \|\hat{f}_L\|_\infty \leq C_\varepsilon \mathfrak{B}\}$. The constant C_ε only depends on $\varepsilon > 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\hat{f}_{\hat{L}} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)} \geq C_\varepsilon \delta_n\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|\hat{f}_{\hat{L}} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \geq C_\varepsilon^2 \delta_n^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}\right) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}^c) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{P}\left(\|\hat{f}_{\hat{L}} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \geq C_\varepsilon^2 \delta_n^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}, D_1\right)\right] + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}^c) \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon^{-2} \delta_n^{-2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_{\hat{L}} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}, D_1\right]\right] + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}^c). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

First, the event $\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}^c$ can be made arbitrary small as $C_\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$ in view of Lemma 25 in Section C.5, which states that the estimator is uniformly bounded in probability by \mathfrak{B} . Thus we take C_ε large such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}^c) \leq \varepsilon/2$.

Next, we analyze the first term of (26) in expectation. Conditioning on D_1 , the oracle inequality for model selection given by Theorem 5 applies. The application of Theorem 5 to this context is given by Lemma 16 in Section B.2, which states for any $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_{\hat{L}} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}, D_1\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[(1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}\|\hat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \mid \mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}, D_1\right] + \delta_{1,n_2}$$

where

$$\delta_{1,n} := C \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(R_n \mathfrak{B} + \frac{\mathfrak{B}^2}{n\delta}\right)$$

and

$$R_n = \begin{cases} n^{-1+1/q} & \text{under (A1)} \\ n^{-1}(\log n)^{1/\beta} & \text{under (A2)}. \end{cases}$$

The constant C only depends on $\|f_0\|_\infty, \sigma^2, q, C_q$ (defined in (A1)), and β, C_β (defined in (A2)). As this result holds for any $L \in \mathcal{L}$, the choice of L no longer depends on data. It now remains to analyze $\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2$ for fixed L where the expectation is taken over D_1 .

It first follows that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \leq (1 + 1/\delta)\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + (1 + \delta)\|f_L^* - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2.$$

Furthermore, Lemmas 18 and 19 in Section C.2 provide the upper bound on $\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2$ for fixed L , which states that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \leq (\mathfrak{B} \log n)^2 \delta_{2,n_1}$$

where

$$\delta_{2,n} := \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\frac{m\sigma^2 \log^2 \{n(L + \sigma^2 + \|f_0\|_\infty)\}}{n} + \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{m,L}} \|f - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \right).$$

Since $(1 + \delta)^2 \leq (1 + 3\delta)$ and $(1 + \delta)(1 + 1/\delta) \leq (3 + 1/\delta)$ for $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \geq C_\varepsilon^2 \delta_n^2\right) \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon^{-2} \delta_n^{-2} \left((1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + \delta_{1,n_2} \right) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathfrak{B}}^c) \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon^{-2} \delta_n^{-2} \left((1 + \delta)^2 \|f_L^* - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + (1 + \delta)(1 + 1/\delta)\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + \delta_{1,n_2} \right) + \varepsilon/2 \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon^{-2} \delta_n^{-2} \left((1 + 3\delta)\|f_L^* - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + (3 + 1/\delta)(\mathfrak{B} \log n)^2 \delta_{2,n_1} + \delta_{1,n_2} \right) + \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, this holds for any choice of L , we choose

$$\delta_n^2 := \inf_{L > 0} \left((1 + \delta)\|f_L^* - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + 3(1 + 1/\delta)(\mathfrak{B} \log n)^2 \delta_{2,n_1} \right) + \delta_{1,n_2}$$

and take C_ε large enough so that the right-hand side expression is bounded by ε . This concludes that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$,

$$\|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \leq C_\varepsilon^2 \inf_{L > 0} \left((1 + \delta)\|f_L^* - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + (1 + 1/\delta)(\mathfrak{B} \log n)^2 \delta_{2,n_1} \right) + \delta_{1,n_2}$$

for a constant C_ε only depending on ε .

A.2 Proofs of Theorems 2 and 3

Both corollaries concern the behavior of the fixed- L oracle inequality, given by

$$\delta_{2,n} := \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\frac{m\sigma^2 \log^2 \{n(L + \sigma^2 + \|f_0\|_\infty)\}}{n} + \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{m,L}} \|f - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \right),$$

in the proof of Theorem 4. The proof of Corollary 3 is straightforward since this corresponds to the case when $f_L^* \in \mathcal{F}_{m,L}$ for some m . In this case, we have $\inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{m,L}} \|f - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 = 0$ for some m , and hence

$$\delta_{2,n} := \frac{m\sigma^2 \log^2 \{n(L + \sigma^2 + \|f_0\|_\infty)\}}{n} \lesssim \frac{m(\log n(L \vee 1))^2}{n}$$

bounded up to a constant depending on σ^2 and $\|f_0\|_\infty$. By plugging into the expression given by Theorem 4, we conclude the claim.

We now move on to the proof of Corollary 2. By definition of the decomposition space $\mathcal{F}(1, L)$, any projection f_L^* admits the decomposition $f_L^*(x) = g^*(x) - Lx$ where g^* is non-decreasing. This implies that $g_L^*(0) = f_L^*(0)$ and $g_L^*(1) = f_L^*(1) - L$. We consider the following partition of X into m disjoint sets related to a function in $\mathcal{F}_{m,L}$:

$$I_j = \{x \in [0, 1] \mid g_{0,L}^*(x) \in [(j-1)\epsilon, j\epsilon], \epsilon = m^{-1}[g_{0,L}^*(1) - g_{0,L}^*(0)]\}.$$

The corresponding piecewise plus linear function $f_{m,L}$ is

$$f_{m,L}(x) := \sum_{j=1}^m (j-1)m^{-1}[g_{0,L}^*(1) - g_{0,L}^*(0)]1(x \in I_j) - Lx.$$

Under this choice, it is direct to assert that

$$\|f_L^* - f_{m,L}\|_{L_2(P)}^2 = \int \left(\sum_{j=1}^m g_L^*(x) - (j-1)m^{-1}[g_L^*(1) - g_L^*(0)]1(x \in I_j) \right)^2 dP \lesssim m^{-2},$$

which is finite under the additional assumption that $\|f_L^*\|_\infty < \infty$. By optimizing the choice of $m > 0$ to minimize

$$\frac{m\sigma^2 \log^2 \{n(L + \sigma^2 + \|f_0\|_\infty)\}}{n} + m^{-2},$$

we obtain

$$\delta_{2,n} \leq \frac{m\sigma^2 \log^2 \{n(L + \sigma^2 + \|f_0\|_\infty)\}}{n} + m^{-2} \lesssim \left(\frac{(\log n(L \vee 1))^2}{n} \right)^{2/3}.$$

This concludes the claim.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 9

Below, we present the oracle inequality for the general Algorithm 1. We recall from the main text that the oracle estimator of the k -monotone component is defined as

$$g_L^* := \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{C}(k)} \int (f_0(x) + L^\top x^k/k! - g(x))^2 dP_X.$$

As the general approach to proof is analogous to that of Theorem 4, we only provide a brief statement. The estimator \widehat{f}_L is assumed to be bounded in probability by F and thus there exists a constant C_ε large enough such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\widehat{f}_L\|_\infty \geq C_\varepsilon F \right) \leq \varepsilon/2. \quad (27)$$

We denote by \mathcal{E}_F the event that \widehat{f}_L is bounded by $C_\varepsilon F$. Conditioning on \mathcal{E}_F and D_1 , we invoke Theorem 5 in the context of a k -monotone estimator. The approach is also analogous to Lemma 16 in Section B.2; Define the following class of estimators

$$\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{L} := \left\{ \widehat{f}_L := \widehat{g}_L(x; D_1) - L^\top x^k/k!; L \in \mathcal{L} \right\} \quad (28)$$

where $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For simplicity, we assume that \mathcal{L} is a hypercube such that the volume of \mathcal{L} is given by $|\mathcal{L}|^d$ for some $|\mathcal{L}| \geq 0$. Under the additional assumption that the estimator for k -monotone components is Lipschitz in parameter such that

$$\|\widehat{g}_{L_1}(\cdot; D_1) - \widehat{g}_{L_2}(\cdot; D_1)\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \leq \|L_1 - L_2\|_\infty,$$

we can use the following chain of inequalities:

$$\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)) \leq \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{L}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \lesssim (|\mathcal{L}|/\varepsilon)^d.$$

By the analogous derivation to Lemma 16 in Section B.2, we obtain for any $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\widehat{f}_{\widehat{L}} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \middle| \mathcal{E}_F, D_1 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[(1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + \delta_{1, n_2} \middle| \mathcal{E}_F, D_1 \right]$$

where

$$\widetilde{\delta}_{1, n} := Cd \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) (R_n F + n^{-1} F^2 / \delta).$$

We note that the only difference from Theorem 4 is that the ε -covering of the class $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{L}$ grows polynomially in d and hence $\widetilde{\delta}_{1, n}$ now grows linearly in d . Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\|\widehat{f}_{\widehat{L}} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \geq C_\varepsilon^2 \delta_n^2 \right) \\ & \leq C_\varepsilon^{-2} \delta_n^{-2} \left((1 + \delta)^2 \|f_L^* - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + (1 + \delta)(1 + 1/\delta) \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + \widetilde{\delta}_{1, n_2} \right) + \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

We thus conclude the result following the analogous argument to Theorem 5 but simply observing that

$$\mathbb{E} \|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 = \mathbb{E} \|(\widehat{g}_L - L^\top x^k/k!) - (g_L^* - L^\top x^k/k!)\|_{L_2(P)}^2 = \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{g}_L - g_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2.$$

Supplement B Oracle inequality for model selection under heavy-tailed errors

This section derives a general oracle inequality for cross-validation under heteroscedastic and heavy-tailed errors. We first recall several notations. Let $(X_1, Y_1) \dots (X_n, Y_n)$ be an IID observation from the joint distribution P taking values in $\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$ where

$$Y_i = f_0(X_i) + \xi_i \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n. \quad (29)$$

Let \mathcal{F} be a subset of a metric space, corresponding to the set of candidate functions (i.e., estimators) of f_0 . We assume that \mathcal{F} does not depend on the observations. Typically, this is attained by first splitting observations into two sets, using the first half for constructing \mathcal{F} and the other half for selecting the best candidate. We define a loss function $\ell(X, Y; f)$ as any non-negative function. An example is the squared error, corresponding to $\ell(X, Y; f) := (Y - f(X))^2$. The final estimator \hat{f} is determined by the minimizer of the empirical mean of the loss function:

$$\hat{f} := \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(X, Y; f). \quad (30)$$

We frequently use the notation $Pg := \int g(X, Y) dP = \mathbb{E}[g(X, Y)]$. We denote by \mathbb{P}_n the empirical distribution function of the observation, and by \mathbb{G}_n the empirical process, specifically,

$$\mathbb{G}_n g := n^{1/2} (\mathbb{P}_n - P) g = n^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(X, Y)] \right). \quad (31)$$

With the above definition in place, one can deduce the following algebraic inequality, which is a slight modification of Lemma 2.1 by [van der Vaart et al. \(2006\)](#):

Lemma 11. *Let $\hat{f} := \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{P}_n \ell(\cdot; f)$ be the minimizer of the empirical loss function and let $\hat{f}^\dagger \in \mathcal{F}$ be an approximate minimizer of the empirical loss, satisfying*

$$\mathbb{P}_n \ell(\cdot; \hat{f}) \leq \mathbb{P}_n \ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) \leq \mathbb{P}_n \ell(\cdot; \hat{f}) + \Gamma_n(\hat{f}^\dagger, \hat{f}) \quad (32)$$

where Γ_n a random process indexed by $\hat{f}^\dagger, \hat{f} \in \mathcal{F}$. Then for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\delta > 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\ell((X, Y); \hat{f}^\dagger)] &\leq (1 + 2\delta) \mathbb{E}[\ell((X, Y); f)] \\ &\quad + n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{F}} \left((1 + \delta) \mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell(\cdot; \eta) \right] \\ &\quad + n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{F}} \left((1 + \delta) \mathbb{G}_n + \delta n^{1/2} P \right) - \ell(\cdot; \eta) \right] \\ &\quad + (1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathcal{F}} \Gamma_n(\eta_1, \eta_2) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 11. By the basic inequality and the assumption that $\hat{f}^\dagger \in \mathcal{F}$ is an approximate minimizer of the empirical loss, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + \delta) \mathbb{P}_n \ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) &\leq (1 + \delta) \mathbb{P}_n \ell(\cdot; \hat{f}) + (1 + \delta) \Gamma_n(\hat{f}^\dagger, \hat{f}) \\ &\leq (1 + \delta) \mathbb{P}_n \ell(\cdot; f) + (1 + \delta) \Gamma_n(\hat{f}^\dagger, \hat{f}) \quad \text{for any } f \in \mathcal{F}. \end{aligned}$$

By adding and subtracting relevant terms, the above inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
P\ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) &\leq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{P}_n\ell(\cdot; f) - (1 + \delta)\mathbb{P}_n\ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) + P\ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) + (1 + \delta)\Gamma_n(\hat{f}^\dagger, \hat{f}) \\
&\implies P\ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) \leq (1 + \delta)(\mathbb{P}_n - P)\ell(\cdot; f) - (1 + \delta)(\mathbb{P}_n - P)\ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) \\
&\quad - \delta P\ell(\cdot; f) + \delta P\ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) + (1 + 2\delta)P\ell(\cdot; f) + (1 + \delta)\Gamma_n(\hat{f}^\dagger, \hat{f}) \\
&\implies P\ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) \leq (1 + 2\delta)P\ell(\cdot; f) + n^{-1/2} \left\{ (1 + \delta)\mathbb{G}_n\ell(\cdot; f) - n^{1/2}\delta P\ell(\cdot; f) \right\} \\
&\quad + n^{-1/2} \left\{ (1 + \delta)\mathbb{G}_n\{-\ell(\cdot; \hat{f})\} - n^{1/2}\delta P\{-\ell(\cdot; \hat{f})\} \right\} + (1 + \delta)\Gamma_n(\hat{f}^\dagger, \hat{f}) \\
&\implies P\ell(\cdot; \hat{f}^\dagger) \leq (1 + 2\delta)P\ell(\cdot; f) + \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \left\{ (1 + \delta)\mathbb{G}_n\ell(\cdot; \eta) - n^{1/2}\delta P\ell(\cdot; \eta) \right\} \\
&\quad + \sup_{\eta \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \left\{ (1 + \delta)\mathbb{G}_n\{-\ell(\cdot; \eta)\} - n^{1/2}\delta P\{-\ell(\cdot; \eta)\} \right\} + (1 + \delta) \sup_{\eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathcal{F}} \Gamma_n(\eta_1, \eta_2).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude the claim by taking the expectation. \square

When \hat{f}^\dagger is exactly the least-square estimator, we have $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n] = 0$, which coincides with Lemma 2.1 of [van der Vaart et al. \(2006\)](#). This result suggests that we need to analyze the two uncentered empirical process terms to derive oracle inequalities for model selection. [van der Vaart et al. \(2006\)](#) studies this problem under stronger assumptions for the distribution of ξ , which we aim to generalize here.

