

Adaptive Bayesian density estimation in sup-norm

ZACHARIE NAULET¹

¹*Université Paris-Saclay
Laboratoire de mathématiques d'Orsay
91405, Orsay, France
E-mail: zacharie.naulet@universite-paris-saclay.fr*

We investigate the problem of deriving adaptive posterior rates of contraction on \mathbb{L}_∞ balls in density estimation. Although it is known that log-density priors can achieve optimal rates when the true density is sufficiently smooth, adaptive rates were still to be proven. Here we establish that the so-called *spike-and-slab* prior can achieve adaptive and optimal posterior contraction rates. Along the way, we prove a generic \mathbb{L}_∞ contraction result for log-density priors with independent wavelet coefficients. Interestingly, our approach is different from previous works on \mathbb{L}_∞ contraction and is reminiscent of the classical test-based approach used in Bayesian nonparametrics. Moreover, we require no lower bound on the smoothness of the true density, albeit the rates are deteriorated by an extra $\log(n)$ factor in the case of low smoothness.

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62G07; secondary 62G20

Keywords: Bayesian density estimation; supremum norm; adaptation

1. Introduction

We consider the problem of estimating a density p with respect to Lebesgue measure on $[0, 1]$ given n independent and identically distributed samples $\mathbf{X}_n := (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ from the corresponding distribution P . We adopt the Bayesian paradigm and put a joint distribution on the log-density and the observations.

Over the decades, there has been a growing interest for the understanding of the frequentist behaviour of posterior distributions initiated by the seminal papers of [Schwartz \(1965\)](#); [Barron, Schervish and Wasserman \(1999\)](#); [Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart \(2000\)](#). In particular [Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart \(2000\)](#) states generic sufficient conditions for obtaining rates of concentration of the posterior distribution near the true model in some distance. The approach relies on the well-known existence of exponentially powerful test functions. The existence of such tests depends on the distance considered, and is guaranteed for the \mathbb{L}_1 or Hellinger distance between densities, and also for the \mathbb{L}_2 metric under supplementary assumptions. It is, however, now well understood that the test approach fails to give optimal rates when the risk is measured with respect to the \mathbb{L}_∞ distance, see [Castillo \(2014\)](#); [Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber \(2015\)](#); [Yoo, Rousseau and Rivoirard \(2017\)](#).

The failure of the classical approach for \mathbb{L}_∞ rates is unfortunate because one has in general a better intuition of the shape of \mathbb{L}_∞ balls rather than Hellinger balls, making the \mathbb{L}_∞ risk a more natural distance for evaluating performance of estimators. From a frequentist point of view, density estimation in sup-norm is now well understood. Minimax lower bounds can be found in [Hasminskii \(1979\)](#) while upper bounds can be found for instance in [Ibragimov and Hasminskii \(1980\)](#); [Goldenshluger and Lepski \(2014\)](#).

For Bayesian procedures, concentration on \mathbb{L}_∞ balls is much less understood. For the non-adaptive case, the first result goes back to [Giné and Nickl \(2011\)](#) where optimal rates are obtained in white-noise regression using conjugacy arguments. In the same paper, the authors obtained (possibly adaptive) rates for density estimation in sup-norm using a testing approach, but failed to achieve optimality. Using conjugacy arguments, [Yoo and Ghosal \(2016\)](#) also obtain non-adaptive but optimal rates for estimating a regression function. [Scricciolo \(2014\)](#) adapts the techniques of [Giné and Nickl \(2011\)](#) to obtain optimal rates when the true density is analytic. The first non-adaptive optimal result in density estimation for non ultra-smooth densities is to be credited to [Castillo \(2014\)](#), where the author uses techniques based on semi-parametric Bernstein–von Mises theorems. His approach, however, requires a minimal smoothness to be applicable. Recently, [Castillo \(2017\)](#) obtained non-adaptive but optimal rates for density estimation in sup-norm using Pólya trees prior, with no lower bound required on the smoothness.

The existence of adaptive and optimal results is, to our knowledge, even more limited. The first successful result is in [Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber \(2015\)](#) where the authors get adaptive optimal rates in \mathbb{L}_∞ norm for white-noise regression using a *spike-and-slab* prior. They also obtain adaptive and optimal rates in density estimation, though their result is rather an existence result as their abstract sieve prior is not computable. More recently, [Yoo, Rousseau and Rivoirard \(2017\)](#) obtained adaptive optimal rates in \mathbb{L}_∞ norm for estimating a regression function, using a white-noise approximation of the likelihood to adapt the techniques developed in [Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber \(2015\)](#). Since the first version of the current paper, [Castillo and Mismar \(2019\)](#) have introduced spike-and-slab Pólya trees and built upon the results of [Castillo \(2017\)](#) to obtain adaptive contraction rates, though the arguments we use are different.

In density estimation, it is not obvious to proceed as [Yoo, Rousseau and Rivoirard \(2017\)](#) and reduce the problem to white-noise regression, although it is known those models are equivalent (in the Le Cam sense) under certain assumptions. Here, instead, we propose a different approach. We obtain in [Section 3](#) a general contraction result for log-density priors with independent wavelet coefficients. This result is the building block of our main [Theorem 2.2](#) about the *spike-and-slab* log-density prior. The posterior *spike-and-slab* is known to be the Bayesian analogue of *hard thresholding* ([Härdle et al., 2000](#)), as already noticed by [Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber \(2015\)](#); [Yoo, Rousseau and Rivoirard \(2017\)](#). As such, it constitutes the prototypical example of model for which we expect adaptive and optimal \mathbb{L}_∞ contraction. Unlike [Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber \(2015\)](#); [Yoo, Rousseau and Rivoirard \(2017\)](#), however, the present paper does not exploit the thresholding property of the spike-and-slab posterior to establish the posterior support of the wavelet coefficients, but uses a more classical approach.

In the case of the spike-and-slab prior, we show that our method can be applied to obtain *minimax* optimal and adaptive posterior contraction. More precisely, we show that if $L := \log p \in B_{\infty, \infty}^s[0, 1]$, where $B_{\infty, \infty}^s[0, 1]$ denotes the Hölder-Zygmund space with smoothness $s > 1/2$ (see [Definition 2.1](#)), then there exists $M > 0$ such that as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(L' : \|L' - L\|_\infty \leq M \varepsilon_n^*(s) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) = 1 + o(1),$$

where $\varepsilon_n^*(s)$ is the minimax rate over bounded balls in $B_{\infty,\infty}^s[0,1]$ under \mathbb{L}_∞ loss (Donoho et al., 1996)

$$\varepsilon_n^*(s) := \left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{\frac{s}{2s+1}}.$$

Interestingly, our method can be applied to obtain adaptive rates in the region $0 < s \leq 1/2$, which to the best of our knowledge is the first result of this type in the Bayesian literature for methods not relying on conjugacy arguments. The rates we obtain in this region are, however, slightly deteriorated by a factor $\log(n)$.

In contrast with previous results in \mathbb{L}_∞ loss, the approach used in this paper is somewhat less specific and uses the same kind of arguments as for the *master theorem of Bayesian nonparametrics* (Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart, 2000; Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2007a,b). In particular, it relies on the existence of suitable test functions and proving the prior positivity of some neighborhoods, in apparent contradiction with the folk wisdom that no test for the \mathbb{L}_∞ loss has enough power to obtain optimal rates Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber (2015); Yoo, Rousseau and Rivoirard (2017). This contradiction is only apparent, as here we require to test only very specific kind of alternatives, and exponentially consistent tests are not needed. Although hard to generalize, we believe the present paper shows that the traditional approach of (Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart, 2000; Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2007a,b) is more powerful than we believed, giving hope for the existence of general contraction results in strong norms.

This article comes with a supplementary material, which contain additional proofs and various classical results about the spike-and-slab log-density prior. We adopt the convention that every section, subsection, theorem, etc. of the supplemental has label prefixed by S and is cited in cyan. References to the main document are cited in blue with no prefix.

2. Exponentiated random wavelet series

2.1. Log-density priors

We use the S -regular, orthogonal, boundary corrected wavelets of Cohen, Daubechies and Vial (1993), referred to as the CDV basis. We denote this basis by $\{\varphi_{j,k} : (j,k) \in \mathcal{V}\}$, where $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+^2$, and refer to Cohen, Daubechies and Vial (1993); Giné and Nickl (2016); Castillo (2014) for details. Each index (j,k) is a pair where $j \geq 0$ is the wavelet level and k the location index. The CDV basis is an orthogonal basis for $\mathbb{L}_2[0,1]$ equipped with the Lebesgue measure. We endow $\mathbb{L}_2[0,1]$ with the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle := \int_{[0,1]} fg$. If $f \in B_{\infty,\infty}^s[0,1]$ for some $s > 0$, then the wavelet series $\sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} \langle f, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k}$ converges uniformly to f . Conversely, for a given $(\theta_{j,k})_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}}$, the series $\sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} \theta_{j,k} \varphi_{j,k}$ converges uniformly if θ is in

$$\Theta \subseteq \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}} : \sup_{x \in [0,1]} \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} |\theta_{j,k}| |\varphi_{j,k}(x)| < \infty \right\}.$$

Thus, we shall consider prior distributions over the space Θ . Such prior distribution induces a prior distribution on the space of densities on $[0,1]$ (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) through the mapping $\theta \mapsto p_\theta$ such that

$$p_\theta(x) := \frac{\exp\{\sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} \theta_{j,k} \varphi_{j,k}(x)\}}{\int_{[0,1]} \exp\{\sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} \theta_{j,k} \varphi_{j,k}\}}, \quad x \in [0,1]. \quad (2.1)$$

The coefficients θ in [equation \(2.1\)](#) are immediately seen to be the basis coefficients of an unnormalized version of the log-density $\log p_\theta$. By defining the log-normalizing constant

$$\xi^\theta := -\log \left(\int_{[0,1]} \exp \left\{ \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} \theta_{j,k} \varphi_{j,k} \right\} \right) \in \mathbb{R},$$

we can rewrite the log-density $L_\theta := \log p_\theta$ as

$$L_\theta = \xi^\theta + \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} \theta_{j,k} \varphi_{j,k} = \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} (\theta_{j,k} + \langle \xi^\theta, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle) \varphi_{j,k}.$$

2.2. Spike-and-Slab log-density priors

To obtain adaptive and optimal rates of contraction, we consider the so-called *spike-and-slab* prior distribution over Θ ([Mitchell and Beauchamp, 1988](#)). For some weights $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) \in [0, 1]^\mathbb{N}$

$$\theta_{j,k} \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \begin{cases} (1 - \omega_j) \delta_0 + \omega_j Q_j(\cdot) & \text{if } 0 \leq j \leq \frac{\log(n)}{\log(2)}, \\ \delta_0 & \text{if } j > \frac{\log(n)}{\log(2)}. \end{cases}$$

Here δ_0 is the point mass at zero and Q_j are probability distributions on \mathbb{R} . We assume Q_j have densities q_j such that for some $0 < s_0 < 1/2$ and for some density f , we have $q_j(x) := 2^{j(s_0+1/2)} f(2^{j(s_0+1/2)}x)$ for every $j \geq 0$. We write F the probability distribution with density f . We further assume that there are $a_1, b_1, b_2, \mu_*, x_0 > 0$ such that

$$a_1 e^{-j b_1} \leq \omega_j \leq \min\{1/2, 2^{-j(1+\mu_*)}\}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\sup_{x > 1 \vee x_0} e^{b_2 x} (1 - F[-\log(x), \log(x)]) \leq 1. \quad (2.3)$$

In order to ensure that the prior puts enough mass on neighborhoods of the true log-density L , we also assume that for all $G > 0$ there is $g > 0$ such that

$$\inf_{x \in [-G, G]} f(x) \geq g. \quad (2.4)$$

We note that the assumptions of [equations \(2.2\) and \(2.4\)](#) are classical in the literature for rates of contraction in supremum loss. The [equation \(2.3\)](#) is however very strong, but guarantees that *a priori* L_θ has wavelet coefficients of reasonable magnitude, which guarantees that the posterior concentrates on nice neighborhoods of L , see in particular [Section S4](#). As an example of distribution F that satisfy the requirements of [equations \(2.3\) and \(2.4\)](#), one could take the distribution of the random variable $\log(Z)$ where Z has an inverse-Gaussian distribution (or any distribution on \mathbb{R}_+ with an exponential behaviour both near 0 and ∞).

2.3. Adaptation and optimality under supremum loss

This paper considers adaptation over bounded Hölder-Zygmund balls, which we define below. First, we give a precise definition for the Hölder-Zygmund spaces of smoothness.

Definition 2.1 (Hölder-Zygmund spaces). *For any $s > 0$, the Hölder-Zygmund space $B_{\infty,\infty}^s[0,1]$ is the space of uniformly continuous functions $f : [0,1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|f\|_{\infty,\infty,s} < \infty$, where $\|f\|_{\infty,\infty,s} := \sup_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} 2^{j(s+1/2)} |\langle f, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle|$.*

We are now in position to define the bounded Hölder-Zygmund ball of log-densities with radius $R > 0$ and smoothness $s > 0$

$$\Sigma(R, s) := \left\{ L \in B_{\infty,\infty}^s[0,1] : \|L\|_{\infty,\infty,s} \leq R, \int_{[0,1]} \exp(L) = 1 \right\}.$$

We prove in the supplemental that spike-and-slab log-density priors satisfying [equations \(2.2\)](#) to [\(2.4\)](#) achieve adaptive and nearly optimal posterior contraction rates $\varepsilon_n^*(s)$ over $\Sigma(R, s)$ under Hellinger loss. In particular, the next theorem is proven in [Section S3](#).

Theorem 2.1. *Let Π be the spike-and-slab log-density prior satisfying [equations \(2.2\)](#) to [\(2.4\)](#) and let $H(P, Q)$ denote the Hellinger distance between probability distributions P and Q . Then for all $0 < s_0 \leq s \leq S$ and for all $R > 0$ there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{L \in \Sigma(R, s)} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta} : H(P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, P_L) > M \varepsilon_n^*(s) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) = 0.$$

The main theorem of the paper establishes that spike-and-slab log-density priors can achieve the optimal posterior contraction rates if we consider the \mathbb{L}_∞ loss. The rate is optimal when $s > 1/2$, with a slight deterioration in the region of small smoothness.

Theorem 2.2. *Let Π be the spike-and-slab log-density prior satisfying [equations \(2.2\)](#) to [\(2.4\)](#). Also let $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^*(s) := \varepsilon_n^*(s)$ if $s > 1/2$ or $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^*(s) := \log(n) \varepsilon_n^*(s)$ if $0 < s \leq 1/2$. Then for all $0 < s_0 \leq s \leq S$ and for all $R > 0$ there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{L \in \Sigma(R, s)} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\boldsymbol{\theta} : \|L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - L\|_\infty > M \tilde{\varepsilon}_n^*(s) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) = 0.$$

We emphasize that the [Theorem 2.2](#) also entails posterior concentration of $\|p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - p_L\|_\infty$ at rate $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^*(s)$, and thus because $L \in \Sigma(R, s)$ implies that $e^{-R} \leq p_L \leq e^R$. Hence, $\|p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - p_L\|_\infty$ and $\|L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - L\|_\infty$ are equivalent distances when the latter is small enough. This assumption that L belongs to a Hölder ball of smoothness is stronger than the classical frequentist assumption that only p_L does. In particular, we see that it entails that p_L is bounded from below, which is of great help in the proofs. Of course, this begs the question of what can be said when p_L is smooth but not bounded from below, which is outside the scope of this paper. We note that assuming smoothness on L rather than p_L is classical in the Bayesian community (see [Castillo, 2014](#)).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the [Section 3](#) we establish the main notations and give the main ideas behind the proof of the [Theorem 2.2](#). In particular, we give guidelines for the proof and state a central contraction result in [Theorem 3.1](#) which is at the core of the proof of [Theorem 2.2](#). Then, in [Section 4](#) we discuss the main implications of our results. Finally, proofs are given in [Sections 5 to 7](#), respectively for the [Theorem 2.2](#), the [Theorem 3.1](#), and for auxiliary results. Many secondary proofs are deferred to the [Section S5](#) of the supplemental.

3. Heuristic and main ideas behind the proof of [Theorem 2.2](#)

3.1. Notations

We let $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \dots\}$ denote the set of natural numbers, and we let $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \{0, 1, \dots\}$ denote the set of positive integers. The symbols \lesssim and \gtrsim are used to denote inequalities up to generic constants. If $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$, we write $a \asymp b$. For two sequences $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ and $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$, the notation $a_n = o(b_n)$ means $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n/b_n| = 0$, and $a_n = O(b_n)$ means $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n/b_n| = C$ for some $C \geq 0$. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we let $a \wedge b$ denote the minimum of a and b , and $a \vee b$ stands for the maximum.

Densities are understood with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Lower-case notations p, q, \dots are used to denote densities, while upper-case P, Q, \dots denote the corresponding distributions. Given a log-density L on $[0, 1]$, we write $p_L := \exp\{L\}$ the corresponding density and P_L the corresponding distribution. When $L = L_\theta$ for some $\theta \in \Theta$, we abbreviate P_θ for P_{L_θ} , etc.

We see $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ as the beginning of an infinite sequence $\mathbf{X}_\infty = (X_1, X_2, \dots)$ defined on a measurable space (Ω, \mathcal{A}) and such that under L , the variables X_1, X_2, \dots are independent and identically distributed (iid) with distribution P_L . We write \mathbb{P}_L the distribution of \mathbf{X}_∞ , and we write indistinctly \mathbb{E}_L the expectation under \mathbb{P}_L or under P_L . We write $\mathbb{P}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ the empirical measure of \mathbf{X}_n .

We use the standard definitions for the \mathbb{L}_p spaces of (equivalence classes) of functions with finite $\|\cdot\|_p$ norm, with $\|f\|_p^p := \int |f|^p$ if $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $\|f\|_\infty := \text{ess sup}_x |f(x)|$. We will also make use of the *Hellinger* distance between two probability distributions P and Q having respective densities p and q , defined as $H(P, Q) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \|\sqrt{p} - \sqrt{q}\|_2$.

3.2. Change of parameterization

For some integer J_0 to be chosen sufficiently large, we define $B_0 := \{(j, k) \in \mathcal{V} : j \leq J_0\}$. The indices in B_0 corresponds to small scales wavelets and will require special cares. To ease the proof, it is convenient to relabel the wavelets with indices not in B_0 . We let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{V} \setminus B_0$ be the bijection corresponding to the lexicographical reordering of the index set $\mathcal{V} \setminus B_0$; i.e. writing $\psi(m) = (j, k)$ and $\psi(m') = (j', k')$

$$m \leq m' \iff (j < j') \text{ or } (j = j' \text{ and } k \leq k').$$

For all $m \geq 1$ we write $J_m := \psi(m)_1$ the scale-index of the wavelet $\varphi_{\psi(m)}$. By construction $J_1 = J_0 + 1$ and $J_1 \leq J_2 \leq \dots$. For proofs, it is also convenient to define $B_m := \{\psi(m)\}$ for all $m \geq 1$.

