Goodness-of-fit testing for Hölder continuous densities under local differential privacy

Amandine Dubois $^{*,1},$ Thomas B. Berrett^2, and Cristina Butucea $^{\dagger 3}$

¹CREST, ENSAI, Campus de Ker-Lann - Rue Blaise Pascal - BP 37203 - 35172 BRUZ cedex amandine.dubois@ensai.fr

²Department of Statistics, University of Warwick - Coventry - CV4 7AL - United Kingdom tom.berrett@warwick.ac.uk

³CREST, ENSAE, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, 5 avenue Henry Le Chatelier, F-91120 Palaiseau cristina.butucea@ensae.fr

Abstract

We address the problem of goodness-of-fit testing for Hölder continuous densities under local differential privacy constraints. We study minimax separation rates when only noninteractive privacy mechanisms are allowed to be used and when both non-interactive and sequentially interactive can be used for privatisation. We propose privacy mechanisms and associated testing procedures whose analysis enables us to obtain upper bounds on the minimax rates. These results are complemented with lower bounds. By comparing these bounds, we show that the proposed privacy mechanisms and tests are optimal up to at most a logarithmic factor for several choices of f_0 including densities from uniform, normal, Beta, Cauchy, Pareto, exponential distributions. In particular, we observe that the results are deteriorated in the private setting compared to the non-private one. Moreover, we show that sequentially interactive mechanisms improve upon the results obtained when considering only non-interactive privacy mechanisms.

1 Introduction

Over the past few years, data privacy has become a fundamental problem in statistical data analysis. While more and more personal data are collected each day, stored and analyzed, private data analysis aims at publishing valid statistical results without compromising the privacy of the individuals whose data are analysed. Differential privacy has emerged from this line of research as a strong mathematical framework which provides rigorous privacy guarantees.

Global differential privacy has been formalized by Dwork et al. [Dwo+06]. Their definition requires a curator who gathers the confidential data of n individuals and generates a privatized output from this complete information. Only this privatized output can be released. In a nutshell, the differential privacy constraints require that altering a single entry in the original dataset does not affect the probability of a privatized output too much. One intuition behind this definition is that if the distribution of the privatized output does not depend too much on any single element of the database, then it should be difficult for an adversary to guess if one given person is in the database or not. We refer the reader to [WZ10] for a precise definition of global differential privacy and more discussion on its testing interpretation. In this paper, we will rather focus on the stronger notion of local differential privacy for which no trusted curator is needeed. In the local setup, each individual generates a privatized version of its true data on its own machine, and only the privatized data are collected for analysis. Thus, the data-owners do not have to share their true data with

^{*}Financial support from GENES and from the French ANR grant ANR-18-EURE-0004

[†]Financial support from GENES and the French National Research Agency (ANR) under the grant Labex Ecodec (ANR-11-LABEX-0047)

anyone else. However, some interaction between the n individuals can be allowed. We will consider two specific classes of locally differentially privacy mechanisms : non-interactive and sequentially interactive privacy mechanisms, respectively. In the local non-interactive scenario, each individual generates a private view Z_i of its original data X_i on its own machine independently of all the other individuals. In the sequentially interactive scenario, the privatized data Z_1, \ldots, Z_n are generated such that the *i*-th individual has access to the previously privatized data Z_1, \ldots, Z_{i-1} in addition to the original data X_i in order to generate its own Z_i .

In this paper, we study a goodness-of-fit testing problem for densities under local differential privacy constraints. Goodness-of-fit testing problems consist in testing whether n independent and identically distributed random variables $X_1, ..., X_n$ were drawn from a specified distribution P_0 or from any other distribution P with $d(P_0, P) \ge \rho$ for some distance between distributions d and some separation parameter $\rho > 0$. Here, the considered distributions will be assumed to have Hölder smooth densities and we will measure the separation between distributions using the L_1 norm which corresponds (up to a constant) to the total variation distance. Moreover, only privatised data $Z_1, ..., Z_n$ are supposed available to be used in order to design testing procedures. Therefore we proceed in two steps: first randomize the original sample into a private sample, then build a test using the latter sample. Optimality is shown over all test procedures and additionally over all privacy mechanisms satisfying the privacy constraints. We adopt a minimax point of view and aim at determining the private minimax testing radius which is the smallest separation parameter for which there exists a private testing procedure whose first type and second type error probabilities are bounded from above by a constant fixed in advance.

Contributions

Our contributions can be summarized as follows. First, when non-interactive privacy mechanisms are used, we present an α -locally differentially private such mechanism and construct a testing procedure based on the privatized data. Its analysis indicates how to tune the parameters of the test statistic and the threshold of the test procedure in order to get a least upper bound on the non interactive testing radius. This result is further complemented with a lower bound.

Next, we prove that these bounds can be improved when allowing for sequential interaction. When previously privatized random variables are publicly available, we may proceed in two steps in order to improve on the detection rates. The first part of the sample is privatized as in the non-interactive case and it is used to acquire partial information on the unknown probability density. This information is further encoded in the private versions of the second part of the sample and the whole procedure benefits and attains faster rates of detection. This idea was previously introduced in [BRS20] and was also successful for testing discrete distributions in [BB20].

Finally, we investigate the optimality of our results for many choices of the null density f_0 . We prove that our lower bounds and upper bounds match up to a constant in the sequentially interactive scenario, and up to a logarithmic factor in the non-interactive scenario, for several f_0 including densities from uniform, gaussian, beta, Cauchy, Pareto and exponential distributions.

Related work

Goodness-of-fit testing for separation norm $\|\cdot\|_1$ has recently received great attention in the non-private setting. Valiant and Valiant [VV17] studies the case of discrete distributions. Given a discrete distribution P_0 and an unknown discrete distribution P, they tackle the problem of finding how many samples from P one should obtain to be able to distinguish with high probability the case that $P = P_0$ from the case that $\|P - P_0\|_1 \ge \varepsilon$. They provide both upper bounds and lower bounds on this sample complexity as a function of ε and the null hypothesis P_0 . Other testing procedures for this problem have been proposed in [DK16], and [BW19] has revisited the problem in a minimax framework similar to the one considered in this paper (without privacy constraints). Note that before these papers, the majority of the works on this problem focused on the case where P_0 is the uniform distribution, or considered a worst-case setting. The upper and lower bounds obtained in [VV17] and [BW19] appear to match in most usual cases but do not match for some pathological distributions. This problem has been fixed in [CC20], where the authors provide matching upper and lower bounds on the minimax separation distance for separation norm $\|\cdot\|_t$, t in [1,2]. As for the continuous case, [BW19] studies goodness-of-fit testing for densities with separation norm $\|\cdot\|_1$, focusing on the case of Hölder continuous densities. As it has already been observed for the discrete case, they prove that the local minimax testing radius (or minimax separation distance) strongly depends on the null distribution. We extend their results to the private setting.

Many papers have been devoted to the study of testing problems under global differential privacy constraints. This includes goodness-of-fit testing [Gab+16; ASZ18; ADR18; CDK17; WLK15], independence testing [Gab+16; WLK15] and closeness testing [ASZ18; ADR18]. In the local setting of differential privacy, [KOV14; KOV16; Jos+19] study simple hypothesis testing, and [GR18; She18; Ach+19] consider independence testing. Some of these references and a few others also deal with goodness-of-fit testing under local differential privacy constraints: [GR18] studies the asymptotic distribution of several test statistics used for fitting multinomial distributions, while [She18] and [Ach+19] provide upper and lower bounds on the sample complexity for fitting more general but finitely supported discrete distributions. However, [Ach+19] considers only the case where the null distribution P_0 is the uniform distribution, and both papers prove lower bounds only with respect to the choice of the test statistic for a fixed specific privacy mechanism. In the minimax results below we prove optimality over all test statistics and also over all privacy mechanisms submitted to the local differential privacy constraints.

Minimax goodness-of-fit testing for discrete random variables has first been studied with \mathbb{L}_2 separation norm in [LLL20]. They consider the non-interactive scenario exclusively, and their lower bound result is proven for the uniform distribution P_0 under the null. Lam-Weil *et al.* [LLL20] also tackles the problem of goodness-of-fit testing for continuous random variables with $\|\cdot\|_2$ separation norm. They are the first to study minimax testing rates for the problem of goodness-of-fit testing for compactly supported densities over Besov balls $\mathcal{B}_{2,\infty}^s(L)$ in the setting of non-interactive local differential privacy. They provide an upper bound which holds for any density f_0 , and a matching lower bound in the special case where f_0 is the uniform density over [0,1]. In a parallel work, [BRS20] investigates the estimation of the integrated square of a density over general Besov classes $\mathcal{B}_{p,q}^s$, and prove that allowing for sequential interaction improves over the results obtained in the non-interactive scenario in terms of minimax estimation rates. As an application, they discuss non-interactive and sequentially interactive L_2 -goodness-of-fit testing for densities supported on [0,1] which lie in Besov balls. They thus extend the results obtained in [LLL20] to more general Besov balls, to the interactive scenario, and to the case where f_0 is not assumed to be the uniform distribution, but has to be bounded from below on its support.

Later, locally differentially private goodness-of-fit testing for discrete random variables (not necessarily finite supported) has been studied in [BB20] in a minimax framework. The authors aim at computing the minimax testing rates when $d(P, P_0) = \sum_{j=1}^d |P(j) - P_0(j)|^i$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. They provide upper bounds on the minimax testing rates by constructing and analysing specific private testing procedures, complement these results with lower bounds, and investigate the optimality of their results for several choices of the null distribution P_0 . Interestingly, they tackle both the sequentially interactive case and the non-interactive case and prove that the minimax testing rates are improved when sequential interaction is allowed. Such a phenomenon appears neither for simple hypothesis testing [Jos+19], nor for many estimation problems (see for instance [DJW18; BB19; RS20; But+20]).

We pursue these works by considering goodness-of-fit testing of Hölder-smooth probability densities and the separation norm $\|\cdot\|_1$. Moreover, similarly to [BW19], we consider densities with Hölder smoothness β in (0,1] and that can tend to 0 on their support, with possibly unbounded support. Our goal is to show how differential privacy affects the minimax separation radius for this goodness-of-fit test. Balakrishnan and Wasserman[BW19], following works in discrete testing initiated by [VV17], have shown that two procedures need to be aggregated in this case. They split the support of the density f_0 into a compact set B where f_0 is bounded from below by some positive constant and they build a weighted \mathbb{L}_2 test on this set; then they build a tail test on \overline{B} which is based on estimates of the total probabilities $(P - P_0)(\overline{B})$. They show that the separation rates are of order

$$\left(\frac{(\int_B f_0(x)^{\gamma} dx)^{1/\gamma}}{n}\right)^{\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+d}}, \quad \text{where } \gamma = \frac{2\beta}{3\beta+d},$$

for d-dimensional observations and depend of f_0 via an integral functional. The cut-off (choice of B) will depend on n and their separation rates are not minimax optimal due to different cut-offs in the upper and lower bounds.

We show that under local differential privacy constraints, we get for an optimal choice of B the separation rates

$$|B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$

when only non-interactive privacy mechanisms are allowed, and we show that better rates are obtained

$$|B|^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+2}}$$

when interactive privacy mechanims are allowed (using previously published privatized information). We see that our rates only depend on f_0 in a global way through the length |B| of the set B and that explains why we do not need to weight the \mathbb{L}_2 test statistic. Further work will include extension to more general Hölder and Besov classes with $\beta > 0$ and adaptation to the smoothness β by aggregation of an increasing number of tests as introduced by [Spo96].

Organization of the paper

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the notion of local differential privacy and describe the minimax framework considered in the rest of the paper. In Section 3 we introduce a non-interactive privacy mechanism and an associated testing procedure. Its analysis leads to an upper bound on the non-interactive testing radius which is complemented by a lower bound. In Section 4 we give a lower bound on the testing radius for the sequentially interactive scenario and present a sequentially interactive testing procedure which improves on the rates of the non interactive case. In Section 5 we prove that our results are optimal (at most up to a logarithmic factor) for several choices of the null density f_0 .

2 Problem statement

Let $(X_1, ..., X_n) \in \mathcal{X}^n$ be i.i.d. with common probability density function (pdf) $f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}_+$. We assume that f belongs to the smoothness class $H(\beta, L)$ for some smoothness $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and L > 0, where

$$H(\beta, L) = \left\{ f : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}_+ : |f(x) - f(y)| \le L|x - y|^{\beta}, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{X} \right\}$$

In the sequel, we will omit the space \mathcal{X} in the definition of functions f and f_0 and integrals, and we will choose a set B such that $B \subset \mathcal{X}$ and denote by $\overline{B} = \mathcal{X} \setminus B$.

Given a probability density function f_0 in $H(\beta, L_0)$ for some $L_0 < L$, we want to solve the goodness-of-fit test

$$H_0$$
 : $f \equiv f_0$
 $H_1(\rho)$: $f \in H(\beta, L)$ and $||f - f_0||_1 \ge \rho$,

where $\rho > 0$ under an α -local differential privacy constraint. We will consider two classes of locally differentially private mechanisms : sequentially interactive mechanisms and non-interactive mechanisms. In the sequentially interactive scenario, privatized data Z_1, \ldots, Z_n are obtained by successively applying suitable Markov kernels : given $X_i = x_i$ and $Z_1 = z_1, \ldots, Z_{i-1} = z_{i-1}$, the i-th data-holder draws

$$Z_i \sim Q_i(\cdot \mid X_i = x, Z_1 = z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1} = z_{i-1})$$

for some Markov kernel $Q_i: \mathscr{Z} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{Z}^{i-1} \to [0,1]$ where the measure spaces of the non-private and private data are denoted with $(\mathcal{X}, \mathscr{X})$ and $(\mathscr{Z}, \mathscr{Z})$, respectively. We say that the sequence of Markov kernels $(Q_i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$ provides α -local differential privacy or that Z_1, \dots, Z_n are α -local differentially private views of X_1, \dots, X_n if

$$\sup_{A \in \mathscr{Z}} \sup_{z_1, \dots, z_{i-1} \in \mathscr{Z}} \sup_{x, x' \in \mathscr{X}} \frac{Q_i(A \mid X_i = x, Z_1 = z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1} = z_{i-1})}{Q_i(A \mid X_i = x', Z_1 = z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1} = z_{i-1})} \le e^{\alpha}, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n.$$
(1)

We will denote by Q_{α} the set of all α -LDP sequentially interactive mechanisms. In the noninteractive scenario Z_i depends only on X_i but not on Z_k for k < i. We have

$$Z_i \sim Q_i(\cdot \mid X_i = x_i)$$

and condition (1) becomes

$$\sup_{A \in \mathscr{Z}} \sup_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{Q_i(A \mid X_i = x)}{Q_i(A \mid X_i = x')} \le e^{\alpha}, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

We will denote by $\mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\text{NI}}$ the set of all α -LDP non-interactive mechanisms. Given an α -LDP privacy mechanism Q, let $\Phi_Q = \{\phi : \mathcal{Z}^n \to \{0,1\}\}$ denote the set of all tests based on Z_1, \ldots, Z_n .

The sequentially interactive α -LDP minimax testing risk is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\rho) := \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\alpha} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_Q} \sup_{f \in H_1(\rho)} \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(\phi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(\phi = 0) \right\}.$$

We define similarly the non-interactive α -LDP minimax testing risk $\mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\rho)$, where the first infimum is taken over the set $\mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}$ instead of \mathcal{Q}_{α} . Given $\gamma \in (0,1)$, we study the α -LDP minimax testing radius defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) := \inf \left\{ \rho > 0 : \mathcal{R}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\rho) \le \gamma \right\},\$$

and we define similarly $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma)$.

Notation For any positive integer number n, we denote by $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ the set of integer values $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$. If B is a compact set on \mathbb{R} , we denote by |B| its length (its Lebesgue measure). For any function ψ and any positive real number h, we denote the rescaled function by $\psi_h = \frac{1}{h}\psi(\frac{1}{h})$. For two sequences $(a_n)_n$ and (b_n) , we denote by $a_n \leq b_n$ that there exists some constant C > 0 such that $a_n \leq Cb_n$, and we write $a_n \approx b_n$ if both $a_n \leq b_n$ and $b_n \leq a_n$.

3 Non-interactive Privacy Mechanisms

In this section we design a non-interactive α -locally differentially private mechanism and the associated testing procedure. We study successively its first and second type error probabilities in order to obtain an upper bound on the testing radius $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma)$. We then present a lower bound on the testing radius. The test and privacy mechanism proposed in this section will turn out to be (nearly) optimal for many choices of f_0 since the lower bound and the upper bound match up to a logarithmic factor for several f_0 , see Section 5 for many examples.

3.1 Upper bound in the non-interactive scenario

We propose a testing procedure that, like [BW19], combines an \mathbb{L}_2 procedure on a bulk set B where the density f_0 under the null is bounded away from 0 by some (small) constant and an \mathbb{L}_1 procedure on the tail \overline{B} . However, we note that, unlike [BW19], the rate depends on f_0 in a global way, only through the length |B| of the set B. Our procedure also translates to the case of continuous distributions the one proposed by Berrett and Butucea [BB20] for locally private testing of discrete distributions. It consists in the following steps:

- 1. Consider a compact set $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ (its choice depends on f_0 , and on values of n and α).
- 2. Using the first half of the (privatized) data, define an estimator S_B of $\int_B (f f_0)^2$.
- 3. Using the second half of the (privatized) data, define an estimator T_B of $\int_{\bar{B}} (f f_0)$.
- 4. Reject H_0 if either $S_B \ge t_1$ or $T_B \ge t_2$.

Assume without loss of generality that the sample size is even and equal to 2n so that we can split the data into equal parts, X_1, \ldots, X_n and X_{n+1}, \ldots, X_{2n} . Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a nonempty compact set, and let $(B_j)_{j=1,\ldots,N}$ be a partition of B, h > 0 be the bandwidth and (x_1, \ldots, x_N) be the centering points, that is $B_j = [x_j - h, x_j + h]$ for all $j \in [\![1, N]\!]$. Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function satisfying the following assumptions.

Assumption 3.1. ψ is a bounded function supported in [-1, 1] such that

$$\int_{-1}^{1} \psi(t) dt = 1, \text{ and } \int_{-1}^{1} |t|^{\beta} |\psi(t)| dt < \infty.$$

In particular, Assumption 3.1 implies that $\psi_h(x_j - y) = 0$ if $y \notin B_j$, where $\psi_h(u) = \frac{1}{h}\psi(\frac{u}{h})$. We now define our first privacy mechanism. For $i \in [\![1, n]\!]$ and $j \in [\![1, N]\!]$ set

$$Z_{ij} = \frac{1}{h}\psi\left(\frac{x_j - X_i}{h}\right) + \frac{2\|\psi\|_{\infty}}{\alpha h}W_{ij},$$

where $(W_{ij})_{i \in [\![1,n]\!], j \in [\![1,N]\!]}$ is a sequence of i.i.d Laplace(1) random variables. Using these privatized data, we define the following U-statistic of order 2.

$$S_B := \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq k} (Z_{ij} - f_0(x_j)) (Z_{kj} - f_0(x_j)).$$

The second half of the sample is used to design a tail test. For all $i \in [n + 1, 2n]$ set

$$Z_i = \pm c_{\alpha}$$
, with probabilities $\frac{1}{2} \left(1 \pm \frac{I(X_i \notin B)}{c_{\alpha}} \right)$

where $c_{\alpha} = (e^{\alpha} + 1)/(e^{\alpha} - 1)$. Using these private data, we define the following statistic.

$$T_B = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} Z_i - \int_{\overline{B}} f_0.$$

We then put

$$\Phi = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } S_B \ge t_1 \text{ or } T_B \ge t_2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$
(2)

where

$$t_1 = \frac{3}{2} L_0^2 C_\beta^2 N h^{2\beta} + \frac{196 \|\psi\|_\infty^2 \sqrt{N}}{\gamma n \alpha^2 h^2}, \quad t_2 = \sqrt{\frac{20}{n \alpha^2 \gamma}}, \quad (3)$$

with $C_{\beta} = \int_{-1}^{1} |u|^{\beta} |\psi(u)| du$. The privacy mechanism that outputs $(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n, Z_{n+1}, \ldots, Z_{2n})$ is non-interactive since for all $i \in [\![1, 2n]\!] Z_i$ depends only on X_i . The following result establishes that this mechanism also provides α -local differential privacy. Its proof is deferred to Section A.1 in the Appendix.

Proposition 3.2. For all $i \in [\![1, 2n]\!]$, Z_i is an α -locally differentially private view of X_i .

The following proposition studies the properties of the test statistics. Its proof is given in the Appendix A.2.

Proposition 3.3. 1. It holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f}^{n}}[S_{B}] = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left([\psi_{h} * f](x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j}) \right)^{2}.$$
(4)

Under Assumption 3.1 it also holds if $\alpha \in (0, 1]$

$$Var_{Q_{f}^{n}}(S_{B}) \leq \frac{36\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{n\alpha^{2}h^{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left([\psi_{h} * f](x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j}) \right)^{2} + \frac{164\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{4}N}{n(n-1)\alpha^{4}h^{4}}.$$
(5)

2. It holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[T_B] = \int_{\overline{B}} (f - f_0), \quad and \quad Var_{Q_f^n}(T_B) = \frac{1}{n} \left(c_\alpha^2 - \left(\int_{\overline{B}} f \right)^2 \right).$$

The study of the first and second type error probabilities of the test Φ in (2) with a convenient choice of h leads to the following upper bound on $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma)$.