B.1 Proof of Theorem 5

Proof of Theorem 5. For each $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))$ be an ε -covering of the set \mathcal{F} relative to $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ -norm. We denote by f_j for $j = 1 \dots, \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))$ the functions corresponding to the center of the ε -covering. We construct a finite set of functions \mathcal{F}_ε as follows: for $j = 1 \dots, \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))$, if $f_j \in \mathcal{F}$, we include in \mathcal{F}_ε . Otherwise, we include any function $f'_j \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\|f'_j - f_j\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \leq \varepsilon$. We note that f'_j always exists by the definition of ε -covering. The resulting set \mathcal{F}_ε satisfies the following properties by construction: (i) $|\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon| = \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))$, (ii) $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{F}$ and (iii) for any function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $f' \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ such that $\|f - f'\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)} \leq 2\varepsilon$ by the triangle inequality. We denote by \hat{f} the empirical risk minimizer over the original space \mathcal{F} . By the property (iii) of \mathcal{F}_ε , there exists $\hat{f}^\diamond \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ such that

$$\|\hat{f}^\diamond - \hat{f}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)} = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1} (\hat{f}^\diamond(X_i) - \hat{f}(X_i))^2 \right\}^{1/2} \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

In other words, the function \widehat{f}^\diamond is the element of \mathcal{F}_ε that is closest to \widehat{f} in $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ metric. This implies the following basic inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}^\diamond) &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}) + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}^\diamond) - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}) \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}) + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \widehat{f}^\diamond)^2 - (Y_i - \widehat{f})^2 \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}) + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n -2Y_i(\widehat{f}^\diamond - \widehat{f}) + (\widehat{f}^\diamond - \widehat{f})(\widehat{f}^\diamond + \widehat{f}) \\
&\leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}) \\
&\quad + \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{f}^\diamond(X_i) - \widehat{f}(X_i))^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |2(\xi_i - f_0) + \widehat{f}^\diamond + \widehat{f}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}) + 4\varepsilon \left\{ \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2 \right)^{1/2} + \|f_0\|_\infty + F \right\} \\
&= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}) + 4\varepsilon \Gamma_n
\end{aligned}$$

for

$$\Gamma_n := \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2 \right)^{1/2} + \|f_0\|_\infty + F,$$

where the inequality is followed by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. We note that Γ_n no longer depends on specific \widehat{f} but only on the envelope F . We now define \widehat{f}^\dagger as the empirical risk minimizer over the finite covering \mathcal{F}_ε . Since \widehat{f} is the empirical risk minimizer over \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \subset \mathcal{F}$, we obtain the following chain of inequalities:

$$n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}^\dagger) \leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}^\diamond) \leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}) + 4\varepsilon \Gamma_n \leq n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(\cdot; \widehat{f}^\dagger) + 4\varepsilon \Gamma_n.$$

We thus have shown that \widehat{f}^\diamond approximately minimizes the empirical risk over \mathcal{F}_ε with the gap no greater than $4\varepsilon \Gamma_n$. In view of Lemma 11, for any $\delta > 0$ and any $f^\diamond \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\ell((X, Y); \widehat{f}^\diamond)] &\leq (1 + 2\delta) \mathbb{E}[\ell((X, Y); f^\diamond)] \\
&\quad + (1 + \delta)n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \frac{\delta}{(1 + \delta)} n^{1/2} P \right) \ell(\cdot; f) \right] \\
&\quad + (1 + \delta)n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon} \left(\mathbb{G}_n + \frac{\delta}{(1 + \delta)} n^{1/2} P \right) - \ell(\cdot; f) \right] + 4\varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n].
\end{aligned}$$

Let ℓ_0 be an excess squared loss such that $\ell_0((x, y); f) := (y - f(x))^2 - (y - f_0(x))^2$. Then by Lemma 12 under (A1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); \widehat{f}^\diamond)] &\leq (1 + 2\delta) \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); f^\diamond)] \\
&\quad + C \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon|) \left(n^{-1+1/q} F + n^{-1} F^2 / \delta \right) + 4\varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n]. \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

The left-hand-side of (33) approximates the object of interest as we can see

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); \widehat{f}^\diamond)] - \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); \widehat{f})] \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}[(\widehat{f}^\diamond - f_0)^2] - \mathbb{E}[(\widehat{f} - f_0)^2] \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E}[(\widehat{f}^\diamond + \widehat{f} - 2f_0)(\widehat{f}^\diamond - \widehat{f})] \right| \\
&\leq \left(\mathbb{E}(\widehat{f}^\diamond - \widehat{f})^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{E}(\widehat{f}^\diamond + \widehat{f} - 2f_0)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq 2\varepsilon \left(\mathbb{E}(\widehat{f}^\diamond + \widehat{f} - 2f_0)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq 4\varepsilon(F + \|f_0\|_\infty).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have by the reverse triangle inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); \widehat{f}^\diamond)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); \widehat{f})] - 4\varepsilon(F + \|f_0\|_\infty).$$

Similarly, by the property (iii) of \mathcal{F}_ε , for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $f^\diamond \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \|f - f^\diamond\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)} = \left(\mathbb{E} |f(X) - f^\diamond(X)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 2\varepsilon$$

and we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}[(f^\diamond - f_0)^2] - \mathbb{E}[(f - f_0)^2] \right| \leq 2\varepsilon \left(\mathbb{E}(f^\diamond + f - 2f_0)^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 4\varepsilon(F + \|f_0\|_\infty).$$

Therefore, by the triangle inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); f^\diamond)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); f)] + 4\varepsilon(F + \|f_0\|_\infty)$$

for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$. As the inequality (33) holds for any $f^\diamond \in \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon$, it can be stated for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); \widehat{f}^\diamond)] \leq (1 + 2\delta) \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); f^\diamond)] \\
&\quad + C \log(1 + \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))) \left(n^{-1+1/q}F + n^{-1}F^2/\delta \right) + 4\varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n] \\
\implies \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); \widehat{f})] - 4\varepsilon(F + \|f_0\|_\infty) &\leq (1 + 2\delta) \left\{ \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); f)] + 4\varepsilon(\|f_0\|_\infty + F) \right\} \\
&\quad + C \log(1 + \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))) \left(n^{-1+1/q}F + n^{-1}F^2/\delta \right) + 4\varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n] \\
\implies \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); \widehat{f})] &\leq (1 + 2\delta) \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); f)] \\
&\quad + C \log(1 + \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))) \left(n^{-1+1/q}F + n^{-1}F^2/\delta \right) \\
&\quad + 4\varepsilon(2 + 2\delta)(\|f_0\|_\infty + F) + 4\varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n] \\
\implies \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); \widehat{f})] &\stackrel{(I)}{\leq} (1 + 2\delta) \mathbb{E}[\ell_0((X, Y); f)] \\
&\quad + C \left\{ \log(1 + \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))) \left(n^{-1+1/q}F + n^{-1}F^2/\delta \right) + \varepsilon(\sigma + \|f_0\|_\infty + F) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In step (I) we used the following bound on $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n]$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_i^2 \right)^{1/2} + \|f_0\|_\infty + F \right] \leq \sigma + \|f_0\|_\infty + F$$

since $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^2 | X_i] < \sigma^2$. Similarly under **(A2)**, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\ell((X, Y); \widehat{f})] \\
& \leq (1 + 2\delta) \mathbb{E}[\ell((X, Y); f)] \\
& \quad + Cn^{-1} \log(1 + \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))) \left(F(\log n)^{1/\beta} + F^2/\delta \right) \\
& \quad + 4\varepsilon(2 + 2\delta)(\|f_0\|_\infty + F) + 2\varepsilon \mathbb{E}[\Gamma_n] \\
& \leq (1 + 2\delta) \mathbb{E}[\ell((X, Y); f)] \\
& \quad + C \left\{ n^{-1} \log(1 + \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}, L_2(\mathbb{P}_n))) \left(F(\log n)^{1/\beta} + F^2/\delta \right) + \varepsilon(\sigma + \|f_0\|_\infty + F) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

As the choice of $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we conclude by taking the infimum over ε . \square

We now appeal to the following bound on the supremum of the expectation of the uncentered empirical process over a finite set of functions.

Lemma 12. *Suppose that the observations $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are generated from the regression model $Y = f_0(X) + \xi$ where $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i | X_i] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^2 | X_i] \leq \sigma^2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and additionally either **(A1)** or **(A2)** holds. Let $\ell_0((x, y); f)$ be the excess squared loss such that $\ell_0((x, y); f) := (y - f(x))^2 - (y - f_0(x))^2$. Then, for a finite class of functions \mathcal{F} , uniformly bounded by F , and for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant C only depending on $\|f_0\|_\infty$, q , C_q and σ^2 such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell(\cdot; f) \right] \leq C \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left(n^{-1/2+1/q} F + n^{-1/2} F^2/\delta \right) \tag{35}$$

under **(A1)**. Similarly, for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant C only depending on $\|f_0\|_\infty$, β , C_β and σ^2 such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell(\cdot; f) \right] \leq C n^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left(F(\log n)^{1/\beta} + F^2/\delta \right) \tag{36}$$

under **(A2)**. The same upper bounds hold for $\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n + \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \{-\ell(\cdot; f)\} \right]$.

Proof of Lemma 12. First, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\ell_0((X_i, Y_i); f) &= (Y_i - f(X_i))^2 - (Y_i - f_0(X_i))^2 \\
&= (Y_i - f_0(X_i) + f_0(X_i) - f(X_i))^2 - (Y_i - f_0(X_i))^2 \\
&= 2\xi_i(f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) + (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i))^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell_0(\cdot; f) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \left\{ 2\xi(f_0(X) - f(X)) + (f_0(X) - f(X))^2 \right\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left[n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n 2\xi_i(f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) + \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) (f_0(X) - f(X))^2 \right] \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the assumption $\mathbb{E}[\xi | X] = 0$ and the random variable $\xi_i(f_0(X_i) - f(X_i))$ is already centered for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$. We now use the following conditional symmetrization

argument. Let $\xi' := (\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_n)$ be a conditionally independent copy of $\xi := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ given (X_1, \dots, X_n) , meaning that ξ' and ξ follow the same conditional distribution. We also denote by $\varepsilon := (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$ an IID Rademacher random variable. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n 2\xi_i (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) + \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) (f_0(X) - f(X))^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X_1 \dots X_n} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\xi | X_1 \dots X_n} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n 2\xi_i (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) - 2 \mathbb{E}_{\xi' | X_1 \dots X_n} [\xi'_i (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i))] \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) (f_0(X) - f(X))^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X_1 \dots X_n} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\xi', \xi | X_1 \dots X_n} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n 2(\xi_i - \xi'_i) (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) (f_0(X) - f(X))^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X_1 \dots X_n} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon, \xi', \xi | X_1 \dots X_n} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n 2\varepsilon_i |\xi_i - \xi'_i| (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) (f_0(X) - f(X))^2 \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n 4\varepsilon_i |\xi_i| (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) + \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) (f_0(X) - f(X))^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Using this result, we can split the analysis into two parts after truncating the processes by B :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell(\cdot; f) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n 4\varepsilon_i |\xi_i| 1_{\{|\xi_i| \leq B\}} (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) + \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) (f_0(X) - f(X))^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n 4\varepsilon_i |\xi_i| 1_{\{|\xi_i| > B\}} (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) \right] \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

where $B \equiv B_n$ is a positive real number that may change with n . We can use the standard technique to provide the bounds on the first two terms as they are (uncentered) empirical processes for bounded random variables. Toward this task, we first introduce the following Bernstein numbers.

Definition 1 (Bernstein numbers). *Given a measurable function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, call $(M(f), v(f))$ a pair of Bernstein numbers of f if*

$$M(f)^2 P \left(e^{|f|/M(f)} - 1 - \frac{|f|}{M(f)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} v(f).$$

Section 8.1 of [van der Vaart et al. \(2006\)](#) provides the following useful properties of Bernstein numbers, which we present in the following corollary:

Corollary 13. *The following statements regarding Bernstein numbers hold:*

- (i) *If f is uniformly bounded, then $(\|f\|_\infty, 1.5P f^2)$ is a pair of Bernstein numbers.*
- (ii) *If $|f| \leq g$, then a Bernstein pair for g is also a Bernstein pair for f .*

(iii) If $(M(f), v(f))$ and $(M(g), v(g))$ are Bernstein pairs for f and g , then $2(M(f) \vee M(g), v(f) + v(g))$ is a Bernstein pair for $f + g$.

(iv) If $(M(f), v(f))$ is a Bernstein pair for f and $c > 0$, then $(cM(f), c^2v(f))$ is a Bernstein pair for cf .

We then use the following bounds on the uncentered empirical process in terms of Bernstein numbers:

Lemma 14 (Lemma 2.2 of [van der Vaart et al. \(2006\)](#)). *Let \mathbb{G}_n be the empirical process of an IID sample of size n from the distribution P and assume that $Pf \geq 0$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Then, for any Bernstein pairs $(M(f), v(f))$ and for any $\delta > 0$ and $1 \leq p \leq 2$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P) f \right] \leq \frac{8}{n^{1/p-1/2}} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left[\frac{M(f)}{n^{1-1/p}} + \left(\frac{v(f)}{(\delta P f)^{2-p}} \right)^{1/p} \right]$$

where $|\mathcal{F}|$ denotes the cardinality of the set \mathcal{F} . The same upper bound holds for $E[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\mathbb{G}_n + \delta n^{1/2} P)(-f)]$.