Given this re-indexing of the wavelets, we are now in position to define a change or parameterization which is convenient for proofs. We pick an arbitrary reference log-density $L \in \Sigma(R, s)$, and we establish the concentration under L by taking care that the results are uniform over $\Sigma(R, s)$. Given L , we let $\theta_{j,k}^L := \langle L, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle$, and we define

$$F_m^\theta := \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} (\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L) (\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]).$$

Clearly $L_\theta - L$ can be written uniquely in term of the $(F_m^\theta)_{m \geq 0}$, so that we might as well consider $(F_m^\theta)_{m \geq 0}$ as the parameter of the model. For each $m \geq 0$ we will write $\mathcal{F}_m := \text{span}\{\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}] :$

$(j, k) \in B_m$, and $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{F}_1 \times \mathcal{F}_2 \times \dots$ the infinite cartesian product of these spaces. We also let $\mathcal{F}_0 := \{\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F} : \mathbb{E}_L[\exp\{\sum_{m \geq 0} F_m\}] < \infty\}$ denote the subset of proper parameters. Then, we now parameterize the model by $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F}_0$. Using the constraint that $\mathbb{E}_L[\exp\{L_{\mathbf{F}} - L\}] = 1$, we determine that the log-likelihood of the model $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F}_0$ is given by

$$L_{\mathbf{F}} - L = \sum_{m \geq 0} F_m - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp\{\sum_{m \geq 0} F_m\}]. \quad (3.1)$$

3.3. Guidelines for the proof of [Theorem 2.2](#) and intermediate contraction results

Here we present the main ideas behind the proof of [Theorem 2.2](#) and the main intermediate results that are used in the proof. First of all, it is convenient to assume that the posterior concentrates on nice neighborhoods of L . We will prove that the posterior concentrates on the set

$$\mathcal{C}_* := \left\{ \mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F} : \sup_{x \in [0,1]} \sum_{m \geq 0} |F_m(x)| \leq \delta \right\},$$

where $0 < \delta \leq 1$ is a constant to be chosen sufficiently small. Once it has been shown the posterior is concentrated on \mathcal{C}_* , the analysis of the log-likelihood difference $L_{\mathbf{F}} - L$ is easier. Posterior contraction on \mathcal{C}_* can be obtained by the classical machinery *à la Ghosal and van der Vaart* ([Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart, 2000](#); [Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2007b,a](#)) and is essentially a corollary of the [Theorem 2.1](#). It can be done using similar arguments as those already found in [Castillo \(2014\)](#); [Rivoirard and Rousseau \(2012\)](#), as we do in [Section S5.1](#) to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Π be the prior described in [Section 2.2](#). Then for all $0 < s_0 \leq s \leq S$, all $R > 0$, and all $\delta > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{L \in \Sigma(R,s)} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_*^c | \mathbf{X}_n) = 0.$$

To obtain \mathbb{L}_∞ rates, the goal is to relate the distance $\|L_{\mathbf{F}} - L\|_\infty$ to the parameter \mathbf{F} . In particular, we shall seek to relate $\|L_{\mathbf{F}} - L\|_\infty$ to $\{\|F_m\|_2 : m \geq 0\}$, which is motivated by the fact that $\{\|F_m\|_2 : m \geq 0\}$ essentially drives the behaviour of the posterior distributions. The following lemma serves this purpose.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{C}_*$. Then, there exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for all choice of J_0 we have*

$$\|L_{\mathbf{F}} - L\|_\infty \leq C \sum_{j \geq J_0} 2^{j/2} \sup_{m: J_m=j} \|F_m\|_2.$$

In view of [Lemmas 3.1](#) and [3.2](#), to prove the [Theorem 2.2](#) it is enough to prove that the posterior concentrates on a set where the rhs in [Lemma 3.2](#) is smaller than a multiple constant of $\tilde{\varepsilon}_n^*(s)$. Our strategy is to build a partition of \mathcal{F} , where on each part we have a fine control of $\{\|F_m\|_2 : m \geq 0\}$. We build the partition $(\mathcal{S}_I)_{I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+}$, such that for every $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$,

$$\mathcal{S}_I := \{\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F} : m \in I \implies \|F_m\|_2 > H_I(m), \quad m \notin I \implies \|F_m\|_2 \leq H_I(m)\},$$

where we choose $H_m(I)$ as follows. We let $\Gamma, \gamma > 0$ be constants to be determined, and we define the optimal truncation level $j_n \equiv j_n(s)$ as the only integer satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \gamma 2^{-(j_n+1)(s+1/2)} < \Gamma \sqrt{\log(n)/n} \leq \gamma 2^{-j_n(s+1/2)} & \text{if } s > 1/2, \\ \gamma 2^{-(j_n+1)(s+1/2)} < \Gamma 2^{-j_n/2} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \leq \gamma 2^{-j_n(s+1/2)} & \text{if } 0 < s \leq 1/2. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Then, for $\xi > 1$ also to be chosen accordingly,

$$H_I(m) := \begin{cases} \Gamma \xi^{-\mathbf{1}_{0 \in I} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0}} \rho_m & \text{if } J_m \leq j_n, \\ \gamma 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)} & \text{if } J_m > j_n, \end{cases} \quad \rho_m := \begin{cases} \sqrt{\log(n)/n} & \text{if } s > 1/2, \\ 2^{-J_m/2} \varepsilon_n^*(s) & \text{if } 0 < s \leq 1/2. \end{cases}$$

At this point, it might look obscure why the definition of $H_I(m)$ differs according to whether $s > 1/2$ or not, and also according to whether $0 \in I$ or not. The subtle reason of this choice will be found when proving the [Theorem 3.1](#). In fact, we will require to control some covariance terms involving F_m and $F_{m'}$ (see also [Section 6.3](#)). The control of these covariance terms can get tricky, and this particular choice of $H_I(m)$ permits to obtain the desired control.

Since $H_I(m)$ is function of I , it is not immediate that $(\mathcal{S}_I)_{I \subseteq \mathbb{N}}$ is a proper partition. We establish this fact in the next lemma, together with a useful property of this partition.

Lemma 3.3. *The collection $(\mathcal{S}_I)_{I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a partition of \mathcal{F} and*

$$F \in \left(\bigcup_{I \neq \emptyset} \mathcal{S}_I \right)^c \implies \|F_m\|_2 \leq \begin{cases} \Gamma \rho_m & \text{if } J_m \leq j_n, \\ \gamma 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)} & \text{if } J_m > j_n. \end{cases}$$

The previous lemma is one of the key result. In conjunction with [Lemmas 3.1](#) and [3.2](#), it implies the following corollary which is the starting point of the proof of [Theorem 2.2](#).

Corollary 3.1. *For all choice of J_0, Γ, γ, ξ and for all (R, s) there exists $M > 0$ such that the following bound is true.*

$$\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\theta : \|L_\theta - L\|_\infty > M \tilde{\varepsilon}_n^*(s) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \leq \sum_{\substack{I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+ \\ I \neq \emptyset}} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I \mid \mathbf{X}_n).$$

Our strategy is then to bound each of the terms $\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I \mid \mathbf{X}_n)$ for $I \neq \emptyset$; which is done in the [Theorem 3.1](#) below. Interestingly, the technique is reminiscent to the classical testing approach of ([Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart, 2000](#); [Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2007a,b](#)) with extra cares. Large parts of the proofs of [Theorems 2.2](#) and [3.1](#) rely on the fine tuning of the constants $\delta, J_0, \Gamma, \gamma, \xi$, as well as the relation between those constants, and also on taking n sufficiently large. Since the proofs are quite long, it can be challenging to keep track all along of the constraints those constants must satisfy. To facilitate the understanding of the theorems and their proof, we summarize in the next assumption how $\delta, J_0, \Gamma, \gamma, \xi$ and n must be taken at the end of the day for the theorems to hold true.

Assumption 1. *We assume that there are constants $K_0, K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 > 0$ eventually large and eventually depending on (R, s) but solely on (R, s) , such that*

1. $J_0 \geq K_0 \max\{1, \log(1/\delta), \log(\gamma)\}$;
2. $\log(n) \geq K_1 \max\{2^{J_0}, \delta^{-2}, \log(\Gamma), \log(\gamma), \log(\xi)\}$;

3. $\xi \geq K_2 \delta^{-1} \max\{1, \gamma\} 2^{J_0}$;
4. $\gamma \geq K_3 \max\{1, \delta^{-1}\}$;
5. $\Gamma \geq \max\{\gamma, K_4 2^{J_0}, K_4 \xi\}$.

The constant δ will be taken as small as needed.

Finally, bounding $\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I \mid \mathbf{X}_n)$ rely on splitting the parameter \mathbf{F} into two parts $\mathbf{F} = (\mathbf{F}_I, \bar{\mathbf{F}}_I)$ where $\mathbf{F}_I := (F_m)_{m \in I}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I := (F_m)_{m \notin I}$. The following functions will also be used:

$$S_{\mathbf{F}_I} := \sum_{m \in I} F_m, \text{ and, } S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} := \sum_{m \notin I} F_m.$$

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied with constants $K_0, K_1, K_2 > 0$ sufficiently large and let Π be a prior such that \mathbf{F}_I and $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I$ are independent for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then, there are constants $c_0, c_1, c_2, \delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, for all $\frac{512 \cdot c_0 \delta}{1 + 512 \cdot c_0 \delta} < \alpha \leq 1/2$, and for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \leq \left\{ \frac{3 \exp\{-c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2 + c_1 2^{J_0} |I|\}^\alpha \left\{ \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} \right\}^{1-\alpha}}{(1 - e^{-c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2})^{2\alpha}} \right\}^{\frac{1}{1+2\delta}},$$

where $\mathcal{E}_I := \inf\{\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2]\}^{1/2} : \mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{S}_I\}$, $\mathcal{A}_I := \{\mathbf{F}_I : \|\mathbf{F}_m\|_2 > H_I(m)\}$, and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I := \{\mathbf{F}_I : \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] \leq \delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2, \|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta\}$; provided that $\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I) > 0$ and $\mathcal{E}_I > 0$ for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$.

We note that the fact that $\mathcal{E}_I > 0$ and $\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I) > 0$ for the spike-and-slab prior are consequences of Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 7.2 that will be established later. Also, we point out that in the whole paper we make the abuse of notations of writing Π to denote the prior on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, L_θ , $L_{\mathbf{F}}$, \mathbf{F} , as well as for the restricted parameters \mathbf{F}_I or $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I$. The proof of the Theorem 2.2 consists on specializing the bound of Theorem 3.1 to the spike-and-slab prior and using it in conjunction with Corollary 3.1 to conclude.

4. Discussion

The master theorem of Bayesian nonparametrics The current state-of-the-art method in calculating posterior contraction rates is the master theorem developed by Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart (2000); Ghosal and van der Vaart (2007b); Shen et al. (2001). This theorem relies on two main ingredients:

- The existence of tests for the hypothesis $H_0 : L' = L$ against the alternative $H_1 : \|L' - L\|_\infty > M \varepsilon_n^*(s)$, with Type I and Type II errors decreasing as $\exp\{-K n \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2\}$;
- The prior puts enough mass on certain Kullback-Leibler neighborhoods of L .

In the context of \mathbb{L}_∞ contraction, it is known that the master theorem yields suboptimal contraction rates (Giné and Nickl, 2011; Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber, 2015; Yoo, Rousseau and Rivoirard, 2017). The issue is discussed thoroughly in (Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber, 2015; Yoo, Rousseau and Rivoirard, 2017): no test has enough power to obtain the optimal rate of contraction in \mathbb{L}_∞ . In particular, the Type II error has to decay polynomially in n , unless we deteriorate the rate. It is known that not all the alternative H_1 has to be tested – only a suitable sieve – but this does not help either to get optimal rates, the root of the problem being deeper.

The arguments in [Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber \(2015\)](#); [Yoo, Rousseau and Rivoirard \(2017\)](#) are strong, and it is natural to ask what is wrong in the current paper such that the tests we use in the proofs of [Theorems 2.2](#) and [3.1](#) permit optimal contraction rates. This indeed relies on the nature of the alternative we test. We are not constructing tests for $H_1 : \|L' - L\|_\infty > M\varepsilon_n^*(s)$, but instead for each $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, we build a test for $H_1 : L' \in \{L_{\mathbf{F}} : \mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{S}_I\}$. Those tests (see the proof of [Lemma 6.2](#)) have Type I and Type II errors decreasing as $\exp\{-Kn\varepsilon_I^2\}$, which is typically polynomial in n when $|I|$ is small, and thus not in contradiction with the arguments of the aforementioned papers. We remark that $|I|$ small corresponds exactly to those log-densities L' that can be far from L in \mathbb{L}_∞ but close in \mathbb{L}_2 , and thus hard to separate. When $|I|$ gets large, however, the powers of the tests increase, which is what saves us.

The main drawback of the method is getting a sharp enough bound on the denominator of the Bayes rule, which seems hard to do beyond the scope of independent wavelet coefficients, or at least having a nice structure. Anyhow, we believe the approach of the current paper shows that the master theorem of Bayesian nonparametrics can be still useful for \mathbb{L}_∞ contraction, giving some hope toward a general \mathbb{L}_∞ contraction result of the same flavour.

Suboptimality when $0 < s \leq 1/2$ The rates of [Theorem 2.2](#) are slightly suboptimal in the region $0 < s \leq 1/2$. The problem is indeed not inherent to the spike-and-slab prior, and as such not surprising as it is known density estimation on the interval behave very differently when $0 < s \leq 1/2$ or $s > 1/2$, see for instance [Brown et al. \(1998\)](#). Our troubles come from the impossibility of taking $\rho_m = \sqrt{\log(n)/n}$ when $s \leq 1/2$ and we have instead to take a much larger threshold $\rho_m = 2^{-J_m/2}\varepsilon_n^*(s)$. The reasons for this impossibility are to be found in controlling some covariance terms when decomposing the likelihood, see [Section 6.3](#). In fact, this exhibits a major difference on the strength of the result we prove here: in the case $s > 1/2$ the control of the posterior is **much tighter**. In particular, we prove that every wavelet coefficients of L_θ at level $j \leq j_n$ is within $\sqrt{\log(n)/n}$ distance of the coefficients of L if $s > 1/2$, while we are only able to get a distance of $2^{-j/2}\varepsilon_n^*(s)$ otherwise (which is much larger when j is small).

To the best of our knowledge, no method based on asymptotic expansions of the log-likelihood succeeded before in getting posterior \mathbb{L}_∞ rates when $s \leq 1/2$. Thereby, the strategy developed here shed new light on our understanding of \mathbb{L}_∞ contraction. In view of the recent result of [Castillo and Mismar \(2019\)](#), however, methods based on conjugacy arguments are able to obtain adaptivity and optimality over all $0 < s \leq 1$, with no extra $\log(n)$ factor. This shows that we don't really understand yet enough the behaviour of the log-likelihood when $0 < s \leq 1/2$, which should be investigated in a near future by the author.

Estimation of the derivatives The spike-and-slab prior of [Section 2.2](#) also achieves optimal contraction rates for estimating the derivatives of the density. We remark that if L has derivatives $L^{(r)}$, $r \geq 1$ integer, then $s \geq 1 > 1/2$. Then, in this case, investigation of the proof of [Theorem 2.2](#) shows that the posterior contracts on the set $\{L' : |\langle L' - L, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| \lesssim \sqrt{\log(n)/n} \mathbf{1}_{j \leq j_n} + 2^{-j(s+1/2)} \mathbf{1}_{j > j_n} \forall (j, k) \in \mathcal{V}\}$. Then, it is a classical result that this implies for all $1 \leq r \leq s \leq S$ with r integer,

$$\sup_{L \in \Sigma(R, s)} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\theta : \|L_\theta^{(r)} - L^{(r)}\|_\infty > M\varepsilon_n^*(s)^{\frac{s-r}{s}} \mid \mathbf{X}_n) = o(1).$$

5. Proof of the Theorem 2.2

As explained in Section 3.3, the proof of Theorem 2.2 consists on plugging the bound of Theorem 3.1 into the bound of Corollary 3.1. The first step is to obtain an upper estimate on $\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)/\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)$. The next lemma is proved in Section S5.3.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied with constants $K_0, K_1, K_2, K_3 > 0$ sufficiently large. Then, there are universal constants $\nu_1, \nu_2 > 0$ such that for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$\frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} \leq \nu_1 \exp \left\{ \nu_2 \log(n) \sum_{m \in I} 2^{J_0 \mathbf{1}_{m=0}} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} - (1 + \mu_*) \log(2) \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}.$$

Furthermore, if $I \cap \{m : J_m > \log(n)/\log(2)\} \neq \emptyset$, then $\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)/\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I) = 0$.

Then, we can plug the bound of Lemma 5.1 into the Theorem 3.1 and fine-tune α in function of I to obtain a clean bound on $\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n)$. We do so in the following lemma, also proved in Section S5.3.

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied with constants $K_0, K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 > 0$ sufficiently large and $\delta > 0$ is taken sufficiently small. Then, there are universal constants $\nu_3, \nu_4 > 0$ such that for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n) \leq \nu_4 \prod_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m \leq j_n}} n^{-\nu_3 K_4^2} \prod_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m > j_n}} 2^{-J_m(1+\mu_*/2)}.$$

Now we are in position to use the bound established in Lemma 5.2 with the inequality of Corollary 3.1 to finish the proof. Define for simplicity $g_m := \nu_3 K_4^2 \log(n)$ if $0 \leq J_m \leq j_n$ and $g_m := J_m(1 + \mu_*/2) \log(2)$ if $J_m > j_n$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+ \\ I \neq \emptyset}} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n) &\leq \nu_4 \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sum_m b_m \geq 1\}} \prod_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-g_m b_m} \\ &\leq \nu_4 \sum_{m' \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}} b_{m'} \prod_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-g_m b_m} \\ &= \nu_4 \sum_{m' \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{Z}_+}} e^{-g_{m'} b_{m'}} b_{m'} \prod_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \\ m \neq m'}} e^{-g_m b_m} \\ &= \nu_4 \sum_{m' \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-g_{m'}} \prod_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \\ m \neq m'}} (1 + e^{-g_m}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we get the bound,

$$\sum_{\substack{I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+ \\ I \neq \emptyset}} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n) \leq \nu_4 \exp \left(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-g_m} \right) \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-g_m}.$$

The previous display is $o(1)$ whenever $\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-gm} = o(1)$, which we prove now. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-gm} &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-gm} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-gm} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\
&\lesssim n^{-\nu_3 K_4^2} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} + \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} 2^{-j(1+\mu_*/2)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\
&\lesssim n^{-\nu_3 K_4^2} \sum_{j=0}^{j_n} 2^j + \sum_{j > j_n} 2^{-j(1+\mu_*/2)} 2^j \\
&\lesssim n^{-\nu_3 K_4^2} 2^{j_n} + 2^{-j_n \mu_*/2},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third line follows as there are no more than $\lesssim 2^j$ wavelets at level j . Now, we remark that $2^{j_n} \asymp (n/\log(n))^{2/(2s+1)}$. Hence, if K_4 is taken large enough, $\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} e^{-gm} = o(1)$, as claimed.

6. Proof of the Theorem 3.1

6.1. Main ideas

We already know that $\mathcal{S}_I \subseteq \{\mathbf{F}_I : \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] \geq \mathcal{E}_I^2\}$ by construction. We obtain a finer result by further slicing the set \mathcal{S}_I . For $y \geq 1$ integer, we let

$$\mathcal{S}_I^y := \mathcal{S}_I \cap \{\mathbf{F} : y\mathcal{E}_I^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] < (y+1)\mathcal{E}_I^2\}.$$

Similarly, we define we define $\mathcal{A}_I^y := \mathcal{A}_I \cap \{\mathbf{F}_I : y\mathcal{E}_I^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] < (1+y)\mathcal{E}_I^2\}$. Clearly $(\mathcal{A}_I^y)_{y \geq 1}$ is a partition of \mathcal{A}_I . The first lemma establishes a first bound on the posterior mass of \mathcal{S}_I^y .

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied with constants $K_0, K_1, K_2 > 0$ sufficiently large. Also suppose Π is such that \mathbf{F}_I and $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_I$ are independent for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, and $\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I) > 0$ for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then, there are universal constants $c_0, \delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $t > 0$ there is an event Ω_t with $\mathbb{P}_L^n(\Omega_t^c) \leq e^{-t}$ and if $\mathbf{X}_n \in \Omega_t$, for all $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$, for all $y \geq 1$,*

$$\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y | \mathbf{X}_n) \leq 2e^{2\delta t + c_0 \delta y n \mathcal{E}_I^2} \int_{\mathcal{A}_I^y \cap \{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \eta\}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{q_{\mathbf{F}_I}(X_i)}{p_L(X_i)} \frac{\Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}, \quad (6.1)$$

where $q_{\mathbf{F}_I}$ is a probability density on $[0, 1]$ whose exact expression is known but deferred to the proof of the lemma for convenience.

