

Learning the regularity of multivariate functional data

Omar Kassi* Nicolas Klutchnikoff† Valentin Patilea‡

October 3, 2023

Abstract

Combining information both within and between sample realizations, we propose a simple estimator for the local regularity of surfaces in the functional data framework. The independently generated surfaces are measured with errors at possibly random discrete times. Non-asymptotic exponential bounds for the concentration of the regularity estimators are derived. An indicator for anisotropy is proposed and an exponential bound of its risk is derived. Two applications are proposed. We first consider the class of multi-fractional, bi-dimensional, Brownian sheets with domain deformation, and study the nonparametric estimation of the deformation. As a second application, we build minimax optimal, bivariate kernel estimators for the reconstruction of the surfaces.

Key words: Concentration of estimators, Hölder exponent, Minimax rate, Random fields

MSC2020: 62R10; 62G07; 62M99; 60G22

1 Introduction

Functional data analysis (FDA) provides methods for dealing with complex data such that collected by modern sensing devices. See, for instance, the textbooks [Ramsay and Silverman \(2005\)](#), [Horváth and Kokoszka \(2012\)](#), [Kokoszka and Reimherr \(2017\)](#). The paradigm consists of considering that data are generated by a sample of functions, realizations of a stochastic process or random field defined over a continuous domain. However, the realizations are practically never observed over a continuous domain, and rarely without error. All the data points generated by such a realization then represent a single observation unit. The remarkable advantage of functional data analysis is that it can combine information both within and between realizations. Restrictive assumptions, such as stationarity, stationary

*Ensai, CREST - UMR 9194, France; omar.kassi@ensai.fr

†Univ Rennes, IRMAR - UMR 6625, F-35000 Rennes, France; Nicolas.klutchnikoff@univ-rennes2.fr

‡Ensai, CREST - UMR 9194, France; valentin.patilea@ensai.fr

increments or Gaussianity on the data generating process or random field, can therefore be avoided.

We focus here on the case where the realizations are surfaces, *i.e.*, the realizations are generated by a random scalar field defined over a multi-dimensional continuous domain. We call this framework *multivariate functional data*, and focus on the case of a domain in the plane. Thus, in a different way, we use existing FDA terminology, which usually refers to a vector-valued processes defined over an interval. In recent years, a wide panel of applications from different areas, including Astrophysics, Climate Sciences, Geophysics and Material Sciences, deal with data which can be considered as generated by random surfaces. For instance, it is now well admitted that the world ocean plays a key role in regulating Earth's climate. Modern tools, such as floating sensors, provide ocean heat transport measurements, which are made freely available by international programs, such as the Argo Program (<http://www.argo.ucsd.edu>, <http://argo.jcommops.org>). If one studies a specific area of the ocean, an observation unit is represented by the measurements collected at random points, sparsely distributed over the area, at some date in the year. See, for instance [Kuusela and Stein \(2018\)](#), [Park et al. \(2023\)](#), and the references therein, for studies on Argo data. We aim at providing a new perspective for refined and effective analysis of multivariate functional data.

Our main contribution is a new approach for studying the local regularity of random fields in the context of multivariate functional data. A main example of random field we have in mind is the multifractional Brownian sheet, see [Herbin \(2006\)](#). In the case of curves, that means for random fields defined over an interval, the local regularity can be defined naturally using the expectation of the squared increments to which one can impose a Hölder-like condition. The local regularity is then determined by the Hölder exponent and the Hölder constant. See [Golovkine et al. \(2022\)](#). See also [Kent and Wood \(1997\)](#) where the local regularity exponent is linked to the fractal dimension for self-similar Gaussian processes. We here extend the ideas of [Golovkine et al. \(2022\)](#) to random fields defined over a domain in the plane. We thus introduce a general notion of local regularity satisfied by a large class of random fields, propose simple estimation procedures for the regularity parameters, and prove non-asymptotic results. [Stein \(2002\)](#) consider a related estimation idea for a particular class of random fields, and use it to efficiently and exactly simulate fractional Brownian surfaces. [Shen and Hsing \(2020\)](#) study the estimation of the local regularity of a multifractional Brownian sheet from one realization of the process observed on a regular grid, and provide asymptotic theory.

Knowing the regularity of the data generating random field has important consequences for FDA. For instance, there has been increasing interest in the nonparametric estimation of the characteristics, such as the mean and the covariance structure, of the random field generating the functional data. See [Caponera et al. \(2022\)](#) for a valuable review and an interesting approach. It is well-known that the optimal accuracy of nonparametric estimates depends on the regularity of the realizations. See, [Cai and Yuan \(2010\)](#), [Cai and Yuan \(2011\)](#), [Caponera and Marinucci \(2021\)](#), [Golovkine et al. \(2022\)](#). Inference methods for functional data should thus adapt to the regularity of the underlying process when aiming at optimality. [Golovkine et al. \(2023\)](#) and [Wang Guang Wei et al. \(2023\)](#) used regularity

estimators to derive new, easy to implement, adaptive procedures for mean, covariance and functional principal components analysis for data generated by random curves. Adaptation to regularity for multivariate functional data seems yet unexplored.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, the general observation scheme we consider is presented. It encompasses the scenarios of *common design* (the domain points where the random field realizations are observed, possibly with noise, are the same for all realizations) and *random design* (the observation domain points are randomly generated for each realization). Moreover, a general class of bivariate stochastic processes, for which the local regularity is well defined, is introduced. After discussion of some identification issues, in Section 3, we present the estimation approach for the local regularity exponents, as well as the corresponding Hölder constants. Our estimators adapt to both isotropic and anisotropic settings. In Section 4, we provide concentration bounds for the estimators of the local regularity, as well as a risk bound for the anisotropy detection. The new results are of the non-asymptotic type, in the sense that they hold for any number of random field realizations and observation domain points, provided these numbers are sufficiently large. Our estimation approach to local regularity for multivariate functional data opens the door to a large array of adaptive procedures. Two applications are proposed. In Section 5.1, we consider the class of multi-fractional Brownian sheets with domain deformation, an example of a random field that belongs to the class defined in Section 3. Deformed random fields have been studied in the literature, see for instance Clerc and Mallat (2003), Anderes and Stein (2008), Anderes and Chatterjee (2009), but yet seem little explored in the context of the functional data paradigm. As a second application, in Section 5.2 we consider the problem of nonparametric reconstruction of the realizations of a random field from noisy measurements over a discrete set in the domain. A related problem was addressed by Bhattacharya et al. (2014) in the context of Gaussian processes. With the regularity estimates in hand, we build an adaptive Nadaraya-Watson pointwise estimates, and provide a sharp non-asymptotic bound for the average risk which achieves the optimal minimax rate expected in nonparametric statistics. The proofs of our results are given in the Appendix. Additional proofs and technical lemmas are provided in the Supplement.

2 The framework

In this section we present a formal mathematical setup for the local regularity for bivariate stochastic processes (also called scalar random fields, or simply random fields) and the data observed for such processes.

2.1 Data

Consider N independent realizations, also called sheets, $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(j)}, \dots, X^{(N)}$ of a stochastic process X defined over a continuous domain $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. For simplicity, we focus here on domains \mathcal{T} in the plane, though the extension to higher dimensions would not raise different challenges. For the purpose of describing our methodology, we distinguish three observational

scenarios. First, the ideal, infeasible situation where the sheets $X^{(j)}$ are *completely observed*, i.e. without error over the entire domain \mathcal{T} . The second case is the one where the $X^{(j)}$ are observed (measured) at some *discrete points* in the domain \mathcal{T} , *without noise*. The observation points can be fixed to be the same for all the $X^{(i)}$'s (common design), or can be randomly drawn for each sheets separately (independent design). Finally, the most realistic scenario is the one where in the second case, we admit that the realizations of X are observed at discrete domain points *with noise*.

To formally describe the second and third scenarios, let M_1, \dots, M_N be an independent sample of an integer-valued random variable M with expectation $\mathbb{E}[M] = \mathbf{m}$. In the independent design case, for each $1 \leq j \leq N$, and given M_j , let $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)} \in \mathcal{T}$, $1 \leq m \leq M_j$, be a random sample of a random vector $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}$. The $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}$'s represent the observation points for the realization $X^{(j)}$. We assume that the realizations of X , M and \mathbf{T} are mutually independent. In the common design case, $M \equiv \mathbf{m}$ and the $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}$'s are the same for all j . Let $\mathcal{T}_{obs}^{(j)}$ denote the set of observation points $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}$, $1 \leq m \leq M_j$, on the sheet $X^{(j)}$. With common design, $\mathcal{T}_{obs}^{(j)}$ does not depend on j , while with independent design, the expected cardinal of $\mathcal{T}_{obs}^{(j)}$ can be random with mean \mathbf{m} . The following presentation includes both independent design and common design cases. Finally, the data consist of the pairs $(Y_m^{(j)}, \mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{T}$ where $Y_m^{(j)}$ is defined as

$$Y_m^{(j)} = X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}) + \varepsilon_m^{(j)}, \quad \text{with} \quad \varepsilon_m^{(j)} = \sigma(\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}, X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}))e_m^{(j)}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq m \leq M_j.$$

Here, the $e_m^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}$ are independent copies of a centered variable e with unit variance, and $\sigma^2(\cdot, \cdot) \geq 0$ is some unknown, bounded conditional variance function which account for possibly heteroscedastic measurement errors. The case $\sigma(t, x) \equiv 0$ corresponds to our second scenario, while in the third scenario we have positive conditional variance.

For each $1 \leq j \leq N$, let $\tilde{X}^{(j)}$ denote an observable approximation of $X^{(j)}$. If the sheets $X^{(j)}$ were completely observed, as in our infeasible first scenario, $\tilde{X}^{(j)} = X^{(j)}$. When $X^{(j)}$ are observed only at some discrete points $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}$, arbitrary $\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})$ can be obtained by simple interpolation or defined equal to the value of $\tilde{X}^{(j)}$ at the nearest neighbor of \mathbf{t} . Finally, with noisy, discretely observed sheets, $\tilde{X}^{(j)}$ is a pilot nonparametric estimator of $X^{(j)}$, such as kernel smoothing, splines *etc*.

Let us next introduce a general class of stochastic processes (random fields) X with irregular realizations $X^{(j)}$, for which the regularity can vary over the domain \mathcal{T} .

2.2 A class of multivariate processes

Let \mathcal{T} be an open, bounded rectangle with the closure included in $(0, \infty)^2$. In the following, $H_1, H_2 : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow (0, 1)$ are two continuously differentiable functions such that

$$\underline{\beta} = \min_{i=1,2} \inf_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} H_i(\mathbf{t}) > 0. \tag{1}$$

Let $\mathbf{L} = (L_1^{(1)}, L_2^{(1)}, L_1^{(2)}, L_2^{(2)})$, be a vector-valued function with non-negative, Lipschitz continuous, components functions defined on \mathcal{T} such that

$$L_i^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) + L_i^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) > 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}, i = 1, 2. \tag{2}$$

Let X be a real-valued, second order stochastic process defined over $(0, \infty)^2$. Let (e_1, e_2) be the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^2 , and, for sufficiently small scalars Δ , let

$$\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - X \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right\}^2 \right], \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Definition 1. Let H_1, H_2 satisfy (1). The class $\mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}(\mathbf{L}, \mathcal{T})$ is the set of stochastic processes X satisfying the following condition: constants $\Delta_0, C, \beta > 0$ exist such that for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ and $0 < \Delta \leq \Delta_0$,

$$\left| \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) - L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} - L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} \right| \leq C\Delta^{2\max\{H_1(\mathbf{t}), H_2(\mathbf{t})\} + \beta}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2} = \bigcup_{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}(\mathbf{L}, \mathcal{T}),$$

where the union is taken over the set of four-dimensional functions \mathbf{L} with non negative positive, Lipschitz continuous components satisfying (2) The functions H_1, H_2 define the local regularity of the process, while \mathbf{L} represent the local Hölder constants.

Definition 1 is general, and extends the local regularity notion considered by Golovkine et al. (2022) to processes defined over a compact interval on the real line. A main example we have in mind is the multi-fractional Brownian sheet (MfBs) with a domain deformation. MfBs is a generalization of the standard fractional Brownian sheet, where the Hurst parameter is allowed to vary along the domain. The definition of this general class of processes and some of their properties are provided in Section 5.1.

3 Local regularity estimation approach

The idea is to relate the functional parameters H_1, H_2 and \mathbf{L} to quantities which are estimable from the data. In other words, we build estimating equations for each of the parameters we want to estimate. The parameter estimate is then obtained from the sample version of the estimating equation.

Before proceeding with the local regularity estimation, let us discuss the identification aspect. Definition 1 is too general and does not allow all the unknown parameters to be identified without further restrictions. To be more clear, let H_1, H_2, \tilde{H}_1 and \tilde{H}_2 be continuously differentiable functions taking values in $(0, 1)$. Assume that $X \in \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}(\mathbf{L}, \mathcal{T})$ and $X \in \mathcal{H}^{\tilde{H}_1, \tilde{H}_2}(\tilde{\mathbf{L}}, \mathcal{T})$, for some \mathbf{L} and $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$. Then necessarily

$$\min\{H_1(\mathbf{t}), H_2(\mathbf{t})\} = \min\{\tilde{H}_1(\mathbf{t}), \tilde{H}_2(\mathbf{t})\} \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{H_1(\mathbf{t}), H_2(\mathbf{t})\} = \max\{\tilde{H}_1(\mathbf{t}), \tilde{H}_2(\mathbf{t})\},$$

for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}$, and, modulo a permutation of the components, $\mathbf{L} \equiv \tilde{\mathbf{L}}$. In general, the permutation depends on the domain point \mathbf{t} . We deduce from these facts that, for instance, only

$$\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \min\{H_1(\mathbf{t}), H_2(\mathbf{t})\} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \max\{H_1(\mathbf{t}), H_2(\mathbf{t})\},$$

are expected to be identifiable in the general framework we consider. Concerning the components of \mathbf{L} , the identifiable quantities are provided below.

3.1 Estimating equations for $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$ and $\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$

Let $X \in \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}$. Since Δ^b is negligible compared to Δ^a if $0 < a < b$ and Δ is small, in view of Definition 1 we first define the estimation equation for $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$, for some fixed $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}$.

For $i = 1, 2$ and Δ sufficiently small, we have

$$\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) = K_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}}) = K_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})} + K_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})+\beta}),$$

where

$$K_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) = \begin{cases} L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) & \text{if } H_1(\mathbf{t}) < H_2(\mathbf{t}) \\ L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) & \text{if } H_2(\mathbf{t}) < H_1(\mathbf{t}) \\ L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) + L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) & \text{if } H_1(\mathbf{t}) = H_2(\mathbf{t}) \end{cases}, \quad K_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) = \begin{cases} L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) & \text{if } H_1(\mathbf{t}) > H_2(\mathbf{t}) \\ L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) & \text{if } H_2(\mathbf{t}) > H_1(\mathbf{t}) \\ 0 & \text{if } H_1(\mathbf{t}) = H_2(\mathbf{t}) \end{cases},$$

and

$$\tilde{\beta} = \begin{cases} 2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) & \text{if } \underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) < \overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) \\ 2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) + \beta & \text{if } \underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) \end{cases},$$

Related to the previous discussion on the identifiability, similarly to the role of $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$ and $\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$ for $H_1(\mathbf{t})$ and $H_2(\mathbf{t})$, the functions $K_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$ and $K_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$, $i = 1, 2$ are the identifiable functionals of \mathbf{L} . More precisely, given the order choice in the case $H_1(\mathbf{t}) \neq H_2(\mathbf{t})$, the functions $K_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$ and $K_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$ represent the identifiable components of \mathbf{L} . When $H_1(\mathbf{t}) = H_2(\mathbf{t})$, only the $L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) + L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$ are identifiable. See also the discussion following Proposition 4.

