

Nonparametric statistical inference for drift vector fields of multi-dimensional diffusions

Richard Nickl Kolyan Ray

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE KING'S COLLEGE LONDON

Abstract

The problem of determining a periodic Lipschitz vector field $b = (b_1, \dots, b_d)$ from an observed trajectory of the solution $(X_t : 0 \leq t \leq T)$ of the multi-dimensional stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = b(X_t)dt + dW_t, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where W_t is a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion, is considered. Convergence rates of a penalised least squares estimator, which equals the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate corresponding to a high-dimensional Gaussian product prior, are derived. These results are deduced from corresponding contraction rates for the associated posterior distributions. The rates obtained are optimal up to log-factors in L^2 -loss in any dimension, and also for supremum norm loss when $d \leq 4$. Further, when $d \leq 3$, nonparametric Bernstein-von Mises theorems are proved for the posterior distributions of b . From this we deduce functional central limit theorems for the implied estimators of the invariant measure μ_b . The limiting Gaussian process distributions have a covariance structure that is asymptotically optimal from an information-theoretic point of view.

MSC 2000 subject classification: Primary 62G20; secondary 62F15, 65N21.

Key words: penalised least squares estimator, asymptotics of nonparametric Bayes procedures, Bernstein-von Mises theorem, uncertainty quantification.

1 Introduction

For $W_t = (W_t^1, \dots, W_t^d)$ a d -dimensional Brownian motion and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_d)$ a Lipschitz vector field, consider the multi-dimensional Markov diffusion process $(X_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^d) : t \geq 0)$ describing solutions to the stochastic differential equation (SDE)

$$dX_t = b(X_t)dt + dW_t, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (1)$$

The random process $(X_t : t \geq 0)$ describes a Brownian motion whose trajectories are subject to spatially variable displacements enforced by the drift vector field b . We are interested in recovering the parameter b based on observing the process up to time T . A closely related problem is that of estimating the invariant measure μ_b of the diffusion, which describes the probabilities

$$\mu_b(A) =^{a.s.} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T 1_A(X_t)dt \quad (2)$$

corresponding to the average asymptotic time the ergodic process $(X_t : t \geq 0)$ spends in a given measurable subset A of the state space.

While the one-dimensional case $d = 1$ is well studied (see, e.g., [30], [14, 15, 50, 38, 54, 1, 2, 3]), comparably little is known about the in applications highly important multi-dimensional setting, particularly when b is modelled in a nonparametric or high-dimensional way. In the measurement model we consider here, convergence rates of certain multivariate nonparametric kernel-type estimators were first obtained in Dalalyan and Reiß [16], and further recent results in this direction are by Strauch [45, 46, 47], who obtained sharp (and adaptive) convergence rate results for b in pointwise and L^2 -loss, and for μ_b in uniform-norm loss. The proofs of these results are based on certain spectral gap assumptions that permit the use of geometric and functional inequalities for diffusion processes [5]. Ultimately these conditions boil down to requiring that b arises as a gradient vector field ∇B of some scalar potential $B : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying certain curvature assumptions. This is a strong hypothesis on b , which in particular implies that μ_b identifies b and thus the law of the diffusion ($X_t : t \geq 0$).

For observations ($X_t : 0 \leq t \leq T$), the likelihood function is directly available from Girsanov’s theorem, and has a convenient ‘Gaussian’ form in the parameter b . This motivates the use of likelihood based inference procedures: the estimators \hat{b}_T for b we study in the present paper are minimisers of a penalised likelihood (or, equivalently, least squares) criterion over a high-dimensional approximation space. In fact, since the penalties we use are squared Hilbert norms, \hat{b}_T equals a Bayesian ‘maximum a posteriori’ (MAP) estimate arising from a truncated Gaussian series prior. The Bayesian interpretation of \hat{b}_T is exploited in our proofs, and is further appealing since it comes hand in hand with uncertainty quantification methodology (‘posterior credible sets’), and posterior sampling is in principle feasible even for ‘real-world’ discrete data by simulation techniques, see [37, 8] and references therein.

Let us briefly describe our contributions: we obtain convergence rates of \hat{b}_T to the ‘true’ vector field b_0 generating equation (1), and also frequentist contraction rates about b_0 for the corresponding posterior distributions, both in L^2 - and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -distances. For L^2 -loss the rates obtained are minimax optimal (up to log-factors) over Hölder classes in any dimension, and this remains true for $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -loss whenever dimension $d \leq 4$. When $d \leq 3$, we further prove nonparametric Bernstein-von Mises theorems that establish asymptotic normality of the re-centred and scaled posterior distributions $\sqrt{T}(b - \hat{b}_T)|(X_t : 0 \leq t \leq T)$ in a (large enough) function space. From this we in turn deduce corresponding central limit theorems for the implied plug-in estimators for the invariant density μ_b . We exploit that the non-linear identification map $b \mapsto \mu_b$ can be shown to be ‘one-smoothing’. Since inference on b is asymptotically equivalent to a nonparametric regression problem [16], this offers an analytical explanation for why the invariant density μ_b of the process can be estimated at $1/\sqrt{T}$ rate in stronger norms than is the case in i.i.d. density estimation (see Section 2.5).

Instead of the functional inequalities used in [16, 46, 47], our proofs exploit basic martingale concentration properties and techniques from elliptic partial differential equations (PDEs). To simplify the PDE arguments in our proofs we restrict to periodic vector fields b . We avoid the assumption that b is a gradient vector field ∇B altogether. The invariant measure μ_b then no longer identifies the law of the process ($X_t : t \geq 0$) – see after Proposition 1 below for details. Consequently, consistent Bayesian inference for μ_b cannot be based on a prior assigned directly to the invariant measure. In contrast, first modelling b by a Gaussian prior and subsequently recovering μ_b via PDE techniques leads to optimal results.

Standard methods [48] from the study of minimum contrast estimators (such as \hat{b}_T) do not generally allow to derive *optimal* nonparametric convergence rates in stronger norms (such as $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -loss). Our proofs employ techniques from Bayesian Nonparametrics [11, 12,

9, 13] to overcome these limitations in our setting. In this regard our results are related to recent investigations of Bayesian inverse problems [29, 39, 4, 17, 28, 35], Bernstein-von Mises theorems [40, 32, 31, 33] and diffusion models [50, 38, 54, 34, 49, 26, 1].

2 Main results

2.1 Basic notation and definitions

Let \mathbb{T}^d denote the d -dimensional torus, isomorphic to $\sim (0, 1]^d$ if opposite points on the cube are identified. By $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ we denote the usual L^2 -spaces with respect to Lebesgue measure dx , equipped with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2}$. Let μ be a probability measure on \mathbb{T}^d . If its Lebesgue density, also denoted by μ , exists and is bounded and bounded away from zero, then an equivalent norm $\| \cdot \|_\mu$ on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ arises from the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle_\mu = \int fg d\mu$; $f, g \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. The symbol $L^2_0(\mathbb{T}^d)$ denotes the subspace of functions f for which $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f(x) dx = 0$, and $L^2_\mu(\mathbb{T}^d)$ denotes the subspace for which $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f d\mu = 0$.

We define the space $C(\mathbb{T}^d) = C^0(\mathbb{T}^d)$ of continuous functions on \mathbb{T}^d normed by the usual supremum norm $\| \cdot \|_\infty$. For $s > 0$, we denote by $C^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the usual Hölder spaces of $[s]$ -times continuously differentiable functions on \mathbb{T}^d , where $[s]$ is the integer part of s . For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, let $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ denote the usual Sobolev space of functions from \mathbb{T}^d to \mathbb{R} (defined by duality when $s < 0$). They form the special case $p = q = 2$ in the scale of Besov spaces $B^s_{pq}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$, see Chapter 3 of [44] for definitions, where it is also shown that $C^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ embeds continuously into $B^s_{\infty\infty}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $s \geq 0$. When no confusion may arise, we employ the same function space notation for vector fields $f = (f_1, \dots, f_d)$. For instance $f \in H^s \equiv (H^s)^{\otimes d}$ will then mean that each $f_j \in H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and the norm on H^s is given by $\|f\|_{H^s}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d \|f_j\|_{H^s}^2$. We shall repeatedly use standard multiplication inequalities for Besov-Sobolev norms,

$$\|fg\|_{B^s_{pq}} \leq c(s, p, q, d) \|f\|_{B^s_{pq}} \|g\|_{B^s_{\infty\infty}} \leq c'(s, p, q, d) \|f\|_{B^s_{pq}} \|g\|_{C^s}, s \geq 0. \quad (3)$$

Starting with a ‘ S -regular’ Daubechies periodised wavelet basis of $L^2(\mathbb{T})$, we denote by

$$\{\Phi_{l,r} : r = 0, \dots, \min(0, 2^{ld} - 1), l = \{-1, 0\} \cup \mathbb{N}\}$$

a tensor product wavelet basis of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ as described in Section 4.3 of [25]. We denote by V_J the span of all wavelets up to resolution level $l \leq J$, a space whose dimension scales as $O(2^{Jd})$ as $J \rightarrow \infty$. The decay of wavelet coefficients in this basis, or equivalently the scaling (as $J \rightarrow \infty$) of the approximation errors from projections P_{V_J} onto the V_J spaces, characterises the norms of the Besov spaces $B^s_{pq}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and Sobolev spaces $H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$, see p.370f. in [25].

If μ is a probability measure on some metric space, then $Z \sim \mu$ means that Z is a random variable in that space drawn from the distribution μ , also called the law $\mathcal{L}(Z) = \mu$ of Z . We write $Z_T \rightarrow^d Z$, or $Z_T \rightarrow^d \mathcal{L}(Z)$ when no confusion can arise, to denote the usual notion of weak convergence of the laws $\mathcal{L}(Z_T) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(Z)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, see, e.g., Chapter 11 in [18].

For an arbitrary normed linear space $(X, \| \cdot \|_X)$, the topological dual space is

$$X^* = (X, \| \cdot \|_X)^* := \{L : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ linear s.t. } |L(x)| \leq C\|x\|_X \text{ for all } x \in X \text{ and some } C > 0\},$$

which is a Banach space for the norm $\|L\|_{X^*} \equiv \sup_{x \in X, \|x\|_X \leq 1} |L(x)|$. We will sometimes use the symbols $\lesssim, \gtrsim, \simeq$ to denote one- or two-sided inequalities up to multiplicative constants that may either be universal or ‘fixed’ in the context where the symbols appear. We also write $(\cdot)_+ = \max(\cdot, 0)$ to denote the non-negative part of a real number, and $a \vee b, a \wedge b$ to denote maximum and minimum of real numbers a, b , respectively.

2.2 Diffusions with periodic drift; likelihood, prior and posterior

Consider the SDE (1) where the vector field $b : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ is Lipschitz continuous and one-periodic, that is $b(\cdot + m) = b(\cdot)$ for every $m \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Then a strong pathwise solution of this SDE exists which is a d -dimensional diffusion Markov process $X_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^d)$. We denote by $P_b = P_b^x$ the cylindrical probability measure describing the law of (X_t) in path space $C([0, \infty))$ when $X_0 = x$; its restriction $P_b^T = P_b^{T,x}$ to the separable space $C([0, T])$ describes the law of the process $X^T \equiv (X_t : t \in [0, T])$ until time T , see, e.g., Sections 24 and 39 in [6]. We suppress the dependence on the starting value x as our results do not depend on it.

We seek to recover the drift function $b : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ from an observed trajectory X^T . The periodic model (which has also been used in [38, 54] when $d = 1$) is convenient in our context as it effectively confines the diffusion process (X_t) to a bounded state space \mathbb{T}^d . To be precise, while our diffusion takes values in the whole of \mathbb{R}^d (in particular (X_t) will not be globally recurrent), the values of the process (X_t) modulo \mathbb{Z}^d contain all relevant statistical information. In particular we have (arguing as in the proof of Lemma 1 below),

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \varphi(X_t) dt \xrightarrow{P_b} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \varphi d\mu_b \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty, \quad \forall \varphi \in C(\mathbb{T}^d),$$

where μ_b is a uniquely defined probability measure on \mathbb{T}^d and where we identify φ with its periodic extension to \mathbb{R}^d on the left-hand side. The measure μ_b has the usual probabilistic interpretation as an invariant measure appearing in the limit of ergodic averages, but for our purposes it is more convenient to define it in terms of a partial differential equation involving the generator of the diffusion Markov process. Heuristically, if $(P_t = e^{tL} : t \geq 0)$ is the transition operator of a diffusion process with invariant measure μ and generator L , then we can differentiate the invariant identity $\int P_t[\varphi] d\mu = \int \varphi d\mu \forall t$ at $t = 0$, so that $\int L\varphi d\mu = 0$ for all smooth φ . If L^* is the adjoint operator for the standard L^2 -inner product, then it must satisfy $\int \varphi L^* \mu = 0$ for all smooth φ , and hence necessarily $L^* \mu = 0$ (in the weak sense), which can be used to identify μ via the adjoint generator L^* .

To make this precise, in our periodic setting the generator $L : H^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is

$$L = L_b = \frac{1}{2} \Delta + b \cdot \nabla = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2} + \sum_{i=1}^d b_i(\cdot) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, \quad (4)$$

and from integration by parts we see that the adjoint operator for $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L^2}$ equals

$$L^* = L_b^* = \frac{1}{2} \Delta - b \cdot \nabla - \operatorname{div}(b), \quad \operatorname{div}(b) = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial b_j}{\partial x_j}, \quad (5)$$

so that μ_b can be identified as the solution of the PDE

$$L_b^* \mu_b \equiv \frac{1}{2} \Delta \mu_b - b \cdot \nabla \mu_b - \operatorname{div}(b) \mu_b = 0. \quad (6)$$

If b arises as a gradient vector field ∇B for some $B \in C^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, one can check directly that $\mu_b \propto e^{2B}$ solves (6). For general vector fields b one can prove the following result (see after (66) in Section 4 below).

Proposition 1. *Let $b \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$. A unique periodic solution μ_b to (6) satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} d\mu_b = 1$ exists. Moreover, μ_b is Lipschitz continuous and bounded away from zero on \mathbb{T}^d , with $\|1/\mu_b\|_\infty$ and the Lipschitz constant $\|\mu_b\|_{Lip}$ depending on b only through a bound for $\|b\|_\infty$.*

While for gradient vector fields we can recover b from μ_b via $b = (1/2)\nabla \log \mu_b$, the invariant measure μ_b does *not* identify b or the law P_b of $(X_t : t \geq 0)$ for general vector fields b (unless $d = 1$). To see this, start with a gradient vector field $b = \nabla B$ and invariant measure $\mu_b \propto e^{2B}$. For any smooth *divergence free* vector field \bar{v} and $v = \bar{v}/\mu$ (so that $\text{div}(v\mu) = 0$) one checks by integration by parts that $\int \phi L_{b+v}^* \mu_b = \int \mu_b L_{b+v} \phi = 0$ for all smooth ϕ , and as a consequence μ_b is also the invariant measure for L_{b+v} . Thus any statistical approach to recover b via first estimating μ_b is bound to fail in our general setting.

We instead propose likelihood-based inference methods. The log-likelihood function $\ell_T(b)$ of our measurement model can be obtained from Girsanov's theorem (Section IX.1 in [42] or 17.7 in [6]): for any periodic and Lipschitz $b : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$e^{\ell_T(b)} = \frac{dP_b^T}{dP_0^T}(X^T) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \|b(X_t)\|^2 dt + \int_0^T b(X_t) \cdot dX_t\right), \quad (7)$$

where P_0^T is the law of a standard d -dimensional Brownian motion $(W_t : t \in [0, T])$. Note that an application of Itô's formula (as in Lemma 1 below) allows to re-write $\ell_T(b)$ in terms of path integrals against $(X_t : 0 \leq t \leq T)$ so that computation of ℓ_T from an observed trajectory X^T is possible. [In practice this may involve a further discretisation step, see [37, 8].]

Our approach to inference on b amounts to computing a penalised maximum likelihood estimator over a high-dimensional wavelet approximation space. More precisely, set

$$\hat{b}_T = \hat{b}(X^T) = \operatorname{argmin}_{b \in V_J^{\otimes d}} \left[-\ell_T(b) + \frac{1}{2} \|b\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \right], \quad (8)$$

where $V_J^{\otimes d} = \otimes_{j=1}^d V_J$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ is a Hilbert tensor norm on $V_J^{\otimes d}$. The estimator \hat{b}_T has a natural Bayesian interpretation as the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate arising from a mean zero Gaussian prior $\Pi = \otimes_{j=1}^d \Pi_j$ on $V_J^{\otimes d}$ with reproducing kernel Hilbert space \mathbb{H} . Indeed, the posterior distribution $\Pi(\cdot|X^T)$ arising from observing $X^T \sim P_b^T$ is of the form

$$d\Pi(b|X^T) = \frac{e^{\ell_T(b)} d\Pi(b)}{\int e^{\ell_T(b)} d\Pi(b)} \propto e^{\ell_T(b) - \frac{1}{2} \|b\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2}, \quad b \in V_J^{\otimes d}. \quad (9)$$

Our proofs imply that the denominator in the last expression is finite and non-zero with probability approaching one under the law of X^T as $T \rightarrow \infty$. The map $(b, c) \mapsto \int_0^T b(X_t)c(X_t)dt + \langle b, c \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}$ induces an inverse covariance D_H^{-1} on some linear subspace $H \subset V_J^{\otimes d}$. [Since $1 \in V_J^{\otimes d}$, $\dim H \neq 0$, and our proofs imply in fact that $H = V_J^{\otimes d}$ with high probability under the law of X^T .] Using Theorem 9.5.7 in [18] and linearity of $b \mapsto \int_0^T b(X_t) \cdot dX_t$, the distribution $\Pi(\cdot|X^T)$ is thus Gaussian on $V_J^{\otimes d}$ and the MAP estimate (8) equals the posterior mean $E^{\Pi}[b|X^T]$.

Concretely, the Gaussian process priors $\Pi = \Pi_T$ we will use here are constructed from high-dimensional wavelet expansions for $b = (b_1, \dots, b_d)$ of the form:

$$b_j = \sum_{l \leq J} \sum_r \sigma_l g_{l,r,j} \Phi_{l,r}, \quad g_{l,r,j} \sim^{iid} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad j = 1, \dots, d, \quad (10)$$

where the $\Phi_{l,r}$ form a periodised wavelet basis of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, where $J = J_T \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ in a way to be chosen below, and where the weights σ_l govern the regularisation prescribed by the penalty functional. Recall (p.75 in [25]) that the Gaussian process (10) has reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) inner product of tensor form

$$\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} = \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{l \leq J} \sum_r \sigma_l^{-2} \langle g_{1,j}, \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_2 \langle g_{2,j}, \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_2, \quad g_1, g_2 \in V_J^{\otimes d}. \quad (11)$$

2.3 Contraction rates for the posterior distribution and MAP estimate

We now give results concerning the concentration of the posterior measure $\Pi(\cdot|X^T)$ around the ‘ground truth’ vector field b_0 that generated X^T according to the diffusion equation (1). This implies convergence rates of the same order of magnitude for the MAP estimate \hat{b}_T (see Corollary 1). We denote the ‘true’ invariant measure from Proposition 1 by $\mu_0 = \mu_{b_0}$.

Our first theorem gives a contraction rate in the ‘natural distance’ induced by the statistical experiment, following the general theory [21]. Initially this distance is a ‘random Hellinger semimetric’, and we straightforwardly adapt ideas in [50] to the multi-dimensional setting (see Theorem 7 below). In dimension $d = 1$, the theory of diffusion local times can then be used to deduce from this convergence results in the standard $\|\cdot\|_{\mu_0}, \|\cdot\|_{L^2}$ -distances [50, 38, 54], but when $d > 1$ such local times are not appropriately defined. Instead, we exploit concentration properties of the high-dimensional ‘design’ matrices induced by the random Hellinger semimetric on $V_J^{\otimes d}$ (see Lemma 10) to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Let $s > \max(d/2, 1), d \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $b_0 \in C^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Consider the Gaussian prior Π_T from (10) with $2^J \approx T^{\frac{1}{2a+d}}$ and $\sigma_l = 2^{-l(\alpha+d/2)}$ for $a > \max(d-1, 1/2)$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq a$. Then for $\varepsilon_T = T^{-\frac{a \wedge s}{2a+d}}(\log T)$ and every $M_T \rightarrow \infty$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\Pi_T(b : \|b - b_0\|_{\mu_0} \geq M_T \varepsilon_T | X^T) \xrightarrow{P_{b_0}} 0.$$

In particular, if $a = s$ then $\varepsilon_T = T^{-\frac{s}{2s+d}}(\log T)$.

Since we wish to perform the primary regularization via the truncation level J rather than the variance scaling α we have assumed that $0 \leq \alpha \leq a$. It is possible to improve the logarithmic factors here and in Theorem 2 below under certain choices of a, α, s , but we do not pursue this further in the present paper.

From the previous theorem, and imposing slightly stronger conditions on b_0 and Π_T , one can obtain perturbation approximations of the Laplace transform of $\Pi(\cdot|X^T)$ by the Laplace transform of a certain Gaussian distribution (see Proposition 2), and this makes more precise ‘semiparametric’ tools available for the analysis of the posterior distribution. In particular, adapting ideas in [9] (see also [12, 13, 10, 33]) we obtain contraction results in the $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ -norm.