The last lemma is the key result of the proof. Interestingly, the classical approach to concentration rates *à la* Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart (2000) consists on establishing a similar relation, but with $q_{\mathbf{F}_I}$ replaced by $\exp\{L_{\mathbf{F}}\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I$ replaced by a Kullback-Leibler neighborhood of p_L . We use the estimate of Lemma 6.1 to bound $\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y | \mathbf{X}_n)$ using the standard testing approach *à la* Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart (2000), coupled with the *square-root trick* of Lijoi, Prünster and Walker (2005); Walker, Lijoi and Prünster (2007); Ghosal and van der Vaart (2007a). This step is rather immediate in view of the existing literature and it boils down to bound $\inf\{\mathbb{H}(Q_{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}}, P_L)^2 : \mathbf{F}_I \in \mathcal{A}_I^y, \|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta\}$ and the metric entropy (in the Hellinger distance) of the set of densities $\mathcal{P}_I^y := \{q_{\mathbf{F}_I} : \mathbf{F}_I \in \mathcal{A}_I^y, \|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta\}$. This gives the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied with constants $K_0, K_1, K_2 > 0$ sufficiently large, and let everything as in Lemma 6.1. Then, there are universal constants $c_1, \delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$, for all $y \geq 1$, for all $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y | \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}] \leq \left\{ \frac{8 \exp(-\frac{yn\mathcal{E}_I^2}{256} + 2\delta t + c_1 2^{J_0} |I|) \Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{1 - e^{-yn\mathcal{E}_I^2/256}} \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

We can obtain a bound on $\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}]$ by summing over $y \geq 1$ the bound obtained in Lemma 6.2. This gives a valid bound, but it is not sharp enough in cases where $|I|$ gets too large or $n\mathcal{E}_I^2$ is too small. Indeed, in those cases, we can improve the bound to give more importance to the prior by remarking that taking the expectation both sides of the expression in Lemma 6.1 and applying Fubini's theorem gives

$$\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y | \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}] \leq 2e^{2\delta t + c_0 \delta y n \mathcal{E}_I^2} \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}. \quad (6.2)$$

This improvement permits to assume only $\mu_* > 0$, otherwise we would have to assume $\mu_* > 1$, which may be undesirable in practice (as it may cause over-shrinkage). The next lemma leverages that $\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y | \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}]$ is bounded above by the minimum between the expression in Lemma 6.2 and the last display to get a sharp bound on $\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}]$.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied with constants $K_0, K_1, K_2 > 0$ sufficiently large, and let everything as in Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2. Then, there are universal constants $c_2, \delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \delta \leq \delta_0$, for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$, for all $\frac{512 \cdot c_0 \delta}{1 + 512 \cdot c_0 \delta} < \alpha \leq 1/2$, for all $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}] \leq \frac{\sqrt{8} e^{2\delta t} \exp\{-c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2 + c_1 2^{J_0} |I|\}^\alpha \left\{ \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} \right\}^{1-\alpha}}{(1 - e^{-c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2})^{2\alpha}}.$$

Finally, to obtain the bound in the statement of the theorem, we note that,

$$\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n) \leq \inf_{t>0} \left\{ e^{-t} + \mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}] \right\}.$$

Plugging the bound obtained in Lemma 6.3 into the previous display and solving to find the infimum gives the bound of the theorem when choosing δ small enough.

6.2. Proofs of Lemmas 6.1 to 6.3

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Let define $\Phi(f) := f - \mathbb{E}_L[f] - \log \mathbb{E}_L[e^{f - \mathbb{E}_L[f]}]$ and $C(f, g) := \log \mathbb{E}_L[e^{\Phi(f)} e^{\Phi(g)}]$. We will see that $-C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_I})$ is asymptotically equivalent to the covariance of $S_{\mathbf{F}_I}$ and $S_{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_I}$, and thus we will refer abusively to this term as the covariance from now on. It is easily seen that the log-likelihood can be rewritten as

$$L_{\mathbf{F}} - L = \Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}) + \Phi(S_{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_I}) - C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_I}).$$

Then, by the Bayes rule,

$$\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y | \mathbf{X}_n) = \frac{\int_{\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n \Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n \Phi(S_{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_I})} e^{-nC(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F})}{\int e^{n\mathbb{P}_n \Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n \Phi(S_{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_I})} e^{-nC(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\tilde{\mathbf{F}}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F})}. \quad (6.3)$$

Recall that $\mathbf{F}_I := (F_m)_{m \in I}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I := (F_m)_{m \notin I}$. Also, in addition to \mathcal{A}_I^y , we let

$$\mathcal{N}_I := \{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I : \forall m \notin I, \|F_m\|_2 \leq H_I(m)\}.$$

It is immediate that if $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{S}_I^y$ then $\mathbf{F}_I \in \mathcal{A}_I^y$ and $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I \in \mathcal{N}_I$. Also, if $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{C}_*$, then

$$\max\{|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}(x)|, |S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(x)|\} \leq \max\left\{\sum_{m \in I} |F_m(x)|, \sum_{m \notin I} |F_m(x)|\right\} \leq \sum_{m \geq 0} |F_m(x)| \leq \delta.$$

So for all $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{C}_*$ and for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have $\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta$ and $\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta$. It follows by [equation \(6.3\)](#) that $\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y \mid \mathbf{X}_n)$ is bounded from above by

$$\frac{\int \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_I^y}(\mathbf{F}_I) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N}_I}(\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I) \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})} e^{-nC(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F})}{\int \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I}(\mathbf{F}_I) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N}_I}(\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I) \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})} e^{-nC(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F})}.$$

The main challenge in the proof of the theorem is to control the term $C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})$ both in the numerator and denominator, which is deferred to [Section 6.3](#). In fact, by [Corollaries 6.1](#) and [6.2](#), if the constants K_0, K_1, K_2 in [Assumption 1](#) are taken sufficiently large, there is a universal $C > 0$ such that taking δ small enough gives

$$2e^{C\delta_{yn}\mathcal{E}_I^2} \frac{\int \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_I^y}(\mathbf{F}_I) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N}_I}(\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I) \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F})}{\int \mathbf{1}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I}(\mathbf{F}_I) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{N}_I}(\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I) \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F})},$$

But \mathbf{F}_I is independent of $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I$ and $S_{\mathbf{F}_I}$ is solely function of \mathbf{F}_I (respectively $S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I$), thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y \mid \mathbf{X}_n) &\leq 2e^{C\delta_{yn}\mathcal{E}_I^2} \frac{\int \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_I^y} \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I)}{\int \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I)} \\ &= 2e^{C\delta_{yn}\mathcal{E}_I^2} \frac{\int \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}_I^y} \mathbf{1}_{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I)}{\int \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I)}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

where the second line follows because $\mathbf{F}_I \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I \implies \|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta$ by construction. It is interesting that $x \mapsto p_L(x)e^{\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}(x)}$ is indeed a proper density function, *i.e.* it is non-negative and integrates to 1. We write $q_{\mathbf{F}_I}(x) := p_L(x)e^{\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}(x)}$. We then can bound the expectation of [equation \(6.4\)](#) using the standard approach *à la* [Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart](#). In particular, we arrive at the bound of [equation \(6.1\)](#) by controlling the \mathbb{P}_L -probability of the event

$$\Omega_t := \left\{ \mathbf{X}_n : \int \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{q_{\mathbf{F}_I}(X_i)}{p_L(X_i)} \frac{\Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} \geq e^{-n\delta^2\mathcal{E}_I^2} e^{-\sqrt{2n\delta^2\mathcal{E}_I^2t} - \delta t} \right\}.$$

Proposition 6.1. *Let Π be any probability measure supported on the set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I$. For all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$, for all $0 < \delta \leq \log(2)$, for all $t > 0$, and for all $n > 0$, $\mathbb{P}_L^n(\Omega_t) \geq 1 - e^{-t}$.*

Then, on the event that $\mathbf{X}_n \in \Omega_t$, the [equation \(6.4\)](#) becomes

$$\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \leq 2e^{C\delta n y \mathcal{E}_I^2 + n\delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2 + \sqrt{2n\delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2 t} + \delta t} \int_{\mathcal{A}_I^y \cap \{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \eta\}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{q_{\mathbf{F}_I}(X_i) \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I)}{p_L(X_i) \Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}.$$

The conclusion follows because $y \geq 1$, and because if $t \leq 2n\mathcal{E}_I^2$ then $\sqrt{2n\delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2 t} + \delta t \leq 2\delta n \mathcal{E}_I^2 + \delta t$, while if $t > 2n\mathcal{E}_I^2$ then $\sqrt{2n\delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2 t} + \delta t \leq 2\delta t$. Hence we can take $\delta_0 = \log(2)$ and $c_0 = C + 2 + \delta_0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.2. First we obtain a lower bound on $\inf\{\mathbb{H}(Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}, P_L)^2 : \mathbf{F}_I \in \mathcal{A}_I^y, \|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta\}$. The following proposition helps.

Proposition 6.2. *As $\eta \rightarrow 0$ it holds $\mathbb{H}(Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}, P_L)^2 \geq \frac{1}{8} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] e^{O(\eta)}$ for all $S_{\mathbf{F}_I}$ satisfying $\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \eta$. Then $\inf\{\mathbb{H}(Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}, P_L)^2 : \mathbf{F}_I \in \mathcal{A}_I^y, \|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta\} \geq \frac{y\mathcal{E}_I^2}{16}$ for δ small enough (but not depending on I nor on y).*

For $\epsilon > 0$ and any subset A of a metric space equipped with metric d , we let $N(\epsilon, A, d)$ denote the ϵ -covering number of A , i.e. the smallest number of balls of radius ϵ needed to cover A . If d is induced by some norm $\|\cdot\|$, we write $N(\epsilon, A, \|\cdot\|)$. By [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2007a, Corollary 1\)](#) our [Proposition 6.2](#) implies that for all $D > 0$, all $y \geq 1$, and all $n \geq 1$ there exists a test $\phi_{n,y}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_L[\phi_{n,y}] \leq \frac{N(\frac{\sqrt{y}\mathcal{E}_I}{16}, \mathcal{P}_I^y, \mathbb{H})}{D} \frac{e^{-\frac{yn\mathcal{E}_I^2}{256}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{yn\mathcal{E}_I^2}{256}}}, \quad \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{F}_I \in \mathcal{A}_I^y \\ \|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{F}_I}[1 - \phi_{n,y}] \leq D e^{-\frac{yn\mathcal{E}_I^2}{256}},$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{F}_I}$ is understood as the expectation under $Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}^{\otimes n}$, and where $\mathcal{P}_I^y := \{q_{\mathbf{F}_I} : \mathbf{F}_I \in \mathcal{A}_I^y, \|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta\}$. Using the estimate of [Lemma 6.1](#) we find that $\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}]$ is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_L[\phi_{n,y} \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y \mid \mathbf{X}_n)] + \mathbb{E}_L[(1 - \phi_{n,y}) \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_L[\phi_{n,y}] + 2e^{2\delta t + c_0 \delta y n \mathcal{E}_I^2} \int_{\mathcal{A}_I^y \cap \{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \eta\}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{F}_I}[1 - \phi_{n,y}] \frac{\Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} \\ & \leq \frac{N(\frac{\sqrt{y}\mathcal{E}_I}{16}, \mathcal{P}_I^y, \mathbb{H})}{D} \frac{e^{-\frac{yn\mathcal{E}_I^2}{256}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{yn\mathcal{E}_I^2}{256}}} + 2D e^{2\delta t + c_0 \delta y n \mathcal{E}_I^2 - \frac{yn\mathcal{E}_I^2}{256}} \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}. \end{aligned}$$

The previous display is true for any $D > 0$ and thus we can optimize over D , which is also known as the *square-root trick* ([Lijoi, Prünster and Walker, 2005](#); [Walker, Lijoi and Prünster, 2007](#)). Doing so gives the bound,

$$\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y \mid \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}] \leq \left\{ \frac{8e^{2\delta t + c_0 \delta y n \mathcal{E}_I^2} N(\frac{\sqrt{y}\mathcal{E}_I}{16}, \mathcal{P}_I^y, \mathbb{H}) \Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{1 - e^{-yn\mathcal{E}_I^2/256}} \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} \right\}^{1/2} e^{-\frac{yn\mathcal{E}_I^2}{256}}.$$

To obtain the bound in the statement of the lemma, it is enough to prove that $\sup_{y \geq 1} N(\frac{\sqrt{y}\mathcal{E}_I}{16}, \mathcal{P}_I^y, \mathbb{H}) \leq \exp(c_1 2^{J_0} |I|)$. The following lemma helps.

Proposition 6.3. *There exists $\delta_0 > 0$ such that for all $\delta \leq \delta_0$, all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$, and all $\mathbf{F}_I, \mathbf{F}'_I \in \mathcal{A}_I \cap \{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta\}$ it holds $\mathbb{H}(Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}, Q_{\mathbf{F}'_I})^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_L[(S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - S_{\mathbf{F}'_I})^2]$.*

Observe that for $\mathbf{F}_I, \mathbf{F}'_I \in \mathcal{A}_I$ we have $S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - S_{\mathbf{F}'_I} = \sum_{m \in I} (F_m - F'_m)$, where by construction each $F_m - F'_m$ is in \mathcal{F}_m . Then, by [Proposition 7.1-\(4\)](#), and then by [Proposition 7.1-\(3\)](#),

$$\mathbb{E}_L[(S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - S_{\mathbf{F}'_I})^2] \lesssim \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m - F'_m\|_2^2 \lesssim \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{v \in B_m} \langle F_m - F'_m, \varphi_v \rangle^2. \quad (6.5)$$

On the other hand, for all $\mathbf{F}_I \in \mathcal{A}_I^y$, we have by [Proposition 7.1](#) that,

$$\sum_{m \in I} \sum_{v \in B_m} \langle F_m, \varphi_v \rangle^2 \lesssim \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] \lesssim y \mathcal{E}_I^2. \quad (6.6)$$

By [equations \(6.5\) and \(6.6\)](#) and [Proposition 6.3](#), we find that $N(\frac{\sqrt{y} \mathcal{E}_I}{16}, \mathcal{P}_I^y, \mathbb{H})$ is no more than the covering number of a ball of radius $\lesssim \sqrt{y} \mathcal{E}_I$ with balls of radius $\asymp \sqrt{y} \mathcal{E}_I$ in \mathbb{R}^p equipped with the euclidean distance, with $p = \sum_{m \in I} |B_m| \leq |B_0| \cdot |I|$. By [Pollard \(1990, Lemma 4.1\)](#), this implies that there is a universal $K > 0$ such that

$$N\left(\frac{\sqrt{y} \mathcal{E}_I}{16}, \mathcal{P}_I^y, \mathbb{H}\right) \leq \max\left\{1, \left(\frac{3K \sqrt{y} \mathcal{E}_I}{\sqrt{y} \mathcal{E}_I}\right)^p\right\} \leq \max\{1, (3K)^p\}.$$

Finally, by construction it is true that $|B_0| \lesssim 2^{J_0}$. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.3. We use the fact that for all $u, v \geq 0$ we have $\min\{u, v\} = \inf_{\beta \in (0,1)} \{u^{1-\beta} v^\beta\}$. Then, combining the bounds of [Lemma 6.2](#) with the bound of [equation \(6.2\)](#), we get that for any $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and $y \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y | \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}]}{\sqrt{8} e^{2\delta t}} &\leq \min\left\{e^{c_0 \delta y n \mathcal{E}_I^2} \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}, \left(\frac{\exp(-\frac{y n \mathcal{E}_I^2}{256} + c_1 2^{J_0} |I|)}{1 - e^{-y n \mathcal{E}_I^2 / 256}} \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}\right)^{1/2}\right\} \\ &\leq \frac{\exp\left\{-y n \mathcal{E}_I^2 \left(\frac{\beta}{512} + c_0 \delta \beta - c_0 \delta\right) + \frac{\beta c_1 2^{J_0} |I|}{2}\right\}}{(1 - e^{-n \mathcal{E}_I^2 / 256})^{\beta/2}} \left\{\frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}\right\}^{1-\beta/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any $\frac{512 \cdot c_0 \delta}{1 + 512 \cdot c_0 \delta} < \beta \leq 1$, writing $\mu := \frac{\beta}{512} + c_0 \delta \beta - c_0 \delta > 0$ for simplicity, by Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \geq 1} e^{-y \mu n \mathcal{E}_I^2} \left\{\frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}\right\}^{1-\beta/2} &\leq \left\{\sum_{y \geq 1} e^{-2y \mu n \mathcal{E}_I^2 / \beta}\right\}^{\beta/2} \left\{\sum_{y \geq 1} \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I^y)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}\right\}^{1-\beta/2} \\ &= \frac{e^{-\mu n \mathcal{E}_I^2}}{(1 - e^{-2y \mu n \mathcal{E}_I^2 / \beta})^{\beta/2}} \left\{\frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}\right\}^{1-\beta/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows since $(\mathcal{A}_I^y)_{y \geq 1}$ is a partition of \mathcal{A}_I . Therefore,

$$\sum_{y \geq 1} \frac{\mathbb{E}_L[\Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I^y | \mathbf{X}_n) \mathbf{1}_{\Omega_t}]}{\sqrt{8} e^{2\delta t}} \leq \frac{\exp\left\{-\mu n \mathcal{E}_I^2 + \frac{\beta c_1 2^{J_0} |I|}{2}\right\}}{(1 - e^{-n \mathcal{E}_I^2 / 256})^{\beta/2} (1 - e^{-2\mu n \mathcal{E}_I^2 / \beta})^{\beta/2}} \left\{\frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)}\right\}^{1-\beta/2}.$$

By taking $\alpha = \beta/2$ and $\beta > \frac{1024 \cdot C \delta}{1 + 512 \cdot C \delta}$ we have that $\mu > \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{512} + C\delta)\beta$, whence the conclusion. \square

6.3. Control of the covariance terms

The major difficulty in establishing the [Theorem 3.1](#) is to prove estimates on the covariance terms $C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})$ that are sharp enough. The estimate used in the proof of [Theorem 3.1](#) are established in the [Corollaries 6.1](#) and [6.2](#) below, which are consequences of the next lemma. The proof of the [Lemma 6.4](#) is quite long and is deferred to [Section S5.2](#).