Next, we define

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta) = \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(1)}(\Delta) + \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(2)}(\Delta).$$

The reason for considering this quantity, instead of considering $\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(1)}(\Delta)$ and $\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(2)}(\Delta)$ separately, is that the Hölder constant associated with $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$ can vanish, and this would prevent us from estimating the lower regularity exponent. On contrary, $\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta) &= \left(K_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) + K_1^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) \right) \Delta^{2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})} + \left(K_2^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) + K_2^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) \right) \Delta^{2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})+\beta}) \\ &=: K_1(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})} + K_2(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})+\beta}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and condition (2) guarantees $K_1(\mathbf{t}), K_2(\mathbf{t}) > 0$, and thus allows us to estimate $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$ consistently. We also consider

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta) = \left| \frac{\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \right|. \quad (4)$$

Proposition 1. *Let X belong to the class $\mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}(\mathbf{L}, \mathcal{T})$, introduced by Definition 1. Then, for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}$,*

$$\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\log(\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)) - \log(\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta))}{2 \log(2)} + O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}-2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})}), \quad (5)$$

and

$$\overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\log(\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)) - \log(\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta))}{2 \log(2)} + O(\Delta^{\beta}).$$

To estimate $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$, we thus use the dominating term on the right-hand side of the representation (5) as a proxy, for which we compute an estimate. To build a sample counterpart of the proxy quantity, we can estimate $\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)$ by

$$\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ \widetilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t} - (\Delta/2)e_i) - \widetilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t} + (\Delta/2)e_i) \right\}^2, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (6)$$

where $\widetilde{X}^{(j)}$ is the observable approximation of $X^{(j)}$. In the ideal, infeasible scenario where the sheets $X^{(j)}$ are completely observed, $\widetilde{X}^{(j)} = X^{(j)}$. When $X^{(j)}$ are observed only at some discrete points $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}$, the $\widetilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})$'s can be obtained by simple interpolation or using nearest neighbors. Finally, with noisy, discretely observed sheets, $\widetilde{X}^{(j)}$ can be a pilot nonparametric estimator of $X^{(j)}$, such as bivariate kernel smoothing, splines *etc.*

An estimator of $\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta)$ is then given by $\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta) = \widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(1)}(\Delta) + \widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(2)}(\Delta)$. By plugging this estimator of $\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta)$ into (5), we obtain an estimator of $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$:

$$\widehat{\underline{H}}(\mathbf{t}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\log(\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)) - \log(\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta))}{2 \log(2)} & \text{if } \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta), \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta) > 0 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (7)$$

Moreover, replacing $\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}$ by $\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}$ and $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$ by $\widehat{\underline{H}}(\mathbf{t})$ in (4), we get an estimator of $\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}$:

$$\widehat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta) = \begin{cases} \left| \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{\underline{H}}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{\underline{H}}(\mathbf{t})}} \right| & \text{if } \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{\underline{H}}(\mathbf{t})}} \neq \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{\underline{H}}(\mathbf{t})}} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Finally, using the second part of Proposition 1, we estimator an estimator of $\overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$ under the form

$$\widehat{(\overline{H} - \underline{H})}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\log(\widehat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)) - \log(\widehat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta))}{2 \log(2)}.$$

It will be shown below that, for the pointwise estimation of \overline{H} and \mathbf{L} , we have to distinguish between the isotropic and anisotropic cases. Here, the *isotropic* and *anisotropic* cases are defined locally, and correspond to $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$ and $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) < \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$, respectively. We propose here an estimator of $\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$ which adapts to isotropy. Let us consider the event

$$A_N(\tau) = A_N(\tau; \mathbf{t}) = \left\{ \widehat{(\overline{H} - \underline{H})}(\mathbf{t}) \geq \tau \right\}, \quad (8)$$

for some appropriate, small threshold $\tau > 0$. We then define the following estimator for $\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$:

$$\widehat{\overline{H}}(\mathbf{t}) = \widehat{\underline{H}}(\mathbf{t}) + \widehat{(\overline{H} - \underline{H})}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}_{A_N(\tau)}. \quad (9)$$

Here, for a set S , $\mathbf{1}_S$ denotes the indicator of S . In Section 4.2, we provide an exponential bound for the probability that the anisotropy detection rule defined by $\mathbf{1}_{A_N(\tau)}$ fails. In particular, that indicates how small τ is allowed to be such that $\mathbf{1}_{A_N(\tau)}$ detects anisotropy with high probability.

3.2 Estimating equations for $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{t})$

Assume for the moment that $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) < \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$. A sample-based diagnosis procedure for detecting this situation can be built using the results in Section 4.2 below. Without loss of generality, we consider $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = H_1(\mathbf{t})$. Let us recall that, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) = L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{2H_2+\beta}).$$

Proposition 2. *Let $X \in \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}$. Denote $D(\mathbf{t}) = H_2(\mathbf{t}) - H_1(\mathbf{t}) > 0$. For $i = 1, 2$,*

$$L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}} + O(\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}),$$

and

$$L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{(2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}} \left| \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}} \right| + O(\Delta^\beta).$$

We denote the estimators of the local Hölder constants by

$$\widehat{L}_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}), \quad \widehat{L}_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}), \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{10}$$

The estimators of $L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$, $i = 1, 2$, are obtained by plugging into its dominating term derived in Proposition 2, the estimators in (6), (7). For the estimators of $L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$, we first consider

$$\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) = \widehat{(\overline{H} - \underline{H})}(\mathbf{t}) \quad \text{if } \widehat{(\overline{H} - \underline{H})}(\mathbf{t}) \neq 0, \quad \text{and } \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

If $\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \neq 0$, the estimators of $L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$, $i = 1, 2$, are obtained by plugging into its dominating term, the estimated quantities, otherwise they are set equal to zero.

4 Non-asymptotic results

We now derive concentration inequalities for the pointwise estimators of the parameters (H_1, H_2) and $\mathbf{L} = (L_1^{(1)}, L_2^{(1)}, L_1^{(2)}, L_2^{(2)})$. For this purpose, we need to measure the error between each realizations $X^{(j)}$ of X and its observable approximation of $\widetilde{X}^{(j)}$, as defined in Section 2. We consider the following \mathbb{L}^p -risk :

$$R_p(\mathbf{m}) = \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}[|\xi^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})|^p], \quad \xi^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}) = \widetilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}) - X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}).$$

In general, the \mathbb{L}^p -risk depends on the expected number \mathbf{m} of observed points $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}$. In the ideal scenario where $X^{(j)}$ is observed everywhere without error, $R_p \equiv 0$. We also consider the following assumptions. Below, $B(\mathbf{t}; r)$ denote the ball of radius r centered at \mathbf{t} .

Assumptions.

(H1) Let X belong to the class \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2} , introduced by Definition 1, and let $X^{(j)}$, $1 \leq j \leq N$, be independent realizations of X .

(H2) Three positive constants \mathbf{a} , \mathfrak{A} and r exist such that, for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathbb{E} |X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}) - X^{(j)}(\mathbf{s})|^{2p} \leq \frac{p!}{2} \mathbf{a} \mathfrak{A}^{p-2} \|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^{2pH(\mathbf{t})} \quad \forall \mathbf{s} \in B(\mathbf{t}; r), \quad \forall p \geq 1.$$

(H3) Two positive constants \mathbf{c} and \mathfrak{D} , and a function $\rho(\mathbf{m}) \leq 1$, exist such that

$$R_{2p}(\mathbf{m}) \leq \frac{p!}{2} \mathbf{c} \mathfrak{D}^{p-2} \rho(\mathbf{m})^{2p}, \quad \forall p \geq 1, \quad \forall \mathbf{m} > 1.$$

(H4) Two positive constants \mathfrak{L} and ν exist such that

$$R_2(\mathbf{m}) \leq \mathfrak{L} \mathbf{m}^{-\nu}, \quad \forall \mathbf{m} > 1.$$

The condition in (H2) imposes sub-Gaussian local increments for X . It is satisfied by the processes in the wide class of multi-fractional Brownian sheets (MfBs) with a domain-deformation, as considered in Section 5.1. In the case of noisy, discretely observed realizations $X^{(j)}$, the observable approximation can be obtained from existing bivariate nonparametric smoothing approaches. Under mild conditions, the standard nonparametric smoothers satisfy Assumption 3, with $\rho(\mathbf{m}) = 1$, and Assumption 4. See Fan and Guerre (2016) for the case of local polynomials, and Belloni et al. (2015) for general series estimators. In the second scenario, where the $X^{(j)}$ are observed without noise at discrete points $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}$ in the domain \mathcal{T} , we can simply define $\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})$ as the value of $X^{(j)}$ at the nearest observed point $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}$ to \mathbf{t} . To provide a simple justification that this simple choice is valid, let us consider that a constant $C > 0$ exists such that

$$C^{-1} \leq M_j/\mathbf{m} \leq C, \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq N.$$

Then, with probability exponentially close to 1, there exists at least one point $\mathbf{t}_m^{(j)}$ in the ball $B(\mathbf{t}; \tilde{r})$, provided $\tilde{r} = \mathbf{m}^{-\delta}$, for some $\delta \in (1/2, 1)$. Assumption 3 is then implied by 2 with $\rho(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m}^{-\delta\beta}$, and $\underline{\beta}$ from (1). In particular, this also guarantees 4 with $\nu = 2\delta\underline{\beta}$.

4.1 Concentration bounds for the regularity estimates

We first derive the exponential bound for the concentration of the local regularity exponents. On the one hand, the concentration will depend on the non-stochastic approximation error between the true parameter and their respective dominating terms. From Proposition 1 these approximation errors are

$$R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t}) = \underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \frac{\log(\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)) - \log(\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta))}{2 \log(2)},$$

and

$$R(\overline{H} - \underline{H})(\mathbf{t}) = \{\overline{H} - \underline{H}\}(\mathbf{t}) - \frac{\log(\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)) - \log(\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta))}{2 \log(2)},$$

respectively. We have

$$R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t}) = O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}-2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})}) \quad \text{and} \quad R(\overline{H} - \underline{H})(\mathbf{t}) = O(\Delta^\beta). \quad (11)$$

On the other hand, the concentration of the local regularity exponents estimators will also depend on the error between the realizations of X and their observable approximations $\tilde{X}^{(j)}$. Finally, since we use Bernstein's inequality, the concentration will also depend on the bound of the moments in Assumption 2. To account for these, let

$$\varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m}) = \max\{\Delta^{2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})}, \rho^2(\mathbf{m})\}^{-1}.$$

Note that $\varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m}) = \Delta^{-2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})}$ in the ideal case where $\tilde{X}^{(j)} = X^{(j)}$ and thus $\rho(\mathbf{m}) = 0$.

Proposition 3. *Assumptions (H1) to (H4) hold true. Let $\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})$ and $\widehat{\overline{H}}(\mathbf{t})$ be the estimators defined in (7) and (9), respectively. If Δ is sufficiently small and \mathbf{m} sufficiently large, constants C_1, \dots, C_5 exist such that,*

$$\forall \varepsilon, \tau \in (0, 1) \quad \text{satisfying} \quad \max\{|\log(\Delta)| |R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|, |R(\overline{H} - \underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|\} \leq \varepsilon \leq 2\tau, \quad (12)$$

then

$$\mathbb{P} \left[|\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t})| \geq \varepsilon \right] \leq p_1, \quad (13)$$

and

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \widehat{\overline{H}}(\mathbf{t}) - \overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right] \leq C_3 \{p_1 + p_2 + p_3\}, \quad (14)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 &= C_1 \exp \left(-C_2 N \times \varepsilon^2 \times \Delta^{4\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m}) \right), \\ p_2 &= \exp \left[-C_4 N \times \varepsilon^2 \times \frac{\Delta^{4\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})} \right] \mathbf{1}_{\{\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) < \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})\}}, \\ p_3 &= \exp \left[-C_5 N \times \tau^2 \times \frac{\Delta^{4\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$D(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m}) = \max\{\Delta^{2\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})}, \rho(\mathbf{m})^2\}^{-1}.$$

The term p_2 is specific to the anisotropic case, it disappears when $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$. We next derive the bounds for the concentration of the local Hölder constants' estimators. In the case where $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) \neq \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$, without loss of generality, we set

$$\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = H_1(\mathbf{t}) < H_2(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t}),$$

such that $L_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t})$ and $L_1^{(2)}(\mathbf{t})$ are the Hölder constants corresponding to $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$. et

$$R(L_1^{(i)})(\mathbf{t}) = L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) - \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}} = O(\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}),$$

and

$$R(L_2^{(i)})(\mathbf{t}) = L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) - \frac{1}{(2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}} \left| \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}} \right| = O(\Delta^\beta), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Proposition 4. *Assume that the conditions of Proposition 3 hold true. Then, for the estimators in (10), positive constants $\mathfrak{C}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{C}_4$ exists such that, for $i = 1, 2$, and*

$$\forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1) \text{ satisfying } \max \left\{ |R(L_1^{(i)})(\mathbf{t})|, |\log(\Delta)| |R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|, |R(\overline{H} - \underline{H})(\mathbf{t})| \right\} \leq \varepsilon, \quad (15)$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \widehat{L}_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) - L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq \mathfrak{C}_1 \exp \left(-\mathfrak{C}_2 N \times \varepsilon^2 \times \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}{\log^2(\Delta)} \right). \quad (16)$$

Moreover, if in addition $|R(L_2^{(i)})(\mathbf{t})| \leq \varepsilon$, $i = 1, 2$ then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \widehat{L}_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) - L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq \mathfrak{C}_3 \exp \left(-\mathfrak{C}_4 N \times \varepsilon \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})} \min\{\varepsilon, \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\} \times \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}{\log^4(\Delta)} \times (2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The second exponential bound in Proposition 4 becomes trivial when $D(\mathbf{t}) = 0$, and this reveals that the case $H_1(\mathbf{t}) = H_2(\mathbf{t})$ requires special attention. In this case, the estimator proposed for $L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$ becomes an estimator of $L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) + L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$, $i = 1, 2$. The indicator of the set defined in (8) provides a tool for detecting whether or not $H_1(\mathbf{t}) = H_2(\mathbf{t})$, given a data set. In the following, we investigate the risk associated with this diagnosis tool.

4.2 A risk bound for the anisotropy detection

Assume without loss of generality that $H_1(\mathbf{t}) \leq H_2(\mathbf{t})$. Equation (3) then becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta) &= \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(1)}(\Delta) + \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(2)}(\Delta) \\ &= \left(L_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) + L_1^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) \right) \Delta^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + \left(L_2^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) + L_2^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) \right) \Delta^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})+\beta}) \\ &= K_1(\mathbf{t}) \Delta^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + K_2(\mathbf{t}) \Delta^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})+\beta}). \end{aligned}$$

We can now write

$$\frac{\log(\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)) - \log(\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta))}{2 \log 2} = D(\mathbf{t}) + O(\Delta^\beta).$$

Therefore, if $D(\mathbf{t}) = H_2(\mathbf{t}) - H_1(\mathbf{t}) = 0$, we get

$$\frac{\log(\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)) - \log(\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta))}{2 \log 2} = O(\Delta^\beta).$$

We deduce that, for the event $A_N(\tau)$ introduced in (8), we have to choose τ such that $\Delta = o(\tau^{1/\beta})$. The following result proposes an exponential bound for the risk associated to the rule defined by the indicator $\mathbf{1}_{A_N(\tau)}$ in the definition (9).

Proposition 5. *Assume that the conditions of Proposition 3 hold true. Let*

$$\max\{|\log(\Delta)||R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|, |R(\overline{H} - \underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|\} \leq 2\tau \leq \{\overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t})\} + \mathbf{1}_{\{\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})\}}.$$

If Δ is sufficiently small and \mathbf{m} sufficiently large, for $A_N(\tau)$ defined in (8), we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\mathbf{1}_{A_N(\tau)} \neq \mathbf{1}_{\{\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) < \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})\}}\right) \leq C_3 \exp\left[-C_5 N \times \tau^2 \times \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right],$$

where C_3 and C_5 are the positive constants defined as in Proposition 3.

For a choice of Δ , Proposition 5 allows us to determine the rate of decrease for τ such that the indicator of $A_N(\tau)$ detects with high accuracy whether or not $H_1(\mathbf{t}) = H_2(\mathbf{t})$. The fastest rate depends on the approximation errors (11), which are characteristics of the process X .

5 Examples

We propose two applications where our estimation approach for the local regularity for multivariate functional data opens the door to new procedures and sharp results.

5.1 Estimating the characteristics of general Gaussian processes

The multifractional Brownian motion (MfBm) is a generalization of the standard fractional Brownian motion, where the Hurst parameter is allowed to vary along the path. There are several possible definitions of such a process. They lead to indistinguishable processes, up to a multiplication by a deterministic function. Here, the multi-parameter, anisotropic multifractional Brownian sheet, which is a multivariate extension, is defined following Herbin (2006). This definition relies on the so-called harmonizable representation of the MfBm, see Peltier and Lévy Véhel (1995), Benassi et al. (1997), Ayache et al. (2000), Lebovits and Véhel (2014) among others.

Definition 2. *Set $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and let $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_d) : [0, \infty)^d \rightarrow (0, 1)^d$ be a deterministic map. The multifractional Brownian sheet $W = (W(\mathbf{u}) : \mathbf{u} \in (0, \infty)^d)$ with Hurst functional parameter $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is defined as follows :*

$$W(\mathbf{u}) = \left(\prod_{k=1}^d \frac{1}{C(\eta_k(\mathbf{u}))} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{k=1}^d \frac{e^{it_k \zeta_k} - 1}{|\zeta_k|^{\eta_k(\mathbf{u}) + \frac{1}{2}}} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}(d\boldsymbol{\zeta}), \quad \mathbf{u} \in (0, \infty)^d,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_d)$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}$ is the Fourier Transform of the white noise in \mathbb{R}^d . Here, for any positive x ,

$$C(x) = \left[\frac{2\pi}{\Gamma(2x + 1) \sin(\pi x)} \right]^{1/2}.$$

Notice that, when $d = 1$, the measure $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}(d\zeta)$ is the unique, complex-valued Gaussian measure which can be associated with a standard Gaussian measure over \mathbb{R} by a ‘stochastic Parseval identity’, see [Stoev and Taqqu \(2006\)](#), equation (2.4). In particular, the construction of $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}(d\zeta)$ ensures that W is real-valued.

We focus on the case $d = 2$, and redefine $W = (W(\mathbf{u}) : \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U})$ as the restriction to an open subset $\mathcal{U} \subset (0, \infty)^2$ of the multifractional Brownian sheet with Hurst functional parameter $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_1, \eta_2)$. Note that W is a centered Gaussian process with the covariance function

$$\mathbb{E}[W(\mathbf{u})W(\mathbf{v})] = \prod_{k=1,2} D(\eta_k(\mathbf{u}), \eta_k(\mathbf{v})) \left[u_k^{\eta_k(\mathbf{u})+\eta_k(\mathbf{v})} + v_k^{\eta_k(\mathbf{u})+\eta_k(\mathbf{v})} - |u_k - v_k|^{\eta_k(\mathbf{u})+\eta_k(\mathbf{v})} \right],$$

$\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2), \mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{U}$, where

$$D(x, y) = C^2((x+y)/2) \cdot (2C(x)C(y))^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad D(x, x) \equiv 1/2. \quad (18)$$

In particular, the variance of W is given by $\mathbb{E}[W^2(\mathbf{u})] = u_1^{2\eta_1(\mathbf{u})} u_2^{2\eta_2(\mathbf{u})}$.

