

Adaptive Estimation of Planar Convex Sets

Tony Cai¹, Adityanand Guntuboyina², and Yuting Wei²

August 18, 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we consider adaptive estimation of an unknown planar compact, convex set from noisy measurements of its support function on a uniform grid. Both the problem of estimating the support function at a point and that of estimating the convex set are studied. Data-driven adaptive estimators are proposed and their optimality properties are established. For pointwise estimation, it is shown that the estimator optimally adapts to every compact, convex set instead of a collection of large parameter spaces as in the conventional minimax theory in nonparametric estimation literature. For set estimation, the estimators adaptively achieve the optimal rate of convergence. In both these problems, our analysis makes no smoothness assumptions on the unknown sets.

Keywords: Adaptive estimation, circle convexity, convex set, minimax rate of convergence, support function.

AMS 2000 Subject Classification: Primary: 62G08; Secondary: 52A20.

1 Introduction

We study in this paper the problem of nonparametric estimation of an unknown planar compact, convex set from noisy measurements of its support function. Before describing the details of the problem, let us first introduce the support function. For a compact, convex set K in \mathbb{R}^2 , its support function is defined by

$$h_K(\theta) := \max_{(x_1, x_2) \in K} (x_1 \cos \theta + x_2 \sin \theta) \quad \text{for } \theta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note that h_K is a periodic function with period 2π . It is useful to think about θ in terms of the direction $(\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$. The line $x_1 \cos \theta + x_2 \sin \theta = h_K(\theta)$ is a support line for K (i.e., it

¹Department of Statistics, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. The research of Tony Cai was supported in part by NSF Grants DMS-1208982 and DMS-1403708, and NIH Grant R01 CA127334.

²Department of Statistics, University of California at Berkeley. The research of Adityanand Guntuboyina was supported by NSF Grant DMS-1309356.

touches K and K lies on one side of it). Conversely, every support line of K is of this form for some θ . The convex set K is completely determined by its support function h_K because $K = \bigcap_{\theta} \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1 \cos \theta + x_2 \sin \theta \leq h_K(\theta)\}$.

The support function h_K possesses the *circle-convexity* property (see, e.g., Vitale (1979)): for every $\alpha_1 > \alpha > \alpha_2$ and $0 < \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 < \pi$,

$$\frac{h_K(\alpha_1)}{\sin(\alpha_1 - \alpha)} + \frac{h_K(\alpha_2)}{\sin(\alpha - \alpha_2)} \geq \frac{\sin(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)}{\sin(\alpha_1 - \alpha)\sin(\alpha - \alpha_2)} h_K(\alpha). \quad (1)$$

Moreover the above inequality characterizes h_K , i.e., any periodic function of period 2π satisfying the above inequality equals h_K for a unique compact, convex subset K in \mathbb{R}^2 . The circle-convexity property (1) is clearly related to the usual convexity property. Indeed, if we replace the sine function in (1) by the identity function (i.e., if we replace $\sin \alpha$ by α in (1)), we obtain the condition for convexity. In spite of this similarity, (1) is different from convexity as can be seen from the example of the function $h(\theta) = |\sin \theta|$ which satisfies (1) but is clearly not convex.

1.1 The Problem, Motivations, and Background

We are now ready to describe the problem studied in this paper. Let K^* be an unknown compact, convex set in \mathbb{R}^2 . We study the problem of estimating K^* or h_{K^*} from noisy measurements of h_{K^*} . Specifically, we observe data $(\theta_1, Y_1), \dots, (\theta_n, Y_n)$ drawn according to the model

$$Y_i = h_{K^*}(\theta_i) + \xi_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (2)$$

where $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$ are fixed grid points in $(-\pi, \pi]$ and ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n are i.i.d Gaussian random variables with mean zero and known variance σ^2 . We focus on the dual problems of estimating the scalar quantity $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ as well as the convex set K^* . We propose data-driven adaptive estimators and establish their optimality for both of these problems.

The problem considered here has a range of applications in engineering. The regression model (2) was first proposed and studied by Prince and Willsky (1990) who were motivated by an application to Computed Tomography. Lele et al. (1992) showed how solutions to this problem can be applied to target reconstruction from resolved laser-radar measurements in the presence of registration errors. Gregor and Rannou (2002) considered application to Projection Magnetic Resonance Imaging. It is also a fundamental problem in the field of geometric tomography; see Gardner (2006). Another application domain where this problem might plausibly arise is robotic tactical sensing as has been suggested by Prince and Willsky (1990). Finally this is a very natural shape constrained estimation problem and would fit right into the recent literature on shape constrained estimation. See, for example, Groeneboom and Jongbloed (2014).

Most proposed procedures for estimating K^* in this setting are based on least squares minimization. The least squares estimator \hat{K}_{ls} is defined as any minimizer of $\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - h_K(\theta_i))^2$ as K ranges over all compact convex sets. The minimizer in this optimization problem is not unique and

one can always take it to be a polytope. This estimator was first proposed by Prince and Willsky (1990) who also proposed an algorithm for computing it based on quadratic programming. Further algorithms for computing \hat{K}_{ls} were proposed in Gardner and Kiderlen (2009); Lele et al. (1992); Prince and Willsky (1990).

The theoretical performance of the least squares estimator was first considered by Gardner et al. (2006) who mainly studied its accuracy for estimating K^* under the natural fixed design loss:

$$L_f(K^*, \hat{K}_{\text{ls}}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(h_{K^*}(\theta_i) - h_{\hat{K}_{\text{ls}}}(\theta_i) \right)^2. \quad (3)$$

The key result of Gardner et al. (2006) (specialized to the planar case that we are studying) states that $L_f(K^*, \hat{K}_{\text{ls}}) = O(n^{-4/5})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ almost surely provided K^* is contained in a ball of bounded radius. This result is complemented by the minimax lower bound in Guntuboyina (2011) where it was shown that $n^{-4/5}$ is the minimax rate for this problem. These two results together imply minimax optimality of \hat{K}_{ls} under the loss function L_f . No other theoretical results for this problem are available outside of those in Gardner et al. (2006) and Guntuboyina (2011).

As a result, the following basic questions are still unanswered:

1. For a fixed $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, how does one optimally and adaptively estimate $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$? This is the pointwise estimation problem. In the literature on shape constrained estimation, pointwise estimation has been the most studied problem. Several papers have been written on this for monotonicity constrained estimation; prominent examples being Brunk (1970); Carolan and Dykstra (1999); Cator (2011); Groeneboom (1983, 1985); Jankowski (2014); Wright (1981) and convexity constrained estimation; prominent ones being Cai and Low (2015); Groeneboom et al. (2001a,b); Hanson and Pledger (1976); Mammen (1991). For the problem considered in this paper however, nothing is known about pointwise estimation. It may be noted that the result $L_f(K^*, \hat{K}_{\text{ls}}) = O(n^{-4/5})$ of Gardner et al. (2006) does not say anything about the accuracy of $h_{\hat{K}_{\text{ls}}}(\theta_i)$ as an estimator for $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$.
2. How to construct minimax optimal estimators for the set K^* that also adapt to polytopes? Polytopes with a small number of extreme points have a much simpler structure than general convex sets. In the problem of estimating convex sets under more standard observation models different from the one studied here, it is possible to construct estimators that converge at faster rates for polytopes compared to the overall minimax rate (see Brunel (2014) for a nice summary of this theory). Similar kinds of adaptation has been recently studied for shape constrained estimation problems based on monotonicity and convexity, see Baraud and Birgé (2015); Chatterjee et al. (2014); Guntuboyina and Sen (2013). Based on these results, it is natural to expect minimax estimators that adapt to polytopes in this problem. This has not been addressed previously.

1.2 Our Contributions

We answer both the above questions in the affirmative in the present paper. The main contributions of this paper can be summarized in the following:

1. We study the pointwise adaptive estimation problem in detail in the decision theoretic framework where the focus is on the performance at every function, instead of the maximum risk over a large parameter space. This framework, first introduced in Cai et al. (2013) and Cai and Low (2015) for shape constrained regression, provides a much more precise characterization of the performance of an estimator than the conventional minimax theory does.

In the context of the present problem, the difficulty of estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ at a given K^* and θ_i can be expressed by means of a benchmark $R_n(K^*, \theta)$ which is defined as follows (below \mathbb{E}_L denotes expectation taken with respect to the joint distribution of Y_1, \dots, Y_n generated according to the model (2) with K^* replaced by L):

$$R_n(K^*, \theta) = \sup_L \inf_{\tilde{h}} \max \left(\mathbb{E}_{K^*}(\tilde{h} - h_{K^*}(\theta))^2, \mathbb{E}_L(\tilde{h} - h_L(\theta))^2 \right), \quad (4)$$

where the supremum above is taken over all compact, convex sets L while the infimum is over all estimators \tilde{h} . In our first result for pointwise estimation, we establish, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, a lower bound for the performance of every estimator for estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$. Specifically, it is shown that

$$R_n(K^*, \theta_i) \geq c \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(i) + 1} \quad (5)$$

where $k_*(i)$ is an integer for which an explicit formula can be given in terms of K^* and i ; and c is a universal positive constant. It will turn out that $k_*(i)$ is related to the smoothness of $h_{K^*}(\theta)$ at $\theta = \theta_i$.

We construct a data-driven estimator, \hat{h}_i , of $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ based on local smoothing together with an optimization scheme for automatically choosing a bandwidth, and show that the estimator \hat{h}_i satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq C \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(i) + 1} \quad (6)$$

for a universal positive constant C . Inequalities (5) and (6) together imply that \hat{h}_i is, within a universal constant factor, an optimal estimator of $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ for every compact, convex set K^* . This optimality is stronger than the traditional minimax optimality usually employed in nonparametric function estimation. The quantity $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ depends on the unknown set K^* in a similar way that the Fisher information bound depends on the unknown parameter in a regular parametric model. In contrast, the optimal rate in the minimax paradigm is given in terms of the worst case performance over a large parameter space and does not depend on individual parameter values.

2. Using the optimal adaptive point estimators $\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_n$, we construct two set estimators \hat{K} and \hat{K}' . The details of this construction are given in Section 2.2. In Theorems 3.6 and 3.8, we prove that \hat{K} is minimax optimal for K^* under the loss function L_f while the estimator \hat{K}' is minimax optimal under the integral squared loss function defined by

$$L(\hat{K}', K^*) := \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} (h_{\hat{K}'}(\theta) - h_{K^*}(\theta))^2 d\theta. \quad (7)$$

Specifically, Theorem 3.6 shows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) \leq C \left\{ \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \sqrt{R}}{n} \right)^{4/5} \right\} \quad (8)$$

provided K^* is contained in a ball of radius R . This, combined with the minimax lower bound in Guntuboyina (2011), proves the minimax optimality of \hat{K} . An analogous result is shown in Theorem 3.8 for $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L(K^*, \hat{K}')$. For the pointwise estimation problem where the goal is to estimate $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$, the optimal rate $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ can be as large as $n^{-2/3}$. However the bound (8) shows that the globally the risk is at most $n^{-4/5}$. The shape constraint given by convexity of K^* ensures that the points where pointwise estimation rate is $n^{-2/3}$ cannot be too many. Note that we make no smoothness assumptions for proving (8).

3. We show that our set estimators \hat{K} and \hat{K}' adapt to polytopes with bounded number of extreme points. Already inequality (8) implies that $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K})$ is bounded from above by the parametric risk $C\sigma^2/n$ provided $R = 0$ (note that $R = 0$ means that K^* is a singleton). Because σ^2/n is much smaller than $n^{-4/5}$, the bound (8) shows that \hat{K} adapts to singletons. Theorem 3.7 extends this adaptation phenomenon to polytopes and we show that $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K})$ is bounded by the parametric rate (up to a logarithmic multiplicative factor of n) for all polytopes with bounded number of extreme points. An analogous result is also proved for $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L(K^*, \hat{K}')$ in Theorem 3.8. It should be noted that the construction of our estimators \hat{K} and \hat{K}' (described in Section 2.2) does not involve any special treatment for polytopes; yet the estimators automatically achieve faster rates for polytopes.

We would like to stress two features of this paper: (a) we do not make any smoothness assumptions on the boundary of K^* throughout the paper; in particular, note that we obtain the $n^{-4/5}$ rate for the set estimators \hat{K} and \hat{K}' without any smoothness assumptions, and (b) we go beyond the traditional minimax paradigm by considering adaptive estimation in both the pointwise estimation problem and the problem of estimating the entire set K^* .

1.3 Organization of the Paper

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. The proposed estimators are described in detail in Section 2. The theoretical properties of the estimators are analyzed in Section 3; Section 3.1

gives results for pointwise estimation while Section 3.2 deals with set estimators. In Section 4, we investigate optimal estimation of some special compact convex sets K^* where we explicitly compute the associated rates of convergence. The proofs of the main results are given in Section 6 and additional technical results are relegated to Appendix A.

2 Estimation Procedures

Recall the regression model (2), where we observe noisy measurements $(\theta_1, Y_1), \dots, (\theta_n, Y_n)$ with $\theta_i = 2\pi i/n - \pi$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ being fixed grid points in $(-\pi, \pi]$. In this section, we first describe in detail our estimate \hat{h}_i for $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ for each i . Subsequently, we shall describe how to put together these estimates $\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_n$ to yield set estimators for K^* .

2.1 Estimators for $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ for each fixed i

Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$. Our construction of the estimator \hat{h}_i for $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ is based on the key circle-convexity property (1) of the function $h_{K^*}(\cdot)$. Let us define, for $0 < \phi < \pi/2$ and $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$, the following two quantities:

$$l(\theta, \phi) := \cos \phi (h_{K^*}(\theta + \phi) + h_{K^*}(\theta - \phi)) - \frac{h_{K^*}(\theta + 2\phi) + h_{K^*}(\theta - 2\phi)}{2}$$

and

$$u(\theta, \phi) := \frac{h_{K^*}(\theta + \phi) + h_{K^*}(\theta - \phi)}{2 \cos \phi}.$$

The following lemma states that for every θ , the quantity $h_{K^*}(\theta)$ is sandwiched between $l(\theta, \phi)$ and $u(\theta, \phi)$ for every ϕ . This will be used crucially in defining \hat{h} . The proof of this lemma is a straightforward consequence of (1) and is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 2.1. *For every $0 < \phi < \pi/2$ and every $\theta \in (-\pi, \pi]$, we have $l(\theta, \phi) \leq h_{K^*}(\theta) \leq u(\theta, \phi)$.*

For a fixed $1 \leq i \leq n$, Lemma 2.1 implies that $l(\theta_i, \frac{2\pi j}{n}) \leq h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \leq u(\theta_i, \frac{2\pi j}{n})$ for every $0 \leq j < \lfloor n/4 \rfloor$. Note that when $j = 0$, we have $l(\theta_i, 0) = h_{K^*}(\theta_i) = u(\theta_i, 0)$. Averaging these inequalities for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k$ where k is a fixed integer with $0 \leq k < \lfloor n/4 \rfloor$, we obtain

$$L_k(\theta_i) \leq h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \leq U_k(\theta_i) \quad \text{for every } 0 \leq k < \lfloor n/4 \rfloor \quad (9)$$

where

$$L_k(\theta_i) := \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k l\left(\theta_i, \frac{2\pi j}{n}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad U_k(\theta_i) := \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k u\left(\theta_i, \frac{2\pi j}{n}\right).$$

We are now ready to describe our estimator. Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$. Inequality (9) says that the quantity of interest, $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$, is sandwiched between $L_k(\theta_i)$ and $U_k(\theta_i)$ for every k . Both $L_k(\theta_i)$ and $U_k(\theta_i)$ can naturally be estimated by unbiased estimators. Indeed, let

$$\hat{l}(\theta_i, 2j\pi/n) := \cos(2j\pi/n)(Y_{i+j} + Y_{i-j}) - \frac{Y_{i+2j} + Y_{i-2j}}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{u}(\theta_i, 2j\pi/n) := \frac{Y_{i+j} + Y_{i-j}}{2 \cos(2j\pi/n)}$$

and take

$$\hat{L}_k(\theta_i) := \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \hat{l}(\theta_i, 2j\pi/n) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{U}_k(\theta_i) := \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \hat{u}(\theta_i, 2j\pi/n). \quad (10)$$

Obviously, in order for the above to be meaningful, we need to define Y_i even for $i \notin \{1, \dots, n\}$. This is easily done in the following way: for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let s be such that $i - sn \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and take $Y_i := Y_{i-sn}$.