Theorem 2. *Let $a \wedge s > \max(3d/2 - 1, 1), d \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $b_0 \in C^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Consider the Gaussian prior Π_T from (10) with $2^J \approx T^{\frac{1}{2a+d}}$ and $\sigma_l = 2^{-l(\alpha+d/2)}$ for $0 \leq \alpha < a \wedge s - d/2$. Assume further that $a \leq s + 1$ (if $d \leq 4$) or $a \leq s + d/2 - 1$ ($d \geq 5$). Then for every $\delta > 5/2$,*

$$\Pi_T\left(b : \sum_{j=1}^d \|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_{\infty} \geq (\log T)^{\delta} T^{-\frac{s \wedge [a - (d/2 - 2)_+]}{2a+d}} | X^T\right) \xrightarrow{P_{b_0}} 0 \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular, if $a = s, 0 \leq \alpha \leq s - d/2$ and $d \leq 4$, then the rate is $(\log T)^{\delta} T^{-\frac{s}{2s+d}}$.

By Gaussianity of the posterior distribution, the previous theorems translate into convergence rates of the MAP estimates from (8).

Corollary 1. *Let $\hat{b}_T = E^{\Pi_T}[b|X^T]$. Under the conditions of Theorem 1, for every $M_T \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\|\hat{b}_T - b_0\|_{\mu_0} = O_{P_{b_0}}(M_T T^{-\frac{a \wedge s}{2a+d}} \log T) \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty,$$

while under the conditions of Theorem 2, for every $\delta > 5/2$,

$$\|\hat{b}_T - b_0\|_{\infty} = O_{P_{b_0}}(T^{-\frac{s \wedge [a - (d/2 - 2)_+]}{2a+d}} (\log T)^{\delta}), \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. Consider the function

$$H(b') = \Pi_T(b : \|b - b'\|_{\mu_0} \leq M_T \varepsilon_T | X^T), \quad b' \in V_J^{\otimes d}.$$

The posterior is a Gaussian measure on the finite-dimensional space $V_J^{\otimes d}$, centered at \hat{b}_T . Since $\|\cdot\|_{\mu_0}$ -norm balls centred at the origin are convex symmetric sets, Anderson's Lemma (Theorem 2.4.5 of [25]) yields that \hat{b}_T is a maximizer of H . Using Exercise 8.3 in [21] with the contraction rate from Theorem 1, we deduce that $\|\hat{b}_T - b_0\|_{\mu_0} = O_{P_{b_0}}(M_T \varepsilon_T)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. The $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ -rate follows similarly using the contraction rate from Theorem 2. \square

Up to log-factors, the $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$ -rates obtained are minimax optimal for any dimension d (the lower bounds follow, e.g., from the asymptotic equivalence results in [16], see also [45, 46]). The $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ -rates are then also optimal whenever $d \leq 4$, up to log-factors. The sub-optimality of our rate for $d > 5$ is related to the presence of common semiparametric 'bias terms': the approximation-theoretic Lemma 6 below, which quantitatively improves on previous bounds in [9, 33] of a similar kind to apply also when $d > 1$, gives the desired rate only when $d \leq 4$. We do not know if this is an artefact of our proof or whether it can be essentially improved.

2.4 Bernstein-von Mises theorems for b

We now adopt the framework of nonparametric Bernstein-von Mises theorems from [11, 12], see also the recent contributions [10, 41, 32, 33, 31]. The idea is to obtain a Gaussian approximation for the posterior distribution in a function space in which $1/\sqrt{T}$ -convergence rates can be obtained. More precisely, we will view the re-centred and re-scaled posterior draws $\sqrt{T}(b - \hat{b}_T) | X^T$ as (conditionally on X^T) random vector fields acting linearly on test functions $\phi = (\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d)$ by integration

$$\left(\phi \mapsto \sqrt{T} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (b - \hat{b}(X^T)) \cdot \phi : \phi \in B_{1\infty}^\rho | X^T \right),$$

and show that a Bernstein-von Mises theorem holds true uniformly in ϕ belonging to any bounded subset of the Besov space $B_{1\infty}^\rho$, $\rho > d/2$, $d \leq 3$. Equivalently, the limit theorem holds for the probability laws induced by these stochastic processes in the 'dual' Banach space $(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*$. The limit will be the tight Gaussian probability measure \mathcal{N}_{b_0} on $(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*$ induced by the centred Gaussian white noise process $(\mathbb{W}_0(\phi) : \phi \in B_{1\infty}^\rho)$ with covariance

$$E\mathbb{W}_0(\phi)\mathbb{W}_0(\phi') = \langle \phi, \phi' \rangle_{1/\mu_0} = \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi_j(x) \phi'_j(x) \mu_0^{-1}(x), \quad \phi, \phi' \in B_{1\infty}^\rho;$$

its existence is established in the proof of the following theorem. The choice of Besov space parameters ρ, p, q is maximal, see Remark 1. By embedding other spaces into $B_{1\infty}^\rho$ one deduces various further limit theorems, e.g., in negative Sobolev spaces $H^{-\rho} = (H^\rho)^*$, $\rho > d/2$. For the applications to estimation of μ_b that follow, this particular choice of Besov space is, however, crucial, and restriction to the simpler scale of Sobolev spaces would be insufficient to obtain the results in Section 2.5 below.

For two probability measures τ, τ' in a metric space (S, e) , define the bounded Lipschitz (BL) metric for weak convergence (p.157 in [19]) by

$$\beta_S(\tau, \tau') = \sup_{F: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \|F\|_{Lip} \leq 1} \left| \int_S F d(\tau - \tau') \right|, \quad \|F\|_{Lip} \equiv \sup_{x \in S} |F(x)| + \sup_{x \neq y, x, y \in S} \frac{|F(x) - F(y)|}{e(x, y)}.$$

Theorem 3. Let $1 \leq d \leq 3$, $\rho > d/2$, $a > \max(1, 3d/2 - 1)$ and let $s \geq a$ be such that $s > a - 1 + d/2$. Suppose $b_0 \in C^s(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap H^s(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Let Π_T be the Gaussian prior from (10) with $\sigma_l = 2^{-l(\alpha+d/2)}$, $0 \leq \alpha < a \wedge s - d/2$ and J chosen such that $2^J \approx T^{1/(2a+d)}$. Let $\tilde{\Pi}_T(\cdot|X^T)$ be the conditional law $\mathcal{L}(\sqrt{T}(b - \hat{b}_T)|X^T)$, where $b \sim \Pi_T(\cdot|X^T)$ and $\hat{b}_T = E^{\Pi_T}[b|X^T]$ is the posterior mean, and let \mathcal{N}_{b_0} denote the law in $(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*$ of a centred Gaussian white noise process for $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{1/\mu_0}$. Then, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\beta_{(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*}(\tilde{\Pi}(\cdot|X^T), \mathcal{N}_{b_0}) \xrightarrow{P_{b_0}} 0.$$

Convergence of moments in the previous theorem yields the asymptotics of \hat{b}_T .

Theorem 4. Under the conditions of the previous theorem, the MAP estimate $\hat{b}_T(X^T) = E^{\Pi}[b|X^T]$ satisfies, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{b}_T - b_0) \rightarrow^d \mathcal{N}_{b_0} \text{ in } (B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*.$$

A confidence set for b can now be constructed by using the posterior quantiles to create a multiscale ball around \hat{b}_T , which we can further intersect with smoothness information as in [11, 12] to obtain confidence bands that are valid and near-optimal also in $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -diameter.

Remark 1. Just as in the related situations in [11, 32], one shows that the condition $\rho > d/2$ cannot be relaxed as otherwise the limiting process does not exist as a tight probability measure in $(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*$. Moreover the choices $p = 1, q = \infty$ give the maximal Besov space (on the bounded domain \mathbb{T}^d) in view of standard embeddings, see [44], Section 3.5.

Remark 2. As remarked at the end of Section 2.3, the presence of semi-parametric bias terms prevents our proof from giving a Bernstein-von Mises theorem when $d \geq 4$, and also necessitates the assumption $s > a - 1 + d/2$ in Theorem 3. Similar phenomena occur in nonparametric smoothing problems, see, e.g., Section 3.6 in [24].

2.5 CLTs and asymptotic inference for the invariant measure

We now turn to the problem of making inference on the invariant measure μ_b . From any vector field b we can identify μ_b via the elliptic PDE (6) and hence, given $b \sim \Pi_T(\cdot|X^T)$ and \hat{b}_T , we can (numerically) solve (6) to generate posterior samples $\mu_b|X^T$ and point estimates $\mu_{\hat{b}_T}$ for μ_b . Of course other much simpler estimators of μ_b can be proposed and some discussion of the relative merits of the likelihood-based approach is given in Remark 5.

Using perturbation arguments for the PDE (6) combined with Theorem 3, we obtain the following Bernstein-von Mises theorem for $\sqrt{T}(\mu_b - \mu_{\hat{b}_T}|X^T)$. In the proof we show that the Frechet-derivative of the non-linear map $b \mapsto \mu_b$ is ‘one-smoothing’, a fact that follows from elliptic regularity theory for PDEs. As a consequence, the constraint $\rho > d/2$ from Theorem 3 can be relaxed to $r > d/2 - 1$ when the target of inference is μ_b rather than b .

For the formulation of the following result, we define spaces

$$\mathbb{B}_r = B_{1\infty}^r(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{T}^d), \quad r > 0, \quad d \leq 3,$$

normed by $\|\cdot\|_{L^2} + \|\cdot\|_{B_{1\infty}^r}$; similarly to the previous subsection, the conditional laws $\mathcal{L}(\sqrt{T}(\mu_b - \mu_{\hat{b}_T})|X^T)$ induce stochastic processes in the normed dual space \mathbb{B}_r^* via actions

$$g \mapsto \sqrt{T} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\mu_b - \mu_{\hat{b}_T})g, \quad g \in \mathbb{B}_r,$$

and weak convergence occurs in \mathbb{B}_r^* . We note that the inverse $L_{b_0}^{-1}$ of the generator L_{b_0} from (4) exists as a well-defined mapping from $L_{\mu_0}^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ into $H^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, see Lemma 11 in Section 4. We postpone the special case $d = 1$ to Theorem 6 below.

Theorem 5. *Let $d = 2, 3$ and $r > d/2 - 1$. Under the conditions of Theorem 3, if $\mu_b, \mu_{\hat{b}_T}$ are the solutions of (6) (invariant measures) associated with a posterior draw $b \sim \Pi_T(\cdot|X^T)$ and $\hat{b}_T = E^{\Pi_T}[b|X^T]$, respectively, then for $\tau(\cdot|X^T)$ the conditional law $\mathcal{L}(\sqrt{T}(\mu_b - \mu_{\hat{b}_T})|X^T)$ in \mathbb{B}_r^* we have as $T \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\beta_{\mathbb{B}_r^*}(\tau(\cdot|X^T), \mathcal{N}_{\mu_0}) \xrightarrow{P_{b_0}} 0,$$

where \mathcal{N}_{μ_0} is the tight Borel probability measure on \mathbb{B}_r^* induced by the centred Gaussian process \mathbb{M} with covariance metric

$$\mathbb{E}\mathbb{M}(g)\mathbb{M}(g') = \langle \nabla L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{g}], \nabla L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{g}'] \rangle_{\mu_0}, \quad \bar{g} = g - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} g d\mu_0, \quad g, g' \in \mathbb{B}_r.$$

Moreover, as $T \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\sqrt{T}(\mu_{\hat{b}_T} - \mu_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_{\mu_0} \text{ in } \mathbb{B}_r^*.$$

This theorem has various corollaries, upon using the richness of the spaces $\mathbb{B}_r, r > d/2 - 1$. For instance since H^r imbeds continuously into \mathbb{B}^r on the bounded domain \mathbb{T}^d one deduces weak convergence in P_{b_0} -probability of the conditional laws in negative Sobolev spaces $H^{-r}(\mathbb{T}^d) = (H^r(\mathbb{T}^d))^*$; as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\beta_{H^{-r}}(\mathcal{L}(\sqrt{T}(\mu_b - \mu_{\hat{b}_T})|X^T), \mathcal{N}_{\mu_0}) \xrightarrow{P_{b_0}} 0, \quad r > d/2 - 1, \quad d = 2, 3.$$

Remark 3. Indicator functions of measurable subsets C of \mathbb{T}^d of finite perimeter define elements of $B_{1\infty}^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (proved, e.g., as in Lemma 8b in [23]) and we can thus make inference on invariant probabilities $\mu_b(C) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} 1_C d\mu, d = 2, 3$. More concretely, suppose $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_K$ is a class of Borel subsets of $(0, 1]^d$ that have perimeter bounded by a fixed constant K . This includes, in particular, all convex subsets of \mathbb{T}^d (e.g., Remark 5 in [23]). Then the collection of functions $\{1_C : C \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is bounded in $B_{1\infty}^1(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, and if

$$(\mu_b(C) : C \in \mathcal{C}), \quad b \sim \Pi_T(\cdot|X^T),$$

is the resulting set-indexed process of posterior invariant probabilities, we deduce from Theorem 5 and the continuous mapping theorem for weak convergence that, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\beta_{\ell^\infty(\mathcal{C})}(\mathcal{L}(\sqrt{T}(\mu_b(\cdot) - \mu_{\hat{b}_T}(\cdot))|X^T), \mathcal{N}_{\mu_0}) \xrightarrow{P_{b_0}} 0, \quad \text{and } \sqrt{T}(\mu_{\hat{b}_T} - \mu_{b_0}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}_{\mu_0} \text{ in } \ell^\infty(\mathcal{C}), \quad (12)$$

where $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{C}) \supset \mathbb{B}_r^*$ is the Banach space of bounded functions on \mathcal{C} (see Proposition 3.7.24 in [25] for a precise definition of β_S for non-separable S). One further deduces that the estimated invariant probabilities induced by the MAP estimate \hat{b}_T obey the limit law

$$\sqrt{T} \sup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |\mu_{\hat{b}_T}(C) - \mu_0(C)| \xrightarrow{d} \sup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |\mathbb{M}(1_C)| < \infty \text{ a.s., } T \rightarrow \infty.$$

We finally turn to the special case $d = 1$, where the proof of a version of Theorem 5 needs slight adaptations as then $r > d/2 - 1 = -1/2$ includes negative values. We obtain a central limit theorem for the invariant probability densities $(\mu_b(x), x \in \mathbb{T})$ viewed as sequences of random functions in the space $C(\mathbb{T})$.

For $d = 1$ the solution map L_b^{-1} from before Theorem 5 has a representation $L_b^{-1}[g] = \int_{\mathbb{T}} G_b(\cdot, y)g(y)dy$, $g \in L^2_{\mu_b}(\mathbb{T})$, with periodic Green kernel $G_b : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $G_b(\cdot, x) \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$ for all $x \in \mathbb{T}$. This follows, e.g., from deriving directly explicit expressions for the solution v of the ODE $bv' + v''/2 = (2\mu_b)^{-1}(\mu_b v')' = g$, where $\mu_b \propto e^{2B}$, $B' = b$.

Theorem 6. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3 with $d = 1$ and $a > 3/2$, if $\mu_b, \mu_{\hat{b}_T}$ are the invariant probability densities associated to $b \sim \Pi(\cdot|X^T)$, $\hat{b}_T = E^{\Pi_T}[b|X^T]$, respectively, then*

$$\beta_{C(\mathbb{T})}(\mathcal{L}(\sqrt{T}(\mu_b - \mu_{\hat{b}_T})|X^T), \bar{\mathcal{N}}_{b_0}) \rightarrow^{P_{b_0}} 0, \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_{b_0}$ is the Borel probability law in $C(\mathbb{T})$ induced by the centred Gaussian random function $(\bar{\mathbb{M}}(x) : x \in \mathbb{T})$ with covariance

$$E\bar{\mathbb{M}}(x)\bar{\mathbb{M}}(x') = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d}{dy} G_{b_0}(y, x) \frac{d}{dy} G_{b_0}(y, x') d\mu_0(y), \quad x, x' \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Moreover, as $T \rightarrow \infty$ we also have

$$\sqrt{T}(\mu_{\hat{b}_T} - \mu_0) \rightarrow^d \bar{\mathcal{N}}_{b_0} \text{ in } C(\mathbb{T}). \quad (13)$$

In the recent preprints [2, 3], an analogue of (13) was obtained for an estimator based on directly smoothing the empirical measure $\hat{\mu}_T$ from (2). Their proof is based on first establishing that their estimator is asymptotically close to the local time of the diffusion process, in conceptual analogy to the i.i.d. setting [24]. Our approach to combine Theorem 3 with the Delta-method for the map $b \mapsto \mu_b$ is very different, and also allows one to deal with multi-dimensional situations, where local times are not appropriately defined.

Remark 4 (Information lower bounds). For completeness we briefly explain the statistical optimality of the covariances obtained in the previous limit theorems. For any $h \in H^r(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $r > d/2$, and as $T \rightarrow \infty$, the LAN expansion of our measurement model under P_{b_0} ,

$$\ell_T(b_0 + T^{-1/2}h) - \ell_T(b_0) = W_T(h) - \frac{1}{2}\|h\|_{\mu_0}^2 + o_{P_{b_0}}(1), \quad W_T(h) \rightarrow^d N(0, \|h\|_{\mu_0}^2),$$

is obtained in Lemma 1 below. We then see from standard arguments from asymptotic semiparametric statistics [51] that the asymptotic variance occurring in Theorems 3 and 4 is optimal in an information-theoretic sense. This is also true in the case of Theorems 5, where inference on a non-linear functional $\Phi_g(b) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} g d\mu_b$, $g \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, of b is considered. Indeed, the arguments in the proof of Theorem 5 imply that

$$\Phi_g(b+h) - \Phi_g(b) = \langle \nabla L_b^{-1}[\bar{g}], h \rangle_{\mu_b} + o(\|h\|_{\infty}), \quad \bar{g} = g - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} g d\mu_b.$$

Thus arguing as in Section 7.5 in [32] the Cramer-Rao Lower bound for estimating $\Phi_g(b)$ from our observations is given by

$$\|\nabla L_b^{-1}[\bar{g}]\|_{\mu_b}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left\| \nabla L_b^{-1} \left[g - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} g d\mu_b \right] (x) \right\|^2 d\mu_b(x).$$

Examining the proof of Theorem 6, a similar remark applies to the covariance appearing in that theorem. See also [3] for a comparable result when $d = 1$.

Remark 5. In view of (2) a simple estimate of $\mu_b(\phi) = \int \phi d\mu_b, \phi \in L^2$, is obtained from the ergodic average $\hat{\mu}_T(\phi) = (1/T) \int_0^T \phi(X_t) dt$. This requires ϕ to be point-wise defined and rules out aspects of μ_b such as the value of its probability density at a point treated in Theorem 6. For recovery of $\mu_b(\phi)$ uniformly in classes of ϕ 's, we are not aware of results such as (12) for the empirical estimate $\hat{\mu}_T$ replacing $\mu_{\hat{b}_T}$, except for the case $d = 1$ covered by the results in [52]. The techniques we develop (Lemmas 7 and 9, combined with Theorems 2.3.7 and 3.7.23 in [25]) do imply that any uniformly bounded class \mathcal{F} of functions $\phi : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for which the entropy integral

$$\int_0^\infty \sqrt{\log N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{H^{(d/2-1+\kappa)_+}}, \tau)} d\tau < \infty \quad (14)$$

converges for some $\kappa > 0$ does, under the conditions of Lemmas 7 and 9, satisfy the uniform central limit theorem

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\mu}_T - \mu_0) \rightarrow^d \mathcal{N}_{\mu_0} \text{ in } \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}), T \rightarrow \infty. \quad (15)$$

In the setting of Theorem 5 this requires $r > d - 1$ and hence falls short of the condition $r > d/2 - 1$, particularly excluding the examples from Remark 3. It is an interesting open question whether (14) can be essentially weakened for the CLT for the empirical process $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\mu}_T - \mu_0)$ when $d > 1$ – the regression techniques introduced here show that in principle inference on μ_0 is possible in such strong topologies. It may finally be remarked that at least for the Bayesian statistician, modelling μ_b directly by a prior is not coherent since μ_b does not identify the law P_b^T generating the likelihood (7) (cf. the discussion after Proposition 1).

3 Proofs

We repeatedly use the following basic fact that allows to ‘localise’ the posterior distribution to sets \mathcal{D}_T of high frequentist posterior probability: let \mathcal{D}_T be any measurable set in the support of the prior satisfying $\Pi(\mathcal{D}_T|X^T) = 1 - o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, let $\Pi^{\mathcal{D}_T}(\cdot) = \Pi(\cdot \cap \mathcal{D}_T)/\Pi(\mathcal{D}_T)$ denote the prior conditioned to \mathcal{D}_T and let $\Pi^{\mathcal{D}_T}(\cdot|X^T)$ denote the posterior distribution arising from prior $\Pi^{\mathcal{D}_T}$. By a standard inequality ([51], p. 142),

$$\|\Pi(\cdot|X^T) - \Pi^{\mathcal{D}_T}(\cdot|X^T)\|_{TV} \equiv \sup_A |\Pi(A|X^T) - \Pi^{\mathcal{D}_T}(A|X^T)| \leq 2\Pi(\mathcal{D}_T^c|X^T) \rightarrow^{P_{b_0}} 0, \quad (16)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$, where the supremum is taken over all measurable sets.

The proofs of Theorems 1-6 are based on a variety of auxiliary results developed in separate sections below. For Theorem 1 only Lemma 10 is needed, and this allows to derive an initial localisation of the posterior distribution in a neighbourhood contracting about b_0 in L^2 -norm via (16). The proof of Theorem 2 is then based on semiparametric tools (Proposition 2 and Lemmas 3, 6 below) ultimately resulting in the key Lemma 5(i), which applies to the L^2 -localised posterior distribution. Once Theorem 2 is established, one can refine that lemma (see Lemma 5(ii)) and apply it to the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -localised posterior distribution to prove Theorems 3 and 4. Theorems 5 and 6 then follow from Theorem 3 and some perturbation arguments for the PDE (6).

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1

As a first step we obtain a convergence rate in the natural ‘random Hellinger semimetric h_T ’ corresponding to the regression problem posed by equation (1). We do this using the classical

testing approach (see [21]) which has been formulated in the Brownian semimartingale setting relevant here by van der Meulen et al. [50]. Define

$$h_T^2(b_1, b_2) := \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|b_1(X_s) - b_2(X_s)\|^2 ds = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |b_{1,j}(X_s) - b_{2,j}(X_s)|^2 ds.$$

This random semimetric arises naturally, since the log-likelihood with respect to $P_{b_0}^T$ can be expressed as $M - \frac{1}{2}[M]$, where M is a continuous local martingale with quadratic variation $[M]_T = Th_T^2(b, b_0)$. Consequently, a key additional difficulty in this setting is that the Hellinger semimetric is a random process rather than a deterministic semimetric.

The next result is a combination of Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 of [50], restated in the present context. The proof relies on martingale arguments which generalize to the multi-dimensional setting without difficulty, hence the proof is left to the reader. Consider the statistical experiments $(P_b^T : b \in \mathfrak{B}_T)$, where the parameter spaces \mathfrak{B}_T , which are allowed to vary with T , are arbitrary sets equipped with σ -algebras satisfying mild measurability conditions, see Section 2 of [50]. In particular, these are satisfied by the finite-dimensional spaces considered in Theorem 1.

Theorem 7. *Let $\varepsilon_T \rightarrow 0$ be such that $T\varepsilon_T^2 \rightarrow \infty$. Suppose that for any $C_1 > 0$, there exist measurable sets \mathcal{B}_T and a $C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\Pi_T(\mathcal{B}_T^c) \leq e^{-C_1 T \varepsilon_T^2}, \quad (17)$$

$$\log N(\mathcal{B}_T, \|\cdot\|_{\mu_0}, \varepsilon_T) \leq C_2 T \varepsilon_T^2, \quad (18)$$

and that for some $C_3 > 0$,

$$\Pi_T(b : \|b - b_0\|_{\mu_0} \leq \varepsilon_T) \geq e^{-C_3 T \varepsilon_T^2}. \quad (19)$$

Assume further that for every $\gamma > 0$ there exist $c_\gamma, C_\gamma > 0$ and $D_\gamma \geq 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_{b_0}(c_\gamma \|b - b_0\|_{\mu_0} \leq h_T(b, b_0), \forall b \in \mathfrak{B}_T \text{ with } h_T(b, b_0) \geq D_\gamma \varepsilon_T, \\ \text{and } h_T(b_1, b_2) \leq C_\gamma \|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0}, \forall b_1, b_2 \in \mathfrak{B}_T \text{ with } h_T(b_1, b_2) \geq D_\gamma \varepsilon_T) \geq 1 - \gamma. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Then for every $M_T \rightarrow \infty$, $\Pi_T(b : \|b - b_0\|_{\mu_0} \geq M_T \varepsilon_T | X^T) \xrightarrow{P_{b_0}} 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof of the theorem implies in particular that the denominator in (9) is non-zero on events of P_{b_0} -probability approaching one. We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1 and verify the conditions (17)-(20) of Theorem 7. By Proposition 1, $\|\cdot\|_{L^2}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mu_0}$ are equivalent norms. Applying Theorem 4.5 of [53] (see also Sections 11.3 and 11.4.5 in [21]), there exist measurable sets $B_T \subset V_J$ such that for $\varepsilon_T = T^{-\frac{a \wedge s}{2a+d}} (\log T)$,

$$(i) \log N(B_T, \|\cdot\|_{\infty}, 3\varepsilon_T) \leq 6CT\varepsilon_T^2,$$

$$(ii) \Pi_T(b_j \notin B_T) \leq e^{-CT\varepsilon_T^2} \text{ and}$$

$$(iii) \Pi_T(\|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_{\infty} < 4\varepsilon_T) \geq e^{-T\varepsilon_T^2}.$$

The set $\mathcal{B}_T = \prod_{j=1}^d B_T$ satisfies $\Pi_T(\mathcal{B}_T^c) \leq de^{-CT\varepsilon_T^2}$ and $\log N(\mathcal{B}_T, \|\cdot\|_{\mu_0}, d\|\mu_0\|_{\infty}^{1/2} \varepsilon_T) \leq 6CdT\varepsilon_T^2$, which verifies (17) and (18) for (a constant multiple of) ε_T . Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_T\left(\|b - b_0\|_{\mu_0} \leq 4\sqrt{d}\|\mu_0\|_{\infty}^{1/2} \varepsilon_T\right) &\geq \Pi_T\left(\sup_{j=1, \dots, d} \|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_{L^2} \leq 4\varepsilon_T\right) \\ &\geq \prod_{j=1}^d \Pi_T(\|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_{\infty} \leq 4\varepsilon_T) \geq e^{-dT\varepsilon_T^2}, \end{aligned}$$

thereby verifying (19) for (a constant multiple of) ε_T .

We now verify (20). Since $\Pi_T(V_J^{\otimes d}) = 1$, we may take as parameter space $\mathfrak{B}_T = V_J^{\otimes d} \cup \{b_0\}$. Let $b_{0,j,J}$ denote the orthogonal projection of $b_{0,j}$ onto V_J and set $b_{0,J} = (b_{0,1,J}, \dots, b_{0,d,J})$. Since $b_0 \in C^s$, $\|b_{0,j} - b_{0,j,J}\|_\infty \leq C(b_0)2^{-Js} \leq C(b_0)\varepsilon_T$, so that for our choice of J this yields $h_T(b_0, b_{0,J}) \leq r\varepsilon_T$ and $\|b_0 - b_{0,J}\|_{\mu_0} \leq \|\mu_0\|_\infty^{1/2} \|b_0 - b_{0,J}\|_{L^2} \leq r\varepsilon_T$ for some $r = r(d, b_0)$. By considering the cases $b_1 \in V_J^{\otimes d}$ and $b_1 = b_0$ separately, the event in (20) therefore contains the event

$$\begin{aligned} & \{c_\gamma \|b - b_{0,J}\|_{\mu_0} + c_\gamma r\varepsilon_T \leq h_T(b, b_{0,J}) - r\varepsilon_T \text{ and } h_T(b, b_{0,J}) + r\varepsilon_T \leq C_\gamma \|b - b_{0,J}\|_{\mu_0} - C_\gamma r\varepsilon_T \\ & \quad \forall b \in V_J^{\otimes d} \text{ with } h_T(b, b_{0,J}) \geq (D_\gamma - r)\varepsilon_T\} \\ & \cap \{h_T(b_1, b_2) \leq C_\gamma \|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0}, \forall b_1, b_2 \in V_J^{\otimes d} \text{ with } h_T(b_1, b_2) \geq D_\gamma \varepsilon_T\}. \end{aligned}$$

For D_γ large enough that $(D_\gamma - r) \geq \max\{(C_\gamma + 1)r, 2(c_\gamma + 1)r\}$, the last event contains

$$\begin{aligned} & \{2c_\gamma \|b - b_{0,J}\|_{\mu_0} \leq h_T(b, b_{0,J}) \leq \frac{1}{2}C_\gamma \|b - b_{0,J}\|_{\mu_0}, \forall b \in V_J^{\otimes d} \text{ with } h_T(b, b_{0,J}) \geq (D_\gamma - r)\varepsilon_T\} \\ & \cap \{h_T(b_1, b_2) \leq C_\gamma \|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0}, \forall b_1, b_2 \in V_J^{\otimes d} \text{ with } h_T(b_1, b_2) \geq D_\gamma \varepsilon_T\} \\ & \supset \{2c_\gamma \|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0} \leq h_T(b_1, b_2) \leq \frac{1}{2}C_\gamma \|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0}, \forall b_1, b_2 \in V_J^{\otimes d}\} \end{aligned}$$

since $b_{0,J} \in V_J^{\otimes d}$. It thus suffices to lower bound the probability of the last event.

For $C_\gamma > 2$ and $0 < c_\gamma < 1/2$, this probability equals

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{b_0} \left(4c_\gamma^2 - 1 \leq \frac{h_T^2(b_1, b_2)}{\|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0}^2} - 1 \leq \frac{1}{4}C_\gamma^2 - 1, \forall b_1, b_2 \in V_J^{\otimes d}, b_1 \neq b_2 \right) \\ & \geq 1 - P_{b_0} \left(\sup_{b_1, b_2 \in V_J^{\otimes d}: b_1 \neq b_2} \frac{|h_T^2(b_1, b_2) - \|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0}^2|}{\|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0}^2} > \min\{1 - 4c_\gamma^2, C_\gamma^2/4 - 1\} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the right-hand side in the last probability is a positive constant. Since $b_0 \in C^s$, $s > \max(d-1, 1) \geq \max(d/2, 1)$, Lemma 10 with $x = \sqrt{2}M_0 2^{Jd/2} \rightarrow \infty$ and $M_0 > 1$ large enough yields

$$P_{b_0} \left(\sup_{b_1, b_2 \in V_J^{\otimes d}: b_1 \neq b_2} \left| \frac{h_T^2(b_1, b_2) - \|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0}^2}{\|b_1 - b_2\|_{\mu_0}^2} \right| \geq \frac{CM_0}{\sqrt{T}} 2^{J[d+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} \right) \leq de^{(c'_0 - M_0^2)2^{Jd}} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $0 < \kappa < s - d/2 + 1$ (or $\kappa = 0$ if $d = 1$). Since $T^{-1/2} 2^{J[d+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ for $a > \max(d-1, 1/2)$ and $\kappa > 0$ small enough, the right-hand side of (21) equals $1 - o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. This verifies (20) for $C_\gamma > 2$, $0 < c_\gamma < 1/2$ and $D_\gamma > 0$ large enough, so that applying Theorem 7 completes the proof.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Take the set D_T from (30) below with $\Gamma_T, \sigma_{\Gamma_T}$ as in Lemma 5(i) below. Then by that Lemma and (16) with $\mathcal{D}_T = D_T$, it suffices to prove Theorem 2 for b drawn from the localised posterior distribution $\Pi^{D_T}(\cdot | X^T)$. Let A_T be any events satisfying $P_{b_0}(A_T) \rightarrow 1$ and denote by $P_{V_J}, P_{V_J^{\otimes d}}$ the projection operators onto $V_J, V_J^{\otimes d}$, respectively. Setting

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_T = (\log T)^\delta T^{-\frac{s \wedge [a - (d/2 - 2)_+]}{2a + d}}$$

and applying Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{b_0} \Pi^{D_T} \left(b : \sum_{j=1}^d \|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_\infty \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}_T |X^T| \right) &\leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_T^{-1} E_{b_0} \sum_{j=1}^d E^{\Pi^{D_T}} [\|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_\infty |X^T] 1_{A_T} + P_{b_0}(A_T^c) \\ &\leq \tilde{\varepsilon}_T^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d E_{b_0} E^{\Pi^{D_T}} [\|b_j - P_{V_j}[b_{0,j}]\|_\infty |X^T] 1_{A_T} + \tilde{\varepsilon}_T^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{V_j}[b_{0,j}] - b_{0,j}\|_\infty + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $b_0 \in C^s$, the second term is of order $O(2^{-Js}) = O(T^{-\frac{s}{2a+d}}) = o(\tilde{\varepsilon}_T)$ as required. Suppose first that $d \leq 4$ and let $a_\lambda = 2^{\lambda d/2} 2^{-Jd/2} (\log T)^{-\eta}$ for some $\eta > 1$. Then using that $\sup_x \sum_k |\Phi_{\lambda,k}(x)| \lesssim 2^{\lambda d/2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^d \|b_j - P_{V_j}[b_{0,j}]\|_\infty 1_{A_T} &= 1_{A_T} \sum_{j=1}^d \sup_x \left| \sum_{\lambda \leq J} \sum_k \langle b_j - b_{0,j}, \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2} \Phi_{\lambda,k}(x) \right| \\ &\lesssim 1_{A_T} \sum_j \sum_{\lambda \leq J} \frac{2^{\lambda d/2}}{\sqrt{T}} \max_k \sqrt{T} |\langle b_j - b_{0,j}, \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}| \\ &= 1_{A_T} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_j \sum_{\lambda \leq J} 2^{\lambda d/2} a_\lambda^{-1} \max_k \sqrt{T} |\langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}| \\ &\lesssim 1_{A_T} \frac{J 2^{Jd/2} (\log T)^\eta}{\sqrt{T}} \max_{\lambda \leq J, k, j} \sqrt{T} |\langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking posterior expectations in the last inequality, Lemma 5(i) implies that on an event A_T of P_{b_0} -probability tending to one

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\varepsilon}_T^{-1} \sum_j E^{\Pi^{D_T}} [\|b_j - P_{V_j}[b_{0,j}]\|_\infty |X^T] 1_{A_T} \\ &\lesssim \tilde{\varepsilon}_T^{-1} \frac{J 2^{Jd/2} (\log T)^\eta}{\sqrt{T}} E^{\Pi^{D_T}} \left[\max_{\lambda \leq J, k, j} \sqrt{T} |\langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}| |X^T \right] 1_{A_T} \\ &\lesssim \tilde{\varepsilon}_T^{-1} \frac{J^{3/2} 2^{Jd/2} (\log T)^\eta}{\sqrt{T}} \lesssim (\log T)^{3/2+\eta-\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\delta > 3/2 + \eta$ completes the proof when $d \leq 4$ since $\eta > 1$ was arbitrary. If $d > 4$, we set $a_\lambda = 2^{\lambda d/2} 2^{-J(d-2)} (\log T)^{-\eta}$ for $\eta > 1$ and use again Lemma 5(i) to obtain, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_T^{-1} \sum_j E^{\Pi^{D_T}} [\|b_j - P_{V_j} b_{0,j}\|_\infty |X^T] 1_{A_T} \lesssim \tilde{\varepsilon}_T^{-1} \frac{J^{3/2} 2^{J(d-2)} (\log T)^\eta}{\sqrt{T}} \lesssim (\log T)^{3/2+\eta-\delta} \rightarrow 0.$$

3.3 Proof of Theorems 3 and 4

Let $b \sim \Pi^{\bar{D}_T}(\cdot | X^T)$ conditionally on X^T , where \bar{D}_T is the event from (31) below with $\Gamma_T, \sigma_{\Gamma_T}$ chosen as in Lemma 5(ii). Then by that lemma and (16) with $\mathcal{D}_T = \bar{D}_T$, it suffices to prove Theorem 3 for $\Pi^{\bar{D}_T}(\cdot | X^T)$ in place of $\Pi(\cdot | X^T)$.

Denote the centred ball of radius r in $B_{1^\infty}^\rho = B_{1^\infty}^{\rho, \otimes d}$ by $\mathcal{B}^\rho(r)$, and let $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) \in \mathcal{B}^\rho(1)$. For projections

$$P_{V_j^{\otimes d}}[\eta/\mu_0] = (P_{V_j}[\eta_j/\mu_0] : j = 1, \dots, d),$$

define the centring process

$$\hat{G}_J(\eta) \equiv \langle \hat{G}_J, \eta \rangle_{L^2} = \sum_{j=1}^d \langle \hat{G}_{J,j}, \eta_j \rangle_{L^2} = \langle b_0, \eta \rangle_{L^2} + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T P_{V_J^{\otimes d}}[\eta/\mu_0](X_t) dW_t, \quad \eta \in \mathcal{B}^\rho(1),$$

where the notation $\langle \hat{G}_J, \eta \rangle_{L^2}$ is justified by linearity of the stochastic integral. Next define stochastic processes

$$(Z_1(\eta) = \sqrt{T}(\langle b, \eta \rangle_{L^2} - \hat{G}_J(\eta)) : \eta \in \mathcal{B}^\rho(1)), \quad (Z_2(\eta) : \eta \in \mathcal{B}^\rho(1)),$$

where Z_2 has (cylindrical) law \mathcal{N}_{b_0} , and denote the (conditional) law of Z_1 by $\bar{\Pi}^{\bar{D}_T} = \bar{\Pi}^{\bar{D}_T}(\cdot | X^T)$. Both processes prescribe linear actions on $\mathcal{B}^\rho(1)$ – this is clear for Z_1 and follows also for Z_2 as explained before (24) below. The estimates that follow imply moreover that the Z_i define proper random variables in $(B_{1^\infty}^\rho)^*$. For $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$ to be chosen, define probability measures $\bar{\Pi}_\kappa^{\bar{D}_T}, \mathcal{N}_{b_0, \kappa}$ as the laws of the stochastic processes

$$P_{(\kappa)}(Z_i) \equiv (Z_i(P_{V_\kappa^{\otimes d}}[\eta]) : \eta \in \mathcal{B}^\rho(1)), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

which, as projections, are defined on the same probability space as the Z_i 's. Using the triangle inequality for the metric $\beta = \beta_{(B_{1^\infty}^\rho)^*}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(\bar{\Pi}^{\bar{D}_T}, \mathcal{N}_{b_0}) &\leq \beta(\bar{\Pi}_\kappa^{\bar{D}_T}, \mathcal{N}_{b_0, \kappa}) + \beta(\bar{\Pi}^{\bar{D}_T}, \bar{\Pi}_\kappa^{\bar{D}_T}) + \beta(\mathcal{N}_{b_0}, \mathcal{N}_{b_0, \kappa}) \\ &= \beta_{V_\kappa^{\otimes d}}(\bar{\Pi}_\kappa^{\bar{D}_T}, \mathcal{N}_{b_0, \kappa}) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \sup_{\|\eta\|_{L^i p} \leq 1} |E[F(Z_i) - F(P_{(\kappa)}(Z_i))]| \\ &\leq \beta_{V_\kappa^{\otimes d}}(\bar{\Pi}_\kappa^{\bar{D}_T}, \mathcal{N}_{b_0, \kappa}) + \sum_{i=1}^2 E\|Z_i - P_{(\kappa)}(Z_i)\|_{(B_{1^\infty}^\rho)^*} = A + B + C. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

For term B , we use Parseval's identity and that $\|\eta\|_{B_{1^\infty}^\rho} \leq 1$ implies $\sum_j \sum_r |\langle \eta_j, \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2}| \lesssim 2^{-l(\rho-d/2)}$ for all l to obtain, with $E = E^{\bar{\Pi}^{\bar{D}_T}}[\cdot | X^T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} E\|Z_1 - P_{(\kappa)}(Z_1)\|_{(B_{1^\infty}^\rho)^*} &= E \sup_{\|\eta\|_{B_{1^\infty}^\rho} \leq 1} \sqrt{T} \left| \langle b - \hat{G}_J, \eta - P_{V_\kappa^{\otimes d}}[\eta] \rangle_{L^2} \right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\kappa < \lambda} 2^{-\lambda(\rho-d/2)} E \max_{k,j} \sqrt{T} \left| \langle b_j - \hat{G}_{J,j}, \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2} \right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\kappa < \lambda} 2^{-\lambda(\rho-d/2)} E \max_{k,j} \sqrt{T} |\langle b_j - b_{0,j}, \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}| + \sum_{\kappa < \lambda} 2^{-\lambda(\rho-d/2)} \max_{k,j} \sqrt{T} \left| \langle \hat{G}_{J,j} - b_{0,j}, \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

By Lemma 5(ii) and the usual decay bound for wavelet coefficients of $b_0 \in C^s$, the first sum is bounded in P_{b_0} -probability by

$$\sum_{\kappa < \lambda \leq J, j} 2^{-\lambda(\rho-d/2)} \sqrt{\lambda} + \sqrt{T} \sum_{\lambda > J} 2^{-\lambda(\rho+s)} = o(1)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$ and $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$, since $\rho > d/2$. To deal with the second sum, note that by definition

$$\sqrt{T} \langle \hat{G}_{J,j} - b_{0,j}, \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0](X_t) dW_t^j.$$

Arguing as after (44) below, Bernstein's inequality (49) implies that these variables are sub-Gaussian under P_{b_0} , with variance proxy bounded by

$$\|P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0]\|_{\mu_0}^2 + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0](X_t)|^2 dt - \|P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0]\|_{\mu_0}^2.$$

The first quantity is bounded by $\|\Phi_{\lambda,k}\|_{L^2} \|1/\mu_0\|_\infty \lesssim 1$ whereas Proposition 2(ii) implies that the second quantity is $O_{P_{b_0}}(\tilde{R}_T) = O_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ uniformly over λ, k for our choice of J, s . Thus by the usual sub-Gaussian maximal inequality (Lemma 2.3.4 in [25]), the last term in (23) is $O_{P_{b_0}}(\sum_{\lambda>J} 2^{-\lambda(\rho-d/2)} \sqrt{\lambda}) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ for $\rho > d/2$, so that the last sum in (23) is $o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ as $\kappa, T \rightarrow \infty$.

For term C , we first note that \mathcal{N}_{b_0} defines a tight Gaussian probability measure in the space of bounded functions on $\mathcal{B}^\rho(1)$ (using Theorem 2.3.7, Proposition 2.1.5 and (4.184) in [25]), and arguing as in Theorem 3.7.28 in [25] one shows that \mathcal{N}_{b_0} extends to a Gaussian probability measure on $(B_{1^\infty}^\rho)^*$, in particular a version of Z_2 exists that acts linearly on $\mathcal{B}^\rho(1)$. Define $\Phi_{\lambda,k,j} = (0, \dots, 0, \Phi_{\lambda,k}, 0, \dots, 0) : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, where the non-zero coordinate occurs in the j^{th} entry. Then, using again the standard sub-Gaussian maximal inequality, now for the variables ($Z_2(\Phi_{\lambda,k,j}) \sim N(0, \|\Phi_{\lambda,k}\|_{1/\mu_0}^2)$),

$$\begin{aligned} E\|Z_2 - P_{(\kappa)}(Z_2)\|_{(B_{1^\infty}^\rho)^*} &= E \sup_{\|\eta\|_{B_{1^\infty}^\rho} \leq 1} \left| Z_2(\eta - P_{V_\kappa^{\otimes d}}[\eta]) \right| \\ &\lesssim \sum_{\kappa < \lambda} 2^{-\lambda(\rho-d/2)} E \max_{r,j} |Z_2(\Phi_{\lambda,k,j})| \lesssim \sum_{\kappa < \lambda} 2^{-\lambda(\rho-d/2)} \sqrt{\lambda} =_{\kappa \rightarrow \infty} o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Finally, for term A , consider again the basis $(\Phi_{\lambda,k,j} : j = 1, \dots, d, \lambda \leq \kappa, k)$ of $V_\kappa^{\otimes d}$ for κ fixed. We apply Proposition 2(iii) with $\gamma = P_{V_J^{\otimes d}}[\Phi_{\lambda,k,j}/\mu_0]$, then Lemma 3(ii) and the third part of Lemma 6 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\Pi^{\bar{D}_T}} \left[e^{u\sqrt{T}((b-b_0, \Phi_{\lambda,k,j}/\mu_0)_{\mu_0}) - u\sqrt{T} \int_0^T P_{V_J^{\otimes d}}[\Phi_{\lambda,k,j}/\mu_0](X_t) dW_t} \Big| X^T \right] \\ = C_T \exp \left\{ \frac{u^2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \|P_{V_J^{\otimes d}}[\Phi_{\lambda,k,j}/\mu_0]\|^2 d\mu_0 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we can take $|\Gamma_T| \lesssim 1, \varepsilon_T \sigma_{\Gamma_T} = o(1)$ as in the proof of Lemma 5, and where $C_T = 1 + o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}$. We also have $\|P_{V_J^{\otimes d}}[\Phi_{\lambda,k,j}/\mu_0]\|_{\mu_0} \rightarrow \|\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0\|_{\mu_0} = \|\Phi_{\lambda,k}\|_{1/\mu_0}$ as $J \rightarrow \infty$ since $P_{V_J^{\otimes d}}$ are L^2 -projections. The same is true if $\Phi_{\lambda,k,j}$ is replaced by arbitrary finite linear combinations $\sum_j \sum_{\lambda \leq \kappa, k} a_{\lambda,k,j} \Phi_{\lambda,k,j}$, κ fixed, and thus by Proposition 29 in [32] (or by the results in the supplement of [13]) we deduce joint weak convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions, in particular, for every fixed $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\beta_{V_\kappa^{\otimes d}}(\bar{\Pi}_\kappa^{\bar{D}_T}, \mathcal{N}_{b_0, \kappa}) \rightarrow^{P_{b_0}} 0, \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty. \quad (25)$$

Combining the above bounds, given $\epsilon' > 0$ we can choose $\kappa = \kappa(\epsilon')$ large enough so that by virtue of the bounds following (23) and (24), the terms B, C in (22) are each less than $\epsilon'/3$ (for B on an event of P_{b_0} -probability as close to one as desired). Then applying (25) for this choice of κ we can also make the term A less than $\epsilon'/3$ for T large enough, and with probability as close to one as desired, completing the proof of Theorem 3 with $\bar{\Pi}_T$ replacing $\tilde{\Pi}_T$, that is, with centring equal to \hat{G}_J .

That \hat{G}_J can be replaced by the posterior mean in Theorem 3 is the last step: since the laws $\bar{\Pi}_T$ form a sequence of (conditionally on X^T) Gaussian distributions on $(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*$ that converges weakly in probability, we also have convergence of moments of that sequence in probability (using Exercise 2.1.4 in [25] and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2.7 in [31]) in $(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*$, and since \mathcal{N}_{b_0} has Bochner-mean zero we deduce that

$$\sqrt{T}(E^{\Pi_T}[b|X^T] - \hat{G}_J) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1) \text{ in } (B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*. \quad (26)$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 3. Theorem 4 now follows from (26) and asymptotic normality of the $\sqrt{T}(\hat{G}_J(\eta) - \langle b_0, \eta \rangle)$ variables in the space $(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*$, proved as follows: if we denote by ν_T the law of the latter variables, then arguing just as in (22) we have

$$\beta_{(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*}(\nu_T, \mathcal{N}_{b_0}) \leq \beta_{V_\kappa^{\otimes d}}(\nu_{T,\kappa}, \mathcal{N}_{b_0,\kappa}) + \sum_{i=1}^2 E\|\tilde{Z}_i - P_{(\kappa)}(\tilde{Z}_i)\|_{(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*} \quad (27)$$

where $\tilde{Z}_2 =^{\mathcal{L}} Z_2$ from above and \tilde{Z}_1 has law ν_T . The first term on the right hand side converges to zero, for every fixed κ , by applying the martingale central limit theorem as in (28) to $(1/\sqrt{T}) \int_0^T (\Phi_{\lambda,r,j}/\mu_0)(X_t).dW_t$, $\lambda \leq \kappa$ fixed, and using (49) to show that the term

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T [P_{V_J^{\otimes d}}[\Phi_{\lambda,r,j}/\mu_0] - \Phi_{\lambda,r,j}/\mu_0](X_t).dW_t = o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$$

in view of $\|P_{V_J^{\otimes d}}[\Phi_{\lambda,r,j}/\mu_0] - \Phi_{\lambda,r,j}/\mu_0\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$ as $J \rightarrow \infty$ for fixed $\lambda \leq \kappa$. The third term in (27) was bounded as $o(1)$ for $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ in (24), and the second term also converges to zero as $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ by the arguments below (23). Thus choosing κ large enough but fixed, and letting $T \rightarrow \infty$, Theorem 4 follows since $\beta_{(B_{1\infty}^\rho)^*}$ metrises weak convergence.

3.4 Asymptotic expansion of the posterior Laplace transform

We start with the following basic ‘LAN expansion’ for ℓ_T as in (7).

Lemma 1. *Suppose $b_0 \in C^{(d/2+\kappa) \vee 1}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $h \in H^{d/2+\kappa}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for some $\kappa > 0$. Then*

$$\ell_T(b_0 + h/\sqrt{T}) - \ell_T(b_0) = W_T(h) - \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \|h(X_t)\|^2 dt,$$

where, as $T \rightarrow \infty$, and under P_{b_0} ,

$$W_T(h) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T h(X_t).dW_t \rightarrow^d N(0, \|h\|_{\mu_0}^2), \quad \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \|h(X_t)\|^2 dt \rightarrow^P \frac{1}{2} \|h\|_{\mu_0}^2.$$

Proof. Using (1) with $b = b_0$ and (7),

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_T(b_0 + h/\sqrt{T}) - \ell_T(b_0) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T h(X_t).dX_t - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T b_0(X_t).h(X_t)dt - \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \|h(X_t)\|^2 dt \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T h(X_t).dW_t - \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \|h(X_t)\|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $x \mapsto \|x\|^2$ is a smooth map, the function $f_h(x) = \|h(x)\|^2 - \|h\|_{\mu_0}^2 \in L_{\mu_0}^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap H^{d/2+\kappa}(\mathbb{T}^d) \subset C(\mathbb{T}^d)$. In particular, $LL^{-1}[f_h] = f_h$ where $L^{-1} = L_{b_0}^{-1}$ is the inverse of

the generator L constructed in Lemma 11 below. Moreover, by that Lemma and the Sobolev embedding theorem, $L^{-1}[f_h] \in H^{d/2+\kappa+2} \subset C^2$. By Itô's formula (Theorem 39.3 in [6]),

$$\int_0^T f_h(X_t)dt = \int_0^T LL^{-1}[f_h](X_t)dt = (L^{-1}[f_h](X_T) - L^{-1}[f_h](X_0)) - \int_0^T \nabla L^{-1}[f_h](X_t).dW_t.$$

Since $L^{-1}[f_h] \in C^2$, the first term on the right-hand side is $O(1)$, while the second term satisfies

$$E_{b_0} \left(\int_0^T \nabla L^{-1}[f_h](X_t).dW_t \right)^2 = E_{b_0} \int_0^T \|\nabla L^{-1}[f_h](X_t)\|^2 dt \lesssim T \|L^{-1}[f_h]\|_{C^1}^2,$$

so that $T^{-1} \int_0^T f_h(X_t)dt \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2(P_{b_0})$. Set $M_T^h = \int_0^T h(X_t).dW_t$, so that $(M_T^h)_{T \geq 0}$ is a continuous local L^2 -martingale with quadratic variation $[M^h]_T = \int_0^T \|h(X_t)\|^2 dt$. Consequently, $T^{-1}[M^h]_T - \|h\|_{\mu_0}^2 = T^{-1} \int_0^T f_h(X_t)dt \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2(P_{b_0})$ and hence also in P_{b_0} -probability as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Applying the martingale central limit theorem (p.338f. in [20]),

$$T^{-1/2} M_T^h \rightarrow^d N(0, \|h\|_{\mu_0}^2). \quad (28)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$, completing the proof. \square

A key result is the following expansion of the Laplace transform of the posterior distribution arising from a 'localised' prior $\Pi^{\mathcal{D}_T}$ for two relevant choices of \mathcal{D}_T . These sets, D_T and \bar{D}_T , depend on a further choice $\Gamma_T \subset V_J^{\otimes d}$ of vector fields admitting envelopes

$$|\Gamma_T|_2 \geq \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} \|\gamma\|_{L^2}, \quad \sigma_{\Gamma_T} \geq \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} \|\gamma\|_{\mathbb{H}}, \quad (29)$$

where the $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ -norm arises from the RKHS inner product (11) with the choice $\sigma_l = 2^{-l(\alpha+d/2)}$. For any $M > 0$ and $\varepsilon_T = T^{-\frac{\alpha \wedge s}{2\alpha+d}}(\log T)$ as in Theorem 1, define

$$D_T = \{b \in V_J^{\otimes d} : \|b - b_0\|_{L^2} \leq M_T \varepsilon_T\} \cap \left\{ b \in V_J^{\otimes d} : \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle b, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| \leq M \sqrt{T} \varepsilon_T \sigma_{\Gamma_T} \right\}, \quad (30)$$

where $M_T \rightarrow \infty$ arbitrarily slowly, and for $\bar{M}_T = (\log T)^{\delta-1}$, $\delta > 5/2$, define

$$\bar{D}_T = \{b \in V_J^{\otimes d} : \|b - b_0\|_{\infty} \leq \bar{M}_T \varepsilon_T\} \cap \left\{ b \in V_J^{\otimes d} : \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle b, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| \leq M \sqrt{T} \varepsilon_T \sigma_{\Gamma_T} \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Proposition 2. *Suppose $b_0 \in C^s \cap H^s$, $s > \max(d/2, 1)$, and consider the Gaussian prior (10) with $2^J \approx T^{\frac{1}{2a+d}}$ and $\sigma_l = 2^{-l(\alpha+d/2)}$ for $a > \max(d-1, 1/2)$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq a$. Let $\Gamma_T \subset V_J^{\otimes d}$ be a set of functions admitting envelopes from (29) and let $D_T \subset V_J^{\otimes d}$ denote the set (30) for this choice of Γ_T and arbitrary $M > 0$. For $u \in \mathbb{R}$, $b \in V_J^{\otimes d}$ and fixed $\gamma \in \Gamma_T$, define the perturbations*

$$b_u = b_u(T, \gamma) = b - \frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \gamma \in V_J^{\otimes d}. \quad (32)$$

(i) *If for some $\kappa > 0$ (or $\kappa = 0$ if $d = 1$),*

$$R_T := 2^{J[d+(d/2+\kappa-1)+]} M_T \varepsilon_T |\Gamma_T|_2 \left(1 + \sqrt{\log(1/(M_T \varepsilon_T))} + \sqrt{\log(1/|\Gamma_T|_2)} \right) \rightarrow 0$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$, then for any measurable function $G : L^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$E^{\Pi^{D_T}} [e^{u\sqrt{T}G(b)} | X^T] = e^{\frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \gamma(X_t) \cdot dW_t + \frac{u^2}{2T} \int_0^T \|\gamma(X_t)\|^2 dt + ur_T} \frac{\int_{D_T} e^{S_T(b) + \ell_T(b_u)} d\Pi(b)}{\int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(b)} d\Pi(b)},$$

where $r_T = O_{P_{b_0}}(R_T) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ uniformly over $\gamma \in \Gamma_T$ and

$$S_T(b) = u\sqrt{T} (G(b) - \langle b - b_0, \gamma \rangle_{\mu_0}).$$

(ii) Furthermore,

$$E_{b_0} \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|\gamma(X_t)\|^2 dt - \|\gamma\|_{\mu_0}^2 \right| \lesssim \tilde{R}_T,$$

where

$$\tilde{R}_T := T^{-1/2} 2^{J[d+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} |\Gamma_T|_2^2 \left(1 + \sqrt{\log(1/|\Gamma_T|_2)}\right)$$

for any $\kappa > 0$ ($\kappa = 0$ if $d = 1$). In particular, if both $R_T, \tilde{R}_T \rightarrow 0$, then

$$E^{\Pi^{D_T}} [e^{u\sqrt{T}G(b)} | X^T] = e^{\frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \gamma(X_t) \cdot dW_t + \frac{u^2}{2} \|\gamma\|_{\mu_0}^2 + ur_T + u^2 \tilde{r}_T} \frac{\int_{D_T} e^{S_T(b) + \ell_T(b_u)} d\Pi(b)}{\int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(b)} d\Pi(b)},$$

where $r_T = O_{P_{b_0}}(R_T) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ and $\tilde{r}_T = O_{P_{b_0}}(\tilde{R}_T) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ uniformly over $\gamma \in \Gamma_T$.

(iii) Parts (i) and (ii) remain true if D_T is replaced by \bar{D}_T from (31) and if M_T is replaced by \bar{M}_T in the definition of R_T .

Proof. (i) For $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d) \in \Gamma_T$,

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\Pi^{D_T}} [e^{u\sqrt{T}G(b)} | X^T] &= E^{\Pi^{D_T}} [e^{S_T(b) + u\sqrt{T}\langle b - b_0, \gamma \rangle_{\mu_0}} | X^T] \\ &= Z_T^{-1} \int_{D_T} e^{S_T(b) + u\sqrt{T}\langle b - b_0, \gamma \rangle_{\mu_0} + \ell_T(b_u) + \ell_T(b) - \ell_T(b_u)} d\Pi(b), \end{aligned}$$

with $Z_T = \int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(b)} d\Pi(b)$. Define the empirical process $\mathbb{G}_T[h] = \sqrt{T}(\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T h(X_t) dt - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h d\mu_0)$ for any $h \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Using the LAN expansion from Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_T(b) - \ell_T(b_u) &= \frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \gamma(X_t) \cdot dW_t - \frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T [b(X_t) - b_0(X_t)] \cdot \gamma(X_t) dt + \frac{u^2}{2T} \int_0^T \|\gamma(X_t)\|^2 dt \\ &= \frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \gamma(X_t) \cdot dW_t - u\mathbb{G}_T[(b - b_0) \cdot \gamma] - u\sqrt{T}\langle b - b_0, \gamma \rangle_{\mu_0} + \frac{u^2}{2T} \int_0^T \|\gamma(X_t)\|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

The Laplace transform from the first equation therefore equals

$$e^{\frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \gamma(X_t) \cdot dW_t + \frac{u^2}{2T} \int_0^T \|\gamma(X_t)\|^2 dt} Z_T^{-1} \int_{D_T} e^{-u\mathbb{G}_T[(b - b_0) \cdot \gamma]} e^{S_T(b) + \ell_T(b_u)} d\Pi(b).$$

We use Lemma 7 to control the empirical process term uniformly over $b \in D_T, \gamma \in \Gamma_T$. Set

$$\mathcal{F}_T = \left\{ f_{b, \gamma} := (b - b_0) \cdot \gamma - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (b - b_0) \cdot \gamma d\mu_0 : b \in D_T, \gamma \in \Gamma_T \right\},$$

which is a subset of $L^2_{\mu_0}(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap H^{d/2+\kappa}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $0 < \kappa < s - d/2$ since $\Gamma_T \subset V_J^{\otimes d} \subset H^p$ for any $p \leq S$. Suppose $d \geq 2$. Lemma 9 with $p = d/2 + \kappa - 1$ gives that for any $0 < \kappa < s - d/2 + 1$, $b, \bar{b} \in D_T$ and $\gamma, \bar{\gamma} \in \Gamma_T$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_L(f_{b,\gamma}, f_{\bar{b},\bar{\gamma}}) &\lesssim \|f_{b,\gamma} - f_{\bar{b},\bar{\gamma}}\|_{H^{d/2+\kappa-1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \|(b_j - \bar{b}_j)\gamma_j + (\bar{b}_j - b_{0,j})(\gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j) - \langle b_j - \bar{b}_j, \gamma_j \rangle_{\mu_0} - \langle \bar{b}_j - b_{0,j}, \gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j \rangle_{\mu_0}\|_{H^{d/2+\kappa-1}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d 2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} \|b_j - \bar{b}_j\|_{L^2} \|\gamma_j\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^d \|(\bar{b}_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j})(\gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j) - \langle \bar{b}_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}, \gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j \rangle_{\mu_0}\|_{H^{d/2+\kappa-1}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^d \|(P_{V_J} b_{0,j} - b_{0,j})(\gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j) - \langle P_{V_J} b_{0,j} - b_{0,j}, \gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j \rangle_{\mu_0}\|_{H^{d/2+\kappa-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The first sum above is bounded by $C2^{J(d+\kappa-1)}|\Gamma_T|_2 \|b - \bar{b}\|_{L^2}$, while by Lemma 9 the second sum is bounded by $C \sum_{j=1}^d 2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} M_T \varepsilon_T \|\gamma - \bar{\gamma}\|_{L^2}$. Using Lemma 8, that $b_0 \in C^s \cap H^s$ for $s > d/2$ and (50)-(51), the third sum is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^d \|P_{V_J} b_{0,j} - b_{0,j}\|_{L^\infty} \|\gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j\|_{H^{d/2+\kappa-1}} + \|P_{V_J} b_{0,j} - b_{0,j}\|_{H^{d/2+\kappa-1}} \|\gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \left(2^{-Js} 2^{J(d/2+\kappa-1)} \|\gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j\|_{L^2} + 2^{J(d+\kappa-1-s)} \|\gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j\|_{L^2} \right) \\ &\lesssim 2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} M_T \varepsilon_T \|\gamma - \bar{\gamma}\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

using again that $\Gamma_T \subset V_J^{\otimes d}$. Summarizing,

$$d_L(f_{b,\gamma}, f_{\bar{b},\bar{\gamma}}) \lesssim 2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} (|\Gamma_T|_2 \|b - \bar{b}\|_{L^2} + M_T \varepsilon_T \|\gamma - \bar{\gamma}\|_{L^2}).$$

In particular, \mathcal{F}_T has d_L -diameter $D_{\mathcal{F}_T} \lesssim 2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} M_T \varepsilon_T |\Gamma_T|_2 = o(R_T) = o(1)$. Since $D_T, \Gamma_T \subset (V_J^{\otimes d}, L^2)$ have finite dimension $dv_J = O(d2^{Jd})$, applying Proposition 4.3.34 of [25] yields

$$\begin{aligned} N(\mathcal{F}_T, d_L, \tau) &\leq N(D_T, c2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} |\Gamma_T|_2 \cdot \| \cdot \|_{L^2}, \tau/2) N(\Gamma_T, c2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} M_T \varepsilon_T \| \cdot \|_{L^2}, \tau/2) \\ &\leq (C2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} |\Gamma_T|_2 / \tau)^{dv_J} (C2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} M_T \varepsilon_T / \tau)^{dv_J} \end{aligned}$$

for some $c, C > 0$. Recall the inequality

$$\int_0^a \sqrt{\log(A/x)} dx \leq \frac{2 \log A}{2 \log A - 1} a \sqrt{\log(A/a)} \leq 4a \sqrt{\log(A/a)}$$

for any $A \geq 2$ and $0 < a \leq 1$ (p. 190 of [25]). Using the last two displays and that $D_{\mathcal{F}_T} \rightarrow 0$, $\int_0^{D_{\mathcal{F}_T}} \sqrt{\log 2N(\mathcal{F}_T, d_L, \tau)} d\tau$ is bounded by a multiple of

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{dv_J} \int_0^{D_{\mathcal{F}_T}} \sqrt{\log([C2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} |\Gamma_T|_2] \vee 2/\tau)} d\tau + \sqrt{dv_J} \int_0^{D_{\mathcal{F}_T}} \sqrt{\log([C2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} M_T \varepsilon_T] \vee 2/\tau)} d\tau \\ &\lesssim 2^{Jd/2} D_{\mathcal{F}_T} \left(\sqrt{\log([C2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} |\Gamma_T|_2] \vee 2/D_{\mathcal{F}_T})} + \sqrt{\log([C2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} M_T \varepsilon_T] \vee 2/D_{\mathcal{F}_T})} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking $D_{\mathcal{F}_T} \approx 2^{J(d+\kappa-1)} M_T \varepsilon_T |\Gamma_T|_2$ for $\kappa > 0$ arbitrarily small, one can therefore bound the quantity in Lemma 7 via

$$J(\mathcal{F}_T, d_L, D_{\mathcal{F}_T}) \lesssim 2^{J(3d/2+\kappa-1)} M_T \varepsilon_T |\Gamma_T|_2 (1 + \sqrt{\log(1/(M_T \varepsilon_T))} + \sqrt{\log(1/|\Gamma_T|_2)}) = R_T.$$

Using the Sobolev embedding theorem, Lemma 11, Lemma 9 and similar computations to the above,

$$\sup_{f_{b,\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}_T} \|L^{-1}[f_{b,\gamma}]\|_\infty \lesssim \sup_{f_{b,\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}_T} \|f_{b,\gamma}\|_{H^{(d/2+\kappa-2)_+}} \lesssim 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-2)_+]} M_T \varepsilon_T |\Gamma_T|_2 = o(R_T).$$

Substituting these bounds into Lemma 7 yields $E_{b_0} \sup_{b \in D_T, \gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\mathbb{G}_T[(b - b_0) \cdot \gamma]| \lesssim R_T \rightarrow 0$, proving the first statement. The case $d = 1$ is proved similarly, using instead the simpler bound $d_L(f_{b,\gamma}, f_{\bar{b},\bar{\gamma}}) \lesssim 2^{J/2} |\Gamma_T|_2 \|b - \bar{b}\|_{L^2} + 2^{J/2} M_T \varepsilon_T \|\gamma - \bar{\gamma}\|_{L^2}$.

(ii) Since $x \mapsto \|x\|^2$ is a smooth map, the function $g_\gamma(x) = \|\gamma(x)\|^2 - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \|\gamma(y)\|^2 d\mu_0(y) \in L^2_{\mu_0}(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap H^{d/2+\kappa}$ for $\kappa > 0$. Since $\gamma \in V_J^{\otimes d}$, Lemma 9 with $p = (d/2 + \kappa - 1)_+$ gives that for any $\kappa > 0$ small enough and $\gamma, \bar{\gamma} \in \Gamma_T$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_L(g_\gamma, g_{\bar{\gamma}}) &\lesssim \|g_\gamma - g_{\bar{\gamma}}\|_{H^{(d/2+\kappa-1)_+}} \lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d \|\gamma_j^2 - \bar{\gamma}_j^2 - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\gamma_j^2 - \bar{\gamma}_j^2) d\mu_0\|_{H^{(d/2+\kappa-1)_+}} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{j=1}^d 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} \|\gamma_j - \bar{\gamma}_j\|_{L^2} \|\gamma_j + \bar{\gamma}_j\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} |\Gamma_T|_2 \|\gamma - \bar{\gamma}\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\mathcal{G}_T = \{g_\gamma : \gamma \in \Gamma_T\} \cup \{0\}$ has d_L -diameter $D_{\mathcal{G}_T} \lesssim 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} |\Gamma_T|_2^2$. Using the same arguments as above, one deduces

$$N(\mathcal{G}_T, d_L, \tau) \leq N(\Gamma_T, 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} |\Gamma_T|_2 \|\cdot\|_2, \tau) \leq (C 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} |\Gamma_T|_2 / \tau)^{dv_J}.$$

and hence

$$J(\mathcal{G}_T, d_L, D_{\mathcal{G}_T}) \lesssim 2^{J[d+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} |\Gamma_T|_2^2 \left(1 + \sqrt{\log(1/|\Gamma_T|_2)}\right) = \sqrt{T} \tilde{R}_T.$$

In exactly the same way, $\sup_{g_\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_T} \|L^{-1}[g_\gamma]\|_\infty \lesssim 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-2)_+]} \|\gamma\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-2)_+]} |\Gamma_T|_2^2$. Applying Lemma 7 thus gives

$$\begin{aligned} E_{b_0} \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|\gamma(X_t)\|^2 dt - \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \|\gamma(x)\|^2 d\mu_0(x) \right| \\ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} E_{b_0} \sup_{g_\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_T} |\mathbb{G}_T(g_\gamma)| \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} 2^{J[d+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} |\Gamma_T|_2^2 \left(1 + \sqrt{\log(1/|\Gamma_T|_2)}\right) = \tilde{R}_T. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the proof of Part (iii) follows in the same way, using that the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -norm dominates the L^2 -norm, and replacing M_T by \bar{M}_T . \square

3.5 Change of measure

In this section, let $\Pi = \Pi_T$ be the prior from (10). Using the lower bound for the small-ball probability (19) in the proof of Theorem 1, the proof of the following lemma is similar to the one of Theorem 8.20 in [21], and hence omitted.

Lemma 2. Suppose $b_0 \in C^s$ for $s > 0$. Then there exists a finite constant $C = C(b_0) > 0$ such that if B_T are measurable sets satisfying $\Pi_T(B_T) = o(e^{-CT\varepsilon_T^2})$ for $\varepsilon_T = T^{-\frac{a\wedge s}{2a+d}}(\log T)$, then $E_{b_0}\Pi_T(B_T|X^T) \rightarrow 0$.

We are now ready to prove another key lemma that bounds the ratios of Gaussian integrals occurring in Proposition 2.

Lemma 3. (i) Suppose $b_0 \in C^s \cap H^s$ for some $s > \max(d/2, 1)$. Let $2^J \approx T^{\frac{1}{2a+d}}$ for $a > \max(d-1, 1/2)$ and $\varepsilon_T = T^{-\frac{a\wedge s}{2a+d}}(\log T)$. Let D_T be as in (30) for a choice of $\Gamma_T \subset V_J^{\otimes d}$ whose envelopes from (29) satisfy $|\Gamma_T|_2 = O(\sqrt{T}\varepsilon_T)$ and $\varepsilon_T\sigma_{\Gamma_T} \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Then for all $M > 0$ large enough, $\Pi(D_T|X^T) = 1 - o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$. Moreover for b_u as in (32) and all $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{\int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(b_u)} d\Pi(b)}{\int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(b)} d\Pi(b)} = 1 + \zeta_T(u) \leq C_T e^{r_T u^2}, \quad (33)$$

where $\zeta_T(u) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ for every fixed u , where both $C_T = O_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ and non-random $r_T = o(1)$ are independent of u , and all terms are uniform over $\gamma \in \Gamma_T$.

(ii) The conclusion of Part (i) remains true for $d \leq 4$ and under the conditions of Theorem 2 if D_T is replaced by the set \bar{D}_T from (31) with $\bar{M}_T = (\log T)^{\delta-1}$, $\delta > 5/2$, and if in addition $|\Gamma_T|_2 = O(1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. (i) The first set in the union of sets defining D_T has posterior probability tending to one by Theorem 1. Recall that by definition of the RKHS, $\langle b, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} \sim N(0, \|\gamma\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2)$ for $b \sim \Pi$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{H} = V_J^{\otimes d}$. By Dudley's metric entropy inequality (Section 2.3 in [25]) applied to the Gaussian process $(\langle b, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} : \gamma \in \Gamma_T)$ indexed by bounded subsets of the finite-dimensional space $V_J^{\otimes d}$ (with covering numbers bounded in Proposition 4.3.34 in [25]), we have

$$E^{\Pi} \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle b, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| \lesssim 2^{Jd/2} \sigma_{\Gamma_T} \sqrt{\log(1/\sigma_{\Gamma_T})} \leq M_0 \sqrt{T} \varepsilon_T \sigma_{\Gamma_T} \quad (34)$$

for some $M_0 > 0$, since we may always take $\sigma_{\Gamma_T} \geq 1$. By the Borell-Sudakov-Tsirelson inequality (Theorem 2.5.8 of [25]), for $M > M_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\left(\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle b, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| > M\sqrt{T}\varepsilon_T\sigma_{\Gamma_T}\right) &\leq \Pi\left(\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle b, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| > E^{\Pi} \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle b, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| + (M - M_0)\sqrt{T}\varepsilon_T\sigma_{\Gamma_T}\right) \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}(M-M_0)^2 T \varepsilon_T^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $M > 0$ large enough, the posterior probability of the set in the last display is then $o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ by Lemma 2. This establishes that $\Pi(D_T^c|X^T) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$.

We now establish (33). Letting Π_u denote the law of b_u under the prior and applying the Cameron-Martin theorem (Theorem 2.6.13 of [25]), the desired ratio equals

$$\frac{\int_{D_{T,u}} e^{\ell_T(g)} \frac{d\Pi_u(g)}{d\Pi(g)} d\Pi(g)}{\int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(g)} d\Pi(g)} = \frac{\int_{D_{T,u}} e^{\ell_T(g)} e^{-\frac{u}{\sqrt{T}}\langle \gamma, g \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} - \frac{u^2}{2T}\|\gamma\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2} d\Pi(g)}{\int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(g)} d\Pi(g)}, \quad (35)$$

where $D_{T,u} = \{g = b_u : b \in D_T\}$. By the definition of D_T ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{g \in D_{T,u}, \gamma \in \Gamma_T} \left| \frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \langle \gamma, g \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} + \frac{u^2}{2T} \|\gamma\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \right| &\leq \frac{|u|}{\sqrt{T}} \sup_{b \in D_T, \gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle \gamma, b - uT^{-1/2}\gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{\Gamma_T}^2}{2T} \\ &\leq |u| M \varepsilon_T \sigma_{\Gamma_T} + \frac{3u^2 \sigma_{\Gamma_T}^2}{2T}. \end{aligned}$$

We thus upper bound (35) by

$$e^{\tilde{r}_T u^2 + \tilde{r}'_T |u|} \frac{\int_{D_{T,u}} e^{\ell_T(g)} d\Pi(g)}{\int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(g)} d\Pi(g)} = e^{\tilde{r}_T u^2 + \tilde{r}'_T |u|} \frac{\Pi(D_{T,u}|X^T)}{\Pi(D_T|X^T)}, \quad (36)$$

where $\tilde{r}_T, \tilde{r}'_T \rightarrow 0$ are non-random and uniform over $\gamma \in \Gamma_T$. Since $\alpha|u| \leq \alpha^2 u^2 + 1$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$, the exponential in the last display is bounded by $e^{r_T u^2 + 1}$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$, where $r_T = \tilde{r}_T + (\tilde{r}'_T)^2 = 3\sigma_{\Gamma_T}^2/(2T) + M^2 \varepsilon_T^2 \sigma_{\Gamma_T}^2 \rightarrow 0$. Since we have already shown that $\Pi(D_T|X^T) = 1 - o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ and the posterior probability $\Pi(D_{T,u}|X^T)$ is bounded by one, the inequality in (33) follows.

Turning to the exact asymptotics for fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}$, (36) equals $\Pi(D_{T,u}|X^T)(1 + o_{P_{b_0}}(1))$, and (35) can be lower bounded by (36) with $e^{\tilde{r}_T u^2 + \tilde{r}'_T |u|}$ replaced by $e^{-\tilde{r}_T u^2 - \tilde{r}'_T |u|}$. As a consequence it suffices to prove $\Pi(D_{T,u}|X^T) = 1 - o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(D_{T,u}^c|X^T) &\leq \Pi(g \in V_J^{\otimes d} : \|g + \frac{u}{\sqrt{T}}\gamma - b_0\|_{\mu_0} > M_T \varepsilon_T |X^T) \\ &\quad + \Pi\left(g \in V_J^{\otimes d} : \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle g + \frac{u}{\sqrt{T}}\gamma, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| > M\sqrt{T}\varepsilon_T \sigma_{\Gamma_T} |X^T\right). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 1, $\|\frac{u}{\sqrt{T}}\gamma\|_{\mu_0} \lesssim \frac{|u|}{\sqrt{T}}|\Gamma_T|_2 = O(\varepsilon_T) = o(M_T \varepsilon_T)$, so that the first posterior probability tends to zero by Theorem 1. Using (34), that $\sigma_{\Gamma_T}^2/\sqrt{T} = o(\sqrt{T}\varepsilon_T \sigma_{\Gamma_T})$ and the Borell-Sudakov-Tsirelson inequality (Theorem 2.5.8 of [25]), the prior probability of the second event is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\left(g : \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle g, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| + \frac{|u|\sigma_{\Gamma_T}^2}{\sqrt{T}} > E^\Pi \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma_T} |\langle b, \gamma \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}| + (M - M_0)\sqrt{T}\varepsilon_T \sigma_{\Gamma_T}\right) \\ \leq e^{-\frac{1}{4}(M - M_0)^2 T \varepsilon_T^2} \end{aligned}$$

for T large enough depending on u . For $M > 0$ large enough, Lemma 2 then yields that the posterior probability of this last set is $o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$, which shows $\Pi(D_{T,u}|X^T) = 1 - o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ as desired.

Part (ii) is proved in the same way using Theorem 2 (whose proof only relies on Part (i) of the present lemma) to ensure that $\Pi(\bar{D}_T|X^T) \xrightarrow{P_{b_0}} 1$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, and upon noting that $\|\frac{u}{\sqrt{T}}\gamma\|_\infty \lesssim \frac{2^{Jd/2}|u|}{\sqrt{T}}|\Gamma_T|_2 = O(\varepsilon_T) = o(\bar{M}_T \varepsilon_T)$ since $|\Gamma_T|_2 = O(1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. \square

3.6 A maximal inequality for posterior wavelet coefficients

For $\lambda \leq J$, $1 \leq j \leq d$ and $a_\lambda > 0$ to be chosen, define the vector fields $\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j} = (\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j,1}, \dots, \tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j,d}) : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j,i} = \begin{cases} a_\lambda P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0] & i = j, \\ 0 & i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

Thus $\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}$ is the vector field which projects $a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0$ onto V_J in the j -th coordinate and is uniformly zero on all other coordinates. Denote the collection of all such functions by

$$\Gamma_T = \{\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j} : \lambda \leq J, k, 1 \leq j \leq d\} \subset V_J^{\otimes d}. \quad (37)$$

Lemma 4. *Suppose $b_0 \in C^s$ for some $s > d/2$. Then for Γ_T as in (37) and the RKHS norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{H}}$ defined in (11) with $\sigma_l = 2^{-l(\alpha+d/2)}$ for $\alpha \geq 0$, we can take the envelopes from (29) as*

$$|\Gamma_T|_2 = C(d, \mu_0) \max_{\lambda \leq J} a_\lambda, \quad \sigma_{\Gamma_T} = C(d, \mu_0, \Phi) 2^{J(\alpha+d/2)} \max_{\lambda \leq J} a_\lambda.$$

Proof. Using Proposition 1,

$$\|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}\|_{L^2}^2 = \|P_{V_J}[a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0]\|_{L^2}^2 \leq a_\lambda^2 \|1/\mu_0\|_\infty^2 \|\Phi_{\lambda,k}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim a_\lambda^2.$$

To prove the second bound, note that Proposition 1 implies that $1/\mu_0$ has finite Lipschitz norm $\|1/\mu_0\|_{\text{Lip}}$ on \mathbb{T}^d . Let $x_{l,r} \in \text{supp}(\Phi_{l,r})$ and note that $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\Phi_{l,r})) = O(2^{-l})$ by construction of the wavelets. Using the orthogonality of the wavelets and Hölder's inequality, for $(l,r) \neq (\lambda,k)$ with $\lambda \leq J$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0], \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2}| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Phi_{\lambda,k}(x) \Phi_{l,r}(x) \left(\frac{1}{\mu_0(x)} - \frac{1}{\mu_0(x_{l,r})} \right) dx \right| \\ &\lesssim \|1/\mu_0\|_{\text{Lip}} 2^{-\max(l,\lambda)} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\Phi_{\lambda,k}(x)| |\Phi_{l,r}(x)| dx \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\max(l,\lambda)} 2^{-|l-\lambda|d/2}, \end{aligned}$$

while $|\langle P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0], \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}| \leq \|1/\mu_0\|_\infty \|\Phi_{\lambda,k}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim 1$. Note that for $l \leq \lambda$, there are a constant number of wavelets $\Phi_{l,r}$ intersecting $\text{supp}(P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0])$, while for $l \geq \lambda$, there are $O(2^{(l-\lambda)d})$ such wavelets. Splitting the following sum into these two cases, while separately keeping track of the term $(l,r) = (\lambda,k)$, and using the above bounds gives that for $\lambda \leq J$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 &= \sum_{l \leq J} \sum_r \sigma_l^{-2} |\langle P_{V_J}[a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0], \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2}|^2 \\ &\lesssim a_\lambda^2 \left(\sum_{l=0}^{\lambda} \sigma_l^{-2} 2^{-2\lambda-(\lambda-l)d} + \sum_{l=\lambda+1}^J \sigma_l^{-2} 2^{(l-\lambda)d} 2^{-2l-(l-\lambda)d} + \sigma_\lambda^{-2} \right) \\ &\lesssim a_\lambda^2 \left(2^{-(d+2)\lambda} \sum_{l=0}^{\lambda} 2^{2l(\alpha+d)} + \sum_{l=\lambda+1}^J 2^{(2\alpha+d-2)l} + 2^{(2\alpha+d)\lambda} \right) \\ &\lesssim a_\lambda^2 2^{(2\alpha+d)J}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields $\sigma_{\Gamma_T}^2 \lesssim a_\lambda^2 2^{(2\alpha+d)J}$. □

Lemma 5. *(i) Assume the conditions of Theorem 2 and let D_T be the set from (30) with Γ_T as in (37), envelope σ_{Γ_T} as in Lemma 4 and with the choice of constants*

$$a_\lambda = \begin{cases} 2^{\lambda d/2} 2^{-Jd/2} (\log T)^{-\eta} & \text{if } d \leq 4, \\ 2^{\lambda d/2} 2^{-J(d-2)} (\log T)^{-\eta} & \text{if } d \geq 5, \end{cases}$$

with $\eta > 1$. Then $\Pi(D_T | X^T) = 1 - o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. If $b \sim \Pi^{D_T}(\cdot | X^T)$ and $\Phi_{\lambda,k,\cdot} = (\Phi_{\lambda,k}, \dots, \Phi_{\lambda,k}) : \mathbb{T}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, then for all $\lambda \leq J$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$E^{\Pi^{D_T}} \left[\max_{k,j} \sqrt{T} |\langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}| | X^T \right] = O_{P_{b_0}}(\sqrt{\lambda}), \quad (38)$$

$$E^{\Pi^{D_T}} \left[\max_{\lambda \leq J, k, j} \sqrt{T} |\langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2} | |X^T| \right] = O_{P_{b_0}}(\sqrt{J}). \quad (39)$$

(ii) Assume the conditions of Theorem 3 and let \bar{D}_T be the set from (31) with Γ_T as in (37) with $a_\lambda = 1$ for all λ and envelope σ_{Γ_T} as in Lemma 4. Then $\Pi(\bar{D}_T | X^T) = 1 - o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ and if $b \sim \Pi^{\bar{D}_T}(\cdot | X^T)$, then for all $\lambda \leq J$,

$$E^{\Pi^{\bar{D}_T}} \left[\max_{k,j} \sqrt{T} |\langle b_j - b_{0,j}, \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2} | |X^T| \right] = O_{P_{b_0}}(\sqrt{\lambda}).$$

Proof. The first assertion in (i) follows from Lemmas 3 and 4 since the envelopes satisfy $|\Gamma_T|_2 = O(a_J) = O((\log T)^{-\eta})$, $\sqrt{T}\varepsilon_T \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon_T \sigma_{\Gamma_T} = o(1)$ for $0 \leq \alpha < a \wedge s - d/2$ and the specified choice $2^J \approx T^{1/(2a+d)}$. To prove the first two maximal inequalities, we start by verifying the conditions of Proposition 2 for the case $d \leq 4$. Using the envelopes from Lemma 4, we can bound R_T and \tilde{R}_T in Proposition 2 by

$$R_T \lesssim M_T T^{\frac{d-a\wedge s+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+}{2a+d}} (\log T)^{3/2-\eta} \rightarrow 0$$

for $a \wedge s > \max(3d/2 - 1, 1)$, $0 < \kappa < a \wedge s - 3d/2 + 1$ ($\kappa = 0$ if $d = 1$) and $M_T \rightarrow \infty$ slowly enough, while

$$\tilde{R}_T \lesssim T^{-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{d+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+}{2a+d}} (\log T)^{-2\eta} \sqrt{\log \log T} \rightarrow 0 \quad (40)$$

for $s > \max(d-1, 1/2)$ and $0 < \kappa < s - d + 1$ ($\kappa = 0$ if $d = 1$). We may thus apply Proposition 2 to $G(b) = \langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}$ with $\gamma = \tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j} \in V_J^{\otimes d}$, so that for $b_u = b - \frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$E^{\Pi^{D_T}} \left[e^{u\sqrt{T} \langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}} | X^T \right] = e^{\frac{u}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}(X_t) \cdot dW_t + \frac{u^2}{2} \|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}\|_{\mu_0}^2 + ur_T + u^2 \tilde{r}_T} \frac{\int_{D_T} e^{S_T(b) + \ell_T(b_u)} d\Pi(b)}{\int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(b)} d\Pi(b)},$$

where $r_T = O_{P_{b_0}}(R_T)$, $\tilde{r}_T = O_{P_{b_0}}(\tilde{R}_T)$ uniformly over $\lambda \leq J$ and k, j , and

$$\begin{aligned} S_T(b) &= u\sqrt{T} \langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2} - u\sqrt{T} \langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0] \rangle_{\mu_0} \\ &= u\sqrt{T} a_\lambda \langle \mu_0(b_j - b_{0,j}), \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0 - P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0] \rangle_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the first bound from Lemma 6 with $d \leq 4$, $\eta > 1$,

$$\sup_{b \in D_T} |S_T(b)| \leq C|u|\sqrt{T}(\log T)^{-\eta}(2^{-2J} M_T \varepsilon_T + 2^{-J(s+1+d/2)}) = o(|u|), \quad (41)$$

for $M_T \rightarrow \infty$ slowly enough and $s \geq a - 1$. Applying $\alpha|u| \leq \alpha^2 u^2 + 1$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$ to (41), and using Lemmas 3 and 4 gives for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\frac{\int_{D_T} e^{S_T(b) + \ell_T(b_u)} d\Pi(b)}{\int_{D_T} e^{\ell_T(b)} d\Pi(b)} \leq C_T e^{c_T u^2},$$

where $C_T = O_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ and non-random $c_T = o(1)$ are independent of u and uniform over $\lambda \leq J$ and k, j .

Setting $Z_{\lambda,k,j} = \langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2} - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,\cdot}(X_t) \cdot dW_t$ and using again that $\alpha|u| \leq \alpha^2 u^2 + 1$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$, the Laplace transform satisfies the conditional subgaussian bound

$$E^{\Pi^{D_T}} \left[e^{u\sqrt{T} Z_{\lambda,k,j}} | X^T \right] \leq C'_T e^{\frac{u^2}{2} (\|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}\|_{\mu_0}^2 + c'_T)}$$

for sequences $C'_T = O_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ and $c'_T = 2(\tilde{r}_T + r_T^2 + c_T) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1)$, which are independent of u and uniform over $\lambda \leq J$ and k, j . Since $\|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}\|_{\mu_0}^2 = a_\lambda^2 \|P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0]\|_{\mu_0}^2 \leq a_\lambda^2 \|\mu_0\|_\infty \|1/\mu_0\|_\infty^2 \leq C(b_0)$, by Lemmas 2.3.2 and 2.3.4 of [25], we have

$$\sqrt{T} E^{\Pi^{D_T}} \left[\max_{\lambda \leq J, k, j} |Z_{\lambda,k,j}| |X^T| \right] \lesssim \sqrt{2 \log 2 \dim(V_J^{\otimes d})} (C'_T + 1) \max_{\lambda \leq J, k, j} (\|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}\|_{\mu_0}^2 + c'_T) = O_{P_{b_0}}(\sqrt{J}) \quad (42)$$

since $\dim(V_J^{\otimes d}) = O(d2^{Jd})$. Similarly, for $\lambda \leq J$,

$$\sqrt{T} E^{\Pi^{D_T}} \left[\max_{k,j} |Z_{\lambda,k,j}| |X^T| \right] \lesssim \sqrt{2 \log 2 \dim(V_\lambda^{\otimes d})} (C'_T + 1) \max_{k,j} (\|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}\|_{\mu_0}^2 + c'_T) = O_{P_{b_0}}(\sqrt{\lambda}). \quad (43)$$

We now deduce (39) from (42), the same arguments then also show that (38) follows from (43). Decompose

$$\begin{aligned} & E^{\Pi^{D_T}} \left[\max_{\lambda \leq J, k, j} \sqrt{T} |\langle b_j - b_{0,j}, a_\lambda \Phi_{\lambda,k} \rangle_{L^2}| \middle| X^T \right] \\ & \leq E^{\Pi^{D_T}} \left[\max_{\lambda \leq J, k, j} \sqrt{T} |Z_{\lambda,k,j}| \middle| X^T \right] + \max_{\lambda \leq J, k, j} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}(X_t) \cdot dW_t \right| \end{aligned}$$

and we have shown the first term is $O_{P_{b_0}}(\sqrt{J})$. We now control the P_{b_0} -expectation of the second term by showing that $M_T^{\lambda,k,j} = \int_0^T \tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}(X_t) \cdot dW_t$ are sub-Gaussian with uniform constants on a suitable event A_T . For $\epsilon > 0$ fixed, set

$$A_T = \left\{ \max_{\lambda,k,j} \left| \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}(X_t)\|^2 dt - \|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}\|_{\mu_0}^2 \right| \leq \epsilon \right\}. \quad (44)$$

Applying Markov's inequality, Proposition 2(ii) and (40), $P_{b_0}(A_T^c) \lesssim \epsilon^{-1} \tilde{R}_T \rightarrow 0$. On A_T , $T^{-1} [M^{\lambda,k,j}]_T = T^{-1} \int_0^T \|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}(X_T)\|^2 dt \leq \|\tilde{\Phi}_{\lambda,k,j}\|_{\mu_0}^2 + \epsilon \leq C_0(b_0) + \epsilon$, so that applying Bernstein's inequality (49), for any $x > 0$,

$$P_{b_0}(T^{-1/2} M_T^{\lambda,k,j} 1_{A_T} \geq x) \leq P_{b_0}(M_T^{\lambda,k,j} \geq x\sqrt{T}, [M^{\lambda,k,j}]_T \leq (C_0 + \epsilon)T) \leq e^{-\frac{x^2}{2(C_0 + \epsilon)}}.$$

Consequently, $(T^{-1/2} M^{\lambda,k,j} 1_{A_T} : \lambda, k)$ are sub-gaussian random variables with uniformly bounded constants, so that $E_{b_0} \max_{\lambda \leq J, k, j} T^{-1/2} |M_T^{\lambda,k,j}| 1_{A_T} = O(\sqrt{J})$ by Lemma 2.3.4 of [25]. When $d \geq 5$, one proceeds exactly as above with the only difference to the case $d \leq 4$ being that we use the second bound in Lemma 6 with $a \leq s + d/2 - 1$ rather than the first bound, which is needed to ensure $\sup_{b \in D_T} |S_T(b)| = o(|u|)$.

For (ii), we can invoke Lemma 3(ii) to obtain $\Pi(\bar{D}_T | X^T) \rightarrow 1$ in P_{b_0} -probability. The maximal inequality then follows from the same proof as in (i), using Proposition 2(iii), that the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ -contraction rate implies the same rate in L^2 -norm, and replacing the bias bound (41) by the third inequality of Lemma 6 so that scaling by a_λ is not necessary. The conditions $s > a - 1 + d/2, d < 4$ ensure that the terms $\sqrt{T} 2^{-J(s+1)}$ and $\sqrt{T} 2^{-2J} \|b - b_0\|_\infty$ are both $o(1)$ and hence asymptotically negligible. \square

3.7 An approximation lemma

Lemma 6. *Suppose $b_0 \in C^s$ for some $s \geq 1$ and let $\lambda \leq J$, $1 \leq j \leq d$ and $b \in V_J^{\otimes d}$. If $a_\lambda = 2^{\lambda d/2} 2^{-Jd/2} (\log T)^{-\eta}$ for some $\eta \geq 0$, then*

$$a_\lambda |\langle \mu_0(b_j - b_{0,j}), \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0 - P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0] \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C(2^{-2J} \|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_{L^2} + 2^{-J(s+d/2+1)})(\log T)^{-\eta}.$$

If instead $a_\lambda = 2^{\lambda d/2} 2^{-J(d-2)} (\log T)^{-\eta}$ for some $\eta \geq 0$, then

$$a_\lambda |\langle \mu_0(b_j - b_{0,j}), \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0 - P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0] \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C(2^{-Jd/2} \|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_{L^2} + 2^{-J(s+d-1)}) (\log T)^{-\eta}.$$

Finally,

$$|\langle \mu_0(b_j - b_{0,j}), \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0 - P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0] \rangle_{L^2}| \leq C 2^{-\lambda d/2} (2^{-2J} \|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_\infty + 2^{-J(s+1)}).$$

In all cases, the constant C depends only on b_0 , Φ and d .

Proof. By the triangle inequality, the desired quantity is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & a_\lambda |\langle \mu_0(b_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}), \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0 - P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0] \rangle_{L^2}| \\ & + a_\lambda |\langle \mu_0(b_{0,j} - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}), \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0 - P_{V_J}[\Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0] \rangle_{L^2}| =: (I) + (II). \end{aligned}$$

By Parseval's identity,

$$\begin{aligned} (I) &= a_\lambda \left| \sum_{l>J} \sum_r \langle \mu_0(b_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}), \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2} \langle \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0, \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2} \right| \\ &\leq a_\lambda \sum_{l>J} \max_r |\langle \mu_0(b_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}), \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2}| \sum_r |\langle \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0, \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2}|. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

By Proposition 1 we know that μ_0 has finite Lipschitz norm $\|\mu_0\|_{\text{Lip}}$. Let $x_{l,r} \in I_{l,r} := \text{supp}(\Phi_{l,r})$ and note that $\text{diam}(I_{l,r}) = O(2^{-l})$ by construction of the wavelets. Using that $b_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j} \in V_J$ is orthogonal to $\Phi_{l,r}$ for any $l > J$, $\|\Phi_{l,r}\|_{L^1} \lesssim 2^{-ld/2}$ and (51),

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \mu_0(b_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}), \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2}| &= \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\mu_0(x) - \mu_0(x_{l,r})) (b_j(x) - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}(x)) \Phi_{l,r}(x) dx \right| \\ &\leq \|\mu_0\|_{\text{Lip}} \text{diam}(I_{l,r}) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |b_j(x) - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}(x)| |\Phi_{l,r}(x)| dx \\ &\leq C(b_0, \Phi) 2^{-l} \|b_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}\|_\infty \|\Phi_{l,r}\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq C(b_0, \Phi) 2^{Jd/2} \|b_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}\|_{L^2} 2^{-l(d/2+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Moreover, using $\sup_x \sum_r |\Phi_{l,r}(x)| \lesssim 2^{ld/2}$, $l \geq 0$, and $\langle \Phi_{\lambda,k}, \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2} = 0$ for $\lambda \leq J < l$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_r |\langle \Phi_{\lambda,k}/\mu_0, \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2}| &= \sum_r \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\frac{1}{\mu_0(x)} - \frac{1}{\mu_0(x_{l,r})} \right) \Phi_{\lambda,k}(x) \Phi_{l,r}(x) dx \right| \\ &\leq \|1/\mu_0\|_{\text{Lip}} \text{diam}(I_{l,r}) \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} |\Phi_{\lambda,k}(x)| \sum_r |\Phi_{l,r}(x)| dx \\ &\leq C(b_0, \Phi) 2^{l(d/2-1)} 2^{-\lambda d/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Substituting the last two displays into (45) yields

$$(I) \lesssim a_\lambda 2^{Jd/2} 2^{-\lambda d/2} \|b_j - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}\|_{L^2} \sum_{l>J} 2^{-2l} \lesssim 2^{-2J} (\log T)^{-\eta} \|b_j - b_{0,j}\|_{L^2}$$

as desired. Next expanding (II) as in (45) and using (47),

$$\begin{aligned} (II) &\leq C(b_0, \Phi) a_\lambda \sum_{l>J} \max_r |\langle \mu_0(b_{0,j} - P_{V_J} b_{0,j}), \Phi_{l,r} \rangle_{L^2}| 2^{l(d/2-1)} 2^{-\lambda d/2} \\ &\lesssim a_\lambda 2^{-Js} 2^{-\lambda d/2} \sum_{l>J} 2^{-l} \lesssim 2^{-J(s+1+d/2)} (\log T)^{-\eta} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\|b_{0,j} - P_{V_j}[b_0, j]\|_\infty \lesssim 2^{-Js}$, and the last two displays imply the first inequality in the lemma. If instead $a_\lambda = 2^{\lambda d/2} 2^{-J(d-2)} (\log T)^{-\eta}$, then substituting this value into the final bounds for (I) and (II) gives the required result. The final inequality of the lemma is proved in the same way, but using (46) instead of the inequality in the line below it, so that scaling by a_λ is not required. \square

3.8 Martingale based inequalities

The following results provide uniform control of additive functionals of the diffusion process in both probability and expectation. The first result relates this to the metric entropy of the underlying function class in terms of a metric d_L arising from the diffusion, where $L_{b_0}^{-1}$ is the inverse generator constructed in Lemma 11.

Lemma 7. *Suppose $b_0 \in C^{(d/2+\kappa)\vee 1}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, $\mathcal{F}_T \subset L_{\mu_0}^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap H^{d/2+\kappa}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for some $\kappa > 0$ and $0 \in \mathcal{F}_T$. Set $\mathbb{G}_T[f] = T^{-1/2} \int_0^T f(X_s) ds$, define the pseudo-distance d_L by*

$$d_L^2(f, g) = \sum_{i=1}^d \left\| \partial_{x_i} L_{b_0}^{-1}[f - g] \right\|_\infty^2 \quad (48)$$

on \mathcal{F}_T , let $D_{\mathcal{F}_T}$ be the d_L -diameter of \mathcal{F}_T and set $J(\mathcal{F}_T, d_L, \delta) = \int_0^\delta \sqrt{\log 2N(\mathcal{F}_T, d_L, \tau)} d\tau$. Then

$$E_{b_0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} |\mathbb{G}_T(f)| \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{T}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} \|L_{b_0}^{-1}[f]\|_\infty + 4\sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{F}_T, \sqrt{60}d_L, D_{\mathcal{F}_T}),$$

and for any $x > 0$,

$$P_{b_0} \left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} |\mathbb{G}_T(f)| \geq \frac{2}{\sqrt{T}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} \|L_{b_0}^{-1}[f]\|_\infty + J(\mathcal{F}_T, \sqrt{60}d_L, D_{\mathcal{F}_T})(4\sqrt{2} + 64\sqrt{3}x) \right) \leq e^{-x^2/2}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 11 and the Sobolev embedding theorem, the Poisson equation $Lu = L_{b_0}u = f$ has a unique solution $L^{-1}[f] \in H^{d/2+\kappa+2} \cap L_0^2 \subset C^2$ satisfying $LL^{-1}[f] = f$ for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_T$. We may therefore define for $f \in \mathcal{F}_T$,

$$Z_T(f) = \int_0^T \nabla L^{-1}[f](X_s) \cdot dW_s = L^{-1}[f](X_T) - L^{-1}[f](X_0) - \int_0^T LL^{-1}[f](X_s) ds,$$

where the second equality follows from Itô's lemma (Theorem 39.3 in [6]). Since

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} \left| \int_0^T f(X_s) ds \right| - 2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} \|L^{-1}[f]\|_\infty \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} |Z_T(f)|,$$

it suffices to control $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} |Z_T(f)|$. For fixed $f \in \mathcal{F}_T$, $Z_T(f)$ is a continuous square integrable local martingale with quadratic variation

$$[Z \cdot (f)]_T = \int_0^T \|\nabla L^{-1}[f](X_s)\|^2 ds \leq T \sum_{i=1}^d \|\partial_{x_i} L^{-1}[f]\|_\infty^2 = T d_L^2(f, 0).$$

Recall Bernstein's inequality for continuous local martingales (p. 153 of [42]): if M is a continuous local martingale vanishing at 0 with quadratic variation $[M]$, then for any stopping time T and any $x, L > 0$,

$$P\left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |M_t| \geq x, [M]_T \leq L\right) \leq e^{-\frac{x^2}{2L}}. \quad (49)$$

Applying this to $Z_T(f)$ gives for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_T$ and $x > 0$,

$$P_{b_0}(|Z_T(f)| \geq \sqrt{T}x) = P_{b_0}(|Z_T(f)| \geq \sqrt{T}x, [Z_T(f)]_T \leq Td_L^2(f, 0)) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2d_L^2(f, 0)}\right).$$

Since L^{-1} is linear, so is $f \mapsto Z_T(f)$, and consequently

$$P_{b_0}(|Z_T(f) - Z_T(g)| \geq \sqrt{T}x) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2d_L^2(f, g)}\right),$$

a non-asymptotic inequality. The process $(T^{-1/2}Z_T(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}_T)$ is thus mean-zero and subgaussian with respect to d_L . Write $J = J(\mathcal{F}, \sqrt{60}d_L, D_{\mathcal{F}_T})$ for conciseness (the factor $\sqrt{60}$ comes from our choice of definition for subgaussian constants - see the discussion after Definition 2.3.5 of [25]). By Theorem 2.3.7 of [25], $E_{b_0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} T^{-1/2}|Z_T(f)| \leq 4\sqrt{2}J$, which proves the first assertion. For the second assertion, by Exercise 2.3.1 of [25], one has $\|\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} T^{-1/2}|Z_T(f)|\|_{\psi_2} \leq T^{-1/2}\|Z_T(0)\|_{\psi_2} + 16\sqrt{2}J = 16\sqrt{2}J$, where $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_2}$ denotes the usual ψ_2 -Orlicz norm (see Chapter 2 of [25]). Using Lemma 2.3.1 of [25] and that for any random variable X , $\|X - \mathbb{E}X\|_{\psi_2} \leq 2\|X\|_{\psi_2}$,

$$P_{b_0}\left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} \frac{|Z_T(f)|}{\sqrt{T}} \geq E_{b_0} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} \frac{|Z_T(f)|}{\sqrt{T}} + x\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\sqrt{6} \cdot 32\sqrt{2}J)^2}\right).$$

Using the expectation bound just derived, the above inequality yields

$$P_{b_0}\left(\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_T} T^{-1/2}|Z_T(f)| \geq 4\sqrt{2}J + 64\sqrt{3}Jx\right) \leq e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}.$$

Combining the above gives the required subgaussian inequality. \square

We now establish usable bounds for the metric d_L . The following is a special case of the Runst-Sickel lemma.

Lemma 8 ([43], p. 345). *For $t > 0$ and any bounded $f, g \in H^t(\mathbb{T}^d)$,*

$$\|fg\|_{H^t} \leq C(t, d) (\|f\|_{H^t}\|g\|_{\infty} + \|g\|_{H^t}\|f\|_{\infty}).$$

Lemma 9. *Suppose $b_0 \in C^s$ for $s > \max(d/2 - 1, 0)$. Then for any $0 < \kappa < s - d/2 + 1$ (or $\kappa = 0$ if $d = 1$) and $f, g \in L^2_{\mu_0}(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the pseudo-distance d_L in (48) satisfies*

$$d_L(f, g) \leq C(d, \kappa, b_0)\|f - g\|_{H^{(d/2+\kappa-1)_+}},$$

where $H^0 = L^2$. Let V_J denote the span of all wavelets up to resolution level J of an S -regular wavelet basis of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$. If $\gamma, \rho \in V_J$ and $0 \leq p < S$, then for $C = C(p, d, \Phi, \|\mu_0\|_{\infty})$,

$$\|\gamma\rho - \langle \gamma, \rho \rangle_{\mu_0}\|_{H^p} \leq C2^{J(p+d/2)}\|\gamma\|_{L^2}\|\rho\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. If $d \geq 2$, then for any $0 < \kappa < s - d/2 + 1$, by the Sobolev embedding theorem and Lemma 11,

$$d_L^2(f, g) = \sum_{i=1}^d \|\partial_{x_i} L^{-1}[f - g]\|_\infty^2 \leq C(d, \kappa) \|L^{-1}[f - g]\|_{H^{d/2+\kappa+1}}^2 \leq C(d, \kappa, b_0) \|f - g\|_{H^{d/2+\kappa-1}}^2.$$

If $d = 1$, one similarly has $d_L^2(f, g) \leq C \|L^{-1}[f - g]\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C \|f - g\|_{L^2}^2$. For the second statement, if $p > 0$, then the triangle inequality, Lemma 8 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality bound the quantity in question by

$$\|\gamma\rho\|_{H^p} + |\langle \gamma, \rho \rangle_{\mu_0}| \|1\|_{H^p} \leq C(p, d) (\|\gamma\|_{H^p} \|\rho\|_\infty + \|\rho\|_{H^p} \|\gamma\|_\infty) + \|\mu_0\|_\infty \|\gamma\|_{L^2} \|\rho\|_{L^2}.$$

If $p = 0$, one instead uses the simpler bound $\|\gamma\rho\|_{L^2} \leq \|\gamma\|_{L^2} \|\rho\|_\infty$. By the wavelet characterisation of the Sobolev norm,

$$\|\gamma\|_{H^p}^2 = \sum_{l \leq J} \sum_r 2^{2lp} |\langle \gamma, \Phi_{l,r} \rangle|^2 \leq 2^{2Jp} \|\gamma\|_{L^2}^2. \quad (50)$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and that for all $l \geq 0$, $\|\sum_r \Phi_{l,r}^2\|_\infty \leq C(\Phi) 2^{ld}$,

$$\|\gamma\|_\infty \leq \sup_x \sum_{l \leq J} \sum_r |\langle \gamma, \Phi_{l,r} \rangle| |\Phi_{l,r}(x)| \leq C(\Phi) 2^{Jd/2} \|\gamma\|_{L^2}. \quad (51)$$

Applying these bounds to $\gamma, \rho \in V_J$ gives the result. \square

3.9 A concentration inequality for high-dimensional design matrices

Lemma 10. *Suppose $b_0 \in C^s$ for $s > \max(d/2, 1)$ and let $J \in \mathbb{N}$. Let V_J denote the span of all wavelets up to resolution level J and set $v_J := \dim(V_J) = O(2^{Jd})$. Then for any $0 < \kappa < s - d/2 + 1$ (or $\kappa = 0$ if $d = 1$), there exist constants $c_0(b_0), C(d, b_0, \kappa, \Phi) > 0$ such that for any $x > 0$,*

$$P_{b_0} \left(\sup_{b, \bar{b} \in V_J^{\otimes d}: b \neq \bar{b}} \left| \frac{h_T^2(b, \bar{b}) - \|b - \bar{b}\|_{\mu_0}^2}{\|b - \bar{b}\|_{\mu_0}^2} \right| \geq \frac{C}{\sqrt{T}} 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)+]} (1+x) \right) \leq de^{c_0 v_J - x^2/2}. \quad (52)$$

Proof. Let $b_j, \bar{b}_j \in V_J$ and write $b = (b_1, \dots, b_d)$, $\bar{b} = (\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_d)$ with $b_j = \sum_{l \leq J, r} \theta_{l,r,j} \Phi_{l,r}$ and $\bar{b}_j = \sum_{l \leq J, r} \bar{\theta}_{l,r,j} \Phi_{l,r}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} h_T^2(b, \bar{b}) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^T \left(\sum_{l,r} (\theta_{l,r,j} - \bar{\theta}_{l,r,j}) \Phi_{l,r}(X_s) \right)^2 ds \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{l,r} \sum_{l',r'} (\theta_{l,r,j} - \bar{\theta}_{l,r,j}) (\theta_{l',r',j} - \bar{\theta}_{l',r',j}) \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \Phi_{l,r}(X_s) \Phi_{l',r'}(X_s) ds \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot})^T \hat{\Gamma} (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}_{(l,r)(l',r')} = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \Phi_{l,r}(X_s) \Phi_{l',r'}(X_s) ds$, so that $\hat{\Gamma}$ is a $v_J \times v_J$ symmetric matrix. Similarly,

$$\|b - \bar{b}\|_{\mu_0}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot})^T \Gamma (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot}),$$

where $\Gamma_{(l,r)(l',r')} = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Phi_{l,r}(x) \Phi_{l',r'}(x) d\mu_0(x)$. Let $\zeta_T = CT^{-1/2} 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)+]} (1+x)$ denote the quantity on the right-hand side of (52). Since $(\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot})^T \Gamma (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot}) = \|b_j - \bar{b}_j\|_{\mu_0}^2 \geq 0$ for all j , applying a union bound to the probability in (52) gives

$$\sum_{j=1}^d P_{b_0} \left(\sup_{\theta_{j,\cdot}, \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot} \in \mathbb{R}^{v_J}; (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot})^T \Gamma (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot}) \neq 0} \left| \frac{(\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot})^T (\hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma) (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot})}{(\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot})^T \Gamma (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot})} \right| \geq \zeta_T/d \right).$$

(Note that at least one $(\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot})^T \Gamma (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot}) \neq 0$ by assumption and the above supremum is maximized when $\theta_{j,\cdot} \neq \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot}$, so the denominator is well-defined for all j). Setting $u = (\theta_{j,\cdot} - \bar{\theta}_{j,\cdot}) \in \mathbb{R}^{v_J}$ and using the bilinearity of the above quadratic form, each of the previous probabilities, which are all equal, are bounded by

$$P_{b_0} \left(\sup_{u \in \Theta} |u^T \Lambda u| \geq \zeta_T/d \right), \quad (53)$$

where $\Theta = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^{v_J} : u^T \Gamma u \leq 1\}$ and $\Lambda = \hat{\Gamma} - \Gamma$. Let $\|u\|_{\Gamma}^2 := u^T \Gamma u$, $u \in \mathbb{R}^{v_J}$, and for $0 < \delta < 1$, let $(u^l)_{l=1}^{N(\delta)}$ be a minimal δ -covering of Θ in $\|\cdot\|_{\Gamma}$ -distance. For every $u \in \Theta$, let $u^l = u^l(u)$ denote the closest point in this δ -covering, so that $\|u - u^l\|_{\Gamma} \leq \delta$. By bilinearity, for any $u \in \Theta$,

$$|(u - u^l)^T \Lambda (u - u^l)| \leq \delta^2 \sup_{w \in \Theta} |w^T \Lambda w|.$$

For any $u \in \Theta$, set $g_u = \sum_{l \leq J,r} u_{l,r} \Phi_{l,r}$. By Proposition 1, $\|u\|_{\mathbb{R}^{v_J}} = \|g_u\|_{L^2} \leq \|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty}^{1/2} \|g_u\|_{\mu_0} = \|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty}^{1/2} \|u\|_{\Gamma}$. For $(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^{v_J}$ the eigenvalues of the symmetric matrix Λ and $\lambda_{max} = \max_i |\lambda_i|$, applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$|(u - u^l)^T \Lambda u^l| \leq \|u - u^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{v_J}} \|\Lambda u^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{v_J}} \leq \delta \|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty}^{1/2} \lambda_{max} \|u^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{v_J}} \leq \delta \|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty} \sup_{v: \|v\|_{\mathbb{R}^{v_J}} \leq 1} |v^T \Lambda v|,$$

where the last inequality follows from p.234 of [27]. Since $\sup_{v: \|v\|_{\mathbb{R}^{v_J}} \leq 1} |v^T \Lambda v| \leq \|\mu_0\|_{\infty} \sup_{w \in \Theta} |w^T \Lambda w|$, this yields $|(u - u^l)^T \Lambda u^l| \leq \delta \|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty} \|\mu_0\|_{\infty} \sup_{w \in \Theta} |w^T \Lambda w|$ for all $u \in \Theta$. Combining the above yields for $0 < \delta < 1$,

$$\sup_{u \in \Theta} |u^T \Lambda u| \leq (\delta^2 + 2\delta \|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty} \|\mu_0\|_{\infty}) \sup_{w \in \Theta} |w^T \Lambda w| + \max_{1 \leq l \leq N(\delta)} |(u^l)^T \Lambda u^l|.$$

In particular, taking $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\mu_0)$ small enough that $1 - \delta_0^2 - 2\|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty} \|\mu_0\|_{\infty} \delta_0 \leq 1/2$ implies

$$\sup_{u \in \Theta} |u^T \Lambda u| \leq 2 \max_{1 \leq l \leq N(\delta_0)} |(u^l)^T \Lambda u^l|. \quad (54)$$

Applying a union bound thus yields that (53) is bounded by $N(\delta_0) \sup_{u \in \Theta} P_{b_0}(|u^T \Lambda u| \geq \zeta_T/(2d))$. The covering number of the unit ball in a v_J -dimensional space is bounded by $N(\delta_0) \leq (C/\delta_0)^{v_J} = e^{c_0 v_J}$ (Proposition 4.3.34 of [25]).

For $u \in \Theta$, set $f_u(x) = g_u(x)^2 - \langle g_u, g_u \rangle_{\mu_0} \in L_{\mu_0}^2(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap H^S(\mathbb{T}^d)$, where $S > d/2$ is the regularity of the wavelet basis. Since also $b_0 \in C^s$ with $s > d/2$, applying Lemma 7 to the class $\mathcal{F} = \{f_u, 0\}$ and noting that $u^T \Lambda u = T^{-1} \int_0^T f_u(X_t) dt$ yields

$$P_{b_0} \left(|u^T \Lambda u| \geq CT^{-1} \|L^{-1}[f_u]\|_{\infty} + CT^{-1/2} d_L(f_u, 0)(1+x) \right) \leq e^{-x^2/2}. \quad (55)$$

For $0 < \kappa < s - d/2 + 1$ (or $\kappa = 0$ if $d = 1$), applying Lemma 9 with $\gamma = \rho = g_u \in V_J$ and $p = (d/2 + \kappa - 1)_+$ gives

$$d_L(f_u, 0) \leq C \|g_u^2 - \langle g_u, g_u \rangle_{\mu_0}\|_{H^{(d/2+\kappa-1)_+}} \leq C 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} \|g_u\|_{L^2}^2.$$

By Proposition 1, $\|g_u\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty} \|g_u\|_{\mu_0}^2 = \|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty} u^T \Gamma u \leq \|1/\mu_0\|_{\infty}$, so that $d_L(f_u, 0) \leq C 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]}$ for any $u \in \Theta$. Applying the Sobolev embedding theorem, Lemma 11 and Lemma 9 as above, $\|L^{-1}[f_u]\|_{\infty} \lesssim \|f_u\|_{H^{(d/2+\kappa-2)_+}} \lesssim 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]}$ for κ as above and any $u \in \Theta$. Substituting this into (55) gives

$$\sup_{u \in \Theta} P_{b_0} \left(|u^T \Lambda u| \geq CT^{-1/2} 2^{J[d/2+(d/2+\kappa-1)_+]} (1+x) \right) \leq e^{-x^2/2},$$

where the right-hand side equals ζ_T up to constants. Combining the last inequality with (54) and the remarks after it completes the proof. \square

3.10 Proofs for Section 2.5

We use results from Section 4 below to represent fluctuations $\mu_b - \mu_{b+h}$ by a linear transformation of the vector field h plus a remainder term that will be seen to be quadratic in (suitable norms of) h . In fact, in (59) we express both the linear and remainder terms as solutions to certain inhomogeneous elliptic PDEs. We can then use elliptic regularity estimates to both bound the remainder term and establish continuity of the linear part in suitable norms (so that the continuous mapping theorem can be applied in conjunction with Theorem 3).

3.10.1 Local approximation of the map $b \mapsto \mu_b$

Let μ_b and μ_{b+h} correspond to vector fields $b, b+h \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (cf. Proposition 1). Then necessarily $L_b^* \mu_b = L_{b+h}^* \mu_{b+h}$ or in other words

$$\frac{\Delta}{2} \mu_b - b \cdot \nabla \mu_b - \operatorname{div}(b) \mu_b = \frac{\Delta}{2} \mu_{b+h} - (b+h) \cdot \nabla \mu_{b+h} - \operatorname{div}(b+h) \mu_{b+h}$$

which is the same as

$$\frac{\Delta}{2} (\mu_b - \mu_{b+h}) - b \cdot \nabla (\mu_b - \mu_{b+h}) - \operatorname{div}(b) (\mu_b - \mu_{b+h}) = -h \cdot \nabla \mu_{b+h} - \operatorname{div}(h) \mu_{b+h}.$$

Thus $u = \mu_b - \mu_{b+h}$ solves the equation

$$L_b^* u = -h \cdot \nabla \mu_{b+h} - \operatorname{div}(h) \mu_{b+h}. \quad (56)$$

Next denote by $v_h = v_{b,h}$ the unique periodic solution of the inhomogeneous PDE

$$L_b^* v_h = -h \cdot \nabla \mu_b - \operatorname{div}(h) \mu_b = - \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} (h_j \mu_b) \equiv f_h \quad (57)$$

satisfying $\int v_h = 0$. In view of the results in Section 4 and since, with $dx^{(j)} = \prod_{i \neq j} dx_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} f_h(x) dx &= \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^1 \cdots \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} (h_j(x) \mu_b(x)) dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d-1}} [(h_j \mu_b)(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, 1, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_d) - [(h_j \mu_b)(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, 0, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_d)] dx^{(j)} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

such a solution exists and can be represented as $v_h = (L_b^*)^{-1}[f_h]$, a map that is linear in h . Now since $\int \mu_{b+h} - \int \mu_b = 1 - 1 = 0$, we can use (56), (57) to see that the differences $w_{b,h} = \mu_b - \mu_{b+h} - v_h$ are the unique (periodic) integral-zero solutions of

$$L_{b+h}^* w_{b,h} = L_b^* w_{b,h} - h \cdot \nabla w_{b,h} - \operatorname{div}(h) w_{b,h} = h \cdot \nabla v_h + \operatorname{div}(h) v_h = \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} [h_j v_h] \equiv \bar{f}_h,$$

where again $\int \bar{f}_h = 0$ as in (58) so that we can write $w_{b,h} = (L_{b+h}^*)^{-1}[\bar{f}_h]$. We thus obtain, for any $h \in C^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$, the key decomposition

$$\mu_b(x) - \mu_{b+h}(x) = v_{b,h}(x) + w_{b,h}(x) = (L_b^*)^{-1}[f_h](x) + (L_{b+h}^*)^{-1}[\bar{f}_h](x), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^d. \tag{59}$$

3.10.2 Proof of Theorem 5

It suffices to prove the theorem for

$$\sqrt{T}(\mu_b - \mu_{\hat{b}_T})|X^T, \quad b \sim \Pi^{\bar{D}_T}(\cdot|X^T),$$

where $\Pi^{\bar{D}_T}(\cdot|X^T)$ was introduced at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 3. On the set \bar{D}_T we have the estimate

$$\|b\|_{B_{\infty}^1} \lesssim 2^J \|b - b_0\|_{\infty} + \max_j \|b_{0,j} - P_{V_j}(b_{0,j})\|_{B_{\infty}^1} = O(1)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$, and the same argument shows $\|\hat{b}_T\|_{B_{\infty}^1} = O_{P_{b_0}}(1)$ by virtue of Corollary 1. Proposition 1 then further implies that $\|\mu_b\|_{Lip}, \|\mu_{\hat{b}_T}\|_{Lip}$ are also $O(1)$ and $O_{P_{b_0}}(1)$, respectively – these bounds will be used repeatedly in the proof without further mention. We will use the decomposition (59) with $h = \hat{b}_T - b$.

First, for the ‘remainder’ term, we can use (72) below and (3) to deduce that, uniformly in $\|g\|_{\mathbb{B}_r} \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} w_{b,h} g \right| &\leq \|g\|_{L^2} \|(L_{b+h}^*)^{-1}[\bar{f}_h]\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\bar{f}_h\|_{H^{-2}} = \sup_{\|\phi\|_{H^2} \leq 1} \left| \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \phi \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} [h_j v_h] \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|\phi\|_{H^2} \leq 1} \left| \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h_j v_h \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \phi \right| \lesssim \|h\|_{\infty} \|(L_b^*)^{-1}[f_h]\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \|h\|_{\infty} \|f_h\|_{H^{-2}} \lesssim \|h\|_{\infty} \|h \mu_b\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|h\|_{\infty}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

is $O_{P_{b_0}}((\|\hat{b}_T - b_0\|_{\infty} + \|b - b_0\|_{\infty})^2) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1/\sqrt{T})$ on \bar{D}_T and by Corollary 1.

For the ‘linear’ term we may write, noting the dependence $f_h = f_{h,b}$ on b ,

$$\int v_{b,h}g = \int (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h,b_0}]g + \int (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h,b} - f_{h,b_0}]g + \int [(L_b^*)^{-1} - (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}][f_{h,b}]g = \sum_{i=0}^2 A_i.$$

The last term A_2 is $o_{P_{b_0}}(1/\sqrt{T})$ in \mathbb{B}_r^* since $[(L_b^*)^{-1} - (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}][f_{h,b}]$ can be written as $-(L_b^*)^{-1}[(b - b_0) \cdot \nabla \omega + \operatorname{div}(b - b_0)\omega]$ for $\omega = (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h,b}]$ (arguing just as in (56)), so that using (72) gives (as in (60)) the inequality

$$\|[(L_b^*)^{-1} - (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}][f_h]\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|b - b_0\|_\infty (\|\hat{b}_T - b_0\|_\infty + \|b - b_0\|_\infty) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1/\sqrt{T}). \quad (61)$$

Similarly the term A_1 can be bounded in \mathbb{B}_r^* by

$$\|(L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h,b} - f_{h,b_0}]\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f_{h,b} - f_{h,b_0}\|_{H^{-2}} \lesssim \|h\|_\infty \|b - b_0\|_\infty = o_{P_{b_0}}(1/\sqrt{T}).$$

Finally, for the term A_0 , we first show that the linear operator

$$h \mapsto v_{b_0,h} = (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h,b_0}]$$

is Lipschitz on $C^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for the norms $(B_{1\infty}^{r+1})^*$, \mathbb{B}_r^* , any $d/2 - 1 < r < 1$. Using that $v_{b_0,h} \in L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and writing $\bar{g} = g - \int g d\mu_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{b_0,h}\|_{\mathbb{B}_r^*} &= \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2} + \|g\|_{B_{1\infty}^r} \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} g v_{b_0,h} \right| = \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2} + \|g\|_{B_{1\infty}^r} \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} L_{b_0} L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{g}] v_{b_0,h} \right| \\ &= \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2} + \|g\|_{B_{1\infty}^r} \leq 1} \left| \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} L_{b_0}^* v_{b_0,h} L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{g}] \right| \\ &= \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2} + \|g\|_{B_{1\infty}^r} \leq 1} \left| \sum_{j=1}^d \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} h_j \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{g}] \right) \mu_0 \right| \\ &= \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2} + \|g\|_{B_{1\infty}^r} \leq 1} \left| \langle h, \mu_0 \nabla L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{g}] \rangle_{L^2} \right| \\ &\lesssim \|\mu_0\|_{C^{r+1}} \sup_{\|g\|_{L^2} + \|g\|_{B_{1\infty}^r} \leq 1} \|\nabla L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{g}]\|_{B_{1\infty}^{r+1}} \sup_{\|\tilde{g}\|_{B_{1\infty}^{r+1}} \leq 1} |\langle h, \tilde{g} \rangle_{L^2}| \lesssim \|h\|_{(B_{1\infty}^{r+1})^*}, \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

where we have used (3), (73) below and that ∇ maps $B_{1\infty}^{r+2}$ continuously into $B_{1\infty}^{r+1, \otimes d}$. We note that $\mu_0 \in C^{r+1}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for $r+1 < 2$ and $b_0 \in C^s \cap H^s$, $s > d$, follows from $\|\mu_0\|_{H^1} \lesssim \|\mu_0\|_{Lip} < \infty$ (by Proposition 1 and Rademacher’s theorem) and the iterated application of the inequality (71) below with $u = \mu_0$ to bound $\|\mu_0\|_{H^{r+d/2}}$, which in turn bounds $\|\mu_0\|_{C^{r+1}}$ by the Sobolev imbedding theorem.

Summarizing, with $h = b - \hat{b}_T$ we have proved uniformly in $\|g\|_{\mathbb{B}_r} \leq 1$,

$$\sqrt{T} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} (\mu_b - \mu_{\hat{b}_T})g = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} v_{b_0, \sqrt{T}(b - \hat{b}_T)}g + o_{P_{b_0}}(1),$$

and that the linear operator $h \mapsto v_{b_0,h}$ is continuous from $(C^1(\mathbb{T}^d), \|\cdot\|_{(B_{1\infty}^{r+1})^*})$ to \mathbb{B}_r^* . Theorem 5 now follows from Theorem 3 with $r+1 = \rho$ and the continuous mapping theorem for weak convergence applied to $\sqrt{T}(b - \hat{b}_T)$. We note that the calculation leading to (62) shows

that the covariance of the limiting Gaussian process is the one of the Gaussian process $g \mapsto \mathbb{W}_0(\mu_0 \nabla L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{g}])$, $\mathbb{W}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}_{b_0}$, of the required form. In particular, \mathcal{N}_{μ_0} exists as a tight Gaussian probability measure in \mathbb{B}_r^* as the image of \mathcal{N}_{b_0} under the continuous map $v_{b_0, \cdot}$. The limit of the MAP-estimate follows from similar (in fact simpler) arguments and Theorem 4, and is left to the reader.

3.10.3 Proof of Theorem 6

We finally prove Theorem 6 and explain the necessary modifications to the arguments from the proof of Theorem 5. Using (59) gives

$$\mu_b(x) - \mu_{b+h}(x) = (L_b^*)^{-1}[f_h](x) + (L_{b+h}^*)^{-1}[\bar{f}_h](x), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 5, one shows that \hat{b}_T, b are (in the former case, stochastically) bounded in $B_{\infty\infty}^1$ on the set \bar{D}_T , and so are then $\mu_{\hat{b}_T}, \mu_b$ by Proposition 1. Using the Sobolev-embedding $H^1(\mathbb{T}) \subset C(\mathbb{T})$ and then repeatedly Lemma 12, (72) and the basic interpolation inequality $\|g\|_{H^1} \lesssim \|g\|_{H^2}^{1/2} \|g\|_{L^2}^{1/2}$, the second term can be bounded by

$$\|(L_{b+h}^*)^{-1}[\bar{f}_h]\|_{H^1} \lesssim \|\bar{f}_h\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\bar{f}_h\|_{H^{-2}}^{1/2} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^1} \|h\|_{L^2},$$

which for $a > 3/2$ and $h = b - \hat{b}_T = b - b_0 - (\hat{b}_T - b_0)$, $b \sim \Pi^{\bar{D}_T}(\cdot | X^T)$, is of order $\|h\|_{H^1} \|h\|_{L^2} = o_P(1/\sqrt{T})$ since $\|h\|_{H^1} \lesssim 2^J \|h\|_{L^2}$ for $h \in V_J$. The linear term can be decomposed as

$$(L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_h](x) - [(L_{b_0}^*)^{-1} - (L_b^*)^{-1}][f_h](x).$$

Then arguing as before (61) and using the Sobolev imbedding $H^1 \subset C(\mathbb{T})$ as well as Lemma 12, the second term is bounded, for $a > 3/2$, by

$$\|[(L_b^*)^{-1} - (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}][f_h]\|_{\infty} \lesssim \|b - b_0\|_{\infty} (\|\hat{b}_T - b_0\|_{H^1} + \|b - b_0\|_{H^1}) = o_{P_{b_0}}(1/\sqrt{T}).$$

Similarly, noting the dependence $f_h = f_{h,b}$ on b , the term $(L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h,b}] - (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h,b_0}]$ can be shown to be $o_{P_{b_0}}(1/\sqrt{T})$ in $C(\mathbb{T})$.

We next establish continuity of the linear operator $h \mapsto v_{b_0,h} = (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h,b_0}]$ on $C^1(\mathbb{T})$ for the norms of $(B_{1\infty}^1(\mathbb{T}))^*$, $C(\mathbb{T})$, so that the theorem follows from Theorem 3 and the continuous mapping theorem for weak convergence, just as in the proof of Theorem 5. We use a dual representation for the weighted wavelet sequence norms characterising Besov spaces – more precisely, that the classical identities $(c_0)^* = \ell_1, (\ell_1)^* = \ell_{\infty}$, where $c_0 = \{(a_k) : \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_k = 0\}$ is equipped with the supremum-norm on sequences, imply for $g \in C(\mathbb{T})$,

$$\|g\|_{B_{\infty 1}^0} \lesssim \sup_{\phi \in C(\mathbb{T}) : \|\phi\|_{B_{1\infty}^0} \leq 1} |\langle g, \phi \rangle_{L^2}|.$$

Then, for $\bar{\phi} = \phi - \int \phi d\mu_{b_0}$, and since $v_{b_0,h} \in L_0^2(\mathbb{T}) \cap H^2 \subset C(\mathbb{T})$ by Lemma 12,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{b_0,h}\|_{\infty} &\lesssim \|v_{b_0,h}\|_{B_{\infty 1}^0} \leq \sup_{\phi \in C(\mathbb{T}) : \|\phi\|_{B_{1\infty}^0} \leq 1} \left| \int v_{b_0,h} \phi \right| = \sup_{\phi \in C(\mathbb{T}) : \|\phi\|_{B_{1\infty}^0} \leq 1} \left| \int (L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h,b_0}] L_{b_0} L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{\phi}] \right| \\ &= \sup_{\phi \in C(\mathbb{T}) : \|\phi\|_{B_{1\infty}^0} \leq 1} \left| \int f_{h,b_0} L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{\phi}] \right| \leq \sup_{\|\phi\|_{B_{1\infty}^0} \leq 1} \left\| \mu_0 \frac{d}{dy} L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{\phi}] \right\|_{B_{1\infty}^1} \|h\|_{(B_{1\infty}^1)^*} \lesssim \|h\|_{(B_{1\infty}^1)^*} \end{aligned}$$

since, by (3) and (73),

$$\sup_{\|\phi\|_{B_{1\infty}^0} \leq 1} \|\mu_0 \frac{d}{dy} L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{\phi}]\|_{B_{1\infty}^1} \lesssim \|\mu_0\|_{Lip} \sup_{\|\phi\|_{B_{1\infty}^0} \leq 1} \|L_{b_0}^{-1}[\bar{\phi}]\|_{B_{1\infty}^2} < \infty.$$

The covariance of the limiting Gaussian process is obtained as follows: Since $G_{b_0}(x, y)$ is the periodic Green kernel of $L_{b_0}^{-1}$, the Green kernel of $(L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}$ is $G_{b_0}(y, x)$, and thus by the definitions and integration by parts

$$(L_{b_0}^*)^{-1}[f_{h, b_0}] = - \int_{\mathbb{T}} G_{b_0}(y, \cdot) \frac{d}{dy} [h\mu_0](y) dy = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d}{dy} G_{b_0}(y, \cdot) h(y) \mu_0(y) dy.$$

Inserting for h the limit $\mathbb{W}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}_{b_0}$ of $\sqrt{T}(b - \hat{b}_T)$ gives the desired form of the limiting covariance. Finally, the limit distribution of the MAP estimate follows from the same (in fact simpler) arguments and Theorem 4, and is omitted.

4 Appendix: Some basic facts on the elliptic PDEs involved

Recall that the generator $L = L_b$ of the diffusion process given in (4) is a strongly elliptic second order partial differential operator. We will suppress the dependence on b in most of what follows, all that is required is that b is ‘smooth enough’, and $b \in V_J^{\otimes d}$ will be sufficient throughout. The maximum principle for elliptic operators (see [22, 7]) implies that any (strong and then also weak) periodic solution of the Laplace equation

$$Lu = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{T}^d \tag{63}$$

equals a constant. The adjoint operator $L^* = L_b^*$ was defined in (5), and in the periodic setting considered here the operators (L, L^*) form a Fredholm pair on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$, see p.175f. in [7]. As a consequence, the inhomogeneous equation

$$Lu = f, \quad f \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d), \tag{64}$$

has a solution u if and only if $\langle f, m \rangle_{L^2} = 0$ for every solution $m \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ of

$$L^*m = 0 \text{ on } \mathbb{T}^d. \tag{65}$$

By the Fredholm property the kernel of L^* has the same dimension as the kernel of L and inspection of the form of L^* shows that the solutions $m \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ to (65) are determined up to a normalising constant. It follows that

$$L^*m = 0 \iff m \in \mathcal{K} = \{c\mu : c \in \mathbb{R}\}, \tag{66}$$

where $\mu > 0$ is the unique solution m (‘invariant measure’) satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} m = 1$. Positivity of μ can be deduced from appropriate heat kernel estimates: in fact (arguing, e.g., as on p.167f. in [36]) the solution μ can be seen to be Lipschitz continuous and bounded away from zero on \mathbb{T}^d , and $\|\mu\|_{Lip}$ is bounded by a fixed constant that only depends on d and on an upper bound for $\|b\|_{\infty}$, proving in particular Proposition 1.

We can now state the following basic result for the solution map of the PDE (64).

Lemma 11. *Let $t \geq 2$ and assume $b \in C^{t-2}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. For any $f \in L^2_\mu(\mathbb{T}^d)$ there exists a unique solution $L_b^{-1}[f] \in L^2_0(\mathbb{T}^d)$ of equation (64) satisfying $L_b L_b^{-1}[f] = f$ almost everywhere. Moreover,*

$$\|L_b^{-1}[f]\|_{H^t} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{t-2}},$$

with constants depending on t, d and on an upper bound B for $\|b\|_{B_\infty^{t-2}}$.

Proof. By standard Sobolev space theory and definition of the Laplacian we have for any $u \in \mathcal{H} \equiv H^t \cap \{u : \langle u, 1 \rangle_{L^2} = 0\}$ the inequality

$$\|u\|_{H^t} \lesssim \|\Delta u\|_{H^{t-2}}. \quad (67)$$

Indeed, for $\{e_k : k = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$ the usual trigonometric basis of $L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ we have $\langle u, e_0 \rangle_{L^2} = \langle u, 1 \rangle_{L^2} = 0$, $\langle \Delta u, e_k \rangle = -(2\pi)^2 \sum_j k_j^2 \langle u, e_k \rangle$, and $\sup_{k \neq 0} (1 + \|k\|^2) / \|k\|^2 < \infty$, which gives the result using the characterisation of Sobolev norms in the basis $\{e_k\}$. We then also have, by the triangle inequality and (3),

$$\|u\|_{H^t} \lesssim \|Lu\|_{H^{t-2}} + \|b \cdot \nabla u\|_{H^{t-2}} \lesssim \|Lu\|_{H^{t-2}} + \|b\|_{B_\infty^{t-2}} \|u\|_{H^{t-1}} \quad (68)$$

for all $u \in \mathcal{H}$, with constants depending on t, d . We now deduce from this the inequality

$$\|u\|_{H^t} \lesssim \|Lu\|_{H^{t-2}} \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (69)$$

Indeed, suppose the latter inequality does not hold true, then there exists a sequence $u_m \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\|u_m\|_{H^t} = 1$ for all m but $\|Lu_m\|_{H^{t-2}} \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. At the same time, by compactness, u_m converges in $\|\cdot\|_{H^{t-1}}$ -norm (if necessary along a subsequence) to some $u \in \mathcal{H}$ satisfying $Lu = 0$. Using (68) with fixed constant depending only on B, t, d , we see that u_m is also Cauchy in H^t , and its limit must necessarily satisfy $\|u\|_{H^t} = 1$. However, as remarked after (63), the only solution $u \in \mathcal{H}$ to $Lu = 0$ on \mathbb{T}^d equals $u = \text{const} = 0$, a contradiction to $\|u\|_{H^t} = 1$, proving (69).

By the Fredholm property and (66), a solution u_f to (64) exists whenever $\int f d\mu = 0$, and for $f \in H^{t-2}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ any such solution belongs to $H^t(\mathbb{T}^d)$ (see Theorem 3.5.3 in [7], which is proved for smooth b , but the proof remains valid for $b \in C^{t-2}(\mathbb{T}^d)$). The weak maximum principle (p.179 in [22]) now implies that u_f is unique up to an additive constant, and applying (69) to the unique selection $u_f = L^{-1}[f] \in \mathcal{H}$ completes the proof. \square

We next obtain corresponding results for the adjoint PDE. It follows from (66) that the unique element $m \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} m = 0$ must necessarily vanish identically, and we can study the solution operator $(L^*)^{-1}$ of the inhomogeneous adjoint PDE

$$L^* u = f \text{ on } \mathbb{T}^d, \quad (70)$$

that assigns to any $f \in L^2_0(\mathbb{T}^d)$ the unique solution $u = (L^*)^{-1}[f] \in L^2_0(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Indeed, using the Fredholm property from Section 3.6 in [7] in a reverse way (with L equal to our L^* so that the new L^* is our $(L^*)^* = L$), we see that solutions $u = u_f$ to (70) exist for any periodic f for which $\int f = 0$ (since solutions to $Lu = 0$ equal constants), and if u_1, u_2 are two such solutions, so that $L^*(u_1 - u_2) = 0$ and $\int u_1 = \int u_2$, then necessarily $u_1 = u_2$ by what precedes.

Lemma 12. *Let $t \geq 2$ and assume $b \in C^{t-1}(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Then for any $f \in H^{t-2}(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap L^2_0(\mathbb{T}^d)$, we have $(L_b^*)^{-1}[f] \in H^t(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and*

$$\|(L_b^*)^{-1}[f]\|_{H^t} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{t-2}},$$

with constants depending on t, d and on an upper bound B for $\|b\|_{B_\infty^{t-1}}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of Lemma 11 after deriving the basic inequality

$$\|u\|_{H^t} \lesssim \|L^*u\|_{H^{t-2}} + \|b \cdot \nabla u + \operatorname{div}(b)u\|_{H^{t-2}} \lesssim \|L^*u\|_{H^{t-2}} + \|b\|_{B_{\infty\infty}^{t-2}} \|u\|_{H^{t-1}} + \|b\|_{B_{\infty\infty}^{t-1}} \|u\|_{H^{t-2}} \quad (71)$$

in analogy to (68). \square

We can also give a version of Lemma 12 with $t = 0$. Since $(L_b^*)^{-1}[f] \in L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ we have for all $f \in L_0^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and $\bar{\phi} = \phi - \int \phi d\mu_b$ the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \|(L_b^*)^{-1}[f]\|_{L^2} &= \sup_{\|\phi\|_{L^2} \leq 1} \left| \int (L_b^*)^{-1}[f] L_b L_b^{-1}[\bar{\phi}] \right| = \sup_{\|\phi\|_{L^2} \leq 1} \left| \int f L_b^{-1}[\bar{\phi}] \right| \\ &\leq \|f\|_{H^{-2}} \sup_{\|\phi\|_{L^2} \leq 1} \|L_b^{-1}[\bar{\phi}]\|_{H^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{H^{-2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where we have used Lemma 11 with $t = 2$ in the last inequality, and with constants in the last inequality depending only on d and on bounds for $\|b\|_{B_{\infty\infty}^1}, \|\mu_b\|_{L^2}$.

4.1 Refinements on the Besov scale

For the the proofs of Theorems 5 and 6 we need more refined regularity estimates for the solutions of the PDE involved, replacing the Sobolev norms in Lemma 11 by appropriate Besov norms. The inequality

$$\|L_b^{-1}[f]\|_{B_{1\infty}^t} \lesssim \|f\|_{B_{1\infty}^{t-2}}, \quad t - 2 \geq 0, \forall f \in L_{\mu_b}^2(\mathbb{T}^d), \quad (73)$$

with constants depending on b only via a bound B for $\|b\|_{B_{\infty\infty}^{t-1}}$, is proved in the same way as Lemma 11, replacing the basic inequality (67) by its analogue for Besov norms

$$\|u\|_{B_{1\infty}^t} \lesssim \|\Delta u\|_{B_{1\infty}^{t-2}} \quad \forall u \in B_{1\infty}^t \cap \{u : \langle u, e_0 \rangle = 0\}, \quad (74)$$

which is proved as follows: For all u such that $\langle u, e_0 \rangle = 0$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, an equivalent Littlewood-Paley norm on any Besov space $B_{1\infty}^r$ is given by

$$\|u\|_{B_{1\infty}^r} = \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{jr} \left\| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}, k \neq 0} \psi_j(k) \langle u, e_k \rangle e_k \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)},$$

where the $\psi_j = \psi(\cdot/2^j)$, $\operatorname{supp}(\psi) \in (1/2, 2)^d$ form a Littlewood-Paley resolution of unity, see p.162f. in [44]. Then as after (67)

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{B_{1\infty}^t} &= \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{jt} \left\| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}, k \neq 0} \frac{1}{4\pi^2 \|k\|^2} \psi_j(k) \langle \Delta u, e_k \rangle e_k \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \\ &= \sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{j(t-2)} \left\| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}, k \neq 0} M_j(k) \psi_j(k) \langle \Delta u, e_k \rangle e_k \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \end{aligned}$$

where $M_j = M(\cdot/2^j)$ and $M = \Phi/(4\pi^2 \|\cdot\|^2)$ with Φ a smooth function supported in $(1/4, 9/4)^d$ such that $\Phi = 1$ on $(1/2, 2)^d$. By a standard Fourier multiplier inequality (e.g., Lemma 4.3.27 in [25], which easily generalises to $d > 1$) the last norm can be estimated by

$$\sup_{j \in \mathbb{N}_0} 2^{j(t-2)} \left\| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}, k \neq 0} \psi_j(k) \langle \Delta u, e_k \rangle e_k \right\|_{L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)} \times \|F^{-1} M_j\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)},$$

where F^{-1} is the inverse Fourier transform. Since Φ is smooth and supported in $(-1/4, 3/4)^d$, both M and $F^{-1}M$ belong to the Schwartz-class \mathcal{S} , so that (74) follows from

$$\sup_j \|F^{-1}[M_j]\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \|F^{-1}[M]\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \infty.$$

Acknowledgements. RN was supported by the European Research Council under ERC grant No. 647812 (UQMSI). We would like to thank James R. Norris for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] ABRAHAM, K. Nonparametric Bayesian posterior contraction rates for scalar diffusions with high-frequency data. *Bernoulli, to appear, arXiv:1802.05635* (2018).
- [2] AECKERLE-WILLEMS, C., AND STRAUCH, C. Concentration of scalar ergodic diffusions and some statistical implications. *arXiv:1807.11331* (2018).
- [3] AECKERLE-WILLEMS, C., AND STRAUCH, C. Sup-norm adaptive simultaneous drift estimation for ergodic diffusions. *arXiv:1808.10660* (2018).
- [4] AGAPIOU, S., LARSSON, S., AND STUART, A. M. Posterior contraction rates for the Bayesian approach to linear ill-posed inverse problems. *Stochastic Process. Appl. 123*, 10 (2013), 3828–3860.
- [5] BAKRY, D., GENTIL, I., AND LEDOUX, M. *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*, vol. 348. Springer, Cham, 2014.
- [6] BASS, R. F. *Stochastic processes*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2011.
- [7] BERS, L., JOHN, F., AND SCHECHTER, M. *Partial differential equations*. Lectures in Applied Mathematics, Vol. III. Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York-London-Sydney, 1964.
- [8] BLADT, M., FINCH, S., AND SØRENSEN, M. Simulation of multivariate diffusion bridges. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol. 78*, 2 (2016), 343–369.
- [9] CASTILLO, I. On Bayesian supremum norm contraction rates. *Ann. Statist. 42*, 5 (2014), 2058–2091.
- [10] CASTILLO, I. Pólya tree posterior distributions on densities. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré 53* (2017), 2074–2102.
- [11] CASTILLO, I., AND NICKL, R. Nonparametric Bernstein–von Mises Theorems in Gaussian white noise. *Ann. Statist. 41*, 4 (2013), 1999–2028.
- [12] CASTILLO, I., AND NICKL, R. On the Bernstein–von Mises phenomenon for nonparametric Bayes procedures. *Ann. Statist. 42*, 5 (2014), 1941–1969.
- [13] CASTILLO, I., AND ROUSSEAU, J. A Bernstein–von Mises theorem for smooth functionals in semiparametric models. *Ann. Statist. 43*, 6 (2015), 2353–2383.
- [14] DALALYAN, A. Sharp adaptive estimation of the drift function for ergodic diffusions. *Ann. Statist. 33*, 6 (2005), 2507–2528.
- [15] DALALYAN, A., AND REISS, M. Asymptotic statistical equivalence for scalar ergodic diffusions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields 134*, 2 (2006), 248–282.
- [16] DALALYAN, A., AND REISS, M. Asymptotic statistical equivalence for ergodic diffusions: the multidimensional case. *Probab. Theory Related Fields 137*, 1-2 (2007), 25–47.
- [17] DASHTI, M., LAW, K. J. H., STUART, A. M., AND VOSS, J. MAP estimators and their consistency in Bayesian nonparametric inverse problems. *Inverse Problems 29*, 9 (2013), 095017, 27.
- [18] DUDLEY, R. M. *Real analysis and probability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

- [19] DUDLEY, R. M. *Uniform central limit theorems*, second ed. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2014.
- [20] ETHIER, S. N., AND KURTZ, T. G. *Markov processes, Characterization and convergence*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1986.
- [21] GHOSAL, S., AND VAN DER VAART, A. W. *Fundamentals of Nonparametric Bayesian Inference*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2017.
- [22] GILBARG, D., AND TRUDINGER, N. S. *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1998.
- [23] GINÉ, E., AND NICKL, R. Uniform central limit theorems for kernel density estimators. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 141, 3-4 (2008), 333–387.
- [24] GINÉ, E., AND NICKL, R. An exponential inequality for the distribution function of the kernel density estimator, with applications to adaptive estimation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 143, 3-4 (2009), 569–596.
- [25] GINÉ, E., AND NICKL, R. *Mathematical foundations of infinite-dimensional statistical models*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2016.
- [26] GUGUSHVILI, S., AND SPREIJ, P. Nonparametric Bayesian drift estimation for multi-dimensional stochastic differential equations. *Lith. Math. J.* 54, 2 (2014), 127–141.
- [27] HORN, R. A., AND JOHNSON, C. R. *Matrix analysis*, second ed. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.
- [28] KNAPIK, B., AND SALOMOND, J.-B. A general approach to posterior contraction in nonparametric inverse problems. *Bernoulli* 24, 3 (2018), 2091–2121.
- [29] KNAPIK, B., VAN DER VAART, A. W., AND VAN ZANTEN, J. H. Bayesian inverse problems with Gaussian priors. *Ann. Statist.* 39, 5 (2011), 2626–2657.
- [30] KUTOYANTS, Y. A. *Statistical inference for ergodic diffusion processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2004.
- [31] MONARD, F., NICKL, R., AND PATERNAIN, G. P. Efficient Bayesian nonparametric inference for X-ray transforms. *Annals of Statistics*, to appear; *arXiv:1708.06332* (2017).
- [32] NICKL, R. Bernstein-von Mises theorems for statistical inverse problems I: Schrödinger equation. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, to appear; *arXiv:1707.01764* (2017).
- [33] NICKL, R., AND SÖHL, J. Bernstein-von Mises theorems for statistical inverse problems II: compound Poisson processes. *arXiv:1709.07752* (2017).
- [34] NICKL, R., AND SÖHL, J. Nonparametric Bayesian posterior contraction rates for discretely observed scalar diffusions. *Ann. Statist.* 45, 4 (2017), 1664–1693.
- [35] NICKL, R., VAN DE GEER, S., AND WANG, S. Convergence rates for penalised least squares estimators in PDE-constrained regression problems. *arXiv:1809.08818* (2018).
- [36] NORRIS, J. R. Long-time behaviour of heat flow: global estimates and exact asymptotics. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 140, 2 (1997), 161–195.
- [37] PAPASPILIOPOULOS, O., POKERN, Y., ROBERTS, G. O., AND STUART, A. M. Nonparametric estimation of diffusions: a differential equations approach. *Biometrika* 99, 3 (2012), 511–531.
- [38] POKERN, Y., STUART, A. M., AND VAN ZANTEN, J. H. Posterior consistency via precision operators for Bayesian nonparametric drift estimation in SDEs. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 123, 2 (2013), 603–628.
- [39] RAY, K. Bayesian inverse problems with non-conjugate priors. *Electron. J. Stat.* 7 (2013), 2516–2549.
- [40] RAY, K. *Asymptotic theory for Bayesian nonparametric procedures in inverse problems*.

- PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2014.
- [41] RAY, K. Adaptive Bernstein–von Mises theorems in Gaussian white noise. *Ann. Statist.* 45, 6 (2017), 2511–2536.
 - [42] REVUZ, D., AND YOR, M. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, third ed., vol. 293. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
 - [43] RUNST, T., AND SICKEL, W. *Sobolev spaces of fractional order, Nemytskij operators, and nonlinear partial differential equations*, vol. 3 of *De Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1996.
 - [44] SCHMEISSER, H.-J., AND TRIEBEL, H. *Topics in Fourier analysis and function spaces*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1987.
 - [45] STRAUCH, C. Sharp adaptive drift estimation for ergodic diffusions: the multivariate case. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 125, 7 (2015), 2562–2602.
 - [46] STRAUCH, C. Exact adaptive pointwise drift estimation for multidimensional ergodic diffusions. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 164, 1-2 (2016), 361–400.
 - [47] STRAUCH, C. Adaptive invariant density estimation for ergodic diffusions over anisotropic classes. *Annals of Statistics, to appear* (2018).
 - [48] VAN DE GEER, S. A. *Applications of empirical process theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
 - [49] VAN DER MEULEN, F., AND VAN ZANTEN, H. Consistent nonparametric Bayesian inference for discretely observed scalar diffusions. *Bernoulli* 19, 1 (2013), 44–63.
 - [50] VAN DER MEULEN, F. H., VAN DER VAART, A. W., AND VAN ZANTEN, J. H. Convergence rates of posterior distributions for Brownian semimartingale models. *Bernoulli* 12, 5 (2006), 863–888.
 - [51] VAN DER VAART, A. W. *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998.
 - [52] VAN DER VAART, A. W., AND VAN ZANTEN, J. Donsker theorems for diffusions: necessary and sufficient conditions. *Ann. Probab.* 33, 4 (2005), 1422–1451.
 - [53] VAN DER VAART, A. W., AND VAN ZANTEN, J. H. Rates of contraction of posterior distributions based on Gaussian process priors. *Ann. Statist.* 36, 3 (2008), 1435–1463.
 - [54] VAN WAAIJ, J., AND VAN ZANTEN, H. Gaussian process methods for one-dimensional diffusions: optimal rates and adaptation. *Electron. J. Stat.* 10, 1 (2016), 628–645.