Moreover, we consider a domain deformation A , that is a positive and invertible application $A : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$. Let

$$X = W \circ A \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{E} [\{X(\mathbf{t}) - X(\mathbf{s})\}^2], \quad \forall \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Proposition 6. *If $\boldsymbol{\eta} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow (0, 1)^2$ and $A : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ are continuously differentiable,*

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) &= |A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} |\partial_1 A_2(\mathbf{t})(t_1 - s_1) + \partial_2 A_2(\mathbf{t})(t_2 - s_2)|^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} \\ &\quad + |A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} |\partial_1 A_1(\mathbf{t})(t_1 - s_1) + \partial_2 A_1(\mathbf{t})(t_2 - s_2)|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2) \\ &\quad + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^{2H(\mathbf{t})+1}) + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})+2H_2(\mathbf{t})}), \quad \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{T}, \end{aligned}$$

where ∂_1, ∂_2 denote the partial derivatives and

$$H_1 = \eta_1 \circ A \quad \text{and} \quad H_2 = \eta_2 \circ A.$$

The proof of the following corollary is immediate, and will thus be omitted.

Corollary 1. *Assume the conditions of Proposition 6, and that there exist $\rho \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$0 \leq \overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) \leq \frac{1-\rho}{2}.$$

Then $X = W \circ A \in \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}$ with \mathbf{L} given by :

$$\begin{aligned} L_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) &= |A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} |\partial_1 A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}, & L_2^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) &= |A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} |\partial_1 A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})}, \\ L_1^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) &= |A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} |\partial_2 A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}, & L_2^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) &= |A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} |\partial_2 A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us note that without domain deformation, *i.e.*, when A is the identity, $\mathbf{L} = (1, 0, 0, 1)$. The estimation approach introduced in Section 3 allows to estimate H_1, H_2 and \mathbf{L} in general. The estimation of the domain deformation A is investigated in the following.

5.1.1 Estimating equations for the domain deformation

When one realization of the process is observed on a dense, regular grid, the estimation of the Hurst function of a multifractional Brownian motion was considered by Shen and Hsing (2020). See also Hsing et al. (2016). The use of deformation to model non-stationary processes was first introduced into the spatial statistics literature by Sampson and Guttorp (1992). One dimensional deformations behave locally as a change of scale. In two dimension, deformations can rotate, as well as scale local coordinates. See Anderes and Stein (2008), Anderes and Chatterjee (2009) and Clerc and Mallat (2003) for more details. The fact that the deformation can rotate is mainly related to the identification problem discussed in Section 3.

As a consequence of our new approach, we can build a nonparametric estimator of the deformation A under mild technical conditions. We consider that

$$\text{some } (t_0, s_0) \in \mathcal{T} \text{ is given for which } A_1(t_0, s_0) \text{ and } A_2(t_0, s_0) \text{ are known.} \quad (19)$$

This initial condition avoids identification issues arising in a fully non parametric setup. We also assume that the time-deformation A is such that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} A_k(\mathbf{t}) > 0, \quad \inf_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \partial_i A_k(\mathbf{t}) \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \{\partial_1 A_k(\mathbf{t}) + \partial_2 A_k(\mathbf{t})\} > 0, \quad i, k = 1, 2. \quad (20)$$

Finally, we set $H_1(\mathbf{t}) < H_2(\mathbf{t})$ and focus on the first coordinate A_1 of the deformation A . By Corollary 1, we have

$$L_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) = A_2(\mathbf{t})^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} \partial_1 A_1(\mathbf{t})^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}.$$

Since the variance of X is given by

$$v(\mathbf{t}) = \mathbb{E}[X(\mathbf{t})^2] = A_2(\mathbf{t})^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} A_1(\mathbf{t})^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}, \quad (21)$$

it follows that

$$\left(\frac{L_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t})}{v(\mathbf{t})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}} = \frac{\partial_1 A_1(\mathbf{t})}{A_1(\mathbf{t})}.$$

Integrating both sides we obtain

$$\log A_1(\mathbf{t}) = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_1(s, t_2) ds + h(t_2), \quad \text{for } \mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T},$$

where h is a real-valued function of t_2 and

$$f_1(\mathbf{t}) = \left(\frac{L_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t})}{v(\mathbf{t})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}}.$$

The function h is determined by

$$\frac{h'(t_2)}{h(t_2)} = g_1(t_0, t_2) := \left(\frac{L_1^{(2)}(t_0, t_2)}{v(t_0, t_2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2H_1(t_0, t_2)}}.$$

This leads us to the following estimating equation :

$$A_1(\mathbf{t}) = \lambda_1 \exp \left(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_1(s, t_2) ds + \int_{s_0}^{t_2} g_1(t_0, s) ds \right), \quad \text{where } \lambda_1 = A_1(t_0, s_0). \quad (22)$$

An estimator \widehat{A}_1 of the first component of the domain deformation is easily obtained by replacing f_1 and g_1 by their estimates in (22). Estimators of f_1 and g_1 are naturally obtained by plugging into their expressions, the estimators of $L_1^{(1)}$, $L_1^{(2)}$, H_1 and an estimator $\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t})$ of the variance $v(\mathbf{t})$.

To provide a theoretical result for \widehat{A}_1 , for simplicity, in addition to (1), we assume that constants $\underline{\beta}$, $\overline{\beta}$ are known such that

$$0 < \underline{\beta} \leq \min_{k=1,2} \inf_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} H_k(\mathbf{t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{i=1,2} \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) \leq \overline{\beta}. \quad (23)$$

We then truncate the estimators, *i.e.*, we replace $\widehat{H}_k(\mathbf{t})$ and $\widehat{L}_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$ correspondingly by

$$\max\{\widehat{H}_k(\mathbf{t}), \underline{\beta}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \min\left\{\widehat{L}_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}), \overline{\beta}\right\}, \quad \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}, k, i = 1, 2,$$

respectively. Given the relationship (21) and condition (20), the variance $v(\mathbf{t})$ is necessarily bounded away from zero. Finally, for the estimator of $v(\mathbf{t})$, we assume that, a constant C_v exists such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E} [\{v(\mathbf{t})/\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t})\}^p] < C_v^p, \quad \forall p \geq 1. \quad (24)$$

This condition can be satisfied if, for instance, a positive lower bound \underline{a} for A_1 and A_2 is known in (20). By (21), we then have

$$v(\mathbf{t}) > \underline{v} := \min(\underline{a}^4, 1).$$

In this case, $\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t})$ can simply be defined as maximum between \underline{v} and the empirical second order moment of the observable approximations $\widetilde{X}^{(j)}$.

Let

$$F_1 := \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E} \left[|\widehat{f}_1(\mathbf{t}) - f_1(\mathbf{t})| \right], \quad G_1 := \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E} [|\widehat{g}_1(\mathbf{t}) - g_1(\mathbf{t})|],$$

and $\text{diam}(\mathcal{T}) = \sup_{\mathbf{s}', \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{T}} \|\mathbf{s}' - \mathbf{s}\|$. For the next result, let $\Delta = \mathbf{m}^{-a}$ and $\rho(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m}^{-b}$, with $a > 0$, $b \geq 0$ and $\rho(\mathbf{m})$ introduced in Assumption 3. Moreover, let

$$\chi(\mathbf{t}) = a\{2D(\mathbf{t}) + 1\} - \min\{a\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}), b/2\} > 0.$$

Proposition 7. *The assumptions of Propositions 3 and 6, and conditions (19), (20), (23) and (24) hold true. Moreover, we assume that constants \mathbf{a}_1 and \mathbf{a}_1 exist such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[X(\mathbf{t})^{2p}] \leq \frac{p!}{2} \mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_1^{p-2}, \quad \forall p \in \{1, 2, \dots\}.$$

Then $F_1 + G_1 < \infty$. Moreover, let

$$\left[1/2 - \chi(\mathbf{t}) \liminf_{\mathbf{m}, N} \{ \log(\mathbf{m}) / \log(N) \} \right]_+ < \ell < 1/2. \quad (25)$$

Then, if \mathbf{m} and N are sufficiently large, positive constants \mathfrak{C}_v , \tilde{q}_1 and \tilde{q}_2 exist such that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \widehat{A}_1(\mathbf{t}) - A_1(\mathbf{t}) \right| \right] \\ & \leq \mathfrak{C}_v A_1(\mathbf{t}) \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}) \max \{1, F_1, G_1\} \left\{ \frac{a \log(\mathbf{m})}{\mathbf{m}^{2aD(\mathbf{t}) - \chi(\mathbf{t})}} N^{\ell-1/2} + \tilde{q}_1 \exp(-\tilde{q}_2 N^\ell) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

A similar representation can be derived for A_2 , that is

$$A_2(\mathbf{t}) = \lambda_2 \exp \left(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} f_2(s, t_2) ds + \int_{s_0}^{t_2} g_2(t_0, s) ds \right), \quad (26)$$

where

$$f_2(\mathbf{t}) = \left(\frac{L_2^{(1)}(\mathbf{t})}{v(\mathbf{t})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2H_2(\mathbf{t})}}, \quad g_2(t_0, t_2) = \left(\frac{L_2^{(2)}(t_0, t_2)}{v(t_0, t_2)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2H_2(t_0, t_2)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2 = A_2(t_0, s_0).$$

Estimators of f_2 and g_2 , are obtained by plugging into their expressions, the estimators of $L_2^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$, H_2 , and an estimator of $v(\mathbf{t})$. Let \widehat{A}_2 be the estimator of A_2 obtained by plug-in using (26). Under the conditions of Proposition 7, we can show that $F_2 + G_2$ is finite and derive a similar bound for the \mathbb{L}^1 -risk of \widehat{A}_2 . The arguments are similar and thus omitted.

5.2 Adaptive optimal bivariate smoothing

Consider the problem of nonparametric pointwise estimation of a 2-dimensional anisotropic regression function from a class of functions which are γ_i -Hölder continuous in the direction e_i , with $\gamma_i \in (0, 1]$, $i = 1, 2$. It is well-known that, under some conditions on the noise and given an iid sample of size M_0 , the minimax rate of convergence for the estimation of a regression function f over the class is

$$M_0^{-\frac{\gamma}{2\gamma+1}}, \quad (27)$$

where the effective smoothness γ is defined by the formula

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\gamma_1} + \frac{1}{\gamma_2}.$$

See Ibragimov and Khas'minskii (1981), Lepskii and Spokoiny (1995), Hoffmann and Lepski (2002), Guillou and Klutchnikoff (2011), Bhattacharya et al. (2014).

In the context of multivariate functional data, a natural issue is the reconstruction of the realizations of X using the data. To match the standard nonparametric regression setup, we

hereafter consider the case where the set \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2} in Definition 1, is built with the restriction $\mathbf{L} = (L_1, 0, 0, L_2)$. Fortunately, the local regularity of a process $X \in \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}$ is intrinsically linked to the regularity of the sample paths of the process. Let $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ and assume that

$$\max_{i=1,2} \sup_{0 < \Delta \leq \Delta_0} \frac{\mathbb{E} [\{X(\mathbf{t} - \Delta e_i/2) - X(\mathbf{t} + \Delta e_i/2)\}^{2p}]}{\mathbb{E} [\{X(\mathbf{t} - \Delta e_i/2) - X(\mathbf{t} + \Delta e_i/2)\}^2]^p} < \infty, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (28)$$

By Revuz and Yor (1994, Theorem 2.1, page 26), almost any realization of X is locally γ_i -Hölder continuous in the direction e_i , for any order $0 \leq \gamma_i < H_i(\mathbf{t})$. See also Lemma SM.4 in the Supplementary Material.

Let us notice that, with the simplified structure of \mathbf{L} in the definition of \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2} , the identification problem mentioned in Section 3 no longer occurs, and we have

$$\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) = L_i(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{2\bar{H}(\mathbf{t})+\beta}), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Following the methodology introduced in Section 3, we consider the estimating equations for the local regularity exponents :

$$H_i(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\log(\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(2\Delta)) - \log(\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta))}{2 \log(2)} + O(\Delta^\beta), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Applying these equations with a learning set of realizations of X , we get the estimates $\widehat{H}_i(\mathbf{t})$.

Consider now a new realization X^{new} of X , for which $(Y_m^{new}, \mathbf{t}_m^{new}), 1 \leq m \leq M_0$ with

$$Y_m^{new} = X^{new}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}) + \varepsilon_m^{new}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq M_0,$$

are observed. Here, M_0 is a realization of the variable M , while the \mathbf{t}_m^{new} are independent realizations of the bi-dimensional vector \mathbf{T} , with M and \mathbf{T} introduced in Section 2.1. We use the Nadaraya-Watson estimator to estimate $X^{new}(\mathbf{t})$, and we consider the simpler version with two bandwidths. Formally, let $K : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a density with the support in $[-1, 1] \times [-1, 1]$, and $\mathbf{B} = \text{diag}(1/h_1, 1/h_2)$ a positive, 2×2 bandwidth matrix. Considering the vectors \mathbf{t} and \mathbf{t}_m^{new} as column matrices, and using the rule $0/0 = 0$, the Nadaraya-Watson estimator is then

$$\widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{B}) = \sum_{m=1}^{M_0} Y_m^{new} \frac{K(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new} - \mathbf{t}))}{\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} K(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new} - \mathbf{t}))} =: \sum_{m=1}^{M_0} Y_m^{new} W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}).$$

To achieve the optimal rate of convergence, the bandwidths have to be selected according to the regularity of X . For deriving the properties of $\widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{B})$, we impose the following mild assumptions. $B(\mathbf{0}, r)$ denote the ball centered at the origin of \mathbb{R}^2 , with radius r .

Assumptions.

(LP1) Two positive constants κ and r exist such that

$$\kappa^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{B(\mathbf{0}, r)}(\mathbf{t}) \leq K(\mathbf{t}) \leq \kappa, \quad \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}.$$

$h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ with \mathcal{H} , a bandwidth range satisfying $\sqrt{\mathbf{m}} \inf \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \infty$ and $\sup \mathcal{H} \rightarrow 0$.

(LP2) A constant c exists such that $f_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{t}) \geq c > 0, \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}$, where $f_{\mathbf{T}}$ is the density function of the random vector \mathbf{T} that generated the independent copies $\mathbf{t}_m^{new}, 1 \leq m \leq M_0$.

(LP3) The error terms ε_m^{new} are iid, zero mean random variables with constant variance σ^2 . The variables $M_0, X^{new}, \mathbf{t}_m^{new}$, and $\varepsilon_m^{new}, 1 \leq m \leq M_0$, are mutually independent. A constant $c > 0$ exists such that $c^{-1} \leq M_0/\mathbf{m} \leq c$.

(LP4) The estimators $\widehat{H}_i(\mathbf{t})$ and $\widehat{L}_i(\mathbf{t})$ are independent of the variables $M_0, X^{new}, \mathbf{t}_m^{new}$, and ε_m^{new} . Moreover,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min \left\{ |\widehat{H}_i(\mathbf{t}) - H_i(\mathbf{t})|, |\widehat{L}_i(\mathbf{t}) - L_i(\mathbf{t})| \right\} > \log^{-a}(\mathbf{m}) \right) \leq \mathfrak{k}_1 \exp(-\mathbf{m}), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where \mathfrak{k}_1 is some positive constant and $a > 1$.

In view of our result from Section 4, condition LP4 holds true under mild conditions. Let us consider the pointwise, conditional mean square risk of \widehat{X}^{new} , given the integer M_0 , that is

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{B}, M_0) = \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{B}) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \right\}^2 \middle| M_0 \right]. \quad (29)$$

We first derive a bound of this risk when H_1, H_2 and L_1, L_2 are given.

Proposition 8. *Assume that (LP1), (LP2) and (LP3) hold true. Then*

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{B}, M_0) \leq \frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi} \frac{\sigma^2}{M_0 h_1 h_2} + 2L_1(\mathbf{t})h_1^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + 2L_2(\mathbf{t})h_2^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} + \text{negligible terms}. \quad (30)$$

Minimizing the dominating terms in the risk bound yields the optimal bandwidths. These bandwidths, and the resulting risk rate, will depend on the regularity of the process and the Hölder constants. These facts are gathered in the following result. Before stating it, let

$$\omega(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{H_1(\mathbf{t})H_2(\mathbf{t})}{H_1(\mathbf{t}) + H_2(\mathbf{t})},$$

denote the effective smoothness of X at \mathbf{t} , and let

$$\alpha_i(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\omega(\mathbf{t})}{2\omega(\mathbf{t}) + 1} \times \frac{1}{H_i(\mathbf{t})}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t}) = 2H_1(\mathbf{t})H_2(\mathbf{t}) + H_1(\mathbf{t}) + H_2(\mathbf{t})$.

Corollary 2. *The minimum of the dominant terms in the risk bound in Proposition 8 is attained at (h_1^*, h_2^*) , with*

$$h_1^* = M_0^{-\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})} \left[\frac{\Lambda_1(\mathbf{t})^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})+1}}{\Lambda_2(\mathbf{t})} \right]^{\frac{1}{2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \quad \text{and} \quad h_2^* = M_0^{-\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})} \left[\frac{\Lambda_2(\mathbf{t})^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})+1}}{\Lambda_1(\mathbf{t})} \right]^{\frac{1}{2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})}},$$

where $\Lambda_i(\mathbf{t}) = \kappa^2 \sigma^2 / \{4c\pi H_i(\mathbf{t}) L_i(\mathbf{t})\}$, $i = 1, 2$. Then, up to negligible terms,

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{B}^*, M_0) \leq M_0^{-\frac{2\omega(\mathbf{t})}{2\omega(\mathbf{t})+1}} \Gamma_1(\mathbf{t}),$$

where $\mathbf{B}^* = \text{diag}(1/h_1^*, 1/h_2^*)$, and

$$\Gamma_1(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\kappa^2 \sigma^2}{\pi c} \Lambda_1(\mathbf{t})^{\frac{H_2(\mathbf{t})}{\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \Lambda_2(\mathbf{t})^{\frac{H_1(\mathbf{t})}{\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \{1 + 2H_1(\mathbf{t}) + 2H_2(\mathbf{t})\}.$$

The rate of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{B}^*, M_0)$ is the minimax rate (27) for the effective smoothness $\omega(\mathbf{t})$. In general, $\omega(\mathbf{t})$ is larger than the local effective smoothness of the realization X^{new} , but arbitrarily close provided (28) is satisfied. Finally, we derive the bound of the average, pointwise risk (29) when the regularity parameters are estimated, following our methodology. Let \hat{h}_1^* and \hat{h}_2^* be the bandwidths obtained by replacing $H_i(\mathbf{t})$ and $L_i(\mathbf{t})$ by their estimates $\hat{H}_i(\mathbf{t})$ and $\hat{L}_i(\mathbf{t})$ in the expressions of h_1^* and h_2^* , respectively. Let $\hat{\mathbf{B}}^* = \text{diag}(1/\hat{h}_1^*, 1/\hat{h}_2^*)$.