As k increases, one averages more terms in (10) and hence the estimators $\hat{L}_k(\theta_i)$ and $\hat{U}_k(\theta_i)$ become more accurate. Let

$$\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i) := \hat{U}_k(\theta_i) - \hat{L}_k(\theta_i) = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\frac{Y_{i+2j} + Y_{i-2j}}{2} - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \frac{Y_{i+j} + Y_{i-j}}{2} \right). \quad (11)$$

Because of (9), a natural strategy for estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ is to choose k for which $\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i)$ is the smallest and then use either $\hat{L}_k(\theta_i)$ or $\hat{U}_k(\theta_i)$ at that k as the estimator. This is essentially our estimator with one small difference in that we also take into account the noise present in $\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i)$. Formally, our estimator for $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ is given by:

$$\hat{h}_i = \hat{U}_{\hat{k}(i)}(\theta_i), \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{k}(i) := \operatorname{argmin}_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \left\{ \left(\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i) \right)_+ + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \right\} \quad (12)$$

and $\mathcal{I} := \{0\} \cup \{2^j : j \geq 0 \text{ and } 2^j \leq \lfloor n/16 \rfloor\}$.

Our estimator \hat{h}_i can be viewed as an angle-adjusted local averaging estimator. It is inspired by the estimator of Cai and Low (2015) for convex regression. The number of terms averaged equals $\hat{k}(i) + 1$ and this is analogous to the bandwidth in kernel-based smoothing methods. Our $\hat{k}(i)$ is determined from an optimization scheme. Notice that unlike the least squares estimator $h_{\hat{K}_{\text{ls}}}(\theta_i)$, the construction of \hat{h}_i for a fixed i does not depend on the construction of \hat{h}_j for $j \neq i$.

2.2 Set Estimators for K^*

We next present estimators for the set K^* . The point estimators $\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_n$ do not directly give an estimator for K^* because $(\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_n)$ is not necessarily a valid support vector i.e., $(\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_n)$ does not always belong to the following set:

$$\mathcal{H} := \{(h_K(\theta_1), \dots, h_K(\theta_n)) : K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \text{ is compact and convex}\}.$$

To get a valid support vector from $(\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_n)$, we need to project it onto \mathcal{H} to obtain:

$$\hat{h}^P := (\hat{h}_1^P, \dots, \hat{h}_n^P) := \operatorname{argmin}_{(h_1, \dots, h_n) \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{h}_i - h_i)^2 \quad (13)$$

The superscript P here stands for projection. An estimator for the set K^* can now be constructed immediately from $\hat{h}_1^P, \dots, \hat{h}_n^P$ via

$$\hat{K} := \left\{ (x_1, x_2) : x_1 \cos \theta_i + x_2 \sin \theta_i \leq \hat{h}_i^P \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n \right\}. \quad (14)$$

In Theorems 3.6 and 3.7, we prove upper bounds on the accuracy of \hat{K} under the loss function L_f defined in (3).

There is another reasonable way of constructing a set estimator for K^* based on the point estimators $\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_n$. We first interpolate $\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_n$ to define a function $\hat{h}' : (-\pi, \pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\hat{h}'(\theta) := \frac{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} \hat{h}_i + \frac{\sin(\theta - \theta_i)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} \hat{h}_{i+1} \quad \text{for } \theta_i \leq \theta \leq \theta_{i+1}. \quad (15)$$

Here i ranges over $1, \dots, n$ with the convention that $\theta_{n+1} = \theta_1 + 2\pi$ (and $\theta_n \leq \theta \leq \theta_{n+1}$ should be identified with $-\pi \leq \theta \leq -\pi + 2\pi/n$). Based on this function \hat{h}' , we can define our estimator \hat{K}' of K^* by

$$\hat{K}' := \operatorname{argmin}_K \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\hat{h}'(\theta) - h_K(\theta) \right)^2 d\theta. \quad (16)$$

The existence and uniqueness of \hat{K}' can be justified in the usual way by the Hilbert space projection theorem. In Theorem 3.8, we prove bounds on the accuracy of \hat{K}' as an estimator for K^* under the integral loss L defined in (7).

3 Main Results

We investigate in this section the accuracy of the proposed point and set estimators. The proofs of these results are given in Section 6.

3.1 Accuracy of the Point Estimator

As mentioned in the introduction, we evaluate the performance of the point estimator \hat{h}_i at individual functions, not the worst case over a large parameter space. This provides a much more precise characterization of the accuracy of the estimator. Let us first recall inequality (9) where $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ is sandwiched between $L_k(\theta_i)$ and $U_k(\theta_i)$. Define $\Delta_k(\theta_i) := U_k(\theta_i) - L_k(\theta_i)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. There exists a universal positive constant C such that the risk of \hat{h}_i as an estimator of $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ satisfies the following inequality:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq C \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(i) + 1} \quad (17)$$

where

$$k_*(i) := \operatorname{argmin}_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k(\theta_i) + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \right). \quad (18)$$

Remark 3.1. It turns out that the bound in (17) is linked to the level of smoothness of the function h_{K^*} at θ_i . However for this interpretation to be correct, one needs to regard h_{K^*} as a function on \mathbb{R}^2 instead of a subset of \mathbb{R} . This is further explained in Remark 4.1.

Theorem 3.1 gives an explicit bound on the risk of \hat{h}_i in terms of the quantity $k_*(i)$ defined in (18). It is important to keep in mind that $k_*(i)$ depends on K^* even though this is suppressed in the notation. In the next theorem, we show that $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ also presents a lower bound on the accuracy of every estimator for $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$. This implies, in particular, optimality of \hat{h}_i as an estimator of $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$.

One needs to be careful in formulating the lower bound result in this setting. A first attempt might perhaps be to prove that, for a universal positive constant c ,

$$\inf_{\tilde{h}} \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\tilde{h} - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \geq c \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(i) + 1}$$

where the infimum is over all possible estimators \tilde{h} . This, of course, would not be possible because one can take $\tilde{h} = h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ which would make the left hand side above zero. A formulation of the lower bound which avoids this difficulty was proposed by Cai and Low (2015) in the context of convex function estimation. Their idea, translated to our setting of estimating the support function h_{K^*} at a point θ_i , is to consider, instead of the risk at K^* , the maximum of the risk at K^* and the risk at L^* which is most difficult to distinguish from K^* in term of estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$. This leads to the benchmark $R_n(K^*, \theta_i)$ defined in (4).

Theorem 3.2. *For any fixed $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have*

$$R_n(K^*, \theta_i) \geq c \cdot \frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(i) + 1} \tag{19}$$

for a universal positive constant c .

Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 together imply that $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ is the optimal rate of estimation of $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ for a given compact, convex set K^* . The results show that our data driven estimator \hat{h}_i for $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ performs uniformly within a constant factor of the ideal benchmark $R_n(K^*, \theta_i)$ for every i . This means that \hat{h}_i adapts to every unknown set K^* instead of a collection of large parameter spaces as in the conventional minimax theory commonly used in nonparametric literature.

Given a specific set K^* and $1 \leq i \leq n$, the quantity $k_*(i)$ is often straightforward to compute up to constant multiplicative factors. Several examples are provided in Section 4. From these examples, it will be clear that the size of $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ is linked to the level of smoothness of the function h_{K^*} at θ_i . However for this interpretation to be correct, one needs to regard h_{K^*} as a function on \mathbb{R}^2 instead of a subset of \mathbb{R} . This is explained in Remark 4.1.

The following corollaries shed more light on the quantity $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$. The first corollary below shows that $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ is at most $C(\sigma^2 R/n)^{-2/3}$ for every i and K^* (C is a universal constant). This implies, in particular, the consistency of \hat{h}_i as an estimator for $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ for every i and K^* . In Example 4.3, we provide an explicit choice of i and K^* for which $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1) \geq c(\sigma^2 R/n)^{-2/3}$ (c is a universal constant). This implies that the conclusion of the following corollary cannot in general be improved.

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose K^* is contained in some closed ball of radius R . Then for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have*

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(i) + 1} \leq C \left(\frac{\sigma^2 R}{n} \right)^{2/3} \quad (20)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq C \left(\frac{\sigma^2 R}{n} \right)^{2/3}. \quad (21)$$

for a universal positive constant C .

It is clear from the definition (18) that $k_*(i) \leq n$ for all i and K_* . In the next corollary, we prove that there exist sets K_* and i for which $k_*(i) \geq cn$ for a constant c . For these sets, the optimal rate of estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ is therefore parametric.

For a fixed i and K^* , let $\phi_1(i)$ and $\phi_2(i)$ be such that $\phi_1(i) \leq \theta_i \leq \phi_2(i)$ and such that there exists a single point $(x_1, x_2) \in K^*$ with

$$h_{K^*}(\theta) = x_1 \cos \theta + x_2 \sin \theta \quad \text{for all } \theta \in [\phi_1(i), \phi_2(i)]. \quad (22)$$

The following corollary says that if the distance of θ_i to its nearest end-point in the interval $[\phi_1(i), \phi_2(i)]$ is large (i.e., of constant order), then the optimal rate of estimation of $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ is parametric. This situation happens usually for polytopes (polytopes are compact, convex sets with finitely many vertices); see Examples 4.1 and 4.3 for specific instances of this phenomenon. For non-polytopes, it can often happen that $\phi_1(i) = \phi_2(i) = \theta_i$ in which case the conclusion of the next corollary is not useful.

Corollary 3.4. *For every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have*

$$k_*(i) \geq c n \min(\theta_i - \phi_1(i), \phi_2(i) - \theta_i, \pi) \quad (23)$$

for a universal positive constant c . Consequently

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq \frac{C\sigma^2}{1 + n \min(\theta_i - \phi_1(i), \phi_2(i) - \theta_i, \pi)} \quad (24)$$

for a universal positive constant C .

From the above two corollaries, it is clear that the optimal rate of estimation of $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ can be as large as $n^{-2/3}$ and as small as the parametric rate n^{-1} . The rate $n^{-2/3}$ is achieved, for example, in the situation demonstrated in Example 4.3 while the parametric rate is achieved, for example, for polytopes.

The next corollary argues that in order to bound $k_*(i)$ in specific examples, one only needs to bound the quantity $\Delta_k(\theta_i)$ from above and below. This corollary will be very useful in Section 4 while working out $k_*(i)$ in specific examples.

Corollary 3.5. Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $\{f_k(\theta_i), k \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and $\{g_k(\theta_i), k \in \mathcal{I}\}$ be two sequences which satisfy $g_k(\theta_i) \leq \Delta_k(\theta_i) \leq f_k(\theta_i)$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$. Also let

$$\check{k}(i) := \max \left\{ k \in \mathcal{I} : f_k(\theta_i) < \frac{(\sqrt{6} - 2)\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \right\} \quad (25)$$

and

$$\tilde{k}(i) := \min \left\{ k \in \mathcal{I} : g_k(\theta_i) > \frac{6(\sqrt{2} - 1)\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \right\} \quad (26)$$

as long as there is some $k \in \mathcal{I}$ for which $g_k(\theta_i) > 6(\sqrt{2} - 1)\sigma/\sqrt{k+1}$; otherwise take $\tilde{k}(i) := \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}} k$. We then have $\check{k}(i) \leq k_*(i) \leq \tilde{k}(i)$ and

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq C \frac{\sigma^2}{\check{k}(i) + 1} \quad (27)$$

for a universal positive constant C .

3.2 Accuracy of Set Estimators

We now turn to study the accuracy of the set estimators \hat{K} (defined in (14)) and \hat{K}' (defined in (16)). The accuracy of \hat{K} will be investigated under the loss function L_f (defined in (3)) while the accuracy of \hat{K}' will be studied under the loss function L (defined in (7)).

In Theorem 3.6 below, we prove that $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K})$ is bounded from above by a constant multiple of $n^{-4/5}$ as long as K^* is contained in a ball of radius R . The discussions following the theorem shed more light on its implications.

Theorem 3.6. If K^* is contained in some closed ball of radius $R \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) \leq C \left\{ \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \sqrt{R}}{n} \right)^{4/5} \right\} \quad (28)$$

for a universal positive constant C . Note here that $R = 0$ is allowed (in which case K^* is a singleton).

Note that as long as $R > 0$, the right hand side in (28) will be dominated by the $(\sigma^2 \sqrt{R}/n)^{4/5}$ term for all large n . This would mean that

$$\sup_{K^* \in \mathcal{K}(R)} \mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) \leq C \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \sqrt{R}}{n} \right)^{4/5} \quad (29)$$

where $\mathcal{K}(R)$ denotes the set of all compact convex sets contained in some fixed closed ball of radius R .

The minimax rate of estimation over the class $\mathcal{K}(R)$ was studied in Guntuboyina (2011). In Guntuboyina (2011, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2), it was proved that

$$\inf_{\hat{K}} \sup_{K^* \in \mathcal{K}(R)} \mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) \asymp \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \sqrt{R}}{n} \right)^{4/5} \quad (30)$$

where \asymp denotes equality upto constant multiplicative factors. From (29) and (30), it follows that \hat{K} is a minimax optimal estimator of K^* . We should mention here that an inequality of the form (29) was proved for the least squares estimator \hat{K}_{ls} by Gardner et al. (2006) which implies that \hat{K}_{ls} is also a minimax optimal estimator of K^* .

The $n^{-4/5}$ minimax rate here is quite natural in connection with estimation of smooth functions. Indeed, this is the minimax rate of estimation of twice smooth one-dimensional functions. Although we have not made any smoothness assumptions here, we are working under a convexity-based constraint and convexity is associated, in a broad sense, with twice smoothness (see, for example, Alexandrov (1939)).

Remark 3.2. Because of the formula (3) for the loss function L_f , the risk $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K})$ can be seen as the average of the risk of \hat{K} for estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ over $i = 1, \dots, n$. We have seen in Section 3.1 that the optimal rate of estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ can be as high as $n^{-2/3}$. Theorem 3.6, on the other hand, can be interpreted as saying that, on average over $i = 1, \dots, n$, the optimal rate of estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ is at most $n^{-4/5}$. Indeed, the key to proving Theorem 3.6 is to establish the following inequality:

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*(i) + 1} \leq C \left\{ \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \sqrt{R}}{n} \right)^{4/5} \right\}.$$

under the assumption that K^* is contained in a ball of radius R . Therefore, even though each term $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ can be as large as $n^{-2/3}$, on average, their size is at most $n^{-4/5}$.

Remark 3.3. Theorem 3.6 provides different qualitative conclusions when K^* is a singleton. In this case, one can take $R = 0$ in (28) to get the parametric bound $C\sigma^2/n$ for $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K})$. Because this is smaller than the nonparametric $n^{-4/5}$ rate, it means that \hat{K} adapts to singletons. Singletons are simple examples of polytopes and one naturally wonders here if \hat{K} also adapts to other polytopes as well. This is however not implied by inequality (28) which gives the rate $n^{-4/5}$ for every K^* that is not a singleton. It turns out that \hat{K} indeed adapts to other polytopes and we prove this in the next theorem. In fact, we prove that \hat{K} adapts to any K^* that is well-approximated by a polytope with not too many vertices. It is currently not known if the least squares estimator \hat{K}_{ls} has such adaptive estimation properties.

In the next theorem, we prove another bound for $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K})$. This bound demonstrates adaptive estimation properties of \hat{K} as described in the previous remark. Before stating the theorem, we need some notation. Recall that polytopes are compact, convex sets with finitely many extreme points (or vertices). The space of all polytopes in \mathbb{R}^n will be denoted by \mathcal{P} . For a polytope

$P \in \mathcal{P}$, we denote by v_P , the number of extreme points of P . Also recall the notion of Hausdorff distance between two compact, convex sets K and L defined by

$$\ell_H(K, L) := \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} |h_K(\theta) - h_L(\theta)|. \quad (31)$$

This is not the usual way of defining the Hausdorff distance. For an explanation of the connection between this and the usual definition, see, for example, Schneider (1993, Theorem 1.8.11).

Theorem 3.7. *There exists a universal positive constant C such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) \leq C \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left[\frac{\sigma^2 v_P}{n} \log \left(\frac{en}{v_P} \right) + \ell_H^2(K^*, P) \right]. \quad (32)$$

Remark 3.4 (Near-parametric rates for polytopes). The bound (32) implies that \hat{h} has the parametric rate (upto a logarithmic factor of n) for estimating polytopes. Indeed, suppose that K^* is a polytope with v vertices. Then using $P = K^*$ in the infimum in (32), we have the risk bound

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) \leq \frac{C \sigma^2 v}{n} \log \left(\frac{en}{v} \right). \quad (33)$$

This is the parametric rate $\sigma^2 v/n$ up to logarithmic factors and is smaller than the nonparametric rate $n^{-4/5}$ given in (28).

Remark 3.5. When $v = 1$, inequality (33) has a redundant logarithmic factor. Indeed, when $v = 1$, we can use (28) with $R = 0$ which gives (33) without the additional logarithmic factor. We do not know if the logarithmic factor in (33) can be removed for values of v larger than one as well.

We now turn to our second set estimator \hat{K}' . For this estimator, the next theorem provides an upper bound on its accuracy under the integral loss function L (defined in (7)). Qualitatively, the bounds on $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L(K^*, \hat{K}')$ given in the next theorem are similar to the bounds on $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K})$ proved in Theorems 3.6 and 3.7.

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose K^* is contained in some closed ball of radius $R \geq 0$. The risk $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L(K^*, \hat{K}')$ satisfies both the following inequalities:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L(K^*, \hat{K}') \leq C \left\{ \frac{\sigma^2}{n} + \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \sqrt{R}}{n} \right)^{4/5} + \frac{R^2}{n^2} \right\} \quad (34)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L(K^*, \hat{K}') \leq C \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left[\frac{\sigma^2 v_P}{n} \log \left(\frac{en}{v_P} \right) + \ell_H^2(K^*, P) + \frac{R^2}{n^2} \right]. \quad (35)$$

The only difference between the inequalities (34) and (35) on one hand and (28) and (32) on the other is the presence of the R^2/n^2 term. This term is usually very small and does not change the qualitative behavior of the bounds. However note that inequality (32) did not require any assumption on K^* being in a ball of radius R while this assumption is necessary for (35).

Remark 3.6. The rate $(\sigma^2\sqrt{R}/n)^{4/5}$ is the minimax rate for this problem under the loss function L . Although this has not been proved explicitly anywhere, it can be shown by modifying the proof of Guntuboyina (2011, Theorem 3.2) appropriately. Theorem 3.8 therefore shows that \hat{K}' is a minimax optimal estimator of K^* under the loss function L .

4 Examples

We now investigate the conclusions of the theorems of the previous section for specific choices of K^* . For calculations in the following examples, it will be useful here to note that the quantity $\Delta_k(\theta_i) = U_k(\theta_i) - L_k(\theta_i)$ has the following alternative expression:

$$\frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(\theta_i + 4j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(\theta_i - 4j\pi/n)}{2} - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n) h_{K^*}(\theta_i + 2j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(\theta_i - 2j\pi/n)}{2 \cos(2j\pi/n)} \right). \quad (36)$$

Example 4.1 (Single point). Suppose $K^* := \{(x_1, x_2)\}$ for a fixed point $(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. In this case

$$h_{K^*}(\theta) = x_1 \cos \theta + x_2 \sin \theta \quad \text{for all } \theta. \quad (37)$$

It can then be directly checked from (36) that $\Delta_k(\theta_i) = 0$ for every $k \in \mathcal{I}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. As a result, it follows that $k_*(i) = \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}} k \geq cn$ for a positive constant c .

Theorem 3.1 then says that the point estimator \hat{h}_i satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq \frac{C\sigma^2}{n} \quad (38)$$

for a universal positive constant C . One therefore gets the parametric rate here.

Also, Theorem 3.6 and inequality (34) in Theorem 3.8 can both be used here with $R = 0$. This implies that the set estimators \hat{K} and \hat{K}' both converge to K^* at the parametric rate under the loss functions L_f and L respectively.

Example 4.2 (Ball). Suppose K^* is a ball centered at (x_1, x_2) with radius $R > 0$. It is then easy to verify that

$$h_{K^*}(\theta) = x_1 \cos \theta + x_2 \sin \theta + R \quad \text{for all } \theta. \quad (39)$$

As a result, for every $k \in \mathcal{I}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$\Delta_k(\theta_i) = \frac{R}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \left(1 - \frac{\cos \frac{4\pi j}{n}}{\cos \frac{2\pi j}{n}} \right) \leq R \left(1 - \frac{\cos 4\pi k/n}{\cos 2\pi k/n} \right) = \frac{R(1 + 2 \cos 2\pi k/n)}{\cos 2\pi k/n} (1 - \cos 2\pi k/n). \quad (40)$$

Because $k \leq n/16$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$, it is easy to verify that $\Delta_k(\theta_i) \leq 8R \sin^2(\pi k/n) \leq 8R\pi^2 k^2/n^2$. Taking $f_k(\theta_i) = 8R\pi^2 k^2/n^2$ in Corollary 3.5, we obtain that $k_*(i) \geq c(n\sigma^2/R)^{2/5}$ for a constant c .

Also since the function $1 - \cos(2x)/\cos(x)$ is a strongly convex function on $[-\pi/4, \pi/4]$ with second derivative lower bounded by 3, we have

$$\Delta_k(\theta_i) = \frac{R}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \left(1 - \frac{\cos \frac{4\pi j}{n}}{\cos \frac{2\pi j}{n}} \right) \geq \frac{R}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{2\pi j}{n} \right)^2 = \frac{R\pi^2 k(2k+1)}{n^2}.$$

This gives $k_*(i) \leq C(n\sigma^2/R)^{2/5}$ as well for a constant C . We thus have $k_*(i) \asymp (n\sigma^2/R)^{2/5}$ for every i . Theorem 3.1 then gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq C \left(\frac{\sigma^2 \sqrt{R}}{n} \right)^{4/5} \quad \text{for every } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \quad (41)$$

Theorem 3.6 and inequality (34) prove that the set estimators \hat{K} and \hat{K}' also converge to K^* at the $n^{-4/5}$ rate.

In the preceding examples, we saw that the optimal rate $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ for estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ did not depend on i . Next, we consider *asymmetric* examples where the rate changes with i .

Example 4.3 (Segment). Suppose K^* is the vertical line segment joining the two points $(0, R)$ and $(0, -R)$ for a fixed $R > 0$. One then gets $h_{K^*}(\theta) = R|\sin \theta|$ for all θ . For simplicity, assume that n is even and consider $i = n/2$ so that $\theta_{n/2} = 0$. It can then be verified that

$$\Delta_k(\theta_{n/2}) = \Delta_k(0) = \frac{R}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \tan \frac{2\pi j}{n} \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Because $j \mapsto \tan(2\pi j/n)$ is increasing, we get

$$\frac{3\pi Rk}{8n} \leq \frac{R}{k+1} \left(\frac{3k}{4} + 1 \right) \tan(2\pi k/4n) \leq \Delta_k(0) \leq R \tan(2\pi k/n) \leq 2R \sin(2\pi k/n) \leq \frac{4\pi Rk}{n}.$$

Corollary 3.5 then gives

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(n/2) + 1} \asymp \left(\frac{\sigma^2 R}{n} \right)^{2/3}. \quad (42)$$

It was shown in Corollary 3.3 that the right hand side above represents the maximum possible value of $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ when K^* lies in a closed ball of radius R . Therefore this example presents the situation where estimation of $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ is the most difficult. See Remark 4.1 for the connection to smoothness of $h_{K^*}(\cdot)$ at θ_i .

Now suppose that $i = 3n/4$ (assume that $n/4$ is an integer for simplicity) so that $\theta_i = \pi/2$. Observe then that $h_{K^*}(\theta) = R \sin \theta$ (without the modulus) for $\theta = \theta_i \pm 4j\pi/n$ for every $0 \leq j \leq k, k \in \mathcal{I}$. Using (36), we have $\Delta_k(\theta_i) = 0$ for every $k \in \mathcal{I}$. This immediately gives $k_*(i) = \lfloor n/16 \rfloor$ and hence

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(3n/4) + 1} \asymp \frac{\sigma^2}{n}. \quad (43)$$

In this example, the risk for estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ changes with i . For $i = n/2$, we get the $n^{-2/3}$ rate while for $i = 3n/4$, we get the parametric rate. For other values of i , one gets a range of rates between $n^{-2/3}$ and n^{-1} .

Because K^* is a polytope with 2 vertices, Theorem 3.7 and inequality (35) imply that the set estimators \hat{K} and \hat{K}' converge at the near parametric rate $\sigma^2 \log n/n$. It is interesting to note here that even though for some θ_i , the optimal rate of estimation of $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ is $n^{-2/3}$, the entire set can be estimated at the near parametric rate.

Example 4.4 (Half-ball). Suppose $K^* := \{(x_1, x_2) : x_1^2 + x_2^2 \leq 1, x_2 \leq 0\}$. One then has $h_K(\theta) = 1$ for $-\pi \leq \theta \leq 0$ and $h_K(\theta) = |\cos \theta|$ for $0 < \theta \leq \pi$. Assume n is even and take $i = n/2$ so that $\theta_i = 0$. Then

$$\Delta_k(0) = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\frac{\cos 4\pi j/n + 1}{2} - \frac{\cos 4\pi j/n \cos 2\pi j/n + 1}{\cos 2\pi j/n} \right) = \frac{1}{2(k+1)} \sum_{j=0}^k \left(1 - \frac{\cos 4\pi j/n}{\cos 2\pi j/n} \right).$$

This is exactly as in (40) with $R = 1$ and an additional factor of $1/2$. Arguing as in Example 4.2, we obtain that

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(n/2) + 1} \asymp \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \right)^{4/5}.$$

Now take $i = 3n/4$ (assume $n/4$ is an integer) so that $\theta_i = \pi/2$. Observe then that $h_{K^*}(\theta) = |\cos \theta|$ for $\theta = \theta_i \pm 4j\pi/n$ for every $0 \leq j \leq k, k \in \mathcal{I}$. The situation is therefore similar to (42) and we obtain

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(3n/4) + 1} \asymp \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \right)^{2/3}.$$

Similar to the previous example, the risk for estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ changes with i and varies from $n^{-2/3}$ to $n^{-4/5}$. On the other hand, Theorem 3.6 states that the set estimator \hat{K} still estimates K^* at the rate $n^{-4/5}$.

Remark 4.1 (Connection between risk and smoothness). The reader may observe that the support functions (37) and (39) in the two examples above differ only by the constant R . It might then seem strange that only the addition of a non-zero constant changes the risk of estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ from n^{-1} to $n^{-4/5}$. It turns out that the function (37) is much more smoother than the function (39); the right way to view smoothness of $h_{K^*}(\cdot)$ is to regard it as a function on \mathbb{R}^2 . This is done in the following way. Define, for each $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$,

$$h_{K^*}(z) = \max_{(x_1, x_2) \in K^*} (x_1 z_1 + x_2 z_2).$$

When $z = (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, this definition coincides with our definition of $h_{K^*}(\theta)$. A standard result (see for example Corollary 1.7.3 and Theorem 1.7.4 in Schneider (1993)) states that the subdifferential of $z \mapsto h_{K^*}(z)$ exists at every $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and is given by

$$F(K^*, z) := \{(x_1, x_2) \in K^* : h_{K^*}(z) = x_1 z_1 + x_2 z_2\}.$$

In particular, $z \mapsto h_{K^*}(z)$ is differentiable at z if and only if $F(K^*, z)$ is a singleton.

This point of view of studying h_{K^*} as a function on \mathbb{R}^2 sheds qualitative light on the risk bounds obtained in the examples. In the case of Example 4.1 when $K^* = \{(x_1, x_2)\}$, it is clear that $F(K^*, z) = \{(x_1, x_2)\}$ for all z . Because this set does not change with z , this provides the case of maximum smoothness (because the derivative is constant) and thus we get the n^{-1} rate.

In Example 4.2 when K^* is a ball centered at $x = (x_1, x_2)$ with radius R , it can be checked that $F(K^*, z) = \{x + Rz/\|z\|\}$ for every $z \neq 0$. Since $F(K^*, z)$ is a singleton for each $z \neq 0$, it follows that $z \mapsto h_{K^*}(z)$ is differentiable for every z . For $R \neq 0$, the set $F(K^*, z)$ changes with z and thus here h_{K^*} is not as smooth as in Example 4.1. This explains the slower rate in Example 4.2 compared to 4.1.

Finally in Example 4.3, when K^* is the vertical segment joining $(0, R)$ and $(0, -R)$, it is easy to see that $F(K^*, z) = K^*$ when $z = (1, 0)$. Here $F(K^*, z)$ is not a singleton which implies that $h_{K^*}(z)$ is non-differentiable at $z = (1, 0)$. This is why one gets the slow rate $n^{-2/3}$ for estimating $h_{K^*}(\theta_{n/2})$ in Example 4.3.

5 Discussions

In this paper we study the problems of estimating both the support function at a point, $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$, and the convex set K^* . Data-driven adaptive estimators are constructed and their optimality is established. For pointwise estimation, the quantity $k_*(i)$, which appears in both the upper bound (17) and the lower bound (19), is related to the smoothness of $h_{K^*}(\theta)$ at $\theta = \theta_i$. The construction of \hat{h}_i is based on local smoothing together with an optimization scheme for choosing the bandwidth. Smoothing methods for estimating the support function have previously been studied by Fisher et al. (1997). Specifically, working under certain smoothness assumptions on the true support function $h_{K^*}(\theta)$, Fisher et al. (1997) estimated it using periodic versions of standard nonparametric regression techniques such as local regression, kernel smoothing and splines. They evade the problem of bandwidth selection however by assuming that the true support function is sufficiently smooth. Our estimator comes with a scheme for choosing the bandwidth automatically from the data and hence we do not need any smoothness assumptions on the true convex set.

To avoid complications, we have assumed throughout the paper that the noise level σ is known. In practice, σ is typically unknown and needs to be estimated. Under the setting of the present paper, σ is easily estimable by using the median of the consecutive differences. Let $\delta_i = Y_{2i} - Y_{2i-1}$, $i = 1, \dots, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. A simple robust estimator of the noise level σ is the following median absolute deviation (MAD) estimator:

$$\hat{\sigma} = \frac{\text{median}|\delta_i - \text{median}(\delta_i)|}{1.349}.$$

It was noted that the construction of our estimators \hat{K} and \hat{K}' given in Section 2.2 does not

involve any special treatment for polytopes; yet we obtain faster rates for polytopes. Such automatic adaptation to polytopes has been observed in other contexts: isotonic regression where one gets automatic adaptation for piecewise constant monotone functions (see Chatterjee et al. (2014)) and convex regression where one gets automatic adaptation for piecewise affine convex functions (see Guntuboyina and Sen (2013)).

Finally, we note that because $\sigma^2/(k_*(i) + 1)$ gives the optimal rate in pointwise estimation, it can potentially be used as a benchmark to evaluate other estimators for $h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ such as the least squares estimator $h_{\hat{K}_{\text{ls}}}(\theta_i)$. This however is beyond the scope of the current paper.

6 Proofs of the main results

We prove the main results in this section. Additional technical results and proofs are given in Appendix A.

6.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We provide the proof of Theorem 3.1 here. The proof uses three simple lemmas: Lemma A.1, A.2 and A.3 which are stated and proved in Appendix A.

Fix $i = 1, \dots, n$. Because $\hat{h}_i = \hat{U}_{\hat{k}(i)}(\theta_i)$, we write

$$\left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i)\right)^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\hat{U}_k(\theta_i) - h_{K^*}(\theta_i)\right)^2 I\{\hat{k}(i) = k\}$$

where $I(\cdot)$ denotes the indicator function. Taking expectations on both sides and using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i)\right)^2 \leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\hat{U}_k(\theta_i) - h_{K^*}(\theta_i))^4} \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_{K^*} \{\hat{k}(i) = k\}}.$$

The random variable $\hat{U}_k - h_{K^*}(0)$ is normally distributed and we know that $\mathbb{E}Z^4 \leq 3(\mathbb{E}Z^2)^2$ for every gaussian random variable Z . We therefore have

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i)\right)^2 \leq \sqrt{3} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{E}(\hat{U}_k(\theta_i) - h_{K^*}(\theta_i))^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_{K^*} \{\hat{k}(i) = k\}}.$$

Because $\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \hat{U}_k(\theta_i) = U_k(\theta_i)$ (defined in (9)), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} (\hat{U}_k(\theta_i) - h_{K^*}(\theta_i))^2 = (U_k(\theta_i) - h_{K^*}(\theta_i))^2 + \text{var}(\hat{U}_k(\theta_i)).$$

Because $L_k(\theta_i) \leq h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \leq U_k(\theta_i)$, it is clear that $U_k(\theta_i) - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \leq U_k(\theta_i) - L_k(\theta_i) = \Delta_k(\theta_i)$. Also, Lemma A.3 states that the variance of \hat{U}_k is at most $\sigma^2/(k+1)$. Putting these together, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i)\right)^2 \leq \sqrt{3} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k^2(\theta_i) + \frac{\sigma^2}{k+1}\right) \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_{K^*} \{\hat{k}(i) = k\}}.$$

The proof of (17) will therefore be complete if we show that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k^2(\theta_i) + \frac{\sigma^2}{k+1} \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{P}_{K^*} \{ \hat{k}(i) = k \}} \leq C \frac{\sigma^2}{k_*(i) + 1} \quad (44)$$

for a universal positive constant C .

Below, we write Δ_k, \hat{k} and k_* for $\Delta_k(\theta_i), \hat{k}(i)$ and $k_*(i)$ respectively for ease of notation. We also write \mathbb{P} for \mathbb{P}_{K^*} .

We prove (44) by considering the two cases: $k \leq k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}$ and $k > k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}$ separately.

The first case is $k \leq k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}$. By Lemma A.1 and (88), we get

$$\Delta_k \leq \Delta_{k_*} \leq \frac{6(\sqrt{2}-1)\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \leq \frac{6(\sqrt{2}-1)\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}}$$

and consequently

$$\Delta_k^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{k+1} \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{k+1} \left(36(\sqrt{2}-1)^2 + 1 \right) \quad \text{for all } k \leq k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (45)$$

We bound $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}$ by writing

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left(\hat{\Delta}_k \right)^+ + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \leq \left(\hat{\Delta}_{k_*} \right)^+ + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \left(\hat{\Delta}_{k_*} \right)^+ \geq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} - \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\}.$$

Because $k \leq k_*$, the positive part above can be dropped and we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{\Delta}_{k_*} \geq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} - \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\}.$$

Because $\hat{\Delta}_{k_*}$ is normally distributed with mean Δ_{k_*} , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ Z \geq \frac{2\sigma(k+1)^{-1/2} - 2\sigma(k_*+1)^{-1/2} - \Delta_{k_*}}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_{k_*})}} \right\},$$

where Z is a standard normal random variable. From (88), we have

$$\frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} - \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} - \Delta_{k_*} \geq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{k+1}{k_*+1}} (3\sqrt{2}-2) \right).$$

As a result,

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ Z \geq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{(k+1)\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_{k_*})}} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{k+1}{k_*+1}} (3\sqrt{2}-2) \right) \right\}.$$

Suppose

$$\tilde{k} := (k_*+1) \left(3\sqrt{2}-2 \right)^{-2} - 1.$$

For $k < \tilde{k}$, we use the bound given by Lemma A.3 on the variance of $\hat{\Delta}_{k^*}$ to obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} \leq \mathbb{P}\left\{Z \geq 2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{k_* + 1}{k + 1}} - 3\sqrt{2} + 2 \right)\right\} \leq \exp\left(-2 \left[\sqrt{\frac{k_* + 1}{k + 1}} - 3\sqrt{2} + 2 \right]^2\right).$$

Using this and (45), we see that the quantity

$$\sum_{k < \tilde{k}, k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{k + 1} \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}}$$

is bounded from above by

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{k_* + 1} \left(36(\sqrt{2} - 1)^2 + 1 \right) \sum_{k < \tilde{k}, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{k_* + 1}{k + 1} \exp\left(- \left[\sqrt{\frac{k_* + 1}{k + 1}} - 3\sqrt{2} + 2 \right]^2\right).$$

Because \mathcal{I} consists of integers of the form 2^j , it follows that for any two successive integers k_1 and k_2 in \mathcal{I} , we have $3/2 \leq (k_1 + 1)/(k_2 + 1) \leq 2$. Using this, it is easily seen that

$$\sum_{k < \tilde{k}, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{k_* + 1}{k + 1} \exp\left(- \left[\sqrt{\frac{k_* + 1}{k + 1}} - 3\sqrt{2} + 2 \right]^2\right)$$

is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{j \geq 4} 2^j \exp\left(- \left[(3/2)^{j/2} - 3\sqrt{2} + 2 \right]^2\right) + \sum_{0 \leq j \leq 3} 2^j,$$

which is just a universal positive constant. We have proved therefore that

$$\sum_{k < \tilde{k}, k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{k + 1} \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}} \leq \frac{C_1 \sigma^2}{k_* + 1}, \quad (46)$$

for a positive constant C_1 .

For $\tilde{k} \leq k \leq k_*$, we simply use (45) along with the trivial bound $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} \leq 1$ to get

$$\sum_{\tilde{k} \leq k \leq k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{k + 1} \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}} \leq \left(36(\sqrt{2} - 1)^2 + 1 \right) \frac{\sigma^2}{k_* + 1} \sum_{\tilde{k} \leq k < k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{k_* + 1}{k + 1}.$$

Once again because \mathcal{I} consists of integers of the form 2^j , we get

$$\sum_{\tilde{k} \leq k \leq k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{k_* + 1}{k + 1} \leq \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^j \left\{ (3/2)^j \leq (3\sqrt{2} - 2)^2 \right\}.$$

The right hand side above is just a constant. It follows therefore that

$$\sum_{\tilde{k} \leq k \leq k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{k + 1} \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}} \leq \frac{C_2 \sigma^2}{k_* + 1}, \quad (47)$$

for a positive constant C_2 . Combining (46) and (47), we deduce that

$$\sum_{k \leq k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{k+1} \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}} \leq \frac{C\sigma^2}{k_* + 1} \quad (48)$$

where $C := C_1 + C_2$ is a universal positive constant.

We next deal with the case $k > k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}$. Assume that $\{k \in \mathcal{I} : k > k_*\}$ is non-empty for otherwise there is nothing to prove. By the first part of (89), we get

$$\sum_{k > k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{k+1} \right) \sqrt{\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{(\sqrt{6} - 2)^2} \right) \sum_{k > k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}} \Delta_k^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}}. \quad (49)$$

We first bound $\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}$ for $k > k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}$. We proceed by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{\Delta}_k^+ + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \leq \hat{\Delta}_{k_*}^+ + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{\Delta}_k + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \leq \hat{\Delta}_{k_*}^+ + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\} \quad (\text{because } x \leq x^+) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{\Delta}_k + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \leq \hat{\Delta}_{k_*} + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\} + \mathbb{P}_K \left\{ \hat{\Delta}_k + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \leq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{\Delta}_k \leq \hat{\Delta}_{k_*} + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\} + \mathbb{P}_K \left\{ \hat{\Delta}_k \leq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ \hat{\Delta}_{k_*} - \hat{\Delta}_k \geq -\frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\} + \mathbb{P} \left\{ -\hat{\Delta}_k \geq -\frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Both $\hat{\Delta}_{k_*} - \hat{\Delta}_k$ and $\hat{\Delta}_k$ are normally distributed with means $\Delta_{k_*} - \Delta_k$ and Δ_k respectively. As a result

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ Z \geq \frac{\Delta_k - \Delta_{k_*} - 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_{k_*} - \hat{\Delta}_k)}} \right\} + \mathbb{P} \left\{ Z \geq \frac{\Delta_k - 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_k)}} \right\}$$

where Z is a standard normal random variable. Using (88), we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} \leq \mathbb{P} \left\{ Z \geq \frac{\Delta_k - 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2} (3\sqrt{2} - 2)}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_{k_*} - \hat{\Delta}_k)}} \right\} + \mathbb{P} \left\{ Z \geq \frac{\Delta_k - 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_k)}} \right\}.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma A.3, we get, for $k > k_*$,

$$\sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_{k_*} - \hat{\Delta}_k)} \leq \sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_{k_*})} + \sqrt{\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_k)} \leq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \leq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}}$$

Also $\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_k) \leq \sigma^2/(k+1) \leq \sigma^2/(k_*+1)$. Therefore if $k > k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}$ is such that

$$\Delta_k \geq 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2} (3\sqrt{2} - 2), \quad (50)$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{Z \geq \frac{\Delta_k - 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}(3\sqrt{2} - 2)}{\sigma\sqrt{2}(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}}\right\} + \mathbb{P}\left\{Z \geq \frac{\Delta_k - 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}}{\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}}\right\} \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{P}\left\{Z \geq \frac{\Delta_k - 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}(3\sqrt{2} - 2)}{\sigma\sqrt{2}(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}}\right\} \\
&\leq 2\exp\left(-\frac{k_* + 1}{2\sigma^2}\left(\Delta_k - 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}(3\sqrt{2} - 2)\right)^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality $(x - y)^2 \geq x^2/2 - y^2$ with $x = \Delta_k$ and $y = 2\sigma(k_* + 1)^{-1/2}(3\sqrt{2} - 2)$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\} \leq 2\exp\left(2(3\sqrt{2} - 2)^2\right)\exp\left(-\frac{(k_* + 1)\Delta_k^2}{4\sigma^2}\right) \quad (51)$$

whenever $k \in I, k > k_*$ satisfies (50). It is easy to see that when (50) is not satisfied, the right hand side above is larger than 2. Thus, inequality (51) is true for all $k \in \mathcal{I}, k > k_*$. As a result,

$$\Delta_k^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{P}\{\hat{k} = k\}} \leq \sqrt{2}\exp\left((3\sqrt{2} - 2)^2\right)\xi(\Delta_k^2) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathcal{I}, k > k_*. \quad (52)$$

where

$$\xi(z) := z \exp\left(-\frac{(k_* + 1)z}{8\sigma^2}\right) \quad \text{for } z > 0.$$

By (49) and (52), the proof would therefore be complete if we show that $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}: k > k_*} \xi(\Delta_k^2)$ is bounded from above by a universal positive constant. For this, note first that the function $\xi(z)$ is decreasing for $z \geq \check{z} := 8\sigma^2/(k_* + 1)$ and attains its maximum over $z > 0$ at $z = \check{z}$. Note also the second part of inequality (89) gives $\Delta_k^2 \geq z_k$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}, k > k_*$ where

$$z_k := \frac{(\sqrt{6} - 2)^2 \sigma^2 (k + 1)}{4(k_* + 1)^2}$$

We therefore get

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi(\Delta_k^2) &\leq \xi(\max(z_k, \check{z})) = \max(z_k, \check{z}) \exp\left(\frac{-(k_* + 1)\max(z_k, \check{z})}{8\sigma^2}\right) \\
&\leq \max(z_k, \check{z}) \exp\left(\frac{-(k_* + 1)z_k}{8\sigma^2}\right) \leq (z_k + \check{z}) \exp\left(\frac{-(k_* + 1)z_k}{8\sigma^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Because $k > k_*$, it is easy to see that

$$\check{z} = \frac{8\sigma^2}{k_* + 1} \leq \frac{8\sigma^2(k + 1)}{(k_* + 1)^2}.$$

We deduce that

$$\xi(\Delta_k^2) \leq \left[\frac{(\sqrt{6} - 2)^2}{4} + 8\right] \frac{\sigma^2(k + 1)}{(k_* + 1)^2} \exp\left(-\frac{(\sqrt{6} - 2)^2}{32} \frac{k + 1}{k_* + 1}\right).$$

Denoting the constants above by c_1 and c_2 , we can write

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}: k > k_*} \xi(\Delta_k^2) \leq \frac{c_1 \sigma^2}{k_* + 1} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}: k > k_*} \frac{k + 1}{k_* + 1} \exp\left(-\frac{k + 1}{c_2(k_* + 1)}\right).$$

The sum in the right hand side above is easily seen to be bounded from above by

$$\sum_{j \geq 0} 2^j \exp\left(-\frac{1}{c_2} \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^j\right)$$

which is further bounded by a universal constant. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

This subsection is dedicated to the proof of Theorem 3.2. We use Lemma A.4 which is stated and proved in Section A. We also use a classical inequality due to Le Cam (1986) which states that for every estimator \tilde{h} and compact, convex set L^* ,

$$\max \left[\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\tilde{h} - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2, \mathbb{E}_{L^*} \left(\tilde{h} - h_{L^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \right] \geq \frac{1}{4} (h_{K^*}(\theta_i) - h_{L^*}(\theta_i))^2 (1 - \|P_{K^*} - P_{L^*}\|_{TV}). \quad (53)$$

Here P_{L^*} is the product of the Gaussian probability measures with mean $h_{L^*}(\theta_i)$ and variance σ^2 for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Also $\|P - Q\|_{TV}$ denotes the total variation distance between P and Q .

For ease of notation, we assume, without loss of generality, that $\theta_i = 0$. We also write Δ_k for $\Delta_k(\theta_i)$ and k_* for $k_*(i)$.

Suppose first that K^* satisfies the following condition: There exists some $\alpha \in (0, \pi/4)$ such that

$$\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha} - h_{K^*}(0) > \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_\alpha}} \quad (54)$$

where n_α denotes the number of integers i for which $-\alpha < 2i\pi/n < \alpha$. This condition will not be satisfied, for example, when K^* is a singleton. We shall handle such K^* later. Observe that $n_\alpha \geq 1$ for all $0 < \alpha < \pi/4$ because we can take $i = 0$.

Let us define, for each $\alpha \in (0, \pi/4)$,

$$a_{K^*}^*(\alpha) := \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha}, \frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) - h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \sin \alpha} \right).$$

and let $L^* = L^*(\alpha)$ be defined as the smallest convex set that contains both K^* and the point $a_{K^*}^*(\alpha)$. In other words, L^* is the convex hull of $K^* \cup \{a_{K^*}^*(\alpha)\}$.

We now use Le Cam's inequality (53). To control the total variation distance in the right hand side of (53), we use Pinsker's inequality:

$$\|P_{K^*} - P_{L^*}\|_{TV} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} D(P_{K^*} \| P_{L^*})},$$

and the fact that (note that $\theta_i = 2\pi i/n - \pi$)

$$D(P_{K^*} \| P_{L^*}) = \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (h_{K^*}(2i\pi/n - \pi) - h_{L^*}(2i\pi/n - \pi))^2.$$

The support function of L^* is easily seen to be the maximum of the support functions of K^* and the singleton $\{a_{K^*}(\alpha)\}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{L^*}(\theta) &:= \max \left(h_{K^*}(\theta), \frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha} \cos \theta + \frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) - h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \sin \alpha} \sin \theta \right) \\ &= \max \left(h_{K^*}(\theta), \frac{\sin(\theta + \alpha)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(\alpha) + \frac{\sin(\alpha - \theta)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(-\alpha) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using (1), it can be shown that

$$h_{K^*}(\theta) \leq \frac{\sin(\theta + \alpha)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(\alpha) + \frac{\sin(\alpha - \theta)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(-\alpha) \quad \text{for } -\alpha < \theta < \alpha, \quad (55)$$

and

$$h_{K^*}(\theta) \geq \frac{\sin(\theta + \alpha)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(\alpha) + \frac{\sin(\alpha - \theta)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(-\alpha) \quad \text{for } \theta \in [-\pi, -\alpha] \cup [\alpha, \pi]. \quad (56)$$

To see this, assume that $\theta > 0$ without loss of generality. We then work with the two separate cases $\theta \in [0, \alpha]$ and $\theta \in [\alpha, \pi]$. In the first case, apply (1) with $\alpha_1 = \alpha, \alpha = \theta$ and $\alpha_2 = -\alpha$ to get (55). In the second case, apply (1) with $\alpha_1 = \theta, \alpha = \alpha$ and $\alpha_2 = -\alpha$ to get (56).

As a result of (55) and (56), we get that

$$h_{L^*}(\theta) = \frac{\sin(\theta + \alpha)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(\alpha) + \frac{\sin(\alpha - \theta)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(-\alpha) \quad \text{for } -\alpha < \theta < \alpha,$$

and that $h_{L^*}(\theta)$ equals $h_{K^*}(\theta)$ for every other θ in $(-\pi, \pi]$.

We now give an upper bound on $h_{L^*}(\theta) - h_{K^*}(\theta)$ for $0 \leq \theta < \alpha$. Using (1) with $\alpha_1 = \theta, \alpha = 0$ and $\alpha_2 = -\alpha$, we obtain

$$h_{K^*}(\theta) \geq \frac{\sin(\alpha + \theta)}{\sin \alpha} h_{K^*}(0) - \frac{\sin \theta}{\sin \alpha} h_{K^*}(-\alpha).$$

Thus for $0 \leq \theta < \alpha$, we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq h_{L^*}(\theta) - h_{K^*}(\theta) &= \frac{\sin(\theta + \alpha)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(\alpha) + \frac{\sin(\alpha - \theta)}{\sin 2\alpha} h_{K^*}(-\alpha) - h_{K^*}(\theta) \\ &\leq \frac{\sin(\theta + \alpha)}{\sin \alpha} \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha} - h_{K^*}(0) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Because $0 < \alpha < \pi/4, 0 \leq \theta \leq \alpha$, we use the fact that the sine function is increasing on $(0, \pi/2)$ to deduce that

$$0 \leq h_{L^*}(\theta) - h_{K^*}(\theta) \leq \frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha} - h_{K^*}(0) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq \theta < \alpha.$$

One can similarly deduce the same inequality for the case $-\alpha < \theta \leq 0$ as well.

Because of this and the fact that $h_{L^*}(\theta)$ equals $h_{K^*}(\theta)$ for all θ in $(-\pi, \pi]$ that are not in the interval $(-\alpha, \alpha)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} D(P_{K^*} || P_{L^*}) &= \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^n (h_{K^*}(2i\pi/n - \pi) - h_{L^*}(2i\pi/n - \pi))^2 \\ &\leq \frac{n\alpha}{2\sigma^2} \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha} - h_{K^*}(0) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Also because $h_{L^*}(0) = (h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha))/(2 \cos \alpha)$, we obtain, by (53), that

$$r \geq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha} - h_{K^*}(0) \right)^2 \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{n_\alpha}{4\sigma^2}} \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha} - h_{K^*}(0) \right) \right) \quad (57)$$

for every $0 < \alpha < \pi/4$ where

$$r := \inf_{\tilde{h}} \max \left[\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\tilde{h} - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2, \mathbb{E}_{L^*} \left(\tilde{h} - h_{L^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \right] \quad (58)$$

where the infimum above is over all estimators \tilde{h} . Let us now define α_* by

$$\alpha_* := \inf \left\{ 0 < \alpha < \pi/4 : \frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha} - h_{K^*}(0) > \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_\alpha}} \right\}.$$

Note first that $\alpha_* > 0$ because $n_\alpha \geq 1$ for all α and thus for α very small while the quantity $(h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha))/(2 \cos \alpha) - h_{K^*}(0)$ becomes close to 0 for small α (by continuity of $h_{K^*}(\cdot)$).

Also because we have assumed (54), it follows that $0 < \alpha_* < \pi/4$. Now for each $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have

$$\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha_* - \epsilon) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha_* + \epsilon)}{2 \cos(\alpha_* - \epsilon)} - h_{K^*}(0) \leq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_{\alpha_* - \epsilon}}}.$$

Letting $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ in the above and using the fact that $n_{\alpha_* - \epsilon} \rightarrow n_{\alpha_*}$ and the continuity of h_{K^*} , we deduce

$$\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha_*) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha_*)}{2 \cos \alpha_*} - h_{K^*}(0) \leq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_{\alpha_*}}}. \quad (59)$$

Because $0 < \alpha_* < \pi/4$, by the definition of the infimum, there exists a decreasing sequence $\{\alpha_k\} \in (0, \pi/4)$ converging to α_* such that

$$\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha_k) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha_k)}{2 \cos \alpha_k} - h_{K^*}(0) > \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_{\alpha_k}}} \quad \text{for all } k.$$

For k large, n_{α_k} is either n_{α_*} or $n_{\alpha_*} + 2$, and hence letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha_*) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha_*)}{2 \cos \alpha_*} - h_{K^*}(0) \geq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_{\alpha_*} + 2}} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_{\alpha_*}}},$$

where we also used that $n_{\alpha_*} \geq 1$. Combining the above with (59), we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_{\alpha_*}}} \leq \frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha_*) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha_*)}{2 \cos \alpha_*} - h_{K^*}(0) \leq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n_{\alpha_*}}}.$$

Using $\alpha = \alpha_*$ in (57), we get

$$r \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{24n_{\alpha_*}}. \quad (60)$$

We shall now show that

$$\alpha_* \leq \tilde{\alpha} := \frac{8(k_* + 1)\pi}{n} \quad (61)$$

when $8(k_* + 1)\pi/n \leq \pi/4$ (otherwise (61) is obvious). This would imply, because $\alpha \mapsto n_\alpha$ is non-decreasing, that

$$n_{\alpha_*} \leq n_{\tilde{\alpha}} = \frac{n\tilde{\alpha}}{\pi} - 1 = 8k_* + 7.$$

This and (60) would give

$$r \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{24(8k_* + 7)} \geq \frac{c\sigma^2}{k_* + 1}$$

for a positive constant c . This would prove the theorem when assumption (54) is true.

To prove (61), we only need to show that

$$\frac{h_{K^*}(\tilde{\alpha}) + h_{K^*}(-\tilde{\alpha})}{2 \cos \tilde{\alpha}} - h_{K^*}(0) > \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n\tilde{\alpha}}} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{8k_* + 7}}. \quad (62)$$

We verify this via Lemma A.4 on a case-by-case basis. When $k_* = 0$, we have $\tilde{\alpha} = 8\pi/n$ so that, by Lemma A.4, the left hand side above is bounded from below by Δ_2 . Because k_* is zero, by definition of k_* , we have

$$\Delta_2 + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{3}} \geq \Delta_0 + 2\sigma = 2\sigma.$$

This gives $\Delta_2 \geq 2\sigma(1 - (1/\sqrt{3}))$ which can be verified to be larger than $\sigma/\sqrt{8k_* + 7} = \sigma/\sqrt{7}$.

When $k_* = 1$, we have $\tilde{\alpha} = 16\pi/n$ so that, by Lemma A.4, the left hand side in (62) is bounded from below by Δ_4 . Because $k_* = 1$, by definition of k_* , we have

$$\Delta_4 + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{5}} \geq \Delta_1 + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{2}} \geq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{2}}$$

which gives $\Delta_4 \geq 2\sigma((1/\sqrt{2}) - (1/\sqrt{5}))$. This can be verified to be larger than $\sigma/\sqrt{8k_* + 7} = \sigma/\sqrt{15}$.

When $k_* \geq 2$, we again use Lemma A.4 to argue that the left hand side in (62) is bounded from below by $\Delta_{2(k_*+1)}$. Because Δ_k is increasing in k (Lemma A.1), we have $\Delta_{2(k_*+1)} \geq \Delta_{2k_*}$. By the definition of k_* (and the fact that $\Delta_{k_*} \geq 0$), we have

$$\Delta_{2k_*} \geq \frac{2\sigma}{k_* + 1} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{k_* + 1}{2k_* + 1}} \right).$$

Because $k_* \geq 2$, it can be easily checked that $(k_* + 1)/(2k_* + 1) \leq 3/5$ and $(8k_* + 7)/(k_* + 1) \geq 23/3$. These, together with the fact that $2(1 - \sqrt{3/5})\sqrt{23/3} > 1$, imply (62). This completes the proof of the theorem when assumption (54) holds.

We now deal with the simpler case when (54) is violated. When (54) is violated, we first show that

$$k_* > \frac{12n}{16(1 + 2\sqrt{3})^2} - 1. \quad (63)$$

To see this, note first that, because (54) is violated, we have

$$\frac{h_{K^*}(\alpha) + h_{K^*}(-\alpha)}{2 \cos \alpha} - h_{K^*}(0) \leq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n\alpha}} \leq \sigma \left(\frac{n\alpha}{\pi} - 1 \right)^{-1/2}$$

for all $\alpha \in (0, \pi/4]$. Lemma A.4 implies that for every $1 \leq k \leq n/16$, we get

$$\Delta_k \leq \frac{h_{K^*}(4k\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(-4k\pi/n)}{2 \cos 4k\pi/n} - h_{K^*}(0) \leq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{4k-1}} \leq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{3k}}.$$

Now for every

$$k \leq \frac{12n}{16(1+2\sqrt{3})^2} - 1, \quad (64)$$

we have

$$\Delta_k + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \geq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \geq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{3n/16}} + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{n/16}} > \Delta_{n/16} + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{n/16+1}}.$$

It follows therefore that any k satisfying (64) cannot be a minimizer of $\Delta_k + 2\sigma(k+1)^{-1/2}$, thereby implying (63).

Let L^* be defined as the Minkowski sum of K^* and the closed ball with center 0 and radius $\sigma(3n/2)^{-1/2}$. In other words, $L^* := \{x + \sigma(3n/2)^{-1/2}y : x \in K \text{ and } \|y\| \leq 1\}$. The support function L^* can be checked to equal:

$$h_{L^*}(\theta) = h_{K^*}(\theta) + \sigma(3n/2)^{-1/2}.$$

Le Cam's bound again gives

$$r \geq \frac{1}{4} (h_{K^*}(0) - h_{L^*}(0))^2 \{1 - \|P_{K^*} - P_{L^*}\|_{TV}\} \quad (65)$$

where r is as defined in (58). By use of Pinsker's inequality, we have

$$\|P_{K^*} - P_{L^*}\|_{TV} \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (h_K(2i\pi/n - \pi) - h_{\hat{K}}(2i\pi/n - \pi))^2} = \frac{1}{2\sigma} \sqrt{\frac{n\sigma^2}{3n/2}} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, from (65) and (63), we get that

$$r \geq \frac{\sigma^2}{12n} \geq \frac{1}{16(1+2\sqrt{3})^2} \frac{\sigma^2}{k_* + 1}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.2.

6.3 Proof of Theorem 3.6

Recall the definition of \tilde{h}^P in (13) and the definition of the estimator \hat{K} in (14). The first thing to note is that

$$h_{\hat{K}}(\theta_i) = \hat{h}_i^P \quad \text{for every } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (66)$$

To see this, observe first that, because $\hat{h}^P = (\hat{h}_1^P, \dots, \hat{h}_n^P)$ is a valid support vector, there exists a set \tilde{K} with $h_{\tilde{K}}(\theta_i) = \hat{h}_i^P$ for every i . It is now trivial (from the definition of \hat{K}) to see that $\tilde{K} \subseteq \hat{K}$ which implies that $h_{\hat{K}(\theta_i)} \geq h_{\tilde{K}}(\theta_i) = \hat{h}_i^P$. On the other hand, the definition of \hat{K} immediately gives $h_{\hat{K}}(\theta_i) \leq \hat{h}_i^P$.

The observation (66) immediately gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) = \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (h_{K^*}(\theta_i) - \hat{h}_i^P)^2$$

It will be convenient here to introduce the following notation. Let $h_{K^*}^{vec}$ denote the vector $(h_{K^*}(\theta_1), \dots, h_{K^*}(\theta_n))$. Also, for $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\ell(u, v)$ denote the scaled Euclidean distance defined by $\ell^2(u, v) := \sum_{i=1}^n (u_i - v_i)^2/n$. With this notation, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) = \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \ell^2(h_{K^*}^{vec}, \hat{h}^P). \quad (67)$$

Recall that \hat{h}^P is the projection of $\hat{h} := (\hat{h}_1, \dots, \hat{h}_n)$ onto \mathcal{H} . Because \mathcal{H} is a closed convex subset of \mathbb{R}^n , it follows that (see, for example, Stark and Yang (1998))

$$\ell^2(h, \hat{h}) \geq \ell^2(\hat{h}, \hat{h}^P) + \ell^2(h, \hat{h}^P) \quad \text{for every } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

In particular, with $h = h_{K^*}^{vec}$, we obtain $\ell^2(h_{K^*}^{vec}, \hat{h}^P) \leq \ell^2(h_{K^*}^{vec}, \hat{h})$. Combining this with (67), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) \leq \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \ell^2(h_{K^*}^{vec}, \hat{h}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2. \quad (68)$$

In Theorem 3.1, we proved that

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq \frac{C\sigma^2}{k_*(i) + 1} \quad \text{for every } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) \leq \frac{C\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*(i) + 1}.$$

For inequality (28), it is therefore enough to prove that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*(i) + 1} \leq C \left\{ 1 + \left(\frac{R\sqrt{n}}{\sigma} \right)^{2/5} \right\}. \quad (69)$$

Our following proof of (69) is inspired by an argument due to Zhang (2002, Theorem 2.1) in a very different context.

Recall that $k_*(i)$ takes values in $\mathcal{I} := \{0\} \cup \{2^j : j \geq 0, 2^j \leq \lfloor n/16 \rfloor\}$. For $k \in \mathcal{I}$, let

$$\rho(k) := \sum_{i=1}^n I\{k_*(i) = k\} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(k) := \sum_{i=1}^n I\{k_*(i) < k\}$$

Note that $\ell(0) = 0$, $\ell(1) = \rho(0)$ and $\rho(k) = \ell(2k) - \ell(k)$ for $k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}$. As a result

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*(i) + 1} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\rho(k)}{k + 1} = \ell(1) + \sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\ell(2k) - \ell(k)}{k + 1}.$$

Let K denote the maximum element of \mathcal{I} . Because $\ell(2K) = n$, we can write

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*(i) + 1} = \frac{n}{K + 1} + \frac{\ell(1)}{2} + \sum_{k \geq 2, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{k\ell(k)}{(k + 1)(k + 2)}.$$

Using $n/(K+1) \leq C$ and loose bounds for the other terms above, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*(i)+1} \leq C + \sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{3\ell(k)}{k}. \quad (70)$$

We shall show below that

$$\ell(k) \leq \min \left(n, \frac{ARk^{5/2}}{\sigma n} \right) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathcal{I} \quad (71)$$

for a universal positive constant A . Before that, let us first prove (69) assuming (71). Assuming (71), we can write

$$\sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\ell(k)}{k} = \sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\ell(k)}{k} I \left\{ k \leq \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{2/5} \right\} + \sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\ell(k)}{k} I \left\{ k > \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{2/5} \right\} \quad (72)$$

In the first term on the right hand side above, we use the bound $\ell(k) \leq ARk^{5/2}/(\sigma n)$. We then get

$$\sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\ell(k)}{k} I \left\{ k \leq \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{2/5} \right\} \leq \frac{AR}{\sigma n} \sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} k^{3/2} I \left\{ k \leq \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{2/5} \right\}.$$

Because \mathcal{I} consists of integers of the form 2^j , the sum in the right hand side above is bounded from above by a constant multiple of the last term. This gives

$$\sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\ell(k)}{k} I \left\{ k \leq \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{2/5} \right\} \leq \frac{CR}{\sigma n} \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{3/5} = C \left(\frac{R\sqrt{n}}{\sigma} \right)^{2/5} \quad (73)$$

For the second term on the right hand side in (72), we use the bound $\ell(k) \leq n$ which gives

$$\sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\ell(k)}{k} I \left\{ k > \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{2/5} \right\} \leq n \sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} k^{-1} I \left\{ k > \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{2/5} \right\}$$

Again, because \mathcal{I} consists of integers of the form 2^j , the sum in the right hand side above is bounded from above by a constant multiple of the first term. This gives

$$\sum_{k \geq 1, k \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{\ell(k)}{k} I \left\{ k > \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{2/5} \right\} \leq Cn \left(\frac{\sigma n^2}{AR} \right)^{-2/5} = C \left(\frac{R\sqrt{n}}{\sigma} \right)^{2/5}. \quad (74)$$

Inequalities (73) and (74) in conjunction with (70) proves (69) which would complete the proof of (28).

We only need to prove (71). For this, observe first that when $k_*(i) < k$, Corollary 3.5 gives that

$$\Delta_k(\theta_i) \geq \frac{(\sqrt{6}-2)\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}}. \quad (75)$$

This is because if (75) is violated, then Corollary 3.5 gives $k \leq \check{k}(i) \leq k_*(i)$. Consequently, we have

$$I\{k_*(i) < k\} \leq \frac{\Delta_k(\theta_i)\sqrt{k+1}}{(\sqrt{6}-2)\sigma}$$

and

$$\ell(k) \leq \frac{\sqrt{k+1}}{(\sqrt{6}-2)\sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_k(\theta_i) \quad \text{for every } k \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (76)$$

Now using the expression (36) for $\Delta_k(\theta_i)$, it is easy to see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_k(\theta_i) = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \delta_j \quad (77)$$

where δ_j is given by

$$\delta_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(\theta_i + 4j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(\theta_i - 4j\pi/n)}{2} - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \frac{h_{K^*}(\theta_i + 2j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(\theta_i - 2j\pi/n)}{2} \right).$$

We will now prove an upper bound for δ_j under the assumption that K^* is contained in a ball of radius $R \geq 0$. We may assume without loss of generality that this ball is centered at the origin because the expression for δ_j above remains unchanged if $h_{K^*}(\theta)$ is replaced by $h_{K^*}(\theta) - a_1 \cos \theta - a_2 \sin \theta$ for any $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Because $\theta_i = 2\pi i/n - \pi$, we can rewrite δ_j as

$$\delta_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(\theta_{i+2j}) + h_{K^*}(\theta_{i-2j})}{2} - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \frac{h_{K^*}(\theta_{i+j}) + h_{K^*}(\theta_{i-j})}{2} \right).$$

Because $\theta \mapsto h_{K^*}(\theta)$ is a periodic function of period 2π , the above expression only depends on $h_{K^*}(\theta_1), \dots, h_{K^*}(\theta_n)$. In fact, it is easy to see that

$$\delta_j = \left(1 - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n h_{K^*}(\theta_i).$$

Now because K^* is contained in the ball of radius R centered at the origin, it follows that $|h_{K^*}(\theta_i)| \leq R$ for each i which gives

$$\delta_j \leq nR \left(1 - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \right) \leq nR \left(1 - \frac{\cos(4k\pi/n)}{\cos(2k\pi/n)} \right) = \frac{nR(1 + 2\cos 2\pi k/n)}{\cos 2\pi k/n} (1 - \cos 2\pi k/n)$$

for all $0 \leq j \leq k$. Because $k \leq n/16$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$, it follows that

$$\delta_j \leq 8nR \sin^2(\pi k/n) \leq \frac{8R\pi^2 k^2}{n} \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq j \leq k.$$

The identity (77) therefore gives $\sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_k(\theta_i) \leq 8R\pi^2 k^2/n$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$. Consequently, from (76) and the trivial fact that $\ell(k) \leq n$, we obtain

$$\ell(k) \leq \min \left(n, \frac{8\pi^2}{(\sqrt{6}-2)} \frac{Rk^2 \sqrt{k+1}}{\sigma n} \right) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Note that $\ell(0) = 0$ so that the above inequality only gives something useful for $k \geq 1$. Using $k+1 \leq 2k$ for $k \geq 1$ and denoting the resulting constant by C , we obtain (71). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.6.

6.4 Proof of Theorem 3.7

The following lemma will be crucially used in our proof of Theorem 3.7. For every compact, convex set P and $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $k_*^P(i)$ denote the quantity k_* with K^* replaced by P . More precisely,

$$k_*^P(i) := \operatorname{argmin}_{k \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\Delta_k^P(\theta_i) + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \right)$$

where $\Delta_k^P(\theta_i)$ is given by

$$\frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\frac{h_P(\theta_i + 4j\pi/n) + h_P(\theta_i - 4j\pi/n)}{2} - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \frac{h_P(\theta_i + 2j\pi/n) + h_P(\theta_i - 2j\pi/n)}{2} \right).$$

The next lemma states that for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, the risk $\mathbb{E}_{K^*}(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i))^2$ can be bounded from above by a combination of $k_*^P(i)$ and how well K^* can be approximated by P . This result holds for every P . The approximation of K^* by P is measured in terms of the Hausdorff distance (defined in (31)).

Lemma 6.1 (Approximation). *There exists a universal positive constant C such that for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every compact, convex set P , we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq C \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{k_*^P(i) + 1} + \ell_H^2(K^*, P) \right). \quad (78)$$

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and a compact, convex set P . For notational convenience, we write $\Delta_k, \Delta_k^P, k_*$ and k_*^P for $\Delta_k(\theta_i), \Delta_k^P(\theta_i), k_*(\theta_i)$ and $k_*^P(\theta_i)$ respectively.

We assume that the following condition holds:

$$k_*^P + 1 \geq \frac{24(\sqrt{2} - 1)}{\sqrt{6} - 2} (k_* + 1). \quad (79)$$

If this condition does not hold, we have

$$\frac{1}{k_* + 1} < \frac{24(\sqrt{2} - 1)}{\sqrt{6} - 2} \frac{1}{k_*^P + 1}$$

and then (6.1) immediately follows from Theorem 3.1.

Note that (79) implies, in particular, that $k_*^P > k_*$. Inequality (89) in Lemma A.2 applied to $k = k_*^P$ implies therefore that

$$\Delta_{k_*^P} \geq \frac{(\sqrt{6} - 2)\sqrt{k_*^P + 1}\sigma}{2(k_* + 1)}.$$

Also inequality (88) applied to the set P instead of K^* gives

$$\Delta_{k_*^P}^P \leq \frac{6(\sqrt{2} - 1)\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*^P + 1}}.$$

Combining the above pair of inequalities, we obtain

$$\Delta_{k_*^P} - \Delta_{k_*^P}^P \geq \frac{(\sqrt{6} - 2)\sqrt{k_*^P + 1}\sigma}{2(k_* + 1)} - \frac{6(\sqrt{2} - 1)\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*^P + 1}}.$$

The right hand above is non-decreasing in $k_*^P + 1$ and so we can replace $k_*^P + 1$ by the lower bound in (79) to obtain, after some simplification,

$$\Delta_{k_*^P} - \Delta_{k_*^P}^P \geq \frac{\sigma}{4\sqrt{k_* + 1}} \sqrt{24(\sqrt{2} - 1)(\sqrt{6} - 2)}. \quad (80)$$

The key now is to observe that

$$|\Delta_k - \Delta_k^P| \leq 2\ell_H(K^*, P) \quad \text{for all } k. \quad (81)$$

This follows from the definition (31) of the Hausdorff distance which gives

$$|\Delta_k - \Delta_k^P| \leq \ell_H(K^*, P) \left(1 + \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \right)$$

and this clearly implies (81) because $\cos(4j\pi/n)/\cos(2j\pi/n) \leq 1$ for all $0 \leq j \leq k$.

From (81) and (80), we deduce that

$$\ell_H(K^*, P) \geq \frac{c\sigma}{\sqrt{k_* + 1}}$$

for a universal positive constant c . This, together with inequality (17), clearly implies (78) which completes the proof. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.7.

Proof of Theorem 3.7. We use inequality (68) from the proof of Theorem 3.6. This inequality, along with (78) for $i = 1, \dots, n$, gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 \leq C \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*^P(i) + 1} + \ell_H^2(K^*, P) \right)$$

for every compact, convex set P . By restricting P to be in the class of polytopes, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L_f(K^*, \hat{K}) \leq C \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*^P(i) + 1} + \ell_H^2(K^*, P) \right).$$

For the proof of (32), it is therefore enough to show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*^P(i) + 1} \leq C v_P \log(en/v_P) \quad \text{for every } P \in \mathcal{P} \quad (82)$$

where v_P denotes the number of extreme points of P and C is a universal positive constant. Fix a polytope P with $v_P = k$. Let the extreme points of P be z_1, \dots, z_k . Let S_1, \dots, S_k denote a partition of $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n\}$ into k nonempty sets such that for each $j = 1, \dots, k$, we have

$$h_P(\theta_i) = z_j(1) \cos \theta_i + z_j(2) \sin \theta_i \quad \text{for all } \theta_i \in S_j$$

where $z_j = (z_j(1), z_j(2))$. For (82), it is enough to prove that

$$\sum_{i:\theta_i \in S_j} \frac{1}{k_*^P(i) + 1} \leq C \log(en_j) \quad \text{for every } j = 1, \dots, k \quad (83)$$

where n_j is the cardinality of S_j . This is because we can write

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{k_*^P(i) + 1} = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i:\theta_i \in S_j} \frac{1}{k_*^P(i) + 1} \leq C \sum_{j=1}^k \log(en_j) \leq Ck \log(en/k)$$

where we used the concavity of $x \mapsto \log(ex)$. We prove (83) below. Fix $1 \leq j \leq k$. The inequality is obvious if S_j is a singleton because $k_*^P(i) \geq 0$. So suppose that $n_j = m \geq 2$. Without loss of generality assume that $S_j = \{\theta_{u+1}, \dots, \theta_{u+m}\}$ where $0 \leq u \leq n - m$. The definition of S_j implies that

$$h_P(\theta) = z_j(1) \cos \theta + z_j(2) \sin \theta \quad \text{for all } \theta \in [\theta_{u+1}, \theta_{u+m}].$$

We can therefore apply inequality (23) to claim the existence of a positive constant c such that

$$k_*^P(i) \geq c n \min(\theta_i - \theta_{u+1}, \theta_{u+m} - \theta_i) \quad \text{for all } u+1 \leq i \leq u+m.$$

The minimum with π in (23) is redundant here because $\theta_{u+m} - \theta_{u+1} < 2\pi$. Because $\theta_i = 2\pi i/n - \pi$, we get

$$k_*^P(i) \geq 2\pi c \min(i - u - 1, u + m - i) \quad \text{for all } u+1 \leq i \leq u+m.$$

Therefore, there exists a universal constant C such that

$$\sum_{i:\theta_i \in S_j} \frac{1}{k_*^P(i) + 1} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{1 + \min(i-1, m-i)} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{i} \leq C \log(em).$$

This proves (83) thereby completing the proof of Theorem 3.7. \square

6.5 Proof of Theorem 3.8

Recall the definition (16) of the estimator \hat{K}' and that of the interpolating function (15). Following an argument similar to that used at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 3.6, we observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L(K^*, \hat{K}') \leq \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(h_{K^*}(\theta) - \hat{h}'(\theta) \right)^2 d\theta = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\theta_i}^{\theta_{i+1}} \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(h_{K^*}(\theta) - \hat{h}'(\theta) \right)^2 d\theta \quad (84)$$

Now fix $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\theta_i \leq \theta \leq \theta_{i+1}$ and let $u(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(h_{K^*}(\theta) - \hat{h}'(\theta) \right)^2$. Using the expression (15) for $\hat{h}'(\theta)$, we get that

$$u(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(h_{K^*}(\theta) - \frac{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} \hat{h}_i - \frac{\sin(\theta - \theta_i)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} \hat{h}_{i+1} \right)^2.$$

We now write $\hat{h}_i = \hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) + h_{K^*}(\theta_i)$ and a similar expression for \hat{h}_{i+1} . The elementary inequality $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)$ along with $\max(\sin(\theta - \theta_i), \sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta)) \leq \sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)$ then imply that

$$u(\theta) \leq 3\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 + 3\mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_{i+1} - h_{K^*}(\theta_{i+1}) \right)^2 + 3b^2(\theta)$$

where

$$b(\theta) := h_{K^*}(\theta) - \frac{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} h_{K^*}(\theta_i) - \frac{\sin(\theta - \theta_i)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} h_{K^*}(\theta_{i+1})$$

Therefore from (84) (remember that $|\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i| = 2\pi/n$), we deduce

$$\mathbb{E}_{K^*} L(K^*, \hat{K}') \leq \frac{12\pi}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2 + 3 \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} b^2(\theta) d\theta.$$

Now to bound $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{K^*} \left(\hat{h}_i - h_{K^*}(\theta_i) \right)^2$, we can simply use the arguments from the proofs of Theorems 3.6 and 3.7. Therefore, to complete the proof of Theorem 3.8, we only need to show that

$$|b(\theta)| \leq \frac{CR}{n} \quad \text{for every } \theta \in (-\pi, \pi] \quad (85)$$

for some universal constant C . For this, we use the hypothesis that K^* is contained in a ball of radius R . Suppose that the center of the ball is (x_1, x_2) . Define $K' := K^* - \{(x_1, x_2)\} := \{(y_1, y_2) - (x_1, x_2) : (y_1, y_2) \in K^*\}$ and note that $h_{K'}(\theta) = h_{K^*}(\theta) - x_1 \cos \theta - x_2 \sin \theta$. It is then easy to see that $b(\theta)$ is the same for both K^* and K' . It is therefore enough to prove (85) assuming that $(x_1, x_2) = (0, 0)$. In this case, it is straightforward to see that $|h_{K^*}(\theta)| \leq R$ for all θ and also that h_{K^*} is Lipschitz with constant R . Now, because $\max(\sin(\theta - \theta_i), \sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta)) \leq \sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)$, it can be checked that

$$|b(\theta)| \leq |h_{K^*}(\theta)| \left| 1 - \frac{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} - \frac{\sin(\theta - \theta_i)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} \right| + |h_{K^*}(\theta_i) - h_{K^*}(\theta)| + |h_{K^*}(\theta_{i+1}) - h_{K^*}(\theta)|.$$

Because h_{K^*} is R -Lipschitz and bounded by R , it is clear that we only need to show

$$\left| 1 - \frac{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} - \frac{\sin(\theta - \theta_i)}{\sin(\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)} \right| \leq \frac{C}{n}$$

in order to prove (85). For this, write $\alpha = \theta_{i+1} - \theta$ and $\beta = \theta - \theta_i$ so that the above expression becomes

$$\left| 1 - \frac{\sin \alpha + \sin \beta}{\sin(\alpha + \beta)} \right| \leq |1 - \cos \alpha| + |1 - \cos \beta| \leq \frac{\alpha^2 + \beta^2}{2} \leq \frac{C}{n^2} \leq \frac{C}{n}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.8.

6.6 Proofs of Corollaries in Section 3.1

The proofs of the corollaries stated in Section 3.1 are given here. For these proofs, we need some simple properties of the $\Delta_k(\theta_i)$ which are stated and proved in Appendix A.

We start with the proof of Corollary 3.5.

Proof of Corollary 3.5. Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$. We will prove that $\check{k}(i) \leq k_*(i) \leq \tilde{k}(i)$. Inequality (27) would then follow from Theorem 3.1. For simplicity, we write Δ_k for $\Delta_k(\theta_i)$, f_k for $f_k(\theta_i)$, g_k for $g_k(\theta_i)$, k_* for $k_*(i)$, \check{k} for $\check{k}(i)$ and \tilde{k} for $\tilde{k}(i)$.

Inequality (89) in Lemma A.2 gives

$$\Delta_k \geq \frac{\sigma(\sqrt{6}-2)}{\sqrt{k+1}} \quad \text{for all } k > k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Thus any $k \in \mathcal{I}$ for which $f_k \leq \Delta_k < \sigma(\sqrt{6}-2)/\sqrt{k+1}$ has to satisfy $k \leq k_*$. This proves $\check{k} \leq k_*$.

For $k_* \leq \tilde{k}$, we first inequality (88) in Lemma A.2 to obtain $\Delta_{k_*} \geq 6(\sqrt{2}-1)\sigma/\sqrt{k_*+1}$. Also Lemma A.1 states that $k \mapsto \Delta_k$ is non-decreasing for $k \in \mathcal{I}$. We therefore have

$$g_k \leq \Delta_k \leq \Delta_{k_*} \leq \frac{6(\sqrt{2}-1)\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \leq \frac{6(\sqrt{2}-1)\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \quad \text{for all } k \leq k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Therefore any $k \in \mathcal{I}$ for which $g_k > 6(\sqrt{2}-1)\sigma/\sqrt{k+1}$ has to be larger than k_* . This proves $\tilde{k} \geq k_*$. The proof is complete. \square

We next give the proof of Corollary 3.3.

Proof of Corollary 3.3. We only need to prove (20). Inequality (21) would then follow from Theorem 3.1. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and suppose that K^* is contained in a ball of radius R centered at (x_1, x_2) . We shall prove below that $\Delta_k(\theta_i) \leq 6\pi Rk/n$ for every $k \in \mathcal{I}$ and (20) would then follow from Corollary 3.5. Without loss of generality, assume that $\theta_i = 0$.

As in the proof of Theorem 3.8, we may assume that K^* is contained in the ball of radius R centered at the origin. This implies that $|h_{K^*}(\theta)| \leq R$ for all θ and also that h_{K^*} is Lipschitz with constant R . Note then that for every $k \in \mathcal{I}$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$, the quantity

$$Q := \frac{h_{K^*}(4j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(-4j\pi/n)}{2} - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n) h_{K^*}(2j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(-2j\pi/n)}{2 \cos(2j\pi/n)}$$

can be bounded as

$$|Q| = \left| \frac{h_{K^*}(4j\pi/n) - h_{K^*}(2j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(-4j\pi/n) - h_{K^*}(-2j\pi/n)}{2} - \left(\frac{\cos(4j\pi/n) - \cos(2j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \right) \frac{h_{K^*}(2j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(-2j\pi/n)}{2} \right| \leq \frac{6Rj\pi}{n}.$$

Here we used also the fact that $\cos(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz and $\cos(2j\pi/n) \geq 1/2$. The inequality $\Delta_k(0) \leq 6\pi Rk/n$ then immediately follows. The proof is complete. \square

We conclude this section with a proof of Corollary 3.4.

Proof of Corollary 3.4. By Theorem 3.1, inequality (24) is a direct consequence of (23). We therefore only need to prove (23). Fix $k \in \mathcal{I}$ with

$$k \leq \frac{n}{4\pi} \min(\theta_i - \phi_1(i), \phi_2(i) - \theta_i). \quad (86)$$

It is then clear that $\theta_i \pm 4j\pi/n \in [\phi_1(i), \phi_2(i)]$ for every $0 \leq j \leq k$. From (22), it follows that

$$h_{K^*}(\theta) = x_1 \cos \theta + x_2 \sin \theta \quad \text{for all } \theta = \theta_i \pm \frac{4j\pi}{n}, 0 \leq j \leq k.$$

We now argue that $\Delta_k(\theta_i) = 0$. To see this, note first that $\Delta_k(\theta_i) = U_k(\theta_i) - L_k(\theta_i)$ has the following alternative expression (36). Plugging in $h_{K^*}(\theta) = x_1 \cos \theta + x_2 \sin \theta$ in (36), one can see by direct computation that $\Delta_k(\theta_i) = 0$ for every $k \in \mathcal{I}$ satisfying (86). The definition (18) of $k_*(i)$ now immediately implies that

$$k_*(i) \geq \min\left(\frac{n}{4\pi} \min(\theta_i - \phi_1(i), \phi_2(i) - \theta_i), cn\right)$$

for a small enough universal constant c . This proves (23) thereby completing the proof. \square

References

- Alexandrov, A. D. (1939). Almost everywhere existence of the second differential of a convex function and some properties of convex surfaces connected with it. *Leningrad State Univ. Annals [Uchenye Zapiski] Math. Ser. 6*, 3–35.
- Baraud, Y. and L. Birgé (2015). Rates of convergence of rho-estimators for sets of densities satisfying shape constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.04427*.
- Brunel, V.-E. (2014). *Non-parametric estimation of convex bodies and convex polytopes*. Ph. D. thesis, Université Pierre et Marie Curie-Paris VI; University of Haifa.
- Brunk, H. D. (1970). Estimation of isotonic regression. In *Nonparametric Techniques in Statistical Inference (Proc. Sympos., Indiana Univ., Bloomington, Ind., 1969)*, pp. 177–197. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Cai, T. T. and M. G. Low (2015). A framework for estimation of convex functions. *Statistica Sinica 25*, 423–456.
- Cai, T. T., M. G. Low, and Y. Xia (2013). Adaptive confidence intervals for regression functions under shape constraints. *Annals of Statistics 41*, 722–750.
- Carolan, C. and R. Dykstra (1999). Asymptotic behavior of the Grenander estimator at density flat regions. *Canad. J. Statist. 27(3)*, 557–566.

- Cator, E. (2011). Adaptivity and optimality of the monotone least-squares estimator. *Bernoulli* 17, 714–735.
- Chatterjee, S., A. Guntuboyina, and B. Sen (2014). On risk bounds in isotonic and other shape restricted regression problems. *Annals of Statistics*. to appear.
- Fisher, N. I., P. Hall, B. A. Turlach, and G. S. Watson (1997). On the estimation of a convex set from noisy data on its support function. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92, 84–91.
- Gardner, R. J. (2006). *Geometric Tomography* (second ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, R. J. and M. Kiderlen (2009). A new algorithm for 3D reconstruction from support functions. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 31, 556–562.
- Gardner, R. J., M. Kiderlen, and P. Milanfar (2006). Convergence of algorithms for reconstructing convex bodies and directional measures. *Annals of Statistics* 34, 1331–1374.
- Gregor, J. and F. R. Rannou (2002). Three-dimensional support function estimation and application for projection magnetic resonance imaging. *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology* 12, 43–50.
- Groeneboom, P. (1983). The concave majorant of Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.* 11(4), 1016–1027.
- Groeneboom, P. (1985). Estimating a monotone density. In *Proceedings of the Berkeley conference in honor of Jerzy Neyman and Jack Kiefer, Vol. II (Berkeley, Calif., 1983)*, Wadsworth Statist./Probab. Ser., Belmont, CA, pp. 539–555. Wadsworth.
- Groeneboom, P. and G. Jongbloed (2014). *Nonparametric Estimation under Shape Constraints: Estimators, Algorithms and Asymptotics*, Volume 38. Cambridge University Press.
- Groeneboom, P., G. Jongbloed, and J. A. Wellner (2001a). A canonical process for estimation of convex functions: The "invelope" of integrated brownian motion $+t^4$. *Annals of Statistics* 29, 1620–1652.
- Groeneboom, P., G. Jongbloed, and J. A. Wellner (2001b). Estimation of convex functions: characterizations and asymptotic theory. *Annals of Statistics* 29, 1653–1698.
- Guntuboyina, A. (2011). Optimal rates of convergence for the estimation of reconstruction of convex bodies from noisy support function measurements. *Annals of Statistics*. to appear.
- Guntuboyina, A. and B. Sen (2013). Global risk bounds and adaptation in univariate convex regression. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*. To appear, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1305.1648>.
- Hanson, D. L. and G. Pledger (1976). Consistency in concave regression. *Ann. Statist.* 4(6), 1038–1050.

- Jankowski, H. (2014). Convergence of linear functionals of the Grenander estimator under misspecification. *Ann. Statist.* 42(2), 625–653.
- Le Cam, L. (1986). *Asymptotic Methods in Statistical Decision Theory*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Lele, A. S., S. R. Kulkarni, and A. S. Willsky (1992). Convex-polygon estimation from support-line measurements and applications to target reconstruction from laser-radar data. *Journal of the Optical Society of America, Series A* 9, 1693–1714.
- Mammen, E. (1991). Nonparametric regression under qualitative smoothness assumptions. *Ann. Statist.* 19(2), 741–759.
- Prince, J. L. and A. S. Willsky (1990). Reconstructing convex sets from support line measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 12, 377–389.
- Schneider, R. (1993). *Convex Bodies: The Brunn-Minkowski Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Stark, H. and Y. Yang (1998). Vector space projections. *John Wiley & Sons, New York*.
- Vitale, R. A. (1979). Support functions of plane convex sets. Technical report, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, CA.
- Wright, F. T. (1981). The asymptotic behavior of monotone regression estimates. *Ann. Statist.* 9(2), 443–448.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2002). Risk bounds in isotonic regression. *Ann. Statist.* 30(2), 528–555.

A Some additional technical results and proofs

In this appendix, we provide additional technical results and proofs.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. The inequality $h_{K^*}(\theta) \leq u(\theta, \phi)$ is obtained by using (1) with $\alpha_1 = \theta + \phi, \alpha_2 = \theta - \phi$ and $\alpha = \theta$. For $l(\theta, \phi) \leq h_{K^*}(\theta)$, we use (1) with $\alpha_1 = \theta + 2\phi, \alpha_2 = \theta$ and $\alpha = \theta + \phi$ to obtain

$$h_{K^*}(\theta) \geq 2h_{K^*}(\theta + \phi) \cos \phi - h_{K^*}(\theta + 2\phi).$$

One similarly has $h_{K^*}(\theta) \geq 2h_{K^*}(\theta - \phi) \cos \phi - h_{K^*}(\theta - 2\phi)$ and $l(\theta, \phi) \leq h_{K^*}(\theta)$ is deduced by averaging these two inequalities. \square

Lemma A.1. *Recall the quantity $\Delta_k(\theta_i)$ defined in (36). The inequality $\Delta_{2k}(\theta_i) \geq 1.5\Delta_k(\theta_i)$ holds for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $0 \leq k \leq n/16$.*

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that $\theta_i = 0$. We will simply write Δ_k for $\Delta_k(\theta_i)$ below for notational convenience. Let us define, for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\delta(\theta) := \frac{h_{K^*}(2\theta) + h_{K^*}(-2\theta)}{2} - \frac{\cos 2\theta}{\cos \theta} \frac{h_{K^*}(\theta) + h_{K^*}(-\theta)}{2}.$$

Note then that $\Delta_k = \sum_{j=0}^k \delta(2j\pi/n)/(k+1)$. We shall first prove that

$$\delta(y) \geq \left(\frac{\tan y}{\tan x} \right) \delta(x) \quad \text{for every } 0 < y \leq \pi/4 \text{ and } x < y \leq 2x. \quad (87)$$

For this, first apply (1) to $\alpha_1 = 2x, \alpha_2 = x$ and $\alpha = y$ to get

$$h_{K^*}(y) \leq \frac{\sin(y-x)}{\sin x} h_{K^*}(2x) + \frac{\sin(2x-y)}{\sin x} h_{K^*}(x).$$

We then apply (1) to $\alpha_1 = 2y, \alpha_2 = x$ and $\alpha = 2x$ to get (note that $2y - x \leq 2y < \pi/2$)

$$h_{K^*}(2y) \geq \frac{\sin(2y-x)}{\sin x} h_{K^*}(2x) - \frac{\sin(2y-2x)}{\sin x} h_{K^*}(x).$$

Combining these two inequalities, we get (note that $2y \leq \pi/2$ which implies that $\cos 2y \geq 0$)

$$h_{K^*}(2y) - \frac{\cos 2y}{\cos y} h_{K^*}(y) \geq \alpha h_{K^*}(2x) - \beta h_{K^*}(x),$$

where

$$\alpha := \frac{\sin(2y-x)}{\sin x} - \frac{\cos 2y}{\cos y} \frac{\sin(y-x)}{\sin x}$$

and

$$\beta := \frac{\sin(2y-2x)}{\sin x} + \frac{\cos 2y}{\cos y} \frac{\sin(2x-y)}{\sin x}.$$

It can be checked by a straightforward calculation that

$$\alpha = \frac{\tan y}{\tan x} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{\tan y \cos 2x}{\tan x \cos x}.$$

It follows therefore that

$$h_{K^*}(2y) - \frac{\cos 2y}{\cos y} h_{K^*}(y) \geq \frac{\tan y}{\tan x} \left(h_{K^*}(2x) - \frac{\cos 2x}{\cos x} h_{K^*}(x) \right).$$

We similarly obtain

$$h_{K^*}(-2y) - \frac{\cos 2y}{\cos y} h_{K^*}(-y) \geq \frac{\tan y}{\tan x} \left(h_{K^*}(-2x) - \frac{\cos 2x}{\cos x} h_{K^*}(-x) \right).$$

The required inequality (87) now results by adding the above two inequalities. A trivial consequence of (87) is that $\delta(y) \geq \delta(x)$ for $0 < y \leq \pi/4$ and $x < y \leq 2x$. Further, applying (87) to $y = 2x$ (assuming that $0 < x < \pi/8$), we obtain $\delta(2x) \geq 2\delta(x)$. Note that $\tan 2x = 2 \tan x / (1 - \tan^2 x) \geq 2 \tan x$ for $0 < x < \pi/8$.

To prove $\Delta_{2k} \geq (1.5)\Delta_k$, we fix $1 \leq k \leq n/16$ (note that the inequality is trivial when $k = 0$) and note that

$$\Delta_{2k} = \frac{1}{2k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{2k} \delta\left(\frac{2j\pi}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{2k+1} \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\delta\left(\frac{2(2j-1)\pi}{n}\right) + \delta\left(\frac{4j\pi}{n}\right) \right)$$

where we used the fact that $\delta(0) = 0$. Using the bounds proved for $\delta(\theta)$, we have

$$\delta\left(\frac{2(2j-1)\pi}{n}\right) \geq \delta\left(\frac{2j\pi}{n}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \delta\left(\frac{4j\pi}{n}\right) \geq 2\delta\left(\frac{2j\pi}{n}\right).$$

Therefore

$$\Delta_{2k} \geq \frac{3}{2k+1} \sum_{j=1}^k \delta\left(\frac{2j\pi}{n}\right) \geq \frac{3}{2(k+1)} \sum_{j=0}^k \delta\left(\frac{2j\pi}{n}\right) = \frac{3}{2}\Delta_k$$

and this completes the proof. \square

Lemma A.2. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Consider $\Delta_k(\theta_i)$ (defined in (36)) and $k_*(i)$ (defined in (18)). We then have the following inequalities

$$\Delta_{k_*(i)}(\theta_i) \leq \frac{6(\sqrt{2}-1)\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*(i)+1}}. \quad (88)$$

and

$$\Delta_k(\theta_i) \geq \max\left(\frac{(\sqrt{6}-2)\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}}, \frac{(\sqrt{6}-2)\sqrt{k+1}\sigma}{2(k_*+1)}\right) \quad \text{for all } k > k_*(i), k \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (89)$$

Proof. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Below we simply denote $k_*(i)$ and $\Delta_k(\theta_i)$ by k_* and Δ_k respectively for notational convenience.

We first prove (88). If $k_* \geq 2$, we have

$$\Delta_{k_*} + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \leq \Delta_{k_*/2} + \sqrt{2} \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+2}} \leq \Delta_{k_*/2} + \sqrt{2} \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}}.$$

Using Lemma A.1 (note that $k_* \in \mathcal{I}$ and hence $k_* \leq n/16$), we have $\Delta_{k_*/2} \leq (2/3)\Delta_{k_*}$. We therefore have

$$\Delta_{k_*} + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \leq \frac{2}{3}\Delta_{k_*} + \sqrt{2}\frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}}$$

which proves (88). Inequality (88) is trivial when $k_* = 0$. Finally, for $k_* = 1$, we have $\Delta_1 + \sqrt{2}\sigma \leq \Delta_0 + 2\sigma = 2\sigma$ which again implies (88).

We now turn to (89). Let k' denote the smallest $k \in \mathcal{I}$ for which $k > k_*$. We start by proving the first part of (89):

$$\Delta_k \geq \frac{(\sqrt{6}-2)\sigma}{\sqrt{k+1}} \quad \text{for } k > k_*, k \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (90)$$

Note first that if (90) holds for $k = k'$, then it holds for all $k \geq k'$ as well because $\Delta_k \geq \Delta_{k'}$ (from Lemma A.1) and $1/\sqrt{k+1} \leq 1/\sqrt{k'+1}$. We therefore only need to verify (90) for $k = k'$. If $k_* = 0$, then $k' = 1$ and because

$$\Delta_1 + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{2}} \geq \Delta_0 + 2\sigma = 2\sigma,$$

we obtain $\Delta_1 \geq (2 - \sqrt{2})\sigma$. This implies (90). On the other hand, if $k_* > 0$, then $k' = 2k_*$ and we can write

$$\Delta_{2k_*} + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{2k_*+1}} \geq \Delta_{k_*} + \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}} \geq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{k_*+1}}.$$

This gives

$$\Delta_{2k_*} \geq \frac{2\sigma}{\sqrt{2k_*+1}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2k_*+1}{k_*+1}} - 1 \right)$$

which implies inequality (90) for $k = 2k_*$ because $(2k_*+1)/(k_*+1) \geq 3/2$. The proof of (90) is complete.

For the second part of (89), we use Lemma A.1 which states $\Delta_{2k} \geq (1.5)\Delta_k \geq \sqrt{2}\Delta_k$ for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$. By a repeated application of this inequality, we get

$$\Delta_k \geq \sqrt{\frac{k}{k'}}\Delta_{k'} \geq \sqrt{\frac{k+1}{k'+1}}\Delta_{k'} \quad \text{for all } k \geq k'.$$

Using (90) for $k = k'$, we get

$$\Delta_k \geq \frac{(\sqrt{6}-2)\sigma\sqrt{k+1}}{k'+1}.$$

The proof of (89) is now completed by observing that $k' \leq 2k_* + 1$. □

Lemma A.3. *Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. For every $0 \leq k \leq n/8$, the variance of the random variable $\hat{U}_k(\theta_i)$ (defined in (10)) is at most $\sigma^2/(k+1)$. Also, for every $0 \leq k \leq n/16$, the variance of the random variable $\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i)$ (defined in (11)) is at most $\sigma^2/(k+1)$.*

Proof. Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$. We shall first prove the bound for the variance of $\hat{U}_k(\theta_i)$ for a fixed $0 \leq k \leq n/8$. Note that

$$\hat{U}_k(\theta_i) = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{Y_{i+j} + Y_{i-j}}{2 \cos(2j\pi/n)}.$$

It is therefore straightforward to see that

$$\text{var}(\hat{U}_k(\theta_i)) = \frac{\sigma^2}{(k+1)^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^k \sec^2(2j\pi/n) \right).$$

For $1 \leq j \leq k \leq n/8$, we have $\sec(2j\pi/n) \leq \sqrt{2}$ because $2j\pi/n \leq \pi/4$. The inequality $\text{var}(\hat{U}_k(\theta_i)) \leq \sigma^2/(k+1)$ then immediately follows.

Let us now turn to the variance of $\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i)$. When $k = 0$, the conclusion is obvious since $\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i) = 0$. Otherwise, the expression (11) for $\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i)$ can be rewritten as

$$\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i) = S_1 + S_2 + S_3$$

where

$$S_1 = \frac{-1}{k+1} \sum_{j=1}^k \{j \text{ is odd}\} \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n) Y_{i+j} + Y_{i-j}}{\cos(2j\pi/n) 2},$$

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=1}^k \{j \text{ is even}\} \left(1 - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \right) \frac{Y_{i+j} + Y_{i-j}}{2},$$

and

$$S_3 = \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=k+1}^{2k} \{j \text{ is even}\} \frac{Y_j + Y_{-j}}{2}.$$

S_1, S_2 and S_3 are clearly independent. Moreover, the different terms in each S_i are also independent. Thus

$$\text{var}(S_1) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2(k+1)^2} \sum_{j=1}^k \{j \text{ is odd}\} \frac{\cos^2(4j\pi/n)}{\cos^2(2j\pi/n)},$$

$$\text{var}(S_2) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2(k+1)^2} \sum_{j=1}^k \{j \text{ is even}\} \left(1 - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \right)^2,$$

and

$$\text{var}(S_3) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2(k+1)^2} \sum_{j=k+1}^{2k} \{j \text{ is even}\} \leq \frac{\sigma^2}{2(k+1)}.$$

Now for $k \leq n/16$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$,

$$0 \leq \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n)}{\cos(2j\pi/n)} \leq 1$$

which implies that $\text{var}(S_1) + \text{var}(S_2) \leq \sigma^2/2(k+1)$. Thus $\text{var}(\hat{\Delta}_k(\theta_i)) \leq \sigma^2/(k+1)$. \square

The following lemma was used in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Lemma A.4. *Let Δ_k be the quantity (36) with $\theta_i = 0$ i.e.,*

$$\Delta_k := \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(4j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(-4j\pi/n)}{2} - \frac{\cos(4j\pi/n) h_{K^*}(2j\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(-2j\pi/n)}{2} \right).$$

Then the following inequality holds for every $k \leq n/16$:

$$\Delta_k \leq \frac{h_{K^*}(4k\pi/n) + h_{K^*}(-4k\pi/n)}{2 \cos(4k\pi/n)} - h_{K^*}(0).$$

Proof. From Lemma A.1, it follows that $\delta(2i\pi/n) \leq \delta(2k\pi/n)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ (this follows by reapplying Lemma A.1 to $2i\pi/n, 4i\pi/n, \dots$ until we hit $2k\pi/n$). As a consequence, we have $\Delta_k \leq \delta(2k\pi/n)$. Now, if $\theta = 2k\pi/n$ then $\theta \leq \pi/8$ and we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(\theta) &= \frac{h_{K^*}(2\theta) + h_{K^*}(-2\theta)}{2} - \frac{\cos 2\theta}{\cos \theta} \frac{h_{K^*}(\theta) + h_{K^*}(-\theta)}{2} \\ &= \cos 2\theta \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(2\theta) + h_{K^*}(-2\theta)}{2 \cos 2\theta} - h_{K^*}(0) \right) - \cos 2\theta \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(\theta) + h_{K^*}(-\theta)}{2 \cos \theta} - h_{K^*}(0) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Because $h_{K^*}(\theta) + h_{K^*}(-\theta) \geq 2h_{K^*}(0) \cos \theta$ and $\cos 2\theta \geq 0$, we have

$$\delta(\theta) \leq \cos 2\theta \left(\frac{h_{K^*}(2\theta) + h_{K^*}(-2\theta)}{2 \cos 2\theta} - h_{K^*}(0) \right) \leq \frac{h_{K^*}(2\theta) + h_{K^*}(-2\theta)}{2 \cos 2\theta} - h_{K^*}(0).$$

The proof is complete. □