Theorem 3.4. Assume that $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\beta \leq 1$. The test procedure Φ in (2) with t_1 and t_2 in (3) and bandwidth h given by $h \asymp |B|^{-1/(4\beta+3)} (n\alpha^2)^{-2/(4\beta+3)}$ attains the following bound on the separation rate

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{NI}(f_0,\gamma) \le C(L,\gamma,\psi) \cdot \left\{ |B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \int_{\overline{B}} f_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \right\},$$

for all compact set $B \subset \mathbb{R}$.

The proof can be found in Appendix A.2. Note that the tightest upper bound is obtained for the sets *B* that minimize the right-hand sides in Theorem 3.4. In order to do this, we note that the upper bounds sum a term which increases with *B*, a term which decreases with *B*: $\int_{\overline{B}} f_0$ and a term $1/\sqrt{n\alpha^2}$ free of *B*. Thus we suggest to choose $B = B_{n,\alpha}$ as a level set

$$B_{n,\alpha} \in \arg\inf_{B \text{ compact set}} \left\{ |B| : \int_{\overline{B}} f_0 \ge |B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \text{ and } \inf_{B} f_0 \ge \sup_{\overline{B}} f_0 \right\}.$$
(6)

3.2 Lower bound in the non-interactive scenario

We now complete the study of the testing radius $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma)$ with the following lower bound.

Theorem 3.5. Let $\alpha > 0$. Assume that $\beta \leq 1$. Set $z_{\alpha} = e^{2\alpha} - e^{-2\alpha}$ and $C_0(B) = \min\{f_0(x) : x \in B\}$. For all compact set $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ we get

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{NI}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\gamma,L,L_0) \left[\log \left(C|B|^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (nz_{\alpha}^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \min \left\{ |B|C_0(B), |B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \right\}.$$

If, moreover, the compact set B is satisfying

$$|B|^{\beta/(4\beta+3)}C_0(B) \ge C(nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-2\beta/(4\beta+3)}$$
(7)

for some C > 0, it holds

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{NI}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\gamma,L,L_0) \left[\log \left(C|B|^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (nz_{\alpha}^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} |B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}.$$

Discussion of the optimality of the bounds. The choice of the set *B* is crucial for obtaining matching rates in the upper and lower bounds.

In the case where the support \mathcal{X} of f_0 is compact with $c_1 \leq |\mathcal{X}| \leq c_2$ for two constants $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 > 0$ and if f_0 is bounded from below on \mathcal{X} , one can take $B = \mathcal{X}$. Indeed, for such functions, the choice $B = \mathcal{X}$ yields an upper bound of order $(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$. Moreover, (7) holds with this choice of B and Theorem 3.5 proves that the upper bound is optimal up to (at most) a logarithmic factor. In the case of densities with bounded support but which can tend to 0 on their support, and in the case of densities with unbounded support, we suggest to choose $B = B_{n,\alpha}$ as defined in (6) both in the upper and lower bounds.

By inspection of the proof, we can also write that $B_{n,\alpha}$ in (6) is such that

$$B_{n,\alpha} \in \arg \inf_{B \text{ compact set}} \left\{ |B| : \int_{\overline{B}} f_0 \ge \psi_{n,\alpha}(B) \text{ and } \inf_{B} f_0 \ge \sup_{\overline{B}} f_0 \right\},\$$

where $\psi_{n,\alpha}(B) = |B|h^{\beta} + \frac{|B|^{3/4}}{h^{3/4}\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} = |B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}}$ for an optimal choice of $h = h^*(B) = (|B|^{1/2}n\alpha^2)^{-2/(4\beta+3)}$. Indeed, we choose $B_{n,\alpha}$ as a level set such that $\int_{\overline{B}} f_0$ (which is decreasing with B) be equal to $\psi_{n,\alpha}(B)$ (which is increasing with B). For the choices $B = B_{n,\alpha}$ and $h = h^*(B_{n,\alpha})$ we thus obtain an upper bound on $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma)$ of order

$$|B_{n,\alpha}|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}}$$

Recall that f_0 is a Hölder smooth function and thus uniformly bounded. Moreover, $\psi_{n,\alpha}(B)$ and $\int_{\overline{B}} f_0$ are continuous quantities of the length of the set B when it varies in the family of level sets. Thus, for small rates $\psi_{n,\alpha}(B_{n,\alpha})$ we have necessarily $\int_{B_{n,\alpha}} f_0$ that does not tend to 0, hence $|B_{n,\alpha}|$ does not tend to 0. Then the term $|B_{n,\alpha}|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$ will be dominant.

The following proposition gives a sufficient condition so that our upper and lower bounds match up to a logarithmic factor.

Proposition 3.6. Let $B_{n,\alpha}$ be defined by (6). If there exists a compact set $K \subset \overline{B}_{n,\alpha}$ and some $c \in]0,1[$ such that

$$\int_{K} f_0 \ge c \int_{\overline{B}_{n,\alpha}} f_0 \quad and \quad c \frac{|B_{n,\alpha}|}{|K|} \gtrsim 1,$$
(8)

then it holds

$$\left[\log\left(|B_{n,\alpha}|^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}}\right)\right]^{-1}|B_{n,\alpha}|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{NI}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim |B_{n,\alpha}|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$

Proof. Indeed, if K satisfies (8), then it holds

$$\int_{K} f_0 \leq |K| \sup_{K} f_0 \leq |K| \sup_{\overline{B}_{n,\alpha}} f_0 \leq |K| \inf_{B_{n,\alpha}} f_0,$$

and

$$\int_{K} f_0 \ge c \int_{\overline{B}_{n,\alpha}} f_0 \ge c \psi_{n,\alpha}(B_{n,\alpha}) \ge c |B_{n,\alpha}| \left(h^*(B_{n,\alpha})\right)^{\beta} \gtrsim |K| \left(h^*(B_{n,\alpha})\right)^{\beta}$$

which yields $\inf_{B_{n,\alpha}} f_0 \gtrsim (h^*(B_{n,\alpha}))^{\beta}$, and condition (7) is thus satisfied with $B = B_{n,\alpha}$. Thus, the choice $B = B_{n,\alpha}$ ends the proof of the proposition.

Let us now discuss a sufficient condition for the existence of a compact set $K \subset \overline{B}_{n,\alpha}$ satisfying (8). Let us consider the special case of decreasing densities f_0 with support $\mathcal{X} = [0, +\infty)$. Note that for such functions, $B_{n,\alpha}$ takes the form $B_{n,\alpha} = [0, a]$. Writing $f_0(x) = \ell(x)/(1+x)$, a sufficient condition for the existence of a compact set $K \subset \overline{B}_{n,\alpha}$ satisfying (8) is that

$$\sup_{x \ge 1} \frac{\ell(tx)}{\ell(x)} \le c$$

for some constant c < 1 and some t > 1. Indeed, in this case, taking K = [a, ta], it holds $c|B_{n,\alpha}|/|K| = c/t$, and

$$\int_{ta}^{\infty} f_0 \leq c \int_{ta}^{\infty} \frac{\ell(x/t)}{1+x} dx = ct \int_a^{\infty} \frac{\ell(u)}{1+tu} du \leq c \left(\sup_{x \geq a} \frac{t(1+x)}{1+tx} \right) \int_a^{\infty} \frac{\ell(u)}{1+u} du$$
$$\leq c \left(1 + \frac{t-1}{1+ta} \right) \int_a^{\infty} f_0,$$

and thus

$$\frac{\int_K f_0}{\int_{\overline{B}_{n,\alpha}} f_0} = 1 - \frac{\int_{ta}^{\infty} f_0}{\int_a^{\infty} f_0} \ge 1 - c\{1 + o(1)\},$$

and (8) is satisfied if a is large enough. In this case our upper and lower bounds match up to a logarithmic factor.

Note that f_0 in Example 5.2 checks the condition for all t > 1 and the only example where this condition is not satisfied is Example 5.8. In the latter, the density $f_0(x) = \frac{A \log(2)^A}{(x+2)(\log(x+2))^{A+1}}$, $x \in [0, \infty)$, for some A > 0 arbitrarily small but fixed, has very slowly decreasing tails. An additional logarithmic factor is lost in the lower bounds in this least favorable case.

Proof of Theorem 3.5. We use the well-known reduction technique. The idea is to build a family $\{f_{\nu}: \nu \in \mathcal{V}\}\$ that belong to the alternative set of densities $H_1(\rho)$ and then reduce the test problem to testing between f_0 and the mixture of the f_{ν} . Our construction of such functions is inspired by the one proposed in [LLL20] for goodness-of-fit testing over Besov Balls $\mathcal{B}_{2,\infty}^s$ in the special case where f_0 is the uniform distribution over [0, 1], and in [BRS20] for the minimax estimation over Besov ellipsoids $\mathcal{B}_{p,q}^s$ of the integrated square of a density supported in [0,1]. However, we need to make some modifications in order to consider Hölder smoothness instead of Besov smoothness and to tackle the case of densities with unbounded support. Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a nonempty compact set, and let $(B_j)_{j=1,\dots,N}$ be a partition of B, h > 0 be the bandwidth and (x_1,\dots,x_N) be the centering points, that is $B_j = [x_j - h, x_j + h]$ for all $j \in [1, N]$. Let $\psi : [-1, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\psi \in H(\beta, L), \ \int \psi = 0 \text{ and } \int \psi^2 = 1. \text{ For } j \in [\![1, N]\!], \text{ define}$

$$\psi_j : t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \psi\left(\frac{t-x_j}{h}\right).$$

Note that the support of ψ_j is B_j , $\int \psi_j = 0$ and $(\psi_j)_{j=1,\dots,N}$ is an orthonormal family. Fix a privacy mechanism $Q = (Q_1, \dots, Q_n) \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}$. According to lemma B.3 in [BRS20], we can consider for every $i \in [\![1,n]\!]$ a probability measure μ_i on \mathcal{Z}_i and a family of μ_i -densities $(q_i(\cdot \mid x))_{x \in \mathbb{R}}$ such that for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ one has $dQ_i(\cdot \mid x) = q_i(\cdot \mid x)d\mu_i$ and $e^{-\alpha} \leq q_i(\cdot \mid x) \leq e^{\alpha}$. Denote by $g_{0,i}(z_i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} q_i(z_i \mid x) f_0(x) dx$ the density of Z_i when X_i has density f_0 . Define for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$ the operator $K_i : L_2(\mathbb{R}) \to L_2(\mathcal{Z}_i, d\mu_i)$ by

$$K_i f = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{q_i(\cdot \mid x) f(x) \mathbb{1}_B(x)}{\sqrt{g_{0,i}(\cdot)}} \mathrm{d}x, \quad f \in L_2(\mathbb{R}).$$

Note that this operator is well-defined since $g_{0,i}(z_i) \ge \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-\alpha} f_0(x) dx = e^{-\alpha} > 0$ for all z_i . Observe that its adjoint operator K_i^{\star} is given by

$$K_i^{\star}: \ell \in L_2(\mathcal{Z}_i, d\mu_i) \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \frac{\ell(z_i)q_i(z_i \mid \cdot)\mathbb{1}_B(\cdot)}{\sqrt{g_{0,i}(z_i)}} \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i).$$

Using Fubini's theorem we thus have for all $f \in L_2(\mathbb{R})$

$$K_i^* K_i f = \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{q_i(z_i \mid y) f(y) \mathbb{1}_B(y)}{\sqrt{g_{0,i}(z_i)}} \mathrm{d}y \right) \frac{q_i(z_i \mid \cdot) \mathbb{1}_B(\cdot)}{\sqrt{g_{0,i}(z_i)}} \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i)$$
$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \frac{q_i(z_i \mid y) q_i(z_i \mid \cdot) \mathbb{1}_B(y) \mathbb{1}_B(\cdot)}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i) \right) f(y) \mathrm{d}y,$$

meaning that $K_i^* K_i$ is an integral operator with kernel $F_i(x, y) = \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \frac{q_i(z_i|y)\mathbf{1}_B(y)\mathbf{1}_B(y)\mathbf{1}_B(y)}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} d\mu_i(z_i).$ Define the operator

$$K = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} K_i^{\star} K_i,$$

which is symmetric and positive semidefinite. Define also

$$W_N = \operatorname{span}\{\psi_j, j = 1, \dots, N\}.$$

Let (v_1,\ldots,v_N) be an orthonormal family of eigenfunctions of K as an operator on the linear $L_2(\mathbb{R})$ -subspace W_N . Note that since v_k can be written as a linear combination of the ψ_i 's, it holds $\int_{\mathbb{R}} v_k = 0$ and $\operatorname{Supp}(v_k) \subset B$. We also denote by $\lambda_1^2, \ldots, \lambda_N^2$ the corresponding eigenvalues. Note that they are non-negative.

Define the functions

$$f_{\nu}: x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto f_0(x) + \delta \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\nu_j}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} v_j(x),$$

where for $j = 1, ..., N \nu_j \in \{-1, 1\}, \delta > 0$ may depend on $B, h, N, \psi, \gamma, L, L_0, \beta, n$ and α , and will be specified later, and

$$\tilde{\lambda_j} = \max\left\{\frac{\lambda_j}{z_{\alpha}}, \sqrt{2h}\right\}, \quad z_{\alpha} = e^{2\alpha} - e^{-2\alpha}.$$

The following lemma shows that for δ properly chosen, for most of the possible $\nu \in \{-1, 1\}^N$, f_{ν} is a density belonging to $H(\beta, L)$ and f_{ν} is sufficiently far away from f_0 in a L_1 sense.

Lemma 3.7. Let \mathbb{P}_{ν} denote the uniform distribution on $\{-1,1\}^N$. Let b > 0. If the parameter δ appearing in the definition of f_{ν} satisfies

$$\delta \leq \frac{h}{\sqrt{\log(2N/b)}} \min\left\{\frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{L_0}{L}\right)h^{\beta}\right\},\,$$

where $C_0(B) := \min\{f_0(x) : x \in B\}$, then there exists a subset $A_b \subseteq \{-1, 1\}^N$ with $\mathbb{P}_{\nu}(A_b) \ge 1 - b$ such that

- i) $f_{\nu} \geq 0$ and $\int f_{\nu} = 1$, for all $\nu \in A_b$,
- *ii)* $f_{\nu} \in H(\beta, L)$, for all $\nu \in A_b$,
- *iii)* $||f_{\nu} f_0||_1 \ge \frac{3C_1}{8} \frac{\delta N}{\sqrt{\log(\frac{2N}{b})}}$, for all $\nu \in A_b$, with $C_1 = \int_{-1}^1 |\psi|$.

Denote by $g_{\nu,i}(z_i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} q_i(z_i \mid x) f_{\nu}(x) dx$ the density of Z_i when X_i has density f_{ν} , and

$$dQ_n(z_1,\ldots,z_n) = \mathbb{E}_{\nu}\left[\prod_{i=1}^n g_{\nu,i}(z_i) \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i)\right]$$

If δ is chosen such that $\delta \leq \frac{h}{\sqrt{\log(2N/b)}} \min\left\{\frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{L_0}{L}\right)h^{\beta}\right\}$, setting

$$\rho^{\star} = \frac{3C_1}{8} \frac{\delta N}{\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}},$$

we deduce from the above lemma that if

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n}\left[\left(\frac{dQ_n}{dQ_{f_0}^n}\right)^2\right] \le 1 + (1 - \gamma - b)^2 \text{ for all } Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}},\tag{9}$$

then it holds

$$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}^{\mathrm{NI}}_{\alpha}} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_Q} \sup_{f \in H_1(\rho^{\star})} \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(\phi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(\phi = 0) \right\} \ge \gamma$$

where $H_1(\rho^*) := \{f \in H(\beta, L) : f \ge 0, \int f = 1, \|f - f_0\|_1 \ge \rho^*\}$, and consequently $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{NI}}(f_0, \gamma) \ge \rho^*$. Indeed, if (9) holds, then we have

$$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_{Q}} \sup_{f \in H_{1}(\rho^{\star})} \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}}(\phi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(\phi = 0) \right\}$$

$$\geq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_{Q}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}}(\phi = 1) + \sup_{\nu \in A_{b}} \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{\nu}}^{n}}(\phi = 0) \right)$$

$$\geq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_{Q}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}}(\phi = 1) + \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \left[I(\nu \in A_{b}) \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{\nu}}^{n}}(\phi = 0) \right] \right)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{\nu}\left[I(\nu \in A_b)\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{\nu}}^n}(\phi=0)\right] = \mathbb{P}_{Q_n}(\phi=0) - \mathbb{E}_{\nu}\left[I(\nu \in A_b^c)\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{\nu}}^n}(\phi=0)\right]$$
$$\geq \mathbb{P}_{Q_n}(\phi=0) - \mathbb{P}_{\nu}(A_b^c)$$
$$\geq \mathbb{P}_{Q_n}(\phi=0) - b.$$

Thus, if (9) holds, we have

$$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_{Q}} \sup_{f \in H_{1}(\rho^{\star})} \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}}(\phi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(\phi = 0) \right\}$$

$$\geq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_{Q}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}}(\phi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_{n}}(\phi = 0) - b \right)$$

$$\geq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}} \left(1 - \mathrm{TV}(Q_{n}, Q_{f_{0}}^{n}) - b \right)$$

$$= \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}} \left(1 - b - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}} \left[\left(\frac{dQ_{n}}{dQ_{f_{0}}^{n}} \right)^{2} \right] - 1} \right) \geq \gamma.$$

We now prove that (9) holds under an extra assumption on δ .

We have that

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n} \left[\left(\frac{dQ_n}{dQ_{f_0}^n} \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n} \left[\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\nu} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n g_{\nu,i}(Z_i) \right]}{\prod_{i=1}^n g_{0,i}(Z_i)} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\nu,\nu'} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \delta \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\nu_k}{\tilde{\lambda}_k} \cdot \frac{\langle q_i(Z_i \mid \cdot), v_k \rangle}{g_{0,i}(Z_i)} \right) \cdot \left(1 + \delta \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\nu'_k}{\tilde{\lambda}_k} \cdot \frac{\langle q_i(Z_i \mid \cdot), v_k \rangle}{g_{0,i}(Z_i)} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\nu,\nu'} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \delta \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\nu_k}{\tilde{\lambda}_k} \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}} \left[\frac{\langle q_i(Z_i \mid \cdot), v_k \rangle}{g_{0,i}(Z_i)} \right] + \delta \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\nu'_k}{\tilde{\lambda}_k} \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}} \left[\frac{\langle q_i(Z_i \mid \cdot), v_k \rangle}{g_{0,i}(Z_i)} \right] \right. \\ &\left. + \delta^2 \sum_{k_1, k_2 = 1}^N \frac{\nu_{k_1} \nu'_{k_2}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{k_1} \tilde{\lambda}_{k_2}} \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}} \left[\frac{\langle q_i(Z_i \mid \cdot), v_{k_1} \rangle \langle q_i(Z_i \mid \cdot), v_{k_2} \rangle}{(g_{0,i}(Z_i))^2} \right] \right), \end{split}$$

where we have interverted $\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\nu,\nu'}$ and used the independence of the $Z_i, i = 1, \ldots, n$. Now, observe that

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}} \left[\frac{\langle q_i(Z_i \mid \cdot), v_k \rangle}{g_{0,i}(Z_i)} \right] &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \frac{\langle q_i(z_i \mid \cdot), v_k \rangle}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} \cdot g_{0,i}(z_i) \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} q_i(z_i \mid x) v_k(x) \mathrm{d}x \right) \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} v_k = 0, \end{split}$$

and, using that $\operatorname{Supp}(v_k) \subset B$ for all k,

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}} \left[\frac{\langle q_i(Z_i \mid \cdot), v_{k_1} \rangle \langle q_i(Z_i \mid \cdot), v_{k_2} \rangle}{(g_{0,i}(Z_i))^2} \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \frac{\langle q_i(z_i \mid \cdot), v_{k_1} \rangle \langle q_i(z_i \mid \cdot), v_{k_2} \rangle}{(g_{0,i}(z_i))^2} \cdot g_{0,i}(z_i) \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \frac{1}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} q_i(z_i \mid x) v_{k_1}(x) \mathrm{d}x \right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} q_i(z_i \mid y) v_{k_2}(y) \mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \frac{q_i(z_i \mid x) q_i(z_i \mid y) \mathbb{1}_B(x) \mathbb{1}_B(y)}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i) \right) v_{k_1}(x) v_{k_2}(y) \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} F_i(x, y) v_{k_1}(x) v_{k_2}(y) \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y = \langle v_{k_1}, K_i^* K_i v_{k_2} \rangle. \end{split}$$