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose [Assumption 1](#) is satisfied with constants $K_0, K_1, K_2 > 0$ sufficiently large. Then, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $1 < \delta \leq 1$, for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$, for all $\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta$, and for all $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I \in \mathcal{N}_I$, if $s > 1/2$*

$$\begin{aligned} |C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})| &\leq C\delta \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}^2] + \delta\Gamma \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \|F_0\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I} \\ &\quad + \delta\Gamma \xi^{-\mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{n}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and if $0 < s \leq 1/2$,

$$\begin{aligned} |C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})| &\leq C\delta \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}^2] + \delta\Gamma 2^{-J_0/2} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \|F_0\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I} \\ &\quad + \delta \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \Gamma^2 \xi^{-2\mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2 \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \delta \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \gamma \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 6.1. *Suppose [Assumption 1](#) is satisfied with constants $K_0, K_1, K_2 > 0$ sufficiently large. Then, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $1 < \delta \leq 1$, for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$, for all $y \geq 1$, for all $\mathbf{F}_I \in \mathcal{A}_I^y$, and for all $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I \in \mathcal{N}_I$*

$$C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}) \geq -C\delta y \mathcal{E}_I^2 - \frac{\delta}{n}.$$

Corollary 6.2. *Suppose [Assumption 1](#) is satisfied with constants $K_0, K_1, K_2 > 0$ sufficiently large. Then, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $1 < \delta \leq 1$, for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$\sup\{C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}) : \mathbf{F}_I \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I, \bar{\mathbf{F}}_I \in \mathcal{N}_I\} \leq C\delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2.$$

6.4. Proofs of Propositions 6.1 to 6.3

Proof of Proposition 6.1. The proof is an adaptation of the classical Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart (2000, Lemma 8.1). The first step is to remark that by Jensen's inequality applied to the logarithm

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I} \left(\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_L[\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}] \right) \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I) \\ &\quad + n \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I} \mathbb{E}_L[\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}] \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I). \end{aligned}$$

For all $\mathbf{F}_I \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I$, since $\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}] = 0$, we have whenever $0 < \delta \leq \log(2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_L[\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}] &= -\log \mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}}] \\ &\geq -\log \mathbb{E}_L \left[1 + S_{\mathbf{F}_I} + \frac{1}{2} S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2 e^{\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty} \right] \\ &\geq -\log \left(1 + \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] \right). \end{aligned}$$

By definition $\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] \leq \delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2$ whenever $\mathbf{F}_I \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I$. That is $\mathbb{E}_L[\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}] \geq -\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] \geq -\delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2$ for any $\mathbf{F}_I \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I$. Hence,

$$\log \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I} e^{n\mathbb{P}_n\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})} \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I} \left(\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_L[\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}] \right) \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I) - n\delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2. \quad (6.7)$$

Now we define the random variables $Z_i := \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I} (\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}(X_i) - \mathbb{E}_L[\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}]) \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I)$. Observe that $\mathbb{E}_L[Z_i] = 0$, and $\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - \mathbb{E}_L[\Phi S_{\mathbf{F}_I}] = S_{\mathbf{F}_I}$, so we have $|Z_i| \leq \delta$ because Π is a probability measure. Further, by an application of Jensen's inequality and Fubini's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_L[Z_i^2] &= \mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I} S_{\mathbf{F}_I}(X_i) \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_L \left[\int_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I} S_{\mathbf{F}_I}(X_i)^2 \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I) \right] \\ &= \int_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] \Pi(d\mathbf{F}_I). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathbb{E}_L[Z_i^2] \leq \delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2$, because of the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I$, and because Π is a probability measure. By the equation (6.7), the probability of Ω_t^c is no more than the probability of having $\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \leq -\delta t - \sqrt{2n\delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2 t}$. The conclusion of the proposition then follows by Bernstein's inequality (Boucheron, Lugosi and Massart, 2013, Theorem 2.10). \square

Proof of Proposition 6.2. Observe that by definition $q_{\mathbf{F}_I}(x) = p_L(x) e^{\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})}$. Also we have $\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}] = 0$ and thus $\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}) = S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}}]$. We lower bound $H(Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}, P_L)$ by obtaining an upper bound on the Hellinger affinity $R(Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}, P_L) := \int_{[0,1]} \sqrt{q_{\mathbf{F}_I} p_L}$ and using that $H(Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}, P_L)^2 = 1 - R(Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}, P_L)$. Clearly $R(Q_{\mathbf{F}_I}, P_L) = \mathbb{E}_L[e^{\frac{1}{2}\Phi(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})}] = \mathbb{E}_L[e^{\frac{1}{2}S_{\mathbf{F}_I}}] / \mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}}]^{1/2}$. But $\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \leq \eta$,

thus $\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F_I}}] \geq 1 + \mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}^2]e^{-\eta} = 1 + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}^2]e^{-\eta}$. Consequently, $\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F_I}}]^{1/2} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}^2]e^{O(\eta)}$. Similarly, $\mathbb{E}_L[e^{\frac{1}{2}S_{F_I}}] \leq 1 + \frac{1}{8}\mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}^2]e^\eta$. It follows $R(Q_{F_I}, P_L) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{8}\mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}^2]e^{O(\eta)}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 6.3. Remark that $\mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}] = 0$, so $\Phi(S_{F_I}) = S_{F_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F_I}}]$, and similarly for $\Phi(S_{F'_I})$. Since $\|S_{F_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta$ then $\|\Phi(S_{F_I})\|_\infty \leq 2\delta$, similarly for $S_{F'_I}$. By a Taylor expansion there is $u \in (\Phi(S_{F_I}), \Phi(S_{F'_I}))$, and hence $|u| \leq 2\delta$, such that $e^{\frac{1}{2}\Phi(S_{F_I})} = e^{\frac{1}{2}\Phi(S_{F'_I})} + \frac{1}{2}(\Phi(S_{F_I}) - \Phi(S_{F'_I}))e^u$. That is, $(e^{\frac{1}{2}\Phi(S_{F_I})} - e^{\frac{1}{2}\Phi(S_{F'_I})})^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}e^{4\delta}(\Phi(S_{F_I}) - \Phi(S_{F'_I}))^2$. Then we can bound the Hellinger distance as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} H(Q_{F_I}, Q_{F'_I})^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \int \left(\sqrt{p_L e^{\Phi(S_{F_I})}} - \sqrt{p_L e^{\Phi(S_{F'_I})}} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_L \left[(e^{\frac{1}{2}\Phi(S_{F_I})} - e^{\frac{1}{2}\Phi(S_{F'_I})})^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{8} e^{4\delta} \mathbb{E}_L \left[(\Phi(S_{F_I}) - \Phi(S_{F'_I}))^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the square in the last equation and using that $\mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}] = \mathbb{E}_L[S_{F'_I}] = 0$, we find that

$$H(Q_{F_I}, Q_{F'_I})^2 \leq \frac{1}{8} e^{4\delta} \mathbb{E}_L[(S_{F_I} - S_{F'_I})^2] + \frac{1}{8} e^{4\delta} \log^2 \frac{\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F_I}}]}{\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F'_I}}]}. \quad (6.8)$$

Now remark that $\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F_I}}] = \mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F'_I}} e^{S_{F_I} - S_{F'_I}}] = \mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F'_I}}] + \mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F'_I}}(e^{S_{F_I} - S_{F'_I}} - 1)]$, and hence $|\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F_I}}]/\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{F'_I}}] - 1| \leq e^{O(\delta)} \mathbb{E}_L[|S_{F_I} - S_{F'_I}|] \leq e^{O(\delta)} \mathbb{E}_L[(S_{F_I} - S_{F'_I})^2]^{1/2}$. It follows that the second term of the rhs of equation (6.8) is bounded by $\frac{1}{8} e^{O(\delta)} \mathbb{E}_L[(S_{F_I} - S_{F'_I})^2]$, and hence $H(Q_{F_I}, Q_{F'_I}) \leq \frac{1}{4} e^{O(\delta)} \mathbb{E}_L[(S_{F_I} - S_{F'_I})^2]$. \square

6.5. Proofs of Corollaries 6.1 and 6.2

Proof of Corollary 6.1: the case where $s > 1/2$. By construction, if $m \in I$ and $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{A}_I$, then $\|F_m\|_2 \geq H_I(m)$. Thus, if $I \cap \{m : J_m \leq j_n\} \neq \emptyset$, for all $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{A}_I$,

$$(\Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}})^2 \frac{\log(n)}{n} \leq \sum_{m \in I} H_I(m)^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \leq \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n}.$$

Also if $0 \in I$, then $\Gamma^2 \log(n)/n \leq \|F_0\|_2^2$. Therefore Lemma 6.4 and Young's inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{C}(S_{F_I}, S_{\bar{F}_I})| &\leq C\delta \mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}^2] + \delta \|F_0\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I} + \delta \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta}{2} \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} + \frac{\delta}{2n}. \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows since $\sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \asymp \mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I}^2]$ by Proposition 7.1-(4). \square

Proof of Corollary 6.1: the case where $0 < s \leq 1/2$. By construction, if $m \in I$ and $F \in \mathcal{A}_I$, then $\|F_m\|_2 \geq H_I(m)$. Thus, if $I \cap \{m : J_m \leq j_n\} \neq \emptyset$, for all $F \in \mathcal{A}_I$,

$$(\Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}})^2 \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2 \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \leq \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n}.$$

Similarly if $I \cap \{m : J_m > j_n\} \neq \emptyset$, we have by construction for all $F \in \mathcal{A}_I$

$$\gamma^2 \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \leq \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n}.$$

Also of $0 \in I$, then $\Gamma^2 2^{-J_0} \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2 \leq \|F_0\|_2^2$. Therefore Lemma 6.4 implies

$$|C(S_{F_I}, S_{\tilde{F}_I})| \leq C \delta \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\tilde{F}_I}^2] + \delta \|F_0\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I} + \delta \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2.$$

The conclusion follows since $\sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \asymp \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\tilde{F}_I}^2]$ by Proposition 7.1-(4). \square

Proof of Corollary 6.2. The proof follows immediately from Lemma 6.4, from the fact that $\sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \asymp \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\tilde{F}_I}^2]$ by Proposition 7.1-(4), and from the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I$. \square

7. Auxiliary results and remaining proofs

7.1. Relations between norms

In many places we need to relate norm of various functions. In this section we collect the propositions that serve this purpose.

Proposition 7.1. *Let J_0 be chosen large enough. Then the following are true.*

1. For all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and all $F \in \mathcal{F}_m$, $F = \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle (\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}])$;
2. For all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, all $F \in \mathcal{F}_m$, and all $(j,k) \notin B_0 \cup B_m \implies \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle = 0$.
3. There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and all $F \in \mathcal{F}_m$, $C_1 \sum_{v \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_v \rangle^2 \leq \|F\|_2^2 \leq C_2 \sum_{v \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_v \rangle^2$.
4. There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for all $J \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$, for all collections $\{F_m \in \mathcal{F}_m : m \in J\}$, $C_1 \sum_{m \in J} \|F_m\|_2^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_L[(\sum_{m \in J} F_m)^2] \leq C_2 \sum_{m \in J} \|F_m\|_2^2$.
5. There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that $\sup_x \sum_k |\varphi_{j,k}(x)| \leq C_1 2^{j/2}$ for all $j \geq 0$, and $\sum_k |\mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]| \leq C_2 2^{j/2}$ for all $j \geq 0$. Consequently, $\sup_x \sum_k |\varphi_{j,k}(x) - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]| \leq 2 \max\{C_1, C_2\} 2^{j/2}$ for all $j \geq 0$;

Proposition 7.2. *Suppose Assumption 1 is valid. There exists a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$,*

$$\mathcal{E}_I^2 \geq C \left(\frac{\Gamma^2 \log(n)}{n} \sum_{m \in I} \xi^{-21_{0 \in I}} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} + \gamma^2 \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right).$$

7.2. Proofs of the lemmas used in the guidelines of Section 3 and proof of the Corollary 3.1

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Write $g = \sum_{m \geq 0} F_m$ for simplicity. Then, remark that $\mathbb{E}_L[g] = 0$, and thus $\mathbb{E}_L[e^g] \geq \mathbb{E}_L[1 + g + \frac{1}{2}g^2 e^{-\|g\|_\infty}] = 1 + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_L[g^2]e^{-\|g\|_\infty} \geq 1$, and with the same argument $1 \leq \mathbb{E}_L[e^g] \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_L[g^2]e^{\|g\|_\infty}$. It follows from equation (3.1) that $|L_{\mathbf{F}} - L| \leq |g| + |\log \mathbb{E}_L[e^g]| = |g| + \log \mathbb{E}_L[e^g] \leq |g| + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_L[g^2]e^{\|g\|_\infty}$. Since $\mathbb{E}_L[g^2] \leq \|g\|_\infty^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_{\mathbf{F}} - L\|_\infty &\leq \left\| \sum_{m \geq 0} F_m \right\|_\infty \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sum_{m \geq 0} F_m \right\|_\infty e^{\|\sum_{m \geq 0} F_m\|_\infty} \right) \\ &\lesssim \left\| \sum_{m \geq 0} F_m \right\|_\infty, \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

because by assumption $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{C}_*$. Further, by Proposition 7.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{m \geq 0} F_m \right\|_\infty &\leq \sup_{x \in [0,1]} \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} |\langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| |\varphi_{j,k}(x) - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]| \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in [0,1]} \sum_{j \geq J_0} \sup_{m: J_m = j} \sup_{(j,k) \in B_m} |\langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| \sum_k |\varphi_{j,k}(x) - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j \geq J_0} \sup_{m: J_m = j} \|F_m\|_2 2^{j/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

The conclusion follows by combining equations (7.1) and (7.2). \square

Proof of Lemma 3.3. We first establish that $(\mathcal{S}_I)_{I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+}$ is a partition of \mathcal{F} . Pick $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F}$ arbitrary. We want to show that there exists a unique $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{S}_I$. We have the following two possibilities:

- If $\|F_0\|_2 \geq \rho_0 \Gamma$, choose $I = \{0\} \cup \{m \geq 1 : \|F_m\|_2 > \rho_m \Gamma \xi^{-1}, J_m \leq j_n\} \cup \{m \geq 1 : \|F_m\|_2 > \gamma 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)}, J_m > j_n\}$.
- If $\|F_0\|_2 < \rho_0 \Gamma$, choose $I = \{m \geq 1 : \|F_m\|_2 > \rho_m \Gamma, J_m \leq j_n\} \cup \{m \geq 1 : \|F_m\|_2 > \gamma 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)}, J_m > j_n\}$.

The index set I is uniquely defined by \mathbf{F} , and $\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{S}_I$. We now prove the second claim. Let $A := \bigcup_{I \neq \emptyset} \mathcal{S}_I$. We can decompose A as $A_1 \cup A_2$ where $A_1 := \bigcup_{I \neq \emptyset, 0 \in I} \mathcal{S}_I = \bigcup_{I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+, 0 \in I} \mathcal{S}_I$, and $A_2 := \bigcup_{I \neq \emptyset, 0 \notin I} \mathcal{S}_I$. Remark that $A_1 = \{\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F} : \|F_0\|_2 \geq \rho_0 \Gamma\}$, and $A_2 = A_1^c \cap \{\mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F} : \exists m \geq 1, \|F_m\|_2 > H_I(m)\}$. Note that if $0 \in I$ then A_1^c is empty, so

$$A_2 = A_1^c \cap \left\{ \mathbf{F} \in \mathcal{F} : \exists m \geq 1, \|F_m\|_2 \geq \rho_m \Gamma \xi^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} + \gamma 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}.$$

The conclusion follows since $A^c = A_1^c \cap A_2^c$ and since $\xi > 1$. \square

Proof of Corollary 3.1: the case where $s > 1/2$. In view of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, it is sufficient to show that

$$\sum_{j=J_0}^{j_n} \Gamma \rho_m 2^{j/2} + \sum_{j > j_n} \gamma 2^{-js} \lesssim \tilde{\varepsilon}_n^*(s). \quad (7.3)$$

But, $\gamma \sum_{j>j_n} 2^{-js} \lesssim \gamma 2^{-j_n s} \lesssim (\Gamma/\gamma)^{\frac{2s}{2s+1}} \varepsilon_n^*(s)$ by the definition of j_n in equation (3.2). On the other hand $\sum_{j=J_0}^{j_n} \Gamma \rho_m 2^{j/2} \lesssim \Gamma \sqrt{\log(n)/n} 2^{j_n/2} \lesssim \Gamma (\gamma/\Gamma)^{\frac{1}{2s+1}} \varepsilon_n^*(s)$, still by equation (3.2). \square

Proof of Corollary 3.1: the case where $0 < s \leq 1/2$. As for the other case, it is enough to show that equation (7.3) holds true. In this cas, $\gamma \sum_{j>j_n} 2^{-js} \lesssim \gamma 2^{-j_n s} \lesssim \Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2$ by equation (3.2). Also, $\sum_{j=J_0}^{j_n} \Gamma \rho_m 2^{j/2} \leq \Gamma j_n \varepsilon_n^*(s) \lesssim \log(\Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s)/\gamma) \Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s) \lesssim \log(n) \varepsilon_n^*(s)$, again by equation (3.2). \square

7.3. Proofs of Propositions 7.1 and 7.2

Proof of Proposition 7.1, Item (1). By construction we know that there are numbers $a_{j,k} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $F = \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} a_{j,k} (\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}])$. We note that if $m \geq 1$ the coefficients $(a_{j,k})$ are uniquely determined by $a_{j,k} = \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle$, because $J_m > J_0$ is large enough such that all $\langle \varphi_{j,k}, 1 \rangle = 0$ for all $(j,k) \in B_m$. Thus $\langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle = \sum_{(j',k') \in B_m} a_{j',k'} \langle \varphi_{j',k'}, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle = a_{j,k}$, for any $(j,k) \in B_m$. This establishes the proof for $m \geq 1$. For $m = 0$, it is the case that F_0 is in the span of $\{\varphi_{j,k} : (j,k) \in B_0\}$ (because the constants are included in the span), and thus F_0 can be uniquely written as $F_0 = \sum_{(j,k) \in B_0} \langle F_0, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k}$. But by construction, $\mathbb{E}_L[F_0] = 0$, so in fact $F_0 = \sum_{(j,k) \in B_0} \langle F_0, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle (\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}])$. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.1, Item (2). This follows from the Item (1) and because for $(j,k) \notin B_0$ and J_0 large enough, we have $\langle 1, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle = 0$. Therefore, it is the case that $\langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle = \sum_{(j',k') \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_{j',k'} \rangle \langle \varphi_{j',k'}, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle$. By orthogonality of the wavelet basis, the previous is either 0 if $(j,k) \notin B_m$, or $\langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle$ otherwise. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.1, Item (3). The lower bound is immediate because $\|F\|_2^2 = \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle^2 \geq \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle^2$, so indeed $C_1 = 1$ works. For the upper bound, we note that because $\|L\|_\infty \lesssim 1$ we have $\|F_m\|_2^2 \asymp \mathbb{E}_L[F_m^2]$, and by Item (1)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_L[F_m^2] &= \mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L \left[\sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k} \right] \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\lesssim \left\| \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k} \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by the orthogonality of the wavelet basis. \square

Proof of Proposition 7.1, Item (4). We start with the upper bound, which follows from similar arguments than those of the Item (3). Indeed, recall that $\mathbb{E}_L[g^2] \asymp \|g\|_2^2$ for all g because $\|L\|_\infty \lesssim 1$, hence

$$\mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} F_m \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L \left[\sum_{m \in J} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k} \right] \right)^2 \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\lesssim \left\| \sum_{m \in J} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle \varphi_{j,k} \right\|_2^2 \\
&= \sum_{m \in J} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle^2
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by the [Item \(2\)](#),

$$\mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} F_m \right)^2 \right] \lesssim \sum_{m \in J} \|F_m\|_2^2. \quad (7.4)$$

We now proceed with the lower bound. By the [Item \(1\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{m \in J} F_m \right\|_2^2 &= \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} \left\langle \sum_{m' \in J} F_{m'}, \varphi_{j,k} \right\rangle^2 \\
&\geq \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \left\langle \sum_{m' \in J} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_{m'}} \langle F_{m'}, \varphi_{j',k'} \rangle (\varphi_{j',k'} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j',k'}]), \varphi_{j,k} \right\rangle^2 \\
&= \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \left\langle \sum_{m' \in J} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_{m'}} \langle F_{m'}, \varphi_{j',k'} \rangle \varphi_{j',k'}, \varphi_{j,k} \right\rangle^2 \\
&= \sum_{m \in J} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle^2 \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third line follows because $\langle 1, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle = 0$ for all $(j,k) \notin B_0$, and the last line by orthogonality of the wavelet basis. Therefore by the [Item \(3\)](#) it must be the case that

$$\mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} F_m \right)^2 \right] \gtrsim \sum_{m \in J} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0}. \quad (7.5)$$

The last display gives the proof in the case where $0 \notin J$. We now assume that $0 \in J$, which is a more delicate case. In this situation, we have that $F_0 = \sum_{m \in J} F_m - \sum_{m \in J} F_m \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0}$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_L[F_0^2] &\leq 2\mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} F_m \right)^2 \right] + 2\mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} F_m \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right)^2 \right] \\
&\lesssim \mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} F_m \right)^2 \right] + \sum_{m \in J} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0},
\end{aligned} \quad (7.6)$$

where the second line follows from the upper bound of [equation \(7.4\)](#) applied to the index set $J \setminus \{0\}$. Combining [equations \(7.5\)](#) and [\(7.6\)](#),

$$\|F_0\|_2^2 \lesssim \mathbb{E}_L[F_0^2] \lesssim \mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} F_m \right)^2 \right]. \quad (7.7)$$

Now if we combine the [equations \(7.5\) and \(7.7\)](#), we have indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(\sum_{m \in J} F_m \right)^2 \right] &\gtrsim \max \left\{ \sum_{m \in J} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0}, \|F_0\|_2^2 \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m \in J} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} + \frac{1}{2} \|F_0\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m \in J} \|F_m\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 7.1, Item (5). The first claim is a well-known localization properties of the wavelet basis. The second fact follows because $\mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}] \leq \|p_L\|_\infty \|\varphi_{j,k}\|_1 \lesssim \|p_L\|_\infty 2^{-j/2}$, and because there are no more than 2^j wavelets at each level $j \geq 0$. The third fact is obvious. □

Proof of Proposition 7.2. From the definition of \mathcal{E}_I and from [Proposition 7.1-\(4\)](#), it is immediate that $\mathcal{E}_I^2 \gtrsim \sum_{m \in I} H_I(m)^2$. If $s > 1/2$ then the result is immediate. In case $0 < s \leq 1/2$, then we note that by definition of j_n

$$\gamma 2^{-j_n(s+1/2)} \geq \Gamma 2^{-j_n/2} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \implies 2^{-j_n} \geq \left(\frac{\Gamma}{\gamma} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \left(\frac{\log(n)}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2s+1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \in I} \rho_m^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} &= \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \\ &\geq 2^{-j_n} \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2 \sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \\ &= \left(\frac{\Gamma}{\gamma} \right)^{\frac{1}{s}} \cdot \frac{\log(n)}{n} \sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \\ &\geq \frac{\log(n)}{n} \sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is true under [Assumption 1](#). □

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research grant #FA9550-15-1-0074. The author also thanks Daniel M. Roy for helpful discussions and the opportunity to work on this project.

