

Uniform in bandwidth exact rates for a class of kernel estimators

Davit VARRON ^{*} Ingrid VAN KEILEGOM [†]

August 17, 2018

Abstract

Given an i.i.d sample (Y_i, Z_i) , taking values in $\mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, we consider a collection Nadarya-Watson kernel estimators of the conditional expectations $\mathbb{E}(\langle c_g(z), g(Y) \rangle + d_g(z) \mid Z = z)$, where z belongs to a compact set $H \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, g a Borel function on $\mathbb{R}^{d'}$ and $c_g(\cdot), d_g(\cdot)$ are continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^d . Given two bandwidth sequences $h_n < \mathfrak{h}_n$ fulfilling mild conditions, we obtain an exact and explicit almost sure limit bounds for the deviations of these estimators around their expectations, uniformly in $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $z \in H$ and $h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n$ under mild conditions on the density f_Z , the class \mathcal{G} , the kernel K and the functions $c_g(\cdot), d_g(\cdot)$. We apply this result to prove that smoothed empirical likelihood can be used to build confidence intervals for conditional probabilities $\mathbb{P}(Y \in C \mid Z = z)$, that hold uniformly in $z \in H$, $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]$. Here \mathcal{C} is a Vapnik-Chervonenkis class of sets.

Key Words: Local empirical processes, empirical likelihood, kernel smoothing, uniform in bandwidth consistency.

^{*}Laboratoire de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, Université de Franche-Comté, 16 route de gray, 25000 Besançon, France, E-mail: dvarron@univ-fcomte.fr. Financial support from IAP research network P6/03 of the Belgian Government (Belgian Science Policy).

[†]Institute of Statistics, Université catholique de Louvain, Voie du Roman Pays 20, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium, E-mail: ingrid.vankeilegom@uclouvain.be. Financial support from IAP research network P6/03 of the Belgian Government (Belgian Science Policy), and from the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC Grant agreement No. 203650 is gratefully acknowledged.

1 Introduction and statement of the main results

Consider an i.i.d sample $(Y_i, Z_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ taking values in $\mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, with the same distribution as a vector (Y, Z) , and write $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the usual inner product. In this paper, we investigate the limit behaviour of quantities of the following form (assuming that this expression is meaningful):

$$W_n(g, h, z) := f_Z(z)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\left(\langle c_g(z), g(Y_i) \rangle + d_g(z) \right) K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) - \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\langle c_g(z), g(Y_i) \rangle + d_g(z) \right) K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) \right) \right]. \quad (1)$$

Here, K denotes a kernel, $h > 0$ is a smoothing parameter, g is a Borel function from $\mathbb{R}^{d'}$ to \mathbb{R}^k and f_Z is (a version) of the density of Z . Given a class of functions \mathcal{G} satisfying some Vapnik-Chervonenkis type conditions (see conditions (HG1) below), and given a compact set H , Einmahl and Mason (2000) showed that somewhat recent tools in empirical processes theory could be used efficiently to provide exact rates of convergence of

$$\sup \{ |W_n(g, h_n, z)|, g \in \mathcal{G}, z \in H \},$$

along a bandwidth sequence h_n fulfilling some mild conditions (see condition (HV) in the sequel). The exact content of their result is written in Theorem 1 below. The contribution of the present paper is twofold. As a first contribution, we provide an extension of the result of Einmahl and Mason, by enriching Theorem 1 with a uniformity in the bandwidth h , when h is allowed to vary into an interval $[h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]$, with h_n and \mathfrak{h}_n fulfilling conditions of Theorem 1. This extension is stated in Section 1.2 (Theorem 2), and is proved in Section 3. As a second contribution (Theorem 3), we apply our Theorem 2 to establish confidence intervals for quantities of the form

$$\mathbb{P}(Y \in C \mid Z = z), C \in \mathcal{C}, z \in H,$$

by empirical likelihood techniques. Indeed, we prove that these confidence intervals can be built to hold uniformly in $z \in H$, $C \in \mathcal{C}$ and $h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]$, under conditions that are very similar to those of Theorem 2. This result is stated in Section 1.4 and is proved in Section 4.

1.1 A result of Einmahl and Mason

As our first result is an extension of Theorem 1 in Einmahl and Mason (2000) we have to first introduce the notations and assumptions they made in their article. Consider a compact set $H \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with nonempty interior. We shall make the following assumption on the law of (Y, Z) .

(Hf) (Y, Z) has a density $f_{Y,Z}$ that is continuous in x on $\mathbb{R}^{d'} \times O'$, where $O' \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is open and where $H \subset O'$.

Moreover f_Z is continuous and bounded away from zero and infinity on O' .

From now on, O will denote an open set fulfilling $H \subsetneq O \subsetneq O'$. Now consider a class \mathcal{G} of functions from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^k . For $l = 1, \dots, k$, write $\mathcal{G}_l := \Pi_l(\mathcal{G})$, where $\Pi_l(x_1, \dots, x_l, \dots, x_k) := x_l$ for $(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

(HG) Each class \mathcal{G}_l is a pointwise separable VC subgraph class and has a finite valued measurable envelope function G_l satisfying, for some $p \in (2, \infty]$:

$$\alpha := \max_{l=1, \dots, k} \sup_{z \in O} \|G_l(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{L}_{Y|Z=z}, p} < \infty,$$

where $\|G_l(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{L}_{Y|Z=z}, p}$ is the L^p -norm of G_l under the distribution of $Y|Z = z$. For a definition of a pointwise separable VC subgraph class we refer to Van de Vaart and Wellner (1996, p. 110 and 141). Now, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, consider a pair of functions $(c_g(\cdot), d_g(\cdot))$, where c_g maps \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^k and d_g maps \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} , and assume that

(HC) The classes of functions $\mathcal{D}_1 := \{c_g, g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_2 := \{d_g, g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ are uniformly bounded and uniformly equicontinuous on O .

We now formulate our assumptions on the Kernel K , with the following definition.

$$\mathcal{K} := \left\{ K(\lambda \cdot -z), \lambda > 0, z \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\}. \quad (2)$$

(HK1) K has bounded variation and the class \mathcal{K} is VC subgraph.

(HK2) $K(s) = 0$ when $s \notin [-1/2, 1/2]^d$.

(HK3) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(s) ds = 1$.

Note that (HK1) is fulfilled for a quite large class of kernels (see, e.g., Mason (2004), Example F.1). In Einmahl and Mason (2000), the authors have studied the almost sure asymptotic behaviour of

$$\sup \left\{ |W_n(g, h_n, z)|, g \in \mathcal{G}, z \in H \right\}$$

(recall (1)), along a bandwidth sequence $(h_n)_{n \geq 1}$ that satisfies the following conditions (here we write $\log_2 n := \log \log(n \vee 3)$):

(HV) $h_n \downarrow 0$, $nh_n^d \uparrow \infty$, $\log(1/h_n)/\log_2 n \rightarrow \infty$, $h_n^d(n/\log(1/h_n))^{1-2/p} \rightarrow \infty$,

where p is as in condition (HG). We also set

$$\Delta^2(g, z) := \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\langle c_g(z), g(Y) \rangle + d_g(z) \right)^2 \middle| Z = z \right), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^d, g \in \mathcal{G}, \quad (3)$$

$$\Delta^2(g) := \sup_{z \in H} \Delta^2(g, z), \quad g \in \mathcal{G} \quad (4)$$

$$\Delta^2(\mathcal{G}) := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \Delta^2(g). \quad (5)$$

Given a measurable space (χ, \mathcal{T}) , a measure Q and a Borel function $\psi : \chi \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we write

$$\|\psi\|_{Q, p}^p = \int_{\chi} |\psi|^p dQ. \quad (6)$$

Under the above mentioned assumptions, Einmahl and Mason have proved the following theorem, λ denoting the Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 1 (Einmahl, Mason, 2000) *Under assumptions (HG), (HC), (Hf), (HK1)–(HK3) and (HV), we have almost surely*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in H, g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{|W_n(g, h_n, z)|}{\sqrt{2nh_n^d \log(h_n^{-d})}} = \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}. \quad (7)$$

We point out that (7) is slightly stronger than Theorem 1 of Einmahl and Mason (2000), as $f_Z(z)^{-1/2}$ appears in our definition of $W_n(g, h, z)$ which is not the case in their paper. However, (7) is a consequence of their Theorem 1, as $f_Z^{-1/2}$ is uniformly continuous on H , by (Hf).