Proposition 9. *Assume the conditions of Proposition 8 and 4 hold true. Then*

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{t}; \hat{\mathbf{B}}^*, M_0) \leq \Gamma_2(\mathbf{t}) M_0^{-\frac{2\omega(\mathbf{t})}{2\omega(\mathbf{t})+1} + 2\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m})} \times \{1 + o(\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m}))\},$$

where

$$\Gamma_2(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\kappa^2 \sigma^2}{c\pi \Lambda_1^{\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_2^{\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})} + L_1(\mathbf{t}) \left(\frac{\Lambda_1(\mathbf{t})^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})+1}}{\Lambda_2(\mathbf{t})} \right)^{\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})} + L_2(\mathbf{t}) \left(\frac{\Lambda_2(\mathbf{t})^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})+1}}{\Lambda_1(\mathbf{t})} \right)^{\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})}.$$

Proposition 9 shows that, modulo some constant terms, the price for the estimation of the local regularity is the factor $M_0^{2\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m})}$, for some $a > 1$. Since $\mathbf{m}^{\log^{-1}(\mathbf{m})} = e$ for any $\mathbf{m} > 0$, the factor is essentially equal to 1 under very mild condition.

A Proofs

Below \sim means left hand side bounded above and below by constants times the right hand side.

Proof of Proposition 1. By definition, we have that

$$\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta) = \left(K_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) + K_1^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) \right) \Delta^{2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}}) =: \underline{K}(\mathbf{t}) \Delta^{2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}}).$$

Moreover, $\underline{K}(\mathbf{t}) = K_1(\mathbf{t}) + K_2(\mathbf{t})$ if $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$, and $\underline{K}(\mathbf{t}) = K_1(\mathbf{t})$ otherwise, with $K_1(\mathbf{t})$ and $K_2(\mathbf{t})$ defined (3). We deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log(\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(2\Delta)) - \log(\gamma_{\mathbf{t}}(\Delta))}{2\log(2)} &= \frac{\log\left(\underline{K}(\mathbf{t})(2\Delta)^{2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}})\right) - \log\left(\underline{K}(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}})\right)}{2\log(2)} \\ &= \underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) + \frac{\log\left(1 + O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}-2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})})\right) - \log\left(1 + O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}-2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})})\right)}{2\log(2)} = \underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) + O(\Delta^{\tilde{\beta}-2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})}), \quad (31) \end{aligned}$$

which gives the first part of the statement. For the second part, by the expansion (3),

$$\gamma_t(\Delta) = K_1(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})} + K_2(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2\overline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{2\overline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t})+\beta}).$$

Therefore, $\alpha_t(\Delta)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_t(\Delta) &= \left| \frac{\gamma_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \right| \\ &= \left| K_2(\mathbf{t}) \left(2^{2\overline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t})-2\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})} - 1 \right) \Delta^{2\overline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t})-2\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{2\overline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t})-2\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})+\beta}) \right| \\ &=: |\overline{K}(\mathbf{t})| \Delta^{2\overline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t})-2\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})} + O(\Delta^{2\overline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t})-2\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})+\beta}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, replace γ_t by α_t in (31), and derive the representation for $\overline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t}) - \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. Similar to that of Proposition 1. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. We next simply write $\varrho(\Delta)$ instead of $\varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})$. The proof is organized in several steps. First, using Assumptions 2, 3 and 4, combined with Bernstein's inequality, a constant $\mathbf{u} > 0$ exists such that, for any $i = 1, 2$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and $0 < \Delta \leq \Delta_0$:

$$\max \left\{ \mathbb{P} \left(\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta) - \theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta) \geq \varepsilon \right), \mathbb{P} \left(\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta) - \theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta) \leq -\varepsilon \right) \right\} \leq \exp(-\mathbf{u}N\varepsilon^2\varrho(\Delta)), \quad (32)$$

with $\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta)$ defined in (6), and provided that \mathbf{m} is sufficiently large. The proof of (32) is provided in the Supplementary Material.

Step 1 : proof of equation (13). For $\max\{R(\underline{\mathbf{H}})(\mathbf{t}), R(\overline{\mathbf{H}} - \underline{\mathbf{H}})(\mathbf{t})\} \leq \varepsilon \leq 2\tau$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left[|\widehat{\underline{\mathbf{H}}}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t})| \geq 2\varepsilon \right] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[|\widehat{\underline{\mathbf{H}}}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t}) + R(\underline{\mathbf{H}})(\mathbf{t})| \geq \varepsilon \right] =: A_\varepsilon$$

Using the definitions and elementary inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon &= \mathbb{P} \left[\left| \log \left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\gamma_t(2\Delta)\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)} \right) \right| \geq 2\varepsilon \log 2 \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\gamma_t(2\Delta)\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)} \geq 2^{2\varepsilon} \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\gamma_t(2\Delta)\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)} \leq 2^{-2\varepsilon} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{\gamma_t(2\Delta)} \geq 2^\varepsilon \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{\gamma_t(2\Delta)} \leq 2^{-\varepsilon} \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\gamma_t(\Delta)} \geq 2^\varepsilon \right] + \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\gamma_t(\Delta)} \leq 2^{-\varepsilon} \right] \\ &\leq 4 \exp(-\mathbf{u}N(2^\varepsilon - 1)^2\gamma_*(\Delta)\varrho(\Delta)) + 4 \exp(-\mathbf{u}N(1 - 2^{-\varepsilon})^2\gamma_*(\Delta)\varrho(\Delta)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma_*(\Delta) = \min\{\gamma_t^2(2\Delta), \gamma_t^2(\Delta)\}$, and the last line is a direct consequence of (32).

By elementary algebra and the fact that, for small Δ , we have $\gamma_t(\Delta) = K_1(\mathbf{t})\Delta^{2\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})}\{1 + o(1)\}$, we deduce that positive constants C_1 and C_2 exist such that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[|\widehat{\underline{\mathbf{H}}}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{\mathbf{H}}(\mathbf{t})| \geq \varepsilon \right] \leq C_1 \exp(-C_2N\varepsilon^2\Delta^{4\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{t})}\varrho(\Delta)). \quad (33)$$

Step 2. This step consists in proving that constants \tilde{L}_5, \tilde{L}_6 exist such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\alpha}_t(\Delta) - \alpha_t(\Delta)| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \tilde{L}_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{L}_6 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)}\right), \quad (34)$$

provided Δ is sufficiently small. The proof is relegated to the Supplementary Material.

Step 3. To prove equation (14), we recall that

$$\overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) + D(\mathbf{t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) + \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}_{A_N(\tau)},$$

where the event $A_N(\tau)$ is defined in (8), and $\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})$ is the estimator of the difference $\overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$. We simply write A_N instead of $A_N(\tau)$ in the sequel. Two cases can be distinguished : the isotropic case, where $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$, and the anisotropic case, where $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) < \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$. In the anisotropic situation, we use (33), with ε as in (12), to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq 2\varepsilon\right] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - D(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] + \mathbb{P}[\overline{A}_N] \\ &\leq C_1 \exp(-C_2 N \varepsilon^2 \Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)) + \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - D(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] + \mathbb{P}[\overline{A}_N]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, for a set A , \overline{A} denotes its complement. We now remark that, for ε as in (12),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - D(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\log\left(\frac{\hat{\alpha}_t(2\Delta)\alpha_t(\Delta)}{\hat{\alpha}_t(\Delta)\alpha_t(2\Delta)}\right)\right| \geq \varepsilon \log(2)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_t(2\Delta)}{\alpha_t(2\Delta)} \geq 2^{\varepsilon/2}\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_t(\Delta)}{\alpha_t(\Delta)} \leq 2^{-\varepsilon/2}\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_t(2\Delta)}{\alpha_t(2\Delta)} \leq 2^{-\varepsilon/2}\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_t(\Delta)}{\alpha_t(\Delta)} \geq 2^{\varepsilon/2}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

We focus on the first term, the other three can be bounded similarly. By (34), for small Δ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_t(2\Delta)}{\alpha_t(2\Delta)} \geq 2^{\varepsilon/2}\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[\hat{\alpha}_t(2\Delta) - \alpha_t(2\Delta) \geq (2^{\varepsilon/2} - 1)\alpha_t(2\Delta)\right] \\ &\leq \tilde{L}_5 \exp\left[-\tilde{L}_6 N \left((2^{\varepsilon/2} - 1)\alpha_t(2\Delta)\right)^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(2^{\varepsilon/2} - 1)^2 \geq \varepsilon^2 \log^2(2)/4$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\hat{\alpha}_t(2\Delta)}{\alpha_t(2\Delta)} \geq 2^{\varepsilon/2}\right] \leq \tilde{L}_5 \exp\left[-\tilde{L}_7 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right],$$

for some positive constant \tilde{L}_7 . The same inequality, with possibly different constants, remains valid for the three other terms. Therefore, a constant \tilde{L}_8 exists such that, for ε as in (12),

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - D(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] \leq \tilde{L}_8 \exp\left[-\tilde{L}_7 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right]. \quad (35)$$

Finally, it remains to bound $\mathbb{P}[\bar{A}_N]$. Since $\tau \leq D(\mathbf{t})/2$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\bar{A}_N) = \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - D(\mathbf{t}) \leq \tau - D(\mathbf{t})\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - D(\mathbf{t}) \leq -\tau\right).$$

Using (35) with 2τ in place of ε (which is allowed by the condition $\varepsilon \leq 2\tau$) leads to

$$\mathbb{P}[\bar{A}_N] \leq \tilde{L}_8 \exp\left[-4\tilde{L}_7 N \tau^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right]. \quad (36)$$

This implies, for ε as in (12),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] &\leq C_1 \exp\left[-C_2 N (\varepsilon^2/4) \Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)\right] \\ &+ \tilde{L}_8 \exp\left[-\tilde{L}_7 N (\varepsilon^2/4) \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right] + \tilde{L}_8 \exp\left[-4\tilde{L}_7 N \tau^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right], \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

and this concludes the proof of the anisotropic case.

For the isotropic case, where $\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})$, we use (33) and decompose as follows :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] + \mathbb{P}[A_N] \\ &\leq C_1 \exp\left[-C_2 N \varepsilon^2 \Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)\right] + \mathbb{P}[A_N]. \end{aligned}$$

We now have to bound $\mathbb{P}[A_N]$, instead of $\mathbb{P}[\bar{A}_N]$. For this, we can simply write

$$\mathbb{P}[A_N] = \mathbb{P}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \geq \tau] = \mathbb{P}[\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - D(\mathbf{t}) \geq \tau].$$

Using (35) with 2τ in place of ε we then obtain

$$\mathbb{P}[A_N] \leq \tilde{L}_8 \exp\left[-4\tilde{L}_7 N \tau^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right], \quad (38)$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] &\leq C_1 \exp\left[-C_2 N \varepsilon^2 \Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)\right] \\ &+ \tilde{L}_8 \exp\left[-4\tilde{L}_7 N \tau^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Combining (37) and (39), three positive constants L_3, L_4 and L_5 exist such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] &\leq L_3 \left\{ \exp\left[-L_2 N \varepsilon^2 \Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)\right] \right. \\ &\left. + \exp\left[-L_4 N \tau^2 \Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta) \log^{-2}(\Delta) \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right] + P \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for any ε as in (12), where

$$P = \exp\left[-L_5 N \varepsilon^2 \Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta) \log^{-2}(\Delta) \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right] \mathbf{1}_{\{\underline{H}(\mathbf{t}) < \overline{H}(\mathbf{t})\}}.$$

Let us note that P is a term which only occurs in the anisotropic case. \square

Proof of Proposition 4. Proof of (16). Here is the anisotropic case, and we consider $H_1(\mathbf{t}) = \underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$. Set ε as in (15) and, for $i = 1, 2$, define

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \widehat{L}_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) - L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) \right| \geq 2\varepsilon \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \widehat{L}_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) - L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) + R(L_1^{(i)})(\mathbf{t}) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) =: \mathfrak{A}_\varepsilon^{(i)}.$$

Using the definition of $\widehat{L}_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})$ we can decompose :

$$\mathfrak{A}_\varepsilon^{(i)} \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \geq \left(1 + \varepsilon \frac{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}}{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}} \leq \left(1 + \varepsilon \frac{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right). \quad (40)$$

To bound these two terms, we first notice that a constant K exists such that, $\forall \varepsilon$ as in (15),

$$\left(1 + \varepsilon \frac{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \frac{1}{2\sqrt{1 + L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})}} + \varepsilon O(\Delta^{2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) - H(\mathbf{t})}) \geq 1 + \varepsilon K,$$

provided Δ is sufficiently small. Then, by (32), for sufficiently large \mathbf{m} ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \geq \left(1 + \varepsilon \frac{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq \exp \left(-\mathbf{u} K N \varepsilon^2 \{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)\}^2 \varrho(\Delta) \right).$$

Since $\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta) \sim L_1^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) \Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}$ we obtain :

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \geq \left(1 + \varepsilon \frac{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq \exp \left(-\mathcal{L} N \varepsilon^2 \Delta^{4H(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta) \right), \quad (41)$$

for some constant \mathcal{L} . For the second term, since Δ is small, and $\log(x) \leq x - 1$, $x > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}}{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}} \leq \left\{ 1 + \varepsilon \frac{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \right\}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}}{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}} \leq 1 - K\varepsilon \right] \leq \mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - H(\mathbf{t}) \geq -\frac{K/2}{\log(\Delta)} \varepsilon \right],$$

provided ε satisfies (15). Using (33), we get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}}{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}} \leq \left(1 + \varepsilon \frac{\Delta^{2H(\mathbf{t})}}{\theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq C_1 \exp \left(-\frac{C_2 K^2}{4} N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^{4H(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \right). \quad (42)$$

Finally, combining (40), (41), (42), and considering, without loss of generality, $\Delta_0 \leq e^{-1}$ in Definition 1, positive constants \mathfrak{C}_1 and \mathfrak{C}_2 exist such that, $\forall \varepsilon$ as in (15), we have :

$$\mathfrak{A}_\varepsilon^{(i)} \leq \mathfrak{C}_1 \exp \left(-\mathfrak{C}_2 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^{4H(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \right), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Proof of (17): For $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}$ and $i = 1, 2$, let

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) = \left| \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \right| \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) = \left| \frac{\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{t})}} \right|.$$

For any ε such that $|R(L_2^{(i)})(\mathbf{t})| \leq \varepsilon$ (recall $|R(L_2^{(i)})(\mathbf{t})| = O(\Delta^\beta)$) and $i = 1, 2$, we decompose as follows :

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{L}_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) - L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) \geq 2\varepsilon, \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \neq 0\right) \leq B_1^{(i)} + B_2^{(i)} + B_3^{(i)} + B_4^{(i)},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_1^{(i)} &= \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) - \alpha_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon/3}\right), \quad B_2^{(i)} = \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\widehat{\alpha}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) - \alpha_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)}{\{4^{D(\mathbf{t})} - 1\}\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}} \geq \varepsilon/3\right), \\ B_3^{(i)} &= \mathbb{P}\left(\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \left(\frac{1}{\{4^{\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} - 1\}\Delta^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{1}{\{4^{D(\mathbf{t})} - 1\}\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}}\right) \geq \varepsilon/3, \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \neq 0\right), \quad (43) \\ B_4^{(i)} &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{\{4^{\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} - 1\}\Delta^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{1}{\{4^{D(\mathbf{t})} - 1\}\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}} \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon/3}, \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \neq 0\right). \end{aligned}$$

By the arguments used for (34), \mathbf{m} sufficiently large, constants \tilde{C}_1 and \tilde{C}_2 exists such that, $\forall \varepsilon$ such that $|\log(\Delta)||R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})| \leq \varepsilon$ (recall $|R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})| = O(\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})})$ in the anisotropic case),

$$\begin{aligned} B_1^{(i)} &\leq \tilde{C}_1 \exp\left[-\tilde{C}_2 N \varepsilon \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)}\right] \\ \text{and} \quad B_2^{(i)} &\leq \tilde{C}_1 \exp\left[-\tilde{C}_2 N \varepsilon^2 (4^{D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2 \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)}\right]. \quad (44) \end{aligned}$$

To bound $B_3^{(i)}$ and $B_4^{(i)}$ in (43), we use the fact that $\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \sim L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})(4^{D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}$, Lemma SM.1 in the Supplement, and the fact that $L_2^{(1)}, L_2^{(2)}$ are bounded functions. Moreover, we show that the probability of the event $\{\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) = 0\}$ is negligible, see (SM.6). The details are given in the Supplementary. From that and (44), the proof follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. A direct consequence of (36) and (38). \square

Proof of Proposition 6. First, let us denote

$$B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = 2D(H_1(\mathbf{t}), H_1(\mathbf{s}))D(H_2(\mathbf{t}), H_2(\mathbf{s})) \quad \forall \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{T},$$

with $D(x, y)$ defined in (18). By construction the function $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ is symmetric. Moreover, we show in the Supplementary Material that

$$B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{2} + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2). \quad (45)$$