We now apply Lemma 14 to the class of functions

$$\mathcal{H} := \{(x, \xi, \varepsilon) \mapsto 4\varepsilon|\xi|I\{|\xi| \leq B\}(f_0(x) - f(x)) + (f_0(x) - f(x))^2 : f \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

First, we observe that for each $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$, we have $P\eta = \|f_0 - f\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \geq 0$ from earlier symmetrization. We now derive a Bernstein pair. For each $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$, we split functions into two parts:

$$\underbrace{4\varepsilon|\xi|I\{|\xi| \leq B\}(f_0(x) - f(x))}_{:=\eta_1} + \underbrace{(f_0(x) - f(x))^2}_{:=\eta_2}$$

and use (iii) of Corollary 13. Since η_1 is uniformly bounded, $M(\eta_1) = 4B\|f_0 - f\|_\infty$ and the variance is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\{4\varepsilon|\xi|I\{|\xi| \leq B\}(f_0(x) - f(x))\}^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\{4\varepsilon|\xi|I\{|\xi| \leq B\}\}^2 \mid X \right] (f_0(x) - f(x))^2 \right] \\ &\leq 16\sigma^2 \|f_0 - f\|_{L_2(P)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly for η_2 , we have

$$M(\eta_2) = \|(f_0 - f)^2\|_\infty \leq (\|f_0\|_\infty + F)\|f_0 - f\|_\infty$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} [(f_0(x) - f(x))^4] \leq (\|f_0\|_\infty + F)^2 \|f_0 - f\|_{L_2(P)}^2.$$

By (iii) of Corollary 13, we have

$$\{M(\eta), v(\eta)\} = \left\{ (8B \vee 2\|f_0\|_\infty + 2F)\|f_0 - f\|_\infty, (16\sigma^2 + 2\|f_0\|_\infty^2 + 2F^2)\|f_0 - f\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \right\}.$$

By Lemma 14 with $p = 1$, for $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} (\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P)(f_0(X) - f(X))^2 \right] \\ &\leq 8n^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left[(8B \vee 2\|f_0\|_\infty + 2F)\|f_0 - f\|_\infty + \frac{(16\sigma^2 + 2\|f_0\|_\infty^2 + 2F^2)}{\delta} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we turn to (37). Under the finite q th moment of ξ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n 4\varepsilon_i |\xi_i| I(|\xi_i| > B) (f_0(X_i) - f(X_i)) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n |\xi_i| |\xi_i|^{q-1} / B^{q-1} \|f_0 - f\|_\infty \right] \\ & \leq n^{-1/2} \max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{\|f_0 - f\|_\infty}{B^{q-1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n |\xi_i|^q \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Putting together, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell(\cdot; f) \right] \\ & \leq 8n^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left[\{8B \vee 2(\|f_0\|_\infty + F)\} (\|f_0\|_\infty + F) + \frac{(16\sigma^2 + 2\|f_0\|_\infty^2 + 2F^2)}{\delta} \right] \\ & \quad + n^{-1/2} \frac{(\|f_0\|_\infty + F)}{B^{q-1}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n |\xi_i|^q \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As the choice of B is arbitrary, we optimize and obtain that

$$B = \left(\frac{(q-1)E[\sum_{i=1}^n |\xi_i|^q]}{64 \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|)} \right)^{1/q}.$$

Plugging this in, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell_0(\cdot; f) \right] \\ & \leq 2n^{-1/2} (\|f_0\|_\infty + F) \left((q-1) \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n |\xi_i|^q \right] \right)^{1/q} (64 \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|))^{1-1/q} \\ & \quad + 8n^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left[2(\|f_0\|_\infty + F)^2 + \frac{(16\sigma^2 + 2\|f_0\|_\infty^2 + 2F^2)}{\delta} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Finally by (A1), we have for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell_0(\cdot; f) \right] \\ & \leq 2C_q n^{-1/2} (\|f_0\|_\infty + F) ((q-1)n)^{1/q} (64 \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|))^{1-1/q} \\ & \quad + 8n^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left[2(\|f_0\|_\infty + F)^2 + \frac{(16\sigma^2 + 2\|f_0\|_\infty^2 + 2F^2)}{\delta} \right] \\ & \leq 128eC_q n^{-1/2+1/q} (\|f_0\|_\infty + F) \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \\ & \quad + 8n^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left(\frac{16\sigma^2 + 6\|f_0\|_\infty^2 + 6F^2}{\delta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

since $(64 \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|))^{1/q} \geq 1$ for $|\mathcal{F}| \geq 1$ and $q \geq 2$. Thus we conclude that there exists a constant C depending only on $\|f_0\|_\infty$, q , C_q and σ^2 such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell_0(\cdot; f) \right] \leq C \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left(n^{-1/2+1/q} F + n^{-1/2} F^2 / \delta \right).$$

Next, under [\(A2\)](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell_0(\cdot; f) \right] \\
& \leq 2C_\beta n^{-1/2} (\|f_0\|_\infty + F) \left((q-1)nq^{q/\beta} \right)^{1/q} (64 \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|))^{1-1/q} \\
& \quad + 8n^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left[2(\|f_0\|_\infty + F)^2 + \frac{(16\sigma^2 + 2\|f_0\|_\infty^2 + 2F^2)}{\delta} \right] \\
& \leq 128eC_\beta n^{-1/2} (\|f_0\|_\infty + F) n^{1/q} q^{1/\beta} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \\
& \quad + 8n^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left(\frac{16\sigma^2 + 6\|f_0\|_\infty^2 + 6F^2}{\delta} \right) \\
& \leq Cn^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left(Fn^{1/q} q^{1/\beta} + F^2/\delta \right)
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant C depending only on $\|f_0\|_\infty$, C_β and σ^2 . The only term involving q is $n^{1/q} q^{1/\beta}$. By choosing the optimal choice of $q_* = \beta \log n$, we get

$$n^{1/q_*} q_*^{1/\beta} = n^{1/(\beta \log n)} (\beta \log n)^{1/\beta} = e^{1/\beta} \beta^{1/\beta} (\log n)^{1/\beta}$$

This explains why we only require [\(A2\)](#) to hold for $1 \leq q \leq \lceil \beta \log n \rceil$. We thus conclude

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n - \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \ell_0(\cdot; f) \right] \leq Cn^{-1/2} \log(1 + |\mathcal{F}|) \left(F(\log n)^{1/\beta} + F^2/\delta \right).$$

In view of Lemma 14, the bound for $\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left(\mathbb{G}_n + \delta n^{1/2} P \right) \{-\ell_0(\cdot; f)\} \right]$ is identical. \square

B.2 Application of the model selection result

We now apply the model selection result by Theorem 5 to our context. The proof of our main result uses one of the lemmas presented below. We define additional notation.

Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval on \mathbb{R} whose width is denoted by $|\mathcal{L}|$. We then construct the following set of estimators based on the subset of data $D_1 := \{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_1\}$:

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}} := \left\{ \widehat{f}_L := \widehat{g}_L(x; D_1) - Lx; L \in \mathcal{L} \right\}. \quad (38)$$

The estimator $\widehat{g}_L(x; D_1)$ is given by (7). First, we claim that the class of functions given by $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is uniformly Lipschitz in parameter in the following lemma:

Lemma 15. *For any two estimators $\widehat{f}_{L_1}, \widehat{f}_{L_2} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$, it follows that*

$$\|\widehat{f}_{L_1} - \widehat{f}_{L_2}\|_\infty \leq 2|L_1 - L_2|$$

Proof of Lemma 15. We denote by $|D_1| = n_1$. For each $L \in \mathcal{L}$, the corresponding estimator \widehat{f}_L is defined explicitly by the max-min formula (Robertson et al., 1988) as

$$\widehat{f}_L(x) := \widehat{g}_L(x; D_1) - Lx = \min_{X_{(u)} \geq x} \max_{X_{(l)} \leq x} \frac{1}{u-l+1} \sum_{i=l}^u (Y_{(i)} + LX_{(i)}) - Lx$$

where $X_{(1)} \dots X_{(n_1)}$ is the order statistics of X according to D_1 and $Y_{(1)} \dots Y_{(n_1)}$ denotes their corresponding observations without breaking the initial pairs of (X_i, Y_i) for each $i \in \mathcal{I}_1$. Given two

estimators $\widehat{f}_{L_1}(x)$ and $\widehat{f}_{L_2}(x)$ constructed from shared data D_1 , we define the indices that attain the minimum and maximum at in the above display as (l_1, u_1) and (l_2, u_2) respectively. To illustrate concretely, we have

$$\widehat{f}_{L_1}(x) = \frac{1}{u_1 - l_1 + 1} \sum_{i=l_1}^{u_1} (Y_{(i)} + L_1 X_{(i)}) - L_1 x.$$

Since two estimators are obtained from the same training set with the only difference being the values of L , the order statistics $\{X_{(i)}, Y_{(i)}\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1}$ are also shared. For each x , it now follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \widehat{f}_{L_1}(x) - \widehat{f}_{L_2}(x) \\ &= (\widehat{g}_{L_1}(x) - L_1 x) - (\widehat{g}_{L_2}(x) - L_2 x) \\ &= \min_{X_{(u)} \geq x} \max_{X_{(l)} \leq x} \frac{1}{u - l + 1} \sum_{i=l}^u (Y_{(i)} + L_1 X_{(i)}) - \min_{X_{(u)} \geq x} \max_{X_{(l)} \leq x} \frac{1}{u - l + 1} \sum_{i=l}^u (Y_{(i)} + L_2 X_{(i)}) \\ &\quad - (L_1 - L_2)x \\ &\leq \max_{X_{(l)} \leq x} \frac{1}{u_2 - l + 1} \sum_{i=l}^{u_2} (Y_{(i)} + L_1 X_{(i)}) - \max_{X_{(l)} \leq x} \frac{1}{u_2 - l + 1} \sum_{i=l}^{u_2} (Y_{(i)} + L_2 X_{(i)}) - (L_1 - L_2)x \\ &\leq \frac{1}{u_2 - l_1 + 1} \sum_{i=l_1}^{u_2} (Y_{(i)} + L_1 X_{(i)}) - \frac{1}{u_2 - l_1 + 1} \sum_{i=l_1}^{u_2} (Y_{(i)} + L_2 X_{(i)}) - (L_1 - L_2)x \\ &= \frac{|L_2 - L_1|}{u_2 - l_1 + 1} \sum_{i=l_1}^{u_2} X_{(i)} + |L_1 - L_2|x. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude the claim by taking the supremum over x . \square

Next, we derive the corresponding oracle inequality for the model selection over the class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Lemma 16. *Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval on \mathbb{R} whose width is denoted by $|\mathcal{L}|$. Let $\widehat{f} \equiv \widehat{f}_{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}(\cdot; D_1)$ be the estimator of based on empirical minimizer over the data D_2 independent from D_1 . We denote by $F := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}} \|f\|_{\infty}$. Then for any $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending on $\|f_0\|_{\infty}, C_q, q, C_{\beta}, \beta$, and σ^2 such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \|\widehat{f} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \mid D_1 \right] \leq (1 + \delta) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \mid D_1 \right] + C \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(R_n F + \frac{2F^2}{n\delta} \right)$$

where

$$R_n := \begin{cases} n^{-1+1/q} & \text{under (A1)} \\ n^{-1}(\log n)^{1/\beta} & \text{under (A2)}. \end{cases}$$

Proof of Lemma 16. Throughout the proof, we state the result conditioning on D_1 and thus treat (38) as a non-random set of functions. Lemma 15 establishes that the function class $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is uniformly Lipschitz in parameters such that

$$\|\widehat{f}_{L_1} - \widehat{f}_{L_2}\|_{\infty} \leq 2|L_1 - L_2| \quad \text{for any } \widehat{f}_{L_1}, \widehat{f}_{L_2} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}.$$

Since $|L_1 - L_2| \leq \varepsilon/2$ implies $\|\widehat{f}_{L_1} - \widehat{f}_{L_2}\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon$, the ε -covering number of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is bounded by the $\varepsilon/2$ -covering number of \mathcal{L} . As \mathcal{L} is simply a bounded interval in \mathbb{R} , we have $\mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)}) \leq \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon, \mathcal{L}, |\cdot|) \leq 2|\mathcal{L}|/\varepsilon$.

We now invoke Theorem 5. Theorem 5 under **(A1)** states that for any $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 &\leq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \\ &\quad + C \inf_{\varepsilon > 0} \left\{ \log(1 + 2|\mathcal{L}|/\varepsilon) \left(n^{-1+1/q}F + \frac{2F^2}{n\delta} \right) + \varepsilon F \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for a constant C depending on $C_q, \|f_0\|_\infty, q$, and σ^2 . By minimizing the choice over ε , we obtain, with the choice $\varepsilon = n^{-1+1/q} + 2F(n\delta)^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 &\leq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \\ &\quad + C \log \left(1 + \frac{|\mathcal{L}|}{n^{-1+1/q} + 2\delta^{-1}n^{-1}F} \right) \left(n^{-1+1/q}F + n^{-1}F^2/\delta \right) \\ &\leq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + C \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(n^{-1+1/q}F + n^{-1}F^2/\delta \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof under **(A2)** is analogous, and we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f} - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{f}_L - f_0\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + C \log(1 + n|\mathcal{L}|) \left(n^{-1}F(\log n)^{1/\beta} + n^{-1}F^2/\delta \right)$$

for a constant C depending on $C_\beta, \|f_0\|_\infty, \beta$, and σ^2 . □

Supplement C Supporting lemmas for oracle inequalities

The proof of Theorem 4 crucially depends on the oracle inequality for the estimator \widehat{f}_L under some fixed L . The aim of this section is to provide the corresponding result as well as other supporting technical lemmas. We organize this section as follows: the main result of this section is Lemma 17 presented below whose proof is provided in Section C.1. Lemma 17 further depends on two results: Lemmas 18 and 19. Lemma 18 is a general statement that relates Lemma 17 to the upper bound of the expectation of certain empirical process. Lemma 19 provides the corresponding upper bound for our context. The proofs of these lemmas are provided in Section C.2. Sections C.3 and C.4 provide additional technical results for Lemma 19. Section C.5 proves that the proposed estimator is bounded in probability, which is a result we frequently refer to throughout.

We recall relevant notation for this section. For each fixed L , we define a function space

$$\mathcal{F}(L) := \left\{ f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \exists g \in \mathcal{C} \text{ such that } f(x) = g(x) - Lx \text{ for all } x \in [0, 1] \right\}$$

where \mathcal{C} is a convex cone, consisting of non-decreasing functions from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} . The fixed- L estimator is given by (25) and we define a fixed- L oracle function as follows:

$$f_L^*(x) := g_L^*(x) - Lx \quad \text{where} \quad g_L^* := \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{E}(Y + LX - g(X))^2. \quad (39)$$

We also recall that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\mathcal{F}_{m,L}$ a set of any m -piecewise function, taking the following form:

$$f_{m,L}(x) := \sum_{j=1}^m a_j 1(x \in I_j) - Lx \quad (40)$$

where $a_i < a_j$ for $i < j$ and $\{I_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is any non-overlapping partition of $[0, 1]$ such that $\cup_{j=1}^m I_j = [0, 1]$. For P -integrable function g , we denote by $Pg = \int g dP$ and by $\mathbb{G}_n g := n^{1/2}(\mathbb{P}_n - P)g$ its empirical process. The main result of this section is stated below:

Lemma 17. *Let \widehat{f}_L be the fixed- L estimator given by (25) and f_L^* be the fixed- L oracle function given by (39). Consider the regression model (1) and assume $\mathbb{E}[\xi^2 | X_i] \leq \sigma^2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Define $B(L) := \|f_0\|_\infty + \sigma^2 + 2L$. Then, there exists constants C_ε and N_ε only depending on $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that for any $n \geq N_\varepsilon$, the following holds with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$:*

$$\|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \leq C_\varepsilon B(L)^2 \inf_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{m,L}} \|f - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 + \frac{m\sigma^2 \log^2\{nB(L)\}}{n} \right). \quad (41)$$

C.1 Proof of Lemma 17

Proof of Lemma 17. The first aim is to establish that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, it holds

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq C_\varepsilon B(L) \delta_n \right) \leq \varepsilon \quad (42)$$

for a large constant C_ε only depending on ε and δ_n to be defined shortly. We split the event of interest into cases whether the estimator is bounded by $B(L) := \|f_0\|_\infty + \sigma^2 + 2L$ up to a constant.