Using $1 + x \leq \exp(x)$, we thus obtain

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n} \left[\left(\frac{dQ_n}{dQ_{f_0}^n} \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\nu,\nu'} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \delta^2 \sum_{k_1,k_2=1}^N \frac{\nu_{k_1}\nu'_{k_2}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{k_1}\tilde{\lambda}_{k_2}} \langle v_{k_1}, K_i^* K_i v_{k_2} \rangle \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\nu,\nu'} \left[\exp\left(\delta^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k_1,k_2=1}^N \frac{\nu_{k_1}\nu'_{k_2}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{k_1}\tilde{\lambda}_{k_2}} \langle v_{k_1}, K_i^* K_i v_{k_2} \rangle \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\nu,\nu'} \left[\exp\left(n\delta^2 \sum_{k_1,k_2=1}^N \frac{\nu_{k_1}\nu'_{k_2}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{k_1}\tilde{\lambda}_{k_2}} \langle v_{k_1}, Kv_{k_2} \rangle \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\nu,\nu'} \left[\exp\left(n\delta^2 \sum_{k_1,k_2=1}^N \frac{\nu_{k_1}\nu'_{k_2}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{k_1}\tilde{\lambda}_{k_2}} \cdot \lambda_{k_2}^2 \langle v_{k_1}, v_{k_2} \rangle \right) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\nu,\nu'} \left[\exp\left(n\delta^2 z_\alpha^2 \sum_{k=1}^N \nu_k \nu'_k \right) \right], \end{split}$$

where we have used that

$$\frac{\lambda_k^2}{\tilde{\lambda}_k^2} = \frac{\lambda_k^2}{\max\{z_\alpha^{-2}\lambda_k^2, 2h\}} \le z_\alpha^2.$$

Now, using that for k = 1, ..., N, ν_k , ν'_k are Rademacher distributed and independent random variables, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n} \left[\left(\frac{dQ_n}{dQ_{f_0}^n} \right)^2 \right] \le \mathbb{E}_{\nu,\nu'} \left[\prod_{k=1}^N \exp\left(n\delta^2 z_\alpha^2 \nu_k \nu'_k \right) \right] \\ = \mathbb{E}_{\nu} \left[\prod_{k=1}^N \cosh\left(n\delta^2 z_\alpha^2 \nu_k \right) \right] = \prod_{k=1}^N \cosh\left(n\delta^2 z_\alpha^2 \right) \le \exp\left(\frac{Nn^2 \delta^4 z_\alpha^4}{2} \right),$$

where the last inequality follows from $\cosh(x) \le \exp(x^2/2)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, (9) holds as soon as $\left[2\log\left(1+(1-b-c)^2\right)\right]^{1/4}$

$$\delta \leq \left[\frac{2\log\left(1 + (1 - b - \gamma)^2\right)}{Nn^2 z_{\alpha}^4}\right] \quad .$$

Finally, taking $\delta = \min\left\{\frac{h}{\sqrt{\log(2N/b)}}\min\left\{\frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{L_0}{L}\right)h^{\beta}\right\}, \left[\frac{2\log\left(1 + (1 - b - \gamma)^2\right)}{Nn^2 z_{\alpha}^4}\right]^{1/4}\right\}$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\psi,b,\gamma) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log\left(2N/b\right)}} \min\left\{\frac{|B|}{\sqrt{\log\left(2N/b\right)}} \min\left\{\frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{L_0}{L}\right)h^{\beta}\right\}, \frac{N^{3/4}}{\sqrt{nz_{\alpha}^2}}\right\}$$

If B is chosen such that $C_0(B) = \min\{f_0(x), x \in B\} \ge Ch^{\beta}$, then the bound becomes

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\psi,b,\gamma,L,L_0) \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log\left(2N/b\right)}} \min\left\{\frac{|B|h^{\beta}}{\sqrt{\log(2N/b)}}, \frac{N^{3/4}}{\sqrt{nz_{\alpha}^2}}\right\},$$

and the choice $h \asymp |B|^{-1/(4\beta+3)} (n z_{\alpha}^2)^{-2/(4\beta+3)}$ yields

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\rm NI}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\psi,b,\gamma,L,L_0) \left[\log \left(C|B|^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (nz_{\alpha}^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} |B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}.$$

Note that with this choice of h, the condition $C_0(B) \ge Ch^{\beta}$ becomes

$$|B|^{\beta/(4\beta+3)}C_0(B) \ge C(nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-2\beta/(4\beta+3)}.$$

4 Interactive Privacy Mechanisms

In this section, we prove that the results obtained in Section 3 can be improved when sequential interaction is allowed between data-holders.

4.1 Upper bound in the interactive scenario

We first propose a testing procedure which relies on some sequential interaction between dataholders. We then prove that this test achieves a better separation rate than the one obtained in Section 3.

We assume that the sample size is equal to 3n so that we can split the data in three parts. Like in the non-interactive scenario, we consider a non-empty compact set $B \subset \mathbb{R}$, and $B = \bigcup_{j=1}^{N} B_j$ a partition of B with $|B_j| = 2h$ for all $j \in [1, N]$.

With the first third of the data, X_1, \ldots, X_n , we generate privatized arrays $Z_i = (Z_{ij})_{j=1,\ldots,N}$ that will be used to estimate $p(j) := \int_{B_j} f$. Let's consider the following privacy mechanism. We first generate an i.i.d. sequence $(W_{ij})_{i \in [\![1,n]\!], j \in [\![1,N]\!]}$ of Laplace(1) random variables and for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $j = 1, \ldots, N$ we set

$$Z_{ij} = I(X_i \in B_j) + \frac{2}{\alpha} W_{ij}.$$

For each j = 1, ..., N, we then build an estimator of $p(j) := \int_{B_j} f$ via

$$\widehat{p}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{ij}.$$

We now privatize the second third of the data. Set $c_{\alpha} = \frac{e^{\alpha}+1}{e^{\alpha}-1}$ and $\tau = (n\alpha^2)^{-1/2}$. For all $i \in [n+1, 2n]$, we generate $Z_i \in \{-c_{\alpha}\tau, c_{\alpha}\tau\}$ using the estimator \hat{p}_j and the true data X_i by

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z_{i} = \pm c_{\alpha}\tau \mid X_{i} \in B_{j}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 \pm \frac{\left[\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau}}{c_{\alpha}\tau}\right)$$
$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z_{i} = \pm c_{\alpha}\tau \mid X_{i} \in \overline{B}\right) = \frac{1}{2},$$

where $[x]_{-\tau}^{\tau} = \max\{-\tau, \min(x, \tau)\}$, and $p_0(j) = \int_{B_i} f_0$. We then define the test statistic

$$D_B = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} Z_i - \sum_{j=1}^{N} p_0(j) [\widehat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}.$$

The analysis of the mean and variance of this statistic can be found in Appendix B.2. It will be crucial in the analysis of our final test procedure.

Finally, we define the same tail test statistic as in Section 3. For all $i \in [\![2n+1, 3n]\!]$, a private view Z_i of X_i is generated by

$$Z_i = \pm c_{\alpha}$$
, with probabilities $\frac{1}{2} \left(1 \pm \frac{I(X_i \notin B)}{c_{\alpha}} \right)$

and we set

$$T_B = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=2n+1}^{3n} Z_i - \int_{\overline{B}} f_0.$$

The final test is

$$\Phi = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } D_B \ge t_1 \text{ or } T_B \ge t_2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$
(10)

where

$$t_1 = \frac{2\sqrt{5}}{n\alpha^2\sqrt{\gamma}}, \qquad t_2 = \sqrt{\frac{20}{n\alpha^2\gamma}}.$$
(11)

We denote the privacy mechanism that outputs $(Z_1, \ldots, Z_n, Z_{n+1}, \ldots, Z_{2n}, Z_{2n+1}, \ldots, Z_{3n})$ by Q. It is sequentially interactive since each Z_i for $i \in [n + 1, 2n]$ depends on the privatized data (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n) through \hat{p}_j , but does not depend on the other Z_k , $k \in [n + 1, 2n]$, $k \neq i$. The following result establishes that this mechanism provides α -local differential privacy. Its proof is deferred to Appendix B.1.

Proposition 4.1. The sequentially interactive privacy mechanism Q provides α -local differential privacy.

The following Proposition gives properties of the test statistic D_B . Its proof is in the Appendix B.2.

Proposition 4.2. 1. It holds $\mathbb{E}_{Qf^n}[D_B] = \sum_{j=1}^N \{p(j) - p_0(j)\}\mathbb{E}\left[[\hat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right]$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}_{Qf_0^n}[D_B] = 0$. Moreover, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{Qf^n}[D_B] \ge \frac{1}{6} D_\tau(f) - 6\frac{\tau}{\sqrt{n}},\tag{12}$$

with $D_{\tau}(f) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)| \min \{ |p(j) - p_0(j)|, \tau \}$ where we recall that $p(j) := \int_{B_j} f$. 2. It holds

$$Var_{Qf^n}(D_B) \le \frac{5}{(n\alpha^2)^2} + 67\frac{D_{\tau}(f)}{n\alpha^2}.$$

The following result presents an upper bound on $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma)$. Its proof is in Appendix B.3.

Theorem 4.3. Assume that $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $\beta < 1$. The test procedure Φ in (10) with t_1 and t_2 in (11) and bandwidth h given by

$$h \asymp |B|^{-\frac{1}{2\beta+1}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{1}{2\beta+1}},$$

attains the following bound on the separation rate

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \le C(L,L_0,\gamma) \left\{ |B|^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}} + \int_{\overline{B}} f_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \right\}.$$

This result indicates to choose the optimal set $B = B_{n,\alpha}$ as a level set

$$B_{n,\alpha} = \arg \inf_{B \text{ compact set}} \left\{ \int_{\overline{B}} f_0 \ge |B|^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \text{ and } \inf_{B} f_0 \ge \sup_{\overline{B}} f_0 \right\}.$$
 (13)

4.2 Lower bound in the interactive scenario

In this subsection we complement the study of $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma)$ with a lower bound. This lower bound will turn out to match the upper bound for several f_0 , proving the optimality of the test and privacy mechanism proposed in the previous subsection for several f_0 . See Section 5 for the optimality.

Theorem 4.4. Let $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Assume that $\beta \leq 1$. Recall that $z_{\alpha} = e^{2\alpha} - e^{-2\alpha}$ and $C_0(B) = \min\{f_0(x) : x \in B\}$. For all compact sets $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ we get

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\gamma, L, L_0) \min\left\{ |B| C_0(B), |B|^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} (nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}} \right\}$$

If, moreover, B is satisfying

$$|B|^{\beta/(2\beta+1)}C_0(B) \ge C(nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-\beta/(2\beta+1)}$$
(14)

for some C > 0, it holds

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\gamma,L,L_0)|B|^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} (nz_\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}}.$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix B.4.

Let us note that the same comment after Theorem 3.5 holds in this case. In all examples, we choose the set $B_{n,\alpha}$ as defined in (13) and show that it checks the condition (14) giving thus minimax optimality of the testing rates.

	Non-private separation rate	Private separation rate,	Private separation rate,
		non-interactive scenario	interactive scenario
		(up to a log factor)	
$\mathcal{U}([a,b])$	$n^{-2/5}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-2/7}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-1/3}$
$\mathcal{N}(0,1)$	$n^{-2/5}$	$\log(n\alpha^2)^{3/7}(n\alpha^2)^{-2/7}$	$\log(n\alpha^2)^{1/3}(n\alpha^2)^{-1/3}$
Beta(a, b)	$n^{-2/5}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-2/7}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-1/3}$
Spiky null	$n^{-2/5}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-2/7}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-1/3}$
Cauchy(0, a)	$(\log n)^{4/5} n^{-2/5}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-2/13}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-1/5}$
Pareto(a, k)	$n^{-2k/(2+3k)}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-2k/(7k+6)}$	$(n\alpha^2)^{-k/(3k+2)}$
$\operatorname{Exp}(\lambda)$	$n^{-2/5}$	$\log(n\alpha^2)^{6/7}(n\alpha^2)^{-2/7}$	$\log(n\alpha^2)^{2/3}(n\alpha^2)^{-1/3}$

Table 1: Some examples of separation rates for different choices of densities f_0 and $\beta = 1$. The non-private separation rates can be found in [BW19]

5 Examples

In this section, we investigate the optimality of our lower and upper bounds for some examples of densities f_0 . For all the examples studied below, our bounds are optimal (up to a constant) in the interactive scenario, and optimal up to a logarithmic factor in the non-interactive scenario.

The densities considered in this section are Hölder continuous with exponent β for all $\beta \in (0, 1]$ unless otherwise specified. The results are stated for n large enough and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $n\alpha^2 \to +\infty$ as $n \to \infty$. They are summarised in Table 1 for $\beta = 1$ and compared to the nonprivate separation rates. The proofs can be found in Appendix C.

Example 5.1. Assume that f_0 is the density of the continuous uniform distribution on [a, b] where a and b are two constants satisfying a < b, that is

$$f_0(x) = \frac{1}{b-a}I(x \in [a, b])$$

Taking B = [a, b] in Theorems 3.5, 3.4, 4.4 and 4.3 yields the following bounds on the minimax radius

$$\left[\log\left(C(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}}\right)\right]^{-1}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}},$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \asymp (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}}$$

Example 5.2. Assume that f_0 is the density of the Pareto distribution with parameters a > 0 and k > 0, that is

$$f_0(x) = \frac{ka^k}{x^{k+1}}I(x \ge a).$$

It holds

$$\left[\log\left(C(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}\cdot\frac{2\beta}{k(4\beta+3)+3\beta+3}+\frac{2}{4\beta+3}}\right)\right]^{-1}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2k\beta}{k(4\beta+3)+3\beta+3}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2k\beta}{k(4\beta+3)+3\beta+3}},$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \asymp (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{k\beta}{k(2\beta+1)+\beta+1}}.$$

Example 5.3. Assume that f_0 is the density of the exponential distribution with parameter $\lambda > 0$, that is

$$f_0(x) = \lambda \exp(-\lambda x) I(x \ge 0).$$

It holds

$$\left[\log \left(C \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$
and
$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \asymp \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}}$$

Example 5.4. Assume that f_0 is the density of the normal distribution with parameters 0 and 1, that is

$$f_0(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right)$$

It holds

$$\left[\log\left(C\log(n\alpha^{2})^{\frac{4\beta+4}{2(4\beta+3)}}(n\alpha^{2})^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}}\right)\right]^{-1}\log(n\alpha^{2})^{\frac{3\beta+3}{2(4\beta+3)}}(n\alpha^{2})^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_{0},\gamma) \lesssim \log(n\alpha^{2})^{\frac{3\beta+3}{2(4\beta+3)}}(n\alpha^{2})^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}},$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \asymp \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{\beta+1}{2(2\beta+1)}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}}$$

Example 5.5. Assume that f_0 is the density of the Cauchy distribution with parameters 0 and a > 0, that is

$$f_0(x) = \frac{1}{\pi a} \frac{a^2}{x^2 + a^2}.$$

It holds

$$\left[\log\left(C(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}\cdot\frac{2\beta}{7\beta+6}+\frac{2}{4\beta+3}}\right)\right]^{-1}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{7\beta+6}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{7\beta+6}}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \asymp (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{3\beta+2}}$$

Example 5.6. Assume that the density f_0 is given by

$$f_0(x) = \begin{cases} L_0 x & \text{if } 0 \le x \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_0}} \\ 2\sqrt{L_0} - L_0 x & \text{if } \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_0}} \le x \le \frac{2}{\sqrt{L_0}} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It holds

$$\left[\log\left(C(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}}\right)\right]^{-1}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}},$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \asymp (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}}$$

Example 5.7. Assume that f_0 is the density of the Beta distribution with parameters $a \ge 1$ and $b \ge 1$, that is

$$f_0(x) = \frac{1}{B(a,b)} x^{a-1} (1-x)^{b-1} I(0 < x < 1),$$
(15)

where $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the Beta function. It holds

$$\left[\log\left(C(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}}\right)\right]^{-1}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}},$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \asymp (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}}.$$

Note that the density f_0 given by (15) can be defined for all a > 0 and b > 0. However, f_0 is Hölder continuous for no exponent $\beta \in (0, 1]$ if a < 1 or b < 1. Note also that if a = 1 and b = 1then f_0 is the density of the continuous uniform distribution on [0, 1], and this case has already been tackled in Example 5.1. Now, if a = 1 and b > 1 (respectively a > 1 and b = 1), one can check that f_0 is Hölder continuous with exponent β for all $\beta \in (0, \min\{b-1, 1\}]$ (respectively $\beta \in (0, \min\{a-1, 1\}]$). Finally, if a > 1 and b > 1 then f_0 is is Hölder continuous with exponent β for all $\beta \in (0, \min\{a-1, b-1, 1\}]$. **Example 5.8.** Assume that the density f_0 is given by

$$f_0(x) = \frac{A \log(2)^A}{(x+2) \log^{A+1}(x+2)} I(x \ge 0),$$

for some A > 0 which can be arbitrarily small but fixed. It holds

$$\left[\log\left(Ca_*^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}}\right)\right]^{-1} \left[\log(a_*)\right]^{-1} a_*^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim a_*^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}},$$

where

$$a_* = \sup\left\{a \ge 0 : \frac{(\log 2)^A}{\log^A(2+a)} \ge a^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}}\right\}.$$

It is easy to see that $a_* > 1$ is up to some log factors a polynomial of $n\alpha^2$: $a_*^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} \simeq (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} / \log^A (2+a_*)$ and therefore

$$a_*^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \asymp \frac{1}{\log^A(n\alpha^2)}.$$

In the interactive case

$$\left[\log(b_*)\right]^{-1} b_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}} \lesssim \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim b_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}},$$

where

$$b_* = \sup\left\{b \ge 0 : \frac{(\log 2)^A}{\log^A(2+b)} \ge b^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}}\right\}.$$

Similarly to the non-interactive case, b_* is up to log factors a polynomial of $n\alpha^2$ and therefore

$$b_*^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}} \asymp \frac{1}{\log^A(n\alpha^2)}.$$

A Proofs of Section 3

A.1 Proof of Proposition 3.2

Let $i \in [\![1,n]\!]$. Set $\sigma := 2 \|\psi\|_{\infty}/(\alpha h)$. The conditional density of Z_i given $X_i = y$ can be written as

$$q^{Z_i|X_i=y}(z) = \prod_{j=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2\sigma} \exp\left(-\frac{|z_j - \psi_h(x_j - y)|}{\sigma}\right).$$

Thus, by the reverse and the ordinary triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{q^{Z_i|X_i=y}(z)}{q^{Z_i|X_i=y'}(z)} &= \prod_{j=1}^N \exp\left(\frac{|z_j - \psi_h(x_j - y')| - |z_j - \psi_h(x_j - y)|}{\sigma}\right) \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^N \exp\left(\frac{|\psi_h(x_j - y') - \psi_h(x_j - y)|}{\sigma}\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{\sigma h} \sum_{j=1}^N \left|\psi\left(\frac{x_j - y'}{h}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{x_j - y}{h}\right)\right|\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{\sigma h} \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\left|\psi\left(\frac{x_j - y'}{h}\right)\right| + \left|\psi\left(\frac{x_j - y}{h}\right)\right|\right]\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(\frac{2\|\psi\|_{\infty}}{\sigma h}\right) \\ &\leq \exp(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from the fact that for a fixed y the quantity $\psi((x_j - y)/h)$ is non-zero for at most one coefficient $j \in [\![1, N]\!]$. This is a consequence of Assumption 3.1. This proves that Z_i is an α -locally differentially private view of X_i for all $i \in [\![1, n]\!]$. Consider now $i \in [\![n + 1, 2n]\!]$. For all $j \in [\![1, N]\!]$ it holds

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i = c_\alpha \mid X_i \notin B\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i = c_\alpha \mid X_i \in B_j\right)} = 1 + \frac{1}{c_\alpha} = \frac{2e^\alpha}{e^\alpha + 1}.$$

Since $2 \le e^{\alpha} + 1 \le 2e^{\alpha}$, we obtain

$$e^{-\alpha} \le 1 \le \frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_i = c_\alpha \mid X_i \notin B)}{\mathbb{P}(Z_i = c_\alpha \mid X_i \in B_j)} \le e^{\alpha}.$$

It also holds

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i = -c_\alpha \mid X_i \notin B\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i = -c_\alpha \mid X_i \in B_j\right)} = 1 - \frac{1}{c_\alpha} = \frac{2}{e^\alpha + 1} \in [e^{-\alpha}, e^\alpha].$$

Now, for all $(j,k) \in [\![1,N]\!]^2$ it holds

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i = c_\alpha \mid X_i \in B_k\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i = c_\alpha \mid X_i \in B_j\right)} = \frac{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i = -c_\alpha \mid X_i \in B_k\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i = -c_\alpha \mid X_i \in B_j\right)} = 1 \in [e^{-\alpha}, e^{\alpha}].$$