Next, using the covariance function structure of the process X , we can write :

$$\begin{aligned}\theta(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) &= \mathbb{E}[X^2(\mathbf{t})] + \mathbb{E}[X^2(\mathbf{s})] - 2\mathbb{E}[X(\mathbf{t})X(\mathbf{s})] \\ &= \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) + \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) + \mathfrak{B}_2(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) + \mathfrak{B}_3(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) - \mathfrak{B}_4(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}), \quad \forall \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{T},\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{B}_1(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) &= |A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})}|A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} - B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})|A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})} \\ &\quad \times (|A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})} + |A_2(\mathbf{s})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})}), \\ \mathfrak{B}_2(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) &= B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) (|A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})} + |A_1(\mathbf{s})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})}) |A_2(\mathbf{t}) - A_2(\mathbf{s})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})}, \\ \mathfrak{B}_3(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) &= B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) (|A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})} + |A_2(\mathbf{s})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})}) |A_1(\mathbf{t}) - A_1(\mathbf{s})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})}, \\ \mathfrak{B}_4(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) &= B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})|A_1(\mathbf{t}) - A_1(\mathbf{s})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})}|A_2(\mathbf{t}) - A_2(\mathbf{s})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})}.\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$a(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = \frac{|A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})-H_1(\mathbf{s})}|A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})-H_2(\mathbf{s})} - B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})}{B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})}.$$

We then have :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{B}_1(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) + \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) &= B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) (a(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})|A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})} - |A_2(\mathbf{s})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})}) \\ &\quad \times (|A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})} - a(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t})|A_1(\mathbf{s})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})}) \\ &\quad + |A_1(\mathbf{s})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})}|A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})} B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) \{a(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})a(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) - 1\}. \quad (46)\end{aligned}$$

Using (45), we show in the Supplementary Material that

$$a(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})a(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) - 1 = O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2). \quad (47)$$

We can next deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) (a(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})|A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})} - |A_2(\mathbf{s})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})}) \times \\ (|A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})} - a(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t})|A_1(\mathbf{s})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})}) = O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2).\end{aligned}$$

From this and (47), equation (46) becomes :

$$\mathfrak{B}_1(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) + \mathfrak{B}_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) = O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2).$$

For the terms $B_3(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})$ and $B_4(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})$, we apply (45). Finally, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(X(\mathbf{t}) - X(\mathbf{s}))^2] \\ &= \mathfrak{B}_4(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) + \frac{1}{2} (|A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})} + |A_1(\mathbf{s})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})}) |A_2(\mathbf{t}) - A_2(\mathbf{s})|^{H_2(\mathbf{t})+H_2(\mathbf{s})} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} (|A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})} + |A_2(\mathbf{s})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})}) |A_1(\mathbf{t}) - A_1(\mathbf{s})|^{H_1(\mathbf{t})+H_1(\mathbf{s})} + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2).\end{aligned}$$

The last expression and the Taylor expansion then imply

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(X(\mathbf{t}) - X(\mathbf{s}))^2] &= |A_1(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} |\partial_1 A_2(\mathbf{t})(t_1 - s_1) + \partial_2 A_2(\mathbf{t})(t_2 - s_2)|^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} \\ &\quad + |A_2(\mathbf{t})|^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} |\partial_1 A_1(\mathbf{t})(t_1 - s_1) + \partial_2 A_1(\mathbf{t})(t_2 - s_2)|^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} \\ &\quad + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2) + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^{2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})+1}) + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^{2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})+2\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})}).\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 7. We start by showing that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E} \left[|\widehat{f}_1(\mathbf{t}) - f_1(\mathbf{t})|^2 \right] < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E} \left[|\widehat{g}_1(\mathbf{t}) - g_1(\mathbf{t})|^2 \right] < \infty. \quad (48)$$

Since $\mathbb{E}|\widehat{f}_1(\mathbf{t}) - f_1(\mathbf{t})|^2 \leq 2f_1^2(\mathbf{t}) + 2\mathbb{E}|\widehat{f}_1(\mathbf{t})|^2$, it suffices to bound $f_1^2(\mathbf{t})$ and $\mathbb{E}|\widehat{f}_1(\mathbf{t})|^2$. By (20) and (23),

$$f_1^2(\mathbf{t}) = \left(L_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t})/v(\mathbf{t}) \right)^{\frac{1}{H_1(\mathbf{t})}} \leq (\overline{\beta}/\underline{v})^{\frac{1}{\underline{\beta}}}.$$

Moreover,

$$\widehat{f}_1^2(\mathbf{t}) = \left(\widehat{L}_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t})/\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t}) \right)^{\frac{1}{H_1(\mathbf{t})}} \leq (\overline{\beta}/\underline{v})^{\frac{1}{\underline{\beta}}} \times \{v(\mathbf{t})/\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t})\}^{\frac{1}{\underline{\beta}}}.$$

Therefore, by (24) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|\widehat{f}_1(\mathbf{t})|^2 \leq (\overline{\beta}/\underline{v})^{\frac{1}{\underline{\beta}}} \times \mathbb{E} \left[\{v(\mathbf{t})/\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t})\}^{\frac{1}{\underline{\beta}}} \right] < \infty.$$

The first part of (48) follows, the second part can be obtained with similar arguments.

Next, by the condition (24) and Fubini's Theorem, a constant \mathfrak{C}_v exists such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[|A_1(\mathbf{t}) - \widehat{A}_1(\mathbf{t})| \right] &\leq \mathfrak{C}_v A_1(\mathbf{t}) \left[\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbb{E} |\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)| ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{s_0}^{t_2} \mathbb{E} |\widehat{g}_1(t_0, s) - g_1(t_0, s)| ds \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

A detailed justification of the last inequality is provided in the Supplementary Material. We next bound the two integrals in (49). For $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, we define the set

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda) = \left\{ |\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)| \leq \lambda \right\}.$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbb{E} \left[|\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)| \right] ds &\leq \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left(\lambda + \mathbb{E} \left[|\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)| \mathbf{1}_{\overline{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda)} \right] \right) ds \\ &\leq \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left(\lambda + \mathbb{E} \left[|\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)|^2 \right]^{1/2} \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda)) \right) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

We now want to apply Lemma SM.5 in the Supplementary Material with

$$a_N = \widehat{L}_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}), \quad b_N = \widehat{v}(\mathbf{t}), \quad c_N = \frac{1}{\widehat{H}_1(\mathbf{t})} \quad \text{and} \quad a = L_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}), \quad b = v(\mathbf{t}), \quad c = \frac{1}{H_1(\mathbf{t})}.$$

and $\mathfrak{C} = \overline{\beta}/\underline{v}$. We first note that, by Proposition 4 with $i = 1$, for any ε satisfying (15),

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \widehat{L}_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) - L_1^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq \mathfrak{C}_1 \exp \left(-\mathfrak{C}_2 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^{4H_1(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}{\log^2(\Delta)} \right).$$

Moreover, by Lemma SM.6, and for sufficiently large \mathbf{m} , there exists a constant ϵ such that

$$\forall \eta \in (0, 1), \quad \mathbb{P}(|\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t}) - v(\mathbf{t})| \geq \eta) \leq 2 \exp(-\epsilon N \eta^2).$$

It remains to derive a bound for the concentration of c_N , which follows from that on the concentration of $\widehat{H}_1(\mathbf{t})$, and the fact that $H_1 \leq 1$: for any ε satisfying (15), and thus (12),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\pm\{c_N - c\} \geq \varepsilon) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\pm\{H_1(\mathbf{t}) - \widehat{H}_1(\mathbf{t})\}\{1 \pm \varepsilon H_1(\mathbf{t})\} \geq \varepsilon H_1^2(\mathbf{t})\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\pm\{H_1(\mathbf{t}) - \widehat{H}_1(\mathbf{t})\} \geq H_1^2(\mathbf{t})\varepsilon/\{1 \pm \varepsilon H_1(\mathbf{t})\}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and thus, by Proposition 3,

$$\mathbb{P}(|c_N - c| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \widetilde{C}_1 \exp\left(-\widetilde{C}_2 N \{\underline{\beta}^4/4\} \varepsilon^2 \Delta^{4H_1(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})\right).$$

Finally, by Lemma SM.5 we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda)) = \mathbb{P}\left(|\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)| \geq \lambda\right) \leq q_1 \exp\left\{-q_2 N \lambda^2 \Delta^{2H_1(s, t_2)} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m}) \log^{-2}(\Delta)\right\},$$

for some constants q_1, q_2 , provided (15) is satisfied with $\varepsilon = \lambda$. By (50), we now write

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbb{E}\left[|\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)|\right] ds \\ &\leq \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left(\lambda + \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\widehat{f}_1(\mathbf{t}) - f_1(\mathbf{t})|^2\right]^{1/2} q_1 \exp\left\{-q_2 N \lambda^2 \frac{\Delta^{2H_1(s, t_2)} \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}{\log^2(\Delta)}\right\}\right) ds \\ &\leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}) \max\left\{1, \sup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}\left[|\widehat{f}_1(\mathbf{t}) - f_1(\mathbf{t})|^2\right]^{1/2}\right\} \left[\lambda + q_1 \exp\left\{-q_2 N \lambda^2 \frac{\Delta^2 \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}{\log^2(\Delta)}\right\}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

A simple choice of λ can be defined as follows : for some suitable $\ell \in (0, 1/2)$, let

$$\lambda = \frac{|\log(\Delta)|}{\Delta \sqrt{\varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}} N^{\ell-1/2},$$

which satisfies (15), provided that ℓ satisfies (25). We then obtain

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbb{E}\left[|\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)|\right] ds \leq C \left(\frac{|\log(\Delta)|}{\Delta \sqrt{\varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})}} N^{\ell-1/2} + q_1 e^{-q_2 N^\ell}\right),$$

for some constant C . Up to a change of the constants C, q_1, q_2 , a similar bound holds true for the second integral on the RHS on (49). It remains to replace Δ and $\rho(\mathbf{m})$ by \mathbf{m}^{-a} and \mathbf{m}^{-b} , respectively. \square

Proof of Proposition 8. The risk $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{B}, M_0)$ is the sum of the squared bias and the variance, for which we derive the following bounds in Lemma SM.3 in the Supplement :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \{X^{new}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}; \mathbf{B}) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\} W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t})\right)^2 \middle| M_0\right] \\ \leq 2 \left\{L_1(\mathbf{t}) h_1^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + L_2(\mathbf{t}) h_2^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})}\right\} \{1 + o(1)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and, for some $a_1 > 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \varepsilon_m^{new} W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \right)^2 \middle| M_0 \right] \leq \frac{\kappa^2 \sigma^2}{c\pi} \frac{1}{M_0 h_1 h_2} \left\{ 1 + a_1 M_0^{-1/4} \right\}.$$

□

Proof of Proposition 9. Let $\widehat{\omega}(\mathbf{t})$, $\widehat{\alpha}_i(\mathbf{t})$ and $\widehat{\Lambda}_i(\mathbf{t})$ be the estimators obtained by replacing $H_i(\mathbf{t})$ and $L_i(\mathbf{t})$ in the definitions of $\omega(\mathbf{t})$, $\alpha_i(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Lambda_i(\mathbf{t})$, respectively. We define the sets

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigcap_{i=1,2} \left\{ |\widehat{\alpha}_i(\mathbf{t}) - \alpha_i(\mathbf{t})| \leq \log^{-a}(\mathbf{m}) \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E} = \bigcap_{i=1,2} \left\{ \left| \widehat{\Lambda}_i(\mathbf{t}) / \Lambda_i(\mathbf{t}) - 1 \right| \leq \log^{-a}(\mathbf{m}) \right\},$$

with a from assumption 4.

Since \widehat{h}_1^* and \widehat{h}_2^* are independent of the new realization X^{new} , by (30) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\{ \widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^*) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \}^2 \middle| M_0, \widehat{h}_1^*, \widehat{h}_2^* \right] &\leq \frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi} \frac{\sigma^2}{M_0 \widehat{h}_1^* \widehat{h}_2^*} \\ &\quad + 2L_1(\mathbf{t}) \{ \widehat{h}_1^* \}^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + 2L_2(\mathbf{t}) \{ \widehat{h}_2^* \}^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})}. \end{aligned}$$

Replacing the expressions of \widehat{h}_1^* and \widehat{h}_2^* , we have

$$\frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi} \frac{\sigma^2}{M_0 \widehat{h}_1^* \widehat{h}_2^*} = \frac{\kappa^2 \sigma^2}{c\pi} M_0^{\alpha_1(\mathbf{t}) + \alpha_2(\mathbf{t}) - 1} \Lambda_1^{-\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_2^{-\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \times \widehat{\Upsilon}(\mathbf{t}),$$

where

$$\widehat{\Upsilon}(\mathbf{t}) = M_0^{\widehat{\alpha}_1(\mathbf{t}) + \widehat{\alpha}_2(\mathbf{t}) - \alpha_1(\mathbf{t}) - \alpha_2(\mathbf{t})} \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_1^{-\widehat{\alpha}_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \widehat{\Lambda}_2^{-\widehat{\alpha}_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})}{\Lambda_1^{-\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_2^{-\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})}.$$

Let $\mathbb{E}_{M_0}[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot \mid M_0]$. Then, on the event $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}$, using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi} \frac{\sigma^2}{M_0 \widehat{h}_1^* \widehat{h}_2^*} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}} \right] &\leq \frac{\kappa^2 \sigma^2}{c\pi} M_0^{\alpha_1(\mathbf{t}) + \alpha_2(\mathbf{t}) - 1} \Lambda_1^{-\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_2^{-\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\widehat{\Upsilon}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa^2 \sigma^2}{c\pi} M_0^{\alpha_1(\mathbf{t}) + \alpha_2(\mathbf{t}) - 1 + 2 \log^{-a}(\mathbf{m})} \Lambda_1^{-\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_2^{-\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_1^{-2\widehat{\alpha}_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \widehat{\Lambda}_2^{-2\widehat{\alpha}_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})}{\Lambda_1^{-2\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_2^{-2\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, on the event \mathcal{E} , for $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_i^{-2\widehat{\alpha}_i(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})}{\Lambda_i^{-2\alpha_i(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})} = \frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_i^{-2\widehat{\alpha}_i(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_i^{-2\widehat{\alpha}_i(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})}{\Lambda_i^{-2\widehat{\alpha}_i(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_i^{-2\alpha_i(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})} \leq (1 + \log^{-a}(\mathbf{m}))^{-2\widehat{\alpha}_i(\mathbf{t})} \Lambda_i(\mathbf{t})^{2 \log^{-a}(\mathbf{m})}.$$

Note that, by definition, $2\alpha_i(\mathbf{t}) < 1$, $i = 1, 2$. It follows that on the event $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\frac{\widehat{\Lambda}_1^{-2\widehat{\alpha}_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \widehat{\Lambda}_2^{-2\widehat{\alpha}_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})}{\Lambda_1^{-2\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_2^{-2\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})} = 1 + O_{\mathbb{P}}(\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m})).$$

Consequently, under $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi} \frac{\sigma^2}{M_0 \widehat{h}_1^* \widehat{h}_2^*} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}} \right] \leq \frac{\kappa^2 \sigma^2}{c\pi \Lambda_1^{\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t}) \Lambda_2^{\alpha_2(\mathbf{t})}(\mathbf{t})} M_0^{-\frac{\omega(\mathbf{t})}{2\omega(\mathbf{t})+1} + 2\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m})} \{1 + O(\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m}))\}.$$

By similar argument, we can also show that on the event $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}$, we have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[L_1(\mathbf{t}) \{\widehat{h}_1^*\}^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}} \right] \\ \leq L_1(\mathbf{t}) \left[\Lambda_1(\mathbf{t})^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})+1} / \Lambda_2(\mathbf{t}) \right]^{\alpha_1(\mathbf{t})} M_0^{-\frac{\omega(\mathbf{t})}{2\omega(\mathbf{t})+1} + 2\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m})} \times \{1 + O(\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m}))\}, \end{aligned}$$

and symmetrically the bound for $\mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[L_2(\mathbf{t}) \{\widehat{h}_2^*\}^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}} | M_0 \right]$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\{\widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^*) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \right] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\{\widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^*) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{E}} \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\{\widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^*) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\{\widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^*) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}} \right], \end{aligned}$$

and given the facts above, it remains to investigate the last two expectations in the last display. Using [4](#), [1](#) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\{\widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^*) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}} \right] + \mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\{\widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^*) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\overline{\mathcal{E}}} \right] = o(\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m})).$$

We finally deduce

$$\mathbb{E}_{M_0} \left[\{\widehat{X}^{new}(\mathbf{t}; \widehat{\mathbf{B}}^*) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \right] \leq \Gamma_2(\mathbf{t}) M_0^{-\frac{\omega(\mathbf{t})}{2\omega(\mathbf{t})+1} + 2\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m})} \times \{1 + O(\log^{-a}(\mathbf{m}))\},$$

with $\Gamma_2(\mathbf{t})$ defined in [Proposition 9](#). □

Acknowledgements: V. Patilea acknowledges support from the grant of the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization, CNCS/CCCDI-UEFISCDI, number PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2020-1112, within PNCDI III.

Supplementary Material: In the Supplement we provide complements for the proofs of [Propositions 3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [8](#), and we prove some technical lemmas. Moreover, the justification for the local Hölder continuity of the realizations of X , stated in [Section 5.2](#) above, is provided.

References

- Anderes, E. and Chatterjee, S. (2009). Consistent estimates of deformed isotropic gaussian random fields on the plane. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 2324–2350.
- Anderes, E. B. and Stein, M. L. (2008). Estimating deformations of isotropic gaussian random fields on the plane. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(2):719–741.