1.2 An extension of Theorem 1

Our first result states that Theorem 1 can be enriched by an additional uniformity in $h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n$ in the supremum appearing in (7), provided that $(h_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(\mathfrak{h}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ do fulfill assumption (HV). We also refer to Einmahl and Mason (2005), where the authors provided some consistency results for kernel type function estimators that hold uniformly in the bandwidth (see also Varron (2008) for an improvement in the case of kernel density estimation).

Theorem 2 *Assume that (HG), (Hf), (HC) and (HK1) – (HK3) are satisfied. Let $(h_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(\mathfrak{h}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be two sequences of constants fulfilling (HV) as well as $h_n = o(\mathfrak{h}_n)$. Then we have almost surely*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in H, g \in \mathcal{G}, h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n} \frac{|W_n(g, h, z)|}{\sqrt{2nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} = \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}. \quad (8)$$

The proof of Theorem 2 is provided in Section 3.

Remark 1 *Einmahl and Mason (2005) have proved a result strong enough to derive that, under weaker conditions than those of Theorem 2, we have almost surely*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, g \in \mathcal{G}, \\ h \in [\frac{c \log n}{n}, 1]}} \frac{f_Z(z)^{1/2} W_n(g, h, z)}{\sqrt{nh^d \log(1/h) + \log \log n}} < \infty. \quad (9)$$

However, the finite constant appearing on the right hand side of (9) is not explicit in their result. The main contribution of Theorem 2 is that the right hand side of (9) is explicit, by paying the price of making stronger assumptions.

Remark 2 *As Theorem 2 is an extension of Theorem 1 of Einmahl and Mason, all the corollaries of Theorem 1 (see Einmahl and Mason (2000)) can be enriched with a uniformity in the bandwidth.*

1.3 Some applications of Theorem 2 to data-driven bandwidth selection

The main statistical interest of Theorem 2 is that we can derive the limit behavior of kernel regression estimators with data-driven bandwidth. Let us consider such a random bandwidth $\bar{h}_n(z) = h(z, Y_1, \dots, Y_n, Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$ that depends on the sample as well as on the point $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In the sequel, Id shall denote the identity function. Our next corollary gives the a.s. limit behavior of the Nadaraya-Watson estimator

$$r_n(z) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{K\left(\frac{z-Z_i}{h}\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{z-Z_j}{h}\right)} Y_i$$

of the regression function $r(z) := \mathbb{E}(Y \mid Z = z)$, when $\bar{h}_n(\cdot)$ satisfies some mild conditions. Note that the asymptotics are given for $r_n(\cdot) - \bar{r}(\bar{h}_n, \cdot)$, with

$$\bar{r}(\bar{h}_n, z) := \bar{h}_n^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^k} y K\left(\frac{u-z}{\bar{h}_n}\right) f_{Y,Z}(y, u) dy du.$$

The *random* differences $\bar{r}(\bar{h}_n, z) - r(z)$ can be controlled by analytic arguments as soon as the a.s. limit behavior is known.

Corollary 1 *Assume that $\bar{h}_n(\cdot)$ satisfies almost surely (resp. in probability)*

$$0 < \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(1/\bar{h}_n)}{\log n} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(1/\bar{h}_n)}{\log n} < 1.$$

Then, we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in H} \frac{\pm \sqrt{f_Z(z)} (r_n(z) - \bar{r}(\bar{h}_n, z)) \sqrt{n \bar{h}_n(z)^d}}{\sqrt{2 \Delta(Id, z) \log(\bar{h}_n(z)^{-d})}} = \|K\|_{\lambda, 2},$$

almost surely (resp. in probability).

Proof: The proof involves continuity arguments for $\Delta(Id, \cdot)$ and the fact that the numerator and denominator of $r_n(z)$ are specific forms of the general object W_n appearing in Theorem 2. We also consider the countable collection of events

$$\left\{ n^{-r} \leq \bar{h}_n \leq n^{-r'} \text{ for all large } n \right\}, \quad r, r' \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1).$$

On each of these countable events, the sequence \bar{h}_n can be bounded from below and above by sequences h_n and \mathfrak{h}_n fulfilling condition (HV) . We omit technical details. \square

Example 1: Tsybakov's plug-in selection rule:

Tsybakov (1987) considered a plug-in bandwidth selection rule when $d = k = 1$. In that case, he suggested that, for a given point $z \in \mathbb{R}$, the bandwidth should be chosen of the form

$$\bar{h}_n(z) := \hat{\beta}_n(z) n^{-1/5},$$

where $\hat{\beta}_n(z)$ is a consistent estimate of the theoretical quantity $\beta(z)$ that minimizes the asymptotic square error of $r_n(z)$. Under the conditions stated in Tsybakov (1987), since most of them being consequences of the assumptions of Theorem 2, the plug-in bandwidth satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 1.

Example 2: cross validation:

We again consider the case $d = k = 1$. An important example is the bandwidth \bar{h}_n that minimizes the sample-based quantity

$$CV(h) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [Y_i - r_{n,-i}(Z_i)]^2 w(Z_i), \quad h \in [n^{-1+\delta}, n^{-\delta}],$$

where w is a weight function on \mathbb{R} and $\delta > 0$ is a fixed (small) value. We refer to Clark (1975) and Priestley and Chao (1972) for more details on that technique. By construction the random sequence \bar{h}_n satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 1. Moreover, it is shown in Härdle *et al.* (1988) that, under mild conditions, we have $\bar{h}_n \sim C_0 n^{-1/5}$ in probability, for a theoretical constant C_0 .

1.4 Asymptotic confidence bands by empirical likelihood

Empirical likelihood methods in statistical inference have been introduced by Owen (2001). This nonparametric technique has suscitated much interest for several practical reasons, the most important one being that it directly provides confidence intervals without requiring further approximation methods, such as the estimation of dispersion parameters. Moreover, empirical likelihood is a very versatile tool which can be adapted in many different fields, for instance in estimation of densities or conditional expectations by kernel smoothing methods. The idea can be summarised as follows : consider an independent, identically distributed sample $(Y_i, Z_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ taking values in $\mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Given $h > 0$, $z \in H$, a function g from $\mathbb{R}^{d'}$ to \mathbb{R}^k and a (kernel) real function K , define the following centring parameter, which plays the role of a deterministic approximation of $\mathbb{E}(g(Y) | Z = z)$:

$$m(g, h, z) := \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(g(Y)K\left(\frac{Z-z}{h}\right)\right)}{\mathbb{E}\left(K\left(\frac{Z-z}{h}\right)\right)}. \quad (10)$$

This quantity is the root of the following equation in θ :

$$\mathbb{E}\left(K\left(\frac{Z-z}{h}\right)(g(Y) - \theta)\right) = 0, \quad (11)$$

which naturally leads to the following formula for a confidence interval (around $m(g, h, z)$) by empirical likelihood methods (for more details see, e.g., Owen (2001), chapter 5) :

$$I_n(g, h, z, c) := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{R}_n(\theta, g, h, z) \geq c\}, \quad (12)$$

where $c \in (0, 1)$ is a given critical value that has to be chosen in practice, and where

$$\mathcal{R}_n(\theta, g, h, z) := \max \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n np_i, \sum_{i=1}^n p_i K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) (g(Y_i) - \theta) = 0, p_i \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1 \right\}. \quad (13)$$

It is known (see, e.g., (2001), chapter 5) that, for fixed $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and fixed g , we can expect

$$m(g, h, z) \in I_n(g, h, z, c) \quad (14)$$

to hold with probability equal to $\mathbb{P}(\chi^2 \leq -2 \log c)$, ultimately as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $h \rightarrow 0$, $nh^d \rightarrow \infty$ (see e.g., Owen, chapter 5). A natural arising question is:

- Can we expect (14) to hold uniformly in z, g and h ?
- In that case, how much uniformity can we get?

Uniformity in g and z would allow to construct asymptotic *confidence bands* (instead of simple confidence intervals), while a uniformity in h would allow more flexibility in the practical choice of that smoothing parameter. Our Theorem 3 provides a tool strong enough to give some positive answers to these questions. We shall focus on the case where $\mathcal{G} = \{1_C, C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ for a class of sets \mathcal{C} . We will also make an abuse of notation, by identifying \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{G} , and hence, we shall write $m(C, h, z)$ for $m(1_C, h, z)$ and so on. Write the conditional variance of $1_C(Y)$ given $Z = z$ as follows :

$$\sigma^2(C, z) := \mathbb{P}(Y \in C \mid Z = z) - \mathbb{P}^2(Y \in C \mid Z = z), \quad C \in \mathcal{C}, \quad z \in H. \quad (15)$$

The next theorem shows that we can construct, by empirical likelihood methods (recall (12)), confidence bands around the centring parameters $m(C, h, z)$ with lengths tending to zero at rate $\sqrt{2\sigma^2(C, z) \log(h^{-d})/nh^d}$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n$. We make the following assumptions on h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n and \mathcal{C} :

$$(HG') \quad \mathcal{C} \text{ is a VC class satisfying } \inf_{z \in H} \inf_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \sigma^2(C, z) =: \beta > 0.$$

$$(HV') \quad h_n \downarrow 0, \quad nh_n^d \uparrow \infty, \quad \log(1/h_n)/\log_2 n \rightarrow \infty, \quad nh_n^d/\log(1/\mathfrak{h}_n) \rightarrow \infty.$$

Note that (HV') is equivalent to (HV) in the specific case where $p = \infty$.

Theorem 3 *Under assumptions (Hf) , $(HK1) - (HK3)$, (HG') and (HV') , as well as $h_n = o(\mathfrak{h}_n)$, we have almost surely:*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n}} \frac{-\log \mathcal{R}_n(m(C, h, z), C, h, z)}{\log(h^{-d})} = 1. \quad (16)$$

The proof of Theorem 3 is provided in Section 4.

Remark 3 *Theorem 3 implies that, for an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, taking $c = h^{d+\epsilon}$ when constructing confidence regions as in (12) ensures that each $m(C, h, z)$ belongs to its associated confidence interval $I_n(C, h, z, c)$. Moreover, this claim turns out to be false when taking $c = h^{d-\epsilon}$ with $\epsilon > 0$. This shows that one cannot go below the theoretical limit $c = h^d$ without losing uniformity in C, h and z .*

Remark 4 *In order to obtain a confidence band for $m(C, h, z)$ uniformly in C, h and z , we need the limiting distribution of*

$$\sup_{z, C, h} \left[-\log \mathcal{R}_n \left(m(C, h, z), C, h, z \right) \right] / \log(h^{-d}), \quad (17)$$

so Theorem 3 is not sufficient for this. Obtaining such a limit law is a real challenge in itself, and is beyond the scope of this paper. We leave that problem as an open problem. In the case of univariate kernel density estimation, Bickel and Rosenblatt (1973) showed that the supremum over the transformed kernel density estimator, obtained after a proper rescaling and a proper translation, converges to an extreme value distribution. The simulations in Section 2 suggest that a proper linear transformation of $[-\log \mathcal{R}_n(m(C, h, z), C, h, z)] / \log(h^{-d})$ (depending on z, C and h) might also lead to a nondegenerate limiting distribution.

2 Simulation results

A simulation study is carried out to illustrate the convergence stated in (16). We estimate the density of (17) for four different sample sizes: $n = 50, 100, 500, 1000$. We specified the following parameters:

1. Z is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1]$. Given $Z = z$, Y has an exponential distribution with expectation $1/z$.
2. C is the class of intervals $[0, t]$, $t \in [1, 2]$.
3. $H = [0.25, 0.75]$.
4. $h_n = n^{-1/5-\delta}$ and $\mathfrak{h}_n = n^{-1/5+\delta}$, with $\delta = 1/20$.

For each sample size, the density is estimated as follows :

- 100 independent samples are simulated (which is enough since the density is univariate).
- For each sample, the supremum in (17) is approximated by a maximum over a finite grid of size 50.
- Finally, the density of (17) is estimated by using a Parzen-Rosenblatt density estimator, applied to the 100 obtained values. We used an Epanechnikov kernel and the bandwidth was obtained from cross validation.

Figure 1 shows the density estimates for $n = 50, 100, 500, 1000$. Figure 2 has been obtained from a second simulation study, where the interval $[h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]$ has been widened ($\delta = 1/10$). As already mentioned in Remark 1.4, Figures 1 and 2 suggest that after a proper linear transformation, the distribution of (17) might converge to a non-degenerate limiting distribution.

Density estimates for delta=1/20




Figure 1: Estimated densities of the supremum in (17) for $\delta = 1/20$. The black curve corresponds to $n = 50$, the light gray curve to $n = 100$, the white curve to $n = 500$ and the dark gray curve to $n = 1000$.

Density estimates for delta=1/10




Figure 2: Estimated densities of the supremum in (17) for $\delta = 1/10$. The light gray curve corresponds to $n = 50$, the black curve to $n = 100$, the white curve to $n = 500$ and the dark gray curve to $n = 1000$.

3 Proof of Theorem 2

For ease of notations, we just prove Theorem 2 when $k = 1$. A close look at the proof shows that there is no loss of generality assuming $k = 1$.

3.1 Truncation

We start our proof of Theorem 2 as Einmahl and Mason did in their proof of Theorem 1. As the support of K is bounded and as $h_n \rightarrow 0$ we have almost surely, for all large n and for all $z \in H$, $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $h_n \leq h \leq h_n$,

$$W_n(g, h, z) = f_Z(z)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\left(c_g(z)g(\tilde{Y}_i) + d_g(z) \right) K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) - \mathbb{E} \left(\left(c_g(z)g(\tilde{Y}_i) + d_g(z) \right) K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) \right) \right], \quad (18)$$

where $\tilde{Y}_i := Y_i 1_{O'}(Z_i)$. Hence, we can suppose that $Y_i = Y_i 1_{O'}(Z_i)$ without changing the limiting behaviour of the processes we are studying here. Now consider a sequence of constants $(\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}$ fulfilling

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_n}{(n/\log(1/h_n))^{1/p}} > 0, \quad (19)$$

and consider the truncated expressions, with G denoting a measurable envelope function of \mathcal{G} fulfilling (HG) ,

$$W_n^{\gamma_n}(g, h, z) := f_Z(z)^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\left(c_g(z)g(Y_i)1_{\{G(Y_i) \leq \gamma_n\}} + d_g(z) \right) K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) - \mathbb{E} \left(\left(c_g(z)g(Y_i)1_{\{G(Y_i) \leq \gamma_n\}} + d_g(z) \right) K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) \right) \right]. \quad (20)$$

The following lemma allows us to study these truncated versions of the $W_n(g, h, z)$.

Lemma 1 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2 and under (19) we have almost surely:*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}, z \in H, h_n \leq h \leq h_n} \frac{|W_n^{\gamma_n}(g, h, z) - W_n(g, h, z)|}{\sqrt{2nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} = 0. \quad (21)$$

Proof: A careful reading of the proof of Lemma 1 in Einmahl and Mason (2000) shows that their assertions (2.8) and (2.9) remain true after adding a uniformity in $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $h_n \leq h \leq h_n$, which readily implies Lemma 1. Note also that Lemma 1 is obvious when (HG) is fulfilled with $p = \infty$. \square

The two next subsections are devoted to proving respectively the outer and inner bounds of Theorem 2.

3.2 Outer bounds

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Our goal in this subsection is to show that, almost surely

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}, z \in H, h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n} \frac{|W_n(g, h, z)|}{\sqrt{2nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} \leq \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2} (1 + 4\epsilon). \quad (22)$$

To this aim, we shall first discretise each of the sets H , $[h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]$ and \mathcal{G} into properly chosen finite grids, then we shall control the oscillations between elements of the grids by a combination of a concentration inequality which is due to Talagrand (see also Massart (1989), Bousquet (2002) and Klein (2002) for sharpened versions) and of an upper bound for the first moment of these oscillations which is due to Einmahl and Mason (2000).

3.2.1 Step 1: discretisations

Consider three parameters $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\delta_2 \in (0, 1)$ and $\rho \in (1, 2)$ that will be chosen small enough in the sequel, and define the following subsequence

$$n_k := \left\lceil \exp(k/\log k) \right\rceil, \quad k \geq 5, \quad N_k := \{n_{k-1}, n_{k-1} + 1, \dots, n_k - 1\}. \quad (23)$$

Note that $n_k/n_{k-1} \rightarrow 1$ and

$$\log \log n_k = \log k(1 + o(1)), \quad k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (24)$$

We then construct the following finite grid for each $k \geq 1$

$$h_{n_k, R_k} := \mathfrak{h}_{n_{k-1}}, \quad h_{n_k, l} := \rho^l h_{n_k}, \quad l = 0, \dots, R_k - 1, \quad (25)$$

where $R_k := \lceil \log(\mathfrak{h}_{n_{k-1}}/h_{n_k}) / \log(\rho) \rceil + 1$, and $[u]$ denotes the only integer q fulfilling $q \leq u < q + 1$. Denote by $|z|_d := \max_{i=1, \dots, d} |z_i|$ the usual maximum norm on \mathbb{R}^d . Now, for fixed k and $0 \leq l \leq R_k$, we construct a finite grid $\mathcal{M}_{k, l} \subset H$ such that, given $z \in H$, there exists $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}_{k, l}$ fulfilling $|z - \mathbf{z}|_d < \delta_1 h_{n_k, l}$. Note that one can construct this grid so as $\#\mathcal{M}_{k, l} \leq C(\delta_1 h_{n_k, l})^{-d}$, where C is a constant that depends only on the volume of H . Now set $\gamma_n := \delta_2 (n_k / \log(1/h_{n_k}^d))^{1/p}$, for each $k \geq 5$, $n \in N_k$. By Lemma 1, showing (22) is equivalent to showing that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in H, g \in \mathcal{G}, h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n} \frac{|W_n^{\gamma_n}(g, h, z)|}{\sqrt{2nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} \leq \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2} (1 + 4\epsilon) \quad (26)$$

almost surely, for a proper choice of $\delta_2 > 0$.

3.2.2 Step 2: a discrete version of (22)

Given a real function ψ defined on a set S , we shall write:

$$\|\psi\|_S := \sup_{s \in S} |\psi(s)|. \quad (27)$$

Recall that, since f_Z is bounded away from 0 on H , we can define

$$\gamma := \inf_{z \in H} f_Z(z) > 0. \quad (28)$$

Also write, for convenience of notations

$$\|c\|_{\mathcal{G} \times H} := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}, z \in H} |c_g(z)|, \quad \|d\|_{\mathcal{G} \times H} := \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}, z \in H} |d_g(z)|. \quad (29)$$

Our first lemma is a version of (26) which is discretised along the finite grids defined in Step 1.

Lemma 2 *For any choice of*

$$0 < \delta_2 < \epsilon \gamma^{1/2} \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda,2} / (6 \|c\|_{H \times \mathcal{G}} \|K\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}), \quad (30)$$

for any finite collection $\{g_1, \dots, g_q\} \subset \mathcal{G}$ and for any $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$, $\rho \in (1, 2)$, we have

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\substack{n \in N_k, 1 \leq \ell \leq q, \\ 0 \leq l \leq R_k, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}_{k,l}}} \frac{|W_n^{\gamma_n}(g_\ell, h_{n_k, l}, \mathbf{z})|}{\sqrt{2n_k h_{n_k, l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k, l}^d)}} \leq \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda,2} (1 + \epsilon). \quad (31)$$

Proof: We can assume here that $q = 1$ with no loss of generality. We rename in this proof g_1 to g . We define, for $z \in H$, $h > 0$ and $\bar{g} \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\psi_{n_k, h, z, \bar{g}} : (y, x) \mapsto f_Z(z)^{-1/2} \left[c_{\bar{g}}(z) \bar{g}(y) 1_{\{G(y) \leq \gamma_{n_k}\}} + d_{\bar{g}}(z) \right] K\left(\frac{x - z}{h}\right). \quad (32)$$

First note that, for each $k \geq 5$, $0 \leq l \leq R_k$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}_{k,l}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_{n_k, h_{n_k, l}, \mathbf{z}, g}\|_{\mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{R}^d} &\leq (\|c\|_{H \times \mathcal{G}} \gamma_{n_k} + \|d\|_{H \times \mathcal{G}}) \gamma^{-1/2} \|K\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \\ &\leq 2 \|c\|_{H \times \mathcal{G}} \gamma^{-1/2} \|K\|_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta_2 (n_k h_{n_k}^d / \log(1/h_{n_k}^d))^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

$$\leq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \|K\|_{\lambda,2}^2 \Delta(\mathcal{G}) (n_k h_{n_k}^d / \log(1/h_{n_k}^d))^{1/2}, \quad (34)$$

where (33) holds for all large k , uniformly in $0 \leq l \leq R_k$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}_{k,l}$, according to assumption (HV), and where (34) holds by (30). Moreover we have (recall (HK2))

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Var}\left(\psi_{n_k, h_{n_k, l}, \mathbf{z}, g}(Y, Z)\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(\psi_{n_k, h_{n_k, l}, \mathbf{z}, g}^2(Y, Z)\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left(f_Z(\mathbf{z})^{-1} \left(c_g(\mathbf{z})g(Y) + d_g(\mathbf{z})\right)^2 K\left(\frac{Z - \mathbf{z}}{h_{n_k, l}}\right)^2\right) \\ &\quad + f_Z(\mathbf{z})^{-1} \|d\|_{H \times \mathcal{G}}^2 \|K\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 \mathbb{P}\left(\{G(Y) \geq \gamma_{n_k}\} \cap \{|Z - \mathbf{z}|_d \leq h_{n_k, l}/2\}\right) \\ &=: A_{1, \mathbf{z}} + A_{2, \mathbf{z}}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The first term on the right hand side of (35) is equal to

$$A_{1, \mathbf{z}} = \int_{|z - \mathbf{z}|_d \leq h_{n_k, l}/2} \mathbb{E}\left(\left(c_g(\mathbf{z})g(Y) + d_g(\mathbf{z})\right)^2 \middle| Z = z\right) \frac{f_Z(z)}{f_Z(\mathbf{z})} K^2\left(\frac{z - \mathbf{z}}{h_{n_k, l}}\right) dz.$$

It follows, by making use of assumption (HC) , that there exists a function $r(\cdot)$ fulfilling $r(u) \rightarrow 0$ as $u \rightarrow 0$ and such that

$$A_{1,\mathbf{z}} \leq \int_{|z-\mathbf{z}|_d \leq h_{n_k,l}/2} \Delta^2(g, z) \frac{f_Z(z)}{f_Z(\mathbf{z})} K^2\left(\frac{z-\mathbf{z}}{h_{n_k,l}}\right) dz + r(h_{n_k,l}) \quad (36)$$

$$\leq \Delta^2(\mathcal{G}) h_{n_k,l}^d \int_{[-1/2,1/2]^d} K^2(u) \frac{f_Z(\mathbf{z} + h_{n_k,l}u)}{f_Z(\mathbf{z})} du (1 + r(h_{n_k,l})) \quad (37)$$

$$\leq \Delta^2(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda,2}^2 h_{n_k,l}^d (1 + \varepsilon_{k,l}), \quad (38)$$

where

$$\varepsilon_{k,l} := \sup_{z \in H, |u|_d \leq 1/2} \left| \frac{f_Z(z + h_{n_k,l}u)}{f_Z(z)} (1 + r(h_{n_k,l})) - 1 \right|. \quad (39)$$

By assumption (Hf) and since $h_{n_k,l} \leq h_{n_{k-1}} \rightarrow 0$ we readily infer that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{0 \leq l \leq R_k} \varepsilon_{k,l} = 0.$$

Moreover we have, uniformly in $0 \leq l \leq R_k$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}_{k,l}$ (recall (HG) and (Hf))

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\{G(Y) \geq \gamma_{n_k}\} \cap \{|Z - \mathbf{z}|_d \leq h_{n_k,l}/2\}\right) \\ & \leq \gamma_{n_k}^{-2} \int_{|z-\mathbf{z}|_d \leq h_{n_k,l}/2} \mathbb{E}\left(G^2(Y) \mid Z = z\right) f_Z(z) dz \\ & \leq \gamma_{n_k}^{-2} h_{n_k,l}^d \alpha^2 \int_{[-1/2,1/2]^d} f_Z(\mathbf{z} + h_{n_k,l}u) du. \\ & \leq \gamma_{n_k}^{-2} h_{n_k,l}^d \alpha^2 \|f_Z\|_0. \end{aligned}$$

As $\gamma_{n_k} \rightarrow \infty$ we conclude that, for all large enough k and for each $0 \leq l \leq R_k$, $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}_{k,l}$,

$$\text{Var}\left(\psi_{n_k, h_{n_k,l}, \mathbf{z}, g}(Y, Z)\right) \leq \Delta^2(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda,2}^2 (1 + \varepsilon) h_{n_k,l}^d. \quad (40)$$

Given a real function $g : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we shall write

$$T_n(g) := \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ g(Y_i, Z_i) - \mathbb{E}\left(g(Y_i, Z_i)\right) \right\}. \quad (41)$$

Combining (34) and (40) making use of the maximal version of Bernstein's inequality (see, e.g. Einmahl and Mason (1996), Lemma 2.2) repeatedly for each $0 \leq l \leq R_k$, $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}_{k,l}$,

we have, for all large k (recall that $\#\mathcal{M}_{k,l} \leq C\delta_1^{-d}h_{n_k,l}^{-d}$),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\substack{n \in N_k, 0 \leq l \leq R_k, \\ \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}_{k,l}}} \frac{|W_n^{\gamma_n}(g, h_{n_k,l}, \mathbf{z})|}{\sqrt{2n_k h_{n_k,l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k,l}^d)}} > \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda,2} (1+\epsilon)\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{l=0}^{R_k} \#\mathcal{M}_{k,l} \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{M}_{k,l}} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{n \in N_k} |T_n(\psi_{n_k, h_{n_k,l}, \mathbf{z}, g})| \geq \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda,2} (1+\epsilon) \sqrt{2n_k h_{n_k,l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k,l}^d)}\right) \\
& \leq \sum_{l=0}^{R_k} \frac{C}{\delta_1^d h_{n_k,l}^d} 2 \exp\left(- (1+\epsilon^2/(1+\epsilon)) \log(1/h_{n_k,l}^d)\right) \\
& \leq \frac{2C}{\delta_1^d} \sum_{l=0}^{R_k} h_{n_k,l}^{d\epsilon^2/2} \\
& = \frac{2C}{\delta_1^d} \sum_{l=0}^{R_k} \rho^{ld\epsilon^2/2} h_{n_k}^{d\epsilon^2/2} = \frac{2C}{\delta_1^d} h_{n_k}^{d\epsilon^2/2} \frac{\rho^{(R_k+1)d\epsilon^2/2} - 1}{\rho^{d\epsilon^2/2} - 1} \leq \frac{2C\rho^{d\epsilon^2/2}}{\delta_1^d(\rho^{d\epsilon^2/2} - 1)} h_{n_{k-1}}^{d\epsilon^2/2}, \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of $R_k := \lceil \log(h_{n_{k-1}}/h_{n_k})/\log(\rho) \rceil + 1$. As $\log(1/h_{n_{k-1}})/\log \log n_{k-1} \rightarrow \infty$ (assumption (HV)), and by (24), the right hand side of expression (42) is summable in k . The proof of Lemma 2 now readily follows by making use of the Borel-Cantelli lemma. \square

3.2.3 Step 3: end of the proof of Theorem 2

Our next lemma allows us to extend the uniformity in Lemma 2 to the whole sets \mathcal{G} , $[h_{n_k}, h_{n_{k-1}}]$ and H , provided that $\delta_1 > 0, \delta_2 > 0, \rho > 1$ and $\{g_1, \dots, g_q\}$ have been properly chosen. Before stating our lemma, we need to recall three facts. We shall be able to properly discretise the class \mathcal{G} by making use of the following result, which is a straightforward adaptation of Lemma 6 of Einmahl and Mason (2000).

Fact 1 (Einmahl, Mason, 2000) *Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $h_{0,\varepsilon} > 0$ and a finite subclass $\{g_1, \dots, g_q\} \subset \mathcal{G}$ (that may depend on ε) fulfilling*

$$\sup_{\substack{0 < h < h_{0,\varepsilon}, \\ z \in H, g \in \mathcal{G}}} \min_{\ell=1, \dots, q} h^{-d} f_Z(z)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left((c_g(z)g(Y) + d_g(z)) - (c_{g_\ell}(z)g_\ell(Y) + d_{g_\ell}(z)) \right)^2 K^2 \left(\frac{Z-z}{h} \right) \right] \leq \varepsilon/2.$$

Now define the following distances on \mathcal{G} :

$$\begin{aligned}
d^2(g_1, g_2) &:= \sup_{\substack{0 < h < h_{0,\varepsilon}, \\ z \in H}} h^{-d} f_Z(z)^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left((c_{g_1}(z)g_1(Y) + d_{g_1}(z)) - (c_{g_2}(z)g_2(Y) + d_{g_2}(z)) \right)^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times K^2 \left(\frac{Z-z}{h} \right) \right], \\
\tilde{d}(g_1, g_2) &:= \max \{ d(g_1, g_2), \|c_{g_1} - c_{g_2}\|_H, \|d_{g_1} - d_{g_2}\|_H \}. \tag{43}
\end{aligned}$$

We write $|K|_v$ for the total variation of K and we set, for $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}$,

$$\omega_\psi(\delta) := \sup_{z_1, z_2 \in H, |z_1 - z_2|_d \leq \delta} \left| \frac{\psi(z_2)}{f_Z(z_2)} - \frac{\psi(z_1)}{f_Z(z_1)} \right|, \quad \delta > 0, \quad (44)$$

$$\beta_1 := \sup_{z \in O} \mathbb{E} \left((G^2(Y) + 1) \middle| Z = z \right) < \infty, \quad (45)$$

$$B := 4\beta_1 \|f_Z\|_O \|f_Z^{-1}\|_O \left(\|K\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 + \left(\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|c_g\|_O^2 \vee \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|d_g\|_O^2 \right) |K|_v^2 \right). \quad (46)$$

The following fact is a straightforward adaptation of Lemma 4 and Lemma 6 in (2000).

Fact 2 (Einmahl, Mason, 2000) Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. For any $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $0 < h < h_{0,\varepsilon}$ fulfilling

$$z + (2h)u \in O \text{ for each } z \in H \text{ and for each } u \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ with } |u|_d \leq 1 \quad (47)$$

and for all large k we have, for each $\rho \in (1, 2]$, $z_1, z_2 \in H$ with $|z_1 - z_2|_d \leq (\delta h)$, and for each $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ fulfilling $\tilde{d}^2(g_1, g_2) \leq \varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\psi_{n_k, z_1, \rho h, g_1}(Y, Z) - \psi_{n_k, z_2, h, g_2}(Y, Z) \right)^2 \right) \\ & \leq B \left(\omega_{c_{g_2}}^2(\delta h) \vee \omega_{d_{g_2}}^2(\delta h) + \rho - 1 + \delta + \varepsilon \right) h^d. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Remarks: Assumption (47) is just technical, in order to have the continuity arguments of Einmahl and Mason valid. The presence of the term $\rho - 1$ on the right hand side of (48) is due to the fact that we take care of the differences $h/h_{n_k, l} - 1$, which are implicitly handled in Lemma 6 of Einmahl and Mason (2000).

The third fact is also largely inspired by the ideas of Einmahl and Mason (2000). We remind that the uniform entropy number of a class of functions \mathcal{F} with measurable envelope F is defined as

$$\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}) := \sup_{Q \text{ proba}} \min \left\{ p \geq 1, \exists (g_1, \dots, g_p) \in \mathcal{F}^p, \sup_{g \in \mathcal{F}} \min_{i=1, \dots, p} \|g - g_i\|_{Q, 2} \leq \epsilon \|F\|_{Q, 2} \right\},$$

where the supremum is taken over all probability measures Q . The following fact is proved in Varron (2008, Proposition 2.1).

Fact 3 (Varron, 2008) Let \mathcal{F} be a class of functions on \mathbb{R}^d with measurable envelope function F satisfying, for some constants $\tau > 0$ and $h \in (0, 1)$,

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{F}} \text{Var}(g(Z_1)) \leq \tau^2 h^d.$$

Assume that there exists $\delta_0, C, v, \beta_0 > 0$ and $p > 2$ fulfilling, for all $0 < \epsilon < 1$,

$$\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}) \leq C \epsilon^{-v}, \quad (49)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left(F(Y)^2 \right) \leq \beta_0^2, \quad (50)$$

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{F}, z \in \mathbb{R}^d} |g(z)| \leq \delta_0 (nh^d / \log(h^{-d}))^{1/p}. \quad (51)$$

Then there exists a universal constant $A > 0$ and a parameter $D(v) > 0$ depending only on v such that, for fixed $\rho_0 > 0$, if $h > 0$ satisfies,

$$K_1 := \max \left\{ 1, (4\delta_0\sqrt{v+1}/\tau)^{\frac{1}{1/2-1/p}}, (\rho_0\delta_0/\tau^2)^{\frac{1}{1/2-1/p}} \right\} \leq \frac{nh^d}{\log(h^{-d})}, \quad (52)$$

$$K_2 := \min \{1/(\tau^2\beta_0), \tau^2\} \geq h^d, \quad (53)$$

then we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{1 \leq m \leq n} \|T_m\|_{\mathcal{F}} \geq (\tau + \rho_0)D(nh^d \log(h^{-d}))^{1/2} \right) \leq 4 \exp \left(-A \left(\frac{\rho_0}{\tau}\right)^2 \log(h^{-d}) \right).$$

We can now state our second lemma, which will conclude the proof of the outer bounds of Theorem 2. Recall that $\epsilon > 0$ was fixed at the very beginning of our proof (see Section 3.2).

Lemma 3 *There exists a finite class $g_1, \dots, g_q \in \mathcal{G}$ as well as two constants $\rho_\epsilon > 1$ and $\delta_{1,\epsilon} > 0$ small enough such that, for each $1 < \rho \leq \rho_\epsilon$ and each $0 < \delta \leq \delta_{1,\epsilon}$, we have almost surely :*

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\substack{n \in N_k, \\ 0 \leq l \leq R_k - 1}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \inf_{1 \leq \ell \leq q} \sup_{\substack{z_1, z_2 \in H, |z_1 - z_2| < \delta, \\ h_{n_k, l} \leq h \leq \rho h_{n_k, l}}} \frac{|W_n^{\gamma n}(g, h_{n_k, l}, z_1) - W_n^{\gamma n}(g_\ell, h, z_2)|}{\sqrt{2n_k h_{n_k, l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k, l}^d)}} \\ & \leq \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2} \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Proof :

Consider the class

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}' := & \left\{ (y, z) \mapsto u_1(c_{g_1}(z_1)g_1(y)1_{\{G(y) \leq t\}} + d_{g_1}(z_1))K\left(\frac{z - z_1}{h}\right) \right. \\ & \left. - u_2(c_{g_2}(z_2)g_2(y)1_{\{G(y) \leq t\}} + d_{g_2}(z_2))K\left(\frac{z - z_2}{\mathfrak{h}}\right), z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d, g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{G}, \right. \\ & \left. t \geq 0, (h, \mathfrak{h}) \in (0, 1)^2, u_1, u_2 \in \left[\inf_H f_Z^{-1/2}, \sup_H f_Z^{-1/2} \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\gamma = \inf_H f$ and note that \mathcal{G}' admits the following function as an envelope function:

$$G' : (y, z) \mapsto 2\gamma^{-1/2} (\|c\|_{H \times \mathcal{G}} G(y) + \|d\|_{H \times \mathcal{G}}) \|K\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}. \quad (55)$$

Set $\beta_4^2 := \mathbb{E}(G'^2(Y, Z)) < \infty$ (the finiteness of β_4 follows from (Hf) and (HG)). By an argument very similar to that used in Lemma 5 of Einmahl and Mason (2000) we readily infer that there exist $C > 0$ and $v > 0$ fulfilling

$$\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}') \leq C\epsilon^{-v}, \quad \epsilon \in (0, 1]. \quad (56)$$

Recalling the notations of Fact 3, we set $\varepsilon = D(v)^{-1}(1 + \sqrt{2/A})^{-1}\epsilon\Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}$. By Fact 1 and by (HC) , for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose a finite subclass $\{g_1, \dots, g_q\} \subset \mathcal{G}$ such that \mathcal{G} is included in the finite reunion of the corresponding balls with \tilde{d} -radius smaller

than $\varepsilon/2$. For fixed $k \geq 5$, $0 \leq l \leq R_k - 1$, $1 \leq \ell \leq q$ and $\delta > 0$, define the following class of functions:

$$\mathcal{G}_{k,l,q,\delta} := \left\{ \psi_{n_k, z_1, h, g} - \psi_{n_k, z_2, h_{n_k, l}, g_\ell}, \quad z_1, z_2 \in H, \quad |z_1 - z_2| \leq \delta, \right. \\ \left. \tilde{d}(g, g_\ell) \leq \varepsilon/2, \quad h_{n_k, l} \leq h \leq \rho h_{n_k, l} \right\}.$$

Obviously we always have $\mathcal{G}_{k,l,\ell,\delta} \subset \mathcal{G}'$. By inclusion, all the classes $\mathcal{G}_{k,l,\ell,\delta}$ inherit properties (55) and (56). Moreover, proving Lemma 3 is equivalent to showing that, almost surely

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\substack{0 \leq l \leq R_k - 1, \\ 1 \leq \ell \leq q}} \frac{\max_{n \in N_k} \|T_n\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k,l,\ell,\delta}}}{\sqrt{2n_k h_{n_k, l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k, l}^d)}} \leq \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2} \varepsilon. \quad (57)$$

As $h_{n_k, l} \leq h_{n_{k-1}} \rightarrow 0$ and by Fact 2, we can choose $\delta_{1,\varepsilon} > 0$ and $\rho_\varepsilon \in (1, 2)$ such that, for each $\delta_1 \in (0, \delta_{1,\varepsilon})$, $\rho \in (1, \rho_\varepsilon)$, for all large k and for all $0 \leq l \leq R_k - 1$,

$$\sup_{\psi \in \mathcal{G}_{k,l,\ell,\delta_{1,\varepsilon}}} h_{n_k, l}^{-d} \mathbb{E}(\psi^2(Y, Z)) \leq \varepsilon^2. \quad (58)$$

Recalling that $h_{n_k} \leq h_{n_k, l} \leq h_{n_{k-1}}$ and assumption (HV), we can choose k large enough so that each class $\mathcal{G}_{k,l,\ell,\delta_1}$ fulfills conditions (52) and (53) with $\beta_0 := \beta_4$, $h := h_{n_k, l}$, $n := n_k$, $\tau := \varepsilon$, $\rho := \sqrt{2/A}\tau$ and C, v appearing in (56). Hence, we have, uniformly in $0 \leq l \leq R_k - 1$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq q$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{n \in N_k} \|T_n\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k,l,\ell,\delta_{1,\varepsilon}}} > \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2} \varepsilon \sqrt{2n_k h_{n_k, l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k, l}^d)} \right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{n \in N_k} \|T_n\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k,l,\ell,\delta_{1,\varepsilon}}} \geq D(v)(\tau + \rho) \sqrt{2n h_{n_k, l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k, l}^d)} \right) \\ \leq 4 \exp \left(-2 \log(1/h_{n_k, l}^d) \right).$$

Now, by Bonferroni's inequality we have, for all large k ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{l=0}^{R_k-1} \bigcup_{j=1}^{J_l} \max_{n \in N_k} \|T_n\|_{\mathcal{G}_{k,l,\delta_{1,\varepsilon}}} > \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2} \varepsilon \sqrt{2n_k h_{n_k, l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k, l}^d)} \right) \\ \leq \sum_{l=0}^{R_k-1} 4 \sharp \mathcal{M}_{k,l} h_{n_k, l}^{2d} \leq \frac{4C}{\delta_{1,\varepsilon}^d} \sum_{l=0}^{R_k-1} h_{n_k, l}^d \leq \frac{4C \delta_{1,\varepsilon}^{-d}}{\rho^d - 1} \rho^{dR_k} \leq \frac{4C \rho^d \delta_{1,\varepsilon}^{-d}}{\rho^d - 1} h_{n_{k-1}}.$$

As $\log(1/h_{n_k})/\log \log(n_k) \rightarrow \infty$ by (HV) and (24), the proof of Lemma 3 is concluded by a straightforward use of the Borel-Cantelli lemma. \square

Combining Lemmas 2 and 3 we get, for any choice of $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ and $\rho > 1$ small enough,

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\substack{n \in N_k, \\ 0 \leq l \leq R_k - 1}} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, \\ h_{n_k, l} \leq h \leq \rho h_{n_k, l}}} \frac{|W_n^{\gamma n}(g, h, z)|}{\sqrt{2n_k h_{n_k, l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k, l}^d)}} \leq \|K\|_{\lambda, 2} \Delta(\mathcal{G})(1 + 3\varepsilon) \text{ a.s.} \quad (59)$$

Now assertion (22) is almost proved, provided that we substitute $n_k h_{n_k, l}^d \log(1/h_{n_k, l}^d)$ by $n h^d \log(1/h^d)$ in the LHS of (59) at the minor cost of replacing $1 + 3\varepsilon$ by $1 + 4\varepsilon$ in the RHS

of (59). This can be achieved by noticing that $\max\{|\sqrt{n/n_k} - 1|, n_{k-1} < n \leq n_k\} \rightarrow 0$ together with the following assertion

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{1 < \rho' \leq \rho, \\ h \in (h_{n_k}, h_{n_{k-1}})}} \left| \sqrt{\frac{(\rho h)^d \log((\rho h)^{-d})}{h^d \log(h^{-d})}} - 1 \right| \leq \epsilon / (1 + 5\epsilon), \quad (60)$$

which, by routine computations, turns out to be true if we choose $\rho > 1$ small enough. This concludes the proof of the outer bounds of Theorem 2. \square

3.3 Inner bounds

Proving the inner bounds of Theorem 2 is a simple consequence of Theorem 1, since, almost surely,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq h_n}} \frac{|W_n(g, h, z)|}{\sqrt{2nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, \\ C \in \mathcal{C}}} \frac{|W_n(g, h_n, z)|}{\sqrt{2nh_n^d \log(h_n^{-d})}} = \Delta(\mathcal{G}) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}, \quad (61)$$

where (61) is a consequence of Theorem 1.

4 Proof of Theorem 3

Our proof of Theorem 3 is inspired by chapter 5 in Owen (2001) and borrows some ideas of Chen *et al.* (2003). Set, for $n \geq 1$, $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $h > 0$ and $z \in H$,

$$X_n(C, h, z) := \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) \left(1_C(Y_i) - m(C, h, z)\right), \quad (62)$$

$$S_n(C, h, z) := f_Z(z)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) \left(1_C(Y_i) - m(C, h, z)\right) \right]^2, \quad (63)$$

$$w_{i,n}(C, h, z) := K\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) \left(1_C(Y_i) - m(C, h, z)\right). \quad (64)$$

The proof of Theorem 3 consists in showing that the quantities

$$-2 \log \left(\mathcal{R}_n(m(C, h, z), C, h, z) \right), \quad C \in \mathcal{C}, z \in H, h \in [h_n, h_n]$$

are asymptotically equivalent to

$$U_n(C, h, z) := \frac{X_n(C, h, z)^2}{f_Z(z) S_n(C, h, z)}, \quad C \in \mathcal{C}, z \in H, h \in [h_n, h_n], \quad (65)$$

and in establishing the almost sure limit behaviour of the quantities $U_n(C, h, z)$. Recall that $\sigma^2(C, z) := \text{Var}(1_C(Y) | Z = z)$ and write

$$r(C, z) := \mathbb{E}(1_C(Y) | Z = z). \quad (66)$$

By (Hf) together with Scheffé's lemma, both $\sigma^2(C, \cdot)$ and $r(C, \cdot)$ are equicontinuous uniformly in $C \in \mathcal{C}$, namely

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{\substack{z_1, z_2 \in H \\ |z_1 - z_2| \leq \delta}} |r(C, z_1) - r(C, z_2)| = 0, \quad (67)$$

$$\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \sup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \sup_{\substack{z_1, z_2 \in H \\ |z_1 - z_2| \leq \delta}} |\sigma^2(C, z_1) - \sigma^2(C, z_2)| = 0. \quad (68)$$

4.1 Step 1: an application of Theorem 2

Recall that $\sigma^2(C, z) := \text{Var}(1_C(Y_i) \mid Z = z)$ and that $r(C, z) := \mathbb{P}(Y \in C \mid Z = z)$. In this first step we prove that, given $\epsilon > 0$, we have $(2 \log(h^{-d}))^{-1} U_n(C, h, z) \leq (1 + \epsilon)$ uniformly in C, h, z , ultimately as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 4 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3, we have almost surely :*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq h_n}} \left| \frac{S_n(C, h, z)}{nh^d \sigma^2(C, z) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}^2} - 1 \right| = 0, \quad (69)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq h_n}} \left| \frac{X_n(C, h, z)}{\sqrt{2f_Z(z) \sigma^2(C, z) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}^2 nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} \right| = 1. \quad (70)$$

As a consequence we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq h_n}} \left| \frac{U_n(C, h, z)}{2 \log(h^{-d})} \right| = 1 \quad a.s. \quad (71)$$

Proof:

Note that (71) is a consequence of (69) and (70). Set $L(\cdot) = K^2(\cdot) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}^{-2}$. To apply Theorem 2 we write $(1_C(Y) - r(C, z))^2 = 1_C(Y)(1 - 2r(C, z)) + r^2(C, z)$. Notice that, under (HG') and (HV') , the class \mathcal{C} and the sequence $(h_n)_{n \geq 1}$ satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2 with $p = \infty$. By Scheffé's lemma together with assumption (Hf) and (HG') , the two following collections of functions are uniformly equicontinuous on H :

$$\mathcal{D}_1 := \{f_Z^{-1/2}(\cdot)(1 - 2r(C, \cdot)), C \in \mathcal{C}\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_2 := \{f_Z^{-1/2}(\cdot)r^2(C, \cdot), C \in \mathcal{C}\}. \quad (72)$$

We can hence apply Theorem 2 to the class \mathcal{C} , with $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$ defined as above, and with the kernel L to obtain, with probability one,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, h_n \leq h \leq h_n} \frac{|\widetilde{W}_n(C, h, z)|}{\sqrt{2nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} < \infty, \quad (73)$$

with

$$\widetilde{W}_n(C, h, z) := f_Z(z)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (1_C(Y_i) - r(C, z))^2 L\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) - \mathbb{E} \left[(1_C(Y_i) - r(C, z))^2 L\left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h}\right) \right] \right\}.$$

Now write

$$\mathbb{E} \left((1_C(Y_i) - r(C, z))^2 L \left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h} \right) \right) =: \tilde{r}(C, h, z). \quad (74)$$

By assumptions (HG') , (HV') and (Hf) together with Scheffé's lemma, we can infer that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]}} \left| \frac{\tilde{r}(C, h, z)}{h^d f_Z(z) \sigma^2(C, z)} - 1 \right| = 0, \quad (75)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]}} |m(C, h, z) - r(C, z)| = 0, \quad (76)$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]} \frac{\log(h^{-d})}{nh^d} = 0. \quad (77)$$

Writing

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(S_n(C, h, z) - n f_Z(z)^{-1} \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}^2 \tilde{r}(C, h, z) \right) - \widetilde{W}_n(C, h, z) \\ &= f_Z(z)^{-1} \left[(m^2(C, h, z) - r^2(C, z)) - 2(m(C, h, z) - r(C, z)) \right] \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}^2 \sum_{i=1}^n L \left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h} \right), \end{aligned}$$

we conclude by Theorem 2 and (76) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n}} \frac{\left| \left(S_n(C, h, z) - n f_Z(z)^{-1} \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}^2 \tilde{r}(C, h, z) \right) - \widetilde{W}_n(C, h, z) \right|}{\sqrt{2nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} = 0$$

with probability one, from where we obtain with (73) and (75) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n}} \frac{\left| S_n(C, h, z) - nh^d \|K\|_{\lambda, 2}^2 \sigma^2(C, z) \right|}{\sqrt{2nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} < \infty. \quad (78)$$

The proof of (69) is now concluded, by (77), (78) and (HG') . Assertion (70) can be proved in a very similar way, taking care that the class $\mathcal{D} := \{f_Z(\cdot)^{-1/2} \sigma(C, \cdot)^{-1}\}$ is uniformly equicontinuous and bounded away from zero and infinity on H . We omit details. \square

4.2 Step 2: convex hull condition

The second step of our proof of Theorem 3 is usually called the "convex hull condition".

Lemma 5 *With probability one, we have, for all large n and for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $z \in H$, $h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n$,*

$$\#\left\{ i : K \left(\frac{Z_i - z}{h} \right) (1_C(Y_i) - m(C, h, z)) > 0 \right\} \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}. \quad (79)$$

Proof: It is sufficient to prove that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]}} \mathbb{P} \left(\pm (1_C(Y) - m(C, h, z)) K \left(\frac{Z - z}{h} \right) > 0 \right) > 0, \quad (80)$$

and that the following class is Glivenko-Cantelli:

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ \left\{ (y, \tilde{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{R}^d, (1_C(y) - m(C, h, z))K\left(\frac{\tilde{z} - z}{h}\right) > 0 \right\}, C \in \mathcal{C}, h > 0, z \in H \right\}.$$

First note that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$, where

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ \left\{ (y, \tilde{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d'} \times \mathbb{R}^d, (1_C(y) - a)K\left(\frac{\tilde{z} - z}{h}\right) > 0 \right\}, C \in \mathcal{C}, h > 0, z \in \mathbb{R}^d, a \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

By (HK1) and by Lemma 2.6.18 in Van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), the two following classes of sets are VC:

$$\mathcal{B}_\pm := \left\{ \left\{ \tilde{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d, \pm K(h^{-d}(\tilde{z} - z)) > 0 \right\}, z \in \mathbb{R}^d, h > 0 \right\}.$$

Moreover, as \mathcal{C} is a VC class of sets, we straightforwardly deduce that the following class is also VC:

$$\mathcal{M}_G := \left\{ \left\{ z \in \mathcal{X}, 1_C(z) > a \right\}, C \in \mathcal{C}, a \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

By a combination of points (i) and (ii) of Lemma 2.6.17 in Van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), we conclude that \mathcal{B} is VC, which entails that \mathcal{A} is Glivenko-Cantelli. We now have to prove (80). Define the following family of random variables

$$\mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{h} := \left\{ (1_C(Y) - m(C, h, z))K\left(\frac{Z - z}{h}\right), z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, 0 < h \leq \mathfrak{h} \right\}.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have $\mathbb{P}(X > 0) \geq \mathbb{E}(X^2)^{-1}\mathbb{E}(X1_{X>0})^2$. Hence it is sufficient to prove that, for \mathfrak{h} small enough we have

$$\inf_{X \in \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{h}} \mathbb{E}(X1_{X>0}) = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{X \in \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{h}} \mathbb{E}(|X|) > 0, \quad (81)$$

$$\sup_{X \in \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{h}} \mathbb{E}(X^2) < \infty. \quad (82)$$

Note that the equality appearing in (81) is a consequence of $\mathbb{E}(X) = 0$ for each $X \in \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{h}$. By (HG'), (Hf) and (67), routine analysis shows that, for \mathfrak{h} small enough, both (82) and the following assertion are true:

$$\inf_{X \in \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{h}} \mathbb{E}(X^2) > \frac{1}{2} \inf_{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}} \sigma^2(C, z) f_Z(z) \|K\|_{\lambda, 2} =: \alpha_0 > 0. \quad (83)$$

Now, as $\mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{h}$ is uniformly bounded by some constant $M > 0$ we get that $\alpha_0 \leq M\mathbb{E}(|X|)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{h}$, and hence (81) is proved. This concludes the proof of Lemma 5. \square

4.3 Step 3: end of the proof of Theorem 3

Lemma 5 ensures us (see, e.g., Owen (2001), p. 219) that almost surely, for all large n and for each $z \in H$, $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n$, the maximum value in $\mathcal{R}_n(m(C, h, z), C, h, z)$ is obtained by choosing the following weights (recall (13)):

$$p_i(C, h, z) := \frac{1}{n} \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_n(C, h, z) w_{i,n}(C, h, z)}, \quad (84)$$

where $\lambda_n(C, h, z)$ is the unique solution of

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_{i,n}(C, h, z)}{1 + \lambda_n(C, h, z)w_{i,n}(C, h, z)} = 0. \quad (85)$$

Our next lemma gives an asymptotic control of

$$\sup_{\substack{C \in \mathcal{C}, z \in H, \\ h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n}} |\lambda_n(C, h, z)|.$$

It is largely inspired by Lemma 1 in Chen *et al.* (2003).

Lemma 6 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2 we have almost surely:*

$$\sup_{\substack{C \in \mathcal{C}, z \in H, \\ h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n}} \sqrt{\frac{nh^d}{\log(h^{-d})}} |\lambda_n(C, h, z)| = O(1). \quad (86)$$

Proof : Following the proof of Owen (2001), p. 220, Lemma 6 will be proved if we check the following three conditions:

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(h^{-d})}{nh^d}} |w_{i,n}(C, h, z)| = o_{a.s.}(1), \quad (87)$$

$$\sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n}} \frac{|X_n(C, h, z)|}{\sqrt{nh^d \log(h^{-d})}} = O_{a.s.}(1), \quad (88)$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n}} \frac{S_n(C, h, z)}{nh^d} > 0 \text{ a.s.} \quad (89)$$

As each $w_{i,n}(C, h, z)$ is almost surely bounded by $2 \|K\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}$, and by (77), condition (87) is readily satisfied. Now note that condition (88) is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 2, and that (89) is a consequence of both Lemma 4 and (HG') . The remainder of the proof of Lemma 6 is done by following Owen (2001), p. 220. \square

Now set

$$V_{i,n}(C, h, z) := \lambda_n(C, h, z)w_{i,n}(C, h, z).$$

By Lemma 6 and assertion (87) we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h_n \leq h \leq \mathfrak{h}_n}} |V_{i,n}(C, h, z)| = 0 \text{ a.s.}, \quad (90)$$

which entails, almost surely, for all large n and for each $z \in H$, $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_{i,n}(C, h, z)}{1 + V_{i,n}(C, h, z)} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n w_{i,n}(C, h, z) \left(1 - V_{i,n}(C, h, z) + V_{i,n}^2(C, h, z)/(1 + V_{i,n}(C, h, z)) \right) \\
&= X_n(C, h, z) - f_Z(z) S_n(C, h, z) \lambda_n(C, h, z) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_{i,n}(C, h, z) V_{i,n}^2(C, h, z)}{1 + V_{i,n}(C, h, z)} \\
&= X_n(C, h, z) - f_Z(z) S_n(C, h, z) \lambda_n(C, h, z) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_{i,n}^3(C, h, z)}{1 + V_{i,n}(C, h, z)} \lambda_n^2(C, h, z). \quad (91)
\end{aligned}$$

From (87), (88) and (90), we conclude that there exists a random sequence ϵ_n such that, almost surely, we have $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{w_{i,n}^3(C, h, z)}{1 + V_{i,n}(C, h, z)} \lambda_n^2(C, h, z) &\leq X_n(C, h, z) \max_i w_{i,n}^2(C, h, z) \\
&\quad \times \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} |1 + V_{i,n}(C, h, z)| \right)^{-1} \lambda_n^2(C, h, z) \\
&\leq \epsilon_n \sqrt{nh^d \log(h^{-d})}, \quad (92)
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $z \in H$, $h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]$. Hence, dividing the right hand side of (91) by $S_n(C, h, z)$, recalling (89) and (77), we obtain with probability one that

$$\lambda_n(C, h, z) = \frac{X_n(C, h, z)}{f_Z(z) S_n(C, h, z)} + \beta_n(C, h, z), \quad (93)$$

with $\beta_n(C, h, z) \leq M \epsilon_n \sqrt{\log(h^{-d})/nh^d}$ uniformly in $C \in \mathcal{C}$, $z \in H$ and $h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]$, for some almost surely finite random variable M . We can now conclude that (recall (65))

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{z \in H, C \in \mathcal{C}, \\ h \in [h_n, \mathfrak{h}_n]}} \left| \frac{-2 \log \left(\mathcal{R}_n(g, z, m(C, h, z)) \right)}{U_n(C, h, z)} - 1 \right| = 0, \quad (94)$$

by reasoning as in Owen (2001), p. 221. The proof of Theorem 3 is then concluded by (71). \square

References

- [1] Bousquet, O (2002). A Bennett concentration inequality and its application to suprema of empirical processes. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, Série 1*, 334, 495–500.
- [2] Chen, S.X., Härdle, W. and Li, M (2003). An empirical likelihood goodness-of-fit test for time series. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Serie B*, 65(3), 663–678.
- [3] Clark, R.M. (1975). A calibration curve for radio carbon dates. *Antiquity*, 49, 251–266.

- [4] Einmahl, U. and Mason, D.M (1996). Some universal results on the behavior of the increments of partial sums. *Annals of Probability*, 24, 1388–1407.
- [5] Einmahl, U. and Mason, D.M (2000). An empirical process approach to the uniform consistency of kernel type estimators. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 13, 1–13.
- [6] Einmahl, U. and Mason, D.M (2005). Uniform in bandwidth consistency of variable bandwidth kernel estimators. *Annals of Statistics*, 33(3), 1380–1403.
- [7] Härdle, W., Hall, P. and Marron, J.S (1988). How far are automatically chosen regression smoothing parameters from their optimum? *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 83(401), 86–95.
- [8] Klein, T. (2002). Une inégalité de concentration à gauche pour les processus empiriques. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, Série 1*, 2002.
- [9] Mason, D.M. (2004). A uniform functional law of the iterated logarithm for the local empirical process. *Annals of Probability*, 32(2), 1391–1418.
- [10] Massart, P. (1989). Strong approximations for multivariate empirical and related processes. *Annals of Probability*, 17, 266–291.
- [11] Owen, A.B. (2001). *Empirical Likelihood*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, London.
- [12] Priestley, M.B. and Chao, M.T. (1972). Non-parametric function fitting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Serie B*, 34(3), 385–392.
- [13] Tsybakov, A.B. (1987). On the choice of the bandwidth in kernel nonparametric regression. *Theory of Probability and Applications*, 32(1), 142–148.
- [14] Van der Vaart, A.W. and Wellner, J.A. (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes*. Springer, New-York.
- [15] Varron, D. (2008). A limited in bandwidth uniformity for the functional limit law for the increments of the empirical process. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 2, 1043–1064.