This proves that Z_i is an α -locally differentially private view of X_i for all $i \in [n+1, 2n]$.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Proof of Proposition 3.3. 1. Equality (4) follows from the independence of Z_i and Z_k for $i \neq k$ and from $\mathbb{E}[Z_{ij}] = \psi_h * f(x_j)$. We now prove (5). Set $a_{h,j} := \psi_h * f(x_j)$ and let us define

$$\widehat{U}_B = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq k} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (Z_{ij} - a_{h,j}) (Z_{kj} - a_{h,j}),$$
$$\widehat{V}_B = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j)) (Z_{ij} - a_{h,j}),$$

and observe that we have

$$S_B = \widehat{U}_B + \widehat{V}_B + \sum_{j=1}^N (a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j))^2.$$

Note that $\operatorname{Cov}(\widehat{U}_B, \widehat{V}_B) = 0$. We thus have

$$\operatorname{Var}(S_B) = \operatorname{Var}(\widehat{U}_B) + \operatorname{Var}(\widehat{V}_B)$$

and we will bound from above $\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{U}_B)$ and $\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{V}_B)$ separately. We begin with $\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{V}_B)$. Since \widehat{V}_B is centered, it holds

$$\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{V}_B) = \mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_B^2]$$

= $\frac{4}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n (a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j)) (a_{h,k} - f_0(x_k)) \mathbb{E}[(Z_{ij} - a_{h,j}) (Z_{tk} - a_{h,k})].$

Note that if $t \neq i$, the independence of Z_i and Z_t yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_{ij}-a_{h,j}\right)\left(Z_{tk}-a_{h,k}\right)\right]=0.$$

Moreover, since the W_{ij} , j = 1, ..., N are independent of X_i and $\mathbb{E}[W_{ij}] = 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_{ij} - a_{h,j}\right)\left(Z_{ik} - a_{h,k}\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{j} - X_{i}\right) + \frac{2\|\psi\|_{\infty}}{\alpha h}W_{ij} - a_{h,j}\right)\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{k} - X_{i}\right) + \frac{2\|\psi\|_{\infty}}{\alpha h}W_{ik} - a_{h,k}\right)\right]\right]$$
$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\psi_{h}\left(x_{j} - X_{i}\right)\psi_{h}\left(x_{k} - X_{i}\right)\right] - a_{h,k}\mathbb{E}\left[\psi_{h}\left(x_{j} - X_{i}\right)\right] + \frac{4\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{\alpha^{2}h^{2}}\mathbb{E}\left[W_{ij}W_{ik}\right]\right]$$
$$- a_{h,j}\mathbb{E}\left[\psi_{h}\left(x_{k} - X_{i}\right)\right] + a_{h,j}a_{h,k}$$
$$= \left[\int\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{j} - y\right)\right)^{2}f(y)\mathrm{d}y + \frac{8\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{\alpha^{2}h^{2}}\right]I(j = k) - a_{h,j}a_{h,k},$$

where the last equality is a consequence of Assumption 3.1. We thus obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}(\widehat{V}_B) &= \frac{4}{n} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j) \right)^2 \left[\int (\psi_h \left(x_j - y \right))^2 f(y) \mathrm{d}y + \frac{8 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{\alpha^2 h^2} \right] \\ &- \frac{4}{n} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N \left(a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j) \right) \left(a_{h,k} - f_0(x_k) \right) a_{h,j} a_{h,k} \end{aligned}$$
$$= \frac{4}{n} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j) \right)^2 \left[\int (\psi_h \left(x_j - y \right))^2 f(y) \mathrm{d}y + \frac{8 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{\alpha^2 h^2} \right] - \frac{4}{n} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \left(a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j) \right) a_{h,j} \right)^2 \right]$$
$$\leq \frac{4}{n} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j) \right)^2 \left[\int (\psi_h \left(x_j - y \right))^2 f(y) \mathrm{d}y + \frac{8 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{\alpha^2 h^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, $\int (\psi_h (x_j - y))^2 f(y) dy \leq \|\psi_h\|_{\infty}^2 \leq \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2 / h^2 \leq \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2 / (\alpha^2 h^2)$ if $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. We finally obtain

$$\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{V}_B) \le \frac{36\|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{n\alpha^2 h^2} \sum_{j=1}^N (a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j))^2.$$

We now bound from above $\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{U}_B)$. One can rewrite \widehat{U}_B as

$$\widehat{U}_B = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq k} h(Z_i, Z_k),$$

where

$$h(Z_i, Z_k) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} (Z_{ij} - a_{h,j}) (Z_{kj} - a_{h,j}).$$

Using a result for the variance of a U-statistic (see for instance Lemma A, p.183 in [Ser80]), we have

$$\binom{n}{2}\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{U}_B) = 2(n-2)\zeta_1 + \zeta_2,$$

where

$$\zeta_1 = \operatorname{Var} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[h(Z_1, Z_2) \mid Z_1 \right] \right), \text{ and } \zeta_2 = \operatorname{Var} \left(h(Z_1, Z_2) \right).$$

We have $\zeta_1 = 0$ since $\mathbb{E}[h(Z_1, Z_2) \mid Z_1] = 0$ and thus

$$\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{U}_B) = \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \operatorname{Var}\left(h(Z_1, Z_2)\right).$$

Write

$$\begin{split} h(Z_1, Z_2) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\psi_h \left(x_j - X_1 \right) + \frac{2 \|\psi\|_\infty}{\alpha h} W_{1j} - a_{h,j} \right) \left(\psi_h \left(x_j - X_2 \right) + \frac{2 \|\psi\|_\infty}{\alpha h} W_{2j} - a_{h,j} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\psi_h \left(x_j - X_1 \right) - a_{h,j} \right) \left(\psi_h \left(x_j - X_2 \right) - a_{h,j} \right) + \frac{4 \|\psi\|_\infty^2}{\alpha^2 h^2} \sum_{j=1}^N W_{1j} W_{2j} \\ &\quad + \frac{2 \|\psi\|_\infty}{\alpha h} \sum_{j=1}^N W_{1j} (\psi_h (x_j - X_2) - a_{h,j}) + \frac{2 \|\psi\|_\infty}{\alpha h} \sum_{j=1}^N W_{2j} (\psi_h (x_j - X_1) - a_{h,j}) \\ &=: \tilde{T}_1 + \tilde{T}_2 + \tilde{T}_3 + \tilde{T}_4. \end{split}$$

We thus have $\operatorname{Var}(h(Z_1, Z_2)) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_i) + 2\sum_{i < j} \operatorname{Cov}(\tilde{T}_i, \tilde{T}_j)$. Observe that $\operatorname{Cov}(\tilde{T}_i, \tilde{T}_j) = 0$ for i < j and $\operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_3) = \operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_4)$. We thus have

$$\operatorname{Var}(h(Z_1, Z_2)) = \operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_1) + \operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_2) + 2\operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_3).$$

The independence of the random variables $(W_{ij})_{i,j}$ yields

$$\operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_2) = \frac{64 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^4 N}{\alpha^4 h^4}.$$

The independence of the random variables $(W_{ij})_{i,j}$ and their independence with X_2 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_{3}) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{T}_{3}^{2}\right] \\ &= \frac{4\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{\alpha^{2}h^{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{N} W_{1j}(\psi_{h}(x_{j} - X_{2}) - a_{h,j}) \sum_{k=1}^{N} W_{1k}(\psi_{h}(x_{k} - X_{2}) - a_{h,k})\right] \\ &= \frac{4\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{\alpha^{2}h^{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[W_{1j}W_{1k}\right] \mathbb{E}\left[(\psi_{h}(x_{j} - X_{2}) - a_{h,j})(\psi_{h}(x_{k} - X_{2}) - a_{h,k})\right] \\ &= \frac{8\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{\alpha^{2}h^{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[(\psi_{h}(x_{j} - X_{2}) - a_{h,j})^{2}\right] \\ &\leq \frac{8\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{\alpha^{2}h^{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[(\psi_{h}(x_{j} - X_{2}) - a_{h,j})^{2}\right].\end{aligned}$$

Now, since $y \mapsto \psi_h(x_j - y)$ is null outside B_j (consequence of Assumption 3.1), it holds

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[(\psi_h(x_j - X_2))^2 \right] = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{B_j} (\psi_h(x_j - y))^2 f(y) dy \le \|\psi_h\|_{\infty}^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{B_j} f \le \|\psi_h\|_{\infty}^2$$

and thus

$$\operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_3) \le \frac{8 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^4}{\alpha^2 h^4}.$$

By independence of X_1 and X_2 , it holds $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_1] = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_{1}) &= \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{T}_{1}^{2}\right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{j} - X_{1}\right) - a_{h,j}\right)\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{j} - X_{2}\right) - a_{h,j}\right)\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{k} - X_{1}\right) - a_{h,k}\right)\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{k} - X_{2}\right) - a_{h,k}\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{j} - X_{1}\right) - a_{h,j}\right)\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{k} - X_{1}\right) - a_{h,k}\right)\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{j} - X_{2}\right) - a_{h,j}\right)\left(\psi_{h}\left(x_{k} - X_{2}\right) - a_{h,k}\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left[\int \psi_{h}(x_{j} - y)\psi_{h}(x_{k} - y)f(y)dy - a_{h,j}a_{h,k}\right]^{2} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\int \psi_{h}(x_{j} - y)\psi_{h}(x_{k} - y)f(y)dy\right)^{2} - 2\sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{h,j}a_{h,k}\int \psi_{h}(x_{j} - y)\psi_{h}(x_{k} - y)f(y)dy \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{h,j}^{2}a_{h,k}^{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 3.1 yields $\int \psi_h(x_j - y)\psi_h(x_k - y)f(y)dy = 0$ if $j \neq k$. We thus obtain

$$\operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_{1}) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\int (\psi_{h}(x_{j}-y))^{2} f(y) \mathrm{d}y \right)^{2} - 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{h,j}^{2} \int (\psi_{h}(x_{j}-y))^{2} f(y) \mathrm{d}y + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{h,j}^{2} \right)^{2}.$$

Now, since $y \mapsto \psi_h(x_j - y)$ is null outside B_j (consequence of Assumption 3.1), observe that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\int (\psi_h(x_j - y))^2 f(y) \mathrm{d}y \right)^2 \le \frac{\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4}{h^4} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\int_{B_j} f \right)^2 \le \frac{\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4}{h^4} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{B_j} f \le \frac{\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4}{h^4},$$

and

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{h,j}^{2}\right)^{2} = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\int \psi_{h}(x_{j}-y)f(y)\mathrm{d}y\right)^{2}\right)^{2} \le \frac{\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{4}}{h^{4}} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\int_{B_{j}} f\right)^{2}\right]^{2} \le \frac{\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{4}}{h^{4}},$$

yielding $\operatorname{Var}(\tilde{T}_1) \leq 2 \frac{\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4}{h^4}$. We thus have

$$\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{U}_B) \le \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \left[2\frac{\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4}{h^4} + \frac{64\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4 N}{\alpha^4 h^4} + \frac{16\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4}{\alpha^2 h^4} \right] \le \frac{164\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4 N}{n(n-1)\alpha^4 h^4}$$

Finally,

$$\operatorname{Var}(S_B) \le \frac{36\|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{n\alpha^2 h^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(a_{h,j} - f_0(x_j)\right)^2 + \frac{164\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4 N}{n(n-1)\alpha^4 h^4}.$$

2. For all $i \in \llbracket n+1, 2n \rrbracket$ it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_j^n}[Z_i] = \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i \mid X_i \notin B\right] \mathbb{P}\left(X_i \notin B\right) + \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i \mid X_i \in B_j\right] \mathbb{P}\left(X_i \in B_j\right)$$
$$= \left[c_\alpha \cdot \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{c_\alpha}\right) - c_\alpha \cdot \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{c_\alpha}\right)\right] \mathbb{P}\left(X_i \notin B\right) + \sum_{j=1}^N \left[c_\alpha \cdot \frac{1}{2} - c_\alpha \cdot \frac{1}{2}\right] \mathbb{P}\left(X_i \in B_j\right)$$
$$= \mathbb{P}\left(X_i \notin B\right).$$

This yields $\mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[T_B] = \int_{\overline{B}} (f - f_0)$, and using the independence of the Z_i , $i = n + 1, \ldots, 2n$ we obtain

$$\operatorname{Var}_{Q_{f}^{n}}[T_{B}] = \frac{1}{n^{2}} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} \operatorname{Var}(Z_{i}) = \frac{1}{n^{2}} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} \left[\mathbb{E}[Z_{i}^{2}] - \mathbb{E}[Z_{i}]^{2} \right] = \frac{1}{n} \left(c_{\alpha}^{2} - \left(\int_{\overline{B}} f \right)^{2} \right).$$

We can now proove Theorem 3.4. We first prove that the choice of t_1 and t_2 in (3) gives $\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(\Phi = 1) \leq \gamma/2$. Since $\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n}[T_B] = 0$, Chebyshev's inequality and Proposition 3.3 yield for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(T_B \ge t_2) \le \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(|T_B| \ge t_2) \le \frac{\operatorname{Var}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(T_B)}{t_2^2} \le \frac{c_{\alpha}^2}{nt_2^2} \le \frac{5}{n\alpha^2 t_2^2} = \frac{\gamma}{4}.$$

If $t_1 > \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n}[S_B] = \sum_{j=1}^N ([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j))^2$, then Chebychev's inequality and Proposition 3.3 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(S_B \ge t_1) &\leq \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(|S_B - \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n}[S_B]| \ge t_1 - \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n}[S_B]) \\ &\leq \frac{\operatorname{Var}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(S_B)}{(t_1 - \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n}[S_B])^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\frac{36\|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{n\alpha^2h^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j)\right)^2}{\left(t_1 - \sum_{j=1}^N \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j)\right)^2\right)^2} + \frac{\frac{164\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4 N}{n(n-1)\alpha^4h^4}}{\left(t_1 - \sum_{j=1}^N \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j)\right)^2\right)^2} \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$t_1 \ge \sum_{j=1}^N \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j) \right)^2 + \max\left\{ \sqrt{\frac{288\|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{\gamma n\alpha^2 h^2}} \sum_{j=1}^N \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j) \right)^2, \sqrt{\frac{1312\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4 N}{\gamma n(n-1)\alpha^4 h^4}} \right\}$$

.

Indeed for $f \in H(\beta, L)$ with $\beta \leq 1$ it holds $|[\psi_h * f](x_j) - f(x_j)| \leq LC_{\beta}h^{\beta}$ for all $j \in [\![1, N]\!]$ where $C_{\beta} = \int_{-1}^{1} |u|^{\beta} |\psi(u)| du$, and thus using $ab \leq a^2/2 + b^2/2$ we obtain

$$\begin{split} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j) \right)^2 + \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{288 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{\gamma n \alpha^2 h^2}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j) \right)^2, \sqrt{\frac{1312 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^4 N}{\gamma n (n-1) \alpha^4 h^4}} \right\} \\ &\leq L_0^2 C_\beta^2 N h^{2\beta} + \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} L_0^2 C_\beta^2 N h^{2\beta} + \frac{144 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{\gamma n \alpha^2 h^2}, \sqrt{\frac{1312 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^4 N}{\gamma n (n-1) \alpha^4 h^4}} \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} L_0^2 C_\beta^2 N h^{2\beta} + \frac{144 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{\gamma n \alpha^2 h^2} + \frac{52 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2 \sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{\gamma n \alpha^2 h^2}} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} L_0^2 C_\beta^2 N h^{2\beta} + \frac{196 \|\psi\|_{\infty}^2 \sqrt{N}}{\gamma n \alpha^2 h^2} = t_1. \end{split}$$

Then it holds

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(S_B \ge t_1) \le \frac{\frac{36\|\psi\|_{\infty}^2}{n\alpha^2 h^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j) \right)^2}{(t_1 - \sum_{j=1}^N \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j) \right)^2)^2} + \frac{\frac{164\|\psi\|_{\infty}^4 N}{n(n-1)\alpha^4 h^4}}{(t_1 - \sum_{j=1}^N \left([\psi_h * f_0](x_j) - f_0(x_j) \right)^2)^2} \\
\le \frac{\gamma}{8} + \frac{\gamma}{8} \le \frac{\gamma}{4},$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(\Phi=1) \le \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(T_B \ge t_2) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(S_B \ge t_1) \le \frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

We now exhibit $\rho_1, \rho_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \int_{B} |f - f_{0}| \ge \rho_{1} \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(S_{B} < t_{1}) \le \gamma/2\\ \int_{\bar{B}} |f - f_{0}| \ge \rho_{2} \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(T_{B} < t_{2}) \le \gamma/2. \end{cases}$$

In this case, for all $f \in H(\beta, L)$ satisfying $||f - f_0||_1 \ge \rho_1 + \rho_2$ it holds

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(\Phi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(\Phi = 0) \le \frac{\gamma}{2} + \min\left\{\mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(S_B < t_1), \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(T_B < t_2)\right\} \le \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{\gamma}{2} = \gamma,$$

since $\int_{B} |f - f_0| + \int_{\bar{B}} |f - f_0| = ||f - f_0||_1 \ge \rho_1 + \rho_2$ implies $\int_{B} |f - f_0| \ge \rho_1$ or $\int_{\bar{B}} |f - f_0| \ge \rho_2$. Consequently, $\rho_1 + \rho_2$ will provide an upper bound on $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0, \gamma)$. If $\int_{\overline{B}} (f - f_0) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[T_B] > t_2$ then Chebychev's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(T_B < t_2) = \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n} \left(\mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[T_B] - T_B > \mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[T_B] - t_2 \right)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n} \left(\left| \mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[T_B] - T_B \right| > \mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[T_B] - t_2 \right)$$

$$\leq \frac{\operatorname{Var}_{Q_f^n}(T_B)}{\left(\mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[T_B] - t_2 \right)^2}$$

$$\leq \frac{c_\alpha^2}{n \left(\int_{\overline{B}} (f - f_0) - t_2 \right)^2}.$$

Now, observe that

$$\int_{\bar{B}} (f - f_0) \ge \int_{\bar{B}} |f - f_0| - 2 \int_{\bar{B}} f_0.$$

Thus, setting

$$\rho_2 = 2 \int_{\bar{B}} f_0 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) t_2,$$

we obtain that $\int_{\bar{B}} |f - f_0| \ge \rho_2$ implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(T_{B} < t_{2}) \leq \frac{2c_{\alpha}^{2}}{nt_{2}^{2}} \leq \frac{10}{n\alpha^{2}t_{2}^{2}} = \frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

We now exhibit ρ_1 such that $\int_B |f - f_0| \ge \rho_1$ implies $\mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(S_B < t_1) \le \gamma/2$. First note that if the following relation holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f}^{n}}[S_{B}] = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left| [\psi_{h} * f](x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j}) \right|^{2} \ge t_{1} + \sqrt{\frac{2 \operatorname{Var}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(S_{B})}{\gamma}},$$
(16)

then Chebychev's inequality yields

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(S_B < t_1) \le \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}\left(S_B \le \mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[S_B] - \sqrt{\frac{2\mathrm{Var}_{Q_f^n}(S_B)}{\gamma}}\right) \le \frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

Using $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ for all a, b > 0 and $ab \leq a^2/2 + b^2/2$ we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{2\operatorname{Var}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(S_{B})}{\gamma}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{72\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{\gamma n\alpha^{2}h^{2}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left([\psi_{h} * f](x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j}) \right)^{2} + \frac{328\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{4}N}{\gamma n(n-1)\alpha^{4}h^{4}} \\ \leq \sqrt{\frac{72\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{\gamma n\alpha^{2}h^{2}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left([\psi_{h} * f](x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j}) \right)^{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{656\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{4}N}{\gamma n^{2}\alpha^{4}h^{4}}} \\ \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left([\psi_{h} * f](x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j}) \right)^{2} + \frac{36\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}}{\gamma n\alpha^{2}h^{2}} + \frac{26\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{\gamma n\alpha^{2}h^{2}}} \\ \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left([\psi_{h} * f](x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j}) \right)^{2} + \frac{62\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}\sqrt{N}}{\gamma n\alpha^{2}h^{2}}.$$

Thus, if

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} |[\psi_h * f](x_j) - f_0(x_j)|^2 \ge 2 \left[t_1 + \frac{62 ||\psi||_{\infty}^2 \sqrt{N}}{\gamma n \alpha^2 h^2} \right]$$
(17)

then (16) holds and we have $\mathbb{P}_{Q_j^n}(S_B < t_1) \leq \gamma/2$. We now link $\sum_{j=1}^N |[\psi_h * f](x_j) - f_0(x_j)|^2$ to $\int_B |f - f_0|$. According to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} |[\psi_h * f](x_j) - f_0(x_j)|\right)^2 \le N \sum_{j=1}^{N} |[\psi_h * f](x_j) - f_0(x_j)|^2.$$

We also have

$$\begin{split} \left| \int_{B} |f - f_{0}| - \sum_{j=1}^{N} 2h |\psi_{h} * f(x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j})| \right| &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{B_{j}} |f - f_{0}| - \sum_{j=1}^{N} 2h |\psi_{h} * f(x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j})| \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{B_{j}} (|f(x) - f_{0}(x)| - |\psi_{h} * f(x_{j}) - f_{0}(x_{j})|) \, \mathrm{d}x \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{B_{j}} |f(x) - f_{0}(x) - \psi_{h} * f(x_{j}) + f_{0}(x_{j})| \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{B_{j}} (|f(x) - f(x_{j})| + |f(x_{j}) - \psi_{h} * f(x_{j})| + |f_{0}(x_{j}) - f_{0}(x)|) \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \left[1 + C_{\beta} + \frac{L_{0}}{L} \right] Lh^{\beta} |B|. \end{split}$$

We thus have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left| [\psi_h * f](x_j) - f_0(x_j) \right|^2 \ge \frac{1}{4Nh^2} \left(\int_B |f - f_0| - \left[1 + C_\beta + \frac{L_0}{L} \right] Lh^\beta |B| \right)^2.$$

Thus, if

$$\int_{B} |f - f_0| \ge \left[1 + C_{\beta} + \frac{L_0}{L} \right] Lh^{\beta} |B| + 2h\sqrt{N} \sqrt{2t_1 + \frac{124\|\psi\|_{\infty}^2 \sqrt{N}}{\gamma n \alpha^2 h^2}} =: \rho_1^2 + \rho_2^2 + \rho_2$$

then (17) holds and we have $\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(S_{B} < t_{1}) \leq \gamma/2$. Consequently

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_{0},\gamma) &\leq \rho_{1} + \rho_{2} \\ &\leq \left[1 + C_{\beta} + \frac{L_{0}}{L}\right] Lh^{\beta}|B| + 2h\sqrt{N}\sqrt{2t_{1} + \frac{124\|\psi\|_{\infty}^{2}\sqrt{N}}{\gamma n\alpha^{2}h^{2}}} + 2\int_{\bar{B}}f_{0} + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)t_{2} \\ &\leq C(L,L_{0},\beta,\gamma,\psi)\left[h^{\beta}|B| + Nh^{\beta+1} + \frac{N^{3/4}}{\sqrt{n\alpha^{2}}} + \int_{\bar{B}}f_{0} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^{2}}}\right] \\ &\leq C(L,L_{0},\beta,\gamma,\psi)\left[h^{\beta}|B| + \frac{|B|^{3/4}}{h^{3/4}\sqrt{n\alpha^{2}}} + \int_{\bar{B}}f_{0} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^{2}}}\right] \end{split}$$

where we have used $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ for a, b > 0 to obtain the second to last inequality. Taking $h \asymp |B|^{-1/(4\beta+3)} (n\alpha^2)^{-2/(4\beta+3)}$ yields

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\rm NI}(f_0,\gamma) \le C(L,L_0,\beta,\gamma,\psi) \left[|B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \int_{\overline{B}} f_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \right].$$

A.3 Proof of Lemma 3.7

For $j = 1, \ldots, N$, write

$$v_j = \sum_{k=1}^N a_{kj} \psi_k.$$

Note that since (ψ_1, \ldots, ψ_N) and (v_1, \ldots, v_N) are two orthonormal bases of W_N , the matrix $(a_{kj})_{kj}$ is orthogonal. We can write

$$f_{\nu}(x) = f_0(x) + \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \psi_k(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Define

$$A_b = \left\{ \nu \in \{-1, 1\}^N : \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \right| \le \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)} \text{ for all } 1 \le k \le N \right\}.$$

The union bound and Hoeffding inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\nu}(A_{b}^{c}) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{N} \mathbb{P}\left(\left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \right| > \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{N} 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}{h \sum_{j=1}^{N} 4\frac{a_{kj}^{2}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}^{2}}} \right) \\ &\leq b, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\tilde{\lambda}_j^2 \ge 2h$ for all j and $\sum_{j=1}^N a_{kj}^2 = 1$. We thus have $\mathbb{P}_{\nu}(A_b) \ge 1-b$.

We now prove *i*). Since $\int \psi_k = 0$ for all k = 1, ..., n, it holds $\int f_{\nu} = \int f_0 = 1$ for all ν . Since $\operatorname{Supp}(\psi_k) = B_k$ for all k = 1, ..., N, it holds $f_{\nu} \equiv f_0$ on B^c and thus f_{ν} is non-negative on B^c . Now, for $x \in B_k$ it holds

$$f_{\nu}(x) = f_0(x) + \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \psi_k(x) \ge C_0(B) - \frac{\delta \|\psi\|_{\infty}}{\sqrt{h}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \right|.$$

Moreover, for any $\nu \in A_b$, we have

$$\frac{\delta \|\psi\|_{\infty}}{\sqrt{h}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \right| \le \frac{\delta \|\psi\|_{\infty}}{h} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)} \le C_0(B)$$

since δ is assumed to satisfy $\delta \leq \frac{h}{\sqrt{\log(2N/b)}} \min\left\{\frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{L_0}{L}\right)h^{\beta}\right\}$. Thus, f_{ν} is non-negative on \mathbb{R} for all $\nu \in A_b$.

To prove *ii*), we have to show that $|f_{\nu}(x) - f_{\nu}(y)| \leq L|x - y|^{\beta}$, for all $\nu \in A_b$, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $f_{\nu} \equiv f_0$ on B^c and $f_0 \in H(\beta, L_0)$, this result is trivial for $x, y \in B^c$. If $x \in B_l$ and $y \in B_k$ it holds

$$\begin{split} |f_{\nu}(x) - f_{\nu}(y)| &\leq |f_{0}(x) - f_{0}(y)| + \left| \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{lj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \psi_{l}(x) - \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \psi_{k}(y) \right| \\ &\leq L_{0} |x - y|^{\beta} + \left| \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{lj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \psi_{l}(x) - \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{lj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \psi_{l}(y) \right| \\ &+ \left| \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \psi_{k}(x) - \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \psi_{k}(y) \right| \\ &\leq L_{0} |x - y|^{\beta} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{h}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{lj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \right| \left| \psi \left(\frac{x - x_{l}}{h} \right) - \psi \left(\frac{y - x_{l}}{h} \right) \right| \\ &+ \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{h}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \right| \left| \psi \left(\frac{x - x_{k}}{h} \right) - \psi \left(\frac{y - x_{k}}{h} \right) \right| \\ &\leq L_{0} |x - y|^{\beta} + \frac{\delta}{h^{\beta + 1/2}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{lj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \right| \cdot L |x - y|^{\beta} + \frac{\delta}{h^{\beta + 1/2}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \right| \cdot L |x - y|^{\beta} \\ &= \left(\frac{L_{0}}{L} + \frac{\delta}{h^{\beta + 1/2}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{lj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \right| + \frac{\delta}{h^{\beta + 1/2}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_{j}} \right| \right) L |x - y|^{\beta}, \end{split}$$

where we have used $\psi \in H(\beta, L)$. Observe that for all k = 1, ..., n and for all $\nu \in A_b$ it holds

$$\frac{\delta}{h^{\beta+1/2}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \right| \le \frac{\delta}{h^{\beta+1}} \cdot \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)} \le \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{L_0}{L}\right),$$

since δ is assumed to satisfy $\delta \leq \frac{h}{\sqrt{\log(2N/b)}} \min\left\{\frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1-\frac{L_0}{L}\right)h^{\beta}\right\}$. Thus, it holds $|f_{\nu}(x) - f_{\nu}(y)| \leq L|x-y|^{\beta}$ for all $\nu \in A_b, x \in B_l$ and $y \in B_k$. The case $x \in B^c$ and $y \in B_k$ can be handled in a similar way, which ends the proof of ii).

We now prove iii). It holds

$$\begin{split} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f_{\nu} - f_{0}| &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j}}{\tilde{\lambda_{j}}} v_{j}(x) \right| dx = \delta \sum_{k=1}^{N} \int_{B_{k}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j}}{\tilde{\lambda_{j}}} v_{j}(x) \right| dx \\ &= \delta \sum_{k=1}^{N} \int_{B_{k}} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda_{j}}} \psi_{k}(x) \right| dx \\ &= \delta \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda_{j}}} \right| \int_{B_{k}} |\psi_{k}(x)| dx \\ &= C_{1} \delta \sqrt{h} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_{j} a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda_{j}}} \right|, \end{split}$$

where $C_1 = \int_{-1}^1 |\psi|$. For all $\nu \in A_b$ it thus holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f_{\nu} - f_0| \ge C_1 \frac{\delta h}{\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}} \sum_{k=1}^N \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \right|^2.$$

Moreover,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \right|^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \right)^2 + \sum_{j \neq l} \frac{\nu_j a_{kj}}{\tilde{\lambda}_j} \frac{\nu_l a_{kl}}{\tilde{\lambda}_l} \right)$$
$$= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_j^2} \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{kj}^2 + \sum_{j \neq l} \frac{\nu_j \nu_l}{\tilde{\lambda}_j \tilde{\lambda}_l} \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{kj} a_{kl}$$
$$= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_j^2},$$

since the matrix $(a_{kj})_{k,j}$ is orthogonal. Thus, for all $\nu \in A_b$ it holds

$$||f_{\nu} - f_0||_1 \ge C_1 \frac{\delta h}{\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{\tilde{\lambda}_j^2}.$$

Set $\mathcal{J} = \{j \in \llbracket 1, N \rrbracket : z_{\alpha}^{-1} \lambda_j \ge \sqrt{2h} \}$, we have for all $\nu \in A_b$

$$\begin{split} \|f_{\nu} - f_{0}\|_{1} &\geq C_{1} \frac{\delta h}{\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{2h} I(z_{\alpha}^{-1}\lambda_{j} < \sqrt{2h}) + \frac{z_{\alpha}^{2}}{\lambda_{j}^{2}} I(z_{\alpha}^{-1}\lambda_{j} \ge \sqrt{2h})\right) \\ &= C_{1} \frac{\delta h}{\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}} \left(\frac{1}{2h} (N - |\mathcal{J}|) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \frac{z_{\alpha}^{2}}{\lambda_{j}^{2}}\right) \\ &\geq C_{1} \frac{\delta h}{\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}} \left(\frac{N}{2h} - \frac{|\mathcal{J}|}{2h} + z_{\alpha}^{2} |\mathcal{J}|^{2} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \lambda_{j}^{2}\right)^{-1}\right) \\ &= C_{1} \frac{\delta N}{2\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}} \left(1 - \frac{|\mathcal{J}|}{N} + \left(\frac{|\mathcal{J}|}{N}\right)^{2} |B| z_{\alpha}^{2} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \lambda_{j}^{2}\right)^{-1}\right), \end{split}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from the inequality between harmonic and artithmetic means. Now,

$$\begin{split} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \lambda_j^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N \langle K v_j, v_j \rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^N \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \frac{q_i(z_i \mid y) q_i(z_i \mid \cdot) \mathbb{1}_B(y) \mathbb{1}_B(\cdot)}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i) \right) v_j(y) \mathrm{d}y, v_j \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{q_i(z_i \mid y) q_i(z_i \mid x) \mathbb{1}_B(y) \mathbb{1}_B(x)}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} v_j(x) v_j(y) \mathrm{d}x \mathrm{d}y \right) \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{q_i(z_i \mid x) \mathbb{1}_B(x)}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} v_j(x) \mathrm{d}x \right)^2 g_{0,i}(z_i) \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{q_i(z_i \mid x)}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} - e^{-2\alpha} \right) \mathbb{1}_B(x) v_j(x) \mathrm{d}x \right)^2 g_{0,i}(z_i) \mathrm{d}\mu_i(z_i), \end{split}$$

since $\int \mathbb{1}_B(x)v_j(x)dx = 0$. Recall that q_i satisfies $e^{-\alpha} \leq q_i(z_i \mid x) \leq e^{\alpha}$ for all $z_i \in \mathcal{Z}_i$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies $e^{-\alpha} \leq g_{0,i}(z_i) \leq e^{\alpha}$, and therefore $0 \leq f_{i,z_i}(x) := \frac{q_i(z_i|x)}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} - e^{-2\alpha} \leq z_{\alpha}$. Writing $f_{i,z_i,B} = \mathbb{1}_B \cdot f_{i,z_i}$, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{q_i(z_i \mid x)}{g_{0,i}(z_i)} - e^{-2\alpha} \right) \mathbb{1}_B(x) v_j(x) \mathrm{d}x \right)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \langle f_{i,z_i,B}, v_j \rangle^2 = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \langle f_{i,z_i,B}, v_j \rangle v_j \right\|_2^2$$
$$= \left\| \operatorname{Proj}_{\operatorname{Vect}(v_1, \dots, v_N)}(f_{i,z_i,B}) \right\|_2^2$$
$$\leq \| f_{i,z_i,B} \|_2^2 \leq z_\alpha^2 |B|.$$

Moreover, $\int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} g_{0,i}(z_i) d\mu_i(z_i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\int_{\mathcal{Z}_i} q_i(z_i \mid x) d\mu_i(z_i)) f_0(x) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_0 = 1$. This gives $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \lambda_j^2 \leq z_{\alpha}^2 |B|$ and for all $\nu \in A_b$

$$\|f_{\nu} - f_0\|_1 \ge C_1 \frac{\delta N}{2\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}} \left(1 - \frac{|\mathcal{J}|}{N} + \left(\frac{|\mathcal{J}|}{N}\right)^2\right) \ge \frac{3C_1}{8} \frac{\delta N}{\sqrt{\log\left(\frac{2N}{b}\right)}}.$$

B Proofs of Section 4

B.1 Proof of Proposition 4.1

Let $i \in [\![1, n]\!]$. Since Z_i depends only on X_i , condition (1) reduces to

$$\frac{q^{Z_i|X_i=y}(z)}{q^{Z_i|X_i=y'}(z)} \le e^{\alpha}, \quad \forall y, y' \in \mathbb{R}, \, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$
(18)

where $q^{Z_i|X_i=y}$ denotes the conditional density of Z_i given $X_i = y$. It holds

$$q^{Z_i|X_i=y}(z) = \prod_{j=1}^N \frac{\alpha}{4} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha|z_j - I(y \in B_j)|}{2}\right).$$

Thus, by the reverse and the ordinary triangle inequality,

$$\frac{q^{Z_i|X_i=y}(z)}{q^{Z_i|X_i=y'}(z)} = \prod_{j=1}^N \exp\left(\frac{\alpha \left[|z_j - I(y' \in B_j)| - |z_j - I(y \in B_j)|\right]}{2}\right)$$
$$\leq \prod_{j=1}^N \exp\left(\frac{\alpha |I(y \in B_j) - I(y' \in B_j)|}{2}\right)$$
$$= \exp\left(\frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N |I(y \in B_j) - I(y' \in B_j)|\right)$$
$$\leq \exp(\alpha),$$

which proves (18).

Consider now $i \in [n+1, 2n]$. Since Z_i depends only on X_i and on Z_1, \ldots, Z_n , condition (1) reduces for $i \in [n+1, 2n]$ to

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(Z_i = z \mid X_i \in A, Z_1 = z_1, \dots, Z_n = z_n)}{\mathbb{P}(Z_i = z \mid X_i \in F, Z_1 = z_1, \dots, Z_n = z_n)} \in [e^{-\alpha}, e^{\alpha}]$$
(19)

for all $z \in \{-c_{\alpha}\tau, c_{\alpha}\tau\}$, $A, F \in \{\overline{B}, B_1, \ldots, B_N\}$ and $z_1, \ldots, z_n \in \mathbb{R}^N$. For all $j, k \in [\![1, N]\!]$, for all z_1, \ldots, z_n it holds

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_{i}=c_{\alpha}\tau \mid X_{i}\in B_{j}, Z_{1}=z_{1}, \dots, Z_{n}=z_{n}\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_{i}=c_{\alpha}\tau \mid X_{i}\in B_{k}, Z_{1}=z_{1}, \dots, Z_{n}=z_{n}\right)} = \frac{1+\frac{[\hat{p}_{j}-p_{0}(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}}{c_{\alpha}\tau}}{1+\frac{[\hat{p}_{k}-p_{0}(k)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}}{c_{\alpha}\tau}} \in \left[\frac{c_{\alpha}-1}{c_{\alpha}+1}, \frac{c_{\alpha}+1}{c_{\alpha}-1}\right] = [e^{-\alpha}, e^{\alpha}],$$

and a similar result holds for $z = -c_{\alpha}\tau$. For all $j \in [[1, N]]$, for all z_1, \ldots, z_n it holds

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_{i} = c_{\alpha}\tau \mid X_{i} \in B_{j}, Z_{1} = z_{1}, \dots, Z_{n} = z_{n}\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_{i} = c_{\alpha}\tau \mid X_{i} \in \overline{B}, Z_{1} = z_{1}, \dots, Z_{n} = z_{n}\right)} = 1 + \frac{[\hat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}}{c_{\alpha}\tau} \in \left[1 - \frac{1}{c_{\alpha}}, 1 + \frac{1}{c_{\alpha}}\right] \subset [e^{-\alpha}, e^{\alpha}].$$

and a similar result holds for $z = -c_{\alpha}\tau$. This ends the proof of (19). Consider now $i \in [\![2n+1, 3n]\!]$. Since Z_i depends only on X_i , condition (1) reduces for $i \in [\![2n+1, 3n]\!]$ to

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i=z\mid X_i\in A\right)}{\mathbb{P}\left(Z_i=z\mid X_i\in F\right)}\in [e^{-\alpha},e^{\alpha}], \quad \forall A,F\in\{\overline{B},B_1,\ldots,B_N\}, \,\forall z\in\{-c_{\alpha},c_{\alpha}\}.$$

We have already proved this in the proof of Proposition 3.2.

B.2 Analysis of the mean and variance of the statistic D_B

Proof of Proposition 4.2. 1. For all $i \in [n+1, 2n]$ it holds

$$\mathbb{P}\left(Z_{i} = \pm c_{\alpha}\tau \mid Z_{1}, \dots, Z_{n}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{i} = \pm c_{\alpha}\tau \mid X_{i} \in B_{j}\right) \mathbb{P}(X_{i} \in B_{j}) + \mathbb{P}\left(Z_{i} = \pm c_{\alpha}\tau \mid X_{i} \in \bar{B}\right) \mathbb{P}(X_{i} \in \bar{B})$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 \pm \frac{\left[\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau}}{c_{\alpha}\tau}\right) p(j) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\bar{B}} f.$$

For $i \in [\![n+1, 2n]\!]$ we thus have

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_i \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n] = c_\alpha \tau \mathbb{P}(Z_i = c_\alpha \tau \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n) - c_\alpha \tau \mathbb{P}(Z_i = -c_\alpha \tau \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$$
$$= \sum_{j=1}^N p(j) [\widehat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[D_B] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}[D_B \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n]\right] = \sum_{j=1}^N \{p(j) - p_0(j)\} \mathbb{E}\left[[\widehat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right].$$

The proof of (12) is similar to the proof of Theorem 3 in [BB20].

2. Write

$$\operatorname{Var}(D_B) = \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{Var}\left(D_B \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n\right)\right] + \operatorname{Var}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[D_B \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n\right]\right).$$

It holds

$$\mathbb{E}[D_B \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n] = \sum_{j=1}^N \{p(j) - p_0(j)\} [\hat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}$$

and

$$\operatorname{Var}(D_B \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n) = \operatorname{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} Z_i - \sum_{j=1}^{N} p_0(j) [\hat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau} \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n\right)$$
$$= \operatorname{Var}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} Z_i \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n\right)$$
$$= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} \operatorname{Var}(Z_i \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$$
$$\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i^2 \mid Z_1, \dots, Z_n\right]$$
$$\leq \frac{c_{\alpha}^2 \tau^2}{n},$$

where we have used the independence of the random variables $(Z_i)_{i=n+1,\ldots,2n}$ conditionnally on Z_1,\ldots,Z_n . This gives

$$\operatorname{Var}(D_B) \leq \frac{c_{\alpha}^2 \tau^2}{n} + \sum_{j=1}^N \{p(j) - p_0(j)\}^2 \operatorname{Var}\left([\widehat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right) \\ + \sum_{j_1 \neq j_2} \{p(j_1) - p_0(j_1)\} \{p(j_2) - p_0(j_2)\} \operatorname{Cov}([\widehat{p}_{j_1} - p_0(j_1)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}, [\widehat{p}_{j_2} - p_0(j_2)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}).$$

Set $P_j = [\hat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}$. We will prove that

$$\operatorname{Var}(P_j) \le \frac{10}{n\alpha^2} \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 (p(j) - p_0(j))^2}{168}\right), \quad \forall j \in [\![1, N]\!],$$
(20)

and

$$|\operatorname{Cov}(P_{j_1}, P_{j_2})| \le \frac{2p(j_1)p(j_2)}{n} \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 \left[(p(j_1) - p_0(j_1))^2 + (p(j_2) - p_0(j_2))^2\right]}{336}\right)$$
(21)

for all $j_1, j_2 \in [\![1, N]\!]$, $j_1 \neq j_2$. We admit these results for the moment and finish the proof of

Proposition 4.2. Using (20) and (21) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}(D_B) &\leq \frac{c_{\alpha}^2 \tau^2}{n} + \frac{10}{n\alpha^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \{p(j) - p_0(j)\}^2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 (p(j) - p_0(j))^2}{168}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{n} \left[\sum_{j=1}^N |p(j) - p_0(j)| p(j) \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 (p(j) - p_0(j))^2}{336}\right)\right]^2 \\ &\leq \frac{c_{\alpha}^2 \tau^2}{n} + \frac{10}{n\alpha^2} \sum_{j=1}^N \{p(j) - p_0(j)\}^2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 (p(j) - p_0(j))^2}{168}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{n} \left[\sum_{j=1}^N p(j)^2\right] \left[\sum_{j=1}^N |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 (p(j) - p_0(j))^2}{168}\right)\right] \\ &\leq \frac{c_{\alpha}^2 \tau^2}{n} + \frac{12}{n\alpha^2} \sum_{j=1}^N |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2 \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 (p(j) - p_0(j))^2}{168}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from Cauchy Schwarz inequality. Now, observe that if $a_j := |p(j) - p_0(j)| \neq 0$, then we can write

$$|p(j) - p_0(j)| \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2(p(j) - p_0(j))^2}{168}\right) = \min\{\tau, a_j\} \cdot \frac{a_j/\tau}{\min\{1, a_j/\tau\}} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{168} \left(\frac{a_j}{\tau}\right)^2\right),$$

where we recall that $\tau = 1/\sqrt{n\alpha^2}$. The study of the function $g: x \mapsto [x/\min\{1, x\}] \exp(-x^2/168)$ gives $g(x) \leq \sqrt{84}e^{-1/2}$ for all $x \geq 0$. We thus have

$$\operatorname{Var}(D_B) \le \frac{c_{\alpha}^2 \tau^2}{n} + \frac{12e^{-1/2}\sqrt{84}}{n\alpha^2} \sum_{j=1}^N |p(j) - p_0(j)| \min\left\{\tau, |p(j) - p_0(j)|\right\}.$$

Using that $\alpha^2 c_{\alpha}^2 \leq 5$ for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$, we finally obtain the claim of Proposition 4.2,

$$\operatorname{Var}(D_B) \le \frac{5}{(n\alpha^2)^2} + \frac{67}{n\alpha^2} D_{\tau}(f).$$

It remains now to prove (20) and (21). We will use the following concentration inequality which is an application of Bernstein's inequality (see for instance Corollary 2.11 in [BLM13])

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\widehat{p}_j - p(j)\right| \ge x\right) \le 2\exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 x^2}{42}\right), \quad \text{for all } 0 < x \le \frac{1}{\alpha}.$$
(22)

Let us prove (20). Let $j \in [1, N]$. We first deal with the case where $p(j) - p_0(j) \ge 2\tau$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}\left(\left[\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right) &= \operatorname{Var}\left(\left[\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau} - \tau\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left[\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau} - \tau\right)^{2}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[(-2\tau)^{2}\mathbb{1}\left(\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j) \leq -\tau\right) + \left(\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j) - \tau\right)^{2}\mathbb{1}\left(\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j) \in [-\tau, \tau]\right)\right] \\ &\leq 4\tau^{2}\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j) \leq \tau\right) \\ &= 4\tau^{2}\mathbb{P}\left(p(j) - \widehat{p}_{j} \geq p(j) - p_{0}(j) - \tau\right) \\ &\leq 4\tau^{2}\mathbb{P}\left(|p(j) - \widehat{p}_{j}| \geq p(j) - p_{0}(j) - \tau\right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, if $p(j) - p_0(j) \ge 2\tau$ then we have $0 < p(j) - p_0(j) - \tau \le p(j) \le 1 \le 1/\alpha$ and (22) gives

$$\operatorname{Var}\left([\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right) \leq 8\tau^{2} \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^{2} \left\{p(j) - p_{0}(j) - \tau\right\}^{2}}{42}\right)$$
$$\leq \frac{8}{n\alpha^{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^{2} \left\{p(j) - p_{0}(j)\right\}^{2}}{168}\right),$$

which ends the proof of (20) for the elements $j \in [\![1, N]\!]$ such that $p(j) - p_0(j) \ge 2\tau$. Starting from $\operatorname{Var}\left([\widehat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right) = \operatorname{Var}\left([\widehat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau} + \tau\right)$, a similar proof gives (20) for the elements $j \in [\![1, N]\!]$ such that $p(j) - p_0(j) \le -2\tau$. It remains to deal with the case $|p(j) - p_0(j)| < 2\tau$. In this case, using that $[\cdot]_{-\tau}^{\tau}$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Var}\left(\left[\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right) &= \operatorname{Var}\left(\left[\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau} - \left[p_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left[\widehat{p}_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau} - \left[p_{j} - p_{0}(j)\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right)^{2}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\widehat{p}_{j} - p(j)\right|^{2}\right] \\ &= \operatorname{Var}(\widehat{p}_{j}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Var}\left(I(X_{i} \in B_{j})\right) + \frac{4}{n^{2}\alpha^{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Var}(W_{ij}) \\ &\leq \frac{9}{n\alpha^{2}} \\ &= \frac{9}{n\alpha^{2}} \exp\left(\frac{n\alpha^{2} \left\{p(j) - p_{0}(j)\right\}^{2}}{168}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^{2} \left\{p(j) - p_{0}(j)\right\}^{2}}{168}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{9 \exp(1/42)}{n\alpha^{2}} \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^{2} \left\{p(j) - p_{0}(j)\right\}^{2}}{168}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption $|p(j) - p_0(j)| \leq 2\tau = 2/\sqrt{n\alpha^2}$. This ends the proof of (20). We now prove (21). For all $i \in [1, n+1]$, we will write

$$\mathbb{E}_{i}\left[\cdot\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\cdot \mid X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}\right],$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j}\left[\cdot\right] = \frac{1}{p(j)} \mathbb{E}\left[\cdot\mathbb{1}(X_{i} \in B_{j}) \mid X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}\right],$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{i}^{comp}\left[\cdot\right] = \frac{1}{p(\overline{B})} \mathbb{E}\left[\cdot\mathbb{1}(X_{i} \in \overline{B}) \mid X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}\right].$$

Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right] \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right], \quad \forall j, j_{2} \neq j_{1}, \tag{23}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{i}^{comp}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right] \stackrel{a.s.}{=} \mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right], \quad \forall j_{2} \neq j_{1}, \tag{24}$$

where we recall that $P_j = [\hat{p}_j - p_0(j)]_{-\tau}^{\tau}$. Let $j_1, j_2 \in [\![1, N]\!], j_1 \neq j_2$. We have

$$Cov (P_{j_1}, P_{j_2}) = Cov (\mathbb{E}_{n+1} [P_{j_1}], \mathbb{E}_{n+1} [P_{j_2}])$$

= $\mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E}_{n+1} [P_{j_1}] \mathbb{E}_{n+1} [P_{j_2}]] - \mathbb{E} [P_{j_1}] \mathbb{E} [P_{j_2}]$
= $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{E}_{i+1} [P_{j_1}] \mathbb{E}_{i+1} [P_{j_2}] - \mathbb{E}_i [P_{j_1}] \mathbb{E}_i [P_{j_2}]) \right],$

where the sum in the last line is a telescoping sum. We thus have

$$\operatorname{Cov}(P_{j_1}, P_{j_2}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}_{i+1}\left[P_{j_1}\right] \mathbb{E}_{i+1}\left[P_{j_2}\right] - \mathbb{E}_i\left[P_{j_1}\right] \mathbb{E}_i\left[P_{j_2}\right]\right].$$
(25)

Now, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{i}[P_{j_{1}}] = \mathbb{E}[P_{j_{1}} | X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[P_{j_{1}} \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}(X_{i} \in B_{j}) + \mathbb{1}(X_{i} \in \overline{B})\right) | X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}\right]$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{N} p(j)\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j}[P_{j_{1}}] + p(\overline{B})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{comp}[P_{j_{1}}]$$

$$= p(j_{1})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}[P_{j_{1}}] + \sum_{\substack{j=1\\ j \neq j_{1}}}^{N} p(j)\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}[P_{j_{1}}] + p(\overline{B})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}[P_{j_{1}}] + p(\overline{B})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}[P_{j_{1}}],$$

where the last equality follows from (23) and (24). We thus obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{i}[P_{j_{1}}] = p(j_{1})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}[P_{j_{1}}] + (1 - p(j_{1}))\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}[P_{j_{1}}].$$
(26)

Similarly, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{i}[P_{j_{2}}] = p(j_{2})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}[P_{j_{2}}] + (1 - p(j_{2}))\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}[P_{j_{2}}].$$
(27)

We now compute $\mathbb{E}_{X_i} [\mathbb{E}_{i+1} [P_{j_1}] \mathbb{E}_{i+1} [P_{j_2}]]$. We have

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{X_{i}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{i+1} \left[P_{j_{1}} \right] \mathbb{E}_{i+1} \left[P_{j_{2}} \right] \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y_{i}) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, y_{i}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n}) f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_{n}) dy_{i+1} \cdots dy_{n} \right. \\ &\left. \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{2}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, y_{i}, y_{i+1}', \dots, y_{n}') f(y_{i+1}') \cdots f(y_{n}') dy_{i+1}' \cdots dy_{n}' \right] dy_{i} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y_{i}) \mathbb{1}(y_{i} \in B_{j}) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, y_{i}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n}) f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_{n}') dy_{i+1}' \cdots dy_{n} \right. \\ &\left. \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{2}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, y_{i}, y_{i+1}', \dots, y_{n}') f(y_{i+1}') \cdots f(y_{n}') dy_{i+1}' \cdots dy_{n}' \right] dy_{i} \\ &\left. + \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y_{i}) \mathbb{1}(y_{i} \in \overline{B}) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, y_{i}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n}) f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_{n}) dy_{i+1} \cdots dy_{n} \right. \\ &\left. \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{2}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, y_{i}, y_{i+1}', \dots, y_{n}') f(y_{i+1}') \cdots f(y_{n}') dy_{i+1}' \cdots dy_{n}' \right] dy_{i} \right] dy_{i} \\ \end{array}$$

For j = 1, ..., N, let x_j be such that $B_j = [x_j - h, x_j + h]$. Observe that if $y_i \in \mathring{B}_j$ then it holds $\mathbb{1}(y_i \in B_k) = \delta_{j,k} = \mathbb{1}(x_j \in B_k)$ where δ is the Kronecker delta. Observe also that if $y_i \in \overline{B}$ then it holds $\mathbb{1}(y_i \in B_k) = 0 = \mathbb{1}(z \in B_k)$ for some $z \in \overline{B}$. This gives

$$P_k(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, y_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n) \mathbb{1}(y_i \in \mathring{B}_j) = P_k(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_j, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n) \mathbb{1}(y_i \in \mathring{B}_j),$$
(28)

and

$$P_k(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, y_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n) \mathbb{1}(y_i \in \overline{B}) = P_k(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, z, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n) \mathbb{1}(y_i \in \overline{B}).$$
(29)

We thus have

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{E}_{X_{i}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{i+1} \left[P_{j_{1}} \right] \mathbb{E}_{i+1} \left[P_{j_{2}} \right] \right] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} p(j) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_{j}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n}) f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_{n}) \mathrm{d}y_{i+1} \cdots \mathrm{d}y_{n} \right. \\ & \left. \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{2}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_{j}, y_{i+1}', \dots, y_{n}') f(y_{i+1}') \cdots f(y_{n}') \mathrm{d}y_{i+1}' \cdots \mathrm{d}y_{n} \right] \\ & \left. + p(\overline{B}) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, z, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n}) f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_{n}) \mathrm{d}y_{i+1} \cdots \mathrm{d}y_{n} \right. \\ & \left. \cdot \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{j_{2}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, z, y_{i+1}', \dots, y_{n}') f(y_{i+1}') \cdots f(y_{n}') \mathrm{d}y_{i+1}' \cdots \mathrm{d}y_{n}' \right]. \end{split}$$

Now, observe that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_k(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_j, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n) f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_n) \mathrm{d}y_{i+1} \cdots \mathrm{d}y_n = \mathbb{E}_i^j [P_k].$$
(30)

Indeed, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j}[P_{k}] = \frac{1}{p(j)} \mathbb{E}\left[P_{k}\mathbb{1}(X_{i} \in B_{j}) \mid X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{p(j)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i+1}} P_{k}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, y_{i}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n})\mathbb{1}(y_{i} \in B_{j})f(y_{i})f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_{n})\mathrm{d}y_{i}\mathrm{d}y_{i+1}\mathrm{d}y_{n}$$

$$= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_{k}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_{j}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n})f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_{n})\mathrm{d}y_{i+1}\mathrm{d}y_{n},$$

where the last equality follows from (28). Similarly, using (29) one can prove that for $z \in \overline{B}$ it holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} P_k(X_1,\ldots,X_{i-1},z,y_{i+1},\ldots,y_n) f(y_{i+1})\cdots f(y_n) \mathrm{d}y_{i+1}\cdots \mathrm{d}y_n = \mathbb{E}_i^{comp}[P_k].$$

We thus have

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_i} \left[\mathbb{E}_{i+1} \left[P_{j_1} \right] \mathbb{E}_{i+1} \left[P_{j_2} \right] \right] = \sum_{j=1}^N p(j) \mathbb{E}_i^j \left[P_{j_1} \right] \mathbb{E}_i^j \left[P_{j_2} \right] + p(\overline{B}) \mathbb{E}_i^{comp} \left[P_{j_1} \right] \mathbb{E}_i^{comp} \left[P_{j_2} \right]$$

and, using (23) and (24) we finally obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_{i}}\left[\mathbb{E}_{i+1}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\mathbb{E}_{i+1}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right]\right] = p(j_{1})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right] + p(j_{2})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right] + (1 - p(j_{1}) - p(j_{2}))\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right].$$
 (31)

Putting (26), (27) and (31) in (25), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Cov}\left(P_{j_{1}},P_{j_{2}}\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[p(j_{1})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right] + p(j_{2})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right] + (1-p(j_{1})-p(j_{2}))\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right] \\ &+ \left\{p(j_{1})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right] + (1-p(j_{1}))\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\right\}\left\{p(j_{2})\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right] + (1-p(j_{2}))\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right]\right\}\right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(j_{1})p(j_{2})\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right] - \mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\right)\left(\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right] - \mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{2}}\right]\right)\right],\end{aligned}$$

and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$|\operatorname{Cov}(P_{j_1}, P_{j_2})| \le \sum_{i=1}^n p(j_1) p(j_2) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_i^{j_1} \left[P_{j_1}\right] - \mathbb{E}_i^{j_2} \left[P_{j_1}\right]\right)^2\right]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_i^{j_1} \left[P_{j_2}\right] - \mathbb{E}_i^{j_2} \left[P_{j_2}\right]\right)^2\right]}.$$
 (32)

Now, using (30) and Jensen's inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right] - \mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\right)^{2}\right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} \left(P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_{j_{1}}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n}) - P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_{j_{2}}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n})\right)\right.$$

$$\left.f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_{n}) dy_{i+1} \cdots dy_{n}\right\}^{2}\right]$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-i}} \left\{P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_{j_{1}}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n}) - P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_{j_{2}}, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{n})\right\}^{2}\right.$$

$$\left.f(y_{i+1}) \cdots f(y_{n}) dy_{i+1} \cdots dy_{n}\right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_{j_{1}}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_{n}) - P_{j_{1}}(X_{1}, \dots, X_{i-1}, x_{j_{2}}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_{n})\right\}^{2}\right]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left[\frac{1}{n} + Y\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau} - [Y]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right)^{2}\right],$$
ere

where

$$Y = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\substack{k=1\\k\neq i}}^{n} \mathbb{1}(X_k \in B_{j_1}) + \frac{2}{n\alpha} \sum_{k=1}^{n} W_{kj_1} - p_0(j_1).$$

Note that since $[\cdot]_{-\tau}^{\tau}$ is continuous Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant 1, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right] - \mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\right)^{2}\right] \leq \frac{1}{n^{2}}$$

However, we can provide another bound when $|p(j_1) - p_0(j_1)| \ge 2(\tau + 1/n)$. Assume that $p(j_1) - p_0(j_1) \ge 2(\tau + 1/n)$. We have

$$\begin{split} & \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right] - \mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\right)^{2}\right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left[\frac{1}{n} + Y\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau} - [Y]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right)^{2}\mathbb{1}(Y \leq \tau)\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left[\frac{1}{n} + Y\right]_{-\tau}^{\tau} - [Y]_{-\tau}^{\tau}\right)^{2}\mathbb{1}(Y > \tau)\right] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n^{2}}\mathbb{P}(Y \leq \tau) \\ & = \frac{1}{n^{2}}\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{\substack{k=1\\k \neq i}}^{n}\mathbb{1}(X_{k} \in B_{j_{1}}) + \frac{2}{n\alpha}\sum_{k=1}^{n}W_{kj_{1}} - p_{0}(j_{1}) \leq \tau\right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n^{2}}\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\mathbb{1}(X_{k} \in B_{j_{1}}) - \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n\alpha}\sum_{k=1}^{n}W_{kj_{1}} - p_{0}(j_{1}) \leq \tau\right) \\ & = \frac{1}{n^{2}}\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{p}_{j_{1}} \leq \tau + \frac{1}{n} + p_{0}(j_{1})\right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n^{2}}\mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{p}_{j_{1}} - p(j_{1})| \geq p(j_{1}) - p_{0}(j_{1}) - \tau - \frac{1}{n}\right) \end{split}$$

Now, if $p(j_1) - p_0(j_1) \ge 2(\tau + 1/n)$ then we have $0 < p(j_1) - p_0(j_1) - \tau - \frac{1}{n} \le p(j_1) \le 1 \le \frac{1}{\alpha}$ and (22) gives

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{1}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right] - \mathbb{E}_{i}^{j_{2}}\left[P_{j_{1}}\right]\right)^{2}\right] \leq \frac{2}{n^{2}}\exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^{2}\left(p(j_{1}) - p_{0}(j_{1}) - \tau - 1/n\right)^{2}}{42}\right)$$
$$\leq \frac{2}{n^{2}}\exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^{2}\left(p(j_{1}) - p_{0}(j_{1})\right)^{2}}{168}\right).$$

One can prove the same result if $p(j_1) - p_0(j_1) \leq -2(\tau + 1/n)$, and similar bounds with j_1 replaced by j_2 hold for $\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{E}_i^{j_1}\left[P_{j_2}\right] - \mathbb{E}_i^{j_2}\left[P_{j_2}\right]\right)^2\right]$. We can now conclude. If $j_1 \neq j_2$ are such that $|p(j_1) - p_0(j_1)| \geq 2(\tau + 1/n)$ and $|p(j_2) - p_0(j_2)| \geq 2(\tau + 1/n)$ then (32) gives

$$|\operatorname{Cov}(P_{j_1}, P_{j_2})| \le \frac{2p(j_1)p(j_2)}{n} \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 \left[(p(j_1) - p_0(j_1))^2 + (p(j_2) - p_0(j_2))^2\right]}{336}\right).$$

If $j_1 \neq j_2$ are such that $|p(j_1) - p_0(j_1)| < 2(\tau + 1/n)$ and $|p(j_2) - p_0(j_2)| \ge 2(\tau + 1/n)$ then (32) gives

$$\begin{split} |\operatorname{Cov} (P_{j_1}, P_{j_2})| \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}p(j_1)p(j_2)}{n} \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2(p(j_2) - p_0(j_2))^2}{336}\right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}p(j_1)p(j_2)}{n} \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2\left[(p(j_1) - p_0(j_1))^2 + (p(j_2) - p_0(j_2))^2\right]}{336}\right) \exp\left(\frac{n\alpha^2(p(j_1) - p_0(j_1))^2}{336}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\exp(1/21)p(j_1)p(j_2)}{n} \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2\left[(p(j_1) - p_0(j_1))^2 + (p(j_2) - p_0(j_2))^2\right]}{336}\right), \end{split}$$

since $|p(j_1) - p_0(j_1)| < 2(\tau + 1/n) \le 4/\sqrt{n\alpha^2}$. The same result holds if $j_1 \ne j_2$ are such that $|p(j_1) - p_0(j_1)| \ge 2(\tau + 1/n)$ and $|p(j_2) - p_0(j_2)| < 2(\tau + 1/n)$. Finally, if $j_1 \ne j_2$ are such that $|p(j_1) - p_0(j_1)| < 2(\tau + 1/n)$ and $|p(j_2) - p_0(j_2)| < 2(\tau + 1/n)$, then (32) gives

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{Cov}(P_{j_1}, P_{j_2})| &\leq \frac{p(j_1)p(j_2)}{n} \\ &\leq \frac{p(j_1)p(j_2)}{n} \exp\left(\frac{2}{21}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{n\alpha^2 \left[(p(j_1) - p_0(j_1))^2 + (p(j_2) - p_0(j_2))^2\right]}{336}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof of (21).

B.3 Proof of Theorem 4.3

The outline of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.4 : we first prove that the choice of t_1 and t_2 in (11) yields $\mathbb{P}_{Q_{t_0}^n}(\Phi = 1) \leq \gamma/2$ and we then exhibit $\rho_1, \rho_2 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \int_{B} |f - f_0| \ge \rho_1 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(D_B < t_1) \le \gamma/2\\ \int_{\bar{B}} |f - f_0| \ge \rho_2 \Rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(T_B < t_2) \le \gamma/2. \end{cases}$$

The quantity $\rho_1 + \rho_2$ will then provide an upper bound on $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma)$.

We have already seen in the proof of the upper bound in the non-interactive scenario that the choice $t_2 = \sqrt{20/(n\alpha^2\gamma)}$ gives $\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(T_B \ge t_2) \le \gamma/4$. Moreover, Chebychev's inequality and Proposition 4.2 yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(D_B \ge t_1) &= \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(D_B - \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n}[D_B] \ge t_1) \le \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}\left(|D_B - \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f_0}^n}[D_B]| \ge t_1\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\operatorname{Var}_{Qf_0^n}(D_B)}{t_1^2} \\ &\leq \frac{5}{(n\alpha^2)^2 t_1^2} \le \frac{\gamma}{4} \end{aligned}$$

for $t_1 = 2\sqrt{5}/(n\alpha^2\sqrt{\gamma})$. We thus have

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(\Phi = 1) \le \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(D_B \ge t_1) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(T_B \ge t_2) \le \frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

We have seen in the proof of Theorem 3.4 (upper bound in the non-interactive scenario) that if we set

$$\rho_2 = 2 \int_{\bar{B}} f_0 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) t_2,$$

then we have

$$\int_{\bar{B}} |f - f_0| \ge \rho_2 \implies \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(T_B < t_2) \le \frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

It remains now to exhibit ρ_1 such that $\int_B |f - f_0| \ge \rho_1$ implies $\mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(D_B < t_1) \le \gamma/2$. Chebychev's inequality gives

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(D_{B} < t_{1}) &= \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}\left(\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f}^{n}}[D_{B}] - D_{B} > \mathbb{E}_{Q_{f}^{n}}[D_{B}] - t_{1}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\operatorname{Var}_{Qf^{n}}(D_{B})}{\left(\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f}^{n}}[D_{B}] - t_{1}\right)^{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\frac{5}{(n\alpha^{2})^{2}}}{\left(\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f}^{n}}[D_{B}] - t_{1}\right)^{2}} + \frac{\frac{67D_{\tau}(f)}{n\alpha^{2}}}{\left(\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f}^{n}}[D_{B}] - t_{1}\right)^{2}}, \end{split}$$

if $\mathbb{E}_{Q_{f}^{n}}[D_{B}] - t_{1} > 0$. Now, observe that if $D_{\tau}(f) \geq 12(t_{1} + 6\tau/\sqrt{n})$, Proposition 4.2 implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[D_B] - t_1 \ge \frac{1}{6}D_{\tau}(f) - \frac{6\tau}{\sqrt{n}} - t_1 \ge t_1 + \frac{6\tau}{\sqrt{n}} \ge t_1$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_f^n}[D_B] - t_1 \ge \frac{1}{6}D_{\tau}(f) - \left(\frac{6\tau}{\sqrt{n}} + t_1\right) \ge \frac{1}{6}D_{\tau}(f) - \frac{1}{12}D_{\tau}(f) = \frac{1}{12}D_{\tau}(f).$$

Thus, if $D_{\tau}(f) \geq 12(t_1 + 6\tau/\sqrt{n})$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(D_B < t_1) \le \frac{5}{(n\alpha^2)^2 t_1^2} + \frac{144 \times 67}{n\alpha^2 D_\tau(f)} = \frac{\gamma}{4} + \frac{9648}{n\alpha^2 D_\tau(f)}$$

Thus, if $D_{\tau}(f)$ satisfies

$$D_{\tau}(f) \ge \frac{C_{\gamma}}{n\alpha^2}$$
, with $C_{\gamma} = \max\left\{\frac{24\sqrt{5}+72}{\sqrt{\gamma}}, \frac{9648 \times 4}{\gamma}\right\}$

then we have $\mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(D_B < t_1) \leq \gamma/2$. We now exhibit ρ_1 such that $\int_B |f - f_0| \geq \rho_1$ implies $D_{\tau}(f) \geq C_{\gamma}/(n\alpha^2)$. To this aim, we will use the following facts

i)
$$D_{\tau}(f) \ge \min\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2, \tau \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2}\right\},\$$

ii) $\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2 \ge C_{\gamma}^2/(n\alpha^2) \Rightarrow \min\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2, \tau \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2}\right\} \ge C_{\gamma}/(n\alpha^2),$

iii)
$$\left(\int_{B} |f - f_0|\right)^2 \le 4(L + L_0)^2 |B|^2 h^{2\beta} + |B|/(2h) \sum_{j=1}^N |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2$$

We admit for now these three facts and conclude the proof of our upper bound. If we have

$$\left(\int_{B} |f - f_0|\right)^2 \ge 4(L + L_0)^2 |B|^2 h^{2\beta} + \frac{|B|}{2h} \frac{C_{\gamma}^2}{n\alpha^2}$$

then iii) implies

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2 \ge \frac{C_{\gamma}^2}{n\alpha^2},$$

and ii) combined with i) yield $D_{\tau}(f) \geq C_{\gamma}/(n\alpha^2)$ and thus $\mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(D_B < t_1) \leq \gamma/2$. We can then take

$$\rho_1 = \sqrt{4(L+L_0)^2|B|^2h^{2\beta} + \frac{|B|}{2h}\frac{C_{\gamma}^2}{n\alpha^2}}.$$

For all $f \in H(\beta, L)$ satisfying $||f - f_0||_1 \ge \rho_1 + \rho_2$ it holds

$$\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_0}^n}(\Phi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(\Phi = 0) \le \frac{\gamma}{2} + \min\left\{\mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(D_B < t_1), \mathbb{P}_{Q_f^n}(T_B < t_2)\right\} \le \frac{\gamma}{2} + \frac{\gamma}{2} = \gamma,$$

since $||f - f_0||_1 \ge \rho_1 + \rho_2$ implies $\int_B |f - f_0| \ge \rho_1$ or $\int_{\bar{B}} |f - f_0| \ge \rho_2$. Consequently, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \le \rho_1 + \rho_2 = \sqrt{4(L+L_0)^2 |B|^2 h^{2\beta} + \frac{|B|}{2h} \frac{C_{\gamma}^2}{n\alpha^2}} + 2\int_{\bar{B}} f_0 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right) t_2$$
$$\le C(L,L_0,\gamma) \left[|B|h^\beta + \sqrt{\frac{|B|}{hn\alpha^2}} + \int_{\bar{B}} f_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \right].$$

The choice $h \asymp |B|^{-\frac{1}{2\beta+1}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{1}{2\beta+1}}$ yields

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \le C\left[|B|^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}} + \int_{\overline{B}} f_0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}}\right]$$

which ends the proof of Theorem 4.3. It remains to prove i), ii) and iii). Let's start with the proof of i). If $\tau \ge \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2}$, then $\tau \ge |p(j) - p_0(j)|$ for all j, and we thus have

$$D_{\tau}(f) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2 = \min\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2, \tau \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2}\right\}$$

We now deal with the case $\tau < \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2}$. In this case, we can write

$$D_{\tau}(f) - \tau \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_{0}(j)|^{2}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_{0}(j)| \min \{|p(j) - p_{0}(j)|, \tau\} - \tau \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_{0}(j)|^{2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{N} |p(k) - p_{0}(k)|^{2}}} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_{0}(j)| \underbrace{\left[\min \{|p(j) - p_{0}(j)|, \tau\} - \frac{\tau |p(j) - p_{0}(j)|}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{N} |p(k) - p_{0}(k)|^{2}}}\right]}_{=:A_{j}},$$

and $A_j \ge 0$ for all j. Indeed, if j is such that $|p(j) - p_0(j)| < \tau$ it holds

$$A_{j} = |p(j) - p_{0}(j)| \left[1 - \frac{\tau}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{N} |p(k) - p_{0}(k)|^{2}}} \right] \ge 0,$$

and if j is such that $|p(j) - p_0(j)| \ge \tau$ it holds

$$A_j = \tau \left[1 - \frac{|p(j) - p_0(j)|}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^N |p(k) - p_0(k)|^2}} \right] \ge 0.$$

Thus, if $\tau < \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2}$ we have

$$D_{\tau}(f) \ge \tau \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2} = \min\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2, \tau \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2}\right\},$$

which end the proof of i). We now prove ii). Assume that $\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2 \ge C_{\gamma}^2/(n\alpha^2)$. It holds $C_{\gamma}^2 \ge C_{\gamma}$ since $C_{\gamma} \ge 1$ and we thus have $\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2 \ge C_{\gamma}/(n\alpha^2)$. It also holds

$$\tau \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p(j) - p_0(j)|^2} \ge \tau \cdot \frac{C_{\gamma}}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} = \frac{C_{\gamma}}{n\alpha^2},$$

yielding ii). Finally, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields

$$\left(\int_{B} |f - f_{0}|\right)^{2} \leq |B| \int_{B} |f - f_{0}|^{2}$$
$$\leq |B| \cdot \left| \int_{B} |f - f_{0}|^{2} - \frac{1}{2h} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (p(j) - p_{0}(j))^{2} \right| + \frac{|B|}{2h} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (p(j) - p_{0}(j))^{2}.$$

Now, observe that

$$\left| \int_{B} |f - f_0|^2 - \frac{1}{2h} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (p(j) - p_0(j))^2 \right| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{B_j} \left[(f - f_0)(x) - \frac{p(j) - p_0(j)}{2h} \right]^2 \mathrm{d}x \right|,$$

and observe also that for $x \in B_j$ it holds

$$\begin{split} \left| (f - f_0)(x) - \frac{p(j) - p_0(j)}{2h} \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{2h} \int_{B_j} \left[(f - f_0)(x) - (f - f_0)(u) \right] \mathrm{d}u \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2h} \int_{B_j} \left[|f(x) - f(u)| + |f_0(x) - f_0(u)| \right] \mathrm{d}u \\ &\leq \frac{L + L_0}{2h} \int_{B_j} |x - u|^\beta \mathrm{d}u \\ &\leq \frac{L + L_0}{2h} \int_{B_j} (2h)^\beta \mathrm{d}u \\ &\leq 2(L + L_0)h^\beta. \end{split}$$

This gives

$$\left| \int_{B} |f - f_0|^2 - \frac{1}{2h} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(p(j) - p_0(j) \right)^2 \right| \le \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{B_j} 4(L + L_0)^2 h^{2\beta} = 4(L + L_0)^2 |B| h^{2\beta},$$

which yields iii).

B.4 Proof of Theorem 4.4

Let $B \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a non-empty compact set, and let $(B_j)_{j=1,...,N}$ be a partition of B, h > 0 be the bandwidth and (x_1, \ldots, x_N) be the centering points, that is $B_j = [x_j - h, x_j + h]$ for all $j \in [\![1, N]\!]$. Let $\psi : [-1, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that $\psi \in H(\beta, L)$, $\int \psi = 0$ and $\int \psi^2 = 1$. For $j \in [\![1, N]\!]$, define

$$\psi_j : t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{h}} \psi\left(\frac{t-x_j}{h}\right).$$

Note that the support of ψ_j is B_j , $\int \psi_j = 0$ and $(\psi_j)_{j=1,\dots,N}$ is an orthonormal family. For $\delta > 0$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N = \{-1, 1\}^N$, define the functions

$$f_{\nu}: x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto f_0(x) + \delta \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j \psi_j(x),$$

The following lemma shows that for δ properly chosen, for all $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N$, f_{ν} is a density belonging to $H(\beta, L)$ and f_{ν} is sufficiently far away from f_0 in a L_1 sense.

Lemma B.1. If the parameter δ appearing in the definition of f_{ν} satisfies

$$\delta \leq \sqrt{h} \cdot \min\left\{\frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{L_0}{L}\right)h^{\beta}\right\},\,$$

where $C_0(B) := \min\{f_0(x) : x \in B\}$, then we have

- i) $f_{\nu} \geq 0$ and $\int f_{\nu} = 1$, for all $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N$,
- *ii)* $f_{\nu} \in H(\beta, L)$, for all $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N$,
- *iii*) $||f_{\nu} f_0||_1 = C_1 \delta N \sqrt{h}$, for all $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N$, with $C_1 = \int_{-1}^1 |\psi|$.

Proof. We first prove *i*). Since $\int \psi_j = 0$ for all j = 1, ..., n, it holds $\int f_{\nu} = \int f_0 = 1$ for all ν . Since $\operatorname{Supp}(\psi_k) = B_k$ for all k = 1, ..., N, it holds $f_{\nu} \equiv f_0$ on B^c and thus f_{ν} is non-negative on B^c . Now, for $x \in B_j$ it holds for all $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N$

$$f_{\nu}(x) = f_0(x) + \delta \nu_j \psi_j(x) \ge C_0(B) - \delta \|\psi_j\|_{\infty} \ge C_0(B) - \frac{\delta \|\psi\|_{\infty}}{\sqrt{h}} \ge 0,$$

since $\delta \leq C_0(B)\sqrt{h}/\|\psi\|_{\infty}$ Thus, f_{ν} is non-negative on \mathbb{R} for all $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N$.

To prove *ii*), we have to show that $|f_{\nu}(x) - f_{\nu}(y)| \leq L|x - y|^{\beta}$, for all $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N$, for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $f_{\nu} \equiv f_0$ on B^c and $f_0 \in H(\beta, L_0)$, this result is trivial for $x, y \in B^c$. If $x \in B_l$ and $y \in B_k$ it holds

$$\begin{split} |f_{\nu}(x) - f_{\nu}(y)| &\leq |f_{0}(x) - f_{0}(y)| + |\delta\nu_{l}\psi_{l}(x) - \delta\nu_{k}\psi_{k}(y)| \\ &\leq L_{0}|x - y|^{\beta} + |\delta\nu_{l}\psi_{l}(x) - \delta\nu_{l}\psi_{l}(y)| + |\delta\nu_{k}\psi_{k}(x) - \delta\nu_{k}\psi_{k}(y)| \\ &\leq L_{0}|x - y|^{\beta} + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{h}} \left|\psi\left(\frac{x - x_{l}}{h}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{y - x_{l}}{h}\right)\right| + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{h}} \left|\psi\left(\frac{x - x_{k}}{h}\right) - \psi\left(\frac{y - x_{k}}{h}\right)\right| \\ &\leq L_{0}|x - y|^{\beta} + \frac{\delta}{h^{\beta + 1/2}} \cdot L|x - y|^{\beta} + \frac{\delta}{h^{\beta + 1/2}} \cdot L|x - y|^{\beta} \\ &= \left(\frac{L_{0}}{L} + \frac{2\delta}{h^{\beta + 1/2}}\right) L|x - y|^{\beta} \\ &\leq L|x - y|^{\beta} \end{split}$$

where we have used $\psi \in H(\beta, L)$ and $\delta \leq \frac{h^{\beta+1/2}}{2} \left(1 - \frac{L_0}{L}\right)$. Thus, it holds $|f_{\nu}(x) - f_{\nu}(y)| \leq L|x-y|^{\beta}$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N$, $x \in B_l$ and $y \in B_k$. The case $x \in B^c$ and $y \in B_k$ can be handled in a similar way, which ends the proof of ii).

We now prove iii). It holds

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f_{\nu} - f_{0}| = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \nu_{j} \psi_{j}(x) \right| dx = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \int_{B_{k}} |\delta \nu_{k} \psi_{k}(x)| dx = \delta N \sqrt{h} \int_{-1}^{1} |\psi|.$$

For a privacy mechanism $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}$, we denote by $Q_{f_0}^n$ (respectively $Q_{f_{\nu}}^n$) the distribution of (Z_1, \ldots, Z_n) when the X_i 's are distributed according to f_0 (respectively to f_{ν}). We set $\bar{Q}^n = 1/2^N \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_N} Q_{f_{\nu}}^n$. If δ is chosen such that $\delta \leq \sqrt{h} \cdot \min\left\{\frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{L_0}{L}\right)h^{\beta}\right\}$, setting $\rho^* = C_1 \delta N \sqrt{h}$, we deduce from the above lemma that if

$$\operatorname{KL}(Q_{f_0}^n, \bar{Q}^n) \le 2(1-\gamma)^2 \text{ for all } Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha},$$
(33)

then it holds

$$\inf_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}}\inf_{\phi\in\Phi_{Q}}\sup_{f\in H_{1}(\rho^{\star})}\left\{\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}}(\phi=1)+\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(\phi=0)\right\}\geq\gamma,$$

where $H_1(\rho^*) := \{f \in H(\beta, L) : f \ge 0, \int f = 1, \|f - f_0\|_1 \ge \rho^*\}$, and consequently $\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0, \gamma) \ge \rho^*$. Indeed, if (33) holds, then we have

$$\begin{split} \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_{Q}} \sup_{f \in H_{1}(\rho^{*})} \left\{ \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}}(\phi = 1) + \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f}^{n}}(\phi = 0) \right\} \geq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_{Q}} \left(\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}}(\phi = 1) + \frac{1}{2^{N}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{N}} \mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{\nu}}^{n}}(\phi = 0) \right) \\ &= \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}} \inf_{\phi \in \Phi_{Q}} \left(1 - \left[\mathbb{P}_{Q_{f_{0}}^{n}}(\phi = 0) - \mathbb{P}_{\bar{Q}^{n}}(\phi = 0) \right] \right) \\ \geq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}} \left[1 - \operatorname{TV}(Q_{f_{0}}^{n}, \bar{Q}^{n}) \right] \\ \geq \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\alpha}} \left[1 - \sqrt{\frac{\operatorname{KL}(Q_{f_{0}}^{n}, \bar{Q}^{n})}{2}} \right] \\ \geq \gamma, \end{split}$$

where the second to last inequality follows from Pinsker's inequality. We now prove that (33) holds under an extra assumption on δ . Fix a privacy mechanism $Q \in Q_{\alpha}$. The conditionnal distribution of Z_i given Z_1, \ldots, Z_{i-1} when X_i is distributed according to f_0 or f_{ν} will be denoted by $\mathcal{L}_{Z_i|Z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(0)}(dz_i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} Q_i(dz_i \mid x_i, z_{1:(i-1)}) f_0(x_i) dx_i$ and $\mathcal{L}_{Z_i|Z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(\nu)}(dz_i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} Q_i(dz_i \mid x_i, z_{1:(i-1)}) f_0(x_i) dx_i$ when X_1, \ldots, X_i are i.i.d. from f_0 will be denoted by

$$\mathcal{L}_{Z_1,\dots,Z_i}^{(0)}(dz_{1:i}) = \mathcal{L}_{Z_i|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(0)}(dz_i)\cdots\mathcal{L}_{Z_2|z_1}^{(0)}(dz_2)\mathcal{L}_{Z_1}^{(0)}(dz_1).$$

The convexity and tensorization of the Kullback-Leibler divergence give

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{KL}(Q_{f_0}^n, \bar{Q}^n) &\leq \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}} \operatorname{KL}(Q_{f_0}^n, Q_{f_\nu}^n) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\mathcal{Z}^{i-1}} \operatorname{KL}\left(\mathcal{L}_{Z_i|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_{Z_i|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(\nu)}\right) \mathcal{L}_{Z_1, \dots, Z_{i-1}}^{(0)}(dz_{1:(i-1)}). \end{aligned}$$

According to lemma B.3 in [BRS20], there exists a probability measure $\mu_{z_{1:(i-1)}}$ on \mathcal{Z} and a family of $\mu_{z_{1:(i-1)}}$ -densities $z_i \mapsto q_i(\cdot \mid x_i, z_{1:(i-1)})$ of $Q_i(\cdot \mid x_i, z_{1:(i-1)})$, $x_i \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

 $e^{-\alpha} \le q_i(z_i \mid x_i, z_{1:(i-1)}) \le e^{\alpha}, \quad \forall z_i \in \mathcal{Z}, \forall x_i \in \mathbb{R}.$

We can thus write $\mathcal{L}_{Z_i|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(0)}(dz_i) = m_i^{(0)}(z_i \mid z_{1:(i-1)})d\mu_{z_{1:(i-1)}}(z_i)$, and $\mathcal{L}_{Z_i|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(\nu)}(dz_i) = m_i^{(\nu)}(z_i \mid z_{1:(i-1)})d\mu_{z_{1:(i-1)}}(z_i)$ with $m_i^{(0)}(z_i \mid z_{1:(i-1)}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} q_i(z_i \mid x_i, z_{1:(i-1)})f_0(x_i)dx_i$ and $m_i^{(\nu)}(z_i \mid z_{1:(i-1)}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} q_i(z_i \mid x_i, z_{1:(i-1)})f_0(x_i)dx_i$. Bounding the Kullback-Leibler divergence by the χ^2 -divergence, we have

$$\begin{split} \operatorname{KL}\left(\mathcal{L}_{Z_{i}|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(0)}, \mathcal{L}_{Z_{i}|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(\nu)}\right) \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left(\frac{d\mathcal{L}_{Z_{i}|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(0)}}{d\mathcal{L}_{Z_{i}|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(\nu)}} - 1\right)^{2} \mathcal{L}_{Z_{i}|z_{1:(i-1)}}^{(\nu)}(dz_{i}) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left(\frac{m_{i}^{(0)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1}) - m_{i}^{(\nu)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1})}{m_{i}^{(\nu)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1})}\right)^{2} m_{i}^{(\nu)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1}) d\mu_{z_{1:(i-1)}}(z_{i}) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} q_{i}(z_{i} \mid x, z_{1:i-1}) \left(f_{0}(x) - f_{\nu}(x)\right) dx}{m_{i}^{(\nu)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1})}\right)^{2} m_{i}^{(\nu)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1}) d\mu_{z_{1:(i-1)}}(z_{i}) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{q_{i}(z_{i} \mid x, z_{1:i-1})}{m_{i}^{(\nu)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1})} - e^{-2\alpha}\right) \left(f_{0}(x) - f_{\nu}(x)\right) dx\right]^{2} m_{i}^{(\nu)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1}) d\mu_{z_{1:(i-1)}}(z_{i}), \end{split}$$

since $\int_{\mathbb{R}} (f_0 - f_{\nu}) = 0$. Recall that q_i satisfies $e^{-\alpha} \leq q_i(z_i \mid x, z_{1:(i-1)}) \leq e^{\alpha}$. Thus, we have $e^{\alpha} = \int e^{\alpha} f_{\nu} \geq m_i^{(\nu)}(z_i \mid z_{1:(i-1)}) \geq e^{-\alpha} \int f_{\nu} = e^{-\alpha}$, and therefore

$$0 \le g_{i,z_{1:i}}(x) := \frac{q_i(z_i \mid x, z_{1:(i-1)})}{m_i^{(\nu)}(z_i \mid z_{1:(i-1)})} - e^{-2\alpha} \le z_\alpha = e^{2\alpha} - e^{-2\alpha}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{split} &\frac{1}{2^{N}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{N}} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{q_{i}(z_{i} \mid x, z_{1:i-1})}{m_{i}^{(\nu)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1})} - e^{-2\alpha} \right) (f_{0}(x) - f_{\nu}(x)) \, dx \right]^{2} m_{i}^{(\nu)}(z_{i} \mid z_{1:i-1}) \\ &\leq e^{\alpha} \delta^{2} \frac{1}{2^{N}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}_{N}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{N} \nu_{k} \int_{\mathbb{R}} g_{i,z_{1:i}}(x) \psi_{k}(x) dx \right]^{2} \\ &= e \delta^{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} g_{i,z_{1:i}}(x) \psi_{k}(x) dx \right]^{2} \\ &\leq e \delta^{2} z_{\alpha}^{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \|\psi_{k}\|_{1}^{2} \leq e \delta^{2} z_{\alpha}^{2} NhC_{1}^{2} = \frac{e}{2} C_{1}^{2} \delta^{2} z_{\alpha}^{2} |B|, \end{split}$$

where we recall that $C_1 = \int |\psi|$. We thus obtain

$$\operatorname{KL}(Q_{f_0}^n, \bar{Q}^n) \le \frac{e}{2} C_1^2 \delta^2 n z_\alpha^2 |B|,$$

and (33) holds as soon as

$$\delta \le \sqrt{\frac{4(1-\gamma)^2}{eC_1^2 n z_\alpha^2 |B|}}.$$

Finally, taking $\delta = \min\left\{\sqrt{h} \cdot \min\left\{\frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \frac{L_0}{L}\right)h^{\beta}\right\}, \sqrt{\frac{4(1-\gamma)^2}{eC_1^2 n z_{\alpha}^2 |B|}}\right\}$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\psi,\gamma) \min\left\{ |B| \min\left\{ \frac{C_0(B)}{\|\psi\|_{\infty}}, \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{L_0}{L}\right) h^{\beta} \right\}, \frac{\sqrt{|B|}}{\sqrt{h}\sqrt{nz_{\alpha}^2}} \right\}.$$

If B is chosen such that $C_0(B) = \min\{f_0(x), x \in B\} \ge Ch^{\beta}$, then the bound becomes

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\psi,\gamma,L,L_0) \min\left\{ |B|h^{\beta}, \frac{\sqrt{|B|}}{\sqrt{h}\sqrt{nz_{\alpha}^2}} \right\}$$

and the choice $h \asymp |B|^{-1/(2\beta+1)} (n z_{\alpha}^2)^{-1/(2\beta+1)}$ yields

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}(f_0,\gamma) \ge C(\psi,\gamma,L,L_0)|B|^{\frac{\beta+1}{2\beta+1}}(nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}}.$$

Note that with this choice of h, the condition $C_0(B) \ge Ch^{\beta}$ becomes $|B|^{\beta/(2\beta+1)}C_0(B) \ge C(nz_{\alpha}^2)^{-\beta/(2\beta+1)}$.

C Proofs of Section 5

C.1 Example 5.2

We first prove the result for the non-interactive case. Take

$$B = [a, T],$$
 with $T = (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2\beta}{k(4\beta+3)+3\beta+3}}.$

Note that T > a for n large enough. Theorem 3.4 gives

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim (T-a)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \left(\frac{a}{T}\right)^k \\ \lesssim T^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + T^{-k} \\ = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2k\beta}{k(4\beta+3)+3\beta+3}}.$$

To obtain the lower bound, we first check that condition (7) in Theorem 3.5 is satisfied. Since $T \to +\infty$ as $n \to \infty$, it holds for n large enough

$$|B|^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}C_{0}(B) = (T-a)^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}\frac{ka^{k}}{T^{k+1}}$$
$$= ka^{k}T^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}-(k+1)}\left(1-\frac{a}{T}\right)^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$
$$\gtrsim T^{\frac{\beta-(k+1)(4\beta+3)}{4\beta+3}}$$
$$\gtrsim C(n\alpha^{2})^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}.$$

Condition (7) is thus satisfied and Theorem 3.5 thus yields for n large enough

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log\left(C(T-a)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} (T-a)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ \gtrsim \left[\log\left(CT^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} T^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ \gtrsim \left[\log\left(C(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3} \cdot \frac{2\beta}{k(4\beta+3)+3\beta+3} + \frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2k\beta}{k(4\beta+3)+3\beta+3}}. \end{aligned}$$

The proof in the interactive scenario follows the same lines at the exception of the choice of T which should be taken as

$$T = (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{\beta}{k(2\beta+1)+\beta+1}}.$$

C.2 Example 5.3

We first prove the result for the non-interactive case. Take

$$B = [0, T],$$
 with $T = \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{2\beta}{4\beta + 3} \log(n\alpha^2).$

Theorem 3.4 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\rm NI}(f_0,\gamma) &\lesssim T^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \exp(-\lambda T) \\ &\lesssim \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ &\lesssim \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, observe that

$$|B|^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}C_0(B) = T^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}} \cdot \lambda \exp(-\lambda T) = \lambda T^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \gtrsim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}.$$

Thus, condition (7) is satisfied and Theorem 3.5 yields

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\text{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log\left(CT^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} T^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ \gtrsim \left[\log\left(C\log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}}(n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}.$$

The proof in the interactive scenario follows the same lines at the exception of the choice of T which should be taken as

$$T = \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{\beta}{2\beta + 1} \log(n\alpha^2).$$

C.3 Example 5.4

We first prove the result for the non-interactive case. Take

$$B = [-T, T],$$
 with $T = \sqrt{\frac{4\beta}{4\beta + 3}\log(n\alpha^2)}.$

Theorem 3.4 gives

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) &\lesssim (2T)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_T^{+\infty} e^{-x^2/2} dx \\ &\lesssim T^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{T} \exp\left(-\frac{T^2}{2}\right) \\ &\lesssim \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{2(4\beta+3)}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ &\lesssim \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{2(4\beta+3)}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}. \end{split}$$

Now, observe that

$$|B|^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}C_0(B) = (2T)^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{T^2}{2}\right) \gtrsim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}.$$

Thus, condition (7) is satisfied and Theorem 3.5 yields

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log\left(C(2T)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} (2T)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ \gtrsim \left[\log\left(C\log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{2(4\beta+3)}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{2(4\beta+3)}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \right]^{-1} \log(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{2(4\beta+3)}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$

The proof in the interactive scenario follows the same lines at the exception of the choice of T which should be taken as

$$T = \sqrt{\frac{2\beta}{2\beta + 1}} \log(n\alpha^2).$$

C.4 Example 5.5

We first prove the result for the non-interactive case. Take

$$B = [-T, T], \quad \text{with} \quad T = (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2\beta}{7\beta+6}}.$$

Theorem 3.4 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) &\lesssim (2T)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{2}{\pi a} \int_T^{+\infty} \frac{a^2}{a^2 + x^2} dx \\ &\lesssim T^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \arctan\left(\frac{a}{T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $T \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$, we have $\arctan(a/T) \sim_{n \to \infty} a/T$ and thus $\arctan(a/T) \leq 2(a/T)$ for n large enough. This gives for n large enough

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\rm NI}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim T^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{T} = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{7\beta+6}}$$

Now, observe that for n large enough it holds

$$|B|^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}C_0(B) = (2T)^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}} \cdot \frac{1}{\pi a} \frac{a^2}{T^2 + a^2} \gtrsim T^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}} \cdot \frac{1}{T^2} = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$

Thus, condition (7) is satisfied and Theorem 3.5 yields

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\rm NI}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log \left(C(2T)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} (2T)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ \gtrsim \left[\log \left(C(n\alpha^2)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3} \cdot \frac{2\beta}{7\beta+6} + \frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{7\beta+6}}.$$

The proof in the interactive scenario follows the same lines at the exception of the choice of T which should be taken as

$$T = (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{\beta}{3\beta+2}}.$$

C.5 Example 5.6

We first prove the result for the non-interactive case. The upper bound is straightforward taking $B = [0, 2/\sqrt{L_0}]$. For the lower bound, take

$$B = \left[T, \frac{2}{\sqrt{L_0}} - T\right], \quad \text{with} \quad T = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$

Note that for n large enough it holds $T < 1/(2\sqrt{L_0})$ and we thus have

$$|B|^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}C_0(B) = \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{L_0}} - 2T\right)^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}} \cdot L_0T \gtrsim T = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}.$$

Thus, condition (7) is satisfied and Theorem 3.5 yields

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\rm NI}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log \left(C \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{L_0}} - 2T \right)^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{L_0}} - 2T \right)^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ \gtrsim \left[\log \left(C (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$

The proof in the interactive scenario follows the same lines at the exception of the choice of T for the lower bound which should be taken as

$$T = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta+1}}.$$

C.6 Example 5.7

Let $a \ge 1$, $b \ge 1$ with a > 1 or b > 1. We first prove the result for the non-interactive case. The upper bound is straightforward taking B = [0, 1]. For the lower bound, we need to distinguish different cases.

<u>Case 1: a > 1, b = 1.</u> In this case f_0 is strictly non-decreasing on [0, 1] and $f_0(0) = 0$. In order that f_0 is bounded from below by a strictly positive quantity, we thus take B of the form $B = [T_1, 1]$ with $0 < T_1 < 1$. We choose

$$T_1 = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{(a-1)(4\beta+3)}}.$$

Observe that for n large enough we have

$$|B|^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}C_0(B) = [1-T_1]^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}} \cdot \frac{1}{B(a,1)}T_1^{a-1} \gtrsim T_1^{a-1} = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$

Thus, condition (7) is satisfied and Theorem 3.5 yields for n large enough

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\rm NI}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log \left(C \left[1 - T_1 \right]^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \left[1 - T_1 \right]^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ \gtrsim \left[\log \left(C (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}. \end{split}$$

<u>Case 2: a = 1, b > 1.</u> In this case f_0 is strictly non-increasing on [0, 1] and $f_0(1) = 0$. In order that f_0 is bounded from below by a strictly positive quantity, we thus take B of the form $B = [0, 1 - T_2]$ with $0 < T_2 < 1$. We choose

$$T_2 = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{(b-1)(4\beta+3)}}.$$

Observe that for n large enough we have

$$|B|^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}C_0(B) = [1-T_2]^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}} \cdot \frac{1}{B(1,b)}T_2^{b-1} \gtrsim T_2^{b-1} = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$

Thus, condition (7) is satisfied and Theorem 3.5 yields for n large enough

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log \left(C \left[1 - T_2 \right]^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \left[1 - T_2 \right]^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ \gtrsim \left[\log \left(C (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}.$$

<u>Case 3: a > 1, b > 1.</u> In this case, f_0 is non-decreasing on [0, (a-1)/(a+b-2)], non-increasing on $\overline{[(a-1)/(a+b-2), 1]}$ and $f_0(0) = f_0(1) = 0$. In order that f_0 is bounded from below by a strictly positive quantity, we thus take B of the form $B = [T_3, 1 - T_4]$ and we choose

$$T_3 = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{(a-1)(4\beta+3)}}, \quad T_4 = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{(b-1)(4\beta+3)}}$$

Observe that for n large enough it holds

$$0 < T_3 < \frac{a-1}{a+b-2} < 1 - T_4 < 1.$$

Observe that for n large enough we have

$$\begin{split} |B|^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}}C_0(B) &= [1 - (T_3 + T_4)]^{\frac{\beta}{4\beta+3}} \cdot \frac{1}{B(a,b)} \min\left\{T_3^{a-1}(1 - T_3)^{b-1}, (1 - T_4)^{a-1}T_4^{b-1}\right\} \\ &\gtrsim \min\left\{T_3^{a-1}, T_4^{b-1}\right\} \\ &\gtrsim (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}. \end{split}$$

Thus, condition (7) is satisfied and Theorem 3.5 yields for n large enough

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log\left(C \left[1 - (T_3 + T_4) \right]^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \left[1 - (T_3 + T_4) \right]^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \\ \gtrsim \left[\log\left(C (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \end{aligned}$$

The proof in the interactive scenario follows the same lines at the exception of the choice of T_1 and T_2 which should be taken as

$$T_1 = T_3 = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{(a-1)(2\beta+1)}}, \quad T_2 = T_4 = (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{\beta}{(b-1)(2\beta+1)}}.$$

C.7 Example 5.8

We prove the result for the non interactive case. Take

$$B = B_{n,\alpha} \in \arg\inf_{B \text{ compact set}} \left\{ \int_{\overline{B}} f_0 \ge |B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \text{ and } \inf_{B} f_0 \ge \sup_{\overline{B}} f_0 \right\},$$

It holds $B = B_{n,\alpha} = [0, a_*]$ with

$$a_* = \sup\left\{a: \frac{(\log 2)^A}{(\log(2+a))^A} \ge a^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}}\right\},\$$

and Theorem 3.4 thus gives

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\rm NI}(f_0,\gamma) \lesssim a_*^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n\alpha^2}} \lesssim a_*^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}},$$

where the last inequality follows from $a_* \ge 1 \ge (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{1}{2\beta+2}}$. Inspecting the proof of Theorem 3.5, we see that the lower bound can be rewritten

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\mathrm{NI}}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log\left(C|B|^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \min\left\{ |B|C_0(B); |B|^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}} \right\}.$$

Yet, for $B = B_{n,\alpha} = [0, a_*]$ it holds

$$|B_{n,\alpha}|C_0(B_{n,\alpha}) = \frac{A(\log 2)^A a_*}{(a_*+2)(\log(2+a_*))^{A+1}} \gtrsim \frac{1}{\log(a_*)} \times a_*^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}$$

yielding

$$\mathcal{E}_{n,\alpha}^{\rm NI}(f_0,\gamma) \gtrsim \left[\log\left(C a_*^{\frac{4\beta+4}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{\frac{2}{4\beta+3}} \right) \right]^{-1} \left[\log(a_*) \right]^{-1} a_*^{\frac{3\beta+3}{4\beta+3}} (n\alpha^2)^{-\frac{2\beta}{4\beta+3}}.$$

References

- [Ach+19] Jayadev Acharya, Clément L. Canonne, Cody Freitag, and Himanshu Tyagi. "Test without Trust: Optimal Locally Private Distribution Testing". In: Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. Vol. 89. 2019, pp. 2067–2076.
- [ASZ18] Jayadev Acharya, Ziteng Sun, and Huanyu Zhang. "Differentially private testing of identity and closeness of discrete distributions". In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. 2018, pp. 6878–6891.
- [ADR18] Maryam Aliakbarpour, Ilias Diakonikolas, and Ronitt Rubinfeld. "Differentially private identity and equivalence testing of discrete distributions". In: International Conference on Machine Learning. 2018, pp. 169–178.
- [BW19] Sivaraman Balakrishnan and Larry Wasserman. "Hypothesis testing for densities and high-dimensional multinomials: Sharp local minimax rates". In: Annals of Statistics 47.4 (2019), pp. 1893–1927.
- [BB19] Thomas B. Berrett and Cristina Butucea. "Classification under local differential privacy". In: Annales de l'ISUP 63 (2019), pp. 191–205.
- [BB20] Thomas B. Berrett and Cristina Butucea. "Locally private non-asymptotic testing of discrete distributions is faster using interactive mechanisms". In: *34, NeurIPS* (2020).
- [BLM13] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities:* A nonasymptotic theory of independence. Oxford university press, 2013.
- [But+20] Cristina Butucea, Amandine Dubois, Martin Kroll, and Adrien Saumard. "Local differential privacy: Elbow effect in optimal density estimation and adaptation over Besov ellipsoids". In: *Bernoulli* 26.3 (2020), pp. 1727–1764.
- [BRS20] Cristina Butucea, Angelika Rohde, and Lukas Steinberger. "Interactive versus noninteractive locally differentially private estimation: Two elbows for the quadratic functional". In: arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2003.04773 (Mar. 2020), arXiv:2003.04773. arXiv: 2003.04773 [math.ST].
- [CDK17] Bryan Cai, Constantinos Daskalakis, and Gautam Kamath. "Priv'IT: private and sample efficient identity testing". In: Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning-Volume 70. 2017, pp. 635–644.
- [CC20] Julien Chhor and Alexandra Carpentier. "Sharp Local Minimax Rates for Goodness-of-Fit Testing in Large Random Graphs, multivariate Poisson families and multinomials". In: arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.13766 (2020).
- [DK16] Ilias Diakonikolas and Daniel M Kane. "A new approach for testing properties of discrete distributions". In: 2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). IEEE. 2016, pp. 685–694.
- [DJW18] John C Duchi, Michael I Jordan, and Martin J Wainwright. "Minimax optimal procedures for locally private estimation". In: Journal of the American Statistical Association 113.521 (2018), pp. 182–201.
- [Dwo+06] Cynthia Dwork, Frank McSherry, Kobbi Nissim, and Adam Smith. "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis". In: *Theory of cryptography conference*. Springer. 2006, pp. 265–284.

- [Gab+16] Marco Gaboardi, Hyun Lim, Ryan Rogers, and Salil Vadhan. "Differentially private chi-squared hypothesis testing: Goodness of fit and independence testing". In: International conference on machine learning. 2016, pp. 2111–2120.
- [GR18] Marco Gaboardi and Ryan Rogers. "Local private hypothesis testing: Chi-square tests". In: International Conference on Machine Learning. 2018, pp. 1626–1635.
- [Jos+19] Matthew Joseph, Jieming Mao, Seth Neel, and Aaron Roth. "The role of interactivity in local differential privacy". In: 2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS). IEEE. 2019, pp. 94–105.
- [KOV14] Peter Kairouz, Sewoong Oh, and Pramod Viswanath. "Extremal mechanisms for local differential privacy". In: Advances in neural information processing systems. 2014, pp. 2879–2887.
- [KOV16] Peter Kairouz, Sewoong Oh, and Pramod Viswanath. "Extremal mechanisms for local differential privacy". In: The Journal of Machine Learning Research 17.1 (2016), pp. 492–542.
- [LLL20] Joseph Lam-Weil, Béatrice Laurent, and Jean-Michel Loubes. "Minimax optimal goodnessof-fit testing for densities under a local differential privacy constraint". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04254* (2020).
- [RS20] Angelika Rohde and Lukas Steinberger. "Geometrizing rates of convergence under local differential privacy constraints". In: *Annals of Statistics* 48.5 (2020), pp. 2646–2670.
- [Ser80] Robert J Serfling. Approximation theorems of mathematical statistics. John Wiley & Sons, 1980.
- [She18] Or Sheffet. "Locally private hypothesis testing". In: International Conference on Machine Learning. PMLR. 2018, pp. 4605–4614.
- [Spo96] Vladimir Spokoiny. "Adaptive hypothesis testing using wavelets". In: The Annals of Statistics 24.6 (1996), pp. 2477–2498.
- [VV17] Gregory Valiant and Paul Valiant. "An automatic inequality prover and instance optimal identity testing". In: SIAM Journal on Computing 46.1 (2017), pp. 429–455.
- [WLK15] Yue Wang, Jaewoo Lee, and Daniel Kifer. "Revisiting differentially private hypothesis tests for categorical data". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.03376* (2015).
- [WZ10] Larry Wasserman and Shuheng Zhou. "A statistical framework for differential privacy".
 In: Journal of the American Statistical Association 105.489 (2010), pp. 375–389.