- Ayache, A., Cohen, S., and Lévy Véhel, J. (2000). The covariance structure of multifractional Brownian motion, with application to long range dependence. In *2000 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing - ICASSP 2000*, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K. (2015). Some new asymptotic theory for least squares series: Pointwise and uniform results. *J. Econometrics*, 186(2):345–366.
- Benassi, A., Jaffard, S., and Roux, D. (1997). Elliptic Gaussian random processes. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 13(1):19–90.
- Bhattacharya, A., Pati, D., and Dunson, D. (2014). Anisotropic function estimation using multi-bandwidth Gaussian processes. *Ann. Stat.*, 42(1):352–381.
- Cai, T. and Yuan, M. (2010). Nonparametric covariance function estimation for functional and longitudinal data. *University of Pennsylvania and Georgia Institute of Technology*.
- Cai, T. T. and Yuan, M. (2011). Optimal estimation of the mean function based on discretely sampled functional data: Phase transition. *Ann. Statist.*, 39(5):2330–2355.
- Caponera, A., Fageot, J., Simeoni, M., and Panaretos, V. M. (2022). Functional estimation of anisotropic covariance and autocovariance operators on the sphere. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 16(2):5080–5148.
- Caponera, A. and Marinucci, D. (2021). Asymptotics for spherical functional autoregressions. *Ann. Stat.*, 49(1):346–369.
- Clerc, M. and Mallat, S. (2003). Estimating deformations of stationary processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 31(6):1772–1821.
- Fan, Y. and Guerre, E. (2016). Multivariate local polynomial estimators: Uniform boundary properties and asymptotic linear representation. In *Essays in Honor of Aman Ullah*, volume 36, pages 489–537. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Golovkine, S., Klutchnikoff, N., and Patilea, V. (2022). Learning the smoothness of noisy curves with application to online curve estimation. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 16(1):1485–1560.
- Golovkine, S., Klutchnikoff, N., and Patilea, V. (2023). Adaptive estimation of irregular mean and covariance functions. arxiv 2108.06507v2.
- Guillou, A. and Klutchnikoff, N. (2011). Minimax pointwise estimation of an anisotropic regression function with unknown density of the design. *Math. Methods Stat.*, 20(1):30–57.
- Herbin, E. (2006). From N parameter fractional Brownian motions to N parameter multifractional Brownian motions. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, 36(4):1249–1284.
- Hoffmann, M. and Lepski, O. (2002). Random rates in anisotropic regression. (With discussion). *Ann. Stat.*, 30(2):325–396.

- Horváth, L. and Kokoszka, P. (2012). *Inference for functional data with applications*, volume 200. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Hsing, T., Brown, T., and Thelen, B. (2016). Local intrinsic stationarity and its inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(5):2058 – 2088.
- Ibragimov, I. A. and Khas'minskii, R. Z. (1981). More on estimation of the density of a distribution. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 25:1155–1165.
- Kent, J. T. and Wood, A. T. A. (1997). Estimating the fractal dimension of a locally self-similar Gaussian process by using increments. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B. Methodological*, 59(3):679–699.
- Kokoszka, P. and Reimherr, M. (2017). *Introduction to functional data analysis*. Texts in Statistical Science Series. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Kuusela, M. and Stein, M. L. (2018). Locally stationary spatio-temporal interpolation of argo profiling float data. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 474(2220):20180400.
- Lebovits, J. and Véhel, J. L. (2014). White noise-based stochastic calculus with respect to multifractional brownian motion. *Stochastics*, 86(1):87–124.
- Lepskii, O. V. and Spokoiny, V. (1995). Local adaptation to inhomogeneous smoothness: resolution level. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 4.
- Park, B., Kuusela, M., Giglio, D., and Gray, A. (2023). Spatiotemporal local interpolation of global ocean heat transport using Argo floats: A debiased latent Gaussian process approach. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 17(2):1491 – 1520.
- Peltier, R.-F. and Lévy Véhel, J. (1995). Multifractional Brownian Motion : Definition and Preliminary Results. Research Report RR-2645, INRIA. Projet FRACTALES.
- Ramsay, J. and Silverman, B. W. (2005). *Functional Data Analysis*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2 edition.
- Revuz, D. and Yor, M. (1994). *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, volume 293 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition.
- Sampson, P. D. and Guttorp, P. (1992). Nonparametric estimation of nonstationary spatial covariance structure. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87(417):108–119.
- Shen, J. and Hsing, T. (2020). Hurst function estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):838 – 862.
- Stein, M. L. (2002). Fast and exact simulation of fractional Brownian surfaces. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 11(3):587–599.

Stoev, S. A. and Taqqu, M. S. (2006). How rich is the class of multifractional Brownian motions? *Stochastic Processes Appl.*, 116(2):200–221.

Wang Guang Wei, S., Patilea, V., and Klutchnikoff, N. (2023). Adaptive functional principal components analysis. arxiv 2306.16091.

Learning the regularity of multivariate functional data

Supplementary Material

Omar Kassi* Nicolas Klutchnikoff† Valentin Patilea‡

October 3, 2023

Abstract

In this Supplementary Material we provide complementary arguments for the proofs of the propositions in the Appendix of the main manuscript. More precisely, in Sections **I**, **II**, **III**, **IV** below we complete the proofs of Propositions **3**, **4**, **6**, **8**, respectively. Moreover, in Section **V** below we provide the justification for the local Hölder continuity of the realizations of X , as stated in Section **5.2** of the main manuscript, and we prove some technical lemmas.

I Complements for the proof of Proposition **3**

Proof of (32). We show that a constant $\mathbf{u} > 0$ exists such that, for any $i = 1, 2$ $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and $0 < \Delta \leq \Delta_0$:

$$\max \left\{ \mathbb{P} \left(\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) - \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \geq \varepsilon \right), \mathbb{P} \left(\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) - \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \leq -\varepsilon \right) \right\} \leq \exp \left(-\mathbf{u} N \varepsilon^2 \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m}) \right), \quad (\text{SM.1})$$

with $\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)$ defined in (6), and provided that \mathbf{m} is sufficiently large. We decompose

$$\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) - \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \bar{Z}_j}_{\text{stochastic term}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \right] - \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)}_{\text{bias term}}, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $\bar{Z}_j = Z_j - \mathbb{E}[Z_j]$, and

$$Z_j = \left(\tilde{X}^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) - \tilde{X}^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \right)^2, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

*Ensai, CREST - UMR 9194, France; omar.kassi@ensai.fr

†Univ Rennes, IRMAR - UMR 6625, F-35000 Rennes, France; Nicolas.klutchnikoff@univ-rennes2.fr

‡Ensai, CREST - UMR 9194, France; valentin.patilea@ensai.fr

Bounding the bias term : Recall that $\xi^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}) = \tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}) - X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})$. Using the identities $a^2 - b^2 = (a - b)^2 + 2b(a - b)$ and $(a - b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$, and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \right] - \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\tilde{X}^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - \tilde{X}^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right)^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - X \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \xi^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - \xi^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right\}^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \xi^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - \xi^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right\} \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. \times \left\{ X^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - X^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right\} \right] \\
&\leq 4R_2(\mathbf{m}) + 4 \left(R_2(\mathbf{m}) \times \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \right)^{1/2} := \frac{\eta_{\mathbf{t}}^*(\Delta)}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Bounding the stochastic term : Using the convexity of the function $x \mapsto x^p$, [2](#) and [3](#) we obtain :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [|\bar{Z}_j|^p] &\leq 2^p \mathbb{E} [|Z_j|^p] \\
&= 2^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\tilde{X}^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - \tilde{X}^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right)^{2p} \right] \\
&= 2^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - X^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) + \xi^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - \xi^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right\}^{2p} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{18^p}{3} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(X^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - X^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right)^{2p} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{18^p}{3} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \xi^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right|^{2p} + \left| \xi^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right|^{2p} \right] \\
&\leq \frac{18^p}{3} \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\left(X^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) - X^{(j)} \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i \right) \right)^{2p} \right] + 2R_{2p}(\mathbf{m}) \right) \\
&\leq \frac{18^p}{3} \left(\frac{p!}{2} \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{A}^{p-2} \Delta^{2pH(\mathbf{t})} + p! c \mathfrak{D}^{p-2} \rho(\mathbf{m})^{2p} \right) \\
&\leq \mathfrak{g} \frac{p!}{2} \mathfrak{G}^{p-2} \times \max \{ \Delta^{2pH(\mathbf{t})}, \rho(\mathbf{m})^{2p} \} = \mathfrak{g} \frac{p!}{2} \mathfrak{G}^{p-2} \times \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})^{-p},
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants \mathfrak{G} and \mathfrak{g} . The bounds on the moments of \bar{Z}_j allows to derive exponential bounds for the concentration $\widehat{\theta}_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) - \theta_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)$. Let \mathbf{m} sufficiently large such that

$0 < \eta_t^*(\Delta) \leq 1$, and let $\eta_t^*(\Delta) \leq \eta \leq 1$. By Bernstein's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta) - \theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta) \geq \eta \right] &= \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \bar{Z}_j + \mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta) \right] - \theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta) \geq \eta \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \bar{Z}_j + \frac{\eta_t^*(\Delta)}{2} \geq \eta \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \bar{Z}_j \geq \frac{\eta}{2} \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left(-\frac{N\eta^2}{8\mathfrak{g}\varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})^{-2} + 4\mathfrak{G}\varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})^{-1}\eta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta) - \theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta) \geq \eta \right] \leq \exp(-\mathbf{u}N\eta^2\varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})),$$

where $\mathbf{u} = \{8\mathfrak{g} + 4\mathfrak{G}\}^{-1}$, because $\eta, \varrho^{-1}(\Delta, \mathbf{m}) \leq 1$. A similar bound can be derived for $\mathbb{P} \left[\widehat{\theta}_t^{(i)}(\Delta) - \theta_t^{(i)}(\Delta) \leq -\eta \right]$. \square

Let us notice that, for proving (33) we have to apply (32) with $\max\{|R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|, |R(\overline{H} - \underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|\} \leq \varepsilon$. The stronger condition $\max\{|\log(\Delta)||R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|, |R(\overline{H} - \underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|\} \leq \varepsilon$ will be needed later, for deriving (I).

Proof of (34). Let ε such that $\max\{|\log(\Delta)||R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|, |R(\overline{H} - \underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|\} \leq \varepsilon$. Under the conditions of Proposition 3, we have to prove that constants \tilde{L}_5, \tilde{L}_6 exist such that, for sufficiently small Δ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{\alpha}_t(\Delta) - \alpha_t(\Delta)| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \tilde{L}_5 \exp \left(-\tilde{L}_6 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \right).$$

Here, $\varrho(\Delta)$ is a short notation for $\varrho(\Delta) = \varrho(\Delta, \mathbf{m})$. Let us define the event

$$\Omega_1 = \left\{ \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \neq \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{(\Delta)^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \right\}.$$

Using the definition of $\hat{\alpha}_t(\Delta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\hat{\alpha}_t(\Delta) - \alpha_t(\Delta)| \geq \varepsilon, \Omega_1) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \right| - \left| \frac{\gamma_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\gamma_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \right| + \left| \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})}} \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \\ &\leq B_\varepsilon + B'_\varepsilon + B''_\varepsilon + B'''_\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{SM.2}$$

where

$$B_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(t)}} - \frac{\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2H(t)}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right), \quad B'_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(t)}} - \frac{\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2H(t)}} \leq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right).$$

$$B''_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{H}(t)}} - \frac{\gamma_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2H(t)}} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right), \quad B'''_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{H}(t)}} - \frac{\gamma_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2H(t)}} \leq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right).$$

Since all these terms can be bounded in a similar way, we focus on B_ε . By rearranging the different terms and using simple algebra, we get

$$B_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2H(t)}} \left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)\Delta^{2H(t)}}{\gamma_t(\Delta)\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(t)}} - 1 \right) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\gamma_t(\Delta)} \geq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \frac{\Delta^{2H(t)}}{\gamma_t(\Delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(t)}}{\Delta^{2H(t)}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \frac{\Delta^{2H(t)}}{\gamma_t(\Delta)} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\gamma_t(\Delta)} \geq 1 + \delta(\Delta) \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(t)}}{\Delta^{2H(t)}} \leq 1 - \delta(\Delta) \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right),$$

where

$$\delta^2(\Delta) = \frac{\Delta^{4H(t)}/\gamma_t^2(\Delta)}{4\{1 + \Delta^{2H(t)}/\gamma_t(\Delta)\}} = K_1^*(\mathbf{t})\{1 + o(1)\} \quad \text{with} \quad K_1^*(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{4\{1 + K_1^2(\mathbf{t})\}}.$$

Using (I), the first term can easily be bounded by

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\gamma_t(\Delta)} \geq 1 + \delta(\Delta) \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\mathbf{u}}{4} N \varepsilon^2 \delta^2(\Delta) \Delta^{4H(t)} \varrho(\Delta) \right). \quad (\text{SM.3})$$

The study of the second term boils down to the concentration of $\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t})$ around $H(\mathbf{t})$. Indeed, using (33), and since $\log(1+x) \leq x$, $\forall x > -1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\Delta^{2\widehat{H}(t)}}{\Delta^{2H(t)}} \leq 1 - \delta(\Delta) \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(2\widehat{H}(\mathbf{t}) - 2H(\mathbf{t}) \geq -\frac{\delta(\Delta)}{\log(\Delta)} \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right)$$

$$\leq C_1 \exp \left(-C_2 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\delta^2(\Delta)}{16 \log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4H(t)} \varrho(\Delta) \right). \quad (\text{SM.4})$$

Therefore, taking together (I) and (I), positive constants \tilde{L}_1 and \tilde{L}_2 exist such that, for Δ sufficiently small,

$$B_\varepsilon \leq \tilde{L}_1 \exp \left(-\tilde{L}_2 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{K_1^*(\mathbf{t})}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4H(t)} \varrho(\Delta) \right). \quad (\text{SM.5})$$

By (I), this implies that two positive constants L_3 and L_4 exist such that, for Δ sufficiently small,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\alpha}_t(\Delta) - \alpha_t(\Delta)| \geq \varepsilon) \leq L_3 \exp \left(-L_4 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^{4H(t)} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \right) + \mathbb{P}(\overline{\Omega}_1).$$

It remains to bound $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\Omega}_1)$. For this, assume without loss of generality, that

$$\gamma_t(2\Delta)/(2\Delta)^{2\mathbf{H}(t)} \geq \gamma_t(\Delta)/\Delta^{2\mathbf{H}(t)}.$$

By definition of $\overline{\Omega}_1$, we then have :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\overline{\Omega}_1) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(t)}} - \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{(\Delta)^{2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(t)}} = 0\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(t)}} - \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{(\Delta)^{2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(t)}} \leq (1-\varepsilon)\left(\frac{\gamma_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\mathbf{H}(t)}} - \frac{\gamma_t(\Delta)}{(\Delta)^{2\mathbf{H}(t)}}\right)\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(t)}} - \frac{\gamma_t(2\Delta)}{(2\Delta)^{2\mathbf{H}(t)}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\alpha_t(\Delta)\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\widehat{\gamma}_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}(t)}} - \frac{\gamma_t(\Delta)}{\Delta^{2\mathbf{H}(t)}} \geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\alpha_t(\Delta)\right) \\ &\leq \tilde{L}_3 \exp\left(-\tilde{L}_4 N \varepsilon^2 \alpha_t^2(\Delta) \frac{\Delta^{4\mathbf{H}(t)} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality, we use inequalities similar to (I) applied with Δ and 2δ , and where ε was replaced by $\varepsilon\alpha_t(\Delta)$. Now, let us notice that

$$\alpha_t(\Delta) = \frac{K_2(\mathbf{t})}{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1} \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} (1 + o(1)),$$

where $K_2(\mathbf{t})$ is defined by (3) and, recall that $D(\mathbf{t}) = \overline{H}(\mathbf{t}) - \underline{H}(\mathbf{t})$. This implies that constants \tilde{L}_5 and \tilde{L}_6 exist such that, for sufficiently small Δ ,

$$\mathbb{P}(|\widehat{\alpha}_t(\Delta) - \alpha_t(\Delta)| \geq \varepsilon) \leq \tilde{L}_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{L}_6 N \varepsilon^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)}\right).$$

□

II Complements for the proof of Proposition 4

We first bound the probability of the event $\{\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) = 0\}$ when $D(\mathbf{t}) > 0$, where

$$\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) = \widehat{(\overline{H} - \underline{H})}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\log(\widehat{\alpha}_t(2\Delta)) - \log(\widehat{\alpha}_t(\Delta))}{2\log(2)}.$$

By (35), for $D(\mathbf{t}) \geq |\log(\Delta)| \max\{|R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|, |R(\overline{H} - \underline{H})(\mathbf{t})|\}$, which is trivially satisfied for small Δ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) = 0) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - D(\mathbf{t})\right| \geq D(\mathbf{t})\right) \\ &\leq \tilde{L}_8 \exp\left(-\tilde{L}_7 N \times D^2(\mathbf{t}) \times \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\right). \quad (\text{SM.6}) \end{aligned}$$

The bound in (II) will be shown to be negligible compared to the bound of

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \widehat{L}_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) - L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) \right| \geq \varepsilon, \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \neq 0 \right),$$

given in (II) below.

Next, the following result implies the bounds for the terms $B_3^{(i)}, B_4^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$, in (43) in the proof of Proposition 4 in the Appendix.