References

BARRON, A., SCHERVISH, M. J. and WASSERMAN, L. (1999). The consistency of posterior distributions in nonparametric problems. *Ann. Statist.* **27** 536–561.

- BOUCHERON, S., LUGOSI, G. and MASSART, P. (2013). *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford university press.
- BROWN, L. D., ZHANG, C.-H. et al. (1998). Asymptotic nonequivalence of nonparametric experiments when the smoothness index is $1/2$. *The Annals of Statistics* **26** 279–287.
- CASTILLO, I. (2014). On Bayesian supremum norm contraction rates. *Ann. Statist.* **42** 2058–2091.
- CASTILLO, I. (2017). Pólya tree posterior distributions on densities. In *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques* **53** 2074–2102. Institut Henri Poincaré.
- CASTILLO, I. and MISMER, R. (2019). Spike and Slab Pólya tree posterior distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.12106*.
- COHEN, A., DAUBECHIES, I. and VIAL, P. (1993). Wavelet bases on the interval and fast algorithms. *Journal of Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* **1** 54–81.
- DONOHO, D. L., JOHNSTONE, I. M., KERKYACHARIAN, G. and PICARD, D. (1996). Density estimation by wavelet thresholding. *Ann. Statist.* 508–539.
- GHOSAL, S., GHOSH, J. K. and VAN DER VAART, A. W. (2000). Convergence rates of posterior distributions. *Ann. Statist.* **28** 500–531.
- GHOSAL, S. and VAN DER VAART, A. (2007a). Posterior convergence rates of Dirichlet mixtures at smooth densities. *Ann. Statist.* **35** 697–723.
- GHOSAL, S. and VAN DER VAART, A. (2007b). Convergence rates of posterior distributions for noniid observations. *Ann. Statist.* **35** 192–223.
- GINÉ, E. and NICKL, R. (2011). Rates of contraction for posterior distributions in L^r -metrics, $1 \leq r \leq \infty$. *Ann. Statist.* **39** 2883–2911.
- GINÉ, E. and NICKL, R. (2016). *Mathematical foundations of infinite-dimensional statistical models* **40**. Cambridge University Press.
- GOLDENSHLUGER, A. and LEPSKI, O. (2014). On adaptive minimax density estimation on \mathbb{R}^d . *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **159** 479–543.
- HÄRDLE, W., KERKYACHARIAN, G., PICARD, D. and TSYBAKOV, A. (2000). *Wavelets, approximation, and statistical applications*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- HASMINSKII, R. Z. (1979). A lower bound on the risks of non-parametric estimates of densities in the uniform metric. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* **23** 794–798.
- HOFFMANN, M., ROUSSEAU, J. and SCHMIDT-HIEBER, J. (2015). On adaptive posterior concentration rates. *Ann. Statist.* **43** 2259–2295.
- IBRAGIMOV, I. A. and HASMINSKII, R. Z. (1980). On estimate of the density function. *Zapiski Nauchnykh Seminarov POMI* **98** 61–85.
- LIJOI, A., PRÜNSTER, I. and WALKER, S. G. (2005). On consistency of nonparametric normal mixtures for Bayesian density estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **100** 1292–1296.
- MITCHELL, T. J. and BEAUCHAMP, J. J. (1988). Bayesian variable selection in linear regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **83** 1023–1032.
- POLLARD, D. (1990). Empirical processes: theory and applications. In *NSF-CBMS regional conference series in probability and statistics* i–86. JSTOR.
- RIVOIRARD, V. and ROUSSEAU, J. (2012). Bernstein–von Mises theorem for linear functionals of the density. *Ann. Statist.* **40** 1489–1523.
- SCHWARTZ, L. (1965). On Bayes procedures. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete* **4** 10–26.
- SCRICCILOLO, C. (2014). Adaptive Bayesian Density Estimation in L^p -metrics with Pitman–Yor or Normalized inverse-Gaussian Process Kernel Mixtures. *Bayesian Analysis* **9** 475–520.
- SHEN, X., WASSERMAN, L. et al. (2001). Rates of convergence of posterior distributions. *Ann. Statist.* **29** 687–714.

- WALKER, S. G., LIJOI, A. and PRÜNSTER, I. (2007). On rates of convergence for posterior distributions in infinite-dimensional models. *Ann. Statist.* 738–746.
- YOO, W. W. and GHOSAL, S. (2016). Supremum norm posterior contraction and credible sets for nonparametric multivariate regression. *Ann. Statist.* **44** 1069–1102.
- YOO, W. W., ROUSSEAU, J. and RIVOIRARD, V. (2017). Adaptive Supremum Norm Posterior Contraction: Spike-and-Slab Priors and Anisotropic Besov Spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.01909*.

Adaptive Bayesian density estimation in sup-norm : Supplementary Material

ZACHARIE NAULET

Université Paris-Saclay

Laboratoire de mathématiques d'Orsay

91405, Orsay, France

E-mail: zacharie.naulet@universite-paris-saclay.fr

S1. Organization

This document is supplementary material for the article *Adaptive Bayesian density estimation in sup-norm*. It contains the missing proofs for the *spike-and-slab* prior example. We refer to the main document for all the definitions.

- In [Section S2](#), we introduce some new notations that were not needed in the main document, but which we will need in the supplemental.
- In [Section S3](#), we prove the posterior concentration on small Hellinger neighborhoods of the true density. This is the first step toward concentration in stronger distances.
- In [Section S4](#), we prove posterior concentration on \mathbb{L}_2 neighborhoods and uniform posterior consistency, which is needed to prove the [Lemma 3.1](#) stated in the main document.
- In [Section S5.1](#), we give the proofs that are missing in the main document. In particular, the [Lemma 3.1](#) establishing the posterior concentration on \mathcal{C}_* is proved in [Section S5.1](#), the [Lemma 6.4](#) controlling the covariance terms is proved in [Section S5.2](#), and finally [Lemmas 5.1](#) and [5.2](#) are proved in [Section S5.3](#).

Every section, subsection, theorem, etc. of the supplemental has label prefixed by S and is cited in cyan. References to the main document are cited in blue with no prefix.

S2. Notations

We use the same conventions as in the main paper. We furthermore make use of the following measures of discrepancy between probability distributions. The Kullback–Leibler divergence is written $\text{KL}(P, Q) := \int_0^1 p \log(p/q)$. We also use the second-order measure of discrepancy $\mathbb{V}(P, Q) := \int_0^1 p \log^2(p/q)$.

For convenience, we also define the following sequence norms on Θ . We denote the usual ℓ_2 norm by $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2^2 := \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} |\theta_{j,k}|^2$. In addition, we define the mixed $\ell_{1,\infty}$ norm such that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_{1,\infty} := \sum_{j \geq 0} \max_k |\theta_{j,k}| 2^{j/2}$. It is a well-known fact that if $f = \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} \theta_{j,k} \varphi_{j,k}$, then $\|f\|_\infty \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_{1,\infty}$, and $\|f\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2$.

S3. Posterior concentration on Hellinger balls

The starting point to the proof of the concentration of the posterior in strong distances is to first establish the contraction of the posterior for P_θ on small Hellinger neighborhoods of P_L . We will prove that for $\varepsilon_n^*(s) := (\log(n)/n)^{s/(2s+1)}$, the spike-and-slab log-density prior satisfies for $M > 0$ large enough,

$$\sup_{L \in \Sigma(R, s)} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\theta : \mathbb{H}(P_\theta, P_L) > M\varepsilon_n^*(s) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) = o(1), \quad n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{S3.1})$$

This will prove the [Theorem 2.1](#). One can notice that $\varepsilon_n^*(s)$ is not the optimal rate for the Hellinger distance. This is a well-known consequence of the fact that prior independence of the wavelets coefficients cannot yield optimal contraction on Hellinger or \mathbb{L}_2 balls ([Hoffmann, Rousseau and Schmidt-Hieber, 2015](#); [Cai, 2008](#)).

[Equation \(S3.1\)](#) is obtained classically, as a consequence of [Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart \(2000, Theorem 2.1\)](#) combined with [Propositions S3.1](#) and [S3.2](#) below.

Proposition S3.1. *Let Π be the spike-and-slab prior described in [Section 2.2](#). Assume $L \in \Sigma(R, s)$ for some $0 < s_0 \leq s \leq S$ and let $\varepsilon_n^*(s) := (\log(n)/n)^{s/(2s+1)}$. Then, there exists $C > 0$ such that for n large enough,*

$$\Pi(\text{KL}(P_L, P_\theta) \leq \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2, \mathbb{V}(P_L, P_\theta) \leq \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2) \geq \exp\{-Cn\varepsilon_n^*(s)^2\}.$$

Proof. Let θ be such that $|\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L| \leq n^{-1/2}$ if $j \leq \tilde{J}$ and $\theta_{j,k} = 0$ for $j > \tilde{J}$, with \tilde{J} a truncation level to be chosen accordingly. Because $|\theta_{j,k}^L| \leq R2^{-j(s+1/2)}$ by assumption, this implies that $\|\theta - \theta^L\|_{1,\infty} \lesssim \sum_{j \leq \tilde{J}} 2^{j/2} n^{-1/2} + \sum_{j > \tilde{J}} 2^{-js} \lesssim 2^{\tilde{J}/2} n^{-1/2} + 2^{-\tilde{J}s} \lesssim \varepsilon_n^*(s)$ by choosing the optimal truncation level. By [van der Vaart and van Zanten \(2008, Lemma 3.1\)](#), this implies that $\text{KL}(P_L, P_\theta) \lesssim \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2$ and $\mathbb{V}(P_L, P_\theta) \lesssim \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2$. Thus, for some $B > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\text{KL}(P_L, P_\theta) \leq B\varepsilon_n^*(s)^2, \mathbb{V}(P_L, \theta) \leq B\varepsilon_n^*(s)^2) \\ &\geq \prod_{j \leq \tilde{J}} \prod_k \omega_j \Pi_{j,k}(|\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L| \leq n^{-1/2}) \prod_{j=\tilde{J}}^{J_n} \prod_k (1 - \omega_j) \\ &\geq \prod_{j \leq \tilde{J}} \prod_k \omega_j 2^{j(s_0+1/2)} \int_{\theta_{j,k}^L - n^{-1/2}}^{\theta_{j,k}^L + n^{-1/2}} f(2^{j(s_0+1/2)} t) dt \prod_{j=\tilde{J}}^{J_n} \prod_k (1 - \omega_j) \\ &= \prod_{j \leq \tilde{J}} \prod_k \omega_j \int_{2^{j(s_0+1/2)}(\theta_{j,k}^L - n^{-1/2})}^{2^{j(s_0+1/2)}(\theta_{j,k}^L + n^{-1/2})} f(t) dt \prod_{j=\tilde{J}}^{J_n} \prod_k (1 - \omega_j). \end{aligned}$$

Since $s \geq s_0$ and $j \leq \tilde{J}$, there is a constant $g > 0$ such that $f \geq g$ always on the domain of integration of the previous display. Moreover, $\omega_j \gtrsim e^{-j b_1}$ and there are no more than a generic constant times 2^j wavelets at each level j , then for some constants $C > 0$,

$$\Pi(\text{KL}(P_L, P_\theta) \leq B\varepsilon_n^*(s)^2, \mathbb{V}(P_L, P_\theta) \leq B\varepsilon_n^*(s)^2) \geq \exp\{-C2^{\tilde{J}} \log(n)\}.$$

The conclusion follows since $2^{\tilde{J}} \log(n) \lesssim n\varepsilon_n^*(s)^2$. \square

Proposition S3.2. *Let Π be the spike-and-slab prior described in Section 2.2. Let $n\varepsilon_n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ with $\log(n\varepsilon_n^2) \gtrsim \log(n)$ and let n be large enough. Then for every $C > 0$ there exists a sequence of sets $(\Theta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ such that $\Pi(\Theta_n) \lesssim \exp\{-Cn\varepsilon_n^2\}$ and $\log N(\varepsilon_n, \mathcal{P}_n, \mathbf{H}) \leq n\varepsilon_n^2$, where $\mathcal{P}_n = \{p_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} : \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta_n\}$.*

Proof. We choose, for some constant $K, K' > 0$,

$$\Theta_n := \left\{ \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta : \begin{array}{l} \sup_{j,k} 2^{j(s_0+1/2)} |\theta_{j,k}| \leq \log(Kn\varepsilon_n^2), \\ |\{\theta_{j,k} \neq 0\}| \leq K'n\varepsilon_n^2 / \log(n\varepsilon_n^2) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then, by construction of the prior since $\theta_{j,k} = 2^{-j(s_0+1/2)} Z_{j,k}$ for $Z_{j,k} \sim F$, and since all the coefficients are independent,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\Theta_n^c) &\leq \sum_{j,k} \omega_j \Pi(|Z_{j,k}| > \log(Kn\varepsilon_n^2)) + \Pi\left(|\{\theta_{j,k} \neq 0\}| > \frac{K'n\varepsilon_n^2}{\log(n\varepsilon_n^2)}\right) \\ &\leq e^{-b_2 Kn\varepsilon_n^2} + \Pi\left(|\{\theta_{j,k} \neq 0\}| > \frac{K'n\varepsilon_n^2}{\log(n\varepsilon_n^2)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows because $\omega_j \leq 2^{-j(1+\mu_*)}$ for $\mu_* > 0$ and because there are at most a generic constant times 2^j wavelets at each level $j \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and because of the assumption of equation (2.3). Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}_{\Pi}[|\{\theta_{j,k} \neq 0\}|] \leq \sum_{j=0}^{J_n} \sum_k 2^{-j(1+\mu_*)} \lesssim 1$, Hence, by Chernoff's bound, for some constant $B > 0$ when $K'n\varepsilon_n^2$ gets large enough

$$\Pi\left(|\{\theta_{j,k} \neq 0\}| > \frac{K'n\varepsilon_n^2}{\log(n\varepsilon_n^2)}\right) \leq e^{-BK'n\varepsilon_n^2}.$$

Thus Θ_n meets the first requirement of the proposition.

We now determine an upper bound on $N(\varepsilon_n, \mathcal{P}_n, \mathbf{H})$. We assume without loss of generality that $M_n := K'n\varepsilon_n^2 / \log(n\varepsilon_n^2)$ is integer. Furthermore there is a generic constant $c > 0$ such that, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \Theta_n$ (see van der Vaart and van Zanten, 2008, Lemma 3.1),

$$\mathbf{H}(P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}'}) \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}'\|_{1,\infty} e^{-c\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}'\|_{1,\infty}}.$$

But, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}' \in \Theta_n$, writing $Z_{j,k} = 2^{j(s_0+1/2)} \theta_{j,k}$ and $Z'_{j,k} = 2^{j(s_0+1/2)} \theta'_{j,k}$, it is clear that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}'\|_{1,\infty} \lesssim \|\mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{Z}'\|_{\infty}$. Since $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ has no more than M_n non-zero entries, $N(\varepsilon_n, \mathcal{P}_n, \mathbf{H})$ is no more than the sum over all possible subsets of indices $I \subseteq A_n := \{(j,k) : j \leq \frac{\log(n)}{\log(2)}\}$ such that $|I| \leq M_n$ of the covering numbers of

$$E_I := \left\{ \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^I : \|\mathbf{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \log(Kn\varepsilon_n^2) \right\}$$

with balls of radius $B\varepsilon_n$, for a universal $B > 0$. A $B\varepsilon_n$ -net over E_I has cardinality no more than

$$\left(\frac{\log(Kn\varepsilon_n^2)}{B\varepsilon_n} \right)^{|I|} \leq \left(\frac{\log(Kn\varepsilon_n^2)}{B\varepsilon_n} \right)^{M_n} \lesssim e^{C_1 K'n\varepsilon_n^2},$$

for some universal $C_1 > 0$. The number of possible subsets is $\sum_{m=0}^{M_n} \binom{|A_n|}{m}$. Using the well-known inequality $\binom{n}{k} \leq \frac{n^k}{k!}$, we deduce that,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{M_n} \binom{|A_n|}{m} \leq \sum_{m=0}^{M_n} \frac{|A_n|^m}{m!} = \frac{e^{|A_n|}}{M_n!} \int_{|A_n|}^{\infty} t^{M_n} e^{-t} dt.$$

By Stirling's formula, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, because $|A_n| \gg M_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=0}^{M_n} \binom{|A_n|}{m} &\leq \frac{(1+o(1))e^{|A_n|+M_n-M_n \log M_n}}{\sqrt{2\pi M_n}} \int_{|A_n|}^{\infty} t^{M_n} e^{-t} dt \\ &= \frac{(1+o(1))|A_n|e^{|A_n|+M_n-M_n \log M_n+M_n \log |A_n|}}{\sqrt{2\pi M_n}} \int_1^{\infty} e^{-u|A_n|+M_n \log(u)} du \\ &\leq \frac{(1+o(1))|A_n|e^{|A_n|+M_n-M_n \log M_n+M_n \log |A_n|}}{\sqrt{2\pi M_n}} \int_1^{\infty} e^{-u|A_n|(1-\frac{M_n}{e|A_n|})} du \\ &= \frac{(1+o(1))e^{M_n(1+e^{-1})-M_n \log M_n+M_n \log |A_n|}}{\sqrt{2\pi M_n}(1-\frac{M_n}{e|A_n|})}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $M_n \asymp \frac{K'n\varepsilon_n^2}{\log(n\varepsilon_n^2)}$ and $|A_n| \lesssim n$, it follows for some universal constant $C_2 > 0$ that $\sum_{m=0}^{M_n} \binom{|A_n|}{m} \lesssim e^{C_2 K' n \varepsilon_n^2}$. The conclusion of the proposition follows by picking K' small enough. \square

S4. Posterior concentration on L^2 balls and uniform consistency

Here we strengthen a little bit the result of [Section S3](#) and we show that the posterior indeed concentrates on $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}$ neighborhoods of θ^L . Indeed, since the coefficients θ^L is only identifiable up to suitable translation, we don't expect to concentrate on balls of the form $\{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^L\| \leq R\}$, but instead on balls of the form $\{\theta : \|\theta + \Xi^\theta - \theta^L\| \leq R\}$, where Ξ^θ is the vector with entries $\Xi_{j,k}^\theta := \langle \xi^\theta, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle$, where ξ^θ is the log-normalizing constant defined in [Section 2.1](#). We remark that by the properties of the wavelet basis, there is a J_0 such that $\Xi_{j,k} = 0$ for all $j \geq J_0$ and all k . We also prove that concentration on $\|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}$ balls imply the posterior concentration on \mathcal{C}_* as required in the main paper.

The proof follows a minor adaptation of [Castillo \(2014, Lemma 4\)](#), itself inspired from ideas of [Rivoirard and Rousseau \(2012\)](#). The argument, however, requires to be adapted to handle the fact that there is a non zero prior mass of having coefficients $\theta_{j,k} \neq 0$ with $j > \tilde{J}$, with \tilde{J} being the optimal truncation level.

Proposition S4.1. *Let Π be the spike-and-slab prior described in [Section 2.2](#). Then, there is a generic constant $C > 0$ such that,*

$$\sup_{J \geq 0} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi \left(\sum_{j > J} \max_k |\theta_{j,k}| 2^{j/2} > C 2^{-J s_0} \log(n) \mid \mathbf{X}_n \right) = o(1).$$

Proof. By construction, $\theta_{j,k} = 2^{-j(s_0+1/2)} Z_{j,k}$, where $Z_{j,k} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$. Then, we see that $\sum_{j>J} \max_k |\theta_{j,k}| 2^{j/2} = \sum_{j>J} 2^{-j s_0} \max_k |Z_{j,k}| \lesssim 2^{-J s_0} \sup_v |Z_v|$. Hence, the probability in the statement of the proposition is bounded by $\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\sup_v |Z_v| \gtrsim \log(n) \mid \mathbf{X}_n)$. But, by the assumptions on F , we have that for any $K > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(\sup_v |Z_v| > \log(K n \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2)) &\leq \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_k \Pi(|Z_{j,k}| > \log(K n \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2)) \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_k \omega_j \Pi(|Z_{j,k}| > \log(K n \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2) \mid \theta_{j,k} \neq 0) \\ &\lesssim \exp\{-b_2 K n \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows because $\omega_j \leq 2^{-j(1+\mu_*)}$ for $\mu_* > 0$ by assumption, and there are at most a generic constant times 2^j wavelets at each level j . By Ghosal, Ghosh and van der Vaart (2000, see the proof of Theorem 2.1) the last display together with Proposition S3.1 implies that the proposition is true, because $\log(n \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2) \asymp \log(n)$ by definition of $\varepsilon_n^*(s)$. \square

We are now in position to adapt Castillo (2014, Lemma 4) to our setting. The idea is to leverage the property that the high frequency coefficients are always small enough (Proposition S4.1) to obtain that the Hellinger contraction implies the desired result.

Proposition S4.2. *Let Π be the spike-and-slab prior described in Section 2.2 and assume $0 < s_0 \leq s \leq S$. Then, under the assumption of the paper, for all $R > 0$ the following holds,*

$$\begin{aligned} \exists K > 0, \quad \sup_{L \in \Sigma(R,s)} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\|\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Xi^\theta - \boldsymbol{\theta}^L\|_2 > K \varepsilon_n^*(s) \mid \mathbf{X}_n) &= o(1), \\ \forall \eta > 0, \quad \sup_{L \in \Sigma(R,s)} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\|\boldsymbol{\theta} + \Xi^\theta - \boldsymbol{\theta}^L\|_{1,\infty} > \eta \mid \mathbf{X}_n) &= o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From Ghosal and van der Vaart (2007, Lemma 8), because p_L is bounded from below (as $\|L\|_\infty < \infty$ by assumption), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_\theta - L\|_2^2 &= \int_{[0,1]} \log^2(p_\theta/p_L) \\ &\lesssim \int_{[0,1]} p_L \log^2(p_\theta/p_L) \\ &\lesssim \mathsf{H}(P_\theta, P_L)^2 (1 + \|L_\theta - L\|_\infty^2). \end{aligned} \tag{S4.1}$$

But, for any $J \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough so that $\Xi_{j,k} = 0$ for all $j > J$ and all k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_\theta - L\|_\infty &\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^J \max_k |\theta_{j,k} + \Xi_{j,k}^\theta - \theta_{j,k}^L| 2^{j/2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j>J} \max_k |\theta_{j,k}| 2^{j/2} + \sum_{j>J} \max_k |\theta_{j,k}^L| 2^{j/2} \end{aligned}$$

By assumption $\sum_{j>J} \max_k |\theta_{j,k}^L| 2^{j/2} \lesssim 2^{-Js}$, and by [Proposition S4.1](#) there is a set Θ_n of posterior mass $1 + o_p(1)$ such that for any $\theta \in \Theta_n$ we have $\sum_{j>J} \max_k |\theta_{j,k}| 2^{j/2} \lesssim 2^{-Js_0} \log(n)$. Hence, whenever $s \geq s_0$, for $\theta \in \Theta_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_\theta - L\|_\infty &\lesssim \sum_{j=0}^J \max_k |\theta_{j,k} + \Xi_v^\theta - \theta_{j,k}^L| 2^{j/2} + 2^{-Js_0} \log(n) + 2^{-Js} \\ &\lesssim 2^{J/2} \|\theta + \Xi^\theta - \theta^L\|_2 + 2^{-Js_0} \log(n) \\ &= 2^{J/2} \|L_\theta - L\|_2 + 2^{-Js_0} \log(n), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by the orthogonality of the wavelet basis. Combining the last display with [equation \(S4.1\)](#) we find that

$$\|L_\theta - L\|_2^2 (1 - 2^J \mathsf{H}(P_\theta, P_L)^2) \lesssim \mathsf{H}(P_\theta, P_L)^2 (1 + 2^{-2Js_0} \log^2(n)).$$

By [equation \(S3.1\)](#), we can furthermore restrict ourselves to the event such that $\{\theta : \mathsf{H}(P_\theta, P_L) \lesssim \varepsilon_n^*(s)\}$. Then, it is always possible to choose J sufficiently large so that $2^{-Js_0} \log(n) = o(1)$, but small enough so that $2^J \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2 = o(1)$. Thus $\|L_\theta - L\|_2^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2$ on $\{\theta : \mathsf{H}(P_\theta, P_L) \lesssim \varepsilon_n^*(s)\}$, and by orthogonality of the wavelet basis $\|\theta + \Xi^\theta - \theta^L\|_2 = \|L_\theta - L\|_2 \lesssim \varepsilon_n^*(s)$. Moreover, we have proven along the way that on the same event $\|\theta + \Xi^\theta - \theta^L\|_{1,\infty} \lesssim 2^{J/2} \|L_\theta - L\|_2 + 2^{-Js_0} \log(n) = o(1)$. \square

S5. Missing proofs of the main document

S5.1. Concentration of the posterior on \mathcal{C}_*

Proof of [Lemma 3.1](#). We prove the lemma by showing that $\|F_0^\theta\|_\infty + \|\sum_{m \geq 1} F_m^\theta\|_\infty \lesssim \|\theta + \Xi^\theta - \theta^L\|_{1,\infty}$. Then, the conclusion of the lemma will follow from [Proposition S4.2](#). We note that it is enough to show the inequality for $\|\theta + \Xi^\theta - \theta^L\|_{1,\infty} \ll 1$ because of [Proposition S4.2](#). For $m \geq 1$, we have $F_m^\theta = (\theta_{\psi(m)} - \theta_{\psi(m)}^L)(\varphi_{\psi(m)} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{\psi(m)}]) = (\theta_{\psi(m)} + \Xi_{\psi(m)}^\theta - \theta_{\psi(m)}^L)(\varphi_{\psi(m)} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{\psi(m)}])$, by choosing J_0 sufficiently large so that $\Xi_{\psi(m)}^\theta = 0$ whenever $m \neq 0$. It follows by [Proposition 7.1-\(5\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{m \geq 1} F_m^\theta \right\|_\infty &\leq \sup_x \sum_{m \geq 1} |\theta_{\psi(m)}^\theta + \Xi_{\psi(m)}^\theta - \theta_{\psi(m)}^L| |\varphi_{\psi(m)}(x) - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{\psi(m)}]| \\ &\leq \sum_{j > J_0} \max_k |\theta_{j,k}^\theta + \Xi_{j,k}^\theta - \theta_{j,k}^L| \sup_x \sum_k |\varphi_{j,k}(x) - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j > J_0} \max_k |\theta_{j,k}^\theta + \Xi_{j,k}^\theta - \theta_{j,k}^L| 2^{j/2} \\ &\leq \|\theta + \Xi^\theta - \theta^L\|_{1,\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

So it remains to show that $\|F_0^\theta\|_\infty$ is also bounded by the same quantity. Remark that $\mathbb{E}_L[\exp\{L_\theta - L\}] = 1$, thus

$$1 = \mathbb{E}_L[e^{L_\theta - L}] = 1 + \mathbb{E}_L[L_\theta - L] + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_L[(L_\theta - L)^2] \cdot O(e^{\|L_\theta - L\|_\infty}).$$

But $\mathbb{E}_L[L_\theta - L] = \xi^\theta + \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} (\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L) \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]$ and $\|L_\theta - L\|_\infty \lesssim \|\theta + \Xi^\theta - \theta^L\|_{1,\infty} \ll 1$ by assumption. Therefore, we have shown

$$\xi^\theta = - \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{V}} (\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L) \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}] + O(\|L_\theta - L\|_2^2).$$

Since for J_0 taken large enough we have $\xi^\theta = \sum_{(j,k) \in B_0} \Xi_{j,k}^\theta \varphi_{j,k}$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 &= \sum_{(j,k) \in B_0} (\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L) (\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]) \\ &= \xi^\theta + \sum_{(j,k) \in B_0} (\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L) \varphi_{j,k} + \sum_{(j,k) \notin B_0} (\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L) \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}] + O(\|L_\theta - L\|_2^2) \\ &= \sum_{(j,k) \in B_0} (\theta_{j,k} + \Xi_{j,k}^\theta - \theta_{j,k}^L) \varphi_{j,k} + \sum_{(j,k) \notin B_0} (\theta_{j,k} + \Xi_{j,k}^\theta - \theta_{j,k}^L) \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}] + O(\|L_\theta - L\|_2^2). \end{aligned}$$

Now we remark that all the terms involved in the last display are bounded in absolute value by $\|\theta + \Xi^\theta - \theta^L\|_{1,\infty}$, and so is $\|F_0\|_\infty$. \square

S5.2. Proofs related to the control of the covariance terms

Proof of Lemma 6.4. We first establish that $\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty$ can be made arbitrary small when $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I \in \mathcal{N}_I$ by taking K_1 large enough in Assumption 1.

Proposition S5.1. *Suppose Assumption 1 is satisfied with $K_1 > 0$ sufficiently large. Then there is a universal constant $C > 0$ such that $\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \leq C \log(\Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s)/\gamma) \Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s)$ for all $\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I \in \mathcal{N}_I$ and all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$.*

In view of the last proposition, we now assume that K_1 is taken large enough so that $\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \ll \delta$. Since $\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}] = \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}] = 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{C}(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}) = \log \mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})]} e^{S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})]}].$$

We remark that $\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}}] = \mathbb{E}_L[1 + S_{\mathbf{F}_I} + \frac{1}{2} S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2 e^{O(\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty)}] = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] e^{O(\delta)}$. This implies that $-\log \mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}}] = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] e^{O(\delta)}$ as well, and $e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})]} = 1 + S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] e^{O(\delta)} + \frac{1}{2} S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2 e^{O(\delta)}$. Also $\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})]}] = 1$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\mathbf{C}(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})} &= \mathbb{E}_L \left[\left(1 + S_{\mathbf{F}_I} + \frac{1}{2} S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2 e^{O(\delta)} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] e^{O(\delta)} \right) e^{S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})]} \right] \\ &= 1 + \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} e^{S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})]}] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] e^{O(\delta)} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2] e^{O(\delta)} \end{aligned}$$

$$= 1 + \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})]}] + O(\delta \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2]).$$

Since $\|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty \ll \delta$,

$$\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})]}]^2 \leq \|S_{\mathbf{F}_I}\|_\infty e^{O(\delta)} \left| \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})]}] \right|.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\mathbf{F}_I}) &= (1 + O(\delta)) \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I} - \log \mathbb{E}_L[\exp(S_{\mathbf{F}_I})]}] + O(\delta \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2]) \\ &= (1 + O(\delta)) \frac{\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} (e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}} - 1)]}{\mathbb{E}_L[e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}}]} + O(\delta \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2]) \\ &= O(\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} (e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}} - 1)]) + O(\delta \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I}^2]). \end{aligned}$$

To prove the lemma, it is enough to obtain sharp estimates on $\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} (e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}} - 1)]$. To this end, we introduce the function $A : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $A(x) = (e^x - 1)/x$, and we define the following ‘‘covariance’’ matrix

$$\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} := \mathbb{E}_L[(\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}])(\varphi_{j',k'} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j',k'}])A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}).$$

The following proposition provides the necessary estimates on $\Sigma^{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}$ that we require to control $C(S_{\mathbf{F}_I}, S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})$.

Proposition S5.2. *Let $\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \leq 1$ and let $\tilde{s} = s$ if $s < 1$ and \tilde{s} arbitrary in $(1/2, 1)$ if $s \geq 1$. Then, the following are true for n large enough (but not depending on I)*

1. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on (R, s) and the wavelet basis, such that for all $(j', k') \neq (j, k)$,*

$$|\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}| \leq C(1 + \|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_{\infty, \infty, \tilde{s}}) \left(2^{-(j \vee j')\tilde{s}} \int |\varphi_{j,k} \varphi_{j',k'}| + 2^{-j(\tilde{s}+1/2)} 2^{-j'(\tilde{s}+1/2)} \right).$$

2. *There exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on (R, s) and the wavelet basis, such that for any $(j', k') \in \mathcal{V}$ and for any $j \leq j'$, $\sum_k |\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}| \leq C 2^{j/2} (1 + \|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_{\infty, \infty, \tilde{s}}) 2^{-j'(\tilde{s}+1/2)}$.*
3. *Suppose [Assumption 1](#) is satisfied for K_0 and K_1 large enough. Then $\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_{\infty, \infty, \tilde{s}} \leq \gamma$ for all $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$.*

It follows from the previous definitions that $\mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} (e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}} - 1)] = \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I})]$. To ease the notations, we define $f_{j,k}^m := \langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle$, so that $F_m = \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} f_{j,k}^m (\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}])$, by [Proposition 7.1-\(1\)](#). Hence, we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{\mathbf{F}_I} (e^{S_{\mathbf{F}_I}} - 1)] &= \sum_{m \in I^c} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_0} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_m} f_{j,k}^0 f_{j',k'}^m \Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I} \\ &+ \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_0} f_{j',k'}^0 f_{j,k}^m \Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} \mathbf{1}_{0 \notin I} \\ &+ \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{m' \in I^c} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_{m'}} f_{j,k}^m f_{j',k'}^{m'} \Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \mathbf{1}_{m' \neq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

We finish the proof by giving a bound on the terms

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &:= \sum_{m \in I^c} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_0} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_m} |f_{j,k}^0| |f_{j',k'}^m| |\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}, \\ R_2 &:= \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_0} |f_{j',k'}^0| |f_{j,k}^m| |\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \mathbf{1}_{0 \notin I}, \\ R_3 &:= \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{m' \in I^c} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_{m'}} |f_{j,k}^m| |f_{j',k'}^{m'}| |\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \mathbf{1}_{m' \neq 0}. \end{aligned}$$

We bound each of the terms above in the next paragraphs. For each term, the bound depends on whether we are in the scenario $s > 1/2$ or not. An important quantity that shows up everywhere is $f^{m,*} := \sup_{(j,k) \in B_m} |\langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle|$. We remark that by construction when $m \notin I$

$$f^{m,*} := \sup_{(j,k) \in B_m} |\langle F_m, \varphi_v \rangle| \leq \|F_m\|_2 \leq H_I(m). \quad (\text{S5.1})$$

Bound on R_1 : case $s > 1/2$. If $0 \notin I$ this term is obviously equal to zero. Thus we now assume that $0 \in I$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\leq f^{0,*} \sum_{m \in I^c} f^{m,*} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_m} \sum_{j=0}^{J_0} \sum_k |\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \\ &\lesssim f^{0,*} (1 \vee \gamma) 2^{J_0/2} \sum_{m \in I^c} f^{m,*} \sum_{(j',k') \in B_m} 2^{-j'(\bar{s}+1/2)} \\ &\lesssim f^{0,*} (1 \vee \gamma) 2^{J_0/2} \sum_{m \in I^c} f^{m,*} 2^{-J_m(\bar{s}+1/2)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows by [Proposition S5.2](#), and the last because $0 \in I$ so for any $m \in I^c$ we have $|B_m| = 1$ and $(j,k) \in B_m \implies j = J_m$. So by [equation \(S5.1\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \in I^c} f^{m,*} 2^{-J_m(\bar{s}+1/2)} &\leq \sum_{m \in I^c} H_I(m) 2^{-J_m(\bar{s}+1/2)} \\ &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1} \sum_{j=J_0+1}^{j_n} \sup_{m: J_m=j} \{\rho_m\} |\{m \in I^c : J_m = j\}| 2^{-j(\bar{s}+1/2)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j>J_n} \gamma 2^{-j(s+\bar{s}+1)} |\{m \in I^c : J_m = j\}| \\ &\lesssim \Gamma \xi^{-1} \sum_{j>J_0} \sup_{m: J_m=j} \{\rho_m\} 2^{-j(\bar{s}-1/2)} + \gamma 2^{-j_n(s+\bar{s})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows because $|\{m \in I^c : J_m = j\}| \lesssim 2^j$ for $j > J_0$ as there are no more than $\lesssim 2^j$ at each level. We deduce that,

$$R_1 \lesssim f^{0,*} \Gamma \xi^{-1} (1 \vee \gamma) 2^{J_0/2} \sum_{j>J_0} 2^{-j(\bar{s}-1/2)} \sup_{m: J_m=j} \{\rho_m\} + f^{0,*} (1 \vee \gamma) 2^{J_0/2} \gamma 2^{-j_n(s+\bar{s})} \quad (\text{S5.2})$$

$$\lesssim \|F_0\|_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(1 \vee \gamma)}{\xi} 2^{J_0(1-\tilde{s})} + \|F_0\|_2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \cdot 2^{J_0/2} \Gamma(1 \vee \gamma) 2^{-j_n(\tilde{s}-1/2)}$$

because $\rho_m = \sqrt{\log(n)/n}$, $\tilde{s} > 1/2$, because $f^{0,*} \leq \|F_0\|_2$, and because of [equation \(3.2\)](#). By choosing $K_1, K_2 > 0$ in [Assumption 1](#) sufficiently large we obtain that $R_1 \ll \delta \Gamma \sqrt{\log(n)/n} \|F_0\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}$.

Bound on R_1 : case $0 < s \leq 1/2$. The [equation \(S5.2\)](#) remains true in this case, but this time we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j>J_0} 2^{-j(\tilde{s}-1/2)} \sup_{m: J_m=j} \{\rho_m\} &\leq \sum_{j>J_0} 2^{-j(s-1/2)} \sup_{m: J_m=j} \{2^{-J_m/2} \varepsilon_n^*(s)\} \\ &= \varepsilon_n^*(s) \sum_{j>J_0} 2^{-js} \\ &\lesssim \varepsilon_n^*(s) 2^{-J_0 s}, \end{aligned}$$

and, by [equation \(3.2\)](#),

$$\gamma 2^{-j_n(s+\tilde{s})} = \gamma 2^{-2j_n s} \lesssim \frac{\Gamma^2 \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2}{\gamma} \quad (\text{S5.3})$$

Therefore,

$$R_1 \lesssim \|F_0\|_2 \Gamma 2^{-J_0/2} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \left(\frac{1 \vee \gamma}{\xi} 2^{J_0(1-s)} + 2^{J_0} \frac{\Gamma(1 \vee \gamma)}{\gamma} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \right).$$

So $R_1 \ll \delta \Gamma 2^{-J_0/2} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \|F_0\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}$ by choosing $K_1, K_2 > 0$ in [Assumption 1](#) sufficiently large.

Bound on R_2 : case $s > 1/2$. R_2 is obviously equal to zero of $0 \in I$, hence we assume now that $0 \notin I$. Then with the same arguments as for the first term

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &\leq f^{0,*} \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} |f_{j,k}^m| \sum_{j'=0}^{J_0} \sum_{k'} |\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \\ &\lesssim (1 \vee \gamma) 2^{J_0/2} f^{0,*} \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} |f_{j,k}^m| 2^{-J_m(\tilde{s}+1/2)} \\ &\lesssim (1 \vee \gamma) 2^{J_0/2} H_I(0) \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2 2^{-J_m(\tilde{s}+1/2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5.4})$$

where the second line follows by [Proposition S5.2-\(2\)](#) and because $(j,k) \in B_m \implies j = J_m$ when $m \neq 0$ (recall $0 \notin I$), the third last line follows because $0 \notin I$ so B_m is a singleton and also because $f^{0,*} \leq H_I(0)$ when $0 \notin I$. We decompose the sum in the rhs [equation \(S5.4\)](#) into the sum of the following two terms

$$S_1 := \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2 2^{-J_m(\tilde{s}+1/2)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \quad (\text{S5.5})$$

$$S_2 := \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2 2^{-J_m(\tilde{s}+1/2)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n}. \quad (\text{S5.6})$$

Then, by Cauchy-Schwarz',

$$S_1 \leq \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2\tilde{s}+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

But, since $0 \notin I$ we have $m \in I \Rightarrow J_m > J_0$, and since there are $\lesssim 2^j$ wavelets at each level j , we deduce that

$$\sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2\tilde{s}+1)} \leq \sum_{j > J_0} |\{m : J_m = j\}| 2^{-j(2\tilde{s}+1)} \lesssim \sum_{j > J_0} 2^{-2j\tilde{s}} \lesssim 2^{-2J_0\tilde{s}}.$$

Hence,

$$S_1 \lesssim 2^{-J_0\tilde{s}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &\leq \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2\tilde{s}+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{j > j_n} 2^{-2j\tilde{s}} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-j_n\tilde{s}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $H_I(0) = \Gamma \sqrt{\log(n)/n}$ in this case,

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &\lesssim \Gamma(1 \vee \gamma) 2^{J_0(1/2-\tilde{s})} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \Gamma(1 \vee \gamma) 2^{J_0/2} \cdot 2^{-j_n\tilde{s}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in this case $\tilde{s} > 1/2$, so by choosing the constants K_0 and K_1 sufficiently large, we obtain that (note that $\xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} = 1$ here)

$$R_2 \ll \delta \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{n}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Bound on R_2 : case $0 < s \leq 1/2$. We note that the equation [equation \(S5.4\)](#) and the decomposition of [equations \(S5.5\)](#) and [\(S5.6\)](#) remain true in this case. We then have,

$$S_1 \leq \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2}$$

Since $0 \notin I$ we have that $m \in I \implies J_m \geq J_1 > J_0$, so that the previous is in fact bounded by

$$S_1 \leq 2^{-J_0 s} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

On the other hand,

$$S_2 \leq \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Since $H_I(0) = \Gamma 2^{-J_0/2} \varepsilon_n^*(s)$ in this case,

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &\lesssim \Gamma(1 \vee \gamma) \cdot 2^{-J_0 s} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2 \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \Gamma(1 \vee \gamma) \varepsilon_n^*(s) \cdot \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

So by choosing K_0 and K_1 large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &\ll \delta \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2 \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad + \delta \gamma \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Bound on R_3 : case $s > 1/2$. We start with the following estimate (using [equation \(S5.1\)](#))

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m' \in I^c} \sum_{(j', k') \in B_{m'}} |f_{j', k'}^{m'}| |\Sigma_{j, k, j', k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \mathbf{1}_{m' \neq 0} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j'' > J_0} \sum_{m' \in I^c} \mathbf{1}_{J_{m'} = j''} \sum_{(j', k') \in B_{m'}} |f_{j', k'}^{m'}| \cdot |\Sigma_{j, k, j', k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \mathbf{1}_{m' \neq 0} \\ &\leq \sum_{j'' > J_0} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j''} \{H_I(m')\} \sum_{m' \in I^c} \mathbf{1}_{J_{m'} = j''} \sum_{(j', k') \in B_{m'}} |\Sigma_{j, k, j', k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \mathbf{1}_{m' \neq 0} \\ &\leq \sum_{j' > J_0} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j'} \{H_I(m')\} \sum_{k'} |\Sigma_{j, k, j', k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows because for $m' \neq 0$ we have $(j', k') \in B_{m'} \implies j' = J_{m'}$ and $B_{m'}$ is a singleton. By [Proposition S5.2-\(1,3\)](#), because there are no more than $\lesssim 2^j$ wavelets at each level $j \geq 0$, and because $\sup_x \sum_k |\varphi_{j, k}(x)| \lesssim 2^{j/2}$ (see [Proposition 7.1-\(5\)](#)), we obtain

$$\sum_{k'} |\Sigma_{j, k, j', k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| \lesssim (1 \vee \gamma) \left(2^{-(j \vee j') \bar{s}} \int |\varphi_{j, k}| \sum_{k'} |\varphi_{j', k'}| + 2^{-j(\bar{s}+1/2)} 2^{-j'(\bar{s}+1/2)} 2^{j'} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim (1 \vee \gamma) 2^{-j/2} 2^{j'/2} \left(2^{-(j \vee j')\bar{s}} + 2^{-j\bar{s}} 2^{-j'\bar{s}} \right) \\ &\lesssim (1 \vee \gamma) 2^{-j/2} 2^{j'/2} 2^{-(j \vee j')\bar{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} R_3 &\lesssim (1 \vee \gamma) \sum_{\substack{m \in I \\ m \neq 0}} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} |f_{j,k}^m| \sum_{j' > J_0} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j'} \{H_I(m')\} 2^{-J_m/2} 2^{j'/2} 2^{-(J_m \vee j')\bar{s}} \\ &\lesssim (1 \vee \gamma) \sum_{\substack{m \in I \\ m \neq 0}} \|F_m\|_2 \sum_{j > J_0} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j} \{H_I(m')\} 2^{-J_m/2} 2^{j/2} 2^{-(J_m \vee j)\bar{s}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5.7})$$

We decompose summation in the previous display into the sum of the following terms:

$$T_1 := \sum_{\substack{m \in I \\ m \neq 0}} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \sum_{j=J_1}^{J_m} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j} \{H_I(m')\} 2^{j/2} 2^{-J_m\bar{s}}, \quad (\text{S5.8})$$

$$T_2 := \sum_{\substack{m \in I \\ m \neq 0}} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \sum_{j=J_{m+1}}^{j_n} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j} \{H_I(m')\} 2^{j/2} 2^{-j\bar{s}}, \quad (\text{S5.9})$$

$$T_3 := \sum_{\substack{m \in I \\ m \neq 0}} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \sum_{j > j_n} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j} \{H_I(m')\} 2^{j/2} 2^{-j\bar{s}}, \quad (\text{S5.10})$$

$$T_4 := \sum_{\substack{m \in I \\ m \neq 0}} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \sum_{j=J_1}^{j_n} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j} \{H_I(m')\} 2^{j/2} 2^{-J_m\bar{s}}, \quad (\text{S5.11})$$

$$T_5 := \sum_{\substack{m \in I \\ m \neq 0}} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \sum_{j=j_n+1}^{J_m} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j} \{H_I(m')\} 2^{j/2} 2^{-J_m\bar{s}}, \quad (\text{S5.12})$$

$$T_6 := \sum_{\substack{m \in I \\ m \neq 0}} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \sum_{j > J_m} \sup_{m' : J_{m'} = j} \{H_I(m')\} 2^{j/2} 2^{-j\bar{s}}. \quad (\text{S5.13})$$

We now bound each terms using the definition of j_n and of $H_I(m)$. Regarding T_1 when $J_1 \leq J_{m'} \leq J_m \leq j_n$ we have $H_I(m') \leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \sqrt{\log(n)/n}$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &\lesssim \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m\bar{s}} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-2J_m\bar{s}} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

But, for $m \neq 0$ we have $J_m > J_0$, and there are no more than $\lesssim 2^j$ blocks of wavelets at each level j so in fact

$$\sum_{m \in I} 2^{-2J_m \tilde{s}} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \leq \sum_{j=J_0+1}^{j_n} \sum_k 2^{-2j\tilde{s}} \lesssim \sum_{j=J_0+1}^{j_n} 2^{j(2\tilde{s}-1)} \lesssim 2^{-J_0(2\tilde{s}-1)}.$$

Therefore,

$$T_1 \lesssim 2^{-J_0(\tilde{s}-1/2)} \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Since $\tilde{s} > 1/2$ in this case, $2^{-J_0(\tilde{s}-1/2)}$ can be made $\ll \delta$ by taking K_0 in [Assumption 1](#) sufficiently large. The same goes for T_2 because $\sum_{j=J_{m+1}}^{j_n} 2^{j/2} 2^{-j\tilde{s}} \lesssim 2^{-J_m(\tilde{s}-1/2)}$, and thus

$$T_2 \lesssim 2^{-J_0(\tilde{s}-1/2)} \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Regarding T_3 , when $J_{m'} > j_n$ we have $H_I(m') \leq \gamma 2^{-J_{m'}(s+1/2)}$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} T_3 &\lesssim \gamma \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \sum_{j > j_n} 2^{-j(s+\tilde{s})} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0}, \\ &\lesssim \gamma 2^{-j_n(s+1/2)} 2^{-j_n(\tilde{s}-1/2)} \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\leq \gamma 2^{-j_n(\tilde{s}-1/2)} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \cdot \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

But, there are no more than $\lesssim 2^j$ wavelets at each level j so in fact

$$\sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \leq \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_k 2^{-j} \lesssim j_n.$$

Therefore,

$$T_3 \lesssim \gamma \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \cdot \sqrt{j_n} 2^{-j_n(\tilde{s}-1/2)} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Regarding T_4 ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_4 &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \sum_{j=J_1}^{j_n} 2^{j/2} 2^{-J_m \tilde{s}} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0}, \\ &\lesssim \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} 2^{j_n/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2\tilde{s}+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

But there are no more than $\lesssim 2^j$ wavelets at each level j so in fact

$$\sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2\bar{s}+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \leq \sum_{j > j_n} \sum_k 2^{-j(2\bar{s}+1)} \lesssim \sum_{j > j_n} 2^{-2j\bar{s}} \lesssim 2^{-2j_n\bar{s}}. \quad (\text{S5.14})$$

Therefore,

$$T_4 \lesssim \Gamma \xi^{-1} \Gamma \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} 2^{-j_n(\bar{s}-1/2)} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}$$

Regarding T_5 , for $J_{m'} > j_n$ we have $H_I(m') \leq \gamma 2^{-J_{m'}(s+1/2)}$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} T_5 &= \gamma \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(\bar{s}+1/2)} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \sum_{j=j_n+1}^{J_m} 2^{-js} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\lesssim \gamma 2^{-j_n s} \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2 2^{-J_m(\bar{s}+1/2)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\ &\leq \gamma 2^{-j_n s} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2\bar{s}+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \gamma 2^{-j_n(s+\bar{s})} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by [equation \(S5.14\)](#). But by [equation \(3.2\)](#) we have $\gamma 2^{-j_n(s+\bar{s})} = \gamma 2^{-j_n(s+1/2)} 2^{-j_n(\bar{s}-1/2)} \sim \Gamma \sqrt{\log(n)/n} 2^{-j_n(\bar{s}-1/2)}$. Therefore,

$$T_5 \lesssim 2^{-j_n(\bar{s}-1/2)} \Gamma \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

It remains T_6 But for $J_{m'} > J_m > j_n$ we again have that $H_I(m') \leq \gamma 2^{-j(s+1/2)}$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} T_6 &= \gamma \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \sum_{j > J_m} 2^{-j(s+\bar{s})} \\ &\lesssim \gamma \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2 2^{-J_m(s+1/2+\bar{s})} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\ &\leq \gamma \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1+2\bar{s})} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \gamma 2^{-j_n(s+\bar{s})} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by the same arguments that led to [equation \(S5.14\)](#). As before,

$$T_6 \lesssim 2^{-j_n(\bar{s}-1/2)} \Gamma \sqrt{\frac{\log(n)}{n}} \cdot \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

The bound for R_3 is obtained by [equation \(S5.7\)](#) and all the estimates on T_1, \dots, T_6 , and by taking the constants in [Assumption 1](#) sufficiently large.

Bound on R_3 : case $0 < s \leq 1/2$. We note that the [equation \(S5.7\)](#) remains valid in this case, as well as the decomposition of [equations \(S5.8\) to \(S5.13\)](#). We again bound each of these terms. Regarding T_1 when $J_1 \leq J_{m'} \leq J_m \leq j_n$, we have $H_I(m') \leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} 2^{-J_{m'}/2} \varepsilon_n^*(s)$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \sum_{j=J_1}^{J_m} \varepsilon_n^*(s) 2^{-J_m s} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\lesssim \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \sum_{m \in I} J_m 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} J_m 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} J_0 2^{-J_0 s} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows for J_0 taken sufficiently large, because $m \neq 0 \Rightarrow J_m > J_0$, and thus $J_m 2^{-2J_m s} \leq J_0 2^{-2J_0 s}$. Regarding T_2 , we have using the same arguments

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \sum_{j=J_m+1}^{j_n} 2^{-j s} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\lesssim \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1_{0 \in I}} 2^{-J_0 s} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now for T_3 ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_3 &\leq \gamma \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \sum_{j > j_n} 2^{-2j s} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\lesssim \gamma 2^{-2j_n s} \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\leq \gamma 2^{-2j_n s} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

But we note that $\gamma 2^{-2j_n s} \lesssim \Gamma^2 \varepsilon_n^*(s)^2 / \gamma$ by [equation \(S5.3\)](#), and hence we have,

$$T_3 \lesssim \frac{\Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s)}{\gamma} \cdot \Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s) \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Now for T_4 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_4 &\leq \Gamma \xi^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} (j_n - J_1) \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0} \\ &\leq j_n \Gamma \xi^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I} \varepsilon_n^*(s) \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} T_5 &\leq \gamma \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \sum_{j=j_n+1}^{J_m} 2^{-js} \mathbf{1}_{m \neq 0}, \\ &\lesssim \gamma 2^{-j_n s} \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\ &\lesssim \gamma 2^{-j_n s} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} T_6 &\leq \gamma \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m/2} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \sum_{j > J_m} 2^{-2js} \\ &\lesssim \gamma \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1/2)} \|F_m\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\ &\lesssim \gamma \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(4s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \gamma 2^{-j_n s} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The bound for R_3 is obtained by [equation \(S5.7\)](#) and all the estimates on T_1, \dots, T_6 and by taking the constants in [Assumption 1](#) sufficiently large. \square

Proof of Proposition S5.1. We use that $F_m = \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} \langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle (\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}])$ by [Proposition 7.1-\(1\)](#). Then, by [Proposition 7.1-\(5\)](#) we deduce that,

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{\bar{F}_I}(x)| &\leq \sum_{m \in I^c} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} |\langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| |\varphi_{j,k}(x) - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]| \\ &\leq \sum_{j \geq 0} \sup_{m \in I^c, J_m=j} \left\{ \|F_m\|_2 \sum_k |\varphi_{j,k}(x) - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]| \right\} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} \sup_{m: J_m=j} \{H_I(m) 2^{J_m/2}\} \end{aligned}$$

By the same argument as in the proof of [Corollary 3.1](#), the previous is seen to be $\lesssim \max\{(\Gamma/\gamma)^{\frac{2s}{2s+1}}, \Gamma(\gamma/\Gamma)^{\frac{1}{2s+1}}\} \varepsilon_n^*(s)$ when $s > 1/2$, and $\lesssim \log(\Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s)/\gamma) \Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s)$ otherwise. \square

Proof of Proposition S5.2, Item (1). We define the function $h(x) := p_L(x)A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(x))$. With this definition, we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I} &= \int h \cdot (\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}])(\varphi_{j',k'} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j',k'}]) \\ &= \int h \cdot \varphi_{j,k}\varphi_{j',k'} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}] \int h \cdot \varphi_{j',k'} \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j',k'}] \int h \cdot \varphi_{j,k} + \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]\mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j',k'}] \int h.\end{aligned}$$

By assumption $\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \leq 1$, thus $\|A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(\cdot))\|_\infty \lesssim 1$ too. Further, for any $g \in B_{\infty,\infty}^s$ we have $|\int g\varphi_{j,k}| \leq C\|g\|_{\infty,\infty,s}2^{-j(s+1/2)}$ for a universal constant depending eventually on s ; see for instance [Giné and Nickl \(2016\)](#). Thus, we deduce that for $C > 0$ eventually depending on \tilde{s} ,

$$|\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}| \leq \left| \int h \cdot \varphi_{j,k}\varphi_{j',k'} \right| + C \max\{\|p\|_{\infty,\infty,\tilde{s}}, \|h\|_{\infty,\infty,\tilde{s}}\} 2^{-j(\tilde{s}+1/2)} 2^{-j'(\tilde{s}+1/2)}. \quad (\text{S5.15})$$

We remark that $p = \exp\{L\}$, and thus $\|p\|_{\infty,\infty,\tilde{s}}$ is in turn bounded by a constant depending only on (R, s) . Further $(j, k) \neq (j', k')$, thus $\int \varphi_{j,k}\varphi_{j',k'} = 0$, hence for any $y \in [0, 1]$,

$$\int h \cdot \varphi_{j,k}\varphi_{j',k'} = \int_{[0,1]} (h(x) - h(y))\varphi_{j,k}(x)\varphi_{j',k'}(x)dx. \quad (\text{S5.16})$$

If $S_{j,k,j',k'} := \text{supp } \varphi_{j,k} \cap \text{supp } \varphi_{j',k'} = \emptyset$, then $\int h \cdot \varphi_{j,k}\varphi_{j',k'} = 0$ and the result is immediate. We now consider that $S_{j,k,j',k'} \neq \emptyset$. In this case, pick $y \in S_{j,k,j',k'}$ arbitrary and remark that for all $x \in S_{j,k,j',k'}$ we have $|x - y| \leq C2^{-j \vee j'}$ for a constant $C > 0$ depending only on the wavelet basis. Then by [equation \(S5.16\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \int h \cdot \varphi_{j,k}\varphi_{j',k'} \right| &\leq \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|h(x) - h(y)|}{|x - y|^{\tilde{s}}} \int_{[0,1]} |x - y|^{\tilde{s}} |\varphi_{j,k}(x)\varphi_{j',k'}(x)| dx \\ &\leq \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|h(x) - h(y)|}{|x - y|^{\tilde{s}}} \cdot 2^{-(j \vee j')\tilde{s}} \int |\varphi_{j,k}\varphi_{j',k'}|. \quad (\text{S5.17})\end{aligned}$$

Then, we obtain the result of the proposition by bounding the \tilde{s} -Hölder norm of h . For all $x, y \in [0, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned}|h(x) - h(y)| &\leq |p_L(x) - p_L(y)| \cdot |A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(x))| + p_L(y)|A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(x)) - A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(y))| \\ &= |e^{L(x)} - e^{L(y)}| \cdot |A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(x))| + e^{L(y)}|A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(x)) - A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(y))|.\end{aligned}$$

Whenever $L \in \Sigma(R, s)$, there is a constant $C > 0$ depending only on R such that $|e^{L(x)} - e^{L(y)}| \leq C|L(x) - L(y)|$ and $\sup_x e^{L(x)} \leq C$. Also $\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_\infty \leq 1$ thus $\sup_x |A(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(x))| \lesssim 1$ and $\sup_x |A'(S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(x))| \lesssim 1$. We deduce,

$$|h(x) - h(y)| \lesssim C|L(x) - L(y)| + C|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(x) - S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}(y)|.$$

By construction $0 < \tilde{s} < 1$, which implies that the \tilde{s} -Hölder norm is equivalent to the $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,\infty,\tilde{s}}$ norm ([Giné and Nickl, 2016](#), Equations 4.149 and 4.152). Then, since $L \in \Sigma(R, s) \subseteq \Sigma(R, \tilde{s})$,

$$\sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|h(x) - h(y)|}{|x - y|^{\tilde{s}}} \lesssim RC + C\|S_{\bar{\mathbf{F}}_I}\|_{\infty,\infty,\tilde{s}}.$$

By equivalence of norms, $\|h\|_{\infty, \infty, \bar{s}}$ is also bounded by a constant (eventually depending on \bar{s}) times the last display. Hence, the conclusion follows by combining [equations \(S5.15\)](#) and [\(S5.17\)](#) with the last display. \square

Proof of Proposition S5.2, Item (2). By the [Item \(1\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k |\Sigma_{j,k,j',k'}^{\bar{F}_I}| &\lesssim (1 + \|S_{\bar{F}_I}\|_{\infty, \infty, \bar{s}}) \left\{ 2^{-j'\bar{s}} \int |\varphi_{j',k'}| \sum_k |\varphi_{j,k}| + 2^{-j'(\bar{s}+1/2)} \sum_k 2^{-j(\bar{s}+1/2)} \right\} \\ &\lesssim (1 + \|S_{\bar{F}_I}\|_{\infty, \infty, \bar{s}}) \left\{ 2^{-j'\bar{s}} 2^{j/2} \int |\varphi_{j',k'}| + 2^{-j'(\bar{s}+1/2)} 2^{-j\bar{s}} 2^{j/2} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by [Proposition 7.1-\(5\)](#) and also because there are no more than $\lesssim 2^j$ wavelets at each level j . The conclusion follows because $\|\varphi_{j',k'}\|_1 \lesssim 2^{-j'}$ for all $(j', k') \in \mathcal{V}$. \square

Proof of Proposition S5.2, Item (3). Note that if $(j, k) \in B_0$ then

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{j(\bar{s}+1/2)} |\langle S_{\bar{F}_I}, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| &\leq 2^{j(\bar{s}+1/2)} \|S_{\bar{F}_I}\|_{\infty} \|\varphi_{j,k}\|_1 \\ &\leq 2^{J_0 \bar{s}} \|S_{\bar{F}_I}\|_{\infty} \\ &\lesssim 2^{J_0 \bar{s}} \log(\Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s)/\gamma) \Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s), \end{aligned} \tag{S5.18}$$

where the last line follows by [Proposition S5.1](#). In the case where $(j, k) \in B_0^c \cap \{(j, k) : j \leq j_n\}$, then by [Proposition 7.1-\(2\)](#) (since under [Assumption 1](#) we can assume wlog that J_0 is arbitrarily large),

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{j(\bar{s}+1/2)} |\langle S_{\bar{F}_I}, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| &\leq 2^{j(\bar{s}+1/2)} \sup_{m \in I^c, m \neq 0} |\langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| \\ &\leq 2^{j(\bar{s}+1/2)} \Gamma \xi^{-\mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} \sup_{m: J_m = j} \{\rho_m\} \\ &\leq \xi^{-\mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} \begin{cases} 2^{j_n(s+1/2)} \Gamma \sqrt{\log(n)/n} & \text{if } s > 1/2, \\ \Gamma 2^{j_n s} \varepsilon_n^*(s) & \text{if } s > 1/2, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the definition of ρ_m and because $j \leq j_n$. Then by definition of j_n in [equation \(3.2\)](#), for all $(j, k) \in B_0^c \cap \{(j, k) : j \leq j_n\}$

$$2^{j(\bar{s}+1/2)} |\langle S_{\bar{F}_I}, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| \leq \xi^{-\mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} \gamma. \tag{S5.19}$$

Finally, in the case where $(j, k) \in B_0^c \cap \{(j, k) : j > j_n\}$, then by [Proposition 7.1-\(2\)](#)

$$2^{j(\bar{s}+1/2)} |\langle S_{\bar{F}_I}, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| \leq 2^{j(\bar{s}+1/2)} \sup_{m \in I^c, m \neq 0} |\langle F_m, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| \leq \gamma. \tag{S5.20}$$

Combining [equations \(S5.18\)](#) to [\(S5.20\)](#), there is a universal $C > 0$ such that,

$$\|S_{\bar{F}_I}\|_{\infty, \infty, \bar{s}} \leq \max\{2^{J_0 \bar{s}} \log(\Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s)/\gamma) \Gamma \varepsilon_n^*(s), \gamma\}.$$

So if K_1 in [Assumption 1](#) is large enough we have that $\|S_{\bar{F}_I}\|_{\infty, \infty, \bar{s}} \leq \gamma$. \square

S5.3. Proofs of Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2

Proof of Lemma 5.1. We prove the lemma by computing an upper bound on $\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)$ and a lower bound on $\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)$. We start with the upper bound. Recall that by construction we have $F_m^\theta = \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} (\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L) (\varphi_{j,k} - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}])$. Take $m \in I \cap \{m : J_m > j_n\}$, assuming without loss of generality that this set is not empty. Since $j_n \gg 1$ we have by [Proposition 7.1](#)

$$\sup_{(j,k) \in B_m} |\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L| = \sup_{(j,k) \in B_m} |\langle F_m^\theta, \varphi_{j,k} \rangle| = \|F_m^\theta\|_2.$$

Hence, if $F_I^\theta \in \mathcal{A}_I$, then

$$\sup_{(j,k) \in B_m} |\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L| \geq \gamma 2^{-J_m(s+1/2)}.$$

But by assumption $|\theta_{j,k}^L| \leq R 2^{-j(s+1/2)}$. This implies that if $K_3 > R$ in [Assumption 1](#) then $\gamma > R$ and it must be the case that $F_I^\theta \in \mathcal{A}_I$ implies that $\theta_{\psi(m)} \neq 0$ for $m \in I \cap \{m : J_m > j_n\}$. We deduce that

$$\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I) \leq \prod_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m > j_n}} \omega_{J_m} \leq \exp \left\{ (1 + \mu_\star) \log(2) \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}.$$

The previous bound is true for any $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$. We remark, however, that $\omega_{J_m} = 0$ when $J_m > \log(n)/\log(2)$, whence the claim that $\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)/\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I) = 0$ if $I \cap \{m : J_m > \log(n)/\log(2)\} \neq \emptyset$ (it is always the case that $\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I) > 0$, see below). We now compute a lower bound on $\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)$. Consider the set

$$E := \left\{ F_I^\theta : \begin{array}{l} m \in I \cap \{m : J_m \leq j_n\} \implies \sup_{(j,k) \in B_m} \sqrt{|B_m|} |\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L| \leq \eta_n, \\ m \in I \cap \{m : J_m > j_n\} \implies \theta_{\psi(m)} = 0. \end{array} \right\}.$$

We will show that $E \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I$ for suitable choice of η_n , and then we will bound $\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I) \geq \Pi(E)$. Pick $F_I^\theta \in E$. By [Proposition 7.1](#), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I^\theta}^2] &\lesssim \sum_{m \in I} \|F_m\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim \eta_n^2 \sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} + \sum_{m \in I} \sup_{(j,k) \in B_m} |\theta_{j,k}^L|^2 \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\ &\leq \eta_n^2 \sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} + R^2 \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n}. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce from [Proposition 7.2](#) that if K_3 in the [Assumption 1](#) is sufficiently large and if $\eta_n = a\delta\sqrt{\log(n)/n}$ for small enough constant $a > 0$, then $\mathbb{E}_L[S_{F_I^\theta}^2] \leq \delta^2 \mathcal{E}_I^2$ for all $F_I^\theta \in E$. Similarly, by [Proposition 7.1-\(5\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{F_I^\theta}\|_\infty &= \sup_{x \in [0,1]} \left| \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} (\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L) (\varphi_{j,k}(x) - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j \geq J_0} \sup_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m = j}} \sup_{(j',k') \in B_m} |\theta_{j',k'} - \theta_{j',k'}^L| \sup_{x \in [0,1]} \sum_k |\varphi_{j,k}(x) - \mathbb{E}_L[\varphi_{j,k}]| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \eta_n \sum_{j=0}^{j_n} 2^{j/2} + \sum_{j>j_n} 2^{j/2} \cdot R2^{-j(s+1/2)} \\ &\lesssim \eta_n 2^{j_n/2} + R2^{-j_n s}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if η_n is taken as above and K_1 in [Assumption 1](#) is large enough, it is the case that $\|S_{F_I}\|_\infty \leq \delta$ for all $F_I^\theta \in E$. We thus have proven that $E \subseteq \tilde{A}_I$. Further,

$$\Pi(E) \geq \prod_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m \leq j_n}} \prod_{(j,k) \in B_m} \left(\omega_j Q_j(\sqrt{|B_m|} |\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L| \leq \eta_n) \right) \prod_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m > j_n}} \prod_{(j,k) \in B_m} (1 - \omega_j). \quad (\text{S5.21})$$

First we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m > j_n}} \prod_{(j,k) \in B_m} (1 - \omega_j) &\geq \exp \left\{ -2 \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} 2^{-j(1+\mu_*)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\} \\ &\geq \exp \left\{ -2 \sum_{j=0}^{j_n} \sum_k 2^{-j(1+\mu_*)} \right\} \\ &\geq C_1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5.22})$$

for a universal constant $C_1 > 0$, where the third line follows because there are no more than $\lesssim 2^j$ wavelets at each level j , and hence $\sum_{j=0}^{j_n} \sum_k 2^{-j(1+\mu_*)} \lesssim 1$ as $\mu_* > 0$. Similarly, since $\omega_j \geq a_1 2^{-j(1+b_1)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m \leq j_n}} \prod_{(j,k) \in B_m} \omega_j &\geq \exp \left\{ -\log \frac{1}{a_1} \sum_{m \in I} |B_m| \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} - b_1 \sum_{m \in I} \sum_{(j,k) \in B_m} j \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\} \\ &\geq \exp \left\{ -\log \frac{1}{a_1} \sum_{m \in I} |B_m| \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} - b_1 \sum_{m \in I} |B_m| J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

because by construction $(j,k) \in B_m \implies j \leq J_m$ (with equality whenever $m \geq 1$). We remark that $|B_0| J_0 \lesssim J_0 2^{J_0} \leq \log(n)$ (by choosing K_1 large enough in [Assumption 1](#)), and $|B_m| J_m = J_m \leq j_n \lesssim \log(n)$ for all $1 \leq m \leq j_n$. Hence, there is a universal constant $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$\prod_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m \leq j_n}} \prod_{(j,k) \in B_m} \omega_j \geq \exp \left\{ -C_2 \log(n) \sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \right\}. \quad (\text{S5.23})$$

Finally, for a universal constant $C_3 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_j(\sqrt{|B_m|} |\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L| \leq \eta_n) &= F \left(|X - 2^{j(s_0+1/2)} \theta_{j,k}^L| \leq 2^{j(s_0+1/2)} \sqrt{\frac{\eta_n}{|B_m|}} \right) \\ &\geq C_3 2^{j(s_0+1/2)} \sqrt{\frac{\eta_n}{|B_m|}} \\ &\geq n^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality is true because by assumption $2^{j(s_0+1/2)}|\theta_{j,k}^L| \leq R2^{j(s_0-s)} \leq R$ since $s \geq s_0$; henceforth the distribution F has density bounded from below by $C_3/2$ in a neighborhood of $2^{j(s_0+1/2)}|\theta_{j,k}^L|$, with C_3 not depending on the choice of the wavelet coefficient. The last inequality is true whenever K_1 in [Assumption 1](#) is taken large enough. Then,

$$\prod_{\substack{m \in I \\ J_m \leq j_n}} \prod_{(j,k) \in B_m} Q_j(\sqrt{|B_m|}|\theta_{j,k} - \theta_{j,k}^L| \leq \eta_n) \geq \exp\left\{-\frac{\log(n)}{2} \sum_{m \in I} |B_m| \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n}\right\}. \quad (\text{S5.24})$$

The conclusion of the lemma follows by combining [equations \(S5.21\)](#) to [\(S5.24\)](#). \square

Proof of Lemma 5.2. We use the bound of [Lemma 5.1](#) in conjunction with [Theorem 3.1](#) to obtain a clean bound on $\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I \mid \mathbf{X}_n)$. We remark that [Lemma 5.1](#) and [Theorem 3.1](#) imply that $\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I \mid \mathbf{X}_n) = 0$ whenever $I \cap \{m : J_m > \log(n)/\log(2)\} \neq \emptyset$. Hence, the bound in the lemma holds trivially when $I \cap \{m : J_m > \log(n)/\log(2)\} \neq \emptyset$, and we will now assume without loss of generality that $I \cap \{m : J_m > \log(n)/\log(2)\} = \emptyset$. We will distinguish between two cases, according to whether $\frac{(1+\mu_*)\log(2)}{2} \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \leq \frac{c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2}{4}$ or not.

Case $\frac{(1+\mu_*)\log(2)}{2} \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \leq \frac{c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2}{4}$. We claim that $n \mathcal{E}_I^2 \gtrsim \log(n)$ in this scenario. Indeed, if $\sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \geq 1$ then $n \mathcal{E}_I^2 \gtrsim \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \geq j_n \gtrsim \log(n)$ by definition of j_n . But if $\sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} = 0$, then it must be the case that $\sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} \geq 1$ since by assumption $I \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, $n \mathcal{E}_I^2 \gtrsim \log(n)$ by the estimate of [Proposition 7.2](#). Then, by picking $\alpha = 1/2$ in [Theorem 3.1](#),

$$\mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I \mid \mathbf{X}_n)^{1+2\delta} \lesssim \exp\left\{-\frac{c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2}{2} + \frac{c_1 2^{J_0} |I|}{2}\right\} \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)^{1/2}}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)^{1/2}}. \quad (\text{S5.25})$$

Using the estimate of [Lemma 5.1](#) and the [Proposition 7.2](#), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} &\leq \frac{c_4 \log(n)}{2} \sum_{m \in I} 2^{J_0 \mathbf{1}_{m=0}} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} - \frac{(1+\mu_*)\log(2)}{2} \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\ &\leq \frac{c_4}{2CT^2} (\xi^{2\mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} + 2^{J_0} \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}) n \mathcal{E}_I^2 - \frac{(1+\mu_*)\log(2)}{2} \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\ &\leq \left\{ \frac{c_4 (\xi^{2\mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} + 2^{J_0} \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I})}{2CT^2} + \frac{c_2}{4} \right\} n \mathcal{E}_I^2 - (1+\mu_*) \log(2) \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5.26})$$

Also, by [Proposition 7.2](#) again,

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 2^{J_0} |I| &= c_1 2^{J_0} \sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} + c_1 2^{J_0} \sum_{m \in I} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 2^{J_0}}{CT^2 \xi^{-2\mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} \log(n)} n \mathcal{E}_I^2 + \frac{c_1 2^{J_0}}{j_n} \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5.27})$$

So if $\delta > 0$ is taken small enough and the constants K_1 and K_4 in [Assumption 1](#) are taken large enough, we obtain the bound in the statement of the lemma by combining [equations \(S5.25\)](#) to [\(S5.27\)](#), and because $j_n \gtrsim \log(n)$ can be made as small as we want in front of 2^{J_0} under [Assumption 1](#).

Case $\frac{(1+\mu_\star)\log(2)}{2} \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} > \frac{c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2}{4}$. In this case, by taking $\alpha = \frac{1024 \cdot c_0 \delta}{1+512 \cdot c_0 \delta}$ in [Theorem 3.1](#), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_L \Pi(\mathcal{C}_* \cap \mathcal{S}_I | \mathbf{X}_n)^{1+2\delta} &\leq \frac{3 \exp(-\alpha c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2 + \alpha c_1 2^{J_0} |I|) \left\{ \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} \right\}^{1-\alpha}}{(1 - e^{-c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2})^{2\alpha}} \\ &\leq \frac{3 \exp(\alpha c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2 + \alpha c_1 2^{J_0} |I|) \left\{ \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} \right\}^{1-\alpha}}{(c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2)^{2\alpha}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5.28})$$

where the second line follows using that $1 - e^{-x} \geq x e^{-x}$ for $x \geq 0$. Using the estimate of [Lemma 5.1](#) and the [Proposition 7.2](#)

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} &\leq c_4 \log(n) \sum_{m \in I} 2^{J_0 \mathbf{1}_{m=0}} \mathbf{1}_{J_m \leq j_n} - (1 + \mu_\star) \log(2) \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \\ &\leq \frac{c_4 (\xi^{2 \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} + 2^{J_0} \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I})}{C \Gamma^2} n \mathcal{E}_I^2 - (1 + \mu_\star) \log(2) \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for any $t \in (0, 1)$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{\Pi(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\Pi(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_I)} &\leq \left\{ -\frac{(1-t)c_2}{2} + \frac{c_4 (\xi^{2 \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I}} + 2^{J_0} \mathbf{1}_{0 \in I})}{C \Gamma^2} \right\} n \mathcal{E}_I^2 \\ &\quad - t(1 + \mu_\star) \log(2) \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5.29})$$

We also note that for this case to happen, it must be that $\{m : J_m > j_n\} \neq \emptyset$. Since we have assumed that $I \cap \{m : J_m > \log(n)/\log(2)\} = \emptyset$, by [Proposition 7.2](#)

$$n \mathcal{E}_I^2 \geq C n \gamma^2 \sum_{m \in I} 2^{-J_m(2s+1)} \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n} \geq C \gamma^2 n^{-2s}.$$

We deduce from the previous that,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2)^{2\alpha}} &\leq \frac{1}{(C c_2 \gamma^2)^{2\alpha}} \exp\{4\alpha s \log(n)\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(C c_2 \gamma^2)^{2\alpha}} \exp\left\{4\alpha s \frac{\log(n)}{j_n} \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

But $j_n \gtrsim \log(\gamma/\Gamma) + \log(n)$ by [equation \(3.2\)](#), which implies that $j_n \gtrsim \log(n)$ when K_1 in [Assumption 1](#) is taken sufficiently large. So taking in addition K_3 sufficiently large, we find that there is a universal constant $C' > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{(c_2 n \mathcal{E}_I^2)^{2\alpha}} \leq \exp\left\{C' \delta \log(2) \sum_{m \in I} J_m \mathbf{1}_{J_m > j_n}\right\}. \quad (\text{S5.30})$$

So if $\delta > 0$ is taken small enough, and the constants K_1 , K_3 and K_4 in [Assumption 1](#) are taken large enough, we obtain the bound in the statement of the lemma by combining [equations \(S5.27\)](#) to [\(S5.30\)](#) and by taking $t = \frac{(1+2\delta)(1+\mu_\star/2+C'\delta)}{1+\mu_\star}$. \square

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by U.S. Air Force Office of Scientific Research grant #FA9550-15-1-0074. The author also thanks Daniel M. Roy for helpful discussions and the opportunity to work on this project.

References

- CAI, T. T. (2008). On information pooling, adaptability and superefficiency in nonparametric function estimation. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **99** 421.
- CASTILLO, I. (2014). On Bayesian supremum norm contraction rates. *Ann. Statist.* **42** 2058–2091.
- GHOSAL, S., GHOSH, J. K. and VAN DER VAART, A. W. (2000). Convergence rates of posterior distributions. *Ann. Statist.* **28** 500–531.
- GHOSAL, S. and VAN DER VAART, A. (2007). Posterior convergence rates of Dirichlet mixtures at smooth densities. *Ann. Statist.* **35** 697–723.
- GINÉ, E. and NICKL, R. (2016). *Mathematical foundations of infinite-dimensional statistical models* **40**. Cambridge University Press.
- HOFFMANN, M., ROUSSEAU, J. and SCHMIDT-HIEBER, J. (2015). On adaptive posterior concentration rates. *Ann. Statist.* **43** 2259–2295.
- RIVOIRARD, V. and ROUSSEAU, J. (2012). Bernstein–von Mises theorem for linear functionals of the density. *Ann. Statist.* **40** 1489–1523.
- VAN DER VAART, A. W. and VAN ZANTEN, J. H. (2008). Rates of contraction of posterior distributions based on Gaussian process priors. *Ann. Statist.* **36** 1435–1463.