This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq C_\varepsilon B(L)\delta_n\right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq C_\varepsilon B(L)\delta_n \mid \|\widehat{f}_L\|_\infty \leq C'_\varepsilon B(L)\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{f}_L\|_\infty > C'_\varepsilon B(L)\right) \end{aligned}$$

where C'_ε is a constant only depending on ε . The second term of the above display can be bounded by $\varepsilon/2$ for arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$ according to Lemma 25 (see Section C.5 for the proof), which states that the estimators are bounded in probability by $B(L)$.

It thus remains to analyze the first term of the above display. To claim this term can also be bounded by $\varepsilon/2$ for arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$, we combine a peeling device, provided by Lemma 18, and a new bound on the local multiplier process, provided by Lemma 19. In summary, Lemma 18 states that the first probability converges to zero for any sequence δ_n as long as the following bound on the local multiplier process holds:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(L): \|f - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \delta_n} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f - f_L^*)|\right] \leq \phi_n(\delta_n)$$

for some ϕ_n such that $\delta \mapsto \phi_n(\delta)/\delta$ is non-increasing and $\phi_n(\delta_n) \leq \sqrt{n}\delta_n^2$. Lemma 19 states that the inequality above indeed holds for our estimator with the following choice of ϕ_n :

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n(\delta_n) & := \sqrt{m}\sigma \left(\delta_n + \|f_{m,L} - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}\right) \log\{\delta_n^{-1}(2B(L) + \|f_0\|_\infty + 2L)\} \\ & \leq \sqrt{m}\sigma \left(\delta_n + \|f_{m,L} - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}\right) \log\{3\delta_n^{-1}B(L)\} \end{aligned}$$

for any $\delta_n \geq n^{-1} > 0$ and $f_{m,L}$ is any m -piecewise function, taking the form (40).

Next, we derive specific choices of δ_n to establish the oracle inequality. We can first establish the upper bound of $\log\{3\delta_n^{-1}B(L)\}$ by $\log\{3nB(L)\}$ under the assumption $\delta_n \geq n^{-1} > 0$. Then, we can solve for the optimal choice of $\delta_n \geq n^{-1}$ based on the following equation:

$$\sqrt{m}\sigma \left(\delta_n + \|f_{m,L} - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}\right) \log\{3nB(L)\} = \sqrt{n}\delta_n^2.$$

The optimal choice of δ_n is then given by

$$\delta_n^2 = C \left(\frac{m\sigma^2 \log^2\{3nB(L)\}}{n} + \|f_{m,L} - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \right)$$

where C is a universal constant. We can then plug this expression into our first result given by (42) and obtain that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$,

$$\|\widehat{f}_L - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \leq C_\varepsilon B(L)^2 \left(\frac{m\sigma^2 \log^2\{3nB(L)\}}{n} + \|f_{m,L} - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}^2 \right)$$

for constant C_ε only depending on ε . Since the above argument holds for arbitrary m and $f_{m,L}$, we conclude the claim by taking the infimum over $\mathcal{F}_{m,L}$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ on the right-hand side. \square

C.2 Proofs of Lemma 18 and Lemma 19

Two Lemmas 18 and 19 play crucial roles in proving Theorem 17. Lemma 18 provides a high-probability upper bound of the estimation error of an empirical risk minimizer via the supremum of localized empirical processes. This result is commonly known as the *peeling device* in the literature. Although this result is not novel, we present the details for the ease of readers' reference. The following result is presented for the general case.

Lemma 18. Let \mathcal{F} be a class of function, further assumed to be a convex set. Consider the regression model (1). We define f^* and \widehat{f}_n as the $L_2(P)$ and $L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)$ -projections of the true regression function f_0 onto \mathcal{F} such that

$$f^* := \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|Y - f\|_{L_2(P)}^2 = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} (f_0(X) + \xi - f(X))^2, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\widehat{f}_n := \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|Y - f\|_{L_2(\mathbb{P}_n)}^2 = \arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_0(X_i) + \xi_i - f(X_i))^2.$$

A collection of localized functions with respect to the $L_2(P)$ -norm centered at f_0 is denoted by

$$\mathcal{F}(\delta_n) := \{f \in \mathcal{F}; \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \delta_n\}.$$

We assume that (i) for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $B^* < \infty$ such that $\|f - f^*\|_\infty \leq B^*$, and (ii) for some ϕ_n such that $\delta \mapsto \phi_n(\delta)/\delta$ is non-increasing, the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f - f^*)| \right] &\leq \phi_n(\delta_n), \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n \epsilon(f - f^*)| \right] &\leq \phi_n(\delta_n), \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n \epsilon(f - f^*) \times (f_0 - f^*)| \right] &\leq \phi_n(\delta_n), \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is an IID Rademacher random variable. Then, there exists C_ϵ, N_ϵ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $n \geq N_\epsilon$:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq C_\epsilon B^* \delta_n \right) < \epsilon,$$

where δ_n is any deterministic positive sequence such that $\phi_n(\delta_n) \leq \sqrt{n} \delta_n^2$. Furthermore, under the same settings, the result can be stated in expectation at the expense of a logarithmic term such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \right] \leq C B^* \delta_n \log(1/\delta_n).$$

In particular for $\delta_n \geq n^{-1} > 0$, we have $\log(1/\delta_n) \leq \log n$.

Proof of Lemma 18. The event we aim to control is given by

$$\left\{ \|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq 2^M B^* \delta_n \right\},$$

and we claim that the probability of the above event converges to zero as $M \rightarrow \infty$.

Toward this goal, we apply the following peeling device:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq 2^M B^* \delta_n \right\} &\subseteq \left\{ \inf_{\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq 2^M B^* \delta_n} \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f(X))^2 \leq \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f^*(X))^2 \right\} \\ &= \bigcup_{j=M}^{\infty} \left\{ \inf_{2^j B^* \delta_n \leq \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq 2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n} \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f(X))^2 - \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f^*(X))^2 \leq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq 2^M B^* \delta_n) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{2^j B^* \delta_n \leq \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq 2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n} \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f(X))^2 - \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f^*(X))^2 \leq 0 \right) \\
& = \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{2^j B^* \delta_n \leq \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq 2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n} \mathbb{K}_n(f, f^*, f_0) \leq -P(f^* - f)^2 - 2P(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where

$$\mathbb{K}_n(f, f^*, f_0) := \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f(X))^2 - \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f^*(X))^2 - P(f^* - f)^2 - 2P(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f).$$

The last term of the inequality (44) can be further bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\| \geq 2^M B^* \delta_n) & \stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{2^j B^* \delta_n \leq \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq 2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n} \mathbb{K}_n(f, f^*, f_0) \leq -P(f^* - f)^2 \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\inf_{2^j B^* \delta_n \leq \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq 2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n} \mathbb{K}_n(f, f^*, f_0) \leq -2^{2j} (B^* \delta_n)^2 \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{2^j B^* \delta_n \leq \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq 2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n} |\sqrt{n} \mathbb{K}_n(f, f^*, f_0)| \geq \sqrt{n} 2^{2j} (B^* \delta_n)^2 \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{2^j B^* \delta_n \leq \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq 2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n} |\sqrt{n} \mathbb{K}_n(f, f^*, f_0)| \right] / (\sqrt{n} 2^{2j} (B^* \delta_n)^2) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\sqrt{n} \mathbb{K}_n(f, f^*, f_0)| \right] / (\sqrt{n} 2^{2j} (B^* \delta_n)^2).
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where we denote by $\mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)$ the collection of the following localized functions:

$$\mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n) := \{f \in \mathcal{F}; \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq 2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n\}.$$

In step (1), we use the fact that \mathcal{F} is convex, which implies $P(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f) > 0$. To elaborate this claim, for any $0 < \delta < 1$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
P(f_0 - f^*)^2 & \stackrel{(2)}{\leq} P(f_0 - (1 - \delta)f^* - \delta\widehat{f}_n)^2 \\
& = P(f_0 - f^* + \delta(f^* - \widehat{f}_n))^2 \\
& = P(f_0 - f^*)^2 + 2\delta P(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - \widehat{f}_n) + \delta^2 P(f^* - \widehat{f}_n)^2 \\
& \implies 2P(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - \widehat{f}_n) \geq -\delta P(f^* - \widehat{f}_n)^2
\end{aligned}$$

and thus we conclude $P(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - \widehat{f}_n) \geq 0$ by taking $\delta \rightarrow 0$. In step (2) above, we use the definition of f^* as a $L^2(P)$ -projection of f_0 onto \mathcal{F} . Also, as \mathcal{F} is convex, $(1 - \delta)f^* + \delta\widehat{f}_n$ is an element of \mathcal{F} .

We now rearrange the last expressions in (45), and we relate them with the empirical processes in our assumption. To show this, we first observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_n(Y - f(X))^2 - \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f^*(X))^2 &= \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f_0(X))^2 + \mathbb{P}_n(f_0 - f)^2 + 2\mathbb{P}_n(Y - f_0(X))(f_0 - f) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{P}_n(Y - f_0(X))^2 - \mathbb{P}_n(f_0 - f^*)^2 - 2\mathbb{P}_n(Y - f_0(X))(f_0 - f^*) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_n(f_0 - f)^2 - \mathbb{P}_n(f_0 - f^*)^2 + 2\mathbb{P}_n(Y - f_0(X))(f_0^* - f) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_n(f_0 - f^*)^2 + \mathbb{P}_n(f^* - f)^2 + 2\mathbb{P}_n(f_0 - f^*)(f_0^* - f) \\
&\quad - \mathbb{P}_n(f_0 - f^*)^2 + 2\mathbb{P}_n\xi(f^* - f) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_n(f^* - f)^2 + 2\mathbb{P}_n(f_0 - f^*)(f_0^* - f) + 2\mathbb{P}_n\xi(f^* - f).
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting $P(f^* - f)^2 + 2P(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f)$ from both sides, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{K}_n(f, f^*, f_0) &= \mathbb{P}_n(f^* - f)^2 + 2\mathbb{P}_n(f_0 - f^*)(f_0^* - f) + 2\mathbb{P}_n\xi(f^* - f) \\
&\quad - P(f^* - f)^2 - 2P(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f) \\
\implies \sqrt{n}\mathbb{K}_n(f, f^*, f_0) &= \mathbb{G}_n(f^* - f)^2 + 2\mathbb{G}_n(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f) + 2\mathbb{G}_n\xi(f^* - f).
\end{aligned}$$

Continuing from (45), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\|\hat{f}_n - f^*\| \geq 2^M B^* \delta_n) &\leq 2 \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} (\sqrt{n} 2^{2j} \delta_n^2)^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n(f^* - f)^2| \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f)| \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n\xi(f^* - f)| \right] \right). \tag{46}
\end{aligned}$$

Using a standard symmetrization argument (See, for instance, Section 3.3 of [Sen \(2018\)](#)), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n(f^* - f)^2| \right] &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n\epsilon(f^* - f)^2| \right] \quad \text{and} \\
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f)| \right] &\leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n\epsilon(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f)| \right].
\end{aligned}$$

By our assumption that $\|f - f_0^*\|_{\infty} \leq B^*$, it also implies $|f^*(X_i) - f(X_i)| \leq B^*$. Therefore, $(f^*(X_i) - f(X_i))^2$ is a $2B^*$ -Lipschitz function of $f^*(X_i) - f(X_i)$. Applying Talagrand's contraction inequality (See, for instance, Theorem 4.12 of [Ledoux and Talagrand \(1991\)](#)), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n\epsilon(f^* - f)^2| \right] \leq 2B^* \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n\epsilon(f^* - f)| \right].$$

Hence, the terms in the right-hand side of (46) can be bounded under our assumptions that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\| \geq 2^M B^* \delta_n) \\
& \leq 8B^* \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} (\sqrt{n}2^{2j} (B^* \delta_n)^2)^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n \epsilon(f - f^*)| \right] \right. \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n \epsilon(f_0 - f^*)(f^* - f)| \right] \\
& \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f^* - f)| \right] \right) \\
& \leq 24 \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \frac{\phi_n(2^{j+1} B^* \delta_n)}{B^* \sqrt{n} 2^{2j} \delta_n^2} \stackrel{(3)}{\leq} 24 \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} \frac{2^{j+1} B^* \phi_n(\delta_n)}{B^* \sqrt{n} 2^{2j} \delta_n^2} \leq 48 \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} 2^{-j}.
\end{aligned}$$

In step (3), we use the assumption that $\phi_n(\delta)/\delta$ is a non-increasing function of δ . As $M \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq 2^M B^* \delta_n) \leq 48 \sum_{j=M}^{\infty} 2^{-j} \rightarrow 0,$$

for any deterministic sequences δ_n such that $\phi_n(\delta_n) \leq \sqrt{n} \delta_n^2$. This concludes the first claim.

To claim the second result in expectation, it follows from $\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{\infty} \leq B^*$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \right] &= \int_0^{B^* \delta_n} \mathbb{P} \left(\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq t \right) dt + \int_{B^* \delta_n}^{B^*} \mathbb{P} \left(\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq t \right) dt \\
&\leq B^* \delta_n + \ln(2) B^* \delta_n \int_0^{\log_2(1/\delta_n)} 2^u \mathbb{P} \left(\|\widehat{f}_n - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \geq 2^u B^* \delta_n \right) du \\
&\leq B^* \delta_n + 48 \ln(2) B^* \delta_n \int_0^{\log_2(1/\delta_n)} 2^u \sum_{j=u}^{\infty} 2^{-j} du \\
&= B^* \delta_n + 96 B^* \delta_n \log(1/\delta_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by the assumption that $\delta_n \geq n^{-1} > 0$, we can upper bound the logarithmic term by $\log n$. We thus conclude the second result. \square

In the proof of Theorem 17, we combine Lemma 18 with the following bound on the supremum of the empirical process of interest. We note that the proof is only provided for the third term of Lemma 18, which is most dispersed and the proof for other terms follow by analogous derivation.

Lemma 19. *We assume the observations $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are IID under the regression model (1) with $E[\xi_i|X_i] = 0$ and $E[\xi_i^2|X_i] \leq \sigma^2$. Let $f_{m,L}$ be a function defined in (40) and let f_L^* be the oracle function defined in (39). Then for any $\delta_n \geq n^{-1} > 0, B > 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}(L): \|f - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \delta_n \\ \|f - f_L^*\|_{\infty} \leq B}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f - f_L^*)| \right] \\
& \lesssim \sqrt{m} \sigma (\delta_n + \|f_{m,L} - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}) \log \{ \delta_n^{-1} (B + \|f_0\|_{\infty} + 2L) \}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 19. For ease of notation, we drop the L in the subscript for $f_{m,L}$ and f_L^* . For any given f_m , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}(L): \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \delta_n \\ \|f - f^*\|_\infty \leq B}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f - f^*)| \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}(L): \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \delta_n \\ \|f - f^*\|_\infty \leq B}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f - f_m)| \right] + \mathbb{E} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f_m - f^*)| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}(L): \|f - f_m\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \delta_n + \|f_m - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \\ \|f - f_m\|_\infty \leq B + \|f^* - f_m\|_\infty}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f - f_m)| \right] + \mathbb{E} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f_m - f^*)| \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}(L): \|f - f_m\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \delta_n + \|f_m - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \\ \|f - f_m\|_\infty \leq B + \|f^* - f_m\|_\infty}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f - f_m)| \right] + \sigma \|f_m - f^*\|_{L_2(P)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Denoting by $B_0 := B + 2\|f^*\|_\infty$ and $\tilde{\delta}_n := \delta_n + \|f_m - f^*\|_{L_2(P)}$, we simply need to bound the following term in expectation:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}(L): \|f - f_m\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \tilde{\delta}_n \\ \|f - f_m\|_\infty \leq B_0}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(f - f_m)| \right].$$

By definition of $f \in \mathcal{F}(L)$ and f_m , we have

$$f(x) = g(x) - Lx \quad \text{and} \quad f_m(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m a_j 1(x \in I_j) - Lx,$$

where g is a non-decreasing function and $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is a sequence such that $a_{i_1} < a_{i_2}$ for any $i_1 < i_2$. Hence, this quantity is identical to the following expression:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{C}: \|g - g_m\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \tilde{\delta}_n \\ \|g - g_m\|_\infty \leq B_0}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi(g - g_m)| \right],$$

where \mathcal{C} is a convex cone consisting of all non-decreasing functions from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} and $g_m(x) := \sum_{j=1}^m a_j 1(x \in I_j)$. We now define a new function space $\mathcal{F}_{\text{target}} \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}(\tilde{\delta}_n, B_0)$ whose element is defined as $g - g_m$ for any non-decreasing function g and fixed g_m , such that,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\text{target}} := \left\{ g - g_m \mid g \in \mathcal{C}, \|g - g_m\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \tilde{\delta}_n, \|g - g_m\|_\infty \leq B_0 \right\}.$$

Each function in this space is an m -piece piecewise isotonic function. Hence, it is equivalent to analyzing the following:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi f| \right]. \tag{48}$$

The display above can be controlled easily for a sub-Gaussian process. Lemma 21 in Section C.3 provides a new result akin to Corollary 2.2.8 by van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), allowing for the dependence between X_i and ξ_i . Applying Lemma 21 to analyze the local multiplier process given by (48), we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi f| \right] \lesssim \sigma J(1, \mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}) \|F\|_{L_2(P)}.$$

where F is an envelope function of the function class $\mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}$ and $J(1, \mathcal{F}_{\text{target}})$ is an entropy integral defined in Lemma 21. In Lemma 23, we will show that the envelope function $F(\cdot)$ of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}$ satisfies

$$\|F\|_{L_2(P)} \lesssim \sqrt{m} \tilde{\delta}_n \sqrt{\log(B_0/\tilde{\delta}_n)}$$

and $\|F\|_{L_2(Q)} \geq \tilde{\delta}_n \geq n^{-1}$ for any probability measure Q . We use this characterization of the envelope function shortly. We also invoke the following bound on the metric entropy of the isotonic function space:

Lemma 20 (Lemma 8 of Han and Wellner (2018)). *We define $\mathcal{F}_0 \subset L_\infty(1)$ where $L_\infty(1)$ is a collection of functions uniformly bounded by 1. Let \mathcal{F}_0 be a VC-major class defined on \mathcal{X} . Then, there exists some constant $C \equiv C_{\mathcal{F}_0} > 0$ such that for any $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_0$, and any probability measure Q , the entropy estimate*

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon \|F\|_{L_2(Q)}, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(Q)}) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{C}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon \|F\|_{L_2(Q)}}\right), \text{ for all } \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$$

holds for any envelope F of \mathcal{F} .

Applying Lemma 20 to our class, we have

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon \|F\|_{L_2(Q)}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(Q)}) \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{C}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\left(\frac{B_0}{\varepsilon \|F\|_{L_2(Q)}}\right).$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} J(1, \mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}) &= \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon \|F\|_{L_2(Q)}, \mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(Q)})} d\varepsilon \\ &\lesssim \int_0^1 \sqrt{\frac{C}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{C}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\left(\frac{B_0}{\varepsilon \|F\|_{L_2(Q)}}\right)} d\varepsilon \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\log(B_0/\tilde{\delta}_n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can apply Lemma 21 to obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{target}}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi f| \right] \lesssim \sqrt{m} \sigma \tilde{\delta}_n \log(B_0/\tilde{\delta}_n).$$

Plug this into (47), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}(L): \|f - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \leq \delta_n \\ \|f - f^*\|_\infty \leq B}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi (f - f^*)| \right] &\lesssim \sqrt{m} \sigma \tilde{\delta}_n \sqrt{\log(B_0/\tilde{\delta}_n) \log(B_0 n)} + \sigma \|f_m - f^*\|_{L_2(P)} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{m} \sigma (\delta_n + \|f_m - f^*\|_{L_2(P)}) \log\{\delta_n^{-1} (B + \|f^*\|_\infty)\}, \end{aligned}$$

recalling the definition $B_0 = B + 2\|f^*\|_\infty$ and $\tilde{\delta}_n = \delta_n + \|f_m - f^*\|_{L_2(P)}$ from earlier. We conclude the claim by providing a bound on $\|f^*\|_\infty$ in view of Lemma 24. \square

C.3 Proofs of Lemmas 21 and 22

The following lemmas are invoked during the proof of Lemma 19 in order to relate the supremum of a multiplier process with the entropy integral of the studied class. Although this result is similar to Corollary 2.2.8 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#), it is more general such that the error variable ξ_i is not required to be independent of its corresponding covariate X_i .

Lemma 21. *Let (X_i, ξ_i) for $i = 1, \dots, n$ be IID random variable pairs such that $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p \sim P_X$, $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i|X_i] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i^2|X_i] \leq \sigma^2$. We assume that the index function space \mathcal{F} satisfies the following metric entropy condition:*

$$J(1, \mathcal{F}) = \sup_Q \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon \|F\|_{L_2(Q)}, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(Q)})} d\varepsilon < \infty,$$

where F is the envelope function of \mathcal{F} and the supremum is taken over all the probability measures whose support is identical to that of X . We further assume $0 \in \mathcal{F}$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi f| \right] \lesssim \sigma J(1, \mathcal{F}) \|F\|_{L_2(P_X)}.$$

Proof of Lemma 21. We first relate the multiplier process of interest to a Rademacher process by the following symmetrization. Denoting by $\{(\tilde{\xi}_i, \tilde{X}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ the jointly IID copies of $\{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and by $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ the IID Rademacher variables, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{G}_n \xi f| \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i f(X_i) - \mathbb{E} \tilde{\xi}_i f(\tilde{X}_i) \right| \right] \\ &\leq n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i f(X_i) - \tilde{\xi}_i f(\tilde{X}_i) \right| \right] \\ &= n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \xi_i f(X_i) - \epsilon_i \tilde{\xi}_i f(\tilde{X}_i) \right| \right] \\ &\leq 2n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \xi_i f(X_i) \right| \right] \\ &= 2n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \xi_i f(X_i) \right| \mid \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We now define a stochastic process W_f indexed by $f \in \mathcal{F}$:

$$W_f := n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \xi_i f(X_i). \tag{49}$$

We derive the upper bound of the supremum of W_f conditioning on the observation $\{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |W_f| \mid \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n \right].$$

Lemma 22 below states that conditioning on $\{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, the stochastic process $\{W_f : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is sub-Gaussian with respect to the following pseudo-metric d on \mathcal{F} :

$$d(f, g) = \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2 \{f(X_i) - g(X_i)\}^2 \right]^{1/2}.$$

Then, we can bound the expected supremum of the W_f by the following Dudley's integral (i.e., Corollary 2.2.8 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#)):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |W_f| \mid \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n \right] &\lesssim \int_0^{\text{diam}(\mathcal{F}, d)} \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{F}, d)} d\delta \\ &\leq \int_0^{\|F\|_d} \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{F}, d)} d\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

The diameter $\text{diam}(\mathcal{F}, d)$ is defined as $\sup_{f, g \in \mathcal{F}} d(f, g)$ and $\|f\|_d$ is the induced norm of d where $\|f\|_d := d(f, 0)$.

We now express the upper bound in the above display using the metric entropy condition in the assumption. We define $Q_i := (n \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j^2)^{-1} \xi_i^2 = n^{-1} \|\xi\|^{-2} \xi_i^2$ where $\|\cdot\|$ is an Euclidean norm. It then follows that for any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$:

$$d^2(f, g) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2 \{f(X_i) - g(X_i)\}^2 = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \{f(X_i) - g(X_i)\}^2 Q_i \right).$$

Conditioning on $\{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, we can define a discrete probability measure $Q(\cdot) = \sum_{i=1}^n Q_i \delta_{X_i}(\cdot)$. This measure further induces a metric:

$$\|f - g\|_{L_2(Q)}^2 = \int (f(x) - g(x))^2 dQ(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \{f(X_i) - g(X_i)\}^2 Q_i.$$

It is also direct to verify that $d(f, g) = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j^2} \|f - g\|_{L_2(Q)}$. We can now continue on (50) using this new measure $Q(\cdot)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |W_f| \mid \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n \right] &\lesssim \int_0^{\|\xi\| \|F\|_{L_2(Q)}} \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\|\xi\|^{-1} \delta, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(Q)})} d\delta \\ &= \|\xi\| \|F\|_{L_2(Q)} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathcal{N}(\|F\|_{L_2(Q)} \tau, \mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{L_2(Q)})} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

We take expectation with respect to the joint distribution $\{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ on both sides and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |W_f| \right] &\lesssim J(1, \mathcal{F}) \mathbb{E}[\|\xi\| \|F\|_{L_2(Q)}] \\ &= J(1, \mathcal{F}) \mathbb{E} \left[\|\xi\| \left(\sum_{i=1}^n F^2(X_i) Q_i \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &= J(1, \mathcal{F}) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n F^2(X_i) \xi_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \right] \\ &\leq J(1, \mathcal{F}) \left(\mathbb{E} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n F^2(X_i) \xi_i^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \sigma J(1, \mathcal{F}) \|F\|_{L_2(P_X)}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the claim. \square

Lemma 22. Let $W_f := n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \xi_i f(X_i)$ and $\{W_f : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ be the stochastic process defined in (49). Conditioning on $\{\xi_i, X_i\}$, the above stochastic process is sub-Gaussian with respect to the following pseudo-metric:

$$d(f, g) = \left(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2 (f(X_i) - g(X_i))^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof of Lemma 22. First, it is direct to see that W_f has a mean zero for every f as this is one of the requirements for a sub-Gaussian process. We recall that the 2-Orlicz-norm for a centered random variable Z is defined as:

$$\|Z\|_{\psi_2} = \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{Z^2}{\lambda^2} \right) - 1 \right] \leq 1 \right\}.$$

A stochastic process is called sub-Gaussian with respect to the metric d if

$$\mathbb{P}(|W_f - W_g| > t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2/2d(f, g))$$

for every $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $t > 0$. This is implied if we can provide the bound on 2-Orlicz norm such that

$$\|W_f - W_g\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sqrt{6}d(f, g)$$

for any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$. See Section 2.2.1 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#) for details. By definition, we have

$$(W_f - W_g)^2 = n^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \xi_i \{f(X_i) - g(X_i)\} \right)^2.$$

In the presentation below, we use $\mathbb{P}_c(\cdot)$ to denote the conditional probability $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\exp((W_f - W_g)^2/\lambda^2) | \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n] \\ & \leq 1 + \int_1^\infty \mathbb{P}_c \left(\lambda^{-2} (W_f - W_g)^2 \geq \log t \right) dt \\ & = 1 + \int_1^\infty \mathbb{P}_c \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \xi_i (f(X_i) - g(X_i)) \right| \geq (n\lambda^2 \log t)^{1/2} \right) dt \\ & \stackrel{(1)}{\leq} 1 + \int_1^\infty 2 \exp \left(- \left[2 \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2 \{f(X_i) - g(X_i)\}^2 \right]^{-1} n\lambda^2 \log t \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Step (1) follows by the application of Hoeffding's inequality (i.e., Lemma 2.2.7 of [van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#)). We denote by $\diamond := n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i^2 \{f(X_i) - g(X_i)\}^2$, and take $\lambda^2 = 6\diamond$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp((W_f - W_g)^2/\lambda^2) | \{(\xi_i, X_i)\}_{i=1}^n] - 1 \leq 2 \int_1^\infty \exp(-3 \log t) dt = 1.$$

By the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_2}$, we deduce $\|W_f - W_g\|_{\psi_2} \leq \sqrt{6\diamond} = \sqrt{6}d(f, g)$. Therefore we conclude that W_f is a sub-Gaussian process with respect to the norm d on \mathcal{F} . \square

C.4 Proof of Lemma 23

The aim of this subsection is to provide the norm of envelope functions associated with the piecewise monotonic functions. The corresponding result is used during the proof of Lemma 19.

Lemma 23. *Let $g_m : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote a fixed piecewise constant function of the form*

$$g_m(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m a_j 1(x \in I_j),$$

where $a_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\{I_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is a non-overlapping partition of $[0, 1]$. We denote by P_X a marginal probability distribution of X over $[0, 1]$. Consider the following function space:

$$\mathcal{F} := \{q \in \mathcal{C} - g_m : \|q\|_{L_2(P_X)} \leq \delta, \|q\|_\infty \leq B\},$$

where $\mathcal{C} \subset L_2(P_X)$ is the space of monotone functions over $[0, 1]$. It then follows that the envelope function F of \mathcal{F} satisfies:

$$\|F\|_{L_2(P_X)} \lesssim \sqrt{m} \delta \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}$$

Proof of Lemma 23. We are going to construct an envelope function of \mathcal{F} for each interval I_j . Combining all the envelopes together would give us an envelope function of \mathcal{F} over $[0, 1]$.

First, when the interval I_j is measure zero under P_X , in other words, $P_X(I_j) = \int_{I_j} dP_X(x) = 0$, we can only use the constant function at $B = \|q\|_\infty$ as the envelope for that interval I_j . Now we consider the non-trivial case for I_j with $P_X(I_j)$ strictly larger than 0. For a pre-specified P_X , we note that $P_j = P_X/P_X(I_j)$ forms a new probability measure for each interval I_j under the assumption that $P_X(I_j) > 0$. We are going to use the following two facts:

1. For any $q \in \mathcal{F}$, its restriction on I_j , $q|_{I_j} : I_j \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is an isotonic function.
2. The function space

$$\mathcal{H} := \{h \text{ is non-decreasing over } [0, 1] \mid \|h\|_{L_2(\mu)} \leq \delta, \|h\|_\infty \leq B\}$$

has its corresponding envelope function

$$H(x) := \min \left\{ B, \delta \max \{ \mu([0, x]), \mu([x, 1]) \}^{-1/2} \right\}.$$

Here, the probability measure μ is defined over $[0, 1]$ and $\mu([a, b])$ is $\int_a^b \mu(x)$ for $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$. Furthermore, we have $\|H\|_{L_2(\mu)} \leq C\delta\sqrt{\log(B/\delta)}$ (See Section 5.1 of [Kuchibhotla and Patra \(2022\)](#)).

The restriction of \mathcal{F} on each interval I_j , denoted by \mathcal{F}_{I_j} , is a subset of the following function space:

$$\mathcal{F}_{I_j} \subset \mathcal{G}_j := \left\{ g : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R} \mid g \text{ is non-decreasing over } I_j, \|g\|_{L_2(P_j)} \leq \delta/P_X^{1/2}(I_j), \|g\|_\infty \leq B \right\}.$$

Combining the above two facts, we know the envelope function of \mathcal{G}_j is

$$G_j(x) = \min \left\{ B, P_X^{-1/2}(I_j) \delta \max \left(P_j[I_j^-, x], P_j[x, I_j^+] \right)^{-1/2} \right\}, \text{ for } x \in I_j,$$

where I_j^- is the left end and I_j^+ is the right end of interval I_j . We further have

$$\|G_j\|_{L_2(P_j)} \lesssim P_X^{-1/2}(I_j)\delta\sqrt{\log(P_X^{1/2}(I_j)B/\delta)}.$$

Then we know the envelope function F of \mathcal{F} can be expressed as:

$$F(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m 1(x \in I_j)\{G_j(x)1(P_X(I_j) > 0) + B1(P_X(I_j) = 0)\}.$$

We calculate the $\|\cdot\|_{L_2(P_X)}$ -norm of F :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 F^2(x)dP_X(x) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{I_j} G_j^2(x)dP_X(x) = \sum_{j=1}^m P_X(I_j) \int_{I_j} G_j^2(x)dP_j(x) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^m P_X(I_j) \left(P_X^{-1}(I_j)\delta^2 \log(P_X^{1/2}(I_j)B/\delta) \right) \\ &\leq m\delta^2 \log(B/\delta). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the claim. Figure 5 below illustrates the derived envelope function. □




Figure 5: An illustration of the envelope function $F(x)$. We demonstrate the case when $B = 3$, $\delta = 0.2$, $I_1 = [0, 1/3]$, $I_2 = (1/3, 1]$ and P_X is uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$.

C.5 Stochastic boundedness of the estimator

We require our proposed estimators to be uniformly bounded in probability. We prove such claim in this section. The following lemma is a more general result than what is known in current literature such that we do not require the covariate X_i to be independent of the error ξ_i .

Lemma 24. *Let f_L^* be a fixed- L oracle function given by (39). It then follows that $\|f_L^*\|_\infty \leq \|f_0\|_\infty + 2L$.*

Proof of Lemma 24. An $L_2(P)$ -projection of any function onto $\mathcal{F}(L)$ can be decomposed as a sum of g_L^* and $-Lx$ where g_L^* is a non-increasing function from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} . We then observe that

$$\|Y - f_L^*\|_{L_2(P)} = \|(Y + LX) - g_L^*\|_{L_2(P)}.$$

Here, the monotonic component g_L^* corresponds to the $L_2(P)$ -projection of a conditional expectation $\eta_0(x) := \mathbb{E}[Z | X = x]$ where $Z := Y + LX$ onto a space of monotone functions. The solution of the best projection onto the monotonic space is explicitly given by the max-min formula (see Equation 2.6 of [Mammen \(1991\)](#) and Lemma 2 of [Anevski and Soulier \(2011\)](#)):

$$g_L^*(x) = \sup_{x \leq u} \inf_{x \geq l} \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(X \in [l, u])} \int_l^u \eta_0(x) dP(x).$$

Furthermore, we have $\|g_L^*\|_\infty \leq \|\eta_0\|_\infty \leq \|f_0\|_\infty + L$. Hence we conclude that

$$\|f_L^*\|_\infty \leq \|g_L^*\|_\infty + L \leq \|f_0\|_\infty + 2L.$$

□

Lemma 25. Assume the regression model (1) where $\|f_0\|_\infty < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[\xi^2|X] \leq \sigma^2$ almost surely. Let \widehat{f}_L be a fixed- L estimator given by (25). It then follows that $\|\widehat{f}_L\|_\infty = O_P(\|f_0\|_\infty + \sigma^2 + L)$. Furthermore, for any set $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}$ whose largest element is denoted by L_+ , it follows that $\sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \|\widehat{f}_L\|_\infty = O_P(\|f_0\|_\infty + \sigma^2 + L_+)$

Proof of Lemma 25. For the result under fixed L , we only need to establish the uniform boundedness of the monotonic component \widehat{g}_L , which directly implies the boundedness of $\widehat{f}_L(x) = \widehat{g}_L(x) + Lx$. For the ease of notation, we will drop the L 's in the subscripts.

We denote by $X_{(1)} \leq X_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq X_{(i)} \leq \dots \leq X_{(n)}$ the order statistics of X_1, \dots, X_n . Similarly, we denote $Y_{(i)}$ and $\xi_{(i)}$ as the corresponding outcome and noise variables of $X_{(i)}$. It is direct to check that $\xi_{(i)}$ and $\xi_{(j)}$ are not independent from each other when $i \neq j$, but we have $\xi_{(i)} \perp\!\!\!\perp \xi_{(j)} | X_1, \dots, X_n$ for any $i \neq j$. This fact is also known as the conditional independence of *concomitant statistics* or induced order statistics. We demonstrate this fact in the case $n = 2$ and when X follows a discrete distribution. We need to show for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, $x_1, x_2 \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\xi_{(1)} \leq x, \xi_{(2)} \leq y | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\xi_{(1)} \leq x | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) \mathbb{P}(\xi_{(2)} \leq y | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2). \end{aligned}$$

When $x_1 \leq x_2$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\xi_{(1)} \leq x, \xi_{(2)} \leq y | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \leq x, \xi_2 \leq y | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \leq x, \xi_2 \leq y, X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) / \mathbb{P}(X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \leq x, X_1 = x_1) \mathbb{P}(\xi_2 \leq y, X_2 = x_2) / \{\mathbb{P}(X_1 = x_1) \mathbb{P}(X_2 = x_2)\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \leq x | X_1 = x_1) \mathbb{P}(\xi_2 \leq y | X_2 = x_2) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\xi_1 \leq x | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) \mathbb{P}(\xi_2 \leq y | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\xi_{(1)} \leq x | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2) \mathbb{P}(\xi_{(2)} \leq y | X_1 = x_1, X_2 = x_2). \end{aligned}$$

We have a almost identical argument when $x_1 > x_2$, in this case $\xi_{(1)} = \xi_2$ and $\xi_{(2)} = \xi_1$. We will use this conditional independence later.

Since \widehat{g} is a piecewise constant non-decreasing function, we only need to control its evaluation on the smallest and largest covariates. The exact formula for these values is given by the max-min formula (See Theorem 1.4.4 of [Robertson et al. \(1988\)](#), for instance) as follows:

$$\widehat{g}_n(X_{(1)}) = \min_{v \geq 1} \left\{ v^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^v Y_{(i)} - LX_{(i)} \right\} \text{ and}$$

$$\widehat{g}_n(X_{(n)}) = \max_{u \leq n} \left\{ u^{-1} \sum_{i=n-u+1}^n Y_{(i)} - LX_{(i)} \right\}.$$

We need to show that these objects are bounded in probability. We only examine $\widehat{g}(X_{(1)})$ as the argument for $\widehat{g}(X_{(n)})$ is analogous. Let v^* be the value of v that attains the minimum of the first equation. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{g}_n(X_{(1)})| &= \left| \min_{v \geq 1} v^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^v Y_{(i)} - LX_{(i)} \right| \\ &= \left| v_*^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{v_*} Y_{(i)} - LX_{(i)} \right| \\ &= \left| v_*^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{v_*} f_0(X_{(i)}) + \xi_{(i)} - LX_{(i)} \right| \\ &\leq \|f_0\|_\infty + \left| \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{(i)} \right| + L \left| v_*^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{v_*} X_{(i)} \right| \\ \implies \mathbb{E} [|\widehat{g}_n(X_{(1)})|] &\leq \|f_0\|_\infty + \mathbb{E} \left| \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{(i)} \right| + L. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to examine the middle term. Denoting by $W(1, n) := \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} k^{-1} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{(i)} \right|$, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[W(1, n)] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[W(1, n) \mid X_1, \dots, X_n]] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(W(1, n) \geq t \mid X_1, \dots, X_n) dt \right] \\ &\leq 1 + \mathbb{E} \left[\int_1^\infty \mathbb{P}(W(1, n) \geq t \mid X_1, \dots, X_n) dt \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Now we provide the upper bound of the tail probability $\mathbb{P}(W(1, n) \geq t \mid X_1, \dots, X_n)$ for $t \geq 1$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\log_2 n$ is an integer. In the presentation below, we use $\mathbb{P}_c(\cdot)$

to denote the conditional probability $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | X_1, \dots, X_n)$. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_c(W(1, n) \geq t) &\leq \mathbb{P}_c\left(\exists j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \log_2 n\}, \max_{2^{j-1} \leq k < 2^j} k^{-1} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{(i)} \right| \geq t\right) + \mathbb{P}_c\left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{(i)} \right| \geq nt\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\log_2 n} \mathbb{P}_c\left(\max_{2^{j-1} \leq k < 2^j} k^{-1} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{(i)} \right| \geq t\right) + (nt)^{-2} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{(i)}\right)^2 \mid X_1, \dots, X_n\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\log_2 n} \mathbb{P}_c\left(\max_{2^{j-1} \leq k < 2^j} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{(i)} \right| \geq 2^{j-1}t\right) + (nt)^{-2} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \xi_{(i)}\right)^2 \mid X_1, \dots, X_n\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\log_2 n} (2^{2j-2}t^2)^{-1} \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{2^{j-1} \leq k < 2^j} \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{(i)}\right)^2 \mid X_1, \dots, X_n\right] + (nt^2)^{-1} \sigma^2 \\
&\stackrel{(1)}{\lesssim} \sum_{j=1}^{\log_2 n} (2^{2j}t^2)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{2^j} \mathbb{E}[\xi_{(i)}^2 \mid X_1, \dots, X_n] + (nt^2)^{-1} \sigma^2 \\
&\leq \sigma^2 t^{-2} \sum_{j=1}^{\log_2 n} 2^{-j} + (nt^2)^{-1} \sigma^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 t^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the above derivation, we use the conditional independence of $\xi_{(i)}$ and $\xi_{(j)}$ for $i \neq j$ as shown earlier. In step (1) we applied a Rosenthal-type inequality ([Merlevède and Peligrad, 2013](#)). We have demonstrated $\mathbb{E}[W(1, n)]$ in (51) can be bounded by $1 + \sigma^2$ up to a constant. We hence conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}|\widehat{g}(X_{(1)})| \lesssim \|f_0\|_\infty + \sigma^2 + 2L$$

which implies the boundedness in probability in view of Markov's inequality.

The uniform statement follows by observing that

$$\sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \|\widehat{f}_L\|_\infty \leq \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \|\widehat{g}_L\|_\infty + \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} Lx \leq \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \|\widehat{g}_L\|_\infty + L_+.$$

Again, the max-min formula implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} |\widehat{g}(X_{(1)})| &\leq \|f_0\|_\infty + \left| \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{(i)} \right| + \sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} L \left| v_*^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{v_*} X_{(i)} \right| \\
&\leq \|f_0\|_\infty + \left| \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^k \xi_{(i)} \right| + L_+.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the analogous argument for controlling the middle term of the above display, which does not depend on L , we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \|\widehat{f}_L\|_\infty\right] \lesssim \|f\|_\infty + \sigma^2 + 2L_+.$$

We conclude the claim in view of Markov's inequality. \square

Supplement D Decomposition and approximation results

Proof of Proposition 6. Let $f^{(k)}$ denote the k th derivative of f . By the assumption that f is $(k-1)$ -times differentiable, it follows that $f(x) + (L'/k!)x^k$ is also $(k-1)$ times differentiable with the $(k-1)$ th derivative $f^{(k-1)}(x) + L'x$. It thus remains to show $g_{L'}^{(k-1)}(x) := f^{(k-1)}(x) + L'x$ is non-decreasing, which implies that $g_{L'}$ is k -monotone. This holds because for any $y \geq x$,

$$g_{L'}^{(k-1)}(y) - g_{L'}^{(k-1)}(x) = \left(f^{(k-1)}(y) + L'y \right) - \left(f^{(k-1)}(x) + L'x \right) \geq -L|y-x| + L'(y-x) \geq 0,$$

which follows by the Lipschitz continuity of $f^{(k-1)}$ and $L' \geq L$. This also proves the inclusion property. To prove that the inclusion is strict, note that the strict inclusion $\Sigma_1(k, L) \subsetneq \text{BL}_1(k, L)$ is clear by taking a function f such that $f^{(k-1)}(x) = |x|$. To prove the second inclusion, note that monotone functions need not be Lipschitz (e.g., piecewise constant monotone functions are not Lipschitz), and hence, $\text{BL}_1(1, L) \subsetneq \mathcal{F}(1, L)$. Similarly, take any function f such that $f^{(k-1)}(\cdot)$ is a piecewise constant monotone function so that $f^{(k-1)}(\cdot)$ cannot be a Lipschitz function. Hence, strict inclusion also holds for $\text{BL}_1(k, L)$ and $\mathcal{F}(k, L')$.

Now, we claim that $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ forms a nested sequence in L . Let $f \in \mathcal{F}(1, L)$. Then, we observe for any $L' \geq L$,

$$f = g(x) - Lx = g(x) + (L' - L)x - L'x \quad (52)$$

where $g(x) + (L' - L)x$ is also non-decreasing since $L' \geq L$. This implies that $f \in \mathcal{F}(1, L)$ implies $f \in \mathcal{F}(1, L')$ for $L' \geq L$. For the general k , the argument is analogous where we repeat the construction over the $(k-1)$ th weak derivative. \square

Proof of Proposition 8. We observe that the result is trivially true for $s \in \mathbb{N}$, because $\overline{L}_\varepsilon = \mathfrak{C}L > L$ and $\text{BL}_1(s, L) \subset \text{BL}_1(\lceil s \rceil, \overline{L}_\varepsilon)$. It remains to prove the result for non-integer $s > 0$. The first inequality is obvious because $\text{BL}_1(\lceil s \rceil, L) \subsetneq \mathcal{F}(\lceil s \rceil, L)$ by Proposition 6. The second inequality follows from Lemma 26 presented below. \square

For $s > 0$, define the Hölder-Zygmund space of smoothness order s on $[0, 1]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_1(s, L) &= \left\{ f \in L_2([0, 1]) \mid \|f\|_\infty + \sup_{t>0} t^{-s} \omega_{\lceil s \rceil+1}(f, t)_\infty \leq L \right\}, \\ &= \left\{ f \in L_2([0, 1]) \mid \|f\|_\infty + \sup_{h \in [0, 1/2]} \sup_{x \in [0, 1-2h]} |\Delta_h^{\lceil s \rceil+1}(f, x)| \leq L \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where for any $t > 0$ and integer $r \geq 1$,

$$\omega_r(f, t)_\infty := \sup_{h \in [0, t]} \sup_{x \in [0, 1-rh]} |\Delta_h^r(f, x)|, \quad \Delta_h^r(f, x) := \sum_{k=0}^r \binom{r}{k} (-1)^{r-k} f(x + kh).$$

See equation (B.18) and Appendix B.11 of Johnstone (2017). Also, see Chapter 2, Section 9 of DeVore and Lorentz (1993). The Hölder-Zygmund space is a generalization of Hölder spaces and such a generalization is useful in characterizing these spaces in terms of Besov spaces and wavelet coefficients. Moreover, if s is a non-integer, then $\mathcal{Z}_1(s, L) = \Sigma_1(s, L)$ (Giné and Nickl, 2021, Proposition 4.3.23), but for s integer, $\mathcal{Z}_1(s, L) \supset \Sigma_1(s, L)$ (and this is a strict inclusion); see,

for example, [DeVore and Lorentz \(1993, page 92\)](#). The difference can be understood by examining the definition of $\mathcal{Z}_1(1, L)$.

$$\mathcal{Z}_1(1, L) = \left\{ f \in L_2([0, 1]) \mid \|f\|_\infty + \sup_{h \geq 0, x \in [0, 1-2h]} \frac{|f(x) - 2f(x+h) + f(x+2h)|}{h} \leq L \right\}.$$

It is clear that Hölder-Zygmund class of order 1 is defined in terms of second-order divided difference rather than the first-order divided difference as in the classical Hölder spaces. From the discussion around equation (4.113) of [Giné and Nickl \(2021\)](#), we get that $\mathcal{Z}_1(s, L) = \mathcal{B}_{\infty, \infty}^s(L; [0, 1])$ (i.e., $\mathcal{Z}_1(s, L)$ is a Besov space) and following equation (9.45) of [Johnstone \(2017\)](#), we can represent functions in $\mathcal{Z}_1(s, L)$ in terms of the Wavelet bases functions with certain constraints on the coefficients. With this background, we now state an approximation result for general Hölder-Zygmund spaces.

Lemma 26. *For any $\varepsilon, L > 0$ and $s' \geq s > 0$, we have*

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{Z}_1(s, L)} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{Z}_1(s', 2L^{s'/s} \varepsilon^{1-s'/s})} \|f - g\|_{L_2([0, 1])} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, there exists a universal constant $\mathfrak{C} \geq 1$ such that, for any non-integer $s > 0$,

$$\sup_{f \in \Sigma_1(s, L)} \inf_{g \in \Sigma_1(\lceil s \rceil, \bar{L}_\varepsilon)} \|f - g\|_{L_2([0, 1])} \leq \varepsilon,$$

where $\bar{L} = \mathfrak{C}L^{\lceil s \rceil/s} \varepsilon^{1-\lceil s \rceil/s}$.

Proof of Lemma 26. From equation (9.45) of [Johnstone \(2017\)](#), we can write any function $f \in \mathcal{Z}_1(s, L)$ as

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{2^{K_0}-1} \gamma_k \varphi_{K_0, k}(x) + \sum_{j \geq K_0} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \theta_{j, k} \psi_{j, k}(x),$$

with coefficients satisfying $\max_{j \geq 1} 2^{(s+1/2)j} \max_{k \geq 1} |\theta_{j, k}| \leq L$. The Zygmund space is characterized by the Wavelet representation along with this constraint on the coefficients as discussed on page 270 of [Johnstone \(2017\)](#). For any $\varepsilon > 0$, set $N_\varepsilon = \lceil \log_2(L/\varepsilon)/s \rceil$ and define

$$f_\varepsilon(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{2^{K_0}-1} \gamma_k \varphi_{K_0, k}(x) + \sum_{j=K_0}^{N_\varepsilon} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \theta_{j, k} \psi_{j, k}.$$

By the orthogonality of the wavelet basis, we get

$$\|f - f_\varepsilon\|_{L_2([0, 1])}^2 = \sum_{j \geq N_\varepsilon+1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} \theta_{j, k}^2 \leq \sum_{j \geq N_\varepsilon+1} \sum_{k=0}^{2^j-1} L^2 2^{-(2s+1)j} = \sum_{j \geq N_\varepsilon+1} L^2 2^{-2sj} \leq L^2 2^{-2sN_\varepsilon} \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

Moreover, for any $s' \geq s$, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq N_\varepsilon} 2^{(s'+1/2)j} \max_{k \geq 1} |\theta_{j, k}| \leq L \times \max_{1 \leq j \leq N_\varepsilon} 2^{(s'-s)j} \leq 2L(L/\varepsilon)^{s'/s-1} = 2L^{s'/s} \varepsilon^{1-s'/s}.$$

Therefore, $f_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{Z}_1(s', 2L^{s'/s} \varepsilon^{1-s'/s})$ and $\|f - f_\varepsilon\|_{L_2([0, 1])} \leq \varepsilon$.

To prove the second part, recall that for any non-integer $s > 0$, there exists universal constants $\underline{C}, \overline{C} > 0$ such that $\Sigma_1(s, \underline{C}L) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_1(s, L) \subseteq \Sigma_1(s, \overline{C}L)$. Hence, applying the first part with s and $s' \equiv s_m = \lceil s \rceil + 1/\log(m)$, we get

$$\sup_{f \in \Sigma_1(s, L)} \inf_{g \in \Sigma_1(s_m, L_{m, \varepsilon})} \|f - g\|_{L_2([0, 1])} \leq \varepsilon,$$

where $L_{m, \varepsilon} = 2\mathfrak{C}L(\varepsilon/L)^{1-s_m/s}$. Note that this holds true for any $m \geq 1$ such that $1/\log(m)$ is not an integer. Note that any $g \in \Sigma_1(s_m, L_{m, \varepsilon})$ satisfies

$$\sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|g^{\lceil s \rceil}(x) - g^{\lceil s \rceil}(y)|}{|x - y|^{1/\log(m)}} \leq L_{m, \varepsilon} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sup_{x \neq y} |g^{\lceil s \rceil}(x) - g^{\lceil s \rceil}(y)| \leq L_{m, \varepsilon},$$

because $x, y \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, $\Sigma_1(s_m, L_{m, \varepsilon}) \subseteq \Sigma_1(\lceil s \rceil, L_{m, \varepsilon})$. Rewrite $L_{m, \varepsilon}$ as

$$L_{m, \varepsilon} = 2\mathfrak{C}L(\varepsilon/L)^{1-\lceil s \rceil/s} \{(\varepsilon/L)^{-1/s}\}^{1/\log(m)}.$$

For $m = (L/\varepsilon)^{1/s}$, we get $2\mathfrak{C}L(\varepsilon/L)^{1-\lceil s \rceil/s} \leq L_{m, \varepsilon} \leq 2e\mathfrak{C}L(\varepsilon/L)^{1-\lceil s \rceil/s}$. So, choose an m such that $1/\log(m)$ is not an integer and $L_{m, \varepsilon} \leq 6\mathfrak{C}L^{\lceil s \rceil/s} \varepsilon^{1-\lceil s \rceil/s}$. Hence, we get

$$\sup_{f \in \Sigma_1(s, L)} \inf_{g \in \Sigma_1(\lceil s \rceil, \overline{L}_\varepsilon)} \|f - g\|_{L_2([0, 1])} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Renaming $6\mathfrak{C}$ to \mathfrak{C} , we get the result. \square

We now prove the inclusion of $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ in the k th bounded variation class. Toward this aim, we recall several properties of the k th convex functions.

Lemma 27 (Theorems 83A and 83B of [Roberts \(1993\)](#); Theorem A of [Kopotun \(1998\)](#)). *Assume $g : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly bounded and k -monotone for some $k \geq 2$, i.e., $\Delta_h^k(g, x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. Then $f^{(k-2)}(x)$ exists and is convex.*

Lemma 28 (Theorems 11B and 11C of [Roberts \(1993\)](#)). *Assume $g : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is convex. Then the left and right derivatives, denoted by $g_-^{(1)}$ and $g_+^{(1)}$ respectively, exist and non-decreasing on $[0, 1]$ ¹.*

Proof of Proposition 7. First, we provide the corresponding result for $k = 1$. For any partition $\{z_i\}_{i=1}^p$ of $[0, 1]$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}(1, L)$, it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^p |f(z_{i+1}) - f(z_i)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^p |g(z_{i+1}) - g(z_i)| + L(z_{i+1} - z_i) = \sum_{i=1}^p g(z_{i+1}) - g(z_i) + L(z_{i+1} - z_i)$$

where the absolute value around g is removed since $g(x+h) - g(x) \geq 0$. By telescoping, we obtain $\text{TV}(f) \leq g(1) - g(0) + L$. As we take the intersection of $\mathcal{F}(1, L)$ and $\|f\|_\infty \leq L'$ for $L' \geq L$, We deduce that $\text{TV}(f) \leq 2\|g\|_\infty + L \leq 2(L' - L) + L = 2L' - L$. The result in the main text is stated for $L' = L$. This concludes that $\mathcal{F}(1, L)$ implies bounded variation. For $k \geq 2$, the argument is similar. Lemma 27 implies that any function g such that $g \in \mathcal{C}(k)$ is $(k-2)$ -times differentiable. Importantly, the $(k-2)$ th derivative is convex. By the monotonicity result of Lemma 28, we

¹The original statement is provided for any open interval $I \subset [0, 1]$. This result was extended to the entire (closed) interval in Problem C (page 7) of [Roberts \(1993\)](#).

have $\text{TV}(f^{(k-1)}) \leq g_-^{(k-1)}(1) - g_+^{(k-1)}(0) + L$. Since we take the intersection between $\mathcal{F}(k, L)$ and $\{f : \|f^{(k-1)}\|_\infty \leq L\}$, which is stronger than assuming bounded essential supremum, we have

$$\text{TV}(f^{(k-1)}) \leq g_-^{(k-1)}(1) - g_+^{(k-1)}(0) + L \leq 2L' - L.$$

Again, the main result is stated for $L = L'$. This concludes the inclusion.

For the strict inclusion, we provide a counterexample. When $k = 1$, consider the following function:

$$f(x) = L/2 \times 1(x \in [1/3, 2/3]).$$

This function has a total variation of L with “jumps” at $x = 1/3$ and $x = 2/3$ (see the left panel of Figure 6 for $L = 1$). However, $g := x \mapsto f(x) + Lx$ is not monotone in the neighborhood of $x = 2/3$ (see the right panel of Figure 6 for $L = 1$). More specifically, we let $x_- \in (5/12, 2/3)$ and $x_+ \in (2/3, 11/12)$, and then we have

$$\Delta_{x_+ - x_-}^1(g, x_-) = g(x_+) - g(x_-) < 0.$$

Hence, g is not included in $\mathcal{C}(1)$ and thus $f \notin \mathcal{F}(1, L)$. For $k \geq 2$, we consider the case where the $(k - 1)$ th weak derivative is given by f . By a similar argument, this contradicts the k -monotonicity of g in view of Lemma 28. This concludes the proposition.

Another intuition is that any function with bounded total variation can be expressed as a difference between two arbitrary non-decreasing functions. On the other hand, our class can only be expressed as a difference of non-decreasing and linear functions. \square




Figure 6: A counterexample of function f whose total variation is L while not included in $\mathcal{F}(1, L)$. The figure is provided for the case $L = 1$.

Supplement E Additional proofs for multivariate decomposition

Proof of Example 1. For each $j \in [d]$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^{k_j}}{\partial t^{k_j}} g_L(x + te_j) &= \frac{\partial^{k_j}}{\partial t^{k_j}} \left(f(x + te_j) + \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{L_i}{(k_i + 1)!} (x + te_j)^{k_i+1} \right) \\ &= \frac{\partial^{k_j}}{\partial t^{k_j}} \left(f(x + te_j) + \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{L_i}{(k_i + 1)!} x_{[i]}^{k_i+1} + \frac{L_j}{(k_j + 1)!} (x_{[j]} + t)^{k_j+1} \right) \\ &= f_{j,x}(t) + L_j(x_{[j]} + t). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to show that the univariate function $t \mapsto \frac{\partial^{k_j}}{\partial t^{k_j}} g_L(x + te_j)$ is non-decreasing in $t \in \mathbb{R}$. From the derivation above, $\frac{\partial^{k_j}}{\partial t^{k_j}} g_L(x + te_j)$ equals $f_{j,x}(0) + L_j x_{[j]}$ when $t = 0$. Thus for $t > 0$, we have

$$f_{j,x}(t) + L_j(x_{[j]} + t) - (f_{j,x}(0) + L_j x_{[j]}) \geq -L_j |t| + L_j t \geq 0.$$

Hence, this concludes that g_L is coordinate-wise $(k + 1)$ -monotone. \square

Proof of Example 3. A multivariate function $g : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is convex if and only if

$$(y - x)^\top (D^1 g(y) - D^1 g(x)) \geq 0$$

for any $x, y \in \Omega$. By definition of g_L and f , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (y - x)^\top (D^1 g_L(y) - D^1 g_L(x)) &= (y - x)^\top (D^1 f(y) - D^1 f(x)) + L \|x - y\|_2^2 \\ &\geq -\|y - x\|_2 \|D^1 f(y) - D^1 f(x)\|_2 + L \|x - y\|_2^2 \\ &\geq -L \|y - x\|_2^2 + L \|x - y\|_2^2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

which follows from Hölder's inequality and the assumed Lipschitz continuity. Thus, the function g_L is convex. \square

Supplement F Additional details for additive models

This section discusses additional details for the additive model provided by Example 5.

F.1 Estimation procedure

The detailed estimation procedure is outlined in Algorithm 2. While the underlying concept behind the procedure remains identical to Algorithm 1, there are notable differences in steps 3 and 4. In this case, we perform a coordinate-descent procedure to update $\hat{g}_{j,L}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, d$ component until the empirical risk converges. Similar to Algorithm 1, step 5 of Algorithm 2 does not require exhaustive evaluation of $\hat{g}_{j,L}$ for each $L \in \mathcal{L}$, but rather, a numerical optimization over the mapping $L \mapsto \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} (Y_i - \hat{f}_L(X_i))^2$ suffices.

Algorithm 2 Additive Lipschitz Function Estimation using Monotone Estimators

Input: Observation sequence $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ where $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. A set of candidate vectors $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

Output: An estimator of $f_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x]$ assuming that f_0 is additive and each component is Lipschitz.

1. Initialize estimators $\hat{g}_i(x)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$. These can, for instance, be constant functions.
2. Randomly split $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ into two disjoint subsets: \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 .
3. For each $\ell \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and $L \in \mathcal{L}$, compute an isotonic regression estimator \hat{g}_ℓ based on $(X_{i,[\ell]}, Z_{i,L} - \sum_{j \neq \ell} g_j(X_{i,[j]}))_{i=1}^n$ where $Z_{i,L} := Y_i + L^\top X_i$. For instance, one may define the LSE for each coordinate as

$$\hat{g}_{\ell,L} := \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{C}(0)} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \left\{ \left(Z_{i,L} - \sum_{j \neq \ell} \hat{g}_j(X_{i,[j]}) \right) - g(X_{i,[\ell]}) \right\}^2,$$

iteratively obtaining an isotonic regression for each coordinate while keeping estimators for the remaining coordinates fixed.

4. Repeat step 3 until the empirical risk associated with \mathcal{I}_1 given by

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \left(Z_{i,L} - \sum_{j=1}^d \hat{g}_{j,L}(X_{i,[j]}) \right)^2$$

converges. Define the resulting estimator for each L as $\hat{f}_L(x) = \sum_{j=1}^d \hat{g}_{j,L}(x) - L^\top x$.

5. Find the “optimal” vector \hat{L} based on $\{(X_i, Y_i) : i \in \mathcal{I}_2\}$ by:

$$\hat{L} := \arg \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} (Y_i - \hat{f}_L(X_i))^2.$$

6. Return the final estimator $\hat{f}_{\hat{L}}(x) := \sum_{j=1}^d \hat{g}_{j,\hat{L}}(x) - \hat{L}^\top x$.
-

F.2 Oracle property of the additive estimator

Below, we claim that, under the additive model, the convergence rate of each additive component informs the convergence rate of overall procedure. This follows from the so-called oracle property of additive estimator, which reduces its analysis to each univariate component (Mammen and Yu, 2007; Guntuboyina and Sen, 2018). Recall that in Example 5, we discussed conditional mean functions with an additive structure that can be decomposed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(x) &= \sum_{j=1}^d f_j(x_{[j]}) = \sum_{j=1}^d g_{j,\alpha_j}(x_{[j]}) - \{\alpha_j/(k_j+1)!\}x_{[j]}^{k_j+1} \\ &= \mu^* + \sum_{j=1}^d g_{j,\alpha_j}^*(x_{[j]}) - \{\alpha_j/(k_j+1)!\}x_{[j]}^{k_j+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where each shape-restricted g_{j,α_j}^* is a function in $\mathcal{C}(k_j)$ for some $k_j \geq 1$. The constant offset μ^* is introduced to ensure that $\int g_{j,\alpha_j}^*(x) dP_X(x) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, d$. This is a common requirement for the identification (Mammen and Yu, 2007). The additive components of the estimator based on Algorithm 2 can be shown to converge (see Theorem 2 of Mammen and Yu (2007)) to the following empirical risk minimizer:

$$(\hat{\mu}, \hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_d) := \arg \min \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \mu + \sum_{j=1}^d \{\alpha_j/k_j!\}x_{[j]}^{k_j} - \sum_{j=1}^d g_j(X_{i,[j]}) \right\}^2$$

where $\arg \min$ is taken over $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $g_j \in \mathcal{C}(k_j)$ under the constraint $\sum_{i=1}^n g_j(X_{i,[j]}) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$. Analyzing the performance of each \hat{g}_ℓ may seem challenging since all components are dependent, sharing the same observed data. However, its behavior can be analyzed as if it was constructed with the knowledge of μ^* and g_{j,α_j}^* for $j \neq \ell$.

We define an oracle estimator of the ℓ -th component of the additive function as follows:

$$\tilde{g}_\ell := \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{C}(k_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ Y_i - \mu^* + \sum_{j=1}^d \{\alpha_j/k_j!\}x_{[j]}^{k_j} - \sum_{j \neq \ell} g_{j,\alpha_j}^*(X_{i,[j]}) - g(X_{i,[\ell]}) \right\}^2.$$

This estimator is not practically feasible as it assumes the knowledge of μ^* and g_{j,α_j}^* for $j \neq \ell$. Under the assumption that the covariate space $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ forms a Cartesian product set $\mathcal{X}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{X}_d$ and $\mathcal{X}_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$, Lemma 3.1 of Guntuboyina and Sen (2018) states that $\hat{g}_\ell = \tilde{g}_\ell$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, d$. This is known as the oracle property. With this general result, we can extend the identical proof of Theorem 4 to the additive model for $k = 1$. In view of the oracle property, we can analyze \tilde{g}_j instead of \hat{g}_j , equipped with the samples $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and the knowledge of μ^*, g_{j,α_j}^* for all $j \neq \ell$. We then apply the proof of Theorem 4 to each univariate component. Finally, the overall estimation error can be bounded by the summation of each component. When the covariate dimension d does not vary with sample size n , the overall convergence rate is identical to the rates provided by Theorem 4 when $k = 1$. Similarly, for $k = 2$ and beyond, we expect the additive estimator's convergence rate to follow seamlessly once the univariate result akin to Theorem 4 for arbitrary k is obtained.

Supplement G Additional numerical studies

As discussed in Section 3, our estimator possesses more desirable properties than the standard cross-validation procedures. We provide additional numerical results that demonstrate its robustness.

G.1 Robustness of the proposed procedures

We examine the robustness of the proposed method regarding two aspects: (1) the specific values of the parameter L and (2) the randomness from cross-validation (i.e., data-splitting). First, we investigate the MSEs of the proposed methods when the parameter L is pre-specified. This means the resulting estimator $\hat{g}_L - Lx^k/k!$ depends on the data only through the estimated k -monotone function \hat{g}_L . We consider the case with univariate covariates and Scenarios 1 and 3 defined in Section 6.1. Figure 7 displays the MSEs (in logarithmic scale), based on the new data, as the value of L changes. The results are presented for sample sizes of $n = 500, 1000$, and 5000 . To recall, Proposition 6 holds for any $L \geq L_0$ where L_0 is the true Lipschitz constant, implying that we expect the MSEs to be robust once the value of L surpasses a certain threshold. In other words, we expect the performance of the estimator to be less sensitive to an over-specified L and thus the overall procedure has a certain degree of robustness. Indeed, Figure 7 displays that the MSEs decrease as L increases until a certain point, then it begins to increase again. The MSEs for larger values of L , however, are not dramatically worse than the underspecified L .

We also investigate the impact of random split on the performance of the proposed methods. To study this, we generate n observations for $n = 500, 1000, 5000$ and 10000 from univariate Scenarios 1 to 4 as defined in Section 6.1. For each given dataset, we compute the proposed estimator 300 times for different cross-validation splits \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 where \mathcal{I}_2 contains $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ observations. To be precise, between each 300 replications, the estimator uses the identical observations $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and only the random splits \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 differ. The top plot of Figure 8 displays the distribution of the MSEs on new data while the bottom plot shows that of L obtained from the cross-validation splits. The Y -axes for both plots are on the logarithmic scale. We observe that the MSEs across different splits are concentrated even for small sample sizes. For example, in Scenario 1 with $n = 500$, the majority of MSEs fall within the range of $10^{-3.25}$ to 10^{-3} , indicating very small variability between cross-validation splits. Similar conclusions can be drawn for the other scenarios as well. The bottom plot of Figure 8 shows that the interquartile range of the distribution of selected α is very small. Occasionally, we would observe outliers but they do not significantly affect the MSE of the estimators as shown in the top plot of Figure 8.




Figure 7: The MSEs of the proposed estimator as the values of L change. The X-axis shows different values of L and the Y-axis shows the mean squared errors based on the new data. Only the Y-axis is on the logarithmic scale. Different line types represent results for different sample sizes. Two scenarios correspond to the univariate settings defined in Section 6.1. In Scenario 1, the Lipschitz constant is 3, while in Scenario 3, the Lipschitz constant is 32.




Figure 8: The box plots of the MSEs and the estimated α parameter across different random splits during the cross-validation step. Four scenarios correspond to the univariate settings defined in Section 6.1 and the Y-axes are on the logarithmic scales. The top row displays that the MSEs of the proposed estimator are fairly concentrated over the variability from the random splits. The bottom row shows the distribution of the α parameter selected by the cross-validation.

G.2 Additional results on adaptive rates

Finally, we investigate the behavior of the proposed estimator in scenarios where the method is expected to be adaptive to a m -piecewise polynomial truth. In particular, Scenario 2 from Section 6.1 represents non-decreasing m -piecewise constant functions with linear functions, and Scenario 3 from Section 6.1 represents m -piecewise convex affines a quadratic function. Theorem 3 and Table 1 imply that the rate of convergence of the proposed estimator in these scenarios is expected to behave like $O(m/n)$ (without a logarithmic term), displaying a linear relationship as the number of m increases. Similar behavior is expected for the convex case in view of the result in the literature. See, for instance, [Guntuboyina and Sen \(2015\)](#); [Han and Wellner \(2018\)](#) among others. To verify this property, we generated 5000 observations from Scenarios 2 and 4 over the values of m in $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. The results are presented in Figure 9. As expected, the average MSEs over 300 repetitions increase linearly as the value of m increases, which further confirms our theoretical understanding of the estimator.




Figure 9: The average MSEs of the proposed estimator for Scenarios 2 and 4 from Section 6.1 with $n = 5000$ as the number of m pieces increases. The Y-axis shows the sample mean of the empirical MSEs over 300 repetitions and it is *not* on the logarithmic scale. For scenario 2, the convergence rate based on Theorem 3 is expected to exhibit a linear relationship with respect to the number of segments m . We expect a similar behavior for the convex case in view of the existing results in the literature. See, for instance, [Guntuboyina and Sen \(2015\)](#); [Han and Wellner \(2018\)](#) among others.

Supplement H Extension to density estimation

Below, we describe how to integrate the proposed framework into nonparametric density estimation. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be IID observations from an unknown density function f_0 . We begin by defining \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 as disjoint index sets such that $\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_2 = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with cardinalities n_1 and n_2 , respectively. Two datasets are obtained as follows: $D_1 := \{X_i : i \in \mathcal{I}_1\}$ and $D_2 := \{X_i : i \in \mathcal{I}_2\}$.

We denote by $X_{(1)} < \dots < X_{(n_1)} < X_{(n_1+1)} = \infty$ the order statistics of the observations in D_1 . The proposed estimator takes the following form:

$$\widehat{f}_L(x) = \exp(g(x) - Lx) \quad \text{where } g \text{ is non-decreasing and } \int \widehat{f}_L(x) dx = 1.$$

We propose an estimation procedure for $L > 0$. We consider the nonparametric maximum likelihood estimator over \widehat{f}_L , corresponding to

$$g_{\text{MLE}} := \arg \max_{g \in \mathcal{C}} \log \widehat{f}_L(X_i) \quad (53)$$

where \mathcal{C} is the set of all non-decreasing functions.

We claim that it suffices to consider the space of non-decreasing piecewise constant functions that take at most n_1 distinct values at each observation X_1, \dots, X_{n_1} . For any $g \in \mathcal{C}$, we define the following function:

$$g^*(x) := \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{when } x < X_{(1)} \\ g(X_{(i)}) & \text{when } X_{(i)} \leq x < X_{(i+1)} \text{ for any } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \\ g(X_{(n_1)}) & \text{when } x \geq X_{(n_1)}. \end{cases}$$

The resulting function g^* is a non-decreasing piecewise constant. We then define the corresponding density estimator as

$$\widehat{f}_L^*(x) := C \exp(g^*(x) - Lx) \quad \text{where } C \text{ is a normalizing constant.}$$

The constant C is introduced to ensure that \widehat{f}_L^* is a density function. Now, we observe that for any $X_i \in D_1$, it follows

$$\log \widehat{f}_L^*(X_i) = \log C + g^*(X_i) - LX_i = \log C + g(X_i) - LX_i = \log C + \log \widehat{f}_L(X_i). \quad (54)$$

Therefore, the solution of the original maximum likelihood problem, given by (53), is not unique but attained by a non-decreasing piecewise constant function with an appropriate normalizing constant $C \geq 1$.

The original optimization problem is thus equivalent to determining the sequence of numbers $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{n_1})$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \max_w \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} \log \widehat{f}_L(X_i; w) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_1} w_i - LX_i \quad \text{subject to} \\ (1) \quad w_1 &\leq w_2 \leq \dots \leq w_{n_1} \quad \text{and} \\ (2) \quad \int \widehat{f}_L(x; w) dx &= 1 \iff \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \exp(w_i) \left(\frac{\exp(-LX_{(i)}) - \exp(-LX_{(i+1)})}{L} \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

We note that $\exp(-LX_{(n_1+1)}) = 0$ for any $L > 0$.

We denote by w_{MLE} the solution of the above optimization, and the estimator for each fixed L is given by $\hat{f}_L(x; w_{\text{MLE}})$. From now on, we suppress w_{MLE} .

We perform a data-adaptive selection procedure for $L \in \mathcal{L}$, where \mathcal{L} is a prespecified interval. Specifically, let dF_{n_2} be the empirical probability measure for D_2 defined as $dF_{n_2} := n_2^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} \delta_{x_i}$, where δ_x denotes the Dirac measure, which places unit mass at a point x . The data-adaptive choice of L is defined as the minimizer of the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between dF_{n_2} and \hat{f}_L . Formally, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{L} &:= \arg \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \text{KL}(dF_{n_2}, \hat{f}_L) = \arg \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \int \log \left(\frac{dF_{n_2}(x)}{\hat{f}_L(x)} \right) dF_{n_2}(x) dx \\ &= \arg \max_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_2} \log \hat{f}_L(X_i). \end{aligned}$$

The final estimator is then given by $\hat{f}_{\hat{L}}(x)$.

Based on the theoretical results presented in this manuscript, we anticipate the following properties of the corresponding estimator. First, this procedure yields a consistent nonparametric density estimator for log-Lipschitz f_0 , that is, the logarithm of f_0 is a Lipschitz function. Second, the estimator is expected to exhibit adaptive convergence rates when the true density is of lower complexity, such that

$$f_0(x) \propto \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^m w_i \times 1\{x \in I_i\} - Lx \right),$$

for $L > 0$, unknown $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is a non-overlapping partition of the domain of X . This includes cases where f_0 is an exponential density ($m = 0$), and any piecewise exponential densities.

Figure 4 in the main text illustrates the estimated density functions based on 500 observations ($n_1 = n_2 = 250$) generated from the following data-generating density functions:

Scenario 1 The data is generated from a Laplace distribution where the true density is defined as $f_0(x) := \frac{1}{2} \exp(-|x|)$. The estimator is expected to converge at the minimax rate.

Scenario 2 The data is generated from an exponential distribution where the true density is defined as $f_0(x) := \exp(-x)$. The estimator is expected to converge at the adaptive rate.