Lemma SM.1. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and set*

$$\mathfrak{D}_\varepsilon = \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{(2^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} - 1)\Delta^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})}} - \frac{1}{(2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}} \geq \varepsilon, \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \neq 0 \right).$$

Then two positive constants \tilde{C}_3 and \tilde{C}_4 exists such that :

$$\mathfrak{D}_\varepsilon \leq \tilde{C}_3 \exp \left(-\tilde{C}_4 N \varepsilon^2 (2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^4(\Delta)} \Delta^{8D(\mathbf{t})} \right). \quad (\text{SM.7})$$

Proof of Lemma SM.1. Let introduce the following notation : for any event \mathcal{A} ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\neq}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}, \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \neq 0).$$

We first decompose as follow :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{D}_\varepsilon &= \mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})-2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} \frac{2^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1} - 1 \geq \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} (2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})-2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(\frac{2^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since Δ is assumed to be sufficiently small, we first have :

$$\mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})-2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2} \right) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(D(\mathbf{t}) - \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) \leq \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{4 \log(\Delta)} \right).$$

Now using (35) with small Δ , we obtain for any $|R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})| \leq \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} / |\log(\Delta)|^2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})-2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2} \right) \\ \leq \mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(2|D(\mathbf{t}) - \widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})| \geq \varepsilon \frac{\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}}{|\log(\Delta)|} \frac{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2} \right) \\ \leq \tilde{L}_8 \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}_7}{4} N \varepsilon^2 (2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^4(\Delta)} \Delta^{8D(\mathbf{t})} \right). \quad (\text{SM.8}) \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, and by using simple algebra we have :

$$\mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(\frac{2^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2} \right) = \mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(2^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - 2D(\mathbf{t})} \geq \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{(2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2}{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})+1}} + 1 \right)$$

Taking the logarithm on both sides and using the inequality $\log(x) \leq x - 1$, $\forall x > 0$, we obtain :

$$\mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(\frac{2^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2} \right) \leq \mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t}) - D(\mathbf{t}) \geq \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{(2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2}{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})+2} \log 2} \right).$$

Finally, using (35)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{\neq} \left(\frac{2^{2\widehat{D}(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1} \geq 1 + \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} \frac{2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1}{2} \right) \\ \leq \tilde{L}_8 \exp \left(-\frac{\tilde{L}_7}{2^{4D(\mathbf{t})+2} \log^2 2} N \varepsilon^2 (2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^4 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^2(\Delta)} \Delta^{8D(\mathbf{t})} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{SM.9})$$

Taking together (II) and (II), we deduce that positive constants \tilde{C}_3 and \tilde{C}_4 exist such that, $\forall \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,

$$\mathfrak{D}_{\varepsilon} \leq \tilde{C}_3 \exp \left(-\tilde{C}_4 N \varepsilon^2 (2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^4(\Delta)} \Delta^{8D(\mathbf{t})} \right). \quad (\text{SM.10})$$

□

We can now derive the bounds for the terms B_3 , B_4 in (43) from the proof of Proposition 4. We first notice that

$$B_3^{(i)} = \mathfrak{D} \frac{\varepsilon}{3\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta)} \quad \text{and} \quad B_4^{(i)} = \mathfrak{D} \sqrt{\varepsilon/3}.$$

Since $\alpha_{\mathbf{t}}^{(i)}(\Delta) \sim L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})(2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)\Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})}$, we obtain : with small Δ and $|R(\underline{H})(\mathbf{t})| \leq \varepsilon \Delta^{2D(\mathbf{t})} / |\log(\Delta)|^2$,

$$B_3^{(i)} \leq \tilde{C}_3 \exp \left(-\tilde{C}_4 N \left(\frac{\varepsilon \Delta^{-2D(\mathbf{t})}}{3L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t})(2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)} \right)^2 (2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^4(\Delta)} \Delta^{8D(\mathbf{t})} \right), \quad (\text{SM.11})$$

$$B_4^{(i)} \leq \tilde{C}_3 \exp \left(-\tilde{C}_4 N \varepsilon (2^{2D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{3 \log^4(\Delta)} \Delta^{8D(\mathbf{t})} \right). \quad (\text{SM.12})$$

Finally, by combining (44), (II) and (II), two positive constants C_3 and C_4 exists such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \widehat{L_2^{(i)}}(\mathbf{t}) - L_2^{(i)}(\mathbf{t}) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq C_3 \exp \left(-C_4 N \varepsilon \min\{\varepsilon, \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})}\} (4^{D(\mathbf{t})} - 1)^2 \frac{\Delta^{4\overline{H}(\mathbf{t})} \varrho(\Delta)}{\log^4(\Delta)} \Delta^{4D(\mathbf{t})} \right),$$

$i = 1, 2$. Here, we also use the fact that $L_2^{(1)}, L_2^{(2)}$ are a bounded function.

III Complements for the proof of Proposition 6

III.1 Proof of equation (45)

We have to prove

$$B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{2} + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2). \quad (\text{SM.13})$$

Here $B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = 2D(H_1(\mathbf{t}), H_1(\mathbf{s}))D(H_2(\mathbf{t}), H_2(\mathbf{s}))$. Let us note that the map $(x, y) \mapsto D(x, y)$ admits partial derivatives of any order on $(0, 1) \times (0, 1)$. Next, let

$$g(x) = \log(\Gamma(2x + 1)) + \log(\sin(\pi x)) =: g_1(x) - g_2(x).$$

We notice that $g''(x) < 0$, for any $x \in (0, 1)$. Indeed, using the expression of the derivative of the digamma function, cf. [Abramowitz and Stegun \(1970, page 260\)](#), we have

$$g''(x) = 4 \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{(2x + 1 + k)^2} - \frac{\pi^2}{\sin^2(\pi x)} = g_1''(x) - g_2''(x).$$

We deduce that g'' is decreasing on $[1/2, 1)$ and, since $g''(0+) = -\infty$, the function g_1'' is decreasing on $(0, 1/2]$ with

$$g_1''(0) = \pi^2/6, \quad g_1''(1/4) = 4\{\pi^2/2 - 4\}, \quad g_1''(1/2) = 4\{\pi^2/6 - 1\},$$

and the function g_2'' is decreasing on $(0, 1/2]$ with

$$g_2''(0+) = \infty, \quad g_2''(1/4) = 2\pi^2, \quad g_2''(1/2) = \pi^2,$$

we conclude that $g'' < 0$ on $(0, 1]$. In other words, $x \mapsto g(x)$ is log-concave, and thus

$$2D(x, y) = \frac{\sqrt{\exp(g(x)) \times \exp(g(y))}}{\exp(g((x+y)/2))} < 1, \quad \forall 0 < x \neq y \leq 1.$$

We deduce that $1/2$ is the maximum value that the function B could reach. Which means that the gradient of B on the diagonal is zero and therefore, we have [\(III.1\)](#).

III.2 Proof of equation (47)

We here prove that

$$a(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})a(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) - 1 = O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2). \quad (\text{SM.14})$$

For two 2-dimensional vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} , let $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ denote their scalar product. Moreover, let ∇H_1 and ∇H_2 be the 2-dimensional vectors of partial derivatives of H_1 and H_2 , respectively. Since the functions H_1 and H_2 are supposed to be continuously differentiable, using [\(45\)](#), we get :

$$a(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}) = \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \{\log(|A_1(\mathbf{t})|)\nabla H_1(\mathbf{t}) + \log(|A_2(\mathbf{t})|)\nabla H_2(\mathbf{t})\} \cdot (\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}) + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2)}{B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})}.$$

Similar arguments lead to :

$$a(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) = \frac{\frac{1}{2} - \{\log(|A_1(\mathbf{s})|) \nabla H_1(\mathbf{t}) + \log(|A_2(\mathbf{s})|) \nabla H_2(\mathbf{t})\} \cdot (\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}) + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2)}{B(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})}.$$

Thus, by multiplying the two quantities, we obtain when \mathbf{s} is close to \mathbf{t} :

$$\begin{aligned} a(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})a(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) &= \frac{1}{B^2(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s})} \\ &\times \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{|A_1(\mathbf{t})|}{|A_1(\mathbf{s})|} \right) \nabla H_1(\mathbf{t}) + \log \left(\frac{|A_2(\mathbf{t})|}{|A_2(\mathbf{s})|} \right) \nabla H_2(\mathbf{t}) \right\} \cdot (\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}) + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{SM.15})$$

On the another hand we have :

$$\log \left(\frac{|A_1(\mathbf{t})|}{|A_1(\mathbf{s})|} \right) = \frac{\nabla A_1(\mathbf{t})}{|A_1(\mathbf{t})|} \cdot (\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}) + O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2),$$

means that

$$\log \left(\frac{|A_1(\mathbf{t})|}{|A_1(\mathbf{s})|} \right) \nabla H_1(\mathbf{t}) \cdot (\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}) = O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2). \quad (\text{SM.16})$$

Similar arguments yield :

$$\log \left(\frac{|A_2(\mathbf{t})|}{|A_2(\mathbf{s})|} \right) \nabla H_2(\mathbf{t}) \cdot (\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}) = O(\|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{s}\|^2). \quad (\text{SM.17})$$

By plugging (III.2) and (III.2) into (III.2), and using (III.1), we obtain (III.2) and thus (47).

III.3 Proof of equation (49)

For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$|e^a - e^b| \leq e^a e^{|a-b|} |a - b|.$$

We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |A_1(\mathbf{t}) - \widehat{A}_1(\mathbf{t})| &\leq A_1(\mathbf{t}) \exp \left[\int_{t_0}^{t_1} |\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)| \, ds + \int_{s_0}^{t_2} |\widehat{g}_1(t_0, s) - g_1(t_0, s)| \, ds \right] \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \int_{t_0}^{t_1} |\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)| \, ds + \int_{s_0}^{t_2} |\widehat{g}_1(t_0, s) - g_1(t_0, s)| \, ds \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It finally remains to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left[\int_{t_0}^{t_1} |\widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2)| \, ds + \int_{s_0}^{t_2} |\widehat{g}_1(t_0, s) - g_1(t_0, s)| \, ds \right] < \infty.$$

By the Taylor expansion of the exponential function, and using the convexity of the function $x \mapsto x^p$, $p \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \exp \left[\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left| \widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2) \right| ds + \int_{s_0}^{t_2} \left| \widehat{g}_1(t_0, s) - g_1(t_0, s) \right| ds \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{2^{p-1}}{p!} \left\{ \left[\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left| \widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2) \right| ds \right]^p + \left[\int_{s_0}^{t_2} \left| \widehat{g}_1(t_0, s) - g_1(t_0, s) \right| ds \right]^p \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Jensen's inequality we now obtain

$$\left[\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left| \widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2) \right| ds \right]^p \leq (2|t_1 - t_0|)^{p-1} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left\{ \left| \widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) \right|^p + |f_1(s, t_2)|^p \right\} ds. \quad (\text{SM.18})$$

We also have by (24) and (20) that

$$f_1(\mathbf{t}) \leq \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}}{\underline{v}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\beta}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \widehat{f}_1(\mathbf{t}) \right|^p \right] \leq \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}}{\underline{v}} \right)^{\frac{p}{2\beta}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{v(\mathbf{t})}{\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t})} \right)^{\frac{p}{2\beta}} \right] \leq \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}}{\underline{v}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\beta}} C_v^{p \lceil 1/(2\beta) \rceil},$$

where $\lceil 1/(2\beta) \rceil$ denote the ceiling of $1/(2\beta)$. Therefore, (III.3) becomes

$$\left[\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left| \widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2) \right| ds \right]^p \leq (2|t_1 - t_0|)^p \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}}{\underline{v}} \right)^{\frac{p}{2\beta}} \times \left\{ 1 + C_v^{\lceil 1/(2\beta) \rceil} \right\}^p.$$

A similar inequality remains valid for the integral of $|\widehat{g}_1(t_0, s) - g_1(t_0, s)|$. We therefore get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \exp \left[\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \left| \widehat{f}_1(s, t_2) - f_1(s, t_2) \right| ds + \int_{s_0}^{t_2} \left| \widehat{g}_1(t_0, s) - g_1(t_0, s) \right| ds \right] \\ & \leq \exp \left(4 \text{diam}(\mathcal{T}) \left(\frac{\overline{\beta}}{\underline{v}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\beta}} \times \left\{ 1 + C_v^{\lceil 1/2\beta \rceil} \right\} \right) := \mathfrak{C}_v. \end{aligned}$$

IV Proof of Proposition 8

The proof of Proposition 8 is a direct consequence of the following lemmas.

Lemma SM.2. *Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold true. Then a positive constant $a_1 > 1$ exists such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq m \leq M_0} W_m^{\text{new}}(\mathbf{t}) \middle| M_0 \right] \leq \frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi M_0 h_1 h_2} \left\{ 1 + a_1 M_0^{-1/4} \right\}.$$

Proof of Lemma SM.2. Recall that, for $1 \leq m \leq M_0$ and $\mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$W_m^{\text{new}}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{K(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{t}_m^{\text{new}} - \mathbf{t}))}{\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} K(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{t}_m^{\text{new}} - \mathbf{t}))}, \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{0}{0} = 0.$$

Let

$$N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) = \text{Card} \{ \mathbf{t}_m^{\text{new}}, 1 \leq m \leq M_0, \|\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{t}_m^{\text{new}} - \mathbf{t})\| \leq 1 \}.$$

Given M_0 , $N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t})$ can also be written as

$$N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) = B_1(\mathbf{t}) + B_2(\mathbf{t}) + \cdots + B_{M_0}(\mathbf{t}) \leq M_0,$$

where $(B_m(\mathbf{t}))_{1 \leq m \leq M_0}$ are iid Bernoulli random variables with parameter $p(\mathbf{t})$ given by

$$p(\mathbf{t}) = p(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{B}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{t}_m^{\text{new}} - \mathbf{t}) \in B(0, 1) | M_0).$$

Using 1 we have

$$W_m^{\text{new}}(\mathbf{t}) \leq \kappa^2 \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) \geq 1\}}}{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t})}, \quad \forall 1 \leq m \leq M_0,$$

which implies

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_m W_m^{\text{new}}(\mathbf{t}) \middle| M_0 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\max_m W_m^{\text{new}}(\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{1}_{\{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) \geq 1\}} \middle| M_0 \right] \leq \kappa^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) \geq 1\}}}{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t})} \middle| M_0 \right].$$

Let

$$\mathcal{G} := \left\{ p(\mathbf{t}) M_0 \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) \geq 1\}}}{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t})} \leq 1 + M_0^{-1/4} \right\}.$$

Since 2 holds true, by Lemma SM.8 we have that $p(\mathbf{t}) \geq \pi c h_1 h_2$, and therefore :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\kappa^2 \mathbf{1}_{\{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) \geq 1\}}}{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t})} \middle| M_0 \right] &\leq \frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi M_0 h_1 h_2} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{M_0 p(\mathbf{t})}{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t})} \mathbf{1}_{\{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) \geq 1\}} \middle| M_0 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi M_0 h_1 h_2} \left(1 + M_0^{-1/4} \right) + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{M_0 p(\mathbf{t})}{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t})} \mathbf{1}_{\{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) \geq 1\}} \mathbf{1}_{\overline{\mathcal{G}}} \middle| M_0 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi M_0 h_1 h_2} \left(1 + M_0^{-1/4} \right) + M_0 p(\mathbf{t}) \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{G}} | M_0) \end{aligned}$$

It remains to bound $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{G}} | M_0)$. By Hoeffding's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathcal{G}} | M_0) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{p(\mathbf{t}) M_0}{N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t})} \geq 1 + M_0^{-1/4} \middle| M_0 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\{-N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) + p(\mathbf{t}) M_0\} (1 + M_0^{-1/4}) \geq p(\mathbf{t}) M_0^{3/4} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(-N_{h_1, h_2}(\mathbf{t}) + p(\mathbf{t}) M_0 \geq \frac{p(\mathbf{t}) M_0^{3/4}}{1 + M_0^{-1/4}} \right) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-2 \left(\frac{p(\mathbf{t}) M_0^{3/4}}{1 + M_0^{-1/4}} \right)^2 M_0 \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{\{M_0^{5/4} p(\mathbf{t})\}^2}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $m h_1 h_2$ tends to infinity, there exists $a_1 > 1$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq m \leq M_0} W_m^{\text{new}}(\mathbf{t}) \middle| M_0 \right] \leq \frac{\kappa^2}{c\pi M_0 h_1 h_2} \left(1 + a_1 M_0^{-1/4} \right).$$

□

Lemma SM.3. *Under the assumptions of Lemma SM.2, a positive constant $a_1 > 1$ exists such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \{X^{new}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\} W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \right)^2 \middle| M_0 \right] \\ \leq 2 \left\{ L_1(\mathbf{t}) h_1^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + L_2(\mathbf{t}) h_2^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} \right\} \{1 + o(1)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \varepsilon_m^{new} W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \right)^2 \middle| M_0 \right] \leq \frac{\kappa^2 \sigma^2}{c\pi} \frac{1}{M_0 h_1 h_2} \left\{ 1 + a_1 M_0^{-1/4} \right\}.$$

Proof of Lemma SM.3. We start by proving the second inequality. For $1 \leq m \neq m' \leq M_0$, ε_m^{new} and $\varepsilon_{m'}^{new}$ are independent. Moreover, the ε_m^{new} and $W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t})$ are independent, and the ε_m^{new} are centered. From these, the fact that $\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) = 1$, and Lemma SM.2, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \varepsilon_m^{new} W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \right)^2 \middle| M_0 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \{\varepsilon_m^{new} W_m^{new}\}^2(\mathbf{t}) \middle| M_0 \right] = \sigma^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \{W_m^{new}\}^2(\mathbf{t}) \middle| M_0 \right] \\ &\leq \sigma^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq m \leq M_0} W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \times \sum_{m=1}^{M_0} W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \middle| M_0 \right] \leq \frac{\sigma^2 \kappa^2}{c\pi M_0 h_1 h_2} \left\{ 1 + a_1 M_0^{-1/4} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first inequality, denote $\mathbf{t}_m^{new} = (t_{m,1}^{new}, t_{m,2}^{new})$ and $\mathcal{T}_{obs}^{new} = \{\mathbf{t}_m^{new}, 1 \leq m \leq M_0\}$. Let $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2) \in \mathcal{T}$. Recall that K is a density with the support in $[-1, 1]^2$, and thus $W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) = 0$ as soon as $|t_1 - t_{m,1}^{new}| \geq h_1$ or $|t_2 - t_{m,2}^{new}| \geq h_2$. By Jensen's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \sum_{m=1}^{M_0} [X^{new}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})] W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \right\}^2 \middle| M_0 \right] \\ \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \{X^{new}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \middle| M_0 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, for $1 \leq m \leq M_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\{X^{new}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \middle| M_0, \mathcal{T}_{obs}^{new} \right] \\ \leq 2\mathbb{E} \left[\{X^{new}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}) - X^{new}(t_1, t_{m,2}^{new})\}^2 \middle| M_0, \mathcal{T}_{obs}^{new} \right] \\ + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\{X^{new}(t_1, t_{m,2}^{new}) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \middle| M_0, \mathcal{T}_{obs}^{new} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\rho_i =: |t_i - t_{m,i}^{new}|$, $i = 1, 2$. Then by Lemma SM.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X^{new}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}) - X^{new}(t_1, t_{m,2}^{new}) \right\}^2 \middle| M_0, \mathcal{T}_{obs}^{new}, \rho_1 \leq h_1 \right] &\leq L_1(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}) \rho_1^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\rho_1 \leq h_1\}} \\ &\leq L_1(\mathbf{t}) \rho_1^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\rho_1 \leq h_1\}} + |L_1(\mathbf{t}) - L_1(\mathbf{t}_m^{new})| \rho_1^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} \mathbf{1}_{\{\rho_1 \leq h_1\}} \\ &\leq L_1(\mathbf{t}) h_1^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + k_1 h_1^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} \|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{t}_m^{new}\|. \end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality we used the fact that L_1 is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant k_1 . Using the same type of arguments, and the fact that L_2 is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant k_2 , we get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X^{new}(t_1, t_{m,2}^{new}) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \right\}^2 \middle| M_0, \mathcal{T}_{obs}^{new}, \rho_2 \leq h_2 \right] \leq L_2(\mathbf{t}) h_2^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} + k_2 h_2^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} \|\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{t}_m^{new}\|.$$

Gathering facts,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{m=1}^{M_0} \left\{ X^{new}(\mathbf{t}_m^{new}) - X^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \right\}^2 W_m^{new}(\mathbf{t}) \middle| M_0 \right] \leq 2 \left\{ L_1(\mathbf{t}) h_1^{2H_1(\mathbf{t})} + L_2(\mathbf{t}) h_2^{2H_2(\mathbf{t})} \right\} \{1 + o(1)\}.$$

□

V Technical lemmas

V.1 Proof of the local Hölder continuity of the realizations of X

In Section 5.2 of the main manuscript, we linked the local regularity in quadratic mean to the (analytic) regularity of the realizations of X . Let us provide a detailed justification for our statement.

Lemma SM.4. *Consider \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2} in Definition 1 is built with restricted $\mathbf{L} = (L_1, 0, 0, L_2)$, and let $X \in \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}$. Assume that*

$$\max_{i=1,2} \sup_{0 < \Delta \leq \Delta_0} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X(\mathbf{t} - \Delta e_i/2) - X(\mathbf{t} + \Delta e_i/2) \right\}^{2p} \right]}{\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X(\mathbf{t} - \Delta e_i/2) - X(\mathbf{t} + \Delta e_i/2) \right\}^2 \right]^p} < \infty, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{SM.19})$$

The, almost any realization of X is locally α -Hölder continuous in the direction e_i , for any order $0 \leq \alpha < H_i(\mathbf{t})$, $i = 1, 2$.

Proof of Lemma SM.4. Condition (4) means that, for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $C_p(\mathbf{t})$, independent of Δ , such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X\left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i\right) - X\left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i\right) \right\}^{2p} \right] \leq C_p(\mathbf{t}) \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X\left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i\right) - X\left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} e_i\right) \right\}^2 \right]^p.$$

Since $\mathbf{L} = (L_1, 0, 0, L_2)$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ X \left(\mathbf{t} - \frac{\Delta}{2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) - X \left(\mathbf{t} + \frac{\Delta}{2} \mathbf{e}_i \right) \right\}^{2p} \right] \leq C_p(\mathbf{t}) L_i^p(\mathbf{t}) \Delta^{2pH_i(\mathbf{t})}, \quad \forall \Delta \in [0, \Delta_0].$$

Using [Revuz and Yor \(1994, Theorem 2.1, page 26\)](#), we then get that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{0 < \Delta \leq \Delta_0} \left(\frac{|X(\mathbf{t} - \Delta \mathbf{e}_i/2) - X(\mathbf{t} + \Delta \mathbf{e}_i/2)|}{\Delta^\nu} \right)^{2p} \right] < \infty, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{N}, \forall \nu \in \left[0, \frac{2pH_i(\mathbf{t}) - 2}{2p} \right).$$

Letting $p \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the stated local Hölder property. \square

Lemma SM.5. *Let a_N, b_N, c_N be three positives sequences such that*

$$c_N \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{a/b, a_N/b_N\} \leq \mathfrak{C},$$

for some constant $\mathfrak{C} > 1$. Let $a, b > 0$ and $c \geq 1$. For $0 \leq u \leq 1$, let

$$\varphi_1(u) = \mathbb{P}(|a_N - a| \geq u), \quad \varphi_2(u) = \mathbb{P}(|b_N - b| \geq u) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_3(u) = \mathbb{P}(|c_N - c| \geq u).$$

Define

$$r_1 = \frac{a\mathfrak{C}}{2 \min\{1, 1/c\}}, \quad r_2 = \frac{b}{6\mathfrak{C}} \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{c}\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad r_3 = \min\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\mathfrak{C}}}, \frac{1}{(a/b)^c |\log(a/b)|}\right\}.$$

We then have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \left(\frac{a_N}{b_N} \right)^{c_N} - \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^c \right| \geq u \right) \leq 2\varphi_1(r_1 u) + 2\varphi_2(r_2 u) + 2\varphi_3(r_3 u).$$

Proof of Lemma SM.5. By elementary algebra, and using the conditions $c_N, c \geq 1$, and $0 \leq u \leq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \left(\frac{a_N}{b_N} \right)^{c_N} - \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^c \right| \geq 2u \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \left(\frac{a_N}{b_N} \right)^{c_N} - \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{c_N} \right| \geq u \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{c_N} - \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^c \right| \geq u \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \int_{\frac{a}{b}}^{\frac{a_N}{b_N}} c_N x^{c_N-1} dx \right| \geq u \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^c \left| \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{c_N-c} - 1 \right| \geq u \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(c_N \left| \frac{a}{b} - \frac{a_N}{b_N} \right| \mathfrak{C} \geq u \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^c \left| \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{c_N-c} - 1 \right| \geq u \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left((c_N - c) \left| \frac{a}{b} - \frac{a_N}{b_N} \right| \geq u/(2\mathfrak{C}) \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(c \left| \frac{a}{b} - \frac{a_N}{b_N} \right| \geq u/(2\mathfrak{C}) \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{c_N-c} - 1 \right| \geq u \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{-c} \right) \\ &\leq \varphi_3(\sqrt{u/(2\mathfrak{C})}) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{b} - \frac{a_N}{b_N} \right| \geq \sqrt{u/(2\mathfrak{C})} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(c \left| \frac{a}{b} - \frac{a_N}{b_N} \right| \geq u/(2\mathfrak{C}) \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{c_N-c} - 1 \right| \geq u \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{-c} \right) \\ &\leq \varphi_3(\sqrt{u/(2\mathfrak{C})}) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{b} - \frac{a_N}{b_N} \right| \geq \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{c}\right\} u/(2\mathfrak{C}) \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{c_N-c} - 1 \right| \geq u \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{-c} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using the inequality

$$|xy - 1| \leq |x - 1||y - 1| + |x - 1| + |y - 1|,$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} \times \frac{b_N}{b} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \times \left| \frac{b_N}{b} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{b_N}{b} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon/3} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{b_N}{b} - 1 \right| \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon/3} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right) + \varphi_2(b\varepsilon/3) \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon/3} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right) + \varphi_2(b\sqrt{\varepsilon/3}) + \varphi_2(b\varepsilon/3). \end{aligned}$$

We next relate

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon/3} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right),$$

to the function φ_1 . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \geq \varepsilon/3 \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{a}{a_N} - 1 < -\varepsilon/3 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} (a - a_N \geq a_N\varepsilon/3) + \mathbb{P} (a - a_N < -a_N\varepsilon/3) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(a - a_N \geq \frac{a\varepsilon}{3 + \varepsilon} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(a - a_N < -\frac{a\varepsilon}{3 - \varepsilon} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $a > 0$ and $-a\varepsilon/\{3 - \varepsilon\} \leq -a\varepsilon/\{3 + \varepsilon\}$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(a - a_N \geq \frac{a\varepsilon}{3 + \varepsilon} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(a - a_N < -\frac{a\varepsilon}{3 + \varepsilon} \right) = \varphi_1 \left(\frac{a\varepsilon}{3 + \varepsilon} \right).$$

By similar arguments we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \sqrt{\varepsilon/3} \right) \leq \varphi_1 \left(\frac{a\sqrt{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{\varepsilon}} \right).$$

We finally deduce that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{a_N} - 1 \right| \geq \varepsilon/3 \right) \leq 2\varphi_1 \left(\frac{a\varepsilon}{3 + \varepsilon} \right) + 2\varphi_2(\varepsilon/3).$$

Which means that for $u \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{a}{b} - \frac{a_N}{b_N} \right| \geq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{c} \right\} u / (2\mathfrak{C}) \right) \leq 2\varphi_1(r_1u) + 2\varphi_2(r_2u),$$

where,

$$r_1 = \frac{a\epsilon}{2 \min\{1, \frac{1}{c}\}} \quad \text{and} \quad r_2 = \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{c}\right\} \frac{b}{6\epsilon}.$$

It finally remains to control

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{c_N-c} - 1\right| \geq u \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-c}\right).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{c_N-c} - 1\right| \geq u \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-c}\right) \\ = \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{c_N-c} \geq 1 + u \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-c}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{c_N-c} \leq 1 - u \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-c}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since for $x > 0$ we have $\log(x) \leq x - 1$, for u small such that $1 - (a/b)^{-c}u > 0$, we obtain :

$$\mathbb{P}\left((c_N - c) \log \frac{a}{b} \leq \log\left(1 - u \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-c}\right)\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left((c_N - c) \log \frac{a}{b} \leq -\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-c} u\right), \quad (\text{SM.20})$$

and since for $x \in [0, 1]$ we have $\log(1 + x) \geq x/2$ we obtain :

$$\mathbb{P}\left((c_N - c) \log \frac{a}{b} \geq \log\left(1 + u \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-c}\right)\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left((c_N - c) \log \frac{a}{b} \geq \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-c} u/2\right). \quad (\text{SM.21})$$

Combining (V.1) and (V.1), whatever the sign of $\log(a/b)$ is, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{c_N-c} - 1\right| \geq u \left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^{-c}\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|c_N - c| \geq \frac{u}{2(a/b)^c |\log(a/b)|}\right) = \varphi_3(r_3 u),$$

where

$$r_3 = \min\left\{1/\sqrt{2}, \left(\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)^c \left|\log\left(\frac{a}{b}\right)\right|\right)^{-1}\right\}$$

□

Lemma SM.6. *Under the conditions of Proposition 7 and for sufficiently large \mathbf{m} , a positive constant ϵ exists such that, for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t}) - v(\mathbf{t})| \geq \eta) \leq 2 \exp(-\epsilon N \eta^2),$$

where $\widehat{v}(\mathbf{t}) = \max\{\widetilde{v}(\mathbf{t}), \underline{v}\}$ with

$$\widetilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \{\widetilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2.$$

Proof of Lemma SM.6. Recall the notation $\xi^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}) = \tilde{X}^{(j)} - X^{(j)}$ for $1 \leq j \leq N$. We decompose

$$\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) - v(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 - \mathbb{E}[\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \right) + \mathbb{E}[\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t})] - \mathbb{E}[\{X(\mathbf{t})\}^2].$$

The bias term : We have

$$\mathbb{E} [\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) - \{X(\mathbf{t})\}^2] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\{\tilde{X}(\mathbf{t}) - X(\mathbf{t})\} \times \{\tilde{X}(\mathbf{t}) + X(\mathbf{t})\} \right],$$

and by Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\mathbb{E} [\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) - \{X(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \leq R_2(\mathbf{m})^{1/2} \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}) + X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \right]^{1/2}.$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}) + X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\{\xi^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}) + 2X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 \right] \\ &\leq 2R_2(\mathbf{m}) + 8\mathbb{E}[\{X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \leq 2R_2(\mathbf{m}) + 8\mathbf{a}_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} [\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) - \{X(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \leq R_2(\mathbf{m})^{1/2} (2R_2(\mathbf{m}) + 8\mathbf{a}_1)^{1/2} := \eta_*.$$

The variance term :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \{\tilde{X}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 - \mathbb{E}[\{\tilde{X}(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \right|^p \right] &\leq 2^p \mathbb{E} \left[\{\tilde{X}(\mathbf{t})\}^{2p} \right] \\ &\leq 2^{3p-1} \left(\mathbb{E}[\{\xi^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^{2p}] + \mathbb{E}[\{X^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^{2p}] \right) \\ &\leq 2^{3p-1} \left(\frac{p!}{2} \mathbf{c} \mathfrak{D}^{p-2} \rho(\mathbf{m})^{2p} + \frac{p!}{2} \mathbf{a}_1 \mathfrak{A}_1^{p-2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since, for sufficiently large \mathbf{m} , $\rho(\mathbf{m}) \leq 1$, positive constants $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{A}}$ exist such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \{\tilde{X}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 - \mathbb{E}[\{\tilde{X}(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \right|^p \right] \leq \frac{p!}{2} \tilde{\mathbf{a}} \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}^{p-2}.$$

Exponential bound: Let $0 < 2\eta \leq \eta_*$, We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) - v(\mathbf{t}) \geq \eta) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 - \mathbb{E}[\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \right) + \mathbb{E}[\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t})] - \mathbb{E}[\{X(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \geq \eta \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 - \mathbb{E}[\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \right) + \eta_* \geq \eta \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2 - \mathbb{E}[\{\tilde{X}^{(j)}(\mathbf{t})\}^2] \right) \geq \eta/2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Bernstein's inequality then implies

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) - v(\mathbf{t}) \geq \eta) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{N\eta^2}{8\tilde{\mathbf{a}} + 4\mathfrak{A}\eta}\right).$$

For sufficiently large \mathbf{m} and $\eta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) - v(\mathbf{t}) \geq \eta) \leq \exp(-\mathbf{c}N\eta^2),$$

for some positive constant \mathbf{c} . The same bound is valid for $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) - v(\mathbf{t}) \leq -\eta)$. Finally, it suffices to notice that by definition

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{v}(\mathbf{t}) - v(\mathbf{t})| \geq \eta) \leq \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{v}(\mathbf{t}) - v(\mathbf{t})| \geq \eta).$$

□

Lemma SM.7. *Let $X \in \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}$ and $\mathbf{L} = (L_1, 0, 0, L_2)$. For any $\rho \leq \Delta_0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\{X(\mathbf{t}) - X(\mathbf{t} + \rho e_i)\}^2] \leq L_i(\mathbf{t})\rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})} \times \{1 + O(\rho \log(\rho))\}, \quad \forall \mathbf{t} \in \mathcal{T}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Proof of Lemma SM.7. We fix $i = 1, 2$ and denote $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i = \mathbf{t} + \rho/2e_i$. Since $X \in \mathcal{H}^{H_1, H_2}$ and $\mathbf{L} = (L_1, 0, 0, L_2)$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\{X(\mathbf{t}) - X(\mathbf{t} + \rho e_i)\}^2] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left\{X\left(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i - \frac{\rho}{2}e_i\right) - X\left(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i + \frac{\rho}{2}e_i\right)\right\}^2\right] \leq L_i(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i)\rho^{2H_i(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i)}.$$

The function H_i is continuously differentiable, and thus

$$\rho^{2H_i(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i)} = \rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})}\rho^{2H_i(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i) - 2H_i(\mathbf{t})} = \rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})}\rho^{2R(\mathbf{t})},$$

with

$$R(\mathbf{t}) = \nabla H_i(\mathbf{t}_*) \cdot (\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i - \mathbf{t}),$$

where \mathbf{t}_* is a point on the segment between $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i$ and \mathbf{t} . (Here, for two 2-dimensional vectors \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} , let $\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ denote their scalar product.) Since by the assumptions, a constant $C > 0$ exists such that $|R(\mathbf{t})| \leq C\rho$ and

$$|\rho^{2R(\mathbf{t})} - 1| = |\exp\{2R(\mathbf{t}) \log(\rho)\} - 1| \leq C2R(\mathbf{t}) \log(\rho),$$

we deduce

$$\rho^{2H_i(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i)} = \rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})} \times \{1 + O(\rho \log(\rho))\}.$$

On the hand, the function L_i is Lipschitz continuous, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\{X(\mathbf{t}) - X(\mathbf{t} + \rho e_i)\}^2] &\leq L_i(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i)\rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})} \times \{1 + O(\rho \log(\rho))\} \\ &\leq (L_i(\mathbf{t})\rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})} + |L_i(\tilde{\mathbf{t}}_i) - L_i(\mathbf{t})|\rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})}) \times \{1 + O(\rho \log(\rho))\} \\ &= (L_i(\mathbf{t})\rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})} + O(\rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})+1})) \times \{1 + O(\rho \log(\rho))\} \\ &= L_i(\mathbf{t})\rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})} + O(\rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})+1} \log(\rho)) \end{aligned}$$

We finally obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\{X(\mathbf{t}) - X(\mathbf{t} + \rho e_i)\}^2] \leq L_i(\mathbf{t})\rho^{2H_i(\mathbf{t})} \times \{1 + O(\rho \log(\rho))\}.$$

□

Lemma SM.8. *We have that*

$$p(\mathbf{t}) \geq \pi c h_1 h_2.$$

Proof of Lemma SM.8. We have

$$p(\mathbf{t}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{t}_m^{[0]} - \mathbf{t}) \in B(0, 1) | M_0) = \int_{\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{t}) \in B(0,1)} f_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}.$$

By substitution ($\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{B}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{t})$), using 2 and the Lebesgue measure of the unit ball, we obtain

$$p(\mathbf{t}) = \int_{\mathbf{s} \in B(0,1)} f_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{s} + \mathbf{t}) |\mathbf{B}^{-1}| d\mathbf{s} \geq c\pi h_1 h_2.$$

□

References

- Abramowitz, M. and Stegun, I. (1970). *Handbook of Mathematical Functions: With Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*. Number 55 in Applied mathematics series. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, DC, USA.
- Revuz, D. and Yor, M. (1994). *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, volume 293 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition.