

# Strong Approximations for Empirical Processes Indexed by Lipschitz Functions

Matias D. Cattaneo<sup>1</sup>      Ruiqi (Rae) Yu<sup>1\*</sup>

June 10, 2024

## Abstract

This paper presents new uniform Gaussian strong approximations for empirical processes indexed by classes of functions based on  $d$ -variate random vectors ( $d \geq 1$ ). First, a uniform Gaussian strong approximation is established for general empirical processes indexed by Lipschitz functions, encompassing and improving on all previous results in the literature. When specialized to the setting considered by Rio (1994), and certain constraints on the function class hold, our result improves the approximation rate  $n^{-1/(2d)}$  to  $n^{-1/\max\{d,2\}}$ , up to the same polylog  $n$  term, where  $n$  denotes the sample size. Remarkably, we establish a valid uniform Gaussian strong approximation at the optimal rate  $n^{-1/2} \log n$  for  $d = 2$ , which was previously known to be valid only for univariate ( $d = 1$ ) empirical processes via the celebrated Hungarian construction (Komlós *et al.*, 1975). Second, a uniform Gaussian strong approximation is established for a class of multiplicative separable empirical processes indexed by Lipschitz functions, which address some outstanding problems in the literature (Chernozhukov *et al.*, 2014, Section 3). In addition, two other uniform Gaussian strong approximation results are presented for settings where the function class takes the form of a sequence of Haar basis based on generalized quasi-uniform partitions. We demonstrate the improvements and usefulness of our new strong approximation results with several statistical applications to nonparametric density and regression estimation.

*Keywords:* empirical processes, coupling, Gaussian approximation, uniform inference, local empirical process, nonparametric regression.

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Operations Research and Financial Engineering, Princeton University

\*Corresponding author: [rae.yu@princeton.edu](mailto:rae.yu@princeton.edu)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Related Literature . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Notation and Main Definitions</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Main Definitions . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>General Empirical Process</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Special Cases and Related Literature . . . . .	12
3.1.1	VC-type Bounded Functions . . . . .	12
3.1.2	VC-type Lipschitz Functions . . . . .	14
3.1.3	Polynomial-Entropy Functions . . . . .	15
3.2	Quasi-Uniform Haar Basis . . . . .	17
<b>4</b>	<b>Residual-Based Empirical Process</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1	Example: Local Polynomial Regression . . . . .	23
4.2	Quasi-Uniform Haar Basis . . . . .	26
<b>5</b>	<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>29</b>

# 1 Introduction

Let  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , be independent and identical distributed (i.i.d.) random vectors supported on a background probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . The classical empirical process is

$$X_n(h) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (h(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x}_i)]), \quad h \in \mathcal{H}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}$  is a (possibly  $n$ -varying) class of functions. Following the empirical process literature, and assuming  $\mathcal{H}$  is “nice”, the stochastic process  $(X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H})$  is said to be Donsker if it converges (as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ) weakly to a Gaussian process in  $\ell^\infty(\mathcal{H})$ , the space uniformly bounded real functions on  $\mathcal{H}$ . This convergence in law result is typically denoted by

$$X_n \rightsquigarrow Z, \quad \text{in } \ell^\infty(\mathcal{H}), \quad (2)$$

where  $(Z(h) : h \in \mathcal{H})$  is a mean-zero Gaussian process with covariance function  $\mathbb{E}[Z(h_1)Z(h_2)] = \mathbb{E}[h_1(\mathbf{x}_i)h_2(\mathbf{x}_i)] - \mathbb{E}[h_1(\mathbf{x}_i)]\mathbb{E}[h_2(\mathbf{x}_i)]$  for all  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$  when  $\mathcal{H}$  is not  $n$ -varying. See [van der Vaart and Wellner \(2013\)](#) and [Giné and Nickl \(2016\)](#) for textbook reviews.

A more challenging endeavour is to construct a uniform Gaussian strong approximation for the empirical process  $X_n$ . That is, if the background probability space is “rich” enough, or is otherwise properly enlarged, the goal is to construct a sequence of mean-zero Gaussian processes  $(Z_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H})$  with the same covariance structure as  $X_n$  (i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[X_n(h_1)X_n(h_2)] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n(h_1)Z_n(h_2)]$  for all  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ ) such that

$$\|X_n - Z_n\|_{\mathcal{H}} := \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |X_n(h) - Z_n(h)| = O(\varrho_n) \quad \text{almost surely (a.s.)}, \quad (3)$$

for a non-random sequence  $\varrho_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Such a refined approximation result is useful in a variety of contexts. For example, it gives a distributional approximation for non-Donsker empirical processes, for which (2) does not hold, and it also offers a precise quantification of the quality of the distributional approximation when (2) holds. In addition, (3) is typically obtained from precise probability concentration inequalities that can be used to construct statistical inference procedures requiring uniformity over  $\mathcal{H}$  and/or the class of underlying data generating processes. Furthermore, because the sequence of Gaussian processes  $Z_n$  are “pre-asymptotic”, they can offer better finite sample approximations to the sampling distribution of  $X_n$  when compared to the large sample approximation based on the limiting Gaussian process  $Z$  as in (2).

There is a large literature on strong approximations for empirical processes, offering different tightness levels for the bound  $\varrho_n$  in (3). In particular, the univariate case ( $d = 1$ ) is mostly settled. A major breakthrough was accomplished by [Komlós \*et al.\* \(1975\)](#), KMT hereafter), who introduced the celebrated Hungarian construction to prove the optimal result  $\varrho_n = n^{-1/2} \log n$  for the special case of the uniform empirical distribution process:  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_i \sim \text{Uniform}(\mathcal{X})$ , and  $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathbb{1}(\cdot \leq x) : x \in [0, 1]\}$ , where  $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$  denotes the indicator function. See [Bretagnolle and](#)

Massart (1989) and Mason and Van Zwet (2011) for more technical discussions on the Hungarian construction, and Csörgó and Revész (1981) and Pollard (2002) for textbook introductions. The KMT result was later extended by Giné *et al.* (2004) and Giné and Nickl (2010) to univariate empirical processes indexed by functions with uniformly bounded total variation: for  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathbb{P}_X$  continuously distributed, the authors obtained

$$\varrho_n = n^{-1/2} \log n, \quad (4)$$

in (3), with  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfying a bounded variation condition (see Remark 2 below for details). More recently, Cattaneo *et al.* (2024b, Lemma SA26 in their supplemental appendix) gave a self-contained proof of a slightly generalized KMT result allowing for a larger class of distributions  $\mathbb{P}_X$ . As a statistical application, Giné *et al.* (2004) and Giné and Nickl (2010) considered univariate kernel density estimation with bandwidth  $b \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and demonstrated that the optimal univariate KMT strong approximation rate  $(nb)^{-1/2} \log n$  is achievable, where  $nb$  is the effective sample size.

Establishing strong approximations for general empirical processes with  $d \geq 2$  is substantially more difficult, since the KMT approach does not easily generalize to multivariate data. Foundational results in the multidimensional context include Massart (1989), Koltchinskii (1994), and Rio (1994). In particular, assuming the function class  $\mathcal{H}$  is uniformly bounded, has bounded total variation, and satisfies a VC-type condition, among other regularity conditions discussed precisely in the upcoming sections, Rio (1994) obtained

$$\varrho_n = n^{-1/(2d)} \sqrt{\log n}, \quad d \geq 2, \quad (5)$$

in (3). This result is tight under the conditions imposed (Beck, 1985), and demonstrates an unfortunate dimension penalty in the convergence rate for  $d$ -variate uniform Gaussian strong approximation. As a statistical application, Rio (1994) also considered the kernel density estimator with bandwidth  $b \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and established (3) with

$$\varrho_n = (nb^d)^{-1/(2d)} \sqrt{\log n}, \quad d \geq 2,$$

where  $nb^d$  is the effective sample size.

While Rio (1994)'s KMT strong approximation result is unimprovable under the conditions he imposed, it has two limitations:

- (1) The class of functions  $\mathcal{H}$  may be too large, and further restrictions can open the door for improvements. For example, in his application to kernel density estimation, Rio (1994, Section 4) assumed that the class  $\mathcal{H}$  is Lipschitzian to verify the sufficient conditions of his strong approximation theorem, but his theorem did not exploit the Lipschitz property in itself. (The Lipschitzian assumption is essentially without loss of generality in the kernel density estimation application.) It is an open question whether the optimal univariate KMT strong approximation rate (4) is achievable when  $d \geq 2$ , under additional restrictions on  $\mathcal{H}$  (e.g., Lipschitz continuity).

(2) As discussed by Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014, Section 3), applying Rio (1994)’s strong approximation result directly to nonparametric local smoothing regression, a “local empirical process” in their terminology, leads to an even more suboptimal strong approximation rate in (3). For example, in the case of kernel regression estimation with  $d$ -dimensional covariates, Rio (1994)’s strong approximation would treat all  $d + 1$  variables (covariates and outcome) symmetrically, and thus it will give a strong approximation rate in (3) of the form

$$\varrho_n = (nb^{d+1})^{-1/(2d+2)}\sqrt{\log n}, \quad d \geq 1, \quad (6)$$

where  $b \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and under standard regular conditions. The main takeaway is that the resulting effective sample size is now  $nb^{d+1}$  when in reality it should be  $nb^d$ , since only the  $d$ -dimensional covariates are smoothed out for estimation of the conditional expectation. It is this unfortunate fact that prompted Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014) to develop strong approximation methods that target the scalar suprema of the stochastic process,  $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} |X_n(h)|$ , instead of the stochastic process itself,  $(X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H})$ , as a way to circumvent the suboptimal strong approximation rates that would emerge from deploying directly results in the literature.

This paper presents new uniform Gaussian strong approximation results for empirical processes that address the two aforementioned limitations. To begin, Section 3 studies the general empirical process (1), and presents two main results. Theorem 1 establishes a uniform Gaussian strong approximation explicitly allowing for the possibility that  $\mathcal{H}$  is Lipschitzian. This result not only encompasses, but also generalizes all previous results in the literature by allowing for  $d \geq 1$  under more generic entropy conditions. For comparison, if we impose the regularity conditions in Rio (1994) and also assume  $\mathcal{H}$  is Lipschitzian, then our result (Corollary 2) verifies (3) with

$$\varrho_n = n^{-1/d}\sqrt{\log n} + n^{-1/2}\log n, \quad d \geq 1,$$

thereby substantially improving (5), in addition to matching (4) when  $d = 1$ ; see Remark 2 for details. Remarkably, we demonstrate that the optimal univariate KMT strong approximation rate  $n^{-1/2}\log n$  is achievable when  $d = 2$ , in addition to achieving the better approximation rate  $n^{-1/d}\sqrt{\log n}$  when  $d \geq 3$ . For example, applying our result to the kernel density estimation example, we obtain the improved strong approximation rate  $(nb^d)^{-1/d}\sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1/2}\log n$ ,  $d \geq 1$ , under the same conditions imposed in prior literature. We thus show that the optimal univariate KMT uniform Gaussian strong approximation holds in (3) for bivariate kernel density estimation. Theorem 1 also considers other entropy notions for  $\mathcal{H}$  beyond the classical VC-type condition, which allows us to demonstrate improvements over Koltchinskii (1994); see Remark 3 for details.

Section 3 also discusses how our rate improvements are achieved, and outlines the outstanding roadblocks in our proof strategy, which prevents us from achieving the univariate KMT uniform Gaussian strong approximation for the general empirical process (1) with  $d \geq 3$ . In essence, and following Rio (1994) and others, our proof first approximates in mean square the class of functions  $\mathcal{H}$  using a Haar basis over carefully constructed disjoint dyadic cells, and then applies the celebrated

Tusnády’s Lemma (Pollard, 2002, Chapter 10, for a textbook introduction) to construct a strong approximation. Thus, our proof requires balancing two approximation errors: (i) a “bias” error emerging from the mean square projection based on a Haar basis, and (ii) a “variance” error emerging from the coupling construction for the projected process. A key observation in our paper is that both errors can be improved by explicitly exploiting a Lipschitz assumption on  $\mathcal{H}$ . However, it appears that to achieve the univariate KMT uniform Gaussian strong approximation for the general empirical process (1) with  $d \geq 3$ , a mean square projection based on a higher-order function class would be needed, for which there are no coupling methods available in the literature.

As a way to circumvent the technical limitations underlying the proof strategy of Theorem 1, Section 3 also presents Theorem 2. This second main theorem establishes a uniform Gaussian strong approximation under the assumption that  $\mathcal{H}$  is spanned by a possibly increasing sequence of finite Haar basis based on generic quasi-uniform cells. This theorem shuts down the projection error, and also relies on a generalized Tusnády’s Lemma proven in the supplemental appendix, to establish a valid coupling over more general partitioning schemes. In this specialized setting, we demonstrate that a uniform Gaussian strong approximation at the optimal univariate KMT rate based on the corresponding effective sample size is possible for all  $d \geq 1$  under certain regularity conditions. As a statistical application in this special setting, we consider the classical multivariate histogram density estimator. Furthermore, the ideas underlying Theorem 2 provide the basis for analyzing certain nonparametric regression estimation procedures based on tree or partitioning-based regression methods.

Section 4 is devoted to addressing the second aforementioned limitation in prior uniform Gaussian strong approximation results. Specifically, that section focuses on the following *residual-based empirical process*:

$$R_n(g, r) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i)|\mathbf{x}_i]), \quad (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, \quad (7)$$

where our terminology reflects the fact that  $g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i)|\mathbf{x}_i] = g(\mathbf{x}_i)\epsilon_i(r)$  with  $\epsilon_i(r) := r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathbf{x}_i]$ , which can be interpreted as a residual in nonparametric local smoothing regression settings. In statistical applications,  $g(\cdot)$  is typically a local smoother based on kernel, series, or nearest-neighbor methods, while  $r(\cdot)$  is some transformation of interest such as  $r(y) = y$  for conditional mean estimation or  $r(y) = \mathbb{1}(y \leq \cdot)$  for conditional distribution estimation. Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014, Section 3.1) call these special cases of  $R_n$  a “local empirical process”.

The residual-based empirical process ( $R_n(g, r) : (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ ) may be viewed as a general empirical process (1) based on independent sample ( $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n$ ), and thus available strong approximation results can be applied directly, including Rio (1994) and our new Theorem 1. However, those off-the-shelf results require over-stringent assumption and can deliver sub-optimal approximation rates. First, available results require  $\mathbf{z}_i$  to admit a positive Lebesgue density on  $[0, 1]^{d+1}$ , possibly after some transformation that is bounded with bounded total variation, thereby imposing strong restrictions on the marginal distribution of  $y_i$ . Second, available results can lead

to the incorrect effective sample size for the strong approximation rate. For example, for a local empirical process where  $g$  denotes local smoothing weights such as a kernel function with bandwidth  $b \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $r(y) = y$ , [Rio \(1994\)](#) gives the approximation rate (6), and our refined [Theorem 1](#) for general empirical processes indexed by Lipschitz functions gives a uniform Gaussian strong approximation rate

$$\varrho_n = (nb^{d+1})^{-1/(d+1)} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1/2} \log n, \quad (8)$$

where the effective sample size is still  $nb^{d+1}$ . This is necessarily suboptimal because the (pointwise) effective sample size for the local (kernel) regression estimator is  $nb^d$ .

A key observation underlying the potential sub-optimality of strong approximation results for local regression empirical processes is that all components of  $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$  are treated symmetrically. More precisely, as explained previously, the Gaussian strong approximation error balances a “bias” part, which captures the error made in project functions to piecewise constant on carefully chosen cells, and a “variance” part, which is the Gaussian strong approximation error for empirical process indexed by projected functions. Results for general empirical processes treat all coordinates of  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  symmetrically, despite the fact that in certain statistical applications, such as nonparametric smoothing regression,  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are distinctively different. For example, in the kernel regression case,  $\mathcal{G}$  is an  $n$ -varying class of functions (via the bandwidth  $b$ ) with envelope proportional to  $b^{-d/2}$ , a Lipschitz constant proportional to  $b^{-d/2-1}$ , and complexity measures depending on  $b$  and  $n$  as well, while  $\mathcal{R}$  may be a singleton or otherwise have complexity independent of  $n$ . Therefore, a design of cells for projection and coupling that is asymmetric in the direction of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and  $y_i$  components may improve the uniform Gaussian strong approximation.

[Theorem 3](#) in [Section 4](#) presents a novel uniform Gaussian strong approximation for the residual-based empirical process  $(R_n(g, r) : (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})$ , which explicitly exploits the multiplicative separability of  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  and the Lipschitz continuity of the function class  $\mathcal{G}$ , while also removing the over-stringent assumptions imposed on the distribution  $y_i$ . When applied to local regression smoothing empirical processes, our result gives a uniform Gaussian strong approximation rate of

$$\varrho_n = (nb^d)^{-1/(d+2)} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1/2} \log n, \quad (9)$$

thereby improving over both [Rio \(1994\)](#) leading to (5), and [Theorem 1](#) leading to (8). In [Section 4.1](#), we leverage [Theorem 3](#) and present a substantive statistical application establishing the best known uniform Gaussian strong approximation result for local polynomial regression estimators ([Fan and Gijbels, 1996](#)). It follows that our results offer a strong approximation rate with the correct effective sample size  $nb^d$  under substantially weaker conditions on the underlying data generating process and function index set  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ .

In general, however, neither [Theorem 1](#) in [Section 3](#) nor [Theorem 3](#) in [Section 4](#) dominates each other, and therefore both are of interest depending on the statistical problem under consideration. Furthermore, building on the ideas underlying [Theorem 2](#), [Section 4](#) also presents [Theorem 4](#) where

$\mathcal{G}$  is further assumed to be spanned by a possibly increasing sequence of Haar basis based on generic quasi-uniform cells, while  $\mathcal{R}$  is an arbitrary function class satisfying some mild regularity conditions. Remarkably, we are able to adapt our proof strategy to leverage the multiplicative structure of the residual-based empirical process  $(R_n(g, r) : (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})$  in such a way that we establish a uniform Gaussian strong approximation at the optimal univariate KMT rate based on the effective sample size for all  $d \geq 1$ , up to a polylog  $n$  term, where  $\text{polylog } n := \log^\kappa(n)$  for some  $\kappa > 0$ , and an additional “bias” term reflecting exclusively the projection error associated with  $\mathcal{R}$ , which is zero when  $\mathcal{R}$  is a singleton. As a substantive statistical application of our last main result Theorem 4, we establish a valid, optimal (up to a polylog  $n$  term) uniform Gaussian strong approximation for a large class of Haar partitioning-based regression estimators such as certain regression trees and related methods (Breiman *et al.*, 1984; Huang, 2003; Cattaneo *et al.*, 2020).

## 1.1 Related Literature

This paper contributes to the literature on strong approximations for empirical processes, and their applications to uniform inference for nonparametric smoothing methods. For foundational introductions and overviews, see Csörgó and Révész (1981), Einmahl and Mason (1998), Berthet and Mason (2006), Mason and Zhou (2012), Giné and Nickl (2016), Pollard (2002), Zaitsev (2013), and references therein. See also Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014, Section 3) for discussion and further references concerning local empirical processes and their role in nonparametric curve estimation.

The celebrated KMT construction (Komlós *et al.*, 1975), Yurinskii’s coupling (Yurinskii, 1978), and Zaitsev’s coupling (Zaitsev, 1987) are three well-known approaches that can be used for constructing uniform Gaussian strong approximations for empirical processes. Among them, the KMT approach often offers the tightest approximation rates when applicable, and is the focus of our paper: closely related literature includes Massart (1989), Koltchinskii (1994), Rio (1994), Giné *et al.* (2004), and Giné and Nickl (2010), among others. As summarized in the introduction, our main first result (Theorem 1) encompasses and substantially improves on all prior results in that literature. Furthermore, Theorems 2, 3, and 4 offer new results for more specific settings of interest in statistics, in particular addressing some outstanding problems in the statistical literature (Chernozhukov *et al.*, 2014, Section 3). We provide detailed comparisons to the prior literature in the upcoming sections.

We do not discuss the other coupling approaches because they deliver slower strong approximation rates under the assumptions imposed in this paper: see Cattaneo *et al.* (2024d) for results based on Yurinskii’s coupling, and Settati (2009) for results based on Zaitsev’s coupling. Finally, employing a different approach, Dedecker *et al.* (2014) obtain a uniform Gaussian strong approximations for the multivariate empirical process indexed by half plane indicators with a dimension-independent approximation rate, up to polylog  $n$  terms.



## 2 Notation and Main Definitions

We employ standard notations from the empirical process literature, suitably modified and specialized to improve exposition. See, for example, [van der Vaart and Wellner \(2013\)](#) and [Giné and Nickl \(2016\)](#) for background definitions and more details.

**Sets.** Suppose  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  are subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .  $\mathbf{m}(\mathcal{U})$  denotes the Lebesgue measure of  $\mathcal{U}$ , and  $\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{V} := \{\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{U}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{V}\}$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  are sets of functions from measure space  $(S, \mathcal{S})$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $(T, \mathcal{T})$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , respectively. Then  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  denotes  $\{(g, r) : (S \times T, \mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{S} \otimes \mathcal{R}$  denotes the product  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $S \times T$ . Denote  $\|\mathcal{U}\|_\infty := \sup\{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty : \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{U}\}$ .

**Norms.** For vectors,  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm and  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  denotes the supremum norm. For a real-valued random variable  $X$ ,  $\|X\|_p = \mathbb{E}[|X|^p]^{\frac{1}{p}}$  for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . For  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\|X\|_{\psi_\alpha} = \min\{\lambda > 0 : \mathbb{E}[\exp((|X|/\lambda)^\alpha)] \leq 2\}$ . For a real-valued function  $g$  defined on a measure space  $(S, \mathcal{S}, Q)$ , define  $Qg := \int g dQ$  and define  $\|g\|_{Q,p} := (Q|g|^p)^{1/p}$  for  $1 \leq p < \infty$ ,  $\|g\|_\infty := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in S} |g(\mathbf{x})|$ . In the case that  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l$  for some  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , define  $\|g\|_{\text{Lip}} := \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in S} |g(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x}')| / \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_\infty$ .  $\mathcal{L}^p(Q)$  is the class of all measurable functions  $g$  from  $S$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\|g\|_{Q,p} < \infty$ ,  $1 \leq p < \infty$ . For  $\alpha > 0$ , define the  $C^\alpha$ -norm of a real valued function on  $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$  by  $\|f\|_{C^\alpha} = \max_{|k| \leq \lfloor \alpha \rfloor} \sup_{\mathbf{x}} |D^k f(\mathbf{x})| + \max_{|k| = \alpha} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}} \frac{|D^k f(\mathbf{x}) - D^k f(\mathbf{y})|}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_2^{\alpha - \lfloor \alpha \rfloor}}$ .  $e_Q$  and  $\rho_Q$  are the semi-metrics on  $\mathcal{L}^2(Q)$  such that  $e_Q(f, g) = \|f - g\|_{Q,2}$  and  $\rho_Q(f, g) = \sqrt{\|f - g\|_{Q,2}^2 - (Qf - Qg)^2}$ . For a class of measurable functions  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^2(Q)$ ,  $C(\mathcal{F}, \rho_{\mathbb{P}})$  is the class of all continuous functionals in  $(\mathcal{F}, \rho_{\mathbb{P}})$ .

**Asymptotics.** For reals sequences  $|a_n| = o(|b_n|)$  if  $\limsup \frac{a_n}{b_n} = 0$ ,  $|a_n| \lesssim |b_n|$  if there exists some constant  $C$  and  $N > 0$  such that  $n > N$  implies  $|a_n| \leq C|b_n|$ .  $|a_n| \lesssim_\alpha |b_n|$  if there exists some constant  $C_\alpha$  and  $N_\alpha$  only depending on  $\alpha$  such that  $|a_n| \leq C_\alpha |b_n|$  for all  $n \geq N_\alpha$ . For sequences of random variables  $a_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(b_n)$  if  $\text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} = 0$ ,  $|a_n| \lesssim_{\mathbb{P}} |b_n|$  if  $\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[|\frac{a_n}{b_n}| \geq M] = 0$ .

**Empirical Processes.** Let  $(\mathcal{S}, d)$  be a semi-metric space. The covering number  $N(\mathcal{S}, d, \varepsilon)$  is the minimal number of balls  $B_s(\varepsilon) := \{t : d(t, s) < \varepsilon\}$  needed to cover  $\mathcal{S}$ . A  $\mathbb{P}$ -Brownian bridge is a centered Gaussian random function  $W_n(f)$ ,  $f \in L_2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{P})$  with the covariance  $\mathbb{E}[W_{\mathbb{P}}(f)W_{\mathbb{P}}(g)] = \mathbb{P}(fg) - \mathbb{P}(f)\mathbb{P}(g)$ , for  $f, g \in L_2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{P})$ . A class  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq L_2(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{P})$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -pregaussian if there is a version of  $\mathbb{P}$ -Brownian bridge  $W_{\mathbb{P}}$  such that  $W_{\mathbb{P}} \in C(\mathcal{F}; \rho_{\mathbb{P}})$  almost surely.

### 2.1 Main Definitions

Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a class of measurable functions from a measure space  $(S, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q$  for some  $q \in \mathbb{N}$ . We first introduce several definitions that capture different properties of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Definition 1.**  $\mathcal{F}$  is pointwise measurable if it contains a countable subset  $\mathcal{G}$  such that for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , there exists a sequence  $(g_m : m \geq 1) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  such that  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} g_m(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in S$ .

**Definition 2.** For any  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{S}$  that is non-empty, the uniform total variation of  $\mathcal{F}$  over  $\mathcal{C}$  is

$$\text{TV}_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{D}_q(\mathcal{C})} \int f(\mathbf{x}) \text{div}(\phi)(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} / \|\phi\|_2 \|\phi\|_\infty,$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_q(\mathcal{C})$  denote the space of  $C^\infty$  functions from  $\mathbb{R}^q$  to  $\mathbb{R}^q$  with compact support in  $\mathcal{C}$ . To save notation, we set  $\text{TV}_{\mathcal{F}} = \text{TV}_{\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R}^q}$ .

**Definition 3.** The local uniform total variation constant of  $\mathcal{F}$  restricted to a subset of  $S$ ,  $\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{S}$ , is a positive number  $K_{\mathcal{F}}$  such that for any cube  $\mathcal{C}$  that is a subset of  $\mathcal{D}$  with edges of length  $\ell$  parallel to the coordinate axes,

$$\text{TV}_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{C}} \leq K_{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}} \ell^{d-1}.$$

To save notation, we set  $K_{\mathcal{F}} = K_{\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{R}^q}$ .

**Definition 4.** The envelopes of the class  $\mathcal{F}$  are

$$M_{\mathcal{F}} = \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\infty}, \quad M_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |f(\mathbf{x})|, \quad \mathbf{x} \in S.$$

Note that in the case that  $\mathcal{F}$  is pointwise measurable,  $M_{\mathcal{F}}$  is measurable.

**Definition 5.** The Lipschitz constant for the class  $\mathcal{F}$  is

$$L_{\mathcal{F}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in S} \frac{|f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x}')|}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_{\infty}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \|f\|_{\text{Lip}},$$

**Definition 6.** The uniform entropy integral for the class  $\mathcal{F}$  is

$$J(\delta, \mathcal{F}, M_{\mathcal{F}}) = \int_0^{\delta} \sup_Q \sqrt{1 + \log N(\mathcal{F}, e_Q, \varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{Q, 2})} d\varepsilon,$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite discrete measures on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ . Here we assume that  $M_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{x})$  is finite for every  $\mathbf{x} \in S$ .

**Definition 7.** The uniform covering number of the class  $\mathcal{F}$  is

$$N_{\mathcal{F}}(\delta) := \sup_Q N(\mathcal{F}, e_Q, \delta \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{Q, 2}), \quad \delta \in (0, \infty),$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite discrete measures on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ . Here we assume that  $M_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{x})$  is finite for every  $\mathbf{x} \in S$ .

**Definition 8.**  $\mathcal{F}$  is a VC-type class with envelope  $M_{\mathcal{F}}$  if (i)  $M_{\mathcal{F}}$  is measurable and  $M_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{x})$  is finite for every  $\mathbf{x} \in S$ , and (ii) there exists some positive constants  $c_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $d_{\mathcal{F}}$  such that for all  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$

$$\sup_Q N(\mathcal{F}, e_Q, \varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{Q, 2}) \leq c_{\mathcal{F}} \varepsilon^{-d_{\mathcal{F}}},$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite discrete measures on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ .

**Definition 9.**  $\mathcal{F}$  is a Polynomial-entropy class with envelope  $M_{\mathcal{F}}$  if (i)  $M_{\mathcal{F}}$  is measurable and  $M_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{x})$  is finite for every  $\mathbf{x} \in S$ , and (ii) there exists some positive constants  $\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F}} < 2$  such that for all  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$

$$\log \sup_Q N(\mathcal{F}, e_Q, \varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{Q,2}) \leq \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{F}} \varepsilon^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F}}},$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite discrete measures on  $(S, \mathcal{S})$ .

**Definition 10.** The uniform  $L_1$  bound for the class  $\mathcal{F}$  is

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{F}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \int_S |f| d\mu.$$

### 3 General Empirical Process

This section presents improved, in some cases optimal, strong approximations for the general empirical process  $(X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H})$  defined in (1). We impose the following assumption on the underlying data generation.

**Assumption A.**  $(\mathbf{x}_i : 1 \leq i \leq n)$  are i.i.d. random vectors taking values in  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}))$  with  $\mathcal{X}$  compact, and their common law  $\mathbb{P}_X$  admits a Lebesgue density  $f_X$  continuous and positive on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

The next theorem gives our first main strong approximation result. Let

$$\mathbf{c}_1 = \frac{\bar{f}_X^2}{\underline{f}_X}, \quad \mathbf{c}_2 = \frac{\bar{f}_X}{\underline{f}_X} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{c}_3 = (2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \frac{\bar{f}_X^{d+1}}{\underline{f}_X^d}.$$

where  $\bar{f}_X := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x})$  and  $\underline{f}_X := \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x})$ , and

$$\mathbf{m}_{n,d} := \begin{cases} n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log n} & \text{if } d = 1 \\ n^{-1/(2d)} & \text{if } d \geq 2 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{l}_{n,d} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d = 1 \\ n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log n} & \text{if } d = 2 \\ n^{-1/d} & \text{if } d \geq 3 \end{cases}.$$

**Theorem 1.** Suppose Assumption A holds with  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$ , and  $\mathcal{H}$  is a class of real-valued pointwise measurable functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$  and  $J(1, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}) < \infty$ . Then, on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists a sequence of mean-zero Gaussian processes  $(Z_n^X(h) : h \in \mathcal{H})$  with almost sure continuous trajectories such that:

- $\mathbb{E}[X_n(h_1)X_n(h_2)] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n^X(h_1)Z_n^X(h_2)]$  for all  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ , and
- $\mathbb{P}[\|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}} > C_1 \mathbf{S}_n(t)] \leq C_2 e^{-t}$  for all  $t > 0$ ,

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are universal constants, and

$$\mathbf{S}_n(t) = \min_{\delta \in (0,1)} \{\mathbf{A}_n(t, \delta) + \mathbf{F}_n(t, \delta)\},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_n(t, \delta) := & \min \{ \mathfrak{m}_{n,d} \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}, \mathfrak{l}_{n,d} \sqrt{\mathfrak{c}_2 \mathfrak{L}_{\mathcal{H}}} \} \sqrt{d \mathfrak{c}_1 \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} \sqrt{t + \log \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta)} \\ & + n^{-1/2} \min \{ \sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{d^3 \mathfrak{c}_3 \mathfrak{K}_{\mathcal{H}}} \} \sqrt{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}}(t + \log \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta))} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$F_n(t, \delta) := J(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}}) \mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}} J^2(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}})}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} + \delta \mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{t} + \frac{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sqrt{n}} t.$$

This theorem on uniform Gaussian strong approximation is given in full generality to accommodate different applications. Section 3.1 below discusses leading special cases, and compares our results to prior literature. The proof of Theorem 1 is in Section SA-II of the supplemental appendix, but we briefly outline the general proof strategy here to highlight our improvements on prior literature and some open questions. The proof begins with the standard “discretization” or “meshing” decomposition:

$$\|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|X_n - X_n \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} + \|Z_n^X \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

where  $\|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$  captures the coupling between the empirical process and the Gaussian process on a  $\delta$ -net of  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_\delta$ , while the terms  $\|X_n - X_n \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $\|Z_n^X \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  capture the “fluctuations” or “ocillation” relative to the meshing for each of the stochastic processes. The latter two errors are handled using standard empirical process results, which give the contribution  $F(\delta)$  emerging from Talagrand’s inequality (Giné and Nickl, 2016, Theorem 3.3.9) combined with a standard maximal inequality (Chernozhukov *et al.*, 2014, Theorem 5.2). See Section SA-II.3 of the supplemental appendix for details.

Following Rio (1994), the “coupling” term  $\|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$  is further decomposed using a mean square projection onto a Haar function space:

$$\|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} \leq \|X_n - \Pi_0 X_n\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} + \|\Pi_0 X_n - \Pi_0 Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} + \|\Pi_0 Z_n^X - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\Pi_0 X_n(h) = X_n \circ \Pi_0 h$  with  $\Pi_0$  the  $L_2$  projection from  $L_2([0, 1]^d)$  to piecewise constant functions on a carefully chosen partition of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Section SA-II.1 introduces a class of recursive *quasi-dyadic* cells expansions of  $\mathcal{X}$ , which we employ to generalize prior results in the literature. Section SA-II.2 then describes the properties of the  $L_2$  projection onto a Haar basis based on quasi-dyadic cells.

The term  $\|\Pi_0 X_n - \Pi_0 Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$  in (10) represents the strong approximation error for the projected process over a recursive dyadic collection of cells partitioning  $\mathcal{X}$ . Handling this error boils down to the coupling of  $\text{Bin}(n, \frac{1}{2})$  with  $\mathfrak{N}(\frac{n}{2}, \frac{n}{4})$ , due to the fact that the constant approximation within each recursive partitioning cell generates count data. Building on the celebrated Tusnády’s Lemma, Rio (1994, Theorem 2.1) established a remarkable coupling result for bounded functions  $L_2$ -projected on a dyadic cells expansion of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Our Lemma SA.10 builds on his powerful ideas, and establishes an analogous result for the case of Lipschitz functions  $L_2$ -projected on dyadic cells expansions of  $\mathcal{X}$ , thereby obtaining a tighter coupling error. A limitation of these results is that they only apply to

a dyadic cell expansion due to the specifics of Tusnády’s Lemma. Section 3.2 below discusses this limitation further, and presents some generalized results, which are further exploited in Section 4.

The terms  $\|X_n - \Pi_0 X_n\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$  and  $\|\Pi_0 Z_n^X - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$  in (10) represent the  $L_2$  projection errors onto a Haar basis based on *quasi-dyadic* cells expansion of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Lemma SA.9 handles this error using Bernstein inequality, taking into account explicitly the potential Lipschitz structure of the functions and the generic cell structure. Balancing these approximation errors with that of  $\|\Pi_0 X_n - \Pi_0 Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$  gives term  $A_n(t, \delta)$  in Theorem 1. Section SA-II of the supplemental appendix provides all technical details, and some additional results that may be of independent theoretical interest.

Theorem 1 restricts the data to be continuously distributed on the  $d$ -dimensional unit cube, a normalized tensor product of compact intervals. This restriction simplifies our proof because we employ the Rosenblatt transform (Lemma SA.12) to account for general distributions supported on  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$ . However, as the next remark discusses, the support restriction and the other assumptions in Theorem 1 can be weakened in certain cases.

**Remark 1.** Theorem 1 imposes Assumption A with  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$ , but these restrictions can be relaxed as follows.

**Univariate case.** When  $d = 1$ , we can remove all the restrictions on the distribution of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  in Assumption A and allow for  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$ , by directly applying the Rosenblatt transform so that  $u_i = F_X(x_i) \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$  i.i.d.,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , where  $F_X(x) := \mathbb{P}_X[x_i \leq x]$ . It follows that  $X_n(h) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (h \circ F_X^{-1})(u_i) - \mathbb{E}[(h \circ F_X^{-1})(u_i)]$ . Then,  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \{h \circ F_X^{-1} : h \in \mathcal{H}\}$  is pointwise measurable because  $\mathcal{H}$  is assumed to be so,  $M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} = M_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $\text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} = \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $J(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, H, \delta) = J(\mathcal{H}, H, \delta)$ , and Theorem 1 holds with  $L_{\mathcal{H}} = \infty$  and  $\mathbf{c}_1 = \mathbf{c}_2 = \mathbf{c}_3 = 1$ . A similar argument can be found in Giné *et al.* (2004, Section 2) and in Cattaneo *et al.* (2024b, Lemma SA20). See Remark 2 below for related discussion.

**Multivariate case.** When  $d > 1$ , the support restriction  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$  in Assumption A can be relaxed by assuming that there exists a diffeomorphism  $\chi : \mathcal{X} \mapsto [0, 1]^d$ . In this case our results continue to hold with  $\mathbf{c}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{c}_2$  and  $\mathbf{c}_3$  replaced by, respectively,

$$\mathbf{c}_1 = \frac{\bar{f}_X^2}{\underline{f}_X} \mathbf{S}_\chi, \quad \mathbf{c}_2 = \frac{\bar{f}_X}{\underline{f}_X} \mathbf{S}_\chi, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{c}_3 = (2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \frac{\bar{f}_X^{d+1}}{\underline{f}_X^d} \mathbf{S}_\chi^d,$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_\chi = \frac{\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d} |\det(\nabla \chi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}))|}{\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d} |\det(\nabla \chi^{-1}(\mathbf{x}))|} \|\|\nabla \chi^{-1}\|_2\|_\infty$  with  $\nabla \chi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$  denoting the Jacobian of  $\chi^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$ , the inverse function of  $\chi(\mathbf{x})$ , and  $\det(\cdot)$  denoting the determinant of its argument.  $\square$

The previous remark can be illustrated as follows. Suppose  $(\mathbf{x}_i : 1 \leq i \leq n)$  are i.i.d.  $\text{Uniform}(\mathcal{X})$  with  $\mathcal{X} = \times_{l=1}^d [a_l, b_l]$ . Then, the Rosenblatt transform (Lemma SA.12) gives  $\chi(x_1, \dots, x_d) = ((b_1 - a_1)^{-1}(x_1 - a_1), \dots, (b_d - a_d)^{-1}(x_d - a_d))$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_\chi = \max_{1 \leq l \leq d} |b_l - a_l|$ ,  $\mathbf{c}_1 = \max_{1 \leq l \leq d} |b_l - a_l| \prod_{l=1}^d |b_l - a_l|^{-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{c}_2 = \max_{1 \leq l \leq d} |b_l - a_l|$  and  $\mathbf{c}_3 = (2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \max_{1 \leq l \leq d} |b_l - a_l|^d \prod_{l=1}^d |b_l - a_l|^{-1}$ . Then, when  $d = 1$ , we have  $\text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} = \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . However, when  $d > 1$ ,  $\text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}$  is strictly greater than  $\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . This example illustrates the dimension penalty implied by the Rosenblatt transform when  $d > 1$ .

### 3.1 Special Cases and Related Literature

Theorem 1 can be specialized to several useful particular cases, which can be employed to compare our main results with prior literature. To this end, we introduce our first statistical example.

**Example 1** (Kernel Density Estimation). The classical kernel density estimator of  $f_X(\mathbf{x})$  is

$$\hat{f}_X(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{b^d} K\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b}\right),$$

where  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a compact supported continuous function such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 1$ . In statistical applications, the bandwidth  $b \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  to enable nonparametric estimation (Wand and Jones, 1995). Consider establishing a strong approximation for the “localized” empirical process  $(\xi_n(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X})$ , where

$$\xi_n(\mathbf{x}) := \sqrt{nb^d}(\hat{f}_X(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{f}_X(\mathbf{x})]) = X_n(h), \quad h \in \mathcal{H},$$

with  $\mathcal{H} = \{b^{-d/2}K((\cdot - \mathbf{x})/b) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ . It follows that  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim b^{-d/2}$ . ▲

Variants of Example 1 have been discussed extensively in prior literature because the process  $\xi_n$  is non-Donsker whenever  $b \rightarrow 0$ , and hence standard weak convergence results for empirical processes can not be used. For example, Giné *et al.* (2004) and Giné and Nickl (2010) established strong approximations for the univariate case ( $d = 1$ ) under i.i.d. sampling with  $\mathcal{X}$  unbounded, Cattaneo *et al.* (2024c) established strong approximations for the univariate case ( $d = 1$ ) under i.i.d. sampling with  $\mathcal{X}$  compact, Rio (1994) established strong approximations for the multivariate case ( $d > 1$ ) under i.i.d. sampling with  $\mathcal{X}$  compact, Sakhanenko (2015) established strong approximations for the multivariate case ( $d > 1$ ) under i.i.d. sampling with  $\mathcal{X}$  unbounded, and Cattaneo *et al.* (2024b) established strong approximations for the univariate case ( $d = 1$ ) under non-i.i.d. dyadic data with  $\mathcal{X}$  compact. Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014, Remark 3.1) provides further discussion and references. See also Cattaneo *et al.* (2024a) for an application of Rio (1994) to uniform inference for conditional density estimation.

#### 3.1.1 VC-type Bounded Functions

Our first corollary considers a VC-type class  $\mathcal{H}$  (Definition 8) of uniformly bounded functions ( $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$ ), but without assuming they are Lipschitz functions ( $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{H}} = \infty$ ).

**Corollary 1** (VC-type Bounded Functions). *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 1 hold. In addition, assume that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a VC-type class with respect to envelope function  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}$  with constant  $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{H}} \geq e$  and exponent  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 1$ . Then, (3) holds with*

$$\varrho_n = \mathbf{m}_{n,d} \sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} + \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{\mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{H}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}\} \sqrt{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}.$$

This corollary recovers the main result in [Rio \(1994, Theorem 1.1\)](#) when  $d \geq 2$ , where  $\mathfrak{m}_{n,d} = n^{-1/(2d)}$ . It also covers  $d = 1$ , where  $\mathfrak{m}_{n,1} = n^{-1/2}\sqrt{\log n}$ , thereby allowing for a precise comparison with prior KMT strong approximation results in the univariate case ([Giné \*et al.\*, 2004](#); [Giné and Nickl, 2010](#); [Cattaneo \*et al.\*, 2024b](#)). Thus, [Corollary 1](#) contributes to the literature by covering all  $d \geq 1$  cases simultaneously. While not presented here to streamline the exposition, the proof of [Corollary 1](#) further contributes to the literature by making explicit the dependence on  $d$ ,  $\mathcal{X}$ , and other features of the underlying data generating process. This additional contribution can be useful for non-asymptotic probability concentration arguments, or for truncation arguments in cases where the random variables have low Lebesgue density (e.g., random variables with unbounded support); see [Sakhanenko \(2015\)](#) for an example. Nonetheless, for  $d \geq 2$ , the main intellectual content of [Corollary 1](#) is due to [Rio \(1994\)](#); we present it here for completeness and as a prelude for the discussion of our upcoming results.

For  $d = 1$ , [Corollary 1](#) delivers an optimal KMT result when  $\mathbb{K}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim 1$ , which employs a weaker notion of total variation relative to prior literature, but at the expense of requiring an additional VC-type condition, as the following remark explains.

**Remark 2.** In [Section 2 of Giné \*et al.\* \(2004\)](#) and the proof of [Giné and Nickl \(2010\)](#), the authors considered univariate ( $d = 1$ ) i.i.d. continuously distributed random variables, and established the strong approximation:

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}} > \frac{\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{H}}(t + C_1 \log n)}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \leq C_2 \exp(-C_3 t),$$

where  $C_1, C_2, C_3$  are absolute constants, and  $\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{H}}$  is the pointwise total variation

$$\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{H}} := \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |h(x_{i+1}) - h(x_i)|.$$

[Cattaneo \*et al.\* \(2020, Lemma SA20\)](#) slightly generalized the result (e.g.,  $\mathbb{P}_X$  is not required to be absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure), and provided a self-contained proof.

The notion of total variation used in [Theorem 1](#) is related to, but different than,  $\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . From [Ambrosio \*et al.\* \(2000, Theorem 3.27\)](#), for any  $h$  that is locally integrable with respect to the Lebesgue measure, denoted by  $h \in \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R})$ , then

$$\text{TV}_{\{g\}} = \inf \left\{ \text{pTV}_{\{g\}} : g = h, \text{ Lebesgue-a.e. in } \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

and the infimum is achieved. Because  $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$ , then  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R})$ , and hence  $\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \text{pTV}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Thus, our result employs a weaker notation of total variation but imposes additional entropy conditions. In contrast, the results in [Giné \*et al.\* \(2004\)](#), [Giné and Nickl \(2010\)](#), and [Cattaneo \*et al.\* \(2024b\)](#) do not have additional complexity requirements on  $\mathcal{H}$  and allow for  $\mathbb{P}_X$  not be dominated by the Lebesgue measure, but their proof strategy is only applicable when  $d = 1$ .  $\square$

We illustrate the usefulness of [Corollary 1](#) with [Example 1](#).

**Example 1** (continued). Let the conditions of Theorem 1 hold, and  $nb^d/\log n \rightarrow \infty$ . Prior literature further assumed  $K$  is Lipschitz to verify the conditions of Corollary 1 with  $\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim b^{d/2-1}$  and  $\text{K}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim 1$ . Then, for  $X_n = \xi_n$ , (3) holds with  $\varrho_n = (nb^d)^{-1/(2d)}\sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1/2}\log n$ .  $\blacktriangle$

The resulting uniform Gaussian approximation convergence rate in Example 1 matches prior literature for  $d = 1$  (Giné *et al.*, 2004; Giné and Nickl, 2010; Cattaneo *et al.*, 2024b) and  $d \geq 2$  (Rio, 1994). This result concerns the uniform Gaussian strong approximation of the *entire* stochastic process, which can then be specialized to deduce a strong approximation for the scalar suprema of the empirical process  $\|\xi_n\|_{\mathcal{H}}$ . As noted by Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014, Remark 3.1(ii)), the (almost sure) strong approximation rate in Example 1 is better than their strong approximation rate (in probability) for  $\|\xi_n\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  when  $d = 1, 2, 3$ , but their approach specifically tailored to the scalar suprema delivers better strong approximation rates when  $d \geq 4$ .

Following prior literature, Example 1 imposed the additional condition that  $K$  is Lipschitz to verify that  $\mathcal{H} = \{b^{-d/2}K((\cdot - \mathbf{x})/b) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  forms a VC-type class, as well as other conditions in Corollary 1. The Lipschitz restriction is easily verified for most kernel functions used in practice. One notable exception is the uniform kernel, which is nonetheless covered by Corollary 1, and prior results in the literature, but with slightly sub-optimal strong approximation rates (an extra  $\sqrt{\log n}$  term appears when  $d \geq 2$ ).

### 3.1.2 VC-type Lipschitz Functions

It is known that the uniform Gaussian strong approximation rate in Corollary 1 is optimal under the assumptions imposed (Beck, 1985). However, the class of functions  $\mathcal{H}$  often has additional structure in statistical applications that can be exploited to improve on Corollary 1. In Example 1, for instance, prior literature further assumed  $K$  is Lipschitz to verify the sufficient conditions. Therefore, our next corollary considers a VC-type class  $\mathcal{H}$  now allowing for the possibility of Lipschitz functions ( $\text{L}_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$ ). This is one of the main contributions of our paper.

**Corollary 2** (VC-type Lipschitz Functions). *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 1 hold. In addition, assume that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a VC-type class with respect to envelope function  $\text{M}_{\mathcal{H}}$  with constant  $\text{c}_{\mathcal{H}} \geq e$  and exponent  $\text{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 1$ . Then, (3) holds with*

$$\varrho_n = \min\{\text{m}_{n,d}\sqrt{\text{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}, \text{l}_{n,d}\sqrt{\text{L}_{\mathcal{H}}}\}\sqrt{\log n}\sqrt{\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} + \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n}\sqrt{\text{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{\text{K}_{\mathcal{H}} + \text{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}\}\sqrt{\text{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}.$$

Temporarily putting aside the potential contributions of  $\text{M}_{\mathcal{H}}$  and  $\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}$ , this corollary shows that if  $\text{L}_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$  then the rate of strong approximation can be substantially improved. In particular, for  $d = 2$ ,  $\text{m}_{n,2} = n^{-1/4}$  but  $\text{l}_{n,2} = n^{-1/2}\sqrt{\log n}$ , implying that  $\varrho_n = n^{-1/2}\log n$  whenever  $\text{K}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim 1$ . Therefore, to the best of our knowledge, Corollary 2 is the first result in the literature establishing a uniform Gaussian strong approximation for general empirical processes based on bivariate data that can achieve the optimal univariate KMT approximation rate. (An additional  $\sqrt{\log n}$  penalty would appear if  $\text{K}_{\mathcal{H}} = \infty$ .)



For  $d \geq 3$ , Corollary 2 also provides improvements relative to prior literature, but falls short of achieving the optimal univariate KMT approximation rate. Specifically,  $\mathfrak{m}_{n,d} = n^{-1/(2d)}$  but  $\mathfrak{l}_{n,d} = n^{-1/d}$  for  $d \geq 3$ , implying that  $\varrho_n = n^{-1/d} \sqrt{\log n}$ . It remains an open question whether further improvements are possible at this level of generality (cf. Section 3.2 below): the main roadblock underlying the proof strategy is related to the coupling approach based on the celebrated Tusnády's inequality for binomial counts, which in turn are generated by the aforementioned mean square approximation of the functions  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  by local constant functions on carefully chosen partitions of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Our key observation underlying Corollary 2, and hence the limitation, is that for Lipschitz functions ( $L_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$ ) both the projection error arising from the mean square approximation and the KMT coupling error by Rio (1994, Theorem 2.1) can be improved. However, further improvements for smoother functions appears to necessitate an approximation approach that would not generate dyadic binomial counts, thereby rendering current coupling approaches inapplicable. Section 3.2 discusses an extension based on a generalization of Tusnády's inequality for a special case of interest in statistics, and we also apply those ideas to other cases of interest in Section 4.

We revisit the kernel density estimation example to illustrate the power of Corollary 2.

**Example 1** (continued). Under the conditions already imposed,  $L_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim b^{-d/2-1}$ , and Corollary 2 implies that, for  $X_n = \xi_n$ , (3) holds with  $\varrho_n = (nb^d)^{-1/d} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1/2} \log n$ .  $\blacktriangle$

Returning to the discussion of Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014, Remark 3.1(ii)), Example 1 illustrates that our almost sure strong approximation rate for the entire empirical process is now better than their strong approximation (in probability) rate for the scalar suprema  $\|\xi_n\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  when  $d \leq 6$ . On the other hand, their approach delivers a better strong approximation rate in probability for  $\|\xi_n\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  when  $d \geq 7$ . Our improvement is obtained without imposing additional assumptions because Rio (1994, Section 4) already assumed  $K$  is Lipschitzian for the verification of the conditions imposed by his strong approximation result (cf. Corollary 1).

### 3.1.3 Polynomial-Entropy Functions

Koltchinskii (1994) also considered uniform Gaussian strong approximations for the general empirical process under other notions of entropy for  $\mathcal{H}$ , thereby allowing for more complex classes of functions when compared to Rio (1994). Furthermore, Koltchinskii (1994) employed a Haar approximation condition, which plays a similar role as to the total variation and the Lipschitz conditions exploited in our paper. Thanks to the generality of our Theorem 1, and to enable a precise comparison to Koltchinskii (1994), the next corollary considers a class  $\mathcal{H}$  satisfying a polynomial entropy condition (Definition 9).

**Corollary 3** (Polynomial-Entropy Functions). *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 1 hold, and that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a polynomial-entropy class with respect to envelope function  $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{H}}$  with constant  $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$  and exponent  $0 < \mathfrak{b}_{\mathcal{H}} < 2$ . Then, (3) holds as follows:*

(i) If  $L_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \infty$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_n &= m_{n,d} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} (\sqrt{\log n} + (m_{n,d}^2 M_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{4}}) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\} (\log n + (m_{n,d}^2 M_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{2}}), \end{aligned}$$

(ii) If  $L_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_n &= l_{n,d} \sqrt{L_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} (\sqrt{\log n} + (l_{n,d}^2 M_{\mathcal{H}}^{-2} L_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{4}}) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\} (\log n + (l_{n,d}^2 M_{\mathcal{H}}^{-2} L_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

This corollary reports a simplified version of our result, which is the best possible bound for the discussion in this section. See Corollary SA.3 in the supplemental appendix for the general case. It is possible to apply Corollary 3 to Example 1, although the result is sub-optimal relative to the previous results leveraging a VC-type condition.

**Example 1** (continued). Under the conditions already imposed, for any  $0 < b_{\mathcal{H}} < 2$ , we can take  $a_{\mathcal{H}} = \log(d+1) + db_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}$  so that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a polynomial-entropy class with constants  $(a_{\mathcal{H}}, b_{\mathcal{H}})$ . Then, Corollary 3(ii) implies that, for  $X_n = \xi_n$ , (3) holds with  $\varrho_n = a_{\mathcal{H}}^2 (nb^d)^{-\frac{1}{d}(1-\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{2})} b^{-db_{\mathcal{H}}} + a_{\mathcal{H}}^2 (nb^d)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{d}} b^{-\frac{db_{\mathcal{H}}}{2}}$ .  $\blacktriangle$

Our running example shows that a uniform Gaussian strong approximation based on polynomial entropy conditions can lead to sub-optimal KMT approximation rates. However, for other (larger) classes of functions, those results are useful. The following remark discusses an example studied in Koltchinskii (1994), and further compares our contributions to his work.

**Remark 3.** Suppose Assumption A holds with  $\mathbb{P}_X$  the uniform distribution on  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$ , and  $\mathcal{H}$  a subclass of  $C^q(\mathcal{X})$  with  $C^q$ -norm uniformly bounded by 1 and  $2 \leq d < q$ . Koltchinskii (1994, page 111) discusses this example after his Theorem 11.3, and reports a uniform Gaussian strong approximation  $n^{-\frac{q-d}{2qd}}$  polylog  $n$ .

Corollary 3 is applicable to this case. More precisely,  $M_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$ ,  $\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$ ,  $L_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$ , and van der Vaart and Wellner (2013, Theorem 2.7.1) shows that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a polynomial-entropy class with constants  $a_{\mathcal{H}} = K$  and  $b_{\mathcal{H}} = d/q$ , where  $K$  is a constant only depending on  $q$  and  $d$ . Then, Corollary 3(ii) implies that, for  $X_n = \xi_n$ , (3) holds with

$$\varrho_n = \begin{cases} n^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{q}} \text{polylog } n & \text{if } d = 2 \\ n^{-\frac{2q-d}{2dq}} \text{polylog } n & \text{if } d > 2 \end{cases},$$

which gives a faster convergence rate than the one obtained by Koltchinskii (1994).

The improvement is explained by two differences between Koltchinskii (1994) and our approach. First, we explicitly incorporate the Lipschitz condition, and hence we can take  $\beta = \frac{2}{d}$  instead of

$\beta = \frac{1}{d}$  in Equation (3.1) of Koltchinskii (1994). Second, using the uniform entropy condition approach, we get  $\log N(\mathcal{H}, e_{\mathbb{P}_X}, \varepsilon) \leq K\varepsilon^{-d/q}$ , while Koltchinskii (1994) started with the bracketing number condition  $\log N_{[\cdot]}(\mathcal{F}, L_1(\mathbb{P}), \varepsilon) = O(\varepsilon^{-d/q})$  and, with the help of his Lemma 8.4, applied Theorem 3.1 with  $\alpha = \frac{d}{d+q}$  in his Equation (3.2). As a result, because the proof of his Theorem 3.1 leverages the fact that Equation (3.2) implies that  $\log N(\mathcal{H}, e_{\mathbb{P}_X}, \varepsilon) = O(\varepsilon^{-2d/q})$ , and his approximation rate is looser by a power of two when compared to the uniform entropy condition underlying our Corollary 3.

Setting  $L_{\mathcal{H}} = \infty$ ,  $b_{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{2d}{q}$ , and keeping the other constants the same, Corollary 3(i) would give  $\varrho_n = n^{-\frac{q-d}{2qd}}$  polylog  $n$ , which is the same rate as in Koltchinskii (1994). Finally, Theorem 3.2 in Koltchinskii (1994) allows for  $\log N(\mathcal{H}, e_{\mathbb{P}_X}, \varepsilon) = O(\varepsilon^{-2\rho})$  where  $\rho$  is not implied by his Equation (3.2), in which case his result would give the strong approximation rate  $n^{-\frac{2q-d}{4qd}}$  polylog  $n$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 Quasi-Uniform Haar Basis

Theorem 1 established that the general empirical process (1) indexed by VC-type Lipschitz functions can admit a strong approximation (3) at the optimal univariate KMT rate  $\varrho_n = n^{-1/2} \log n$  when  $d \in \{1, 2\}$ , and at the improved (but possibly suboptimal) rate  $\varrho_n = n^{-1/d} \sqrt{\log n}$  when  $d \geq 3$ , in both cases putting aside the potential additional contributions controlled by  $M_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $L_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}$ , and  $K_{\mathcal{H}}$ . When applied to kernel density estimation (Example 1), our results showed that  $\varrho_n = (nb^d)^{-1/2} \log n$  when  $d = 1, 2$ , and  $\varrho_n = (nb^d)^{-1/d} \sqrt{\log n}$  when  $d \geq 3$ , where  $nb^d$  is the “effective sample” size.

The possibly suboptimal strong approximation rate  $\varrho_n = n^{-1/d} \sqrt{\log n}$  for  $d \geq 3$  arises from the  $L_2$  approximation of the functions  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  by a Haar basis expansion based on a carefully chosen *dyadic* partition of  $\mathcal{X}$ . In this section, we demonstrate that the general empirical process (1) can admit a univariate KMT optimal strong approximation when  $\mathcal{H}$  belongs to the span of Haar basis based on a *quasi-uniform* partition of  $\mathcal{X}$  with cardinality  $L$ , which can be viewed as an approximation based on  $L \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . More precisely, the following theorem showcases a setting where the univariate KMT optimal approximation rate based on the “effective sample” size  $n/L$  is achieved for all  $d \geq 1$ . Our formulation leverages and generalizes two ideas from the regression Splines literature (Huang, 2003): (i) the cells forming the Haar basis are assumed to be quasi-uniform with respect to  $\mathbb{P}_X$ ; and (ii) the number of active cells of the Haar basis affect the strong approximation.

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose  $(\mathbf{x}_i : 1 \leq i \leq n)$  are i.i.d. random vectors taking values in  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}))$  with common law  $\mathbb{P}_X$ ,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , and  $\mathcal{H}$  is a class of functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $M_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$  and  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \text{Span}\{\mathbb{1}_{\Delta_l} : 0 \leq l < L\}$ , where  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$  forms a quasi-uniform partition of  $\mathcal{X}$  in the sense that*

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \sqcup_{0 \leq l < L} \Delta_l \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\max_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)}{\min_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)} \leq \rho < \infty.$$

Then, on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists a sequence of mean-zero Gaussian processes  $(Z_n^X(h) : h \in \mathcal{H})$  with almost sure continuous trajectories such that:

- $\mathbb{E}[X_n(h_1)X_n(h_2)] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n^X(h_1)Z_n^X(h_2)]$  for all  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{H}$ , and
- $\mathbb{P}[\|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}} > C_1 C_\rho \mathbf{P}_n(t)] \leq C_2 e^{-t} + L e^{-C_\rho n/L}$  for all  $t > 0$ ,

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are universal constants,  $C_\rho$  is a constant that only depends on  $\rho$ , and

$$\mathbf{P}_n(t) = \min_{\delta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \mathbf{H}_n(t, \delta) + \mathbf{F}_n(t, \delta) \right\},$$

with

$$\mathbf{H}_n(t, \delta) := \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}{n/L}} \sqrt{t + \log \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta)} + \sqrt{\frac{\min\{\log_2(L), \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{H}}^2\}}{n}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}(t + \log \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta)),$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{H}} = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbb{1}(\text{Supp}(h) \cap \Delta_l \neq \emptyset)$ .

This theorem shows that if  $n^{-1}L \log L \rightarrow 0$ , then a valid strong approximation can be achieved with exponential probability concentration. The proof of Theorem 2 leverages the fact that the  $L_2$  projection error is zero by assumption, but recognizes that Rio (1994, Theorem 2.1) does not apply because the partitions are *quasi-dyadic*, preventing the use of the celebrated Tusnády’s inequality. Instead, in Section SA-II of the supplemental appendix, we present two technical results to circumvent that limitation: (i) Lemma SA.6 combines Brown *et al.* (2010, Lemma 2) and Sakhanenko (1996, Lemma 2) to establish a new version of Tusnády’s inequality that allows for more general binomial random variables  $\text{Bin}(n, p)$  with  $\underline{p} \leq p \leq \bar{p}$ , the error bound holding uniformly in  $p$ , as required by the quasi-dyadic partitioning structure; and (ii) Lemma SA.7 presents a generalization of Rio (1994, Theorem 2.1) to the case of quasi-dyadic partitions of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

Assuming a VC-type condition on  $\mathcal{H}$ , and putting aside the potential contributions of  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}$ , and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{H}}$ , it follows that (3) holds with  $\varrho_n = \log(L)/(n/L)$ , thereby achieving the optimal univariate KMT approximation rate for all  $d \geq 1$  with “effective sample” size  $n/L$ . More precisely, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 4** (VC-type Haar Basis). *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 2 hold. In addition, assume that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a VC-type class with respect to envelope function  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}$  with constant  $c_{\mathcal{H}} \geq e$  and exponent  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 1$ . Then, (3) holds with*

$$\varrho_n = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}{n/L}} \sqrt{\log n} + \sqrt{\frac{\min\{\log_2(L), \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{H}}^2\}}{n}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \log n.$$

To provide a simple illustration of Theorem 2 to statistics, we consider the classical histogram density estimator.

**Example 2** (Histogram Density Estimation). The histogram density estimator of  $f_X$  is

$$\check{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l) \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_l),$$

where  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$  forms a quasi-uniform partition of  $\mathcal{X}$ , where the partition size  $L \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in statistical applications. We consider establishing a strong approximation for the “localized” empirical process  $(\zeta_n(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X})$ , where

$$\zeta_n(\mathbf{x}) := \sqrt{nL}(\check{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}[\check{f}(\mathbf{x})]) = X_n(h), \quad h \in \mathcal{H},$$

with  $\mathcal{H}$  the collection of Haar basis functions based on the partition  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$ .

The conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied with  $M_{\mathcal{H}} = L^{1/2}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}} = L^{-1/2}$ , and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{H}} = 1$ . It follows that, for  $X_n = \zeta_n$ , (3) holds with

$$\varrho_n = \frac{\log(nL)}{\sqrt{n/L}},$$

provided that  $\log(nL)L/n \rightarrow 0$ . ▲

Theorem 2, and in particular Example 2, showcases the existence of a class of stochastic processes for which a valid uniform Gaussian strong approximation is established with optimal univariate KMT rate in terms of the effective sample size  $n/L$  for all  $d \geq 1$ . This result is achieved because there is no error arising from the mean square approximation ( $\mathcal{H}$  is assumed to be spanned by a Haar space), and with the help of our generalized Tusnády’s inequality (Lemma SA.6).

Because the setup of Theorem 2 is rather special, the finding in this subsection is mostly of theoretical interest. However, our key ideas will be leveraged in the next section when studying regression estimation problems, where the quasi-uniform partitioning arises naturally in setting like regression trees (Breiman *et al.*, 1984) or nonparametric partitioning-based estimation (Cattaneo *et al.*, 2020).

## 4 Residual-Based Empirical Process

This section establishes improved uniform Gaussian strong approximation for the residual empirical process  $(R_n(g, r) : (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})$  defined in (7). We impose the following assumption.

**Assumption B.**  $(\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n)$  are *i.i.d.* random vectors taking values in  $(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}))$  with  $\mathcal{X}$  compact, and  $\mathbf{x}_i \sim \mathbb{P}_X$  admits a Lebesgue density  $f_X$  continuous and positive on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

This assumption incorporates the presence of random variables  $y_i \sim \mathbb{P}_Y$ , but otherwise imposes the same regularity conditions as Assumption A for the marginal distribution  $\mathbb{P}_X$  of  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . In particular, it does not restrict the support of  $\mathbb{P}_Y$  nor requires  $\mathbb{P}_Y$  to be dominated by the Lebesgue measure, which is important for some statistical applications.

To motivate this section, consider first the simple local empirical process discussed in [Chernozhukov \*et al.\* \(2014, Section 3.1\)](#):

$$S_n(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{nb^d} \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b}\right) y_i, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (11)$$

Using our notation for residual empirical process,  $(\sqrt{nb^d}(S_n(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{E}[S_n(\mathbf{x})|\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n]) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}) = (R_n(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R})$  with  $\mathcal{G} = \{b^{-d/2}K(\frac{\cdot - \mathbf{x}}{b}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  and  $\mathcal{R} = \{\text{Id}\}$ , where Id denotes the identity map from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . This setting corresponds to kernel regression estimation with  $K$  interpreted as the equivalent kernel; see [Section 4.1](#) for details. As noted in [Chernozhukov \*et al.\* \(2014, Remark 3.1\(iii\)\)](#), a direct application of [Rio \(1994\)](#), or of our [Theorem 1](#), views  $\mathbf{z}_i$  as the underlying  $(d + 1)$ -dimensional vector of random variables entering the general empirical process  $X_n$  defined in [\(1\)](#). Specifically, under some regularity conditions on  $K$  and non-trivial restrictions on the joint distribution  $\mathbb{P}_Z$ , [Rio \(1994\)](#)'s strong approximation result verifies [\(3\)](#) with [\(6\)](#), which is also verified via [Corollary 1](#). Furthermore, employing a Lipschitz property of  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ , [Corollary 2](#) would give the improved strong approximation result [\(8\)](#), under regularity conditions.

The strong approximation results for  $S_n(\mathbf{x})$  illustrate two fundamental limitations because all the elements in  $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$  are treated symmetrically. First, the effective sample size emerging in the strong approximation rate is  $nb^{d+1}$ , which is necessarily suboptimal because only the  $d$ -dimensional covariate  $\mathbf{x}_i$  are being smoothed out. In other words, since the pointwise variance of the process is of order  $n^{-1}b^{-d}$ , the correct effective sample size should be  $nb^d$ , and therefore applying [Rio \(1994\)](#), or our improved [Theorem 1](#), leads to a suboptimal uniform Gaussian strong approximation for  $S_n(\mathbf{x})$ . Second, applying [Rio \(1994\)](#), or our improved [Theorem 1](#), requires  $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \sim \mathbb{P}_Z$  to be continuously distributed and supported on  $[0, 1]^{d+1}$ , possibly after applying the Rosenblatt transform ([Lemma SA.12](#)), as discussed in [Remark 1](#). This requirement imposes non-trivial restrictions on the joint distribution  $\mathbb{P}_Z$ , and in particular on the marginal distribution of the outcome  $y_i$ , which limit the applicability of the resulting strong approximation results. For example, it could be assumed that  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) = (\mathbf{x}_i, \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i, u_i))$  where  $(\mathbf{x}_i, u_i)$  satisfies [Assumption A](#) and  $\varphi$  is bounded with bounded uniform variation and local uniform variation; see [Chernozhukov \*et al.\* \(2014, Remark 3.1\(iii\)\)](#) for more discussion.

Motivated by the aforementioned limitations, the following theorem explicitly studies the residual empirical process  $(R_n(g, r) : (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})$  defined in [\(7\)](#), leveraging its intrinsic multiplicative separable structure. We present our result under a VC-type condition on  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  to streamline the discussion, but a result at the same level of generality as [Theorem 1](#) is given in the supplemental appendix ([Section SA-I.2](#) and [SA-I.3](#)).

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose [Assumption B](#) holds with  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$ , and the following conditions hold.*

- (i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$ , and a VC-type class with respect to envelope function  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}$  with constant  $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{G}} \geq e$  and exponent  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} \geq 1$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{R}$  is a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P}_Y)$ , and a VC-type

class with respect to  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{R}}$  with constant  $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{R}} \geq e$  and exponent  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}} \geq 1$ . Furthermore, one of the following holds:

- (a)  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$  and  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$ , and set  $\alpha = 0$ , or
- (b)  $M_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$  and  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R},(-|y|,|y|)} \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ .
- (iii) There exists a constant  $\mathbf{c}_4$  such that  $|\log_2 \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}| + |\log_2 \mathbf{TV}| + |\log_2 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}| \leq \mathbf{c}_4 \log_2 n$ , where  $\mathbf{TV} = \max\{\mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}\}$  with  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}} := \{\theta(\cdot, r), r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ , and  $\theta(\cdot, r) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the function defined by  $\theta(\mathbf{x}, r) = \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}]$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Then, on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists a sequence of mean-zero Gaussian processes  $(Z_n^R(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R})$  with almost sure continuous trajectories such that:

- $\mathbb{E}[R_n(g_1, r_1)R_n(g_2, r_2)] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n^R(g_1, r_1)Z_n^R(g_2, r_2)]$  for all  $(g_1, r_1), (g_2, r_2) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ , and
- $\mathbb{P}[\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} > C_1 C_\alpha \mathbb{T}_n(t)] \leq C_2 e^{-t}$  for all  $t > 0$ ,

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are universal constants,  $C_\alpha = \max\{1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, 1 + (4\alpha)^\alpha\}$ , and

$$\mathbb{T}_n(t) := \mathbf{A}_n(t + \mathbf{c}_4 \log_2 n + \mathbf{d} \log(\mathbf{c}n))^{\alpha + \frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{d} + \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}}(t + \mathbf{c}_4 \log_2 n + \mathbf{d} \log(\mathbf{c}n))^{\alpha + 1},$$

$$\mathbf{A}_n := \min \left\{ \left( \frac{\mathbf{c}_1^d \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^{d+1} \mathbf{TV}^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2d+2}}, \left( \frac{\mathbf{c}_1^{\frac{d}{2}} \mathbf{c}_2^{\frac{d}{2}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{TV}^{\frac{d}{2}} \mathbf{L}^{\frac{d}{2}}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+2}} \right\},$$

and  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{R}}$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}}$ ,  $\mathbf{L} = \max\{\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}\}$ .

This theorem establishes a uniform Gaussian strong approximation for the residual stochastic process  $(R_n(g, r) : (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})$  defined in (7) under regularity conditions specifically tailored to leverage its multiplicative separable structure. Condition (i) in Theorem 3 is analogous to the conditions imposed in Corollaries 1 and 2 for the general empirical process. This is a mild, standard restriction on the portion of the stochastic process corresponding to the covariates  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . Condition (ii) in Theorem 3 is a new, mild condition on the portion of the stochastic process corresponding to the outcome  $y_i$ . This condition either assume  $r(y_i)$  to be uniformly bounded, or restricts the tail decay of the function class  $\mathcal{R}$  without requiring specific strong assumptions on the distribution  $\mathbb{P}_Y$  and hence the joint distribution  $\mathbb{P}_Z$  (cf. Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014, Remark 3.1(iii))). Finally, Condition (iii) is weak and imposed only to simplify the exposition; see Section SA-I.2 and SA-I.3 in the supplemental appendix for the general result. We require  $\mathbf{pTV}$  conditions on  $\mathcal{R}$  in (ii), and  $\mathbf{TV}$  conditions on  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}$  in (iii), because  $\mathbf{x}_i$  has a Lebesgue density but  $y_i$  may not have one, which means values of  $\mathcal{R}$  at a Lebesgue measure-zero set can affect the value of  $R_n(g, r)$ , but values of  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}$  at a Lebesgue measure-zero set do not.

The proof strategy of Theorem 3 is the same as for the general empirical process (Theorem 1). First, we discretize to a  $\delta$ -net to obtain

$$\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} \leq \|R_n - R_n \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} + \|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} + \|Z_n^R \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}},$$

where the terms capturing fluctuation off-the-net,  $\|R_n - R_n \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}$  and  $\|Z_n^R \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}$ , are handled via standard empirical process methods. Second, the remaining term  $\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}$ , which captures the finite-class Gaussian approximation error, is once again decomposed via a suitable mean square “projection” from  $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R})$  to the class of piecewise constant Haar functions on a carefully chosen collection of cells partitioning the support of  $\mathbb{P}_Z$ . This is our point of departure from prior literature.

We design of cells based on two key observations: (i) regularity conditions are often imposed on the conditional distribution  $y_i|\mathbf{x}_i$  (as opposed to their joint distribution); and (ii)  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  often require different regularity conditions. For example, in the classical regression case discussed previously,  $\mathcal{R}$  is just the singleton identity function but  $\mathbb{P}_Y$  may have unbounded support, while  $\mathcal{G}$  is a VC-type class of  $n$ -varying functions with  $\mathbb{P}_X$  compact supported. Thus, the dimension of  $y_i$  is a nuisance for the strong approximation, making results like Theorem 1 suboptimal in general. These observations suggest choosing dyadic cells by an asymmetric iterative splitting construction, where first the support of each dimension of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is partitioned, and only after the support of  $y_i$  is partitioned based on the conditional distribution of  $y_i|\mathbf{x}_i$ . See Section SA-III.1 in the supplemental appendix for details of our proposed dyadic cells expansion.

Given our dyadic expansion exploiting the structure of the residual empirical process  $R_n$ , we decompose the term  $\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}$  similarly to (10), leading to a “projected” piecewise constant process and the corresponding two projection errors. However, instead of employing the  $L_2$ -projection  $\Pi_0$  as in (10), we now use another mapping  $\Pi_2$  from  $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R})$  to piecewise constant functions that explicitly factorizes the product  $g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i)$ . In fact, as we discuss in the supplemental appendix (Section SA-III.2), each base level cell  $\mathcal{C}$  produced by our asymmetric dyadic splitting scheme can be written as a product of the form  $\mathcal{X}_l \times \mathcal{Y}_m$ , where  $\mathcal{X}_l$  denotes the  $l$ -th cell for  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_m$  denotes the  $m$ -th cell for  $y_i$ . Thus,  $\Pi_2$  is carefully chosen so that once we know  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_l$  for some  $l$ ,  $\Pi_2[g, r](\mathbf{x}, y) = \sum_{m=0}^{2^N-1} \mathbb{1}(y \in \mathcal{Y}_m) \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_m, \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_l] \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_l]$ , which only depends on  $y$ , and has envelope and total variation no greater than those for  $r$ .

Finally, our Tusnády’s lemma for more general binomial counts (Lemma SA.6) allows for the Gaussian coupling of any piecewise-constant functions over our asymmetrically constructed dyadic cells. A generalization of Rio (1994, Theorem 2.1) enables upper bounding the Gaussian approximation error for processes indexed by piecewise constant functions by summing up a quadratic variation from all layers in the cell expansion. By the above choice of cells and projections, the contribution from the last layers corresponding to splitting  $y_i$  amounts to a sum of one-dimensional KMT coupling error from all possible  $\mathcal{X}_l$  cells. In fact, we know one-dimensional KMT coupling is optimal and, as a consequence, requiring a vanishing contribution of  $y_i$  layers to the approximation error does not add extra requirements besides conditions on envelope functions and an  $L_1$  bound for  $\mathcal{G}$ . This explains why we can obtain strong approximation rates reflecting the correct effective sample size underlying the empirical process for the kernel regression (or “local empirical process”) example. The supplemental appendix contains all the technical details.

The following corollary summarizes the main result from Theorem 3.



**Corollary 5** (Strong Approximation Residual Empirical Process). *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 3 hold. Then,  $\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} = O(\varrho_n)$  a.s. with*

$$\varrho_n = \min \left\{ \frac{(\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^{d+1} \mathbf{TV}^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}})^{\frac{1}{2d+2}}}{n^{1/(2d+2)}}, \frac{(\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{TV}^{\frac{d}{2}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{L}^{\frac{d}{2}})^{\frac{1}{d+2}}}{n^{1/(d+2)}} \right\} (\log n)^{\alpha+3/2} + \frac{(\log n)^{\alpha+1}}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

This corollary shows that our best attainable uniform Gaussian strong approximation rate for the residual empirical process  $R_n$  is  $n^{-1/(d+2)}$  polylog  $n$ , putting aside the contributions from  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}$ ,  $\mathbf{TV} = \max\{\mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}\}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}$ , and  $\mathbf{L} = \max\{\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}\}$ . It is not possible to provide a strict ranking between Corollary 2 and Corollary 5. On the one hand, Corollary 2 treats all components in  $\mathbf{z}_i$  symmetrically, and thus imposes stronger regularity conditions on  $\mathbb{P}_Z$ , but leads to the better approximation rate  $n^{-\min\{1/(d+1), 1/2\}}$  polylog  $n$ , putting aside the potential contributions of  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}$ ,  $\mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}$ . On the other hand, as discussed previously, Corollary 5 can deliver a tighter strong approximation under much weaker regularity conditions whenever  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  varies with  $n$ , as it is the case of the local empirical processes arising from nonparametric statistics. The following section offers a substantive application illustrating this point.

#### 4.1 Example: Local Polynomial Regression

We demonstrate the applicability and improvements of Theorem 3 and Corollary 5 with a substantive application to nonparametric local polynomial regression (Fan and Gijbels, 1996). Assume  $(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_n, y_n)$  satisfy Assumption B, and consider the estimand

$$\theta(\mathbf{x}; r) = \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}], \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, \quad r \in \mathcal{R}, \quad (12)$$

where we focus on two leading cases to streamline the discussion: (i)  $\mathcal{R}_1 := \{\text{Id}\}$  corresponds to the conditional expectation  $\mu(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}[y_i | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}]$ , and (ii)  $\mathcal{R}_2 := \{\mathbb{1}(y_i \leq y) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$  corresponds to the conditional distribution function  $F(y | \mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(y_i \leq y) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}]$ . In the first case,  $\mathcal{R}$  is a singleton but the identify function calls for the possibility of  $\mathbb{P}_Y$  not being dominated by the Lebesgue measure or perhaps being continuously distributed with unbounded support. In the second case,  $\mathcal{R}$  is a VC-type class of indicator functions, and hence  $r(y_i)$  is uniformly bounded, but establishing uniformity over  $\mathcal{R}$  is of statistical interest (e.g., to construct specification hypothesis tests based on conditional distribution functions).

Suppose the kernel function  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-negative, Lipschitz, and compact supported. Using standard multi-index notation,  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{u})$  denotes the  $\frac{(d+\mathbf{p})!}{d! \mathbf{p}!}$ -dimensional vector collecting the ordered elements  $\mathbf{u}^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} / \boldsymbol{\nu}!$  for  $0 \leq |\boldsymbol{\nu}| \leq \mathbf{p}$ , where  $\mathbf{u}^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = u_1^{\nu_1} u_2^{\nu_2} \cdots u_d^{\nu_d}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\nu}! = \nu_1! \nu_2! \cdots \nu_d!$  and  $|\boldsymbol{\nu}| = \nu_1 + \nu_2 + \cdots + \nu_d$ , for  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_d)^\top$  and  $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_d)^\top$ . A local polynomial regression estimator of  $\theta(\mathbf{x}; r)$  is

$$\hat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}; r) := \mathbf{e}_1^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{x}, r), \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{x}, r) := \underset{\boldsymbol{\beta}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (r(y_i) - \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x})^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})^2 K\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b}\right),$$

with  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}_1$  or  $r \in \mathcal{R}_2$ , and  $\mathbf{e}_1$  denoting the first standard basis vector. The estimation error can be decomposed into three terms (linearization, non-linearity error, and smoothing bias):

$$\widehat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r) = \underbrace{\mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r}}_{\text{linearization}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{e}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r}}_{\text{non-linearity error}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n] - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r)}_{\text{smoothing bias}},$$

where  $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{p}(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b}) \mathbf{p}(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b})^\top b^{-d} K(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b})$ ,  $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{p}(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b}) \mathbf{p}(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b})^\top b^{-d} K(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b})]$ , and  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{p}(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b}) b^{-d} K(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b}) (r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i])$ .

It follows immediately that the linear term is

$$\sqrt{nb^d} \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nb^d}} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b}\right) (r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i]) = R_n(g, r), \quad g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}_l,$$

for  $l = 1, 2$ , and where  $\mathcal{G} = \{b^{-d/2} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}(\frac{\cdot - \mathbf{x}}{b}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  with  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{u}) K(\mathbf{u})$  the equivalent boundary-adaptive kernel function. Furthermore, under the regularity conditions given in the supplemental appendix (Lemma SA.1), which relate to uniform smoothness and moment restrictions for the conditional distribution of  $y_i | \mathbf{x}_i$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_1} |\mathbf{e}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r}| &= O((nb^d)^{-1} \log n + (nb^d)^{-3/2} (\log n)^{5/2}) \quad \text{a.s.}, \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_2} |\mathbf{e}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r}| &= O((nb^d)^{-1} \log n) \quad \text{a.s.}, \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_l} |\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n] - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r)| &= O(b^{1+p}) \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad l = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the goal reduces to establishing a Gaussian strong approximation for the residual-based empirical process  $(R_n(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}_l)$ ,  $l = 1, 2$ . In the remaining of this subsection we discuss different attempts to establish such approximation result, culminating with the application of our Theorem 3.

As discussed in Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014, Remark 3.1), a first attempt is to deploy Theorem 1.1 in Rio (1994) (or, equivalently, Corollary 1). Viewing the empirical process as based on the random sample  $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , the theorem requires  $\mathbb{P}_Z$  be continuously distributed with positive Lebesgue density on its support  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^{d+1}$  (using the notation of Assumption A). For this reason, Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014, Remark 3.1) assumes that  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) = (\mathbf{x}_i, \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i, u_i))$  where  $(\mathbf{x}_i, u_i)$  has continuous and positive Lebesgue density supported on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Thus, if  $M_{\{\varphi\}} < \infty$ ,  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\{\varphi\}, \text{supp}(g)} \lesssim \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\text{Supp}(g)) < \infty$ ,  $K_{\{\varphi\}} < \infty$ , and other regularity conditions hold, then we show in the supplemental appendix (Example SA.1) that applying Rio (1994) to  $(X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H})$  with  $\mathcal{H} = \{(g \cdot \varphi) \circ \phi_Z^{-1}\}$ , where  $\phi_Z$  is the Rosenblatt transformation (see Lemma SA.12), gives a Gaussian strong approximation for  $(R_n(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}_l)$ ,  $l = 1, 2$ , with rate (6). Without the condition on *local* uniform variation  $K_{\{\varphi\}} < \infty$ , an additional  $\sqrt{\log n}$  multiplicative factor appears.

The previous result does not exploit Lipschitz continuity, so a natural second attempt is to

employ Corollary 2 to improve it. Retaining the same setup and assumptions, but now also assuming that  $\varphi$  is Lipschitz, our Theorem 1 gives a Gaussian strong approximation for  $(R_n(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}_1)$  with rate (8). See Example SA.2 in the supplemental appendix. Importantly, Theorem 1 does not give an improvement for  $\mathcal{R}_2$  because the Lipschitz condition is not satisfied.

The two attempts so far impose strong assumptions on the joint distribution of the data, and deliver approximation rates based on the incorrect effective sample size (and thus require  $nb^{d+1} \rightarrow \infty$ ). Our Theorem 3 addresses both problems: suppose Assumption B holds and  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a compact supported Lipschitz continuous function, then we verify in the supplemental appendix (Example SA.3) that  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \lesssim b^{-d/2}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \lesssim b^{d/2}$ ,  $\mathbf{TV} \lesssim b^{d/2-1}$ , and  $\mathbf{L} \lesssim b^{-d/2-1}$ , which gives  $\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_2} = O(\varrho_n)$  a.s. with

$$\varrho_n = (nb^d)^{-1/(d+2)} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1/2} \log n.$$

If, in addition, we assume  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] < \infty$ , then  $\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_1} = O(\varrho_n)$  a.s. with

$$\varrho_n = (nb^d)^{-1/(d+2)} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1/2} (\log n)^2.$$

As a consequence, our results verify that there exist valid uniform Gaussian approximations as follows:

- Let  $\widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}) := \widehat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}; r)$  for  $r \in \mathcal{R}_1$ . If  $b^{p+1}(nb^d)^{(d+4)/(2d+4)}(\log n)^{-1/2} + (nb^d)^{-(d+1)/(d+2)}(\log n)^2 = O(1)$ , then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\sqrt{nb^d}(\widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}) - \mu(\mathbf{x})) - Z_n^R(\mathbf{x})| \lesssim \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1+d/2}}{nb^d} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+2}} \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where  $\text{Cov}(Z_n^R(\mathbf{x}), Z_n^R(\mathbf{x}')) = nb^d \text{Cov}(\mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x},r}, \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}'}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}',r})$  for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $r \in \mathcal{R}_1$ .

- Let  $\widehat{F}(r_y | \mathbf{x}) := \widehat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}; r_y)$  for  $r_y \in \mathcal{R}_2$ . If  $b^{p+1}(nb^d)^{(d+4)/(2d+4)}(\log n)^{-1/2} = O(1)$ , and also  $(nb^d)^{-1} \log n = o(1)$ , then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathbb{R}} |\sqrt{nb^d}(\widehat{F}(y | \mathbf{x}) - F(y | \mathbf{x})) - Z_n^R(y, \mathbf{x})| \lesssim \left( \frac{(\log n)^{1+d/2}}{nb^d} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+2}} \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where  $\text{Cov}(Z_n^R(\mathbf{x}), Z_n^R(\mathbf{x}')) = nb^d \text{Cov}(\mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x},r_y}, \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}'}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}',r_{y'}})$  for all  $(\mathbf{x}, y), (\mathbf{x}', y') \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $r_y, r_{y'} \in \mathcal{R}_2$ .

This example gives a substantive statistical application where Theorem 3 offers a strict improvement on the accuracy of the Gaussian strong approximation over Rio (1994), and over Theorem 1 after incorporating the additional Lipschitz condition on the class of functions when applicable. It remains an open question whether the result in this section provides the best Gaussian strong approximation for local empirical processes or, in particular, for the local polynomial regression estimator. The results obtained are the best known in the literature to our knowledge, but we are unaware of lower bounds that would confirm the approximation rates are unimprovable.

## 4.2 Quasi-Uniform Haar Basis

In Section 3.2, we showed that when  $\mathcal{H}$  lies in the span of a Haar basis, the Gaussian strong approximation rate can be optimal in the sense of achieving the univariate KMT approximation rate as a function of the effective sample size. This was a consequence of having no  $L_2$ -projection error in the construction of the strong approximation. In this section, we leverage the same idea to show that when  $\mathcal{G}$  lies in the span of a Haar basis, it is possible to achieve nearly optimal Gaussian strong approximation rates for local empirical processes. This result has direct applicability to regression estimators based on Haar basis, including certain regression trees (Breiman *et al.*, 1984) and nonparametric partitioning-based estimators (Cattaneo *et al.*, 2020).

The following theorem gives our main result, which does not require that  $\mathcal{R}$  lies in a Haar space, thereby highlighting once again the asymmetric roles that  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  play.

**Theorem 4.** *Suppose  $(\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), 1 \leq i \leq n)$  are i.i.d. random variables taking values in  $(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}))$  with  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , and the following conditions hold.*

- (i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is a class of functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $M_{\mathcal{G}} < \infty$  and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \text{Span}\{\mathbb{1}_{\Delta_l} : 0 \leq l < L\}$ , where  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$  forms a quasi-uniform partition of  $\mathcal{X}$  in the sense that

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \sqcup_{0 \leq l < L} \Delta_l \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\max_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)}{\min_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)} \leq \rho < \infty.$$

In addition,  $\mathcal{G}$  is a VC-type class with respect to envelope function  $M_{\mathcal{G}}$  with constant  $c_{\mathcal{G}} \geq e$  and exponent  $d_{\mathcal{G}} \geq 1$ .

- (ii)  $\mathcal{R}$  is a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P}_Y)$ , and a VC-type class with respect to  $M_{\mathcal{R}}$  with constant  $c_{\mathcal{R}} \geq e$  and exponent  $d_{\mathcal{R}} \geq 1$ . Furthermore, one of the following holds:

- (a)  $M_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$  and  $\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$ , and set  $\alpha = 0$ , or  
(b)  $M_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$ ,  $\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}, (-|y|, |y|)} \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ .

- (iii) There exists a constant  $c_5$  such that  $|\log_2 E_{\mathcal{G}}| + |\log_2 M_{\mathcal{G}}| + |\log_2 L| \leq c_5 \log_2 n$ .

Then, on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists mean-zero Gaussian processes  $(Z_n^R(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R})$  with almost sure continuous trajectory such that:

- $\mathbb{E}[R_n(g_1, r_1)R_n(g_2, r_2)] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n^R(g_1, r_1)Z_n^R(g_2, r_2)]$  for all  $(g_1, r_1), (g_2, r_2) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ , and
- $\mathbb{P}[\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} > C_1 C_\alpha (C_\rho \mathbf{U}_n(t) + \mathbf{V}_n(t))] \leq C_2 e^{-t} + L e^{-C_\rho n/L}$  for all  $t > 0$ ,

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are universal constants,  $C_\alpha = \max\{1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, 1 + (4\alpha)^\alpha\}$ ,  $C_\rho$  is a constant that only depends on  $\rho$ ,

$$\mathbf{U}_n(t) := \sqrt{\frac{dM_{\mathcal{G}}E_{\mathcal{G}}}{n/L}}(t + c_5 \log_2(n) + d \log(cn))^{\alpha+1} + \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}}(\log n)^\alpha(t + c_5 \log_2(n) + d \log(cn))^{\alpha+1}$$

with  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_g \mathbf{c}_R$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}_g + \mathbf{d}_R$ , and

$$\mathbf{V}_n(t) := \mathbb{1}(\text{card}(\mathcal{R}) > 1) \sqrt{\mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{E}_g} \left( \max_{0 \leq l < L} \|\Delta_l\|_\infty \right) \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{V}_R} \sqrt{t + \mathbf{c}_5 \log_2(n) + \mathbf{d} \log(cn)},$$

with  $\mathcal{V}_R := \{v_r : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}], \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ .

The first term ( $\mathbf{U}_n(t)$ ) can be interpreted as a ‘‘variance’’ contribution based on ‘‘effective sample size’’  $n/L$ , up to polylog( $n$ ) terms, while the second term ( $\mathbf{V}_n(t)$ ) can be interpreted as a ‘‘bias’’ term that arises from the projection error for the conditional mean function  $\theta(\cdot, r)$ , which may not necessarily lie in the span of Haar basis. In the special case when  $\mathcal{R} = \{r\}$  is a singleton we can construct the cells based on the condition distribution of  $r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i]$ , thereby making the conditional mean function (and hence the ‘‘bias’’ term) zero, while that is not possible when uniformity over  $\mathcal{R}$  is desired.

Theorem 4 gives the following uniform Gaussian strong approximation result.

**Corollary 6** (Haar Basis Residual Empirical Process). *Suppose the conditions of Theorem 4 hold. Then,  $\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} = O(\varrho_n)$  a.s. with*

$$\varrho_n = \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{E}_g}{n/L}} (\log n)^{\alpha+1} + \frac{\mathbf{M}_g}{\sqrt{n}} (\log n)^{2\alpha+1} + \mathbb{1}(\text{card}(\mathcal{R}) > 1) \sqrt{\mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{E}_g} \left( \max_{0 \leq l < L} \|\Delta_l\|_\infty \right) \sqrt{\log n}$$

Setting aside the roles of  $\mathbf{M}_g$  and  $\mathbf{E}_g$ , the approximation rate is effectively  $(\log n)^{\alpha+1} (n/L)^{-1/2} + \mathbb{1}(\text{card}(\mathcal{R}) > 1) \max_{0 \leq l < L} \|\Delta_l\|_\infty \sqrt{\log n}$ , which can achieve the optimal univariate KMT strong approximation rate based on the effective sample size  $n/L$ , up to a polylog( $n$ ) term, when  $\mathcal{R}$  is a singleton function class.

We illustrate the applicability to statistics of Theorem 4 with the following example considering nonparametric regression based on Haar basis approximation.

**Example 3** (Haar Basis Regression Estimators). Suppose  $(\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), 1 \leq i \leq n)$  are i.i.d. random variables taking values in  $(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}))$  with  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ . As in Section 4.1, consider the regression estimand (12), focusing once again on the two leading examples  $\mathcal{R}_1$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2$ . However, instead of local polynomial regression, now consider the Haar partitioning-based estimator:

$$\check{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) = \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(r), \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(r) = \underset{\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^L}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (r(y_i) - \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_i)^\top \mathbf{g})^2,$$

where  $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{u}) = (\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_l) : 0 \leq l < L)$  and  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$  forms a quasi-uniform partition of  $\mathcal{X}$  as defined in Theorem 4. The estimation error can again be decomposed into three terms (linearization, non-linearity error, and smoothing bias)

$$\check{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r) = \underbrace{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \mathbf{T}_r}_{\text{linearization}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})^\top (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}^{-1}) \mathbf{T}_r}_{\text{non-linearity error}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\check{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n] - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r)}_{\text{smoothing bias}},$$

where  $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_i)^\top]$ ,  $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_i)\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_i)^\top$ , and  $\mathbf{T}_r = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x}_i)(r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathbf{x}_i])$ . In this example, the linear term takes the form

$$\sqrt{n/L}\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})^\top \mathbf{Q}^{-1} \mathbf{T}_r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n k_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_i)(r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathbf{x}_i]) = R_n(g, r), \quad g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}_l,$$

for  $l = 1, 2$ , where  $\mathcal{G} = \{k_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  with  $k_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) = L^{-1/2} \sum_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_l) \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_l) / \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)$  the equivalent kernel. Under standard regularity conditions including smoothness and moment assumptions (Lemma SA.2 in the supplemental appendix), we verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_1} |\mathbf{e}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}^{-1}) \mathbf{T}_r| &= O(\log(nL)L/n + (\log(nL)L/n)^{3/2} \log n) \quad \text{a.s.}, \\ \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_2} |\mathbf{e}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}^{-1}) \mathbf{T}_r| &= O(\log(nL)L/n) \quad \text{a.s.}, \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_l} |\mathbb{E}[\check{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r)|\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n] - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r)| &= O\left(\max_{0 \leq l < L} \|\Delta_l\|_\infty\right) \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad l = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the residual-based empirical process  $(R_n(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}_l), l = 1, 2$ , we apply Theorem 4. First,  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} = L^{1/2}$  and  $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} = L^{-1/2}$ , and we can take  $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{G}} = L$  and  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} = 1$  because  $\mathcal{G}$  has finite cardinality  $L$ . For the singleton case  $\mathcal{R}_1$ , we can take  $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{R}_1} = 1$  and  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}_1} = 1$ , and Condition (ii)(a) in Theorem 4 holds, which implies that  $\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_1} = O(\varrho_n)$  a.s. with

$$\varrho_n = \frac{(\log(nL))^2}{\sqrt{n/L}},$$

provided that  $(\log(nL)L/n \rightarrow 0$ . For the VC-Type class  $\mathcal{R}_2$ , we can verify Condition (ii)(b) in Theorem 4 with  $\alpha = 1$  if  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i)|\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ , and we can take  $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{R}_2}$  to be some absolute constant and  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}_2} = 2$  by van der Vaart and Wellner (2013, Theorem 2.6.7), which implies that  $\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_1} = O(\varrho_n)$  a.s. with

$$\varrho_n = \frac{\log(nL)}{\sqrt{n/L}} + \max_{0 \leq l < L} \|\Delta_l\|_\infty,$$

provided that  $(\log(nL)L/n \rightarrow 0$ .

A uniform Gaussian strong approximation for  $(\sqrt{n/L}(\check{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r)) : (\mathbf{x}, r) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{R}_l), l = 1, 2$ , follows directly from the results obtained above, as previously discussed in Section 4.1.  $\blacktriangle$

This example illustrates a substantive statistical application where the optimal univariate KMT strong approximation rate based on the effective sample size  $n/L$ , up to polylog( $n$ ) terms and the complexity of  $\mathcal{R}$ .

## 5 Acknowledgments

We thank Rajita Chandak, Jianqing Fan, Kengo Kato, Jason Klusowski, Xinwei Ma, Boris Shigida, Rocio Titiunik, and Will Underwood for comments. Cattaneo gratefully acknowledges financial support from the National Science Foundation through grant DMS-2210561.

## References

- Ambrosio, L., Fusco, N., and Pallara, D. (2000). *Functions of bounded variation and free discontinuity problems*: Oxford university press.
- Beck, J. (1985). “Lower bounds on the approximation of the multivariate empirical process,” *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, *70*, 289–306.
- Berthet, P. and Mason, D. M. (2006). “Revisiting two strong approximation results of Dudley and Philipp,” *Lecture Notes–Monograph Series*, *51*, 155–172.
- Breiman, L., Friedman, J., Olshen, R., and Stone, C. J. (1984). *Classification and Regression Trees*: Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Bretagnolle, J. and Massart, P. (1989). “Hungarian Constructions from the Nonasymptotic Viewpoint,” *Annals of Probability*, *17*(1), 239–256.
- Brown, L. D., Cai, T. T., and Zhou, H. H. (2010). “Nonparametric regression in exponential families,” *Annals of Statistics*, *38*(4), 2005–2046.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Chandak, R., Jansson, M., and Ma, X. (2024a). “Local Polynomial Conditional Density Estimators,” *Bernoulli*.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Farrell, M. H., and Feng, Y. (2020). “Large sample properties of partitioning-based series estimators,” *Annals of Statistics*, *48*(3), 1718–1741.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Feng, Y., and Underwood, W. G. (2024b). “Uniform Inference for Kernel Density Estimators with Dyadic Data,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Jansson, M., and Ma, X. (2024c). “Local Regression Distribution Estimators,” *Journal of Econometrics*.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Masini, R. P., and Underwood, W. G. (2024d). “Yurinskii’s Coupling for Martingales,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00362*.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K. (2014). “Gaussian approximation of suprema of empirical processes,” *Annals of Statistics*, *42*(4), 1564–1597.

- Csörgő, M. and Revész, P. (1981). *Strong Approximations in Probability and Statistics*, Probability and Mathematical Statistics : a series of monographs and textbooks: Academic Press.
- Dedecker, J., Rio, E., and Merlevède, F. (2014). “Strong approximation of the empirical distribution function for absolutely regular sequences in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,” *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 19(9), 1 – 56.
- Einmahl, U. and Mason, D. M. (1998). “Strong Approximations to the Local Empirical Process,” In *High Dimensional Probability*: Springer, 75–92.
- Fan, J. and Gijbels, I. (1996). *Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications*, New York: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Giné, E., Koltchinskii, V., and Sakhanenko, L. (2004). “Kernel Density Estimators: Convergence in Distribution for Weighted Sup-Norms,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 130(2), 167–198.
- Giné, E. and Nickl, R. (2010). “Confidence Bands in Density Estimation,” *Annals of Statistics*, 38(2), 1122–1170.
- Giné, E. and Nickl, R. (2016). *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-dimensional Statistical Models*: Cambridge University Press.
- Huang, J. (2003). “Local Asymptotics for Polynomial Spline Regression,” *Annals of Statistics*, 31(5), 1600–1635.
- Koltchinskii, V. I. (1994). “Komlós-Major-Tusnády approximation for the general empirical process and Haar expansions of classes of functions,” *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 7(1), 73–118.
- Komlós, J., Major, P., and Tusnády, G. (1975). “An approximation of partial sums of independent RV’s, and the sample DF. I,” *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 32, 111–131.
- Mason, D. M. and Van Zwet, W. R. (2011). “A Refinement of the KMT Inequality for the Uniform Empirical Process,” In *Selected Works of Willem van Zwet*: Springer, 415–428.
- Mason, D. M. and Zhou, H. H. (2012). “Quantile Coupling Inequalities and Their Applications,” *Probability Surveys*, 39–479.
- Massart, P. (1989). “Strong approximation for multivariate empirical and related processes, via KMT constructions,” *Annals of probability*, 266–291.
- Pollard, D. (2002). *A User’s Guide to Measure Theoretic Probability*: Cambridge University Press.
- Rio, E. (1994). “Local Invariance Principles and Their Application to Density Estimation,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 98(1), 21–45.
- Sakhanenko, A. (1996). “Estimates for the accuracy of coupling in the central limit theorem,” *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, 37(4), 811–823.



- Sakhanenko, L. (2015). “Asymptotics of Suprema of Weighted Gaussian Fields with Applications to Kernel Density Estimators,” *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 59(3), 415–451.
- Settati, A. (2009). “Gaussian approximation of the empirical process under random entropy conditions,” *Stochastic processes and their Applications*, 119(5), 1541–1560.
- van der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. (2013). *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Wand, M. and Jones, M. (1995). *Kernel Smoothing*: Chapman & Hall/CRC.
- Yurinskii, V. V. (1978). “On the error of the Gaussian approximation for convolutions,” *Theory of Probability & its Applications*, 22(2), 236–247.
- Zaitsev, A. Y. (1987). “Estimates for the Lévy-Prokhorov distance in the multidimensional central limit theorem for random vectors with finite exponential moments,” *Theory of Probability & its Applications*, 31(2), 203–220.
- Zaitsev, A. Y. (2013). “The Accuracy of Strong Gaussian Approximation for Sums of Independent Random Vectors,” *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 68(4), 721–761.

# Supplemental Appendix to “Strong Approximations for Empirical Processes Indexed by Lipschitz Functions”

Matias D. Cattaneo<sup>1</sup>

Ruiqi (Rae) Yu<sup>1\*</sup>

June 10, 2024

## Abstract

This supplement appendix reports some additional results not discussed in the main paper to conserve space, and provides all the technical proofs.

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Operations Research and Financial Engineering, Princeton University

\*Corresponding author: [rae.yu@princeton.edu](mailto:rae.yu@princeton.edu)

# Contents

<b>SA-I Additional Results</b>	<b>3</b>
SA-I.1 General Empirical Process . . . . .	3
SA-I.2 Multiplicative-Separable Empirical Process . . . . .	3
SA-I.3 Residual-Based Empirical Process . . . . .	6
SA-I.4 Local Polynomial Estimators . . . . .	7
SA-I.5 Haar Basis Regression Estimators . . . . .	10
<b>SA-II General Empirical Process: Proofs</b>	<b>11</b>
SA-II.1 Cell Expansions . . . . .	11
SA-II.2 Projection onto Piecewise Constant Functions . . . . .	11
SA-II.3 Strong Approximation Constructions . . . . .	12
SA-II.4 Meshing Error . . . . .	14
SA-II.5 L2 Projection Error . . . . .	14
SA-II.6 Strong Approximation Errors . . . . .	15
SA-II.7 Rosenblatt Reduction . . . . .	16
SA-II.8 Proof of Lemma SA.3 . . . . .	16
SA-II.9 Proof of Lemma SA.4 . . . . .	17
SA-II.10 Proof of Lemma SA.5 . . . . .	17
SA-II.11 Proof of Lemma SA.6 . . . . .	19
SA-II.12 Proof of Lemma SA.7 . . . . .	20
SA-II.13 Proof of Lemma SA.8 . . . . .	25
SA-II.14 Proof of Lemma SA.9 . . . . .	25
SA-II.15 Proof of Lemma SA.10 . . . . .	26
SA-II.16 Proof of Lemma SA.11 . . . . .	28
SA-II.17 Proof of Lemma SA.12 . . . . .	28
SA-II.18 Proof of Theorem 1 . . . . .	29
SA-II.19 Proof of Theorem 2 . . . . .	30
SA-II.20 Proof of Corollary SA.1 . . . . .	31
SA-II.21 Proof of Corollary SA.2 . . . . .	31
SA-II.22 Proof of Corollary SA.3 . . . . .	32
SA-II.23 Proof of Corollary 1 . . . . .	32
SA-II.24 Proof of Corollary 2 . . . . .	32
SA-II.25 Proof of Corollary 3 . . . . .	32
SA-II.26 Proof of Corollary 4 . . . . .	32
SA-II.27 Proof of Example 1 . . . . .	32
SA-II.28 Proof of Example 2 . . . . .	33
<b>SA-III Multiplicative-Separable and Residual-Based Empirical Process: Proofs</b>	<b>35</b>
SA-III.1 Cell Expansions . . . . .	36
SA-III.2 Projection onto Piecewise Constant Functions . . . . .	36
SA-III.3 Strong Approximation Construction . . . . .	37
SA-III.4 Meshing Error . . . . .	38
SA-III.5 Strong Approximation Errors . . . . .	39
SA-III.6 Projection Error . . . . .	39
SA-III.7 Proof of Lemma SA.15 . . . . .	41
SA-III.8 Proof of Lemma SA.16 . . . . .	43
SA-III.9 Proof of Lemma SA.17 . . . . .	43
SA-III.10 Proof of Lemma SA.18 . . . . .	44
SA-III.11 Proof of Lemma SA.19 . . . . .	45
SA-III.12 Proof of Lemma SA.20 . . . . .	46
SA-III.13 Proof of Lemma SA.21 . . . . .	47
SA-III.14 Proof of Lemma SA.26 . . . . .	48

SA-III.15 Proof of Lemma SA.22	48
SA-III.16 Proof of Lemma SA.23	49
SA-III.17 Proof of Lemma SA.24	50
SA-III.18 Proof of Theorem SA.1	50
SA-III.19 Proof of Theorem SA.2	53
SA-III.20 Proof of Theorem SA.3	55
SA-III.21 Proof of Theorem SA.4	57
SA-III.22 Proof of Lemma SA.1	58
SA-III.23 Proof of Lemma SA.2	59
SA-III.24 Proof of Example SA.1	60
SA-III.25 Proof of Example SA.2	63
SA-III.26 Proof of Example SA.3	63
SA-III.27 Proof of Example 3	63
SA-III.28 Proof of Theorem 3	64
SA-III.29 Proof of Theorem 4	66

## SA-I Additional Results

This section presents additional results not reported in the paper to conserve space and streamline the presentation.

### SA-I.1 General Empirical Process

The following corollaries provide additional results for their counterparts in Section 3.1 of the paper. In particular, the results reported here allow for exponentially decaying tails, and for a more general expression under polynomial entropy condition.

**Corollary SA.1** (VC-Type Bounded Functions). *Suppose the conditions of Corollary 1 hold. Then,*

$$S_n(t) = m_{n,d} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}(t + d_{\mathcal{H}} \log(c_{\mathcal{H}}n)) \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} + \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\}(t + d_{\mathcal{H}} \log(c_{\mathcal{H}}n))$$

in Theorem 1.

**Corollary SA.2** (VC-Type Lipschitz Functions). *Suppose the conditions of Corollary 2 hold. Then,*

$$S_n(t) = \min\{m_{n,d} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, l_{n,d} \sqrt{L_{\mathcal{H}}}\} \sqrt{(t + d_{\mathcal{H}} \log(c_{\mathcal{H}}n)) \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} + \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\}(t + d_{\mathcal{H}} \log(c_{\mathcal{H}}n))$$

in Theorem 1.

**Corollary SA.3** (Polynomial-Entropy Functions). *Suppose the conditions of Corollary 2 hold. Then,*

$$S_n(t) = a_{\mathcal{H}}(2 - b_{\mathcal{H}})^{-2} \min\{S_n^{bdd}(t), S_n^{lip}(t), S_n^{err}(t)\}$$

in Theorem 1, where

$$\begin{aligned} S_n^{bdd}(t) &= m_{n,d} \sqrt{d c_1 M_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} (\sqrt{t} + (m_{n,d}^2 M_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{4}}) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{d^3 c_3 K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\}(t + (m_{n,d}^2 M_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{2}}), \\ S_n^{lip}(t) &= l_{n,d} \sqrt{d c_1 c_2 L_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} (\sqrt{t} + (l_{n,d}^2 M_{\mathcal{H}}^{-2} L_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{4}}) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{d^3 c_3 K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\}(t + (l_{n,d}^2 M_{\mathcal{H}}^{-2} L_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{2}}), \\ S_n^{err}(t) &= \min\{m_{n,d} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, l_{n,d} \sqrt{c_2 L_{\mathcal{H}}}\} \sqrt{d c_1 \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} (\sqrt{t} + n^{\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{2(b_{\mathcal{H}}+2)}}) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{d^3 c_3 K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\}(t + n^{\frac{b_{\mathcal{H}}}{b_{\mathcal{H}}+2}}) + n^{-\frac{1}{b_{\mathcal{H}}+2}} M_{\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{t}. \end{aligned}$$

### SA-I.2 Multiplicative-Separable Empirical Process

This section considers uniform Gaussian strong approximation for the following multiplicative-separable empirical process:

$$M_n(g, r) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (g(\mathbf{x}_i) r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r(y_i)]), \quad (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}. \quad (\text{SA-1})$$

For example, the local empirical process discussed in Section 4 can also be represented as  $(M_n(g, r) : (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})$  with  $\mathcal{G} = \{b^{-d/2}K((\cdot - \mathbf{x})/b) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  and  $\mathcal{R} = \{\text{Id}\}$ , but calculated based on a centered sample  $((\mathbf{x}_i, y'_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n)$ , with  $y'_i = y_i - \mathbb{E}[y_i | \mathbf{x}_i]$ .

The results and proof techniques for the multiplicative-separable empirical process are similar to those for the residual-based empirical process studied in the paper, but we report them here for completeness.

**Theorem SA.1.** *Suppose Assumption B holds with  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$ , and the following two conditions hold.*

- (i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $J(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}, 1) < \infty$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{R}$  be a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P}_Y)$  such that  $J(\mathcal{R}, \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{R}}, 1) < \infty$ .

Furthermore, one of the following holds:

- (a)  $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$  and  $\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$ , and set  $\alpha = 0$ , or
- (b)  $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$  and  $\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}, (-|y|, |y|)} \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ .

Then, on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists a sequence of mean-zero Gaussian processes  $(Z_n^M(g, r) : (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})$  with almost surely continuous trajectory such that:

- $\mathbb{E}[M_n(g_1, r_1)M_n(g_2, r_2)] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n^M(g_1, r_1)Z_n^M(g_2, r_2)]$  for all  $(g_1, r_1), (g_2, r_2) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ , and
- $\mathbb{P}[\|M_n - Z_n^M\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} > C_1 C_\alpha \mathbb{T}_n^M(t)] \leq C_2 e^{-t}$  for all  $t > 0$ ,

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are universal constants,  $C_\alpha = \max\{1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, 1 + (4\alpha)^\alpha\}$  and

$$\mathbb{T}_n^M(t) = \min_{\delta \in (0, 1)} \{A_n^M(t, \delta) + F_n^M(t, \delta)\}$$

with

$$A_n^M(t, \delta) := \sqrt{d} \min \left\{ \left( \frac{c_1^d \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}^d \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^{d+1}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(d+1)}}, \left( \frac{c_1^d c_2^d \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 \text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}^d \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^d}{n^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(d+2)}} \right\} (t + \log(n\mathbb{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(\delta/2)\mathbb{N}_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta/2)N^*))^{\alpha+1} \\ + \sqrt{\frac{\min\{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2(M^* + N^*), \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}(c_3 K_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} + \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} + \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}})\}}{n}} (\log n)^\alpha (t + \log(n\mathbb{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(\delta/2)\mathbb{N}_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta/2)N^*))^{\alpha+1},$$

$$F_n^M(t, \delta) := J(\delta)\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}} + \frac{(\log n)^{\alpha/2} \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}} J^2(\delta)}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} + \frac{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{t} + (\log n)^\alpha \frac{\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t^\alpha,$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}} := \{\theta(\cdot, r) : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}], \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}, \\ J(\delta) := \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{G}, \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}) + \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{R}, \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{R}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}), \\ M^* := \left\lceil \log_2 \min \left\{ \left( \frac{n \text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}}} \right)^{\frac{d}{d+1}}, \left( \frac{n \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}} \right)^{\frac{d}{d+2}} \right\} \right\rceil, \\ N^* := \left\lceil \log_2 \max \left\{ \left( \frac{n \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^{d+1}}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}^d} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}}, \left( \frac{n^2 \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^{2d+2}}{\text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}^d \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^d \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}}^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+2}} \right\} \right\rceil.$$

**Corollary SA.4** (VC-Type Lipschitz Functions). *Suppose the conditions of Theorem SA.1 hold. In addition, assume that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a VC-type class with respect to envelope function  $\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}}$  with constant  $c_{\mathcal{G}} \geq e$  and exponent*

$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} \geq 1$ , and  $\mathcal{R}$  is a VC-type class with respect to  $M_{\mathcal{R}}$  with constant  $c_{\mathcal{R}} \geq e$  and exponent  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}} \geq 1$ . Suppose there exists a constant  $c_4$  such that  $|\log_2 \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}| + |\log_2 \mathbf{TV}| + |\log_2 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}| \leq c_4 \log_2 n$ , where  $\mathbf{TV} = \max\{\mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}\}$  with  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}} := \{\theta(\cdot, r) : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}], \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{T}_n^M(t) &= \sqrt{d} \min \left\{ \left( \frac{c_1^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}^d \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^{d+1}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(d+1)}}, \left( \frac{c_1^d c_2^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}^d \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^d}{n^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(d+2)}} \right\} (t + c_4 \log_2(n) + d \log(cn))^{\alpha+1} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{\min\{c_3 \log_2(n) \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}(c_3 K_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}})\}}{n}} (\log n)^{\alpha} (t + c_4 \log_2(n) + d \log(cn))^{\alpha+1}. \end{aligned}$$

in Theorem SA.1, where  $\mathbf{c} = c_{\mathcal{G}} c_{\mathcal{R}}$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}}$ .

**Theorem SA.2.** Suppose  $(\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), 1 \leq i \leq n)$  are i.i.d. random variables taking values in  $(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}))$  with  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , and the following conditions hold.

- (i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is a class of functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} < \infty$  and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \text{Span}\{\mathbb{1}_{\Delta_l} : 0 \leq l < L\}$ , where  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$  forms a quasi-uniform partition of  $\mathcal{X}$  in the sense that

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \sqcup_{0 \leq l < L} \Delta_l \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\max_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)}{\min_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)} \leq \rho < \infty.$$

In addition,  $J(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}, 1) < \infty$ .

- (ii)  $\mathcal{R}$  is a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P}_Y)$ , such that  $J(\mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{R}}, 1) < \infty$ . Furthermore, one of the following holds:

- (a)  $M_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$  and  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$ , and set  $\alpha = 0$ , or  
(b)  $M_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \lesssim 1 + |y|^{\alpha}$ ,  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}, (-|y|, |y|)} \lesssim 1 + |y|^{\alpha}$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ .

- (iii) There exists a constant  $c_5$  such that  $|\log_2 \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}| + |\log_2 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}| + |\log_2 L| \leq c_5 \log_2 n$ .

Then, on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists mean-zero Gaussian processes  $(Z_n^M(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R})$  with almost sure continuous trajectory such that:

- $\mathbb{E}[M_n(g_1, r_1) M_n(g_2, r_2)] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n^M(g_1, r_1) Z_n^M(g_2, r_2)]$  for all  $(g_1, r_1), (g_2, r_2) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ , and
- $\mathbb{P}[\|M_n - Z_n^M\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} > C_1 C_{\alpha} C_{\rho} \min_{\delta \in (0, 1)} (\mathbf{H}_n^M(t, \delta) + \mathbf{F}_n^M(t, \delta))] \leq C_2 e^{-t} + L e^{-C_{\rho} n/L}$  for all  $t > 0$ ,

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are universal constants,  $C_{\alpha} = \max\{1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, 1 + (4\alpha)^{\alpha}\}$ ,  $C_{\rho}$  is a constant that only depends on  $\rho$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_n^M(t, \delta) &:= \sqrt{\frac{L \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} (t + \log \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(\delta/2) + \log \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta/2) + \log_2 N^*)^{\alpha + \frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\frac{\min\{L + N^*, \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{G}}^2\}}{n}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} (\log n)^{\alpha} (t + \log \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(\delta/2) + \log \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta/2) + \log_2 N^*)^{\alpha+1}, \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathbf{c} = c_{\mathcal{G}} c_{\mathcal{R}}$ ,  $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}}$ ,  $N^* = \left\lceil \log_2 \left( \frac{n \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{2^L \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}} \right) \right\rceil$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{G}} = \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{l=1}^L \mathbb{1}(\text{Supp}(g) \cap \Delta_l \neq \emptyset)$ .

### SA-I.3 Residual-Based Empirical Process

The following theorem presents a generalization of Theorem 3 in the paper.

**Theorem SA.3.** *Suppose Assumption B holds with  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$ , and the following two conditions hold.*

- (i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $J(\mathcal{G}, M_{\mathcal{G}}, 1) < \infty$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{R}$  be a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P}_Y)$  such that  $J(\mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{R}}, 1) < \infty$ .  
Furthermore, one of the following holds:

- (a)  $M_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$  and  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$ , and set  $\alpha = 0$ , or
- (b)  $M_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$ ,  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}, (-|y|, |y|)} \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ .

Then, on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists a sequence of mean-zero Gaussian processes  $(Z_n^R(g, r) : (g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})$  with almost surely continuous trajectory such that:

1.  $\mathbb{E}[R_n(g_1, r_1)R_n(g_2, r_2)] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n^R(g_1, r_1)Z_n^R(g_2, r_2)]$  for all  $(g_1, r_1), (g_2, r_2) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ .
2.  $\mathbb{P}[\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} > C_1 C_\alpha \Upsilon_n^R(t)] \leq C_2 e^{-t}$  for all  $t > 0$ ,

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are universal constants,  $C_\alpha = \max\{1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, 1 + (4\alpha)^\alpha\}$ , and and

$$\Upsilon_n^R(t) = \min_{\delta \in (0, 1)} \{A_n^R(t, \delta) + F_n^R(t, \delta)\}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^R(t, \delta) &:= \sqrt{d} \min \left\{ \left( \frac{c_1^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{TV}^d M_{\mathcal{G}}^{d+1}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(d+1)}}, \left( \frac{c_1^d c_2^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 M_{\mathcal{G}}^2 \mathbf{TV}^{d+1}}{n^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(d+2)}} \right\} (t + \log(nN_{\mathcal{G}}(\delta/2)N_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta/2)N_*))^{d+1} \\ &\quad + \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} (\log n)^\alpha (t + \log(nN_{\mathcal{G}}(\delta/2)N_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta/2)N_*))^{d+1}, \\ F_n^R(t, \delta) &:= J(\delta)M_{\mathcal{G}} + \frac{\log(n)M_{\mathcal{G}}J^2(\delta)}{\delta^2\sqrt{n}} + \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{t} + (\log n)^\alpha \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}}t^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{TV} &:= \max\{\mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}\}, & \mathbf{L} &:= \max\{\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}\}, \\ \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}} &:= \{\theta(\cdot, r) : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}], \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}, \\ M_* &:= \left\lceil \log_2 \min \left\{ \left( \frac{n\mathbf{TV}}{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}} \right)^{\frac{d}{d+1}}, \left( \frac{n\mathbf{L}\mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}M_{\mathcal{G}}} \right)^{\frac{d}{d+2}} \right\} \right\rceil, \\ N_* &:= \left\lceil \log_2 \max \left\{ \left( \frac{nM_{\mathcal{G}}^{d+1}}{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}\mathbf{TV}^d} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}}, \left( \frac{n^2M_{\mathcal{G}}^{2d+2}}{\mathbf{TV}^d\mathbf{L}^d\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+2}} \right\} \right\rceil. \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem presents a generalization of Theorem 4 in the paper.

**Theorem SA.4.** *Suppose  $(\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), 1 \leq i \leq n)$  are i.i.d. random variables taking values in  $(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}))$  with  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , and the following conditions hold.*



- (i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is a class of functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $M_{\mathcal{G}} < \infty$  and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \text{Span}\{\mathbb{1}_{\Delta_l} : 0 \leq l < L\}$ , where  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$  forms a quasi-uniform partition of  $\mathcal{X}$  in the sense that

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \sqcup_{0 \leq l < L} \Delta_l \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\max_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)}{\min_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)} \leq \rho < \infty.$$

In addition,  $J(\mathcal{G}, M_{\mathcal{G}}, 1) < \infty$ .

- (ii)  $\mathcal{R}$  is a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P}_Y)$ , such that  $J(\mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{R}}, 1) < \infty$ . Furthermore, one of the following holds:

- (a)  $M_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$  and  $\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$ , and set  $\alpha = 0$ , or  
(b)  $M_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$ ,  $\text{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}, (-|y|, |y|)} \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ .

- (iii) There exists a constant  $c_5$  such that  $|\log_2 E_{\mathcal{G}}| + |\log_2 M_{\mathcal{G}}| + |\log_2 L| \leq c_5 \log_2 n$ .

Then, on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists mean-zero Gaussian processes  $(Z_n^R(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R})$  with almost sure continuous trajectory such that:

- $\mathbb{E}[R_n(g_1, r_1)R_n(g_2, r_2)] = \mathbb{E}[Z_n^R(g_1, r_1)Z_n^R(g_2, r_2)]$  for all  $(g_1, r_1), (g_2, r_2) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ , and
- $\mathbb{P}[\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} > C_1 C_\alpha (C_\rho \min_{\delta \in (0,1)} (H_n^R(t, \delta) + F_n^R(t, \delta)) + W_n(t))] \leq C_2 e^{-t} + L e^{-C_\rho n/L}$  for all  $t > 0$ ,

where  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are universal constants,  $C_\alpha = \max\{1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, 1 + (4\alpha)^\alpha\}$ ,  $C_\rho$  is a constant that only depends on  $\rho$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} H_n^R(t, \delta) &:= \sqrt{\frac{LM_{\mathcal{G}}E_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} (t + \log N_{\mathcal{G}}(\delta/2) + \log N_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta/2) + \log_2 N^*)^{\alpha + \frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} (\log n)^\alpha (t + \log N_{\mathcal{G}}(\delta/2) + \log N_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta/2) + \log_2 N^*)^{\alpha + 1}, \\ W_n(t) &:= \mathbb{1}(\text{card}(\mathcal{R}) > 1) \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{G}}E_{\mathcal{G}}} \left( \max_{0 \leq l < L} \|\Delta_l\|_\infty \right) L_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} \sqrt{t + \log N_{\mathcal{G}}(\delta/2) + \log N_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta/2) + \log_2 N^*}. \end{aligned}$$

with  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}} := \{\theta(\cdot, r) : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}], \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ .

## SA-I.4 Local Polynomial Estimators

The following lemma provides the sufficient conditions for the results discussed in Section 4.1 in the paper.

**Lemma SA.1.** Consider the setup of Section 4.1, and assume the following regularity conditions hold:

- (a) Assumption B holds.  
(b)  $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \theta(\mathbf{x}; r)$  is  $(\mathbf{p} + 1)$ -times continuously differentiable with bounded  $(\mathbf{p} + 1)$ th partial derivatives uniformly over  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $r \in \mathcal{R}_l$ ,  $l = 1, 2$ , for some  $\mathbf{p} \geq 0$ .  
(c)  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-negative, Lipschitz, and compact supported.

If  $(nb^d)^{-1} \log n \rightarrow 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_2} |\mathbf{e}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x},r}| &= O((nb^d)^{-1} \log n) \quad a.s., \quad \text{and} \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_l} |\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n] - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r)| &= O(b^{1+p}) \quad a.s., \quad l = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

If, in addition,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ , then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_1} |\mathbf{e}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x},r}| = O((nb^d)^{-1} \log n + (nb^d)^{-3/2} (\log n)^{5/2}) \quad a.s.$$

Notice that aside for the condition  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$  for  $\mathcal{R}_1$ , the other assumptions in Theorem 3 are satisfied in this example.

The following two examples provides the omitted details concerning uniform Gaussian strong approximation rates obtained via other methods, which are discussed in Section 4.1 of the paper.

**Example SA.1** (Strong Approximation via [Rio \(1994\)](#)). Consider the setup of Section 4.1, and assume the following regularity conditions hold:

- (a)  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) = (\mathbf{x}_i, \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i, u_i))$ , where  $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, u_i)$  satisfies Assumption A and  $M_{\{\varphi\}} < \infty$ ,  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{TV}_{\{\varphi\}, \text{supp}(g) \times [0,1]} \lesssim \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\text{Supp}(g) \times [0,1]) < \infty$  and  $K_{\{\varphi\}} < \infty$ .
- (b)  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}_l}, \text{supp}(g)} \lesssim \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\text{Supp}(g)) < \infty$  and  $K_{\{\theta(\cdot, r): r \in \mathcal{R}_l\}} < \infty$ , for  $l = 1, 2$ .
- (c)  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-negative, Lipschitz, and compactly supported.

For  $\mathcal{R}_1$ , take  $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{h \circ \phi_Z^{-1} : h \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_1\}$ , where  $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_1 := \{(\mathbf{x}, u) \in \mathcal{X} \times [0,1] \mapsto g(\mathbf{x})\varphi(\mathbf{x}, u) - g(\mathbf{x})\theta(\mathbf{x}, \text{Id}) : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ ,  $\phi_Z$  is the Rosenblatt transformation ([Lemma SA.12](#)) based on the Lebesgue density of  $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, u_i)$ , and  $\mathcal{G} = \{b^{-d/2} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot - \frac{\mathbf{x}}{b}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  with  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{u}) K(\mathbf{u})$ . Then, using the notation introduced in the paper,

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\mathcal{H}_1} &= M_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\{\varphi\}} \lesssim b^{-d/2}, \\ \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_1} &= \frac{\overline{f}_Z^2}{\underline{f}_Z} (\mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}} + M_{\mathcal{G}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\text{Supp}(g))) \lesssim \frac{\overline{f}_Z^2}{\underline{f}_Z} b^{d/2-1}, \\ K_{\mathcal{H}_1} &\leq (2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \frac{\overline{f}_Z^{d+1}}{\underline{f}_Z^d} (K_{\mathcal{G}} + M_{\mathcal{G}} K_{\{\varphi\}} + M_{\mathcal{G}} K_{\mathcal{V}_1}) \lesssim (2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \frac{\overline{f}_Z^{d+1}}{\underline{f}_Z^d} b^{-d/2}, \\ N_{\mathcal{H}_1}(\varepsilon) &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-d-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{SA-2}$$

[Rio \(1994\)](#) implies that  $(X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H}_1) = (\sqrt{nb^d} \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x},r} : \mathbf{x} \in [0,1]^d, r \in \mathcal{R}_1)$  admits a uniform Gaussian strong approximation with rate

$$S_n(t) = C_{d,\varphi,1} \sqrt{\frac{d \overline{f}_Z^2}{\underline{f}_Z} (nb^{d+1})^{-1/(2d+2)} \sqrt{t + (d+1) \log n}} + C_{d,\varphi,1} \frac{(2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \overline{f}_Z^{d+1}}{\underline{f}_Z^d} (nb^d)^{-1/2} (t + (d+1) \log n),$$

where  $C_{d,\varphi,1}$  is a quantity that only depends on  $d$  and  $\varphi$ .

For  $\mathcal{R}_2$ , take  $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{h \circ \phi_Z^{-1} : h \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_2\}$ , where  $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}_2 := \{(\mathbf{x}, u) \in \mathcal{X} \times [0,1] \mapsto g(\mathbf{x})r \circ \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u) - g(\mathbf{x})\theta(\mathbf{x}, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}_2\}$ . Suppose  $\varphi$  is continuously differentiable with  $\min_{(\mathbf{x}, u) \in [0,1]^{d+1}} |\partial_u \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u)| > 0$ . Then, using

the notation introduced in the paper,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}_2} &= \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\{\varphi\}} \lesssim b^{-d/2}, \\ \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_2} &\leq \frac{\bar{f}_Z^2}{\underline{f}_Z} (\text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}, [0,1]^d} + \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\text{supp}(g))) \frac{\max_{(\mathbf{x}, u) \in [0,1]^{d+1}} |\partial_u \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u)|}{\min_{(\mathbf{x}, u) \in [0,1]^{d+1}} |\partial_u \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u)|} \lesssim \frac{\bar{f}_Z^2}{\underline{f}_Z} b^{d/2-1}, \\ \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{H}_2}(\varepsilon) &\lesssim \varepsilon^{-d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

*Rio (1994)* implies that  $(X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H}_2) = (\sqrt{nb^d} \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r} : \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d, r \in \mathcal{R}_2)$  admits a Gaussian strong approximation with rate function

$$\mathbf{S}_n(t) = C_{d, \varphi, 2} \sqrt{\frac{d \bar{f}_Z^2}{\underline{f}_Z} (nb^{d+1})^{-1/(2d+2)} \sqrt{t + (d+1) \log n}} + C_{d, \varphi, 2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{nb^d}} (t + (d+1) \log n),$$

where  $C_{d, \varphi, 2}$  is a quantity that only depends on  $d$  and  $\varphi$ .

The strong approximation rates stated in Section 4.1 now follow directly from the strong approximation results above.  $\blacktriangle$

**Example SA.2** (Strong Approximation via Theorem 1). Consider the setup of Section 4.1, and assume the following regularity conditions hold:

- (a)  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) = (\mathbf{x}_i, \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i, u_i))$ , where  $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, u_i)$  satisfies Assumption A and  $\mathbf{M}_{\{\varphi\}} < \infty$ ,  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\{\varphi\}, \text{supp}(g)} \lesssim \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\text{Supp}(g)) < \infty$ ,  $\mathbf{K}_{\{\varphi\}} < \infty$ , and  $\mathbf{L}_{\{\varphi\}} < \infty$ .
- (b)  $\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} |\theta(\mathbf{x}, r) - \theta(\mathbf{y}, r)| / \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty < \infty$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$ .
- (c)  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-negative, Lipschitz, and compactly supported.

Then, Equations (SA-2) hold, and

$$\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{H}_1} \lesssim \mathbf{L}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1} \frac{\bar{f}_Z}{\underline{f}_Z} \lesssim (\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\{\varphi\}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{L}_{\{\varphi\}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{L}_{V_1}) \frac{\bar{f}_Z}{\underline{f}_Z} \lesssim b^{-d/2-1} \frac{\bar{f}_Z}{\underline{f}_Z}.$$

Theorem 1 implies  $(X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H}_1) = (\sqrt{nb^d} \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r} : \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d, r \in \mathcal{R}_1)$  admits a uniform Gaussian strong approximation with rate

$$\mathbf{S}_n(t) = C_{d, \varphi, 3} \sqrt{\frac{d \bar{f}_Z^3}{\underline{f}_Z^2} (nb^{d+1})^{-1/(d+1)} \sqrt{t + (d+1) \log n}} + C_{d, \varphi, 3} \frac{(2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \bar{f}_Z^{d+1}}{\underline{f}_Z^d} (nb^d)^{-1/2} (t + (d+1) \log n).$$

where  $C_{d, \varphi, 3}$  is a quantity that only depends on  $d$  and  $\varphi$ .

The strong approximation rate stated in Section 4.1 in the paper now follow directly from the strong approximation result above.  $\blacktriangle$

**Example SA.3** (Strong Approximation via Theorem 3). Consider the setup of Section 4.1 and assume the following regularity conditions hold:

- (a) Assumption B holds.

(b)  $\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} |\theta(\mathbf{x}, r) - \theta(\mathbf{y}, r)| / \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty < \infty$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$ .

(c)  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-negative, Lipschitz, and compact supported.

Recall that  $\mathcal{G} = \{b^{-d/2} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}(\frac{\cdot - \mathbf{x}}{b}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ . Then, using the notation introduced in the paper,

$$\mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \lesssim b^{-d/2}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \lesssim b^{d/2}, \quad \mathbb{TV}_{\mathcal{G}} \lesssim b^{d/2-1}, \quad \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{G}} \lesssim b^{-d/2-1}, \quad \mathbb{N}_{\mathcal{G}}(\varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon^{-d-1}.$$

Theorem 3 implies that  $(R_n(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}_1) = (\sqrt{nb^d} \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r} : \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d, r \in \mathcal{R}_1)$  admits a uniform Gaussian strong approximation with rate function

$$\mathbb{S}_n(t) = \left( \frac{\bar{f}_X^3}{\underline{f}_X^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{2(d+2)}} \sqrt{d} (nb^d)^{-1/(d+2)} (t + (d+1) \log n)^{3/2} + (nb^d)^{-1/2} (t + (d+1) \log n).$$

If, in addition,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ , then Theorem 3 implies  $(R_n(g, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}_1) = (\sqrt{nb^d} \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r} : \mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d, r \in \mathcal{R}_1)$  admits a uniform Gaussian strong approximation with rate function

$$\mathbb{S}_n(t) = \left( \frac{\bar{f}_X^3}{\underline{f}_X^2} \right)^{\frac{d}{2(d+2)}} \sqrt{d} (nb^d)^{-1/(d+2)} (t + (d+1) \log n)^{5/2} + (nb^d)^{-1/2} (t + (d+1) \log n).$$

The strong approximation rate stated in Section 4.1 in the paper now follow directly from the strong approximation result above. ▲

## SA-I.5 Haar Basis Regression Estimators

The following lemma gives precise regularity conditions for Example 3 in the paper.

**Lemma SA.2** (Haar Basis Regression Estimators). *Consider the setup in Example 3, and assume the following regularity conditions hold:*

(a) Assumption B holds with  $[0, 1]^d$ .

(b)  $\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} |\theta(\mathbf{x}, r) - \theta(\mathbf{y}, r)| / \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty < \infty$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$ .

(c)  $K : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is non-negative, Lipschitz, and compact supported.

If  $\log(nL)L/n \rightarrow 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}^{-1}) \mathbf{T}_r| &= O(\log(nL)L/n) \quad a.s., \quad \text{and} \\ \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathbb{E}[\check{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n] - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r)| &= O\left(\max_{0 \leq l < L} \|\Delta_l\|_\infty\right) \quad a.s., \quad l = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

If, in addition,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ , then

$$\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_2} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1} - \mathbf{Q}^{-1}) \mathbf{T}_r| = O(\log(nL)L/n + (\log n)(\log(nL)L/n)^{3/2}) \quad a.s.$$

## SA-II General Empirical Process: Proofs

We first introduce quasi-dyadic expansions of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and the associated  $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  projection of functions onto the class of piecewise constant functions on those cells. This enables us to couple a general empirical process indexed by piecewise constant functions with a Gaussian process. We then present a sequence of technical lemmas that bound the different approximation error terms discussed in Section 3 with different levels of generality. The proofs of these preliminary lemmas can be found in the supplemental appendix.

### SA-II.1 Cell Expansions

**Definition SA.1** (Quasi-Dyadic Expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ). *A collection of Borel measurable sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}, \rho) = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 0 \leq j \leq K\}$ , is called a quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of depth  $K$  with respect to probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  if the following three conditions hold:*

1.  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k} \sqcup \mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}$ , for all  $0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 1 \leq j \leq K$ ,
2.  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{K,0}) = 1$ , and
3.  $\max_{0 \leq k < 2^K} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{0,k}) / \min_{0 \leq k < 2^K} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{0,k}) \leq \rho$ .

When  $\rho = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}, 1)$  is called a dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of depth  $K$  with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ .

This definition implies  $\frac{1}{2} \frac{2}{1+\rho} \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) / \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{2\rho}{1+\rho}$  for all  $0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 1 \leq j \leq K$ , since each  $\mathcal{C}_{j-1,l}$  is a disjoint union of  $2^{j-1}$  cells of the form  $\mathcal{C}_{0,k}$ , which implies the third condition in Definition SA.1. Furthermore, in the special case that  $\rho = 1$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})$ , that is, the child level cells are obtained by splitting the parent level cells *dyadically in probability*.

The next definition specializes the dyadic expansion scheme to axis-aligned splits.

**Definition SA.2** (Axis-Aligned Quasi-Dyadic Expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ). *A collection of Borel measurable sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_K(\mathbb{P}, \rho) = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 0 \leq j \leq K\}$ , is an axis-aligned quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of depth  $K$  with respect to probability measure  $\mathbb{P}$  if it can be constructed via the following procedure:*

1. Initialization ( $q = 0$ ): Take  $\mathcal{C}_{K-q,0} = \mathcal{X}$  where  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is the support of  $\mathbb{P}$ .
2. Iteration ( $q = 1, \dots, K$ ): Given  $\mathcal{C}_{K-l,k}$  for  $0 \leq l < q, 0 \leq k < 2^l$ , take  $s = (q \bmod d) + 1$ , and construct  $\mathcal{C}_{K-q,2k} = \mathcal{C}_{K-q+1,k} \cap \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbf{e}_s^\top \mathbf{x} \leq c_{K-q+1,k}\}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{K-q,2k+1} = \mathcal{C}_{K-q+1,k} \cap \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbf{e}_s^\top \mathbf{x} > c_{K-q+1,k}\}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{K-q,2k}) / \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{K-q+1,k}) \in [\frac{1}{1+\rho}, \frac{\rho}{1+\rho}]$  for all  $0 \leq k < 2^{q-1}$ . Continue until  $(\mathcal{C}_{0,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^K)$  has been constructed.

When  $\rho = 1$  and  $\mathbb{P}$  is continuous,  $\mathcal{A}_K(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  is unique.

### SA-II.2 Projection onto Piecewise Constant Functions

For a quasi-dyadic expansion  $\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$ , the mean square projection from  $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to the associated span of the terminal cells  $\mathcal{E}_K := \text{Span}\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}} : 0 \leq k < 2^K\}$  is

$$\Pi_0(\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}, \rho))[h] := \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^K} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}}}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{0,k})} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}} h(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{u}), \quad h \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (\text{SA-3})$$

$\Pi_0(\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}, \rho))[h]$  is a linear combination of a Haar-type basis, which gives the following orthogonal decomposition.

**Lemma SA.3.** For any  $h \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\Pi_0(\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}, \rho))[h] = \beta_{K,0}(h)e_{K,0} + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq K} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h)\tilde{e}_{j,k},$$

where

$$\beta_{j,k}(h) := \frac{1}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j,k}} h(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{u}), \quad \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) := \beta_{j-1,2k}(h) - \beta_{j-1,2k+1}(h),$$

$$e_{j,k} := \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{j,k}}, \quad \tilde{e}_{j,k} := \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})} e_{j-1,2k} - \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})} e_{j-1,2k+1},$$

for  $0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 1 \leq j \leq K$ .

To save notation, we will use  $\Pi_0$  as a short hand for  $\Pi_0(\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}, \rho))$  in what follows. In the special case of axis aligned quasi-dyadic expansion, we use  $\Pi_{\mathcal{A}_{K,d}}$  as a short hand for  $\Pi_0(\mathcal{A}_K(\mathbb{P}, \rho))$ .

### SA-II.3 Strong Approximation Constructions

Suppose  $(\tilde{\xi}_{j,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 1 \leq j \leq K)$  are i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables. Take  $F_{(j,k),m}$  to be the cumulative distribution function of  $(S_{j,k} - mp_{j,k})/\sqrt{mp_{j,k}(1-p_{j,k})}$ , where  $p_{j,k} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})$  and  $S_{j,k}$  is a  $\text{Bin}(m, p_{j,k})$  random variable, and  $G_{(j,k),m}(t) = \sup\{x : F_{(j,k),m}(x) \leq t\}$ . We define  $U_{j,k}, \tilde{U}_{j,k}$ 's via the following iterative scheme:

1. *Initialization:* Take  $U_{K,0} = n$ .
2. *Iteration:* Suppose we have define  $U_{l,k}$  for  $j < l \leq K, 0 \leq k < 2^{K-l}$ , then solve for  $U_{j,k}$ 's such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}_{j,k} &= \sqrt{U_{j,k}p_{j,k}(1-p_{j,k})} G_{(j,k),U_{j,k}} \circ \Phi(\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}), \\ \tilde{U}_{j,k} &= (1-p_{j,k})U_{j-1,2k} - p_{j,k}U_{j-1,2k+1} = U_{j-1,2k} - p_{j,k}U_{j,k}, \\ U_{j-1,2k} + U_{j-1,2k+1} &= U_{j,k}, \quad 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Continue till we have defined  $U_{0,k}$  for  $0 \leq k < 2^K$ .

Then  $\{U_{j,k} : 0 \leq j \leq K, 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}\}$  have the same joint distribution as  $\{\sum_{i=1}^n e_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i) : 0 \leq j \leq K, 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}\}$ . By Vorob'ev–Berkes–Philipp theorem (Dudley, 2014, Theorem 1.31),  $\{\tilde{\xi}_{j,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 1 \leq j \leq K\}$  can be constructed on a possibly enlarged probability space such that the previously constructed  $U_{j,k}$  satisfies  $U_{j,k} = \sum_{i=1}^n e_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i)$  almost surely for all  $0 \leq j \leq K, 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}$ . We will show  $\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}$ 's can be given as a Brownian bridge indexed by  $\tilde{e}_{j,k}$ 's.

**Lemma SA.4.** Suppose  $\mathcal{H}$  is a class of real-valued pointwise measurable functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $M_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$  and  $J(1, \mathcal{H}, M_{\mathcal{H}}) < \infty$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_K$  is a quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of depth  $K$  with respect to  $\mathbb{P}_X$ . Then,  $\mathcal{H} \cup \Pi_0 \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{E}_K$  is  $\mathbb{P}_X$ -pregaussian.

Then by Skorohod Embedding lemma (Dudley, 2014, Lemma 3.35), on a possibly enlarged probability

space, we can construct a Brownian bridge  $(Z_n^X(h) : h \in \mathcal{H})$  that satisfies

$$\tilde{\xi}_{j,k} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})}{\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}} Z_n^X(\tilde{e}_{j,k}),$$

for  $0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 1 \leq j \leq K$ . Moreover, call

$$V_{j,k} := \sqrt{n} Z_n^X(e_{j,k}), \quad \tilde{V}_{j,k} := \sqrt{n} Z_n^X(\tilde{e}_{j,k}), \quad \tilde{\xi}_{j,k} := \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})}{\sqrt{n\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}} \tilde{V}_{j,k}.$$

for  $0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 1 \leq j \leq K$ . Notice that for all  $h \in \mathcal{E}_K$ , we have

$$\sqrt{n} X_n(h) = \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \tilde{U}_{j,k}, \quad \sqrt{n} Z_n^X(h) = \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \tilde{V}_{j,k}.$$

The difference between  $X_n(h)$  and  $Z_n^X(h)$  will rely on the coefficient  $\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h)$  and the coupling between  $\tilde{U}_{j,k}$  and  $\tilde{V}_{j,k}$ , which is the essence of Theorem 2.1 in [Rio \(1994\)](#). Although Theorem 2.1 in [Rio \(1994\)](#) is stated for i.i.d uniformly distributed on  $[0, 1]$  random variables, the underlying process only depends through the counts of the random variables taking values in each interval of the form  $[k2^{-j}, (k+1)2^{-j})$ , which have the same distribution as the counts of  $\mathbf{x}_i$ 's in  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k}$ 's. Hence, we have a direct corollary of Theorem 2.1 in [Rio \(1994\)](#) as follows:

**Lemma SA.5.** *Given a dyadic expansion  $\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}_X, 1)$ , for any  $g \in \mathcal{E}_K$  and any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sqrt{n} |X_n(g) - Z_n^X(g)| \geq 24 \sqrt{\|g\|_{\mathcal{E}_K}^2} x + 4 \sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{\{g\}} x} \right) \leq 2 \exp(-x),$$

where  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{E}_K}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}^2(g)$ , and

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{F}} = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \min \left\{ \sup_{(j,k)} \left[ \sum_{l < j} (j-l)(j-l+1) 2^{l-j} \sum_{m: \mathcal{C}_{l,m} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \tilde{\beta}_{l,m}^2(f) \right], \|f\|_{\infty}^2 K \right\}.$$

The above lemma relies on coupling of  $\text{Bin}(m, 1/2)$  random variables with Gaussian random variables. The coupling also holds for  $\text{Bin}(m, p)$  with the error term only depending on how far away  $p$  is bounded away from 0 and 1:

**Lemma SA.6.** *Suppose  $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$  where  $0 < \underline{p} < p < \bar{p} < 1$ . Then there exists a standard Gaussian random variable  $Z \sim N(0, 1)$  and constants  $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$  only depending on  $\underline{p}$  and  $\bar{p}$  such that whenever the event  $A = \{|X - np| \leq c_1 n\}$  occurs and  $c_0 \sqrt{n} \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |X - np - \sqrt{np(1-p)}Z| &\leq c_2 Z^2 + c_3, \\ |X - np| &\leq \frac{1}{c_0} + 2\sqrt{np(1-p)}|Z|. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we can take  $c_0 > 0$  to be the solution of

$$60c_0\bar{p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{1-\underline{p}}{\underline{p}}} \right)^3 \exp \left( 2\sqrt{\frac{1-\underline{p}}{\underline{p}}} c_0 \right) + 60c_0(1-\underline{p}) \left( \sqrt{\frac{\bar{p}}{1-\bar{p}}} \right)^3 = 1,$$

and take  $c_1 = 15c_0\sqrt{p(1-p)}$ ,  $c_2 = 1/(15c_0)$ ,  $c_3 = 1/c_0$  and  $Z$  can be taken via quantile transformation, that is, define  $F(x) = \mathbb{P}(X - np < \sqrt{np(1-p)}x)$  and let  $\Phi$  be the cumulative distribution function of a  $N(0, 1)$  random variable, then  $Z$  can be defined via  $Z := \Phi^{-1} \circ F\left(\frac{(X - np)/\sqrt{np(1-p)}}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}}\right)$ .

This enables the following strong approximation for the quasi-dyadic case:

**Lemma SA.7.** *Given a quasi-dyadic expansion  $\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}_X, \rho)$ ,  $\rho > 1$ , for any  $g \in \mathcal{E}_K$  and any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\sqrt{n}|X_n(g) - Z_n^X(g)| \geq c_\rho\sqrt{\|g\|_{\mathcal{E}_K}^2 x} + c_\rho\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{\{g\}}x}\right) \\ \leq 2\exp(-x) + 2^{K+2}\exp(-c_\rho n 2^{-K}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{E}_K}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}^2(g)$ ,  $c_\rho$  is a constant that only depends on  $\rho$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{\{g\}}$  is defined in Lemma SA.5.

## SA-II.4 Meshing Error

For  $0 < \delta \leq 1$ , consider the  $(\delta\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}})$ -net of  $(\mathcal{H}, e_{\mathbb{P}})$ , with cardinality no larger than  $N_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta)$ : define  $\pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} : \mathcal{H} \mapsto \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\|\pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}(h) - h\|_{\mathbb{P}_X, 2} \leq \delta\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}$  for all  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ .

**Lemma SA.8.** *For all  $t > 0$  and  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\|X_n - X_n \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{H}} > C\mathbf{F}_n(t, \delta)\right] &\leq \exp(-t), \\ \mathbb{P}\left[\|Z_n^X \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}} > C(\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}J(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}) + \delta\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}\sqrt{t})\right] &\leq \exp(-t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is a universal constant.

## SA-II.5 L2 Projection Error

For  $X_n$ ,  $Z_n^X$ , and  $\Pi_0$  as defined above, and for  $\mathcal{H}_\delta$  a  $\delta$ -net of  $(\mathcal{H}, e_{\mathbb{P}_X})$  with cardinality no greater than  $N_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta)$ , the following lemma controls the mean square projection onto piecewise constant functions.

**Lemma SA.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}_X, \rho) = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 0 \leq j \leq K\}$ ,  $\rho \geq 1$  be a quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of depth  $K$ . Define*

$$\mathcal{V} = \cup_{0 \leq k < 2^K} (\mathcal{C}_{0,k} - \mathcal{C}_{0,k}).$$

Then for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\|X_n - X_n \circ \Pi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} > \sqrt{4\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}t} + \frac{4\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}{3\sqrt{n}}t\right] &\leq 2N_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta)e^{-t}, \\ \mathbb{P}\left[\|Z_n^X - Z_n^X \circ \Pi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} > \sqrt{4\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}t}\right] &\leq 2N_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta)e^{-t}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} =: \min\{2\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}, \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty\} \left(\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x})\right)^2 2^K \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{V})\|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \quad \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} =: \min\{2\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}, \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty\}.$$



In particular, if  $\mathbf{x}_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Unif}([0, 1]^d)$  and the cells  $\mathcal{A}_K(\mathbb{P}_X, 1)$  are axis-aligned dyadic expansion of depth  $K$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\|X_n - X_n \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{A}_{Kd}}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} > \sqrt{4d \min\{2M_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, L_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} 2^{-K}\} 2^{-K} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} t} + \frac{4 \min\{2M_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, L_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} 2^{-K}\}}{3\sqrt{n}} t\right] &\leq 2N_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}(\delta) e^{-t}, \\ \mathbb{P}\left[\|Z_n^X - Z_n^X \circ \Pi_{\mathcal{A}_{Kd}}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} > \sqrt{4d \min\{2M_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, L_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} 2^{-K}\} 2^{-K} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} t}\right] &\leq 2N_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}(\delta) e^{-t}, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $t > 0$ .

## SA-II.6 Strong Approximation Errors

The next lemma controls the strong approximation error for projected processes.

**Lemma SA.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}_X, 1) = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}, 0 \leq j \leq K\}$  be a dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of depth  $K$  as in Definition SA.1. For each  $1 \leq j \leq K$ , define*

$$\mathcal{U}_j := \cup_{0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}} (\mathcal{C}_{j-1, 2k+1} - \mathcal{C}_{j-1, 2k}).$$

Suppose  $X_n, Z_n^X$  and  $\Pi_0$  are as defined above and  $\mathcal{H}_\delta$  is a  $\delta$ -net of  $(\mathcal{H}, e_{\mathbb{P}_X})$  with cardinality no greater than  $N_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}(\delta)$ . Then for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|X_n \circ \Pi_0 - Z_n^X \circ \Pi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} > 48 \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{R}_K(\mathcal{H}_\delta)}{n}} t + 4 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}{n}} t\right] \leq 2N_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}(\delta) e^{-t},$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_K(\mathcal{H}_\delta)$  is defined to be

$$\sum_{j=1}^K \min\{M_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \|U_j\|_\infty L_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\} 2^{K-j} \min\left\{\left(\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f(\mathbf{x})\right)^2 2^{2(K-j)} \|U_j\|_\infty \mathbf{m}(U_j) \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \|U_j\|_\infty L_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, E_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\right\}.$$

**Lemma SA.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}_K(\mathbb{P}_X, \rho) = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq j \leq K, 0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}\}$ ,  $\rho > 1$  be an approximate dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of depth  $K$  as in Definition SA.1. For each  $1 \leq j \leq K$ , define*

$$\mathcal{U}_j := \cup_{0 \leq k < 2^{K-j}} (\mathcal{C}_{j-1, 2k+1} - \mathcal{C}_{j-1, 2k}).$$

Suppose  $\mathcal{H}$  is a class of real-valued pointwise measurable functions in  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $M_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$  and  $J(1, \mathcal{H}, M_{\mathcal{H}}) < \infty$ . Suppose  $X_n, Z_n^X, \Pi_0, \mathcal{H}_\delta$  and  $\mathcal{R}_K$  are defined as in Lemma SA.10. Then for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|X_n \circ \Pi_0 - Z_n^X \circ \Pi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} > C_\rho \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{R}_K(\mathcal{H}_\delta)}{n}} t + C_\rho \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}{n}} t\right] \leq 2N_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}(\delta) e^{-t} + 2^K \exp(-C_\rho n 2^{-K}),$$

where  $C_\rho$  is a constant only depending on  $\rho$ .

## SA-II.7 Rosenblatt Reduction

**Lemma SA.12.** Suppose  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_d)$  is a random variable taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with Lebesgue density  $f_X$  supported on  $[0, 1]^d$ . Define the Rosenblatt transformation  $\phi_X$  based on density of  $\mathbf{x}_i$  by

$$\phi_X(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{P}(X_1 \leq x_1) \\ \mathbb{P}(X_2 \leq x_2 | X_1 = x_1) \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{P}(X_d \leq x_d | X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_{d-1} = x_{d-1}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in [0, 1]^d.$$

Define  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} := \{h \circ \phi_X^{-1}\}$ . Suppose  $\mathbf{u}_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Unif}([0, 1]^d)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} &= \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{H}}, & \mathbb{L}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} &\leq \mathbb{L}_{\mathcal{H}} \frac{\bar{f}_X}{\underline{f}_X}, & \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} &\leq \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}} \frac{\bar{f}_X^2}{\underline{f}_X}, & \mathbb{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} &\leq \mathbb{K}_{\mathcal{H}} (2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \frac{\bar{f}_X^{d+1}}{\underline{f}_X^d} \\ \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}}, & \mathbb{N}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}(\varepsilon) &= \mathbb{N}_{\mathcal{H}}(\varepsilon), \forall 0 < \varepsilon < 1. \end{aligned}$$

## SA-II.8 Proof of Lemma SA.3

First, we show that  $\{e_{Kd,0}\} \cup \{\tilde{e}_{j,k} : 1 \leq j \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}\}$  is an orthogonal basis. For notational simplicity, denote  $\mathcal{J} = \{(j, k) : 1 \leq j \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}\}$ . Let  $(j, k) \in \mathcal{J}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle e_{Kd,0}, \tilde{e}_{j,k} \rangle &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})} e_{j-1,2k}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})} e_{j-1,2k+1}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})} - \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $(j_1, k_1), (j_2, k_2) \in \mathcal{J}$ .

**Case 1:**  $j_1 = j_2$  and  $k_1 \neq k_2$ , then  $\tilde{e}_{j_1, k_1}$  and  $\tilde{e}_{j_2, k_2}$  have different support, hence  $\langle \tilde{e}_{j_1, k_1}, \tilde{e}_{j_2, k_2} \rangle = 0$ .

**Case 2:**  $j_1 \neq j_2$  and w.l.o.g. we will assume  $j_1 < j_2$ . By (1) in Definition SA.1, either  $\mathcal{C}_{j_1, k_1} \cap \mathcal{C}_{j_2, k_2} = \emptyset$  or  $\mathcal{C}_{j_1, k_1} \subset \mathcal{C}_{j_2, k_2}$ . In the first case, we also have  $\langle \tilde{e}_{j_1, k_1}, \tilde{e}_{j_2, k_2} \rangle = 0$ . In the second case, using (1) in Definition SA.1 again, either  $\mathcal{C}_{j_1, k_1} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j_2-1, 2k_2}$  or  $\mathcal{C}_{j_1, k_1} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j_2-1, 2k_2+1}$ . W.l.o.g we assume  $\mathcal{C}_{j_1, k_1} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j_2-1, 2k_2}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tilde{e}_{j_1, k_1}, \tilde{e}_{j_2, k_2} \rangle &= \langle \tilde{e}_{j_1, k_1}, \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j_2-1, 2k_2})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j_2, k_2})} e_{j_2-1, 2k_2} \rangle \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j_2-1, 2k_2})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j_2, k_2})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j_1-1, 2k_1+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j_1, k_1})} e_{j_1-1, 2k_1}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j_1-1, 2k_1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j_1, k_1})} e_{j_1-1, 2k_1+1}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that  $\{e_{Kd,0}\} \cup \{\tilde{e}_{j,k} : 1 \leq j \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}\}$  is an orthogonal basis for  $\mathcal{E}_{Kd} \subseteq L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and hence

$$\Pi_0 h = \frac{\langle h, e_{Kd,0} \rangle}{\langle e_{Kd,0}, e_{Kd,0} \rangle} e_{Kd,0} + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \frac{\langle h, \tilde{e}_{j,k} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{e}_{j,k}, \tilde{e}_{j,k} \rangle} \tilde{e}_{j,k}, \quad \forall h \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

The coefficients are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\langle h, \tilde{e}_{j,k} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{e}_{j,k}, \tilde{e}_{j,k} \rangle} &:= \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h(\mathbf{u}) \tilde{e}_{j,k}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{e}_{j,k}(\mathbf{u}) \tilde{e}_{j,k}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u}} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^{-1} \beta_{j-1,2k}(h) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^{-1} \beta_{j-1,2k+1}(h)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})^2 \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^{-2} + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})^2 \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^{-2}} \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^{-1} \beta_{j-1,2k}(h) - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^{-1} \beta_{j-1,2k+1}(h)}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^{-1} + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^{-1}} \\
&= \beta_{j-1,2k}(h) - \beta_{j-1,2k+1}(h) = \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h), \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{\langle h, e_{Kd,0} \rangle}{\langle e_{Kd,0}, e_{Kd,0} \rangle} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{Kd,0})^{-1} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{Kd,0}} h(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{u}) = \beta_{Kd,0}(h).$$

This proves the claim.  $\square$

### SA-II.9 Proof of Lemma SA.4

First, we will show that  $\Pi_0 \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{E}_{Kd}$  is a VC-type of class. Notice that all  $h \in \Pi_0 \mathcal{H} \cap \mathcal{E}_{Kd}$  can be written in the form  $\sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}} c_k e_{0,k}$  with  $c_k \in [-M_{\mathcal{H}}, M_{\mathcal{H}}]$ . Denote  $D = 2^{Kd}$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\|\sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}} c_k e_{0,k} - \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}} d_k e_{0,k}\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon M_{\mathcal{H}}$  if  $|c_k - d_k| \leq \varepsilon M_{\mathcal{H}}/D$  for all  $0 \leq k < D$ . Hence

$$\sup_Q N(\Pi_0 \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{E}_{Kd}, e_Q, \varepsilon M_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq \left(\frac{D}{\varepsilon}\right)^D, \quad \forall 0 < \varepsilon \leq 1,$$

where sup is taken over all discrete measures on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Moreover, we have assumed  $J(1, \mathcal{H}, M_{\mathcal{H}}) < \infty$ . By Kolmogorov's extension theorem, there exists a mean-zero Gaussian  $Z_n^X$  indexed by  $\mathcal{H} \cup \Pi_0 \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{E}_{Kd}$  with the same covariance structure as  $X_n$ . Since  $M_{\mathcal{H}} < \infty$ ,  $\mathcal{H} \cup \Pi_0 \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{E}_{Kd}$  is totally bounded for  $e_{\mathbb{P}_X}$ . By separability of  $\mathcal{H}$  and Corollary 2.2.9 in [van der Vaart and Wellner \(2013\)](#), there exists a version of  $Z_n^X$  with uniformly  $e_{\mathbb{P}_X}$ -continuous sample path. Hence  $\mathcal{H} \cup \Pi_0 \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{E}_{Kd}$  is pre-Gaussian.  $\square$

### SA-II.10 Proof of Lemma SA.5

Take  $w_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $I_{j,k} := [k2^{-j}, (k+1)2^{-j}]$ ,  $0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq Kd$ . Take  $B$  to be a Brownian bridge on  $[0, 1]$ , that is, there exists a standard Wiener process  $W$  such that  $B(t) = W(t) - tW(1)$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Define

$$v_{j,k} := \sqrt{n} \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}(t \in I_{j,k}) dB(t), \quad \tilde{v}_{j,k} := v_{j-1,2k} - v_{j-1,2k+1}.$$

Take  $F_m$  to be the cumulative distribution function of  $(S_m - \frac{1}{2}m)/\sqrt{m/4}$ , where  $S_m$  is a  $\text{Bin}(m, 1/2)$  random variable, and  $G_m(t) = \sup\{x : F_m(x) \leq t\}$ . Define  $u_{j,k}$ 's and  $\tilde{u}_{j,k}$ 's, again via the iterative quantile transformation technique by:

1. *Initialization:* Take  $u_{Kd,0} = n$ .

2. *Iteration:* Suppose we have define  $u_{l,k}$  for  $0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-l}, j < l \leq Kd$ , then solve for  $u_{j,k}$ 's such that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{u}_{j,k} &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{U_{j,k}} G_{U_{j,k}} \circ \Phi(\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}), \\ \tilde{u}_{j,k} &= \frac{1}{2} u_{j-1,2k} - \frac{1}{2} u_{j-1,2k+1} = u_{j-1,2k} - \frac{1}{2} u_{j,k}, \\ u_{j-1,2k} + u_{j-1,2k+1} &= u_{j,k}, \quad 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}.\end{aligned}$$

Continue till we have defined  $u_{0,k}$  for  $0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}$ .

Then  $u_{j,k}$ 's have the same joint distribution as  $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(w_i \in I_{j,k})$ 's. Hence by Skorohod Embedding lemma (Dudley, 2014, Lemma 3.35), on a rich enough probability space, we can take  $(B(t) : 0 \leq t \leq 1)$  such that  $u_{j,k} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(w_i \in I_{j,k})$  almost surely, for all  $0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}, 0 \leq j \leq Kd$ .

Moreover, distribution of the process  $\{(X_n(h), Z_n^X(h)) : h \in \mathcal{E}_{Kd}\}$  is the same as distribution of the process

$$\left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \tilde{u}_{j,k}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \tilde{v}_{j,k} \right), \quad h \in \mathcal{E}_{Kd},$$

since  $\{(\tilde{u}_{j,k}, \tilde{v}_{j,k}) : 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}, 1 \leq j \leq Kd\}$  and  $\{(\tilde{U}_{j,k}, \tilde{V}_{j,k}) : 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}, 1 \leq j \leq Kd\}$  have the same joint distribution and

$$(X_n(h), Z_n^X(h)) = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \tilde{U}_{j,k}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \tilde{V}_{j,k} \right), \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{E}_{Kd}.$$

Following Section 3 in Rio (1994), we choose either  $p_i = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{Kd} + \frac{1}{i(i+1)} \right)$  or  $p_i = \frac{1}{i(i+1)}$  and Theorem 2.1 in Rio (1994), we have for any  $h \in \mathcal{E}_{Kd}$ , for any  $t > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-t)$ ,

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \tilde{u}_{j,k} - \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \tilde{v}_{j,k} \right| \leq 24 \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}^2(h) t} + \sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{\{h\}} t}.$$

Hence for any  $h \in \mathcal{E}_{Kd}$ , for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sqrt{n} |X_n(h) - Z_n^X(h)| \geq 24 \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}^2(h) t} + \sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{\{h\}} t} \right) \leq 2 \exp(-t).$$

□

## SA-II.11 Proof of Lemma SA.6

Take  $X_j \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Bern}(p)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$  where  $0 < \underline{p} < p < \bar{p} < 1$ . Take  $\xi_j = (X_j - p)/\sqrt{np(1-p)}$  and  $S_n = \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j$ . Then for any  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} L(h) &:= \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} [|\xi_j|^3 \exp(|h\xi_j|)] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{X_j - p}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right)^3 \exp \left( h \frac{X_j - p}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right) \right] \\ &= np \left( \frac{1-p}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right)^3 \exp \left( h \frac{1-p}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right) - n(1-p) \left( \frac{p}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right)^3 \exp \left( -h \frac{p}{\sqrt{np(1-p)}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Take  $c_0 > 0$  such that

$$60c_0\bar{p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{\underline{p}}} \right)^3 \exp \left( 2\sqrt{\frac{1-p}{\underline{p}}}c_0 \right) + 60c_0(1-p) \left( \sqrt{\frac{\bar{p}}{1-\bar{p}}} \right)^3 = 1.$$

Then for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lambda = c_0\sqrt{n}$ ,

$$60\lambda L(2\lambda) \leq 1.$$

Then by Lemma 2 in [Sakhanenko \(1996\)](#), whenever  $c_0\sqrt{n} \geq 1$  and the event  $A = \{|S_n| < c_0\sqrt{n}\}$  occurs,

$$|S_n - Z| \leq \frac{1}{c_0\sqrt{n}} + \frac{S_n^2}{60c_0\sqrt{n}}.$$

Moreover, by its proof,  $Z$  can be taken such that  $Z = \Phi^{-1} \circ F(S_n)$ . We then proceed as in the proof for Lemma 2 in [Brown et al. \(2010\)](#), where they show for each the coupling exits with  $c_0$  to  $c_3$  not depending on  $n$ . They did not give explicit dependency of  $c_0$  to  $c_3$ , however. Take  $c_1$  such that  $c_1/(60c_0) < 1/2$ . In particular, we can take  $c_1 = 15c_0$ . Then on the event  $B = \{|S_n| < c_1\sqrt{n}\}$ ,

$$|S_n - Z| \leq \frac{1}{c_0\sqrt{n}} + |S_n| \frac{c_1\sqrt{n}}{60c_0\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{1}{c_0\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{2}|S_n|.$$

Hence by triangle inequality,  $|S_n| \leq \frac{2}{c_0\sqrt{n}} + 2|Z|$ , and

$$|S_n - Z| \leq \frac{1}{c_0\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{60c_0\sqrt{n}} \left( \frac{2}{c_0\sqrt{n}} + 2|Z| \right)^2 \leq \frac{2}{c_0\sqrt{n}} + \frac{2}{15c_0\sqrt{n}}|Z|^2.$$

Recall  $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$ , whenever the event  $C = \{|X - np| < c_1n\sqrt{\underline{p}(1-\bar{p})}\}$  occurs and  $c_0\sqrt{n} \geq 1$ ,

$$\left| X - np - \sqrt{np(1-p)}Z \right| \leq \frac{2}{c_0}\sqrt{p(1-p)} + \frac{2}{15c_0}\sqrt{p(1-p)}|Z|^2 \leq \frac{1}{c_0} + \frac{Z^2}{15c_0}.$$

Moreover,  $|S_n| \leq \frac{2}{c_0\sqrt{n}} + 2|Z|$  implies

$$|X - np| \leq \frac{1}{c_0} + 2\sqrt{np(1-p)}|Z|.$$

□

## SA-II.12 Proof of Lemma SA.7

For notational simplicity, denote  $\mathcal{J} = \{(j, k) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} : 1 \leq j \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}\}$  and  $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I} \cup \{(0, k) : 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}\}$ .

### Part 1: Construction of Strong Approximation

The construction will be essentially the same as in Section SA-II.3. By Lemma SA.4, there exists a mean-zero Gaussian process  $(Z_n^X(h) : h \in \mathcal{H} \cup \Pi_0 \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{E}_{Kd})$  with almost sure continuous path and the same covariance structure as  $(X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H} \cup \Pi_0 \mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{E}_{Kd})$ . For each  $(j, k) \in \mathcal{J}$ , we will take  $V_{j,k} = \sqrt{n} Z_n^X(e_{j,k})$  and  $\tilde{V}_{j,k} = \sqrt{n} Z_n^X(\tilde{e}_{j,k})$ . By checking the covariance structures, we can show that if we define  $\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}$  such that  $\tilde{V}_{j,k} = \sqrt{n \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^2}} \tilde{\xi}_{j,k}$ , then  $\tilde{\xi}_{j,k} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ ,  $(j, k) \in \mathcal{J}$ . Take  $F_{(j,k),m}$  to be the cumulative distribution function of  $(S_{j,k} - mp_{j,k})/\sqrt{mp_{j,k}(1-p_{j,k})}$ , where  $p_{j,k} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})$  and  $S_{j,k}$  is a  $\text{Bin}(m, p_{j,k})$  random variable. Define  $G_{(j,k),m}(t) = \sup\{x : F_{(j,k),m}(x) \leq t\}$ .

We define  $U_{j,k}$ ,  $(j, k) \in \mathcal{J}$  via the following iterative scheme:

1. *Initialization:* Take  $U_{Kd,0} = n$ .
2. *Iteration:* Suppose we have define  $U_{l,k}$  for  $j < l \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-l}$ , then solve for  $U_{j,k}$ 's such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{U}_{j,k} &= G_{(j,k),U_{j,k}} \circ \Phi(\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}), \\ \tilde{U}_{j,k} &= \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})U_{j-1,2k} - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})U_{j-1,2k+1} = U_{j-1,2k} - \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})U_{j,k}, \\ U_{j-1,2k} + U_{j-1,2k+1} &= U_{j,k}, \quad 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Continue till we have defined  $U_{0,k}$  for  $0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}$ .

$\{\tilde{U}_{j,k} : (j, k) \in \mathcal{J}\}$  have the same joint distribution as  $\{\sum_{i=1}^n e_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i) : (j, k) \in \mathcal{J}\}$ . By Skorohod Embedding lemma (Dudley, 2014, Lemma 3.35),  $Z_n^X$  can be constructed on a possibly enlarged probability space such that the previously constructed  $U_{j,k}$  satisfies  $U_{j,k} = \sum_{i=1}^n e_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i)$  for all  $(j, k) \in \mathcal{J}$ . Take  $\bar{p} = \rho$  and  $\underline{p} = \rho^{-1}$ . Take  $c_0$  to be the positive solution of

$$60c_0\bar{p} \left( \sqrt{\frac{1-\underline{p}}{\underline{p}}} \right)^3 \exp \left( 2\sqrt{\frac{1-\underline{p}}{\underline{p}}}c_0 \right) + 60c_0(1-\underline{p}) \left( \sqrt{\frac{\bar{p}}{1-\bar{p}}} \right)^3 = 1,$$

and take  $c_1 = 15c_0\sqrt{\underline{p}(1-\bar{p})}$ ,  $c_2 = 1/(15c_0)$  and  $c_3 = 1/c_0$ . Define  $A = \{|\tilde{U}_{j,k}| \leq c_1U_{j,k} \text{ for all } (j, k) \in \mathcal{J}\}$ . Notice that we can always take  $c_1 \leq 1$ , since  $|\tilde{U}_{j,k}| \leq U_{j,k}$  a.s.. Using Lemma SA.6, whenever  $A$  occurs,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \tilde{U}_{j,k} - \sqrt{U_{j,k} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^2}} \tilde{\xi}_{j,k} \right| &< c_2\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}^2 + c_3, \\ \left| \tilde{U}_{j,k} \right| &\leq 1/c_0 + 2\sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^2}} U_{j,k} |\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}|, \quad \forall (j, k) \in \mathcal{J}. \end{aligned} \tag{SA-4}$$

Now, we bound  $\mathbb{P}(A^c)$ . By Chernoff's inequality for Binomial distribution, for all  $(j, k) \in \mathcal{I}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(U_{j,k} \leq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[U_{j,k}]\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mathbb{E}[U_{j,k}]}{8}\right).$$

Moreover,  $\rho^{-1}n2^{j-Kd} \leq \mathbb{E}[U_{j,k}] \leq \rho n2^{j-Kd}$ . Hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left(U_{j,k} \leq \rho^{-1}n2^{j-Kd}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\rho^{-1}n2^{j-Kd}\right), \quad \forall (j, k) \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Using Hoeffding's inequality and the fact that  $\tilde{U}_{j,k} = U_{j-1,2k} - \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}U_{j,k} = U_{j-1,2k} - \mathbb{E}[U_{j-1,2k}|U_{j,k}]$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{U}_{j,k}\right| \geq c_1 U_{j,k} \mid U_{j,k} \geq \frac{1}{2}\rho^{-1}n2^{-Kd+j}\right) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{c_1^2 n2^{-Kd+j}}{3\rho}\right).$$

Putting together and using union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A^c) &= \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{U}_{j,k}\right| > c_1 U_{j,k}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{P}\left(U_{j,k} \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho^{-1}n2^{-Kd+j}\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\tilde{U}_{j,k}\right| \geq c_1 U_{j,k} \mid U_{j,k} \geq \frac{1}{2}\rho^{-1}n2^{-Kd+j}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \exp(-\rho^{-1}n2^{j-Kd}) + 2 \exp\left(-\frac{c_1^2 n2^{-Kd+j}}{3\rho}\right) \\ &\leq 4 \cdot 2^{Kd} \exp\left(-\min\left\{\frac{c_1^2}{3} \wedge 1\right\} \rho^{-1}n2^{-Kd}\right). \end{aligned}$$

## Part 2: Bounding Strong Approximation Error

Next we will show that the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [Rio \(1994\)](#) still goes through for *approximate dyadic scheme*. In other words, we will show that the *approximate dyadic scheme* gives essentially the same Gaussian coupling rates as the *exact dyadic scheme*. Using the same notation as in [Rio \(1994\)](#) and define  $\tilde{p}_{j,k} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})/\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})$  for notational simplicity, for  $g \in L_2(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R})$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} X(g) &= \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g) \tilde{U}_{j,k}, \\ Y(g) &= \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g) \sqrt{U_{j,k} \tilde{p}_{j,k} (1 - \tilde{p}_{j,k})} \tilde{\xi}_{j,k}, \\ Z(g) &= \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g) \tilde{V}_{j,k}, \\ \Delta(f) &= X(g) - Z(g), \Delta_1(g) = (X - Y)(g), \Delta_2(g) = (Y - Z)(g). \end{aligned}$$

**Claim 1:**  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta_1(h))\mathbb{1}(A)] \leq \prod_{j=1}^{Kd} \prod_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \mathbb{E}[\cosh(t\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h)(2 + \tilde{\xi}_{j,k}^2/4))]$ . It then follows from the proof of Lemma 2.2 in [Rio \(1994\)](#) that for all  $|t| < 1$ ,

$$\log \mathbb{E}[\exp(4t\Delta_1(h))\mathbb{1}(A)] \leq -\frac{83}{3}c_\rho^2 \left( \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}^2(h) \right) \log(1 - t^2).$$

**Proof of Claim 1:** Denote  $\mathcal{F}_j = \sigma\left(\left\{\tilde{\xi}_{l,k} : j < l \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-l}\right\}\right)$ , for all  $1 \leq j < Kd$ . In particular,  $\sigma\left(\left\{U_{l,k} : j \leq l \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-l}\right\}\right) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_j$ . Then by Equation [SA-4](#), for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \exp \left( t \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g) \left( \tilde{U}_{j,k} - \sqrt{U_{j,k}\tilde{p}_{j,k}(1 - \tilde{p}_{j,k})\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}} \right) \right) \mathbb{1}(A) \middle| \mathcal{F}_j \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \cosh \left( t\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g)(c_2\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}^2 + c_3) \right) \mathbb{1}(A) \middle| \mathcal{F}_j \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then we will use the same induction argument in the proof of Lemma 2.2 in [Rio \(1994\)](#): Call

$$\begin{aligned} S_j(t) &:= \exp \left( t \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g) \left( \tilde{U}_{j,k} - \sqrt{U_{j,k}\tilde{p}_{j,k}(1 - \tilde{p}_{j,k})\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}} \right) \right), \\ T_j(t) &:= \prod_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \cosh \left( t\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g)(c_2\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}^2 + c_3) \right). \end{aligned}$$

So  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta_1)\mathbb{1}(A)] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{Kd} S_j(t)\mathbb{1}(A) \right]$ ,  $\prod_{j=1}^{Kd} \prod_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \mathbb{E}[\cosh(t\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(2 + \tilde{\xi}_{j,k}^2/4))] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{Kd} T_j(t) \right]$ . By Equation [SA-4](#), for all  $1 \leq j \leq Kd$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ S_j(t) \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} T_l(t)\mathbb{1}(A) \middle| \mathcal{F}_j \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{l=1}^j T_l(t)\mathbb{1}(A) \middle| \mathcal{F}_j \right].$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta_1)\mathbb{1}(A)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{Kd} S_j(t)\mathbb{1}(A) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[S_1(t)\mathbb{1}(A)|\mathcal{F}_1] \prod_{j=2}^{Kd} S_j(t) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[T_1(t)\mathbb{1}(A)|\mathcal{F}_1] \prod_{j=2}^{Kd} S_j(t) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[T_1(t)S_2(t)\mathbb{1}(A)|\mathcal{F}_2] \prod_{j=3}^{Kd} S_j(t) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}[T_1(t)T_2(t)\mathbb{1}(A)|\mathcal{F}_2] \prod_{j=3}^{Kd} S_j(t) \right] \leq \dots \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{Kd} T_j(t)\mathbb{1}(A) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{Kd} T_j(t) \right] = \prod_{j=1}^{Kd} \prod_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \mathbb{E}[\cosh(t\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h)(c_2\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}^2 + c_3))] \\ &\leq \prod_{j=1}^{Kd} \prod_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \mathbb{E}[\cosh(tc_\rho\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h)(\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}^2/4 + 2))] \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line, we have used independence of  $\tilde{\xi}_{j,k} : 1 \leq j \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}$ . W.l.o.g, we will assume that  $c_\rho\|g\|_\infty \leq 1$ . Since we know  $\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}, 1 \leq j \leq Kd, 0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}$  are i.i.d standard Gaussian, the same upper bound worked out in [Rio \(1994\)](#) for the right hand side of the inequality also holds here, namely,



for all  $t < 1$ ,

$$\log \mathbb{E}[\exp(4t\Delta_1)\mathbb{1}(A)] \leq -\frac{83}{3}c_{\rho^2} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}^2(h) \right) \log(1-t^2) =: h_{\Delta_1}(t) \quad (\text{SA-5})$$

**Claim 2:**  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(t\Delta_2)\mathbb{1}(A)] \leq \mathbb{E}[\exp(tc_{\rho}\Delta_3)]$  for all  $t > 0$ , where

$$\Delta_3(h) = \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \tilde{\xi}_{j,k} \left( 1 + \sum_{l=j}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq q < 2^{Kd-l}} 2^{-|j-l|/2} |\tilde{\xi}_{l,q}| \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_{l,q} \supseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}) \right), h \in L_2(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}),$$

and  $c_{\rho}$  is a constant that only depends on  $\rho$ .

**Proof of Claim 2:** Denote  $p_{j,k} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})$ . Then for any  $g \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , we have

$$\Delta_2(g) = \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g) \left( \sqrt{U_{j,k}} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[U_{j,k}]} \right) \sqrt{\frac{p_{j-1,2k} p_{j-1,2k+1}}{p_{j,k}^2}} \tilde{\xi}_{j,k}.$$

We will use the same strategy as in [Rio \(1994\)](#) adapted to the quasi-dyadic case: Fix  $0 \leq j \leq Kd, 0 \leq l < 2^{Kd-j}$ , we will denote by  $k_l$  the unique integer in  $[0, 2^{Kd-l})$  such that  $\mathcal{C}_{l,k_l} \supseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{U_{j,k}} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[U_{j,k}]} &= \sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} \sqrt{\frac{U_{l,k_l} p_{j,k}}{p_{l,k_l}}} - \sqrt{\frac{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}} p_{j,k}}{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}} \\ &= \sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} \sqrt{\frac{p_{j,k}}{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}} \left( \sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}} U_{l,k_l}}{p_{l,k_l}}} - \sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Equation [SA-4](#), when the event  $A$  holds,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}} U_{l,k_l}}{p_{l,k_l}}} - \sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}}} \right| &\leq \frac{|\tilde{U}_{l,k_l}|}{\sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}} U_{l,k_l}}{p_{l,k_l}} + \sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}}} \\ &\leq \frac{2\sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,2k_l}}{p_{l,k_l}} \frac{p_{l+1,2k_l+1}}{p_{l,k_l}} U_{l,k_l}} |\tilde{\xi}_{l,k_l}| + \min\{c_0^{-1}, \tilde{U}_{l,k_l}\}}{\sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}} U_{l,k_l}}{p_{l,k_l}} + \sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}}} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,2k_l+1}}{p_{l,k_l}}} |\tilde{\xi}_{l,k_l}| + \frac{\min\{c_0^{-1}, |\tilde{U}_{l,k_l}|\}}{\sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}} U_{l,k_l}}{p_{l,k_l}} + \sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first summand,

$$\sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} \sqrt{\frac{p_{j,k}}{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}} 2\sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,2k_l+1}}{p_{l,k_l}}} |\tilde{\xi}_{l,k_l}| \lesssim c_{\rho} \sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} 2^{-(l-j)/2} |\tilde{\xi}_{l,k_l}|.$$

For the second summand, we separate it into two terms as in [Rio \(1994\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} \sqrt{\frac{p_{j,k}}{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}} \frac{\min \left\{ c_0^{-1}, -\tilde{U}_{l,k_l} \right\}}{\sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}{p_{l,k_l}} U_{l,k_l} + \sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}}} \mathbb{1}(\tilde{U}_{l,k_l} \leq 0) \\ &= \sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} \sqrt{\frac{p_{j,k}}{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}} \frac{\min \left\{ c_0^{-1}, -\tilde{U}_{l,k_l} \right\}}{\sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}} - \tilde{U}_{l,k_l} + \sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}}} \mathbb{1}(\tilde{U}_{l,k_l} \leq 0) \lesssim c_\rho, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\sup_{0 \leq x \leq u} \min \{ c_0^{-1}, x \} / (\sqrt{u} + \sqrt{u+x}) \lesssim 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} \sqrt{\frac{p_{j,k}}{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}} \frac{\min \left\{ c_0^{-1}, \tilde{U}_{l,k_l} \right\}}{\sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}{p_{l,k_l}} U_{l,k_l} + \sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}}} \mathbb{1}(\tilde{U}_{l,k_l} > 0) \\ & \leq \sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} \sqrt{\frac{p_{j,k}}{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}} \left( \sqrt{U_{l+1,k_{l+1}}} - \sqrt{\frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}{p_{l,k_l}} U_{l,k_l}} \right) \mathbb{1} \left( \frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}{p_{l,k_l}} U_{l,k_l} \leq U_{l+1,k_{l+1}} \leq \frac{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}{p_{l,k_l}} U_{l,k_l} + c_0^{-1} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} \sqrt{\frac{p_{j,k}}{p_{l+1,k_{l+1}}}} \sqrt{c_0^{-1}} \lesssim 1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that when the event  $A$  holds,

$$\left| \sqrt{U_{j,k}} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[U_{j,k}]} \right| \leq c_\rho \left( 1 + \sum_{l=j}^{Kd-1} 2^{-(l-j)/2} \sum_{0 \leq q < 2^{Kd-l}} \left| \tilde{\xi}_{l,q} \right| \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_{l,q} \supseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}) \right).$$

It then follows from induction argument similar to Claim 1 that for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} [\exp(t\Delta_2) \mathbb{1}(A)] \leq \mathbb{E} [\exp(tc_\rho \Delta_3)]. \quad (\text{SA-6})$$

Take  $h_{\Delta_3}(t) = \log(\mathbb{E}[\exp(tc_\rho \Delta_3)])$ ,  $t > 0$ . Combining Equation [SA-5](#) and [SA-6](#), for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\Delta_1 \geq t, A) & \leq \inf_{u>0} \mathbb{P}(\exp(\Delta_1 u) \geq \exp(tu), A) \leq \inf_{u>0} \exp(-tu) \mathbb{E}[\exp(\Delta_1 u) \mathbb{1}(A)] \\ & \leq \exp \left( -\sup_{u>0} (tu - h_{\Delta_1}(u/4)) \right) = \exp \left( -\sup_{u>0} \left( tu + \frac{83}{3} c_\rho^2 \|h\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 \log(1 - u^2/16) \right) \right), \\ \mathbb{P}(\Delta_2 \geq t, A) & \leq \inf_{u>0} \exp(-tu) \mathbb{E}[\exp(\Delta_2 u) \mathbb{1}(A)] \leq \exp \left( -\sup_{u>0} (tu - h_{\Delta_3}(u)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\Delta_3$  only depends on  $\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq Kd$ ,  $0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}$ , it follows from Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 in

Rio (1994) that for any  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ , for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left( \sqrt{n} |X_n(h) - Z_n^X(h)| \geq c_\rho \sqrt{\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 t} + c_\rho (1 + \sqrt{8Kd}) \|h\|_{\infty} t \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sqrt{n} |X_n(h) - Z_n^X(h)| \geq c_\rho \sqrt{\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 t} + c_\rho (1 + \sqrt{8Kd}) \|h\|_{\infty} t, A \right) + \mathbb{P}(A^c) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left( |\Delta_1(h) + \Delta_2(h)| \geq c_\rho \sqrt{\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 t} + c_\rho (1 + \sqrt{8Kd}) \|h\|_{\infty} t, A \right) + \mathbb{P}(A^c) \\
& \leq 2 \exp(-t) + \mathbb{P}(A^c) \leq 2 \exp(-t) + 4 \cdot 2^{Kd} \exp \left( - \min \left\{ \frac{c_1^2}{3} \wedge 1 \right\} \rho^{-1} n 2^{-Kd} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} |\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h)|^2$ . □

### SA-II.13 Proof of Lemma SA.8

Take  $\mathcal{L} := \{h - \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}(h) : h \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . Then  $\sigma := \sup_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \|l\|_{\mathbb{P}^X, 2} \leq \delta \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Moreover, for all  $0 < \varepsilon < \delta$ ,

$$\sup_Q N(\mathcal{L}, e_Q, \varepsilon \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq N(\varepsilon) N(\delta) \leq N(\varepsilon)^2,$$

where the supremum is taken over all finite discrete measures. Hence  $\int_0^u \sqrt{1 + \sup_Q \log N(\mathcal{L}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \varepsilon \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}})} d\varepsilon \leq 2J(u, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}})$  for all  $0 < u < \delta$ . By Theorem 5.2 in Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014), we have

$$\mathbb{E} [\|X_n - X_n \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{H}}] \lesssim J(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}) \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} J^2(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}})}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}}.$$

By Talagrand's inequality (Giné and Nickl, 2016, Theorem 3.3.9), for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \|X_n - X_n \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq C \left\{ J(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}) \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} J^2(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}})}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} + \delta \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{t} + \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sqrt{n}} t \right\} \right) \leq \exp(-t),$$

where  $C$  is an absolute constant. By Corollary 2.2.9 in van der Vaart and Wellner (2013),

$$\mathbb{E} [\|Z_n - Z_n \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{H}}] \lesssim J(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}) \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}.$$

By pointwise separability and a concentration inequality for Gaussian suprema, for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \|Z_n - Z_n \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{H}} \geq C' \left\{ J(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}) \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} + \delta \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{t} \right\} \right) \leq \exp(-t),$$

where  $C'$  is another absolute constant. □

### SA-II.14 Proof of Lemma SA.9

Let  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then almost surely,  $|h(\mathbf{x}_i) - \Pi_0 h(\mathbf{x}_i)| \leq \min\{2\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}, \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} \|\mathcal{V}\|_{\infty}\} =: \mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [|h(\mathbf{x}_i) - \Pi_0 h(\mathbf{x}_i)|] &= \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}} |h(\mathbf{x}) - 2^{Kd} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}} h(\mathbf{y}) f_X(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y}| f_X(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&\leq \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}} 2^{Kd} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}} |h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{y})| f_X(\mathbf{y}) f_X(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{x}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using a change of variable  $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$  and the fact that  $f_X$  is bounded above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[|h(\mathbf{x}_i) - \Pi_0 h(\mathbf{x}_i)|] \\ & \leq \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd}} 2^{Kd} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k} - \mathcal{C}_{0,k}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}} |h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})| f_X(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s}) f_X(\mathbf{x}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{s} \\ & \leq \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 2^{Kd} \int_{\mathcal{V}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})| d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{s}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\phi$  be a real-valued non-negative Lebesgue measurable function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = 1$ . Define  $\phi_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-d} \phi(\cdot/\varepsilon)$  and  $h_\varepsilon = h * \phi_\varepsilon$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})| d\mathbf{x} &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{X}} |h_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) - h_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})| d\mathbf{x} \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_0^{\|\mathbf{s}\|} \|\nabla h_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{s}/\|\mathbf{s}\|)\| dt d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \int_0^{\|\mathbf{s}\|} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \|\nabla h_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x} + t\mathbf{s}/\|\mathbf{s}\|)\| d\mathbf{x} dt \leq \|\mathbf{s}\| \mathbf{TV}_{\{h\}}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[|h(\mathbf{x}_i) - \Pi_0 h(\mathbf{x}_i)|] \leq \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 2^{Kd} \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{V}) \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty \mathbf{TV}_{\{h\}},$$

where in (1) we used Dominated Convergence Theorem, in (2) we used Lemma 1 in [De Giorgi \(1955\)](#) and the fact that each  $\mathcal{C}_{0,k}$  is a  $d$ -dimensional cube with side-length at most  $\Delta_{Kd}$ . It follows that

$$\mathbb{W}[h(\mathbf{x}_i) - \Pi_0 h(\mathbf{x}_i)] \leq \min\{2\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty\} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 2^{Kd} \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{V}) \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} =: \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \forall h \in \mathcal{H}_\delta.$$

Then by Bernstein inequality, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|X_n(h) - X_n(\Pi_0 h)| \geq t) &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\frac{1}{2}t^2 n}{n\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} + \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} t\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \min\left\{\frac{\frac{1}{2}t^2 n}{n\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}, \frac{\frac{1}{2}t^2 n}{\frac{1}{3}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} t\sqrt{n}}\right\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Set  $u = \frac{1}{2} \min\left\{\frac{\frac{1}{2}t^2 n}{n\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}, \frac{\frac{1}{2}t^2 n}{\frac{1}{3}\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} t\sqrt{n}}\right\} > 0$ , then either  $t = 2\sqrt{\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}\sqrt{u}$  or  $t = \frac{4}{3}\frac{\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}{\sqrt{n}}u$ . Hence  $t \leq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}\sqrt{u} + \frac{4}{3}\frac{\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}{\sqrt{n}}u$ . It follows that for any  $u > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(|X_n(h) - X_n(\Pi_0 h)| \geq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}\sqrt{u} + \frac{4}{3}\frac{\mathbf{B}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}{\sqrt{n}}u) \leq 2\exp(-u)$ . The result for  $\|X_n - X_n \circ \Pi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$  then follows from a union bound. The result for  $\|Z_n - Z_n \circ \Pi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$  follows from the fact that  $Z_n(h) - Z_n(\Pi_0 h)$  is a mean-zero Gaussian with variance  $\mathbb{W}[X_n(h) - X_n(\Pi_0)]$  and a union bound argument.  $\square$

## SA-II.15 Proof of Lemma SA.10

We employ the same strategy as in the proof of Theorem 1.1 from [Rio \(1994\)](#), except noting that incorporating Lipschitz condition can lead to tighter bound for strong approximation error.

For each  $1 \leq j \leq Kd$ , there exists unique integers  $j_1, \dots, j_d$  such that  $0 \leq j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_d \leq j_1 + 1$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^d j_i = j$ . In particular, there exists a unique  $l := l(j) \in [d]$  such that either  $l \leq d-1$  and  $j_l < j_{l+1}$  or

$l = d$  and  $j_d < j_1 + 1$ . Recall  $\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) = \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}]$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) &= 2^{Kd-j} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}} h(\mathbf{x}) f_X(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - 2^{Kd-j} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}} h(\mathbf{y}) f_X(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} \\
&= 2^{Kd-j} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}} \left( h(\mathbf{x}) - \left( 2^{Kd-j} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}} h(\mathbf{y}) f_X(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} \right) \right) f_X(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\
&= 2^{2(Kd-j)} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}} (h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{y})) f_X(\mathbf{x}) f_X(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y} d\mathbf{x} \\
&= 2^{2(Kd-j)} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1} - \mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}} (h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})) f_X(\mathbf{x}) f_X(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s}) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1}}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s}) d\mathbf{s} d\mathbf{x}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have assumed  $f$  is bounded from above on  $\mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\left| \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \right| \leq 2^{2(Kd-j)} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1} - \mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}} |h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})| d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{s}.$$

Recall we define  $\mathcal{U}_j = \cup_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} (\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1} - \mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k})$ . Then

$$\sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \left| \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \right| \leq \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 2^{2(Kd-j)} \int_{\mathcal{U}_j} \int_{\cup_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}} |h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})| d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{s}.$$

Then by similar smoothing argument as in the proof of Lemma SA.9,

$$\int_{\cup_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}} |h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})| d\mathbf{x} \leq \|s\| \mathbf{TV}_{\{h\}}.$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \left| \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \right| \leq \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 2^{2(Kd-j)} \|\mathcal{U}_j\|_{\infty} \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{U}_j) \mathbf{TV}_{\{h\}}.$$

Alternatively, it also holds that

$$\sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} \left| \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h) \right| \leq 2^{Kd-j} \int_{\cup_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-(j-1)}} \mathcal{C}_{j-1,k}} |h(\mathbf{x})| f_X(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \leq 2^{Kd-j} \mathbf{E}_{\{h\}}.$$

Moreover,  $|\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h)| \leq \min\{\mathbf{M}_{\{h\}}, \|\mathcal{U}_j\|_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{\{h\}}\}$ , hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} |\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h)|^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \min\{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \|\mathcal{U}_j\|_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{Kd-j}} |\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(h)| \leq \mathcal{R}_{Kd}(\mathcal{H}_\delta),$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_{Kd}(\mathcal{H}_\delta)$  is defined to be

$$\sum_{j=1}^{Kd} \min\{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \|\mathcal{U}_j\|_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\} 2^{Kd-j} \min \left\{ \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 2^{2(Kd-j)} \|\mathcal{U}_j\|_{\infty} \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{U}_j) \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \|\mathcal{U}_j\|_{\infty} \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}, \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} \right\}.$$

Applying Lemma SA.5, for any  $h \in \mathcal{H}_\delta$ , for any  $t > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-t)$ ,

$$|X_n \circ \Pi_0(h) - Z_n^X \circ \Pi_0(h)| \leq 48 \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{R}_{Kd}(\mathcal{H}_\delta)}{n} t} + \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}}{n} t}.$$

The result then follows from the fact that  $\text{Card}(\mathcal{H}_\delta) \leq N(\delta)$  and a union bound argument.  $\square$

### SA-II.16 Proof of Lemma SA.11

This follows from Lemma SA.7 and the same bound for  $\|g\|_{\mathcal{B}}$  as in Lemma SA.10.  $\square$

### SA-II.17 Proof of Lemma SA.12

The first three equalities are self-evident. In what follows, we will use  $f_{\mathcal{I}|\mathcal{J}}(\cdot|\cdot)$  as a shorthand for the conditional density  $f_{\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{I}}|\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{J}}}(\cdot|\cdot)$  and use the notations  $\bar{f}_X = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x})$ ,  $\underline{f}_X = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x})$ . Then  $\phi_X^{-1}$  is given by  $\phi_X^{-1} : (u_1, \dots, u_d) \mapsto (g^{-1}(u_1), g_{u_1}^{-1}(u_2), \dots, g_{u_1, \dots, u_{d-1}}^{-1}(u_d))$ , where  $g(x_1) = F_1(x_1)$  and  $g_{u_1, \dots, u_{i-1}}(x_i) = F_{X_i|X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}}(x_i|g^{-1}(u_1), \dots, g_{u_1, \dots, u_{i-2}}^{-1}(u_{i-1}))$ . Hence

$$\nabla \phi_X^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1/f_1(x_1) & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ * & 1/f_{2|1}(x_2|x_1) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & & & & \\ * & * & * & \dots & 1/f_{d|1, \dots, d-1}(x_d|x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}) \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d,$$

where  $(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \phi_X^{-1}(u_1, \dots, u_d)$ . But for any  $m \in [n]$  and  $(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in I^m$ , we have the relation  $f_{[m]}(x_1, \dots, x_m) = \int_{I^{d-m}} f_X(x_1, \dots, x_m, \mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \in [\underline{f}_X, \bar{f}_X]$ . Hence  $\|\|\nabla \phi_X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}\|_\infty \leq \bar{f}_X \underline{f}_X^{-1}$ .

The second to last inequality follows from the fact that for any  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,  $\|h \circ \phi_X^{-1}\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq \|h\|_{\text{Lip}} \|\|\nabla \phi_X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}\|_\infty$ . To show the third inequality, take  $l : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to be a non-negative function such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} l(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 1$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , define  $l_\varepsilon(\cdot) = l(\cdot/\varepsilon)/\varepsilon^d$ . Define  $h_\varepsilon := h * l_\varepsilon$ . Then for any  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}_{\{h \circ \phi_X^{-1}\}} &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbf{u} \in I^d} \|\nabla(h_\varepsilon \circ \phi_X^{-1})(\mathbf{u})\| d\mathbf{u} = \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbf{u} \in [0, 1]^d} \|(\nabla \phi_X^{-1}(\mathbf{u}))^\top \nabla h_\varepsilon(\phi_X^{-1}(\mathbf{u}))\| d\mathbf{u} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|(\nabla \phi_X^{-1}(\phi_X(\mathbf{x})))^\top \nabla h_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})\| \det(\nabla \phi_X(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\nabla h_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})\| d\mathbf{x} \cdot \|\det(\nabla \phi_X)\|_\infty \cdot \|\|\nabla \phi_X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}\|_\infty \leq \text{TV}_{\{h\}} \bar{f}_X \frac{\bar{f}_X}{\underline{f}_X}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  be a cube with edges of length  $a$  parallel to the coordinate axes. Then  $\phi_X^{-1}(\mathcal{C})$  is contained in another cube  $\mathcal{C}'$  with edges of length at most  $2\sqrt{d} \|\|\nabla \phi_X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}\|_\infty a$ . Hence for any  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathcal{C})} \int h(\mathbf{x}) \text{div}(\varphi)(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} / \|\|\varphi\|_2\|_\infty &= \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \|\nabla(h_\varepsilon \circ \phi_X^{-1})(\mathbf{u})\| d\mathbf{u} \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{C}'} \|\nabla(h_\varepsilon \circ \phi_X^{-1})(\phi_X(\mathbf{x}))\| \det(\nabla \phi_X(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{C}'} \|\nabla h_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})\| d\mathbf{x} \cdot \|\det(\nabla \phi_X)\|_\infty \cdot \|\|\nabla \phi_X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}\|_\infty \\ &\leq (2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \|\det(\nabla \phi_X)\|_\infty \cdot \|\|\nabla \phi_X^{-1}\|_{\text{op}}\|_\infty^d a^{d-1} \mathbf{K}_{\{h\}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definition of  $K_{\{h\}}$  in the last line. Hence

$$K_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \leq (2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \bar{f}_X \left( \frac{\bar{f}_X}{\underline{f}_X} \right)^d K_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

□

## SA-II.18 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof proceeds by bounding each of the terms discussed in

$$\|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \|X_n - X_n \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} + \|Z_n^X \circ \pi_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}}$$

and

$$\|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} \leq \|X_n - \Pi_0 X_n\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} + \|\Pi_0 X_n - \Pi_0 Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} + \|\Pi_0 Z_n^X - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta},$$

and then balancing their contributions.

We first make a reduction via Rosenblatt transformation. Take  $\mathbf{u}_i = \phi_X(\mathbf{x}_i)$  where  $\phi_X$  is defined as in Lemma SA.12. And define  $\tilde{h} = h \circ \phi_X^{-1}$  for each  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  and consider  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} = \{\tilde{h} : h \in \mathcal{H}\}$ . Then

$$X_n(h) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n h(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x}_i)] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{h}(\mathbf{u}_i) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}(\mathbf{u}_i)] =: \tilde{X}_n(\tilde{h}), \quad \forall h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Consider  $\mathcal{E}_K$  that is an axis-aligned iterative splitting of depth  $K$  based on the law of  $\mathbf{u}_i$  as given in Definition SA.2. By Lemma SA.4 and Lemma SA.12,  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \cup \Pi_0 \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \cup \mathcal{E}_K$  is pre-Gaussian, hence by the argument in Section SA-II.3, on a possibly enlarged probability space there exists a mean-zero Gaussian process  $Z_n^X$  indexed by  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}} \cup \Pi_0 \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \cup \mathcal{E}_K$  such that with almost sure continuous sample path such that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_n^X(g), Z_n^X(f)] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}_n(g), \tilde{X}_n(f)], \quad \forall g, f \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \cup \Pi_0 \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \cup \mathcal{E}_K,$$

and  $U_{j,k} = \sum_{i=1}^n e_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i)$  for all  $(j, k)$ 's. Let  $\mathcal{H}_\delta$  be a  $\delta \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} = \delta \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}_\delta}$ -net of  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  with cardinality no greater than  $N_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}(\delta)$ .

Since  $\mathbf{u}_i \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \text{Unif}([0, 1]^d)$  and the cells  $\mathcal{A}_K(\mathbb{P}_U, 1)$  are obtained via *axis aligned dyadic expansion of depth  $K$  w.r.p. to  $\mathbb{P}_U$  which is the law of  $\mathbf{u}_i$* , we have  $\mathcal{U}_j \subseteq [-2^{-\frac{K-j}{d}+1}, 2^{-\frac{K-j}{d}+1}]^d$ . Then by Lemma SA.10, for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \|\tilde{X}_n \circ \Pi_0 - Z_n^X \circ \Pi_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} > 48 \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_K(\mathcal{H}_\delta)}{n}} t + \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}}{n}} t \right] \leq 2\tilde{N}(\delta) e^{-t},$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_K(\mathcal{H}_\delta) \leq \begin{cases} \min\{\text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}, \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} \mathbf{L}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}\}, & \text{if } d = 1, \\ \min\{2^K \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}, K \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} \mathbf{L}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}\}, & \text{if } d = 2, \\ \min\{2^{K(d-1)} \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}, 2^{K(d-2)} \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} \mathbf{L}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}\} & \text{if } d \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, from the bound on  $\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}$  from Lemma SA.10, we know for each  $(j, k)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m: \mathcal{C}_{l,m} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \left| \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(\tilde{h}) \right| &\leq 2^{2(K-l)} \int_{\mathcal{U}_l} \int_{\mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |h(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})| d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{s} \\ &\leq 2^{2(K-l)} \int_{\mathcal{U}_l} \|\mathbf{s}\| \mathbb{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \|C_{j,k}\|_{\infty}^{d-1} d\mathbf{s} \leq 2^{2(K-l)} \text{Vol}(\mathcal{U}_l) \|\mathcal{U}_l\|_{\infty} \|C_{j,k}\|_{\infty}^{d-1} \mathbb{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \leq 2^{\frac{d-1}{d}(j-l)} \mathbb{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the definition of  $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}$  that  $\mathcal{C}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \leq \min\{\sqrt{KM_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}^2}, \sqrt{d^3 M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \mathbb{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}}\}$ . For projection error, by Lemma SA.9, for all  $t > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2\tilde{N}(\delta)e^{-t}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{X}_n - \tilde{X}_n \circ \Pi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} &\leq \sqrt{4d \min\{2M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}, L_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} 2^{-K}\} 2^{-K} \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} t} + \frac{4 \min\{2M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}, L_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} 2^{-K}\}}{3\sqrt{n}} t, \\ \|Z_n^X - Z_n^X \circ \Pi_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} &\leq \sqrt{4d \min\{2M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}, L_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} 2^{-K}\} 2^{-K} \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} t}. \end{aligned}$$

We balance the previous two errors by choosing  $K = \lfloor d^{-1} \log_2 n \rfloor$  and get for all  $t > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2\exp(-t)$ ,

$$\|\tilde{X}_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}_\delta} \leq \min\{M_{n,d} \sqrt{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}}, L_{n,d} \sqrt{L_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}}\} \sqrt{(t + \log \tilde{N}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}(\delta)) d \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}} + \sqrt{\frac{\min\{K, d^3 \frac{K_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}}{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}}\}}{n}} (t + \log \tilde{N}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}(\delta)) M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}.$$

Moreover by Lemma SA.8 we bound fluctuation off-the-net by, for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|\tilde{X}_n - \tilde{X}_n \circ \pi_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} > C\tilde{F}_n(t, \delta)] &\leq \exp(-t), \\ \mathbb{P}[\|Z_n^X \circ \pi_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} - Z_n^X\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} > C(M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} J(\delta, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}), M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}) + \delta M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \sqrt{t}] &\leq \exp(-t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{F}_n(t, \delta) := J(\delta, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}, M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}) M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} + \frac{\log(n) M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} J^2(\delta, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}, M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}})}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} + \delta M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \sqrt{t} + \frac{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}}{\sqrt{n}} t.$$

The result then follows from the relation between  $\mathcal{H}$  quantities and  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  quantities in Lemma SA.12 and the decomposition that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|\tilde{X}_n - Z_n^X\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} &\leq \|\tilde{X}_n - \tilde{X}_n \circ \pi_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} + \|Z_n^X - Z_n^X \circ \pi_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{X}_n - \tilde{X}_n \circ \Pi_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} + \|Z_n^X - Z_n^X \circ \Pi_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta} \\ &\quad + \|\tilde{X}_n \circ \Pi_0 - Z_n^X \circ \Pi_0\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have abused the notation to mean the same thing by  $Z_n^X(h)$  and  $Z_n^X(\tilde{h})$ .  $\square$

## SA-II.19 Proof of Theorem 2

Suppose  $2^K \leq L < 2^{K+1}$ . For each  $l \in [d]$ , we can divide at most  $2^K$  cells into two intervals of equal measure under  $\mathbb{P}_X$  such that we get a new partition of  $\mathcal{X} = \sqcup_{0 \leq j < 2^{K+1}} \Delta'_l$  and satisfies

$$\frac{\max_{0 \leq l < 2^{K+1}} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta'_l)}{\min_{0 \leq l < 2^{K+1}} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta'_l)} \leq 2\rho.$$



By construction, there exists an axis-aligned quasi-dyadic expansion  $\mathcal{A}_{K+1}(\mathbb{P}_X, 2\rho) = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq j \leq K+1, 0 \leq k < 2^{K+1-j}\}$  such that

$$\{\mathcal{C}_{0,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{K+1}\} = \{\Delta'_l : 0 \leq l < 2^{K+1}\},$$

and  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \text{Span}\{\mathbb{1}_{\Delta_j} : 0 \leq j < L\} \subseteq \text{Span}\{\mathcal{C}_{0,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{K+1}\}$ . Now we consider the term  $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{H}}$  from Lemma SA.7. Let  $h \in \mathcal{H}$ . By definition of  $S$  and the step of splitting each cell into at most two, there exists  $l_1, \dots, l_{2S} \in \{0, \dots, 2^{K+1} - 1\}$  such that  $h = \sum_{q=1}^{2S} c_q \mathbb{1}(\Delta'_{l_q})$  where  $|c_q| \leq \mathbf{M}_{\{h\}}$ . Fix  $(j, k)$ . Let  $(l, m)$  be an index such that  $\mathcal{C}_{l,m} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}$ . Since each  $\Delta'_{l_q}$  belongs to at most one  $\mathcal{C}_{l-1,k}$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_{l,m}(\mathbb{1}(\Delta'_{l_q})) = 0$  if  $\Delta'_{l_q}$  is not contained in  $\mathcal{C}_{l,m}$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_{l,m}(\mathbb{1}(\Delta'_{l_q})) = 2^{-l+1}$  if  $\Delta'_{l_q} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{l,m}$ . Hence

$$\sum_{m:\mathcal{C}_{l,m} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\beta}_{l,m}(h)|^2 \leq 2S \sum_{q=1}^{2S} \sum_{m:\mathcal{C}_{l,m} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} (c_q \tilde{\beta}_{l,m}(\mathbb{1}(\Delta'_{l_q})))^2 \leq 2S \sum_{q=1}^{2S} c_q^2 2^{-2l} \leq 4S^2 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}^2 2^{-2l}.$$

It follows that

$$\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{H}} = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \min \left\{ \sup_{l < j} \left[ \sum_{l < j} (j-l)(j-l+1) 2^{l-j} \sum_{m:\mathcal{C}_{l,m} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \tilde{\beta}_{l,m}^2(h) \right], \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}^2(K+1) \right\} \lesssim \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \min\{K, S^2\}.$$

Then apply Lemma SA.7, we get there exists a mean-zero Gaussian process  $Z_n^X$  with the same covariance structure as  $X_n$  such that with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-t) - 2^{K+1} \exp(-C_\rho n 2^{-K-1})$ ,

$$\|X_n - Z_n^X\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq \min_{\delta \in (0,1)} \left\{ C_\rho \sqrt{\frac{2^{K+2} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} (t + \log N_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta)) + C_\rho \sqrt{\frac{\min\{K, S^2\}}{n}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} (t + \log N_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta)) + F_n(t, \delta) \right\},$$

where  $K \leq \log_2(L)$ . □

### SA-II.20 Proof of Corollary SA.1

Take  $\delta = n^{-1/2}$ . Under the VC-type class condition,  $\log N_{\mathcal{H}}(n^{-1}) \leq \log(\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{H}}) + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \log(n) \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \log(\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{H}} n)$ , where the last inequality holds since  $\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{H}} \geq e$  and  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} > 0$ . This gives

$$\mathbf{A}_n(t, n^{-1/2}) \leq \mathbf{m}_{n,d} \sqrt{d \mathbf{c}_1 (t + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \log(\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{H}} n)) \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}} + \min \left\{ \sqrt{\log(n) \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{d^3 \mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{H}}} \right\} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} (t + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \log(\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{H}} n)).$$

Moreover,  $J(\delta, \mathcal{H}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq \int_0^\delta \sqrt{1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \log(\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{H}} \varepsilon^{-1})} d\varepsilon \leq 3\delta \sqrt{\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \log(\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{H}}/\delta)}$ . It follows that

$$\mathbf{F}_n(t, n^{-1/2}) \leq \frac{3\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{H}} \log(\mathbf{c}_{\mathcal{H}} n) + \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sqrt{n}} (\sqrt{t} + t).$$

The result then follows from Theorem 1. □

### SA-II.21 Proof of Corollary SA.2

The result follows by taking  $\delta = n^{-1/2}$  and apply Theorem 1, with calculations similar to Corollary SA.1. □

## SA-II.22 Proof of Corollary SA.3

Under the polynomial entropy condition,  $\log N_{\mathcal{H}}(\delta) \leq \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}}$ ,  $J(\delta, \mathcal{H}, M_{\mathcal{H}}) \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{H}}}(2 - \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-1} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}/2+1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} A_n(t, \delta) &\leq \min\{m_{n,d}\sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, l_{n,d}\sqrt{c_2 L_{\mathcal{H}}}\} \sqrt{\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}(t + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}})} + \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{d^3 c_3 K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\}(t + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}}), \\ F_n(t, \delta) &\leq \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{H}}(2 - \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}})^{-2} \left( M_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}/2+1} + \frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sqrt{n}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}} + \delta M_{\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{t} + \frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sqrt{n}} t \right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the two terms  $\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sqrt{n}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}}$  and  $\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sqrt{n}} t$  in  $F_n(t, \delta)$  are dominated by terms in  $A_n(t, \delta)$ . And when  $\delta \leq n^{-1/2}$ , the third term  $\delta M_{\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{t}$  is also dominated by terms in  $A_n(t, \delta)$ . To choose  $\delta$  that balance  $A_n$  and  $F_n$ , we consider the following three cases:

**Case 1:** Choose  $\delta$  such that  $m_{n,d}\sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}}} \asymp M_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}/2+1}$ . Notice that this choice also makes  $\delta M_{\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{t} \leq \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{d^3 c_3 K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\}(t + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}})$ . Plug in  $\delta_* = m_{n,d}\sqrt{\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}/M_{\mathcal{H}}}$  into  $A_n$ , we get  $A_n(t, \delta_*) + F_n(t, \delta_*) \leq S_n^{bdd}(t)$ .

**Case 2:** Choose  $\delta$  such that  $l_{n,d}\sqrt{L_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}}} \asymp M_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}/2+1}$ . Again, this choice of  $\delta$  makes  $\delta M_{\mathcal{H}} \sqrt{t} \leq \sqrt{\frac{M_{\mathcal{H}}}{n}} \min\{\sqrt{\log n} \sqrt{M_{\mathcal{H}}}, \sqrt{d^3 c_3 K_{\mathcal{H}} + M_{\mathcal{H}}}\}(t + \mathbf{a}_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}})$ . Plug in  $\delta_* = l_{n,d}\sqrt{L_{\mathcal{H}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}}/M_{\mathcal{H}}^2}$  into  $A_n$ , we get  $A_n(t, \delta_*) + F_n(t, \delta_*) \leq S_n^{lip}(t)$ .

**Case 3:** Choose  $\delta$  such that  $M_{\mathcal{H}} n^{-1/2} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}} \asymp M_{\mathcal{H}} \delta^{-\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}/2+1}$ . Plug in  $\delta_* = n^{-1/(\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{H}}+2)}$ , we get  $A_n(t, \delta_*) + F_n(t, \delta_*) \leq S_n^{err}(t)$ . □

## SA-II.23 Proof of Corollary 1

The result follows from Corollary SA.1, taking  $t = \log n$ . □

## SA-II.24 Proof of Corollary 2

The result follows from Corollary SA.2, taking  $t = \log n$ . □

## SA-II.25 Proof of Corollary 3

The result follows from Corollary SA.3, taking  $t = \log n$ . □

## SA-II.26 Proof of Corollary 4

The result follows from Theorem 2, taking  $\delta = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $t = \log n$ . □

## SA-II.27 Proof of Example 1

Define  $\mathcal{H} = \{h_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  where  $h_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) := b^{-\frac{d}{2}} K(b^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \cdot))$ . Since  $K$  is compactly supported and Lipschitz,  $\|K\|_{\infty} < \infty$ . Hence  $M_{\mathcal{H}} = b^{-\frac{d}{2}} \|K\|_{\infty} \lesssim b^{-d/2}$  and  $L_{\mathcal{H}} \leq b^{-\frac{d}{2}-1} L_{\{K\}} \lesssim b^{-\frac{d}{2}-1}$ . Since  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \text{Vol}(\text{supp}(h_{\mathbf{x}})) \lesssim$

$b^d$  and each  $h_{\mathbf{x}}$  is differentiable,  $\text{TV}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \text{Vol}(\text{supp}(h_{\mathbf{x}})) \text{L}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim b^{\frac{d}{2}-1}$ . To upper bound  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}}$ , consider the following two cases: (i) If  $a < b$ , then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathcal{C})} \int h_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) \text{div}(\phi)(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{x} / \|\phi\|_2 \|\phi\|_{\infty} \leq \text{L}_{\{h_{\mathbf{x}}\}} \lesssim \text{Vol}(\mathcal{C}) \text{L}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim b^{-\frac{d}{2}-1} a^d \lesssim b^{-d/2} a^{d-1}.$$

(ii) If  $a > b$ , then

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\phi \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathcal{C})} \int h_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) \text{div}(\phi)(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{x} / \|\phi\|_2 \|\phi\|_{\infty} \lesssim \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \text{Vol}(\text{Supp}(h_{\mathbf{x}})) \text{L}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim b^d b^{-\frac{d}{2}-1} \lesssim b^{-\frac{d}{2}} b^{d-1} \lesssim b^{-\frac{d}{2}} a^{d-1}.$$

This shows  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{H}} \lesssim b^{-\frac{d}{2}}$ . Next, by a change of variable,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{H}} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b^{-\frac{d}{2}} |K(b^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u}))| f_X(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} b^{-\frac{d}{2}} |K(\mathbf{z})| f_X(\mathbf{x} - b\mathbf{z}) b^d d\mathbf{z} \lesssim b^{d/2}.$$

Now define  $g_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) = b^{-\frac{d}{2}} \text{M}_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} K(\cdot)$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then  $\text{M}_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} \mathcal{H} = \{g_{\mathbf{x}}(\frac{\mathbf{x}-\cdot}{b}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ . Then there exists a constant  $\mathbf{c}_K$  only depending on  $\|K\|_{\infty}, \text{L}_{\{K\}}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|g_{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\infty} &\leq \mathbf{c}_K, \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{|g_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) - g_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{v})|}{\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_{\infty}} &\leq \mathbf{c}_K, \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{|g_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) - g_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{u})|}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{\infty}} &\leq \mathbf{c}_K, \end{aligned}$$

we can apply Lemma 7 from [Cattaneo et al. \(2024\)](#), which is modified upon Lemma 4.1 from [Rio \(1994\)](#), to show that for all  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$N(\varepsilon, \text{M}_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1} \mathcal{H}) \leq \mathbf{c}_K \varepsilon^{-d-1} + 1.$$

Then, by Theorem 1, on a possibly enlarged probability space,  $(\xi_n(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X})$  admits a Gaussian strong approximation with rate function

$$S_n(t) = s_n \sqrt{t + (d+1) \log n} + \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{nh^d}} (t + (d+1) \log n).$$

To leverage the Lipschitz conditions, observe that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{H}} = b^{-\frac{d}{2}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{|K(b^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{u})) - K(b^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}))|}{\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_{\infty}} \lesssim b^{-\frac{d}{2}-1}.$$

The result then follows from Corollary 2. □

## SA-II.28 Proof of Example 2

Define a kernel function  $k(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$k(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{J} \sum_{0 \leq l < J} \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_l) \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_l), \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Define  $\mathcal{K} = \{k(\cdot, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ . Then  $\text{Card}(\mathcal{K}) \leq J$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{K}} &\leq \sqrt{J}, \\ \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{K}} &\leq \max_{0 \leq l < J} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l) \cdot \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{K}} \leq \rho J^{-1} \sqrt{J} \leq \rho J^{-1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, each function in  $\mathcal{K}$  can be written  $c\mathbb{1}(\Delta_l)$  for some  $l \leq J$ , which implies we can take  $S = 1$ . The result then follows from Theorem 2.  $\square$

**Lemma SA.13** (Product of VC-classes is a VC-class). *Suppose  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  are classes of functions from a measurable space  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  with envelope functions  $M_{\mathcal{F}}$  and  $M_{\mathcal{S}}$ , respectively. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{F}}M_{\mathcal{S}}, \delta) &\leq \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\delta/2)\mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{S}}(\delta/2), \quad \forall 0 < \delta < 1, \\ J(\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{F}}M_{\mathcal{S}}, \delta) &\leq \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{F}, M_{\mathcal{F}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}) + \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sup_P$  and  $\sup_{\mathcal{Q}}$  are taken over all finite discrete measures on  $\mathcal{X}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f, f_1 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $s, s_1 \in \mathcal{S}$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a finite discrete measure on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}))$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \int |f_1 s_1 - f_2 s_2|^2 d\mathcal{Q} &\leq \int |f_1 - f_2|^2 M_{\mathcal{S}}^2 d\mathcal{Q} + \int |s_1 - s_2|^2 M_{\mathcal{F}}^2 d\mathcal{Q} \\ &= \int |f_1 - f_2|^2 d\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} \int M_{\mathcal{S}}^2 d\mathcal{Q} + \int |s_1 - s_2|^2 d\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{F}} \int M_{\mathcal{F}}^2 d\mathcal{Q}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $d\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}} = M_{\mathcal{S}}^2 d\mathcal{Q} / \int M_{\mathcal{S}}^2 d\mathcal{Q}$  and  $d\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{F}} = M_{\mathcal{F}}^2 d\mathcal{Q} / \int M_{\mathcal{F}}^2 d\mathcal{Q}$ . Take  $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}, 2}}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{F}}, 2}}$  to be  $\varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 2}$ -net of  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 2}$ -net of  $\mathcal{S}$  with minimal cardinality. Then for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}, s \in \mathcal{S}$ , there exists  $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}, 2}}$  and  $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}_{\varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{F}}, 2}}$  such that  $\|f - f_0\|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}, 2}^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{S}}, 2}^2$  and  $\|s - s_0\|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{F}}, 2}^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 \|M_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{F}}, 2}^2$ . Hence  $\|fs - f_0 s_0\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 2}^2 \leq 2\varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}M_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 2}^2$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} J(\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{F}}M_{\mathcal{S}}, \delta) &\leq \int_0^{\delta} \sqrt{1 + \log \sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 2}, \varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 2}/\sqrt{2}) + \log \sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{S}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 2}, \varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{S}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 2}/\sqrt{2})} d\varepsilon \\ &\leq \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{F}, M_{\mathcal{F}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}) + \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{S}, M_{\mathcal{S}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Lemma SA.14** (Covering Number using Covariance Semi-metric). *Assume  $\mathcal{F}$  is a class of functions from a measurable space  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  with envelope function  $M_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Let  $P$  be any probability measure on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B})$ . Then for any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,*

$$N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{P, 2}, \varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{P, 2}) \leq \mathbf{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\varepsilon).$$

*Proof.* Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be a sequence of i.i.d random variables with distribution  $P$ . Define  $\mathcal{Q}_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{X_j}$ . Define  $\mathcal{H} = \{(f - g)^2 : f, g \in \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{M_{\mathcal{F}}\}$ . Then for all  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 1}, \varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 1}^2) \leq \sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{H}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 1}, \varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 2}) \leq \sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 1}, \varepsilon \|M_{\mathcal{F}}\|_{\mathcal{Q}, 1})^2.$$

By Theorem 2.4.3 in [van der Vaart and Wellner \(2013\)](#),  $\mathcal{H}$  is Glivenko-Cantelli. Let  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  and  $\delta > 0$ . Then there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  and a realization  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  of  $X_1, \dots, X_N$  such that if we denote  $P_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x_i}$ ,

then for all  $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|f_1 - f_2\|_{P,2}^2 - \|f_1 - f_2\|_{P_n,2}^2 \right| &\leq \delta^2 \varepsilon^2 \|M_F\|_{P,2}^2, \\ \left| \|M_F\|_{P,2} - \|M_F\|_{P_n,2} \right| &\leq \delta \|M_F\|_{P,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $P_n \in \mathcal{A}(\mathcal{X})$ , there exists  $\varepsilon \|M_F\|_{P_n}$ -net,  $\mathcal{G}$ , of  $\mathcal{F}$  with minimal cardinality such that for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , there exists  $f_0 \in \mathcal{G}$  such that  $\|f - f_0\|_{P_n,2} \leq \varepsilon \|M_F\|_{P_n,2} \leq \varepsilon (\|M_F\|_{P,2} + \delta \|M_F\|_{P,2}) \leq (1 + \delta)\varepsilon \|M_F\|_{P,2}$ . It follows that for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , there exists  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  such that

$$\|f - g\|_{P,2} \leq \|f - g\|_{P_n,2} + \left| \|f - g\|_{P,2} - \|f - g\|_{P_n,2} \right| \leq (1 + 2\delta)\varepsilon \|M_F\|_{P,2},$$

Hence

$$N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{P,2}, \varepsilon \|M_F\|_{P,2}) \leq \sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q},2}, \varepsilon \|M_F\|_{\mathcal{Q},2} / (1 + 2\delta)).$$

Take  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  and we get the desired results.  $\square$

## SA-III Multiplicative-Separable and Residual-Based Empirical Process: Proofs

**Assumption SA.1.** Suppose Assumption B holds with  $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^d$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{P}$  the joint distribution of  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_X$  the marginal distribution of  $\mathbf{x}_i$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_Y$  the marginal distribution of  $y_i$ . Suppose the following two conditions hold.

(i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $J(\mathcal{G}, M_{\mathcal{G}}, 1) < \infty$ .

(ii)  $\mathcal{R}$  be a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P}_Y)$  such that  $J(\mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{R}}, 1) < \infty$ .

Furthermore, one of the following holds:

(a)  $M_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$  and  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$ , and set  $\alpha = 0$ , or

(b)  $M_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$ ,  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}, (-|y|, |y|)} \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ .

**Assumption SA.2.** Suppose  $((\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n)$  are i.i.d. random vectors taking values in  $(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}))$ ,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ . Denote by  $\mathbb{P}$  the joint distribution of  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_X$  the marginal distribution of  $\mathbf{x}_i$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_Y$  the marginal distribution of  $y_i$ . Suppose the following conditions hold.

(i)  $\mathcal{G}$  is a class of functions on  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}), \mathbb{P}_X)$  such that  $M_{\mathcal{G}} < \infty$  and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \text{Span}\{\mathbb{1}_{\Delta_l} : 0 \leq l < L\}$ , where  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$  forms a quasi-uniform partition of  $\mathcal{X}$  in the sense that

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \sqcup_{0 \leq l < L} \Delta_l \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\max_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)}{\min_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)} \leq \rho < \infty.$$

In addition,  $J(\mathcal{G}, M_{\mathcal{G}}, 1) < \infty$ .

(ii)  $\mathcal{R}$  is a real-valued pointwise measurable class of functions on  $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{P}_Y)$ , such that  $J(\mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{R}}, 1) < \infty$ .

Furthermore, one of the following holds:

- (a)  $M_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$  and  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R}} \lesssim 1$ , and set  $\alpha = 0$ , or  
(b)  $M_{\mathcal{R}}(y) \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$ ,  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\mathcal{R},(-|y|,|y|)} \lesssim 1 + |y|^\alpha$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  and for some  $\alpha > 0$ , and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ .

### SA-III.1 Cell Expansions

**Definition SA.3** (Cylindered Quasi-Dyadic Expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ). Denote by  $\mathbb{P}$  the joint distribution of  $(X, Y)$ . Let  $\rho \geq 1$ . A collection of Borel measurable sets in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho) = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}, 0 \leq j \leq M+N\}$  is called a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ , with depth  $M$  for the main subspace  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and depth  $N$  for the multiplier subspace  $\mathbb{R}$ , with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ , the joint distribution of a random vector  $(X, Y)$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ , if the following two conditions hold:

1. For all  $N \leq j \leq M+N$ ,  $0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}$ , there exists a set  $\mathcal{X}_{j-N,k} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k} \times \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, the class of projected cells onto the main subspace  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_X[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)] := \{\mathcal{X}_{l,k} : 0 \leq l \leq M, 0 \leq k < 2^{M-l}\}$ , forms a quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of depth  $M$  with respect to  $\mathbb{P}_X$ , the marginal distribution of  $X$ .
2. For all  $0 \leq j < N$ ,  $0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}$ , take  $l, m$  to be the unique non-negative integers such that  $k = 2^{N-j}l + m$ , then there exists  $\mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}$ . Moreover, for each  $0 \leq l < 2^M$ ,  $\{\mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m} : 0 \leq j < N, 0 \leq m < 2^{N-j}\}$  forms a dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}$  with respect to the measure  $\mathbb{P}(Y \in \cdot | \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l})$ .

When  $\rho = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, 1)$  is called a cylindered dyadic expansion.

**Definition SA.4** (Axis-Aligned Quasi-Dyadic Expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ). A collection of Borel measurable sets in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho) = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}, 0 \leq j \leq M+N\}$ ,  $\rho \geq 1$ , is called an axis-aligned cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ , with depth  $M$  for the main subspace  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and depth  $N$  for the multiplier subspace  $\mathbb{R}$ , with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ , the joint distribution of  $(X, Y)$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ , if the following two conditions hold:

1.  $\mathcal{A}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  is a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ , with depth  $M$  for the main subspace  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and depth  $N$  for the multiplier subspace  $\mathbb{R}$ , with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ .
2.  $\mathbf{p}_X[\mathcal{A}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)] := \{\mathcal{X}_{l,k} : 0 \leq l \leq M, 0 \leq k < 2^{M-l}\}$  forms an axis-aligned quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  of depth  $M$  with respect to  $\mathbb{P}_X$ , the marginal distribution of  $X$ .

When  $\rho = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, 1)$  is called an axis-aligned cylindered dyadic expansion.

### SA-III.2 Projection onto Piecewise Constant Functions

Due to the multiplicative-separable structure of  $g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i)$ , we tailor a mapping other than  $L_2$  projection from the space  $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$  to the space of piecewise constant functions on  $\{\mathcal{C}_{0,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N}\}$ , calling it the *product-factorized projection*. This is a technical point that makes the analysis in Lemma SA.19 easier.

First, we define the "projections". For a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  where  $\mathbb{P}$  is the joint distribution of  $(X, Y)$ , the *product-factorized projection* from  $L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$  to  $\mathcal{E}_{M+N} := \text{Span}\{\mathcal{C}_{0,k} = \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m} : 0 \leq l < 2^M, 0 \leq m < 2^N, k = 2^N l + m\}$  is given by

$$\Pi_1(\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho))[g, r] := \gamma_{M+N,0}(g, r)e_{M+N,0} + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq M+N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} \tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r)\tilde{e}_{j,k}, \quad (\text{SA-7})$$

where  $e_{j,k} = \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})$  and  $\tilde{e}_{j,k} = \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) - \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})$  and

$$\gamma_{j,k}(g, r) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}[g(X)r(Y)|X \in \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}], & \text{if } N \leq j \leq M+N, \\ \mathbb{E}[g(X)|X \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[r(Y)|X \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}], & \text{if } j < N, k = 2^{N-j}l + m, \end{cases}$$

and  $\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r) = \gamma_{j-1,2k}(g, r) - \gamma_{j-1,2k+1}(g, r)$ . We will use  $\Pi_1$  as a shorthand for  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho))$ . The Haar basis representation on the right hand side of Equation SA-7 recovers the left hand side by adding up layers of more and more local fluctuation. However, at the bottom layers ( $1 \leq j \leq N$ ), the local fluctuation is characterized by a *product-factorized projection*  $\mathbb{E}[g(X)|X \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[r(Y)|X \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}]$ , instead of  $\mathbb{E}[g(X)r(Y)|X \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}]$ . This makes  $\Pi_1(\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho))[g, r]$  in general different from  $\Pi_0(\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho))[g \cdot r]$ .

For the residual empirical process, we define a new projection that adds up the *product-factorized projection* for  $g \cdot r$  and the  $L_2$ -projection for  $g \cdot \theta(\cdot, r)$ : For all  $(g, r) \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\Pi_2(\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho))[g, r] := \Pi_1(\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho))[g, r] - \Pi_0(\mathfrak{p}_X[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)])(g\theta(\cdot, r)), \quad (\text{SA-8})$$

recalling that  $\theta(\mathbf{x}, r) = \mathbb{E}[r(Y)|X = \mathbf{x}]$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . This projection can also be represented in Haar basis as

$$\Pi_2(\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho))[g, r] = \eta_{M+N,0}(g, r)e_{M+N,0} + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq M+N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} \tilde{\eta}_{j,k}(g, r)\tilde{e}_{j,k},$$

where for all  $g \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $r \in L_2(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\eta(j, k)(g, r) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } N \leq j \leq M+N, \\ \gamma_{j,k}(g, r), & \text{if } j < N, k = 2^{N-j}l + m. \end{cases} \quad (\text{SA-9})$$

We will use  $\Pi_2$  as a shorthand for  $\Pi_2(\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho))$ .

Now we define the empirical processes indexed by projected functions. By slightly abuse of notations, denote by  $(X_n(f) : f \in \mathcal{F})$  the general empirical process based on random sample  $((\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n)$ ,  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq L_2(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$ . That is,  $X_n(f) := n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (f(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)])$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then for any  $g \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $r \in L_2(\mathbb{R})$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1 M_n(g, r) &:= X_n \circ \Pi_1(g, r), \\ \Pi_0 M_n(g, r) &:= X_n \circ \Pi_0[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](gr), \\ \Pi_2 R_n(g, r) &:= X_n \circ \Pi_2(g, r), \\ \Pi_0 R_n(g, r) &:= X_n \circ \Pi_0[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](gr) - X_n \circ \Pi_0(\mathfrak{p}_X[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)])(g\theta(\cdot, r)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{SA-10})$$

where  $\Pi_0(\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho))$  and  $\Pi_0(\mathfrak{p}_X[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)])$  are the  $L_2$ -projections based on cells  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_X[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)]$ , respectively (Equation SA-3).

### SA-III.3 Strong Approximation Construction

**Lemma SA.15.** *Suppose Assumption SA.1 or Assumption SA.2 hold. Suppose  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$ ,  $\rho \geq 1$  is a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  of depth  $M$  in the dimension of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and depth  $N$  in the dimension of  $\mathbb{R}$  with respect to  $\mathbb{P}$ . Then,  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup (\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}) \cup \Pi_1(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \Pi_2(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{E}_{M+N}$  is  $\mathbb{P}$ -pregaussian.*

The construction essentially follows from the arguments in Section SA-II.3. We start with a Gaussian

process indexed by  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup (\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}) \cup \Pi_1(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \Pi_2(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{E}_{M+N}$  with almost sure continuous sample path, and take conditional quantile transformations of Gaussian process indexed by  $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{j,k}}$  to construct counts of  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ 's on the cells  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k}$ 's. By a Skorohod embedding argument, this Gaussian process can be taken on a possibly enriched probability space. More precisely, we have the following

**Lemma SA.16.** *Suppose Assumption SA.1 holds. Suppose  $\rho = 1$ . Then on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists a Brownian bridge  $\mathbb{B}_n$  indexed by  $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \times (\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}) \cup \Pi_1(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \Pi_2(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{E}_{M+N}$  such that that is mean-zero with almost sure continuous sample paths such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{B}_n(f), \mathbb{B}_n(g)] = \text{Cov} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \right], \quad f, g \in \mathcal{F},$$

and for any finite class of functions  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{M+N}$  and any  $x > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) - \sqrt{n} Z_n(f) \right| \geq 24 \sqrt{\|f\|_{\mathcal{E}_{M+N}}^2 x} + 4 \sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{\{f\}} x} \right) \leq 2 \text{Card}(\mathcal{F}) \exp(-x),$$

where  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{E}_{M+N}}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{\{f\}}$  are defined in Lemma SA.5.

**Lemma SA.17.** *Suppose Assumption SA.2 holds. Suppose  $\rho > 1$ . Then on a possibly enlarged probability space, there exists a Brownian bridge  $\mathbb{B}_n$  indexed by  $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \times (\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}) \cup \Pi_1(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \Pi_2(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{E}_{M+N}$  such that  $\mathbb{B}_n$  is mean-zero with almost sure continuous sample paths such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{B}_n(f), \mathbb{B}_n(g)] = \text{Cov} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i), \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \right], \quad f, g \in \mathcal{F},$$

and for any finite class of functions  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{M+N}$  and any  $x > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) - \sqrt{n} Z_n(f) \right| \geq C_\rho \sqrt{\|f\|_{\mathcal{E}_{M+N}}^2 x} + C_\rho \sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{\{f\}} x} \right) \\ \leq 2 \text{Card}(\mathcal{F}) \exp(-x) + 2^{M+2} \exp(-C_\rho n 2^{-M}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_\rho$  is a constant that only depends on  $\rho$ .

The above two lemmas allow for constructions of Gaussian processes and projected Gaussian processes as counterparts of the empirical processes in Section SA-III.2. In particular, we take  $Z_n^M, \Pi_1 Z_n^M, Z_n^R, \Pi_2 Z_n^R$  to be the empirical processes indexed by  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  such that for any  $g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

$$Z_n^M(g, r) := \mathbb{B}_n(gr), \quad \Pi_1 Z_n^M(g, r) := \mathbb{B}_n(\Pi_1[g, r]), \quad Z_n^R(g, r) := \mathbb{B}_n(g(r - \theta(\cdot, r))), \quad \Pi_2 Z_n^R(g, r) := \mathbb{B}_n(\Pi_2[g, r]).$$

## SA-III.4 Meshing Error

For  $0 < \delta \leq 1$ , consider the  $(\delta \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}})$ -net of  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, e_{\mathbb{P}})$ , with cardinality no larger than  $\mathbb{N}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta)$ : Define  $\pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} : \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R} \mapsto \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  such that  $\|\pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}(h) - h\|_{\mathbb{P}, 2} \leq \delta \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}$  for all  $h \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ , where  $\mathbb{P}$  is the distribution of  $(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1)$  satisfying Assumption B.



**Lemma SA.18.** *Suppose Assumption SA.1 or Assumption SA.2 hold. For all  $t > 0$  and  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[ \|M_n - M_n \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} + \|Z_n^M \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} - Z_n^M\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} > C_1 C_\alpha F_n(t, \delta) \right] &\leq \exp(-t), \\ \mathbb{P} \left[ \|R_n - R_n \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} + \|Z_n^R \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} - Z_n^R\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} > C_1 C_\alpha F_n(t, \delta) \right] &\leq \exp(-t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_\alpha = 1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$  and

$$F_n(t, \delta) = J(\delta)M_{\mathcal{G}} + \frac{(\log n)^{\alpha/2} M_{\mathcal{G}} J^2(\delta)}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} + \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t + (\log n)^\alpha \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t^\alpha.$$

### SA-III.5 Strong Approximation Errors

**Lemma SA.19.** *Suppose Assumption SA.1 holds. Let  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  be a cylindered dyadic expansion with  $\rho = 1$ . Suppose  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta$  is a  $\delta$ -net of  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, e_{\mathbb{P}})$  with cardinality no greater than  $N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta)$ . Then for all  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\Pi_1 M_n - \Pi_1 Z_n\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_1 C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M E_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} t + C_1 C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{C_{\{(g,r)\}}}{n}} t \right] &\leq 2N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) e^{-t}, \\ \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\Pi_2 R_n - \Pi_2 Z_n\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_1 C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M E_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} t + C_1 C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{C_{\{(g,r)\}}}{n}} t \right] &\leq 2N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) e^{-t}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_1 > 0$  is a universal constant and  $C_\alpha = 1 + (2\alpha)^{\alpha/2}$ .

**Lemma SA.20.** *Suppose Assumption SA.2 holds. Let  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  be a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion with  $\rho > 1$ . Suppose  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta$  is a  $\delta$ -net of  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, e_{\mathbb{P}})$  with cardinality no greater than  $N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta)$ . Then for all  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\Pi_1 M_n - \Pi_1 Z_n^M\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_1 C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M E_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} t + C_1 C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{C_{\{(g,r)\}}}{n}} t \right] \\ \leq 2N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) e^{-t} + 2^M \exp(-C_\rho n 2^{-M}), \\ \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\Pi_2 R_n - \Pi_2 Z_n^R\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_1 C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M E_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} t + C_1 C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{C_{\{(g,r)\}}}{n}} t \right] \\ \leq 2N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) e^{-t} + 2^M \exp(-C_\rho n 2^{-M}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_1 > 0$  is a universal constant and  $C_\alpha = 1 + (2\alpha)^{\alpha/2}$ .

### SA-III.6 Projection Error

The projection error can be decomposed into two parts: One captures the distance from the original function to the  $L_2$  projection, which we call the  $L_2$ -projection error, the other captures the distance between  $\Pi_1$ ,  $\Pi_2$  and  $\Pi_0$ , which we call the misspecification error.

### SA-III.6.1 Mis-specification Error for $M_n$ -Process

**Lemma SA.21.** *Suppose Assumption SA.1 or Assumption SA.2 hold. Let  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  with  $\rho \geq 1$  be a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion. Let  $\tau > 0$ . Define  $r_\tau := r\mathbb{1}([-\tau^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \tau^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}])$ . Then for any  $g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau) - \Pi_0 M_n(g, r_\tau))^2 \right] &\leq 2(1 + \rho)\tau^2 N^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}}, \\ \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}} &:= \min\{2\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}, \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}}\|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty\} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x}} f_X(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 2^M \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{V})\|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}. \end{aligned}$$

### SA-III.6.2 $L_2$ -projection Error for $M_n$ -Process

**Lemma SA.22.** *Suppose Assumption SA.1 or Assumption SA.2 hold. Let  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  with  $\rho \geq 1$  be a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion. Let  $\tau > 0$ . Define  $r_\tau := r\mathbb{1}([-\tau^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \tau^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}])$ . Then for any  $g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ (\Pi_0 M_n(g, r_\tau) - M_n(g, r_\tau))^2 \right] \leq 2 \left( 2^{-N} \tau^2 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 + (1 + \rho)\tau^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}} \right).$$

### SA-III.6.3 Projection Error for $M_n$ -Process

Combining Lemma SA.21 and SA.22, we can bound the projection error through a truncation argument.

**Lemma SA.23.** *Suppose Assumption SA.1 or Assumption SA.2 hold. Let  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  with  $\rho \geq 1$  be a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion. Then for all  $t > N$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[ \|M_n - \Pi_1 M_n\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}} \sqrt{(1 + \rho)N^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}} + 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 t^{\alpha + \frac{1}{2}}} + C_\alpha \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t^{\alpha + 1} \right] &\leq 4N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) n e^{-t}, \\ \mathbb{P} \left[ \|Z_n^M - \Pi_1 Z_n^M\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}} \sqrt{(1 + \rho)N^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}} + C_\alpha 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 t^{\frac{1}{2}}} + C_\alpha \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t \right] &\leq 4N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) n e^{-t}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_\alpha = 1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$  and  $C_{2\alpha} = 1 + (4\alpha)^\alpha$ .

### SA-III.6.4 Projection Error for $R_n$ -Process

The projection error for  $R_n$ -process can be built up upon the error for  $M_n$ -process and the observation that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_2 R_n(g, r) - R_n(g, r) &= \left( \Pi_1 M_n(g, r) - M_n(g, r) \right) - \left( \Pi_0 [\mathbf{p}_X(\mathcal{C}_{M,N})] X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) \right), \\ \Pi_2 Z_n^R(g, r) - Z_n^R(g, r) &= \left( \Pi_1 Z_n^M(g, r) - Z_n^M(g, r) \right) - \left( \Pi_0 [\mathbf{p}_X(\mathcal{C}_{M,N})] Z_n^X(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - Z_n^X(g\theta(\cdot, r)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in both lines, the first bracket is a projection error for an  $M_n$ -process that has been studied in Section SA-III.6.3, and the second bracket is a projection error for an  $X_n$ -process that has been studied in Section SA-II.5.

**Lemma SA.24.** *Suppose Assumption SA.1 or Assumption SA.2 hold. Let  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)$  with  $\rho \geq 1$  be a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion. Then for all  $t > N$ , with probability at least  $1 - 4N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) n e^{-t}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_n - \Pi_2 R_n\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} &\lesssim \sqrt{\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}} t^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}} \sqrt{(1 + \rho)N^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}} + 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 t^{\alpha + \frac{1}{2}}} + C_\alpha \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t^{\alpha + 1}, \\ \|Z_n^R - \Pi_2 Z_n^R\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} &\lesssim \sqrt{\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}} t^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}} \sqrt{(1 + \rho)N^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}} + 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 t^{\frac{1}{2}}} + C_\alpha \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} := \min\{2\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}, \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} \|\mathcal{V}\|_{\infty}\} \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} f_X(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 2^M \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{V}) \|\mathcal{V}\|_{\infty} \mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}.$$

**Lemma SA.25** (Covering Number of Conditional Mean). *Suppose  $(X, Y)$  is a random variable taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  is a class of measurable functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Consider  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{v_s : s \in \mathcal{S}\}$ . Then for all  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,*

$$\sup_Q N(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{S}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \varepsilon \|v_s\|_{Q,2}) \leq \sup_Q N(\mathcal{S}, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon \|s\|_{Q,2}),$$

where  $\sup$  is taken with respect to all finite discrete measures.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  in be a finite discrete measure on  $\mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ . Let  $r, s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Define a new probability measure  $\tilde{P}$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  by

$$\tilde{P}(A) = \int \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}((\mathbf{z}_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z} \times A) | \mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{z}] d\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{z}), \quad \forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_z}.$$

Then  $\int |S| d\tilde{P} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_z}} \mathbb{E}[S(y_i) | \mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{z}] d\mathcal{Q}(z) < \infty$  since  $\sup_{m \in M_{\mathcal{S}}} \|m\|_{\infty} < \infty$ . Hence  $\tilde{P} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{R})$ . Let  $r, s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then

$$\int |m_r - m_s|^2 d\mathcal{Q} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_z}} \mathbb{E}[|r(y_i) - s(y_i)|^2 | \mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{z}] d\mathcal{Q}(z) = \int |r - s|^2 d\tilde{P}.$$

Here  $\tilde{P}$  is not necessarily a finite discrete measure, but by similar argument as in Lemma SA.14, there exists  $\mathcal{S}_{\varepsilon} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  with cardinality no greater than  $\sup_Q N(\mathcal{S}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \varepsilon \|S\|_{Q,2})$  such that for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , there exists  $r \in \mathcal{S}_{\varepsilon}$  such that  $\|r - s\|_{\tilde{P},2} \leq \varepsilon \|S\|_{\tilde{P},2}$ . Hence  $\|m_r - m_s\|_{Q,2} \leq \varepsilon \|S\|_{\tilde{P},2} = \varepsilon \|m_S\|_{Q,2}$ . This implies that for any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$\sup_Q N(M_{\mathcal{S}}, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \varepsilon \|m_S\|_{Q,2}) \leq \sup_Q N(\mathcal{S}, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon \|S\|_{Q,2}).$$

□

### SA-III.7 Proof of Lemma SA.15

By the entropy integral conditions on  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  and Lemma SA.13,

$$J(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, \mathbf{M}_G M_R, \delta) \leq \sqrt{2} J(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{M}_G, \delta/\sqrt{2}) + \sqrt{2} J(\mathcal{R}, M_R, \delta/\sqrt{2}).$$

**Claim 1:** There exists  $C_{\alpha} > 0$  such that for all  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,

$$J(\Pi_0(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}), C_{\alpha} \mathbf{M}_G N^{\alpha}, \delta) \leq J(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, \mathbf{M}_G M_R, \delta).$$

**Proof of Claim 1:** Under condition (a),  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(Y) | X = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$  and  $|M_R(t)| \leq 1 + |t|^{\alpha}$  for some constant  $\alpha \geq 0$ . By Step 2 in Definition SA.3,  $\max_{0 \leq l < 2^{M+N}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i/(N \log 2)) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{0,l}] \leq 2$ . Hence

$$\max_{0 \leq l < 2^{M+N}} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \mathbb{E}[|r(y_i)| | (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{C}_{0,l}] \leq 1 + \max_{0 \leq l < 2^{M+N}} \mathbb{E}[|y_i|^{\alpha} | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{C}_{0,l}] \lesssim 1 + (2N\sqrt{\alpha})^{\alpha}, \quad (\text{SA-11})$$

Hence

$$\|\Pi_0(gr)\|_\infty \|g \times \mathcal{R}\| \leq C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha, \quad C_\alpha = 1 + (2\sqrt{\alpha})^\alpha. \quad (\text{SA-12})$$

Under condition (b),  $M_{\mathcal{R}} \leq 1$ . Hence Equation SA-12 holds with  $\alpha = 0$ . Hence Let  $Q$  be a finite discrete measure. Let  $f, g \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ . Then by definition of  $\Pi_0$ ,

$$\|\Pi_0 f - \Pi_0 g\|_{Q,2}^2 \leq \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N}} Q(C_{0,k}) (2^{M+N} \int_{C_{0,k}} f - g d\mathbb{P})^2 \leq \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N}} Q(C_{0,k}) 2^{M+N} \int_{C_{0,k}} (f - g)^2 d\mathbb{P}.$$

Define a measure  $\tilde{Q}$  such that for any  $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R})$ ,  $\tilde{Q}(A) = \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N}} Q(C_{0,k}) 2^{M+N} \mathbb{P}(A \cap C_{0,k})$ , then

$$\|\Pi_0 f - \Pi_0 g\|_{Q,2}^2 \leq \|f - g\|_{\tilde{Q},2}^2.$$

By Lemma SA.14, there exists an  $\delta C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha$ -net  $\mathcal{L}$  of  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  with cardinality no greater than  $\sup_Q N(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, e_Q, \delta \|M_{\mathcal{G}} \times M_{\mathcal{R}}\|)$ ,  $\sup$  taken over all finite discrete measures on  $(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1}))$ , such that for all  $f \in \Pi_0(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})$ , there exists  $g \in \mathcal{L}$  such that

$$\|f - g\|_{\tilde{Q},2}^2 \leq \delta^2 \|M_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\tilde{Q},2}^2 \leq \delta^2 (C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha)^2.$$

The claim then follows.

**Claim 2:** There exists  $C_\alpha > 0$  such that for all  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,

$$J(\Pi_1(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}), C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha, \delta) \lesssim J(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{R}}, \delta/3) \text{ and } J(\Pi_2(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}), C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha, \delta) \lesssim J(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{R}}, \delta/4).$$

**Proof of Claim 2:** Suppose  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  is a mapping from  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^{d+1})$  to  $[0, 1]$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{0 \leq l < 2^M} \sum_{0 \leq m < 2^N} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(X \in A) | X \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(Y \in B) | X \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, Y \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}] : \right. \\ \left. E \subseteq A \times B, A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d), B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \right\}.$$

It is easy to verify that  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  defines a probability measure on  $(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}))$ . Recall  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}$  is a collection of cells  $\{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq j \leq M+N, 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N}\}$  where  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k} \times \mathbb{R}$  if  $j \geq N$ . Take  $\mathcal{C}_{M,0} = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : N \leq j \leq M+N, 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}\}$ . Let  $g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](g, r) &= \Pi_1[\mathcal{C}_{M,0}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](g, r) + \Pi_1[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](g, r) - \Pi_1[\mathcal{C}_{M,0}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](g, r) \\ &= \Pi_0[\mathcal{C}_{M,0}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](gr) + \Pi_0[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \rho)](gr) - \Pi_0[\mathcal{C}_{M,0}(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \rho)](gr), \\ \Pi_2[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](g, r) &= \Pi_1[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](g, r) - \Pi_0[\mathcal{C}_{M,0}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](g\theta(\cdot, r)). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|\Pi_0[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \rho)]\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} \leq C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha$ , the previous claim applies not only to  $J(\Pi_0[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)](\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}), C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha, \delta)$  but also to  $J(\Pi_0[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \rho)](\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}), C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha, \delta)$ . Then Claim 2 follows from Claim 1.

**Claim 3:** There exists  $C_\alpha > 0$  such that for all  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,

$$J(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, C_1 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}}, \delta) \leq \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}) + \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{R}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}),$$

$C_1$  is some absolute constant.

**Proof of Claim 3:** Let  $Q$  be a discrete measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Take  $\tilde{Q}$  be the measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\tilde{Q}(E) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}((\mathbf{x}_1, y_1) \in E) | \mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}] dQ(\mathbf{x}), \quad E \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Take  $\tilde{Q}_Y$  to be the marginal of  $\tilde{Q}$  on the last dimension. Then for any  $r_1, r_2 \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $\|r_1 - r_2\|_{\tilde{Q}_Y, 2} \leq \varepsilon \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\theta(\cdot, r_1) - \theta(\cdot, r_2)\|_{\tilde{Q}, 2}^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\mathbb{E}[r_1(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] - \mathbb{E}[r_2(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}]|^2 dQ(\mathbf{x}) \\ & \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[(r_1(y_i) - r_2(y_i))^2 | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] dQ(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (r_1(y) - r_2(y))^2 d\tilde{Q}(\mathbf{x}, y) \\ & = \|r_1 - r_2\|_{\tilde{Q}_Y, 2}^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 \|M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\tilde{Q}_Y, 2}^2 = \varepsilon^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[M_{\mathcal{R}}(y_i)^2 | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] dQ(\mathbf{x}) \lesssim \varepsilon^2 C_{2\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $J(\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, C_1 \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}}, \delta) \leq J(\mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{R}}, \delta)$ , where  $C_1$  some absolute constant. Hence

$$J(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, C_1 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}}, \delta) \leq \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}) + \sqrt{2}J(\mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{R}}, \delta/\sqrt{2}).$$

Moreover,  $\{e_{j,k} : (j,k) \in \mathcal{J}\}$  has cardinality  $2^{M+N}$ . It follows from pointwise separability of  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  and Corollary 2.2.9 in [van der Vaart and Wellner \(2013\)](#) that  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \Pi_1(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \Pi_2(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{E}_{M+N}$  is pre-Gaussian.  $\square$

### SA-III.8 Proof of Lemma SA.16

The result follows from Lemma SA.5 with  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$  replacing  $\mathbf{x}_i$ .  $\square$

### SA-III.9 Proof of Lemma SA.17

Define

$$A = \{|\tilde{U}_{j,k}| \leq c_1 U_{j,k}, \text{ for all } N \leq j \leq M+N, 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}\}.$$

Since in Definition SA.3,  $\{\mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m} : 0 \leq j \leq N, 0 \leq m < 2^{N-j}\}$  is a dyadic expansion, we can apply Tusnády's Lemma ([Bretagnolle and Massart, 1989](#), Lemma 4) and Lemma SA.6 to get whenever  $A$  holds,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \tilde{U}_{j,k} - \sqrt{U_{j,k} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^2}} \tilde{\xi}_{j,k} \right| < c_2 \tilde{\xi}_{j,k}^2 + c_3, \\ & |\tilde{U}_{j,k}| \leq 1/c_0 + 2 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k}) \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j-1,2k+1})}{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k})^2}} U_{j,k} |\tilde{\xi}_{j,k}|, \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq M+N, 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}. \end{aligned}$$

And similarly as in the proof for Lemma SA.7,

$$\mathbb{P}(A^c) \leq 42^M \exp\left(-\min\left\{\frac{c_1^2}{3} \wedge 1\right\} \rho^{-1} n 2^{-M}\right).$$

The rest of the proof follows from Lemma SA.7 by replacing  $\mathbf{x}_i$  with  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ .  $\square$

### SA-III.10 Proof of Lemma SA.18

By Lemma SA.13, for any  $0 < \delta < 1$ ,  $\sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q},2}, \delta \|M_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\mathcal{Q},2}) \leq N(\delta)$  and  $J(\delta, \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, M_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{R}}) \leq J(\delta)$ . By definition  $\|\pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} h - h\|_{\mathbb{P},2} \leq \delta \|M_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\mathbb{P},2}$ , where  $\mathbb{P}$  is the joint law for  $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$ . Take  $\mathcal{L} = \{h - \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} h : h \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}\}$ . Take  $\mathbb{G}_n(f) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n [f(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)]]$ . Then, by Theorem 5.2 in Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{L}}] &\lesssim J(\delta) M_{\mathcal{G}} \|M_{\mathcal{R}}(y_i)\|_{\mathbb{P},2} + \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}} \|\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} M_{\mathcal{R}}(y_i)\|_{\mathbb{P},2} J^2(\delta)}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} \\ &\lesssim J(\delta) M_{\mathcal{G}} (1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) + \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}} J^2(\delta)}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} (1 + (2 \log(n) \alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,  $\|\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}} |g(\mathbf{x}_i) r(y_i)|\|_{\psi_{\alpha-1}} \lesssim M_{\mathcal{G}} (\|\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} y_i\|_{\psi_1})^\alpha \lesssim M_{\mathcal{G}} (\log n)^\alpha$ . Hence, by Theorem 4 in Adamczak (2008), for any  $t > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 4 \exp(-t)$ ,

$$\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{L}} \lesssim J(\delta) M_{\mathcal{G}} (1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) + \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}} J^2(\delta)}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} (1 + (2 \log(n) \alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) + \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t + (\log n)^\alpha \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t^\alpha.$$

In particular,  $\|\mathbb{G}_n\|_{\mathcal{L}} = \|M_n - M_n \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}$ . The bound for  $\|Z_n^M - Z_n^M \circ \pi_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}\|$  follows from a standard concentration inequality for Gaussian suprema. The bound for  $R_n$  process follows from the fact that if we define  $\mathcal{G} \times \bar{\mathcal{R}} = \{g(r - \theta(\cdot, r)) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ , then

$$\sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{G} \times \bar{\mathcal{R}}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q},2}, \delta \|M_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\mathcal{Q},2}) \leq 2 \sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q},2}, \delta \|M_{\mathcal{G}} M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\mathcal{Q},2}). \quad (\text{SA-13})$$

Now we show the above inequality holds: Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  in be a finite discrete measure on  $\mathbb{R}^{dz}$ . Let  $r, s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Define a new probability measure  $\tilde{P}$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  by

$$\tilde{P}(A) = \int \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}((\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times A) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] d\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Then  $\int |S| d\tilde{P} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E}[S(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] d\mathcal{Q}(z) < \infty$  since  $\sup_{m \in M_{\mathcal{S}}} \|m\|_{\infty} < \infty$ . Hence  $\tilde{P} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbb{R})$ . Let  $r, s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then

$$\int |m_r - m_s|^2 d\mathcal{Q} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dz}} \mathbb{E}[|r(y_i) - s(y_i)|^2 | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] d\mathcal{Q}(x) = \int |r - s|^2 d\tilde{P}.$$

Here  $\tilde{P}$  is not necessarily a finite discrete measure, but by similar argument as in Lemma SA.14, there exists  $\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  with cardinality no greater than  $\sup_{\mathcal{Q}} N(\mathcal{S}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{Q},2}, \varepsilon \|S\|_{\mathcal{Q},2})$  such that for any  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , there exists  $r \in \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon$  such that  $\|r - s\|_{\tilde{P},2} \leq \varepsilon \|S\|_{\tilde{P},2}$ . Hence  $\|m_r - m_s\|_{\mathcal{Q},2} \leq \varepsilon \|S\|_{\tilde{P},2} = \varepsilon \|m_S\|_{\mathcal{Q},2}$ . This implies that for

any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$\sup_Q N(M_S, \|\cdot\|_{Q,2}, \varepsilon \|m_S\|_{Q,2}) \leq \sup_Q N(\mathcal{S}, \|\cdot\|, \varepsilon \|S\|_{Q,2}).$$

□

### SA-III.11 Proof of Lemma SA.19

For notational simplicity, we will use  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathcal{X}_{0,l}]$  in short for  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}]$  in short for  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}]$ . First, we consider the  $M_n$ -process.

**Layers  $N+1 \leq j \leq M+N$ :** For this layers,  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k} \times \mathbb{R}$ . By definition of  $\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{N < j \leq M+N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r)| &\leq \sum_{N \leq j < M+N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} \mathbb{E}[|g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i)||\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}] \\ &\leq \sum_{N \leq j < M+N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} \mathbb{E}[|g(\mathbf{x}_i)\mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathbf{x}_i]||\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}] \\ &\lesssim C_\alpha \sum_{N \leq j < M+N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} 2\mathbb{E}[|g(\mathbf{x}_i)\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k})|] \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k})^{-1} \\ &\lesssim C_\alpha \sum_{N \leq j < M+N} \mathbf{E}_g 2^{M+N-j} \lesssim C_\alpha 2^M \mathbf{E}_g, \end{aligned}$$

where in (1) we have used  $E[|r(y_i)||\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \lesssim C_\alpha = 1 + (2\alpha)^{\alpha/2}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover,  $|\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r)| \lesssim C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_g$  for all  $j \in (N, M+N]$ , hence

$$\sum_{N \leq j \leq M+N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r)|^2 \lesssim C_\alpha^2 2^M \mathbf{E}_g \mathbf{M}_g.$$

**Layers  $1 \leq j \leq N$ :** By definition,  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}$ , where  $k = 2^{N-j}l + m$ , for some unique  $l \in [0, 2^M)$  and  $m \in [0, 2^{N-j})$ . Denote  $k = (l, m)$ . Fix  $j$  and  $l$ , sum across  $m$ ,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{2^{N-j}-1} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,(l,m)}(g, r)| = \sum_{m=0}^{2^{N-j}-1} |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l}] (\mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m}] - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m+1}])|.$$

Under condition (a), Notice that  $|\max(\mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,0})| \leq \log(\mathbb{E}[\exp(r(y_i))|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,0}]) \leq \log(2 \cdot 2^N) \leq 2N$ , and similarly  $|\min(\mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2^{N-j}})| \leq 2N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^{2^{N-j}-2} |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m}] - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m+1}]| &\lesssim \text{TV}(r|_{[-2N, 2N]}) \lesssim N^\alpha, \\ |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,1}] - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,0}]| &\leq \left(\max_m - \min_m\right) \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,m}] \lesssim C_\alpha N^\alpha, \\ |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2^{N-j}-1}] - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2^{N-j}-2}]| &\lesssim C_\alpha N^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Under condition (b), since  $\mathbf{TV}_{\{r\}} \lesssim 1$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{\{r\}} \lesssim 1$ , the above three inequality still hold. It follows that for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}$ , fix  $j, l$  and sum across  $m$ ,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{2^{N-j}-1} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,(l,m)}(g, r)| \lesssim C_\alpha N^\alpha |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l}]|.$$

Fix  $j$  and sum the above across  $l$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,(l,m)}(g, r)| &= \sum_{l=0}^{2^{M-1}-1} \sum_{m=0}^{2^{N-j}-1} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,(l,m)}(g, r)| \lesssim C_\alpha N^\alpha \sum_{l=0}^{2^{M-1}-1} \mathbb{E}[|g(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{X}_{0,l})|] \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l})^{-1} \\ &\lesssim C_\alpha N^\alpha 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}. \end{aligned}$$

We can now sum across  $j$  to get

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r)| \lesssim C_\alpha N^{\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

By Equation SA-11,  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r)| \lesssim C_\alpha N^\alpha \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}$ , and hence

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r)|^2 \lesssim C_\alpha^2 N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

**Strong Approximation for Projected Processes** Putting together the previous two parts,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M+N} \sum_{k=0}^{2^{M+N-j}} \tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}^2(g, r) \lesssim C_\alpha^2 N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}.$$

By Lemma SA.16, we know for any  $(g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ , for any  $x > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-x)$ ,

$$|M_n \circ \Pi_1(g, r) - Z_n \circ \Pi_1(g, r)| \lesssim C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} x + C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{C}_{\{(g,r)\}}}{n}} x,$$

where  $C_\alpha$  is a constant that only depends on  $\alpha$ . It then follows from the relation between  $\gamma_{j,k}$  and  $\eta_{j,k}$  which is given in Equation SA-9 that for any  $(g, r) \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$ , for any  $x > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-x)$ ,

$$|R_n \circ \Pi_2(g, r) - Z_n \circ \Pi_2(g, r)| \lesssim C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} x + C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{C}_{\{(g,r)\}}}{n}} x.$$

□

### SA-III.12 Proof of Lemma SA.20

Since  $\mathcal{C}_{M,N}$  is a cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion,  $\rho^{-1} 2^{-M-N+j} \leq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C}_{j,k}) \leq \rho 2^{-M-N+j}$ , for all  $0 \leq j \leq M+N, 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}$ . Hence following the argument in the proof for Lemma SA.19, for any  $g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M+N} \sum_{k=0}^{2^{M+N-j}} \tilde{\eta}_{j,k}^2(g, r) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{M+N} \sum_{k=0}^{2^{M+N-j}} \tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}^2(g, r) \lesssim C_\alpha^2 N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}.$$



The result then follows from Lemma SA.16.  $\square$

### SA-III.13 Proof of Lemma SA.21

Scrutinizing the definition of  $\beta_{j,k}$  and  $\gamma_{j,k}$  from Sections SA-II.2 and SA-III.2, essentially we are going to show the difference between  $\Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau)$  and  $\Pi_0 M_n(g, r_\tau)$  is driven by the difference between  $g$  and  $\Pi_0(\mathbf{p}_X[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)])g(\mathbf{x}_i)$ , the  $L_2$ -projection of  $g$  onto  $\mathbf{p}_X[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)]$ . Expanding  $\Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau) - \Pi_0 M_n(g, r_\tau)$  by Haar basis representation,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau) - \Pi_0 M_n(g, r_\tau) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i, \\ \Delta_i(g, r_\tau) &= \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} \left( \tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r_\tau) - \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g, r_\tau) \right) \tilde{e}_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r_\tau) = \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g, r_\tau)$  for  $j > N$ . Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E} [|\Delta_i(g, r_\tau)|] \leq (1 + \rho) \sum_{0 \leq j < N} \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} |\gamma_{j,k}(g, r) - \beta_{j,k}(g, r)| \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{C}_{j,k}).$$

Recall in Definition SA.3,  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{j-N,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}$ , where  $k = 2^{N-j}l + m$ ,  $0 \leq l < 2^M$  and  $0 \leq m < 2^{N-j}$ . Since  $M_R$  has polynomial growth and  $r_\tau$  has been truncated,

$$\begin{aligned}|\gamma_{j,k}(g, r_\tau) - \beta_{j,k}(g, r_\tau)| &= |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[r_\tau(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}] - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)r_\tau(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}]| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}[(g(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l}])r_\tau(y_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}]| \leq \tau |\mathbb{E}[(g(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l}])|\mathcal{C}_{j,k}]|\end{aligned}$$

Summing across  $j$  and  $k$ , then by similar argument as in the proof of Lemma SA.9,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} [|\Delta_i(g, r_\tau)|] &\leq (1 + \rho)\tau N \mathbb{E} [ |g(\mathbf{x}_i) - \Pi_0(\mathbf{p}_X[\mathcal{C}_{M,N}(\mathbb{P}, \rho)])g(\mathbf{x}_i)| ] \\ &\leq (1 + \rho)\tau N \left( \sup_{\mathbf{x}} f_X(\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 2^M \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{V}) \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty \mathbf{TV}_{\{g\}}.\end{aligned}$$

For each fixed  $j$ ,  $\tilde{e}_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}, y)$  can be non-zero for only one  $k$ . Hence, almost surely,

$$\begin{aligned}|\Delta_i(g, r_\tau)| &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} (\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r_\tau) - \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g, r_\tau)) \tilde{e}_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \max_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} \left| \tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(g, r_\tau) - \tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g, r_\tau) \right| \leq 2 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \max_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} |\gamma_{j,k}(g, r_\tau) - \beta_{j,k}(g, r_\tau)| \\ &\leq 2\tau \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \max_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N-j}} |\mathbb{E}[(g(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathcal{X}_{0,l}])|\mathcal{C}_{j,k}]| \leq 2N\tau \min\{2M_{\mathcal{G}}, L_{\mathcal{G}}\} \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty.\end{aligned}$$

This shows the results.  $\square$

**Lemma SA.26.** *Suppose  $g$  and  $F$  are functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ , where  $F$  is bounded and non-decreasing. Suppose  $T$  is an interval in  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\inf_{t \in T} g(t) \leq 0 \leq \sup_{t \in T} g(t)$ . Suppose we also have  $\mathbf{pTV}_{\{g\}, T} :=$*

$\sup_{n \geq 1} \sup_{x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n \in T} \sum_{i=1}^n |g(x_{i+1}) - g(x_i)| < \infty$ . Then

$$\int_T |g(x)| dF(x) \leq \text{pTV}_{\{g\}, T} \int_T 1 dF(x).$$

### SA-III.14 Proof of Lemma SA.26

The result follows from the observation that for any  $x \in T$ ,  $|g(x)| \leq \text{pTV}_{\{g\}, T}$ .  $\square$

### SA-III.15 Proof of Lemma SA.22

Denote by  $\mathcal{B}$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{C}_{0,k}) = \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}) : 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N}, k = 2^N l + m\}$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i) | \mathcal{B}] - g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i) = \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i) | \mathcal{B}] - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathcal{B}] r_\tau(y_i) + \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathcal{B}] r_\tau(y_i) - g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i).$$

The first two terms are driven by projection of  $r_\tau$  on grids  $\mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}$ 's, and can be upper bounded through probability measure assigned to each grid ( $2^{-N}$ ) and total variation of  $r_\tau$ . We consider the random variable  $\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbb{1}(g(\mathbf{x}_i) > 0) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}] r_\tau(y_i)$ . Take  $m_{j,k}^+ := \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i) \mathbb{1}(g(\mathbf{x}_i) > 0) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}]$ . Apply Lemma SA.26 with  $g(y) = \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbb{1}(g(\mathbf{x}_i) > 0) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}] r_\tau(y) - m_{j,k}^+$ ,  $F(y) = \mathbb{P}(y_i \leq y | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x})$  and interval  $T = \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}$ , to get for each  $0 \leq l < 2^M, 0 \leq m < 2^N$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| (\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbb{1}(g(\mathbf{x}_i) > 0) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}] r_\tau(y_i) - m_{j,k}^+) \mathbb{1}(y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}) \right| \middle| \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m} | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{M}_{\{g\}} \text{TV}_{\{r_\tau | \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, take  $m_{j,k}^- := \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i) \mathbb{1}(g(\mathbf{x}_i) < 0) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}]$ , and we have for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| (\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) \mathbb{1}(g(\mathbf{x}_i) < 0) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}] r_\tau(y_i) - m_{j,k}^-) \mathbb{1}(y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}) \right| \middle| \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m} | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{M}_{\{g\}} \text{TV}_{\{r_\tau | \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two parts and integrate over the event  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| (\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}] r_\tau(y_i) - m_{0,k}) \mathbb{1}(y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}) \right| \middle| \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m} | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}) \mathbf{M}_{\{g\}} \text{TV}_{\{r_\tau | \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}\}} \leq 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_{\{g\}} \text{TV}_{\{r_\tau | \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over  $m$ , we get for each  $0 \leq l < 2^M$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathcal{B}] r_\tau(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i) | \mathcal{B}] \right| \middle| \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \right] \leq 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_{\{g\}} \text{TV}_{\{r_\tau\}}.$$

Hence using the polynomial growth of total variation,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathcal{B}] r_\tau(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i) | \mathcal{B}] \right| \right] \leq 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_{\{g\}} \text{TV}_{\{r_\tau\}} \leq 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_g \tau.$$

Since  $|\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i) | \mathcal{B}] - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathcal{B}] r_\tau(y_i)| \leq \mathbf{M}_g \tau$  almost surely,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ (\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathcal{B}] r_\tau(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r_\tau(y_i) | \mathcal{B}])^2 \right] \leq 2^{-N} \tau^2 \mathbf{M}_g^2.$$

The last two terms are essentially driven by the  $L_2$ -projection error of  $g$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{X}_{0,l}) : 0 \leq l < 2^M\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ . By Jensen's inequality and a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma SA.9,

$$\mathbb{E} [(\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathcal{B}]r_\tau(y_i) - g(\mathbf{x}_i)r_\tau(y_i))^2] \leq \tau^2 \mathbb{E} [(g(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)|\mathcal{A}])^2] \leq (1 + \rho)\tau^2 \mathbb{V}_g.$$

It then follows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ (\Pi_0 M_n(g, r_\tau) - M_n(g, r_\tau))^2 \right] \leq 2 \left( 2^{-N} \tau^2 \mathbb{M}_g^2 + (1 + \rho)\tau^2 \mathbb{V}_g \right).$$

□

### SA-III.16 Proof of Lemma SA.23

We will use a truncation argument for the projection error. First, suppose condition (a) holds. Let  $\tau > 0$ .

**Projection error for truncated processes:** By Lemma SA.21, SA.22 and using Bernstein inequality, for all  $t > 0$ , for each  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ |M_n(g, r_\tau) - \Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau)| \geq 4\tau \sqrt{(1 + \rho)N^2 \mathbb{V}_g + 2^{-N} \mathbb{M}_g^2} \sqrt{t} + \frac{4}{3} \tau \frac{\mathbb{M}_g}{\sqrt{n}} t \right] \leq 2e^{-t}. \quad (\text{SA-14})$$

**Truncation Error:** We choose a cutoff  $\tau$  that satisfies  $\tau^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} > \log(2^{N+1})$ . Recall Equation SA-11 implies  $\max_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N}} \mathbb{E}[|r(y_i)| | (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathcal{C}_{0,k}] \lesssim C_\alpha N^\alpha$ , where  $C_\alpha = 1 + (2\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ . The same argument for Equation SA-11 implies  $\max_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N}} \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)^2 | (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathcal{C}_{0,k}] \lesssim 1 + (N \log(2) \sqrt{2\alpha})^{2\alpha} \lesssim C_{2\alpha} N^{2\alpha}$ , where  $C_{2\alpha} := 1 + (2 \cdot 2\alpha)^{\frac{2\alpha}{2}}$ . Hence the following holds almost surely,

$$|\Pi_1 M_n(g, r) - \Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau)| \leq \max_{l,m} \left| \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l}] \cdot \mathbb{E}[|r(y_i)| \mathbb{1}(|y_i| \geq \tau^{1/\alpha}) | \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}] \right| \lesssim C_\alpha \mathbb{M}_g N^\alpha.$$

Since  $\tau^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} > \log(2^{N+1}) > 0.5N$ ,  $\gamma_{0,k} = \beta_{0,k}$  for all  $k$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}$  for  $0 < m < 2^N - 1$ , that is, the mismatch only happens at edge cells of  $y_i$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ |\Pi_1 M_n(g, r) - \Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau)|^2 \right] \lesssim \mathbb{P}(\Pi_1 M_n(g, r) - \Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau) \neq 0) C_{2\alpha} \mathbb{M}_g^2 N^{2\alpha} \leq C_{2\alpha} 2^{-N+1} \mathbb{M}_g^2 N^{2\alpha}.$$

Apply Bernstein's inequality for  $\Pi_1 M_n(g, r) - \Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau)$ , for all  $t > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-t)$ ,

$$|\Pi_1 M_n(g, r) - \Pi_1 M_n(g, r_\tau)| \lesssim \sqrt{C_{2\alpha} 2^{-N/2} \mathbb{M}_g N^\alpha} \sqrt{t} + C_\alpha \frac{\mathbb{M}_g N^\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} t \leq \sqrt{C_{2\alpha} 2^{-N/2} \mathbb{M}_g N^\alpha} \sqrt{t} + C_\alpha \frac{\mathbb{M}_g \tau}{\sqrt{n}} t. \quad (\text{SA-15})$$

Moreover,  $\mathbb{V}[M_n(g, r) - M_n(g, r_\tau)] \leq \mathbb{M}_g^2 \mathbb{V}[r(y_i) - r_\tau(y_i)] \leq \mathbb{M}_g^2 \mathbb{E}[(r(y_i) - r_\tau(y_i))^2] \leq \mathbb{M}_g^2 \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)^2 \mathbb{1}(|y_i| \geq \tau)] \leq 2^{-N} \mathbb{M}_g^2 \max_{0 \leq k < 2^{M+N}} \mathbb{E}[r(y_i)^2 | (\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i) \in \mathcal{C}_{0,k}] \lesssim C_{2\alpha} \mathbb{M}_g^2 N^{2\alpha} 2^{-N}$ . By Bernstein inequality and a truncation argument, for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\sqrt{n}|M_n(g, r) - M_n(g, r_\tau)| \geq t) \\ & \leq \min_{y>0} 2 \exp \left( -\frac{t^2}{2n \mathbb{V}[M_n(g, r) - M_n(g, r_\tau)] + \frac{2}{3}xy} \right) + 2\mathbb{P} \left( \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |g(\mathbf{x}_i)(r(y_i) - r_\tau(y_i))| \geq y \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $y = M_{\mathcal{G}}t^\alpha$ , we get for all  $t > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 4\exp(-t)$ ,

$$|M_n(g, r) - M_n(g, r_\tau)| \lesssim \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}} 2^{-N/2} M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha \sqrt{t} + C_\alpha \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t^{\alpha+1}. \quad (\text{SA-16})$$

**Putting Together:** Taking  $\tau = t^\alpha > 0.5^\alpha N^\alpha$ , we get from Equation SA-14, SA-15 and SA-16 that for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ , for all  $t > N$ , with probability at least  $1 - 4n\exp(-t)$ ,

$$|\Pi_1 M_n(g, r) - M_n(g, r)| \lesssim \sqrt{C_{2\alpha}} \sqrt{(1 + \rho) N^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G}} + 2^{-N} M_{\mathcal{G}}^2 t^{\alpha + \frac{1}{2}}} + C_\alpha \frac{M_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} t^{\alpha+1}. \quad (\text{SA-17})$$

The bound for  $|\Pi_1 Z_n^M(g, r) - Z_n^M(g, r)|$  follows from the fact that it is a mean-zero Gaussian random variable with variance equal to  $\mathbb{V}[\Pi_1 M_n(g, r) - M_n(g, r)]$ . The result follows then follows from a union bound over  $(g, r) \in (\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta$ .

Now consider the case where condition (b) holds. Condition (b) implies  $M_{\mathcal{R}} \leq 2$ . Hence choosing  $\tau = 2$ , then  $M_n(g, r) = M_n(g, r_\tau)$  almost surely for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ , that is, there is no truncation error. Hence Equation SA-14 implies Equation SA-17 holds with  $\alpha = 0$  and similarly for the  $Z_n^M$  counterpart.  $\square$

### SA-III.17 Proof of Lemma SA.24

By definition of  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$ , by Equation SA-10,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_2 R_n(g, r) - R_n(g, r) &= \left( \Pi_1 M_n(g, r) - M_n(g, r) \right) - \left( \Pi_0 [\mathbf{p}_X(\mathcal{C}_{M, N})] X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) \right), \\ \Pi_2 Z_n^R(g, r) - Z_n^R(g, r) &= \left( \Pi_1 Z_n^M(g, r) - Z_n^M(g, r) \right) - \left( \Pi_0 [\mathbf{p}_X(\mathcal{C}_{M, N})] Z_n^X(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - Z_n^X(g\theta(\cdot, r)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms on RHS of both lines are bounded from Lemma SA.23. Recall  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}} = \{g\theta(\cdot, r) : g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ . We know from Lemma SA.9 for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( |\Pi_0 [\mathbf{p}_X(\mathcal{C}_{M, N})] X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r))| \geq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} t} + \frac{4}{3} \cdot \frac{M_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}}{\sqrt{n}} t \right) &\leq 2\exp(-t), \\ \mathbb{P} \left( |\Pi_0 [\mathbf{p}_X(\mathcal{C}_{M, N})] Z_n^X(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - Z_n^X(g\theta(\cdot, r))| \geq 2\sqrt{\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} t} \right) &\leq 2\exp(-t). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, under condition (a),  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ , hence  $\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[|r(y_i)| | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 1 + \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[|y_i|^\alpha | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \lesssim 1 + (\sqrt{\alpha})^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \leq C_\alpha$  by moment properties of sub-Gaussian random variables. Hence  $M_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} \leq C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}}$ . Under condition (b),  $\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \|r\|_\infty \leq 2$ , hence we also have  $M_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} \leq C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}}$ . The result then follows from a union bound over  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta$ .  $\square$

### SA-III.18 Proof of Theorem SA.1

We make a reduction via the same Rosenblatt transformation in the proof for Theorem 1. Take  $\mathbf{u}_i = \phi_X(\mathbf{x}_i)$  where  $\phi_X$  is defined as in Lemma SA.12. And define  $\tilde{g} = g \circ \phi_X^{-1}$  for each  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  and consider  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \{\tilde{g} : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ . Then for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,

$$M_n(g, r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g(\mathbf{x}_i) r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) r(y_i)] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{g}(\mathbf{u}_i) r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(\mathbf{u}_i) r(y_i)] =: \tilde{M}_n(\tilde{g}, r).$$

Take  $\mathcal{A}_{M,N}(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}, 1)$  to be a *axis-aligned cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion* of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ , with depth  $M$  for the main subspace  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and depth  $N$  for the multiplier subspace  $\mathbb{R}$ , with respect to  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  the joint distribution of  $(\mathbf{u}_i, y_i)$ . Take  $\tilde{Z}_n^M$  to be the mean-zero Gaussian-process in Lemma SA.19 indexed by  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  with the same covariance structure as  $\tilde{M}_n$ . Let  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta$  be a  $\delta\|\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$ -net of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}$  with cardinality no greater than  $\sup_Q N(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}, e_Q, \delta\|\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}})$  where sup is taken over all finite discrete measures on  $[0, 1]^d \times \mathcal{R}$ . By Lemma SA.13,  $\sup_Q N(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}, e_Q, \delta\|\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}) \leq N(\delta)$ . By Lemma SA.19, the SA error for projected process on  $\delta$ -net is bounded by: For all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|\Pi_1 M_n - \Pi_1 Z_n^M\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} t + C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_1(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})}}{n}} t\right] \leq 2N(\delta)e^{-t}.$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_1(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})} = \sup_{f \in \Pi_1(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})} \min \left\{ \sup_{(j,k)} \left[ \sum_{j' < j} (j-j')(j-j'+1)2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \tilde{\beta}_{j',k'}^2(f) \right], \|f\|_\infty^2 (M+N) \right\}.$$

Let  $f \in \Pi_1(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})$ . Then there exists  $g \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $f = \Pi_1[g, r]$ . Since  $f$  is already piecewise-constant, by definition of  $\beta_{j,k}$ 's and  $\gamma_{j,k}$ 's, we know  $\tilde{\beta}_{l,m}(f) = \tilde{\gamma}_{l,m}(g, r)$ . Fix  $(j, k)$ . We consider two cases.

**Case 1:**  $j > N$ . Then by the design of cell expansions (Section SA-III.1),  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k} \times \mathbb{R}$ . First consider  $l$  such that  $N \leq j' \leq j$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{A}_{M,N}(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}, 1)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}'_j \subseteq [-2^{-\frac{M+N-j}{d}+2}, 2^{-\frac{M+N-j}{d}+2}]^d$ ,  $\|\mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}\|_\infty \leq 2^{-\frac{M+N-j}{d}+1}$ . By definition of  $\tilde{\gamma}_{j',m}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m: \mathcal{C}_{j',m} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j,k}(\tilde{g}, r)| &\leq 2^{2(M+N-j')} \int_{\mathcal{U}'_j} \int_{\mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}} |\tilde{g}(\mathbf{x})\theta(\mathbf{x}, r) - \tilde{g}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s})\theta(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{s}, r)| d\mathbf{x} ds \\ &\leq 2^{2(M+N-j')} \mathbf{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, [0,1]^d} \int_{\mathcal{U}'_j} \|\mathbf{s}\| \|\mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}\|_\infty^{d-1} ds \\ &\leq 2^{2(M+N-j')} \text{Vol}(\mathcal{U}'_j) \|\mathcal{U}'_j\|_\infty \|\mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}\|_\infty^{d-1} \mathbf{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, [0,1]^d} \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{d-1}{d}(j-j')} \mathbf{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, [0,1]^d}. \end{aligned}$$

Then consider  $j'$  such that  $0 \leq j' < N$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j',k'}(\tilde{g}, r)| \\ &= \sum_{j': \mathcal{X}_{0,j'} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}} \sum_{0 \leq m < 2^{j'}} |\mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,j'}]| \cdot |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,j'}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{j',j-1,2m}] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,j'}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{j',j-1,2m+1}]| \\ &\leq C_\alpha \sum_{j': \mathcal{X}_{0,j'} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}} |\mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,j'}]| N^\alpha \leq C_\alpha 2^{j-N} \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} N^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j' < j} (j - j')(j - j' + 1)2^{j' - j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j', k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j', k'}(\tilde{g}, r)| \\ & \leq \sum_{N \leq j' < j} (j - j')(j - j' + 1)2^{-\frac{j-j'}{d}} K_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, [0, 1]^d} + \sum_{j' < N} (j - j')(j - j' + 1)2^{j' - N} M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} N^\alpha \lesssim K_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, [0, 1]^d} + M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} N^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

**Case 2:**  $j \leq N$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}_{j, k} = \mathcal{X}_{0, l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l, j, m}$ . Hence for any  $0 \leq j' \leq j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j', k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j', k'}(\tilde{g}, r)| &= |\mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}]| \sum_{m': \mathcal{Y}_{l, j', m'} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_{l, j, m}} |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l, j-1, 2m}]| \\ &\quad - |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l, j-1, 2m+1}]| \\ &\leq C_\alpha |\mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}]| N^\alpha \leq C_\alpha M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} N^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j' < j} (j - j')(j - j' + 1)2^{j' - j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j', k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j', k'}(\tilde{g}, r)| \leq C_\alpha M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} N^\alpha.$$

Moreover, for all  $(j, k)$ , we have  $\tilde{\beta}_{j, k}(\tilde{g}, r) \leq C_\alpha M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} N^\alpha$ . Now, we bound  $K_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, [0, 1]^d}$  in terms of properties of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a cube in  $[0, 1]^d$  with side length  $a$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{D}_d(\mathcal{C})} \int g \circ \phi_X^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \theta(\mathbf{x}, r) \operatorname{div}(\varphi)(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} / \|\varphi\|_2 \|\theta\|_\infty \\ & \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \|\nabla(g_\varepsilon \circ \phi_X^{-1} \cdot \theta(\cdot, r))(\mathbf{u})\|_2 d\mathbf{u} \\ & \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \|\nabla(g_\varepsilon \circ \phi_X^{-1})(\mathbf{u})\| \|\theta(\cdot, r)\|_\infty + \|g_\varepsilon\|_\infty \|\nabla\theta(\mathbf{u}, r)\| \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{u} \in \operatorname{Supp}(g)) d\mathbf{u} \\ & \leq K_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} a^{d-1} + M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} a^d \leq (K_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} + M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}) a^{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Together with Lemma SA.12 for the relation between  $K_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}$  (resp.  $M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}$ ) and  $K_{\mathcal{G}}$  (resp.  $M_{\mathcal{G}}$ ),  $K_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}, [0, 1]^d} \leq c_3 K_{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} + M_{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}$ . Hence

$$\mathbb{C}_{\Pi_1(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})} \leq \min\{C_\alpha^2 (M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha) (c_3 K_{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} + M_{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} + M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha), (C_\alpha M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha)^2 (M + N)\}.$$

Since  $\mathbf{u}_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \operatorname{Unif}([0, 1]^d)$  and the cells  $\mathcal{A}_{M, N}(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}, 1)$  are obtained via *axis aligned dyadic expansion* and  $\mathbf{u}_i$  is uniformly distributed on  $[0, 1]^d$ , we have  $\|\mathcal{X}_{0, k}\|_\infty \leq 2^{-\lfloor M/d \rfloor}$  for all  $0 \leq k < 2^M$ . Then by Lemma SA.23 with  $\rho = 1$ , for all  $t > N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left[\|M_n - \Pi_1 M_n\|_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > \sqrt{2N^2 \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} + 2^{-N} M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^2 t^{\alpha + \frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}}{\sqrt{n}} t^{\alpha + 1}\right] &\leq 4N(\delta) n e^{-t}, \\ \mathbb{P}\left[\|Z_n^M - \Pi_1 Z_n^M\|_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > \sqrt{2N^2 \mathcal{V}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} + 2^{-N} M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^2 t^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}}{\sqrt{n}} t\right] &\leq 4N(\delta) n e^{-t}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} = \sqrt{d} \min\{2M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}, \mathcal{L}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} 2^{-\lfloor M/d \rfloor}\} 2^{-\lfloor M/d \rfloor} \mathcal{T}\mathcal{V}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}.$$

We find the optimal parameters  $M^*$  and  $N^*$  by balancing the two terms, choosing either

$$2^{M^*} = \min \left\{ \left( \frac{n \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}} \right)^{\frac{d}{d+1}}, \left( \frac{n \text{L}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}} \right)^{\frac{d}{d+2}} \right\}, \quad 2^{N^*} = \max \left\{ \left( \frac{n M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^{d+1}}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^d} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+1}}, \left( \frac{n^2 M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^{2d+2}}{\text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^d \text{L}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^d \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+2}} \right\}.$$

It follows that for all  $t > N_*$ , with probability at least  $1 - 4nN(\delta) \exp(-t)$ ,

$$\|M_n - Z_n^M\|_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} \leq \sqrt{d} N^* \min \left\{ \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^d M^{d+1}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(d+1)}}, \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^2 M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^2 \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^d \text{L}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}^d}{n^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(d+2)}} \right\} t^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{C_{\Pi_1}(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})}{n}} t^{\alpha+1}.$$

Moreover by Lemma SA.18 we bound fluctuation off-the-net by, for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[\|\widetilde{M}_n - \widetilde{M}_n \circ \pi_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}} > C_\alpha \widetilde{F}_n(t, \delta)] &\leq \exp(-t), \\ \mathbb{P}[\|\widetilde{Z}_n^M \circ \pi_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} - \widetilde{Z}_n^M\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}} > C(M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}} J(\delta, \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}, M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}}) + \delta M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}} \sqrt{t})] &\leq \exp(-t), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widetilde{F}_n(t, \delta) := J(\delta, \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}, M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} M_{\mathcal{R}}) M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} + \frac{\log(n) M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} J^2(\delta, \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}, M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} M_{\mathcal{R}})}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} + \frac{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}}{\sqrt{n}} t + (\log n)^\alpha \frac{M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}}{\sqrt{n}} t^\alpha.$$

The result then follows from the relation between  $\mathcal{G}$  quantities and  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  quantities in Lemma SA.12 and the decomposition that

$$\begin{aligned} \|M_n - Z_n^M\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} &= \|\widetilde{M}_n - Z_n^M\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}} \\ &\leq \|\widetilde{M}_n - \widetilde{M}_n \circ \pi_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}} + \|Z_n^M - Z_n^M \circ \pi_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}\|_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}} \\ &\quad + \|\widetilde{M}_n - \Pi_1 \widetilde{M}_n\|_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} + \|Z_n^M - \Pi_1 Z_n^M\|_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} + \|\Pi_1 \widetilde{M}_n - \Pi_1 Z_n^M\|_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have abused the notation to mean the same thing by  $Z_n^M(g, r)$  and  $Z_n^M(\tilde{g}, r)$ .  $\square$

### SA-III.19 Proof of Theorem SA.2

Suppose  $2^M \leq J < 2^{M+1}$ . For each  $l \in [d]$ , we can divide at most  $2^M$  cells into two intervals of equal measure under  $\mathbb{P}_X$  such that we get a new partition of  $\mathcal{X} = \sqcup_{0 \leq j < 2^{M+1}} \Delta'_l$  and satisfies

$$\frac{\max_{0 \leq l < 2^{M+1}} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta'_l)}{\min_{0 \leq l < 2^{M+1}} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta'_l)} \leq 2\rho.$$

By construction, for each  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists an axis-aligned quasi-dyadic expansion  $\mathcal{A}_{M+1, N}(\mathbb{P}, 2\rho) = \{\mathcal{C}_{j,k} : 0 \leq j \leq M+1+N, 0 \leq k < 2^{M+1+N-j}\}$  such that

$$\{\mathcal{X}_{0,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{M+1}\} = \{\Delta'_l : 0 \leq l < 2^{M+1}\},$$

and  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \text{Span}\{\mathbb{1}_{\Delta_j} : 0 \leq j < J\} \subseteq \text{Span}\{\mathcal{X}_{0,k} : 0 \leq k < 2^{M+1}\}$ . Hence

$$\Pi_0(g, r) = \Pi_1(g, r) = \sum_{0 \leq l < 2^{K+1}} \sum_{0 \leq m < 2^N} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{j,l,m}) g|_{\mathcal{X}_{0,l}} \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{j,l,m}]. \quad (\text{SA-18})$$

Again, consider  $(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta$  which is a  $\delta \|\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}M_{\mathcal{R}}}\|_{\mathbb{P}}$  of  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}$  of cardinality no greater than  $N(\delta)$ . The SA error for projected process on the  $\delta$ -net is given by Lemma SA.20: For all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\Pi_1 M_n - \Pi_1 Z_n^M\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^{M+1} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{n}} t + C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_1(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})}}{n}} t \right] \\ & \leq 2N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) e^{-t} + 2^M \exp(-C_\rho n 2^{-M}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we find an upper bound for  $\mathbf{C}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}$ . Consider the following two cases.

**Case 1:**  $j \geq N$  Let  $g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}$ . Fix  $(j, k)$ . Let  $(j', m')$  be an index such that  $\mathcal{C}_{j', m'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}$ . If  $N \leq j' \leq M + N$ , then by definition of  $S$  and the step of splitting each cell into at most two, there exists  $l_1, \dots, l_{2S} \in \{0, \dots, 2^{M+1} - 1\}$  with possible duplication such that  $g = \sum_{q=1}^{2S} c_q \mathbb{1}(\Delta'_{l_q})$  where  $|c_q| \leq \mathbf{M}_{\{g\}}$ . Since each  $\Delta'_{l_q}$  belongs to at most one  $\mathcal{X}_{j'-N, k}$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma}_{j', m'}(\mathbb{1}(\Delta'_{l_q}), r) = 0$  if  $\Delta'_{l_q}$  is not contained in  $\mathcal{X}_{j'-N, m'}$  and  $|\tilde{\gamma}_{j', m'}(\mathbb{1}(\Delta'_{l_q}), r)| \leq C_\alpha 2^{-l+1}$  if  $\Delta'_{l_q} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{j'-N, m'}$  where  $C_\alpha = 1 + (2\sqrt{\alpha})^\alpha$ . For  $j'$  such that  $N \leq j' \leq j$ ,

$$\sum_{m': \mathcal{C}_{j', m'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j', m'}(g, r)|^2 \leq 2S \sum_{q=1}^{2S} \sum_{m': \mathcal{C}_{j', m'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} (c_q \tilde{\gamma}_{j', m'}(\mathbb{1}(\Delta_{l_q}), r))^2 \leq 2C_\alpha^2 S \sum_{q=1}^{2S} c_q^2 2^{-2l} \leq 4C_\alpha^2 S^2 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 2^{-2l}.$$

For  $0 \leq j' \leq j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j', k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j', k'}(g, r)| \\ & = \sum_{l: \mathcal{X}_{0, l} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{j-N, k}} \sum_{0 \leq m < 2^{j'}} |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}] \cdot |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l, j-1, 2m}] \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l, j-1, 2m+1}]| \\ & \leq C_\alpha \sum_{l: \mathcal{X}_{0, l} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{j-N, k}} |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}]| N^\alpha \leq C_\alpha 2^{j-N} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|\tilde{\gamma}_{l, m}(g, r)| \lesssim C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha$  for all  $(l, m)$ ,  $\sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j', k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} \tilde{\gamma}_{j', k'}^2(g, r) \leq C_\alpha^2 2^{j-N} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 N^{2\alpha}$ . Putting together

$$\sum_{j' < j} (j - j')(j - j' + 1) 2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j', k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} \tilde{\gamma}_{j', k'}^2(g, r) \lesssim C_\alpha^2 S^2 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 + C_\alpha^2 \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^2 N^{2\alpha}.$$

**Case 2:**  $l < N$  Hence for any  $0 \leq j' \leq j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j', k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j', k'}(\tilde{g}, r)| = |\mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}]| \sum_{m': \mathcal{Y}_{l, j', m'} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_{l, j, m}} |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l, j-1, 2m}] \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l, j-1, 2m+1}]| \\ & \leq C_\alpha |\mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0, l}]| N^\alpha \leq C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} N^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j' < j} (j - j')(j - j' + 1) 2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j', k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j, k}} |\tilde{\gamma}_{j', k'}(\tilde{g}, r)| \leq C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} N^\alpha.$$



It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{C}_{n_1}(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})} &= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \min \left\{ \sup_{(j,k)} \left[ \sum_{l < j} (j-l)(j-l+1)2^{l-j} \sum_{m: \mathcal{C}_{l,m} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \tilde{\gamma}_{l,m}^2(h) \right], \mathbf{M}_{\Pi_1(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})}^2(M+N) \right\} \\ &\leq C_\alpha^2 \mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G}^2 N^{2\alpha} \min\{M+N, S^2+1\}. \end{aligned}$$

By the characterization of projections in Equation SA-18, we know the mis-specification error is zero, that is,  $\Pi_1 M_n(g, r) = \Pi_0 M_n(g, r)$  and  $\Pi_1 Z_n^M(g, r) = \Pi_0 Z_n^M(g, r)$ . Since  $g$  is already piecewise-constant on  $\mathcal{X}_{0,l}$ 's, the  $L_2$ -projection error is solely contributed from  $r$ . Consider  $\mathcal{B} = \sigma(\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}_{0,k}} : 0 \leq k < 2^{M+N+1}\})$ . Denote  $r_\tau = r|_{[-\tau^{1/\alpha}, \tau^{1/\alpha}]}$ . Then

$$|\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)r_\tau(y_i)|\mathcal{B}] - g(\mathbf{x}_i)r_\tau(y_i)| \leq \mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G} |r_\tau(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[r_\tau(y_i)|\mathcal{B}]|.$$

Then by the same argument as in the proof for Lemma SA.22 and the argument for truncation error in the proof for Lemma SA.23, for all  $t > N$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \|M_n - \Pi_1 M_n\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} + \|Z_n^M - \Pi_1 Z_n^M\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} \geq N \sqrt{2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G}^2 t^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{\mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G}}{\sqrt{n}} t^{\alpha+1} \right) \leq 4N(\delta)ne^{-t}. \quad (\text{SA-19})$$

Then apply Lemma SA.20, we get there exists a mean-zero Gaussian process  $Z_n^M$  with the same covariance structure as  $M_n$  such that with probability at least  $1 - 2 \exp(-t) - 2^{M+1} \exp(-C_\rho n 2^{-M-1})$ ,

$$\|\Pi_1 M_n - \Pi_1 Z_n^M\|_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}} \leq C_\rho \min_{\delta \in (0,1)} \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{2^{M+2} \mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G} \mathbf{E}_\mathcal{G}}{n}} (t + \log N(\delta))^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_1(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})}}{n}} (t + \log N(\delta))^{\alpha+1} + F_n(t, \delta) \right\}.$$

□

### SA-III.20 Proof of Theorem SA.3

We will use the same Rosenblatt transformation as in Theorem SA.1. Taking  $\mathbf{u}_i = \phi_X(\mathbf{x}_i)$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \{\tilde{g} : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$  with  $\tilde{g} = g \circ \phi_X^{-1}$ , we have

$$R_n(g, r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i) - g(\mathbf{x}_i)\mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|\mathbf{x}_i] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{g}(\mathbf{u}_i)r(y_i) - \tilde{g}(\mathbf{u}_i)\mathbb{E}[r(y_i)|u_i] =: \tilde{R}_n(\tilde{g}, r).$$

Denote by  $\tilde{P}$  the joint distribution of  $(\mathbf{u}_i, y_i)$ . Take  $\mathcal{A}_{M,N}(\tilde{P}, 1)$  to be the axis-aligned cylindered quasi-dyadic expansion of  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ . Then by Lemma SA.19 and Lemma SA.24, for all  $t > N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[ \|\Pi_2 R_n - \Pi_2 Z_n^R\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_\mathcal{G} \mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G}}{n}} t + C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})}}{n}} t \right] &\leq 2N(\delta)e^{-t}, \\ \mathbb{P} \left[ \|R_n - \Pi_2 R_n\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_\alpha \sqrt{2N^2 \mathbf{V} + 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G}^2 t^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}}} + C_\alpha \frac{\mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G}}{\sqrt{n}} t^{\alpha+1} \right] &\leq 4N(\delta)ne^{-t}, \\ \mathbb{P} \left[ \|Z_n^R - \Pi_2 Z_n^R\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_\alpha \sqrt{2N^2 \mathbf{V} + 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G}^2 t^{\frac{1}{2}}} + C_\alpha \frac{\mathbf{M}_\mathcal{G}}{\sqrt{n}} t \right] &\leq 4N(\delta)ne^{-t}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{V} = \sqrt{d} \min \{2\mathbf{M}_G, \mathbf{L}2^{-\lfloor M/d \rfloor}\} 2^{-\lfloor M/d \rfloor} \mathbf{TV}$ , and

$$\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})} = \sup_{f \in \Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})} \min \left\{ \sup_{(j,k)} \left[ \sum_{j' < j} (j-j')(j-j'+1)2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \tilde{\beta}_{j',k'}^2(f) \right], \|f\|_\infty^2(M+N) \right\}.$$

Let  $f \in \Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})$ . Then there exists  $g \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $f = \Pi_2[g, r]$ . Since  $f$  is already piecewise-constant, by definition of  $\beta_{j,k}$ 's and  $\eta_{j,k}$ 's, we know  $\tilde{\beta}_{l,m}(f) = \tilde{\eta}_{l,m}(g, r)$ . Fix  $(j, k)$ . We consider two cases.

**Case 1:**  $j > N$ . Then by the design of cell expansions (Section SA-III.1),  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k} \times \mathbb{R}$ . By definition of  $\eta_{l,m}$ , for any  $N \leq j' \leq j$ , we have  $(j-j')(j-j'+1)2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}^2(g, r) = 0$ . Now consider  $0 \leq j' < N$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}(g, r)| \\ &= \sum_{l: \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}} \sum_{0 \leq m < 2^{j'}} |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}] \cdot |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m}] \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m+1}]| \\ &\leq C_\alpha \sum_{l: \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}} |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}]| N^\alpha \leq C_\alpha 2^{j-N} \mathbf{M}_G N^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j' < j} (j-j')(j-j'+1)2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}(g, r)| \leq \sum_{j' < j} (j-j')(j-j'+1)2^{j'-N} C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_G N^\alpha \lesssim C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_G N^\alpha.$$

**Case 2:**  $j \leq N$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}$ . Hence for any  $0 \leq j' \leq j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}(g, r)| &= |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}]| \sum_{m': \mathcal{Y}_{l,j',m'} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}} |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m}] \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m+1}]| \\ &\lesssim C_\alpha |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}]| N^\alpha \lesssim C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_G N^\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j' < j} (j-j')(j-j'+1)2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}(g, r)| \lesssim C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_G N^\alpha.$$

Moreover, for all  $(j, k)$ , we have  $\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g, r) \lesssim C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_G N^\alpha$ . Hence  $\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})} \lesssim (C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_G N^\alpha)^2$ . The rest of the proofs follow from choosing optimal  $M, N$  and Lemma SA.18 in the same way as in the proof for Theorem SA.1.  $\square$

### SA-III.21 Proof of Theorem SA.4

Suppose  $2^M \leq J < 2^{M+1}$ . By the same cell divisions in the proof for Theorem SA.2, there exists a quasi-dyadic expansion  $\mathcal{C}_{M+1,N}$  such that

$$\text{Span}(\{\mathbb{1}(\Delta_j) : 0 \leq j < J\}) \subseteq \text{Span}(\{\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{X}_{0,l}) : 0 \leq l < 2^{M+1}\}).$$

By definition, the projection error can be decomposed as

$$R_n(g, r) - \Pi_2 R_n(g, r) = M_n(g, r) - \Pi_1 M_n(g, r) + X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - \Pi_0 X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)),$$

where  $\Pi_0$  denotes the  $L_2$ -projection from  $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  to  $\text{Span} = \{\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{X}_{0,l}) : 0 \leq l < 2^{M+1}\}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - \Pi_0 X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)))^2] &= \sum_{0 \leq j < J} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_j) g^2 |_{\Delta_j} \mathbb{E}[(\theta(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}) - \Pi_0 \theta(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}))^2 | \mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_j] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)^2] \max_{0 \leq j < J} \|\Delta_j\|_\infty^2 \|\theta(\cdot, r)\|_{\text{Lip}}^2 \leq \mathbb{M}_g \mathbb{E}_g \max_{0 \leq j < J} \|\Delta_j\|_\infty^2 L_{V_{\mathcal{R}}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - \Pi_0 X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r))$  is bounded through Bernstein inequality and union bound, for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - \Pi_0 X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r))\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} \geq \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\mathbb{M}_g \mathbb{E}_g} \max_{0 \leq j < J} \|\Delta_j\|_\infty L_{V_{\mathcal{R}}} \sqrt{t} + 2 \frac{\mathbb{M}_g}{\sqrt{n}} t\right) \leq 2 \exp(-t).$$

Combining with Lemma SA.20 and Equation SA-19, and the same calculation as in the proof for Theorem SA.3 to get  $\mathbb{C}_{\Pi_2(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{R})} \lesssim (C_\alpha \mathbb{M}_g N^\alpha)^2$ , for all  $t > N_*$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2N(\delta)e^{-t} - 2^M \exp(-C_\rho n 2^{-M})$ ,

$$\|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} \leq \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\mathbb{M}_g \mathbb{E}_g} \max_{0 \leq j < J} \|\Delta_j\|_\infty L_{V_{\mathcal{R}}} \sqrt{t} + C_\alpha N_* \sqrt{\frac{J \mathbb{E}_g \mathbb{M}_g}{n}} t^{\alpha + \frac{1}{2}} + C_\alpha \frac{\mathbb{M}_g}{\sqrt{n}} t^{\alpha + 1},$$

The rest follows from the error for fluctuation off the  $\delta$ -net given in Lemma SA.18. Notice that the "bias" term  $\sqrt{\mathbb{M}_g \mathbb{E}_g} \max_{0 \leq j < J} \|\Delta_j\|_\infty L_{V_{\mathcal{R}}} \sqrt{t}$  comes from  $X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r)) - \Pi_0 X_n(g\theta(\cdot, r))$  in the decomposition.

In the special case that we have a singleton  $\mathcal{R} = \{r\}$ , we can get rid of the "bias" term by redefining  $\varepsilon_i = \text{sign}(r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i]) |r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i]|^{1/\alpha}$ . Take  $\tilde{r}(u) = \text{sign}(u) |u|^\alpha$ ,  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ . In particular,  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{r}(\varepsilon_i) | \mathbf{x}_i] = 0$  almost surely. Either  $r$  is bounded and we can take  $\alpha = 0$ , which makes  $\tilde{r}$  also bounded; or  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \lesssim 2$  and  $|r(u)| \lesssim 1 + |u|^\alpha$ , which implies  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(\varepsilon_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \lesssim 2$  and  $\tilde{r}$  has polynomial growth. Then for any  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ ,

$$R_n(g, r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g(\mathbf{x}_i) \tilde{r}(\varepsilon_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) \tilde{r}(\varepsilon_i)] =: M'_n(g, \tilde{r}),$$

where  $M'_n$  denotes the empirical process based on random sample  $((\mathbf{x}_i, \varepsilon_i) : 1 \leq i \leq n)$ . The result then follows from Theorem SA.2. By similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem SA.4,

$$\mathbb{C}_{\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \{\tilde{r}\})} = \sup_{f \in \Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \{\tilde{r}\})} \min \left\{ \sup_{(j,k)} \left[ \sum_{j' < j} (j - j')(j - j' + 1) 2^{j' - j} \sum_{k' : \mathcal{C}_{j', k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \tilde{\beta}_{j', k'}^2(f) \right], \|f\|_\infty^2 (M + N) \right\},$$

but  $\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(f)$  vanishes for all  $j > N$  and we obtain similarly  $\mathbb{C}_{\Pi_1(\mathcal{G}, \{\tilde{r}\})} \lesssim (C_\alpha \mathbb{M}_g N^\alpha)^2$ .  $\square$

### SA-III.22 Proof of Lemma SA.1

Here we concisely flash out the arguments that are standard from empirical process literature.

**Convergence rate for each entry of  $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}$ :** Consider  $\mathbf{u}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}) \mathbf{u}_2$ , where  $\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2$  are multi-indices such that  $|\mathbf{u}_1|, |\mathbf{u}_2| \leq p$ . Take  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{u}_2$ . Define

$$g_n(\xi, \mathbf{x}) = \left( \frac{\xi - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right)^\mathbf{v} \frac{1}{h^d} K \left( \frac{\xi - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) \mathbb{1}(\xi \in \mathcal{A}_t), \xi, \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Define  $\mathcal{F} = \{g_n(\cdot, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$ . Then  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathbf{u}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}) \mathbf{u}_2| = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{E}_n[f(\mathbf{x}_i)] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_i)]|$ . By standard arguments from kernel regression literature, we can show  $\mathcal{F}$  forms a VC-type class with exponent  $d$  and constant  $\text{diam}(\mathcal{X})/b$ ,  $M_n := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |f(\mathbf{x})| \lesssim b^{-d}$ ,  $\sigma_n^2 := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{V}[f(\mathbf{x}_i)] \lesssim b^{-d/2}$ . By Corollary 5.1 in Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014), we can show  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{E}_n[f(\mathbf{x}_i)] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_i)]|] \lesssim (nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1} \log n$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is separable, we can use Talagrand's inequality (Giné and Nickl, 2016, Theorem 3.3.9) to get for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{E}_n[f(\mathbf{x}_i)] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}_i)]| \geq C_1 (nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{t + \log n} + C_1 (nb^d)^{-1} (t + \log n) \right) \leq \exp(-t),$$

where  $C_1$  is a constant not depending on  $n$ . This shows  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{u}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}) \mathbf{u}_2 = O((nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1} \log n)$  a.s..

**Convergence rate for  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}\|$ :** Since  $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}$  are finite-dimensional,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}\| = O((nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1} \log n)$  a.s.. By Weyl's Theorem,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}) - \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}})| = O((nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1} \log n)$  a.s., which also implies  $\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \gtrsim 1$  a.s.. Hence

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}\| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}\| \|\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}\| \|\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}\| = O((nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log n}), \quad a.s..$$

**Convergence rate for  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r}\|$ :** Consider  $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r}$  where  $|\mathbf{v}| \leq p$ . Define  $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{(\mathbf{z}, y) \mapsto g_n(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x})(r(y) - \theta(\mathbf{z}, r)) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_1\}$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2 = \{(\mathbf{z}, y) \mapsto g_n(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x})(r(y) - \theta(\mathbf{z}, r)) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_2\}$ . It is not hard to check both  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2$  are VC-type classes. By similar arguments as in  $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}$ , for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_2} |\mathbb{E}_n[h(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)]| \geq C_2 (nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{t + \log n} + C_2 (nb^d)^{-1} (t + \log n) \right) \leq \exp(-t).$$

And if we further assume  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}[\exp(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}] \leq 2$ , then for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_1} |\mathbb{E}_n[h(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)]| \geq C_2 (nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{t + \log n} + C_2 (nb^d)^{-1} (\log n) (t + \log n) \right) \leq \exp(-t).$$

Together with finite dimensionality of the vector  $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_1} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r}\| &= O((nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log n} + (nb^d)^{-1} (\log n)^2), \quad a.s., \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_2} \|\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}, r}\| &= O((nb^d)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log n}), \quad a.s. \end{aligned}$$

### Putting together for Non-Linearity Errors:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_2} |\mathbf{e}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x},r}| &= O((nb^d)^{-1} \log n), \quad a.s., \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_1} |\mathbf{e}_1^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x},r}| &= O((nb^d)^{-1} \log n + (nb^d)^{-3/2} (\log n)^{5/2}), \quad a.s.. \end{aligned}$$

**Bias:** Take  $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x},r} = \mathbb{E}_n \left[ \mathbf{r}_p \left( \frac{\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{x}}{h} \right) K_h(\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{X}_i; r) \right]$  where  $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{x}}(\xi; r) = \theta(\xi; r) - \sum_{0 \leq |\nu| \leq p} \frac{\partial_\nu \theta(\mathbf{x}; r)}{\nu!} (\xi - \mathbf{x})^\nu$ . Since all  $\theta(\cdot; r), r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell$  are  $(p+1)$ -times continuously differentiable with  $\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{|\nu| \leq p} |\partial_\nu \theta(\mathbf{x}; r)| < \infty$ , then  $\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x},r}| = O(b^{p+1})$ . We have proved that  $\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}) \gtrsim 1$  a.s.. Hence

$$\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, r) | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n] - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r)| = \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |\mathbf{e}_1^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{x},r}| = O(b^{p+1}), \quad a.s., \text{ for } \ell = 1, 2.$$

### SA-III.23 Proof of Lemma SA.2

We use the notation  $\mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l)$ , and  $\widehat{\mathbb{P}}_X(\Delta_l) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l)$ ,  $0 \leq l < L$ .

**Non-linearity Errors:** For  $\ell = 1, 2$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}, r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell$ , we have

$$\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{J}}^{-1} - \mathbf{J}^{-1}) \mathbf{T}_r = \sum_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_l) (L^{-1} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_X(\Delta_l)^{-1} - L^{-1} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)^{-1}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l)}{L^{-1}} \epsilon_i(r).$$

By maximal inequality for sub-Gaussian random variables (van der Vaart and Wellner, 2013, Lemma 2.2.2),  $\max_{0 \leq l < L} |L \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_X(\Delta_l) - L \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)| = O(\sqrt{\frac{\log L}{n/L}})$  a.s.. Since  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$  is a quasi-uniform partition on  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\min_{0 \leq l < L} L \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l) = \Omega(1)$ . Hence

$$\max_{0 \leq l < L} |L^{-1} \widehat{\mathbb{P}}_X(\Delta_l)^{-1} - L^{-1} \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)^{-1}| = O(\sqrt{(n/L)^{-1} \log L}), \quad a.s.. \quad (\text{SA-20})$$

Take  $\mathcal{H}_\ell = \{(\mathbf{x}, y) \mapsto L \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_l)(r(y) - \theta(\mathbf{x}, r)) : 0 \leq l < L, r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell\}$ , for  $\ell = 1, 2$ . In particular, if we take  $\mathcal{G} = \{L \mathbb{1}(\cdot \in \Delta_l) : 0 \leq l < L\}$ , then  $\mathcal{G}$  is a VC-type class w.r.p. constant envelope  $L$  with constant  $c_{\mathcal{G}} = L$  and exponent  $d_{\mathcal{G}} = 1$ . In the main text, we explained that both  $\mathcal{R}_1$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2$  are VC-type class with  $c_{\mathcal{R}_1} = 1$ ,  $d_{\mathcal{R}_1} = 1$  and  $c_{\mathcal{R}_2}$  some absolute constant,  $d_{\mathcal{R}_2} = 2$ . By arguments similar to the proof of Lemma SA-III.10, both  $\mathcal{H}_\ell$ 's are VC-type class with  $c_{\mathcal{H}_1} = L$ ,  $d_{\mathcal{H}_1} = 1$ ,  $c_{\mathcal{H}_2} \lesssim L$ ,  $d_{\mathcal{H}_2} = 2$ . Since  $\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \max_{0 \leq l < L} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l) \epsilon_i(r) \right| = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}_\ell} |\mathbb{E}_n[h(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)] - \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)]|$  is the suprema of empirical process, by Corollary 5.1 in Chernozhukov *et al.* (2014),

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_1} \max_{0 \leq l < L} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l) \epsilon_i(r) \right| &= O\left( \sqrt{\frac{\log(nL)}{n/L}} + \log(n) \frac{\log(nL)}{n/L} \right) \quad a.s., \\ \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_2} \max_{0 \leq l < L} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l) \epsilon_i(r) \right| &= O\left( \sqrt{\frac{\log(nL)}{n/L}} \right) \quad a.s.. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{SA-21})$$

Putting together Equations SA-20, SA-21, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \left| \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{x})^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{J}}^{-1} - \mathbf{J}^{-1}) \mathbf{T}_r \right| = O\left( \frac{\log(nL)}{n/L} \right) + \mathbb{1}(\ell = 1) O\left( \log(n) \left( \frac{\log(nL)}{n/L} \right)^{3/2} \right).$$

**Smoothing Bias:** Since we have assumed that  $\sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} |\mu(\mathbf{x}, r) - \mu(\mathbf{y}, r)| / \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty < \infty$ ,  $\ell = 1, 2$ ,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{r \in \mathcal{R}_\ell} |\mathbb{E}[\widehat{\mu}(\mathbf{x}, r) | \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n] - \mu(\mathbf{x}, r)| = \left| \sum_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_l) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l) \mu(\mathbf{x}_i, r)}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l)} - \mu(\mathbf{x}, r) \right| = O\left(\max_{0 \leq l < L} \|\Delta_l\|_\infty\right).$$

### SA-III.24 Proof of Example SA.1

Recall  $\mathcal{G} = \{b^{-d/2} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}(\frac{\cdot - \mathbf{x}}{b}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  with  $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{u}) K(\mathbf{u})$ .

#### (1) Properties of $\mathcal{G}$

Since  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1}\| \lesssim 1$  and  $K$  is continuous with compact support, we know

$$\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \lesssim b^{-d/2}.$$

By a change of variable, we know

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| b^{-d/2} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}}{b}\right) \right\| \right] \lesssim \max_{|\mathbf{v}| \leq \mathbf{p}} b^{d/2} \int \left(\frac{\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}}{b}\right)^\mathbf{v} \frac{1}{b^d} K\left(\frac{\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}}{b}\right) h_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} \lesssim b^{d/2}.$$

Moreover,  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}'} |\mathbf{r}_p(\frac{\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}}{b}) - \mathbf{r}_p(\frac{\mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{x}}{b})| / \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}'\|_\infty \lesssim b^{-1}$  and  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{u}'} |K(\frac{\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}}{b}) - K(\frac{\mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{x}}{b})| / \|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}'\|_\infty \lesssim b^{-1}$ . It follows that

$$\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}} \lesssim b^{-\frac{d}{2}-1}.$$

Notice that the support of functions in  $\mathcal{G}$  has uniformly bounded volume, i.e.  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{Vol}(\text{Supp}(g)) \lesssim b^d$ . Together with the rate for  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}}$ , we know

$$\text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}} \leq \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{Vol}(\text{Supp}(g)) \lesssim b^{\frac{d}{2}-1}.$$

Now we will show that  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^{-1} \mathcal{G}$  is a VC-class. We know  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}'}\| / \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_\infty \lesssim b^{-1}$ . Since  $\inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}\| \gtrsim 1$ , we also have  $\sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}} \|\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}'}^{-1}\| / \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_\infty \lesssim b^{-1}$ . It follows that

$$\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}} = \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}} \left| b^{-d/2} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}\left(\frac{\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}}{b}\right) - b^{-d/2} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}'}\left(\frac{\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{x}'}{b}\right) \right| / \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\|_\infty \lesssim b^{-d/2-1}.$$

Consider  $h_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) = \sqrt{b^d} \mathbf{e}_1^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-1} \mathbf{r}_p(\cdot) K(\cdot)$ . Then  $b^{-d/2} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{x}}(\frac{\cdot - \mathbf{x}}{b}) = h_{\mathbf{x}}(\frac{\cdot - \mathbf{x}}{b})$ . By the rates of  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{G}}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}$ , there exists a constant  $\mathbf{c}$  only depending on  $\|K\|_\infty$ ,  $\mathbf{L}_{\{K\}}$ ,  $\sigma_K$ ,  $\bar{f}_X$ ,  $\underline{f}_X$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|h_{\mathbf{x}}\|_\infty &\leq \mathbf{c}, \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{|h_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) - h_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{v})|}{\|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}\|_\infty} &\leq \mathbf{c}, \\ \sup_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{|h_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) - h_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{u})|}{\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty} &\leq \mathbf{c}. \end{aligned}$$

We can again apply Lemma 7 from [Cattaneo et al. \(2024\)](#) to show that, for all  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,

$$N(\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^{-1}\mathcal{G}, e_{\mathbb{P}}, \varepsilon) \leq \mathbf{c} \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{d+1}} + 1.$$

## (2) Properties of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1$

Let  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ . Take  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1^a = \{g \cdot \varphi : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1^b = \{g \cdot \theta(\cdot, \text{Id}) : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ . Define  $h^a(\mathbf{x}, u) = g(\mathbf{x})\varphi(\mathbf{x}, u)$ . Let  $\iota$  be a real-valued non-negative Lebesgue measurable function on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \iota(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = 1$ . Define  $\iota_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-d} \iota(\cdot/\varepsilon)$  and  $g_\varepsilon = g * \iota_\varepsilon$ . Let  $\xi$  be a real-valued non-negative Lebesgue measurable function on  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1}} \xi(\mathbf{u}) d\mathbf{u} = 1$ . Define  $\xi_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-d-1} \xi(\cdot/\varepsilon)$  and  $\varphi_\varepsilon = \varphi * \xi_\varepsilon$ . Then define  $h_\varepsilon^a(\mathbf{x}, u) = g_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})\varphi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, u)$ . Then for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\|\nabla h_\varepsilon^a(\mathbf{x}, u)\|_2 \leq \|\nabla g_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})\|_2 + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \|\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, u)\|_2 \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \text{Supp}(g_\varepsilon)).$$

Hence by definition of TV and Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}_{\{h^a\}} &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times [0,1]} \|\nabla h_\varepsilon^a(\mathbf{x}, u)\|_2 d\mathbf{x} du \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \|\nabla g_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})\|_2 d\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int \|\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, u)\|_2 \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \text{Supp}(g_\varepsilon)) d\mathbf{x} du \\ &\leq \text{TV}_{\{g\}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\{\varphi\}, \text{Supp}(g) \times [0,1]}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be any cube of side-length  $a$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TV}_{\{h^a\}, \mathcal{C}} &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \|\nabla h_\varepsilon^a(\mathbf{x}, u)\|_2 d\mathbf{x} du \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \|\nabla g_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})\|_2 d\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathcal{C}} \|\nabla \varphi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}, u)\|_2 \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \text{Supp}(g_\varepsilon)) d\mathbf{x} du \\ &\leq \text{TV}_{\{g\}, \mathcal{C}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\{\varphi\}, \text{Supp}(g) \times [0,1] \cap \mathcal{C}} \leq \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{G}} a^d + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{L}_{\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{K}_{\{\varphi\}} a^d. \end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have

$$\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1^a} \leq \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\{\varphi\}}, \quad \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1^a} \leq \text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\{\varphi\}, \text{Supp}(g) \times [0,1]}, \quad \mathbf{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1^a} \leq \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{K}_{\{\varphi\}}.$$

Similar argument shows

$$\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1^b} \leq \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\{\varphi\}}, \quad \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1^b} \leq \text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{V}_1, \text{Supp}(g)}, \quad \mathbf{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1^b} \leq \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{V}_1}.$$

It follows from the assumptions  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\{\varphi\}, \text{Supp}(g) \times [0,1]} \lesssim \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\text{Supp}(g))$  and  $\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\mathcal{V}_1, \text{Supp}(g)} \lesssim \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\text{Supp}(g))$  that

$$\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1} \leq \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\{\varphi\}}, \quad \text{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1} \lesssim \text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\text{Supp}(g)), \quad \mathbf{K}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1} \leq \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{K}_{\{\varphi\}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{V}_1}.$$

By Lemma [SA.13](#),  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1$  is a VC-type class with constant  $c_{\mathcal{G}} c_{\mathcal{R}} 2^{\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}}}$  and exponent  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}}$  with respect to envelope function  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\{\varphi\}}$ .

### (3) Properties of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_2$

The main challenge is that  $\mathcal{R}_2$  contains non-differentiable indicator. First, we study properties of  $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_2$ . Then by Definition 2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_2, [0,1]^{d+1}} &= \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{\substack{\phi \in \mathcal{D}_{d+1}([0,1]^{d+1}) \\ \|\phi\|_2 \leq 1}} \int_{[0,1]^d} \int_{[0,1]} g(\mathbf{x}) \mathbb{1}(u \leq y) \operatorname{div}(\phi)(\mathbf{x}, u) d\mathbf{x} du \\
&\leq \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{\substack{\phi \in \mathcal{D}_d([0,1]^d) \\ \|\phi\|_2 \leq 1}} \sup_{\substack{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_1([0,1]) \\ \|\psi\|_\infty \leq 1}} \int_{[0,1]^d} \int_{[0,1]} g(\mathbf{x}) \mathbb{1}(u \leq y) (\operatorname{div} \phi(\mathbf{x}) + \psi'(u)) d\mathbf{x} du \\
&= \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \sup_{\substack{\phi \in \mathcal{D}_d([0,1]^d) \\ \|\phi\|_2 \leq 1}} \int_{[0,1]^d} g(\mathbf{x}) \operatorname{div} \phi(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} + \sup_{\substack{\psi \in \mathcal{D}_1([0,1]) \\ \|\psi\|_\infty \leq 1}} \int_{[0,1]^d} g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} (\psi(1) - \psi(0)) \\
&\leq \mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{G}, [0,1]^d} + 2\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar argument as in (2) gives

$$\mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{V}_2, [0,1]^d} \leq \mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{V}_2, \operatorname{supp}(g)} \lesssim \mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{G}, [0,1]^d} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\operatorname{supp}(g)).$$

It follows that

$$\mathrm{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_2} \lesssim \mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{G}, [0,1]^d} + \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\operatorname{supp}(g)).$$

Consider the change of variable function  $T : [0,1]^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  given by  $T(\mathbf{x}, u) = (\mathbf{x}, \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u))$ . Observe that  $\nabla T(\mathbf{x}, u)$  is a lower triangular matrix with diagonal  $(\mathbf{1}, \partial_u \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u))$ , we have  $\|\nabla T(\mathbf{x}, u)\|_{\operatorname{op}} = |\partial_u \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u)|$ ,  $\det(\nabla T(\mathbf{x}, u)) = |\partial_u \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u)|$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_2} &= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_2} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbf{u} \in [0,1]^{d+1}} \|\nabla(h_\varepsilon \circ T)(\mathbf{u})\| d\mathbf{u} = \sup_{h \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_2} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbf{u} \in [0,1]^{d+1}} \|(\nabla T(\mathbf{u}))^\top \nabla h_\varepsilon(T(\mathbf{u}))\| d\mathbf{u} \\
&= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_2} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in T([0,1]^{d+1})} \|(\nabla T(T^{-1}(\mathbf{x})))^\top \nabla h_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})\| \det(\nabla T^{-1}(\mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \\
&\leq \sup_{h \in \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_2} \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbf{x} \in T([0,1]^{d+1})} \|\nabla h_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x})\| d\mathbf{x} \|\det(\nabla T)^{-1}\|_\infty \|\|\nabla T\|_{\operatorname{op}}\|_\infty \\
&\leq \mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}_2, [0,1]^{d+1}} \|\det(\nabla T)^{-1}\|_\infty \|\|\nabla T\|_{\operatorname{op}}\|_\infty \leq (\mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{G}, [0,1]^d} + 2\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}) \|\det(\nabla T)^{-1}\|_\infty \|\|\nabla T\|_{\operatorname{op}}\|_\infty \\
&\lesssim (\mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{G}, [0,1]^d} + \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbf{m}(\operatorname{supp}(g))) \frac{\max_{(\mathbf{x}, u) \in [0,1]^{d+1}} |\partial_u \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u)|}{\min_{(\mathbf{x}, u) \in [0,1]^{d+1}} |\partial_u \varphi(\mathbf{x}, u)|}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma SA.13,  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_2$  is a VC-type class with constant  $c_{\mathcal{G}} c_{\mathcal{R}} 2^{\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}}}$  and exponent  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}}$  with respect to envelope function  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}$ .

### (4) Effects of Rosenblatt Transformation

By Lemma SA.12,  $\mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_1} \leq \mathrm{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1} \bar{f}_Z^2 f_Z^{-1}$ ,  $\mathrm{TV}_{\mathcal{H}_2} \leq \mathrm{TV}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_2} \bar{f}_Z^2 f_Z^{-1}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}_1} = \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1}$ ,  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{H}_2} = \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_2}$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and  $\mathcal{H}_2$  are VC-type classes with constant  $c_{\mathcal{G}} c_{\mathcal{R}} 2^{\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}}}$  and exponent  $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{G}} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{R}}$  with respect to envelope functions  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\{\varphi\}}$  and  $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}$  respectively.



### (5) Application of Theorem 1.1 in Rio (1994)

We can now apply Theorem 1.1 in Rio (1994) to get  $\{X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H}_1\}$  admits a Gaussian strong approximation with rate function

$$C_{d,\varphi} \sqrt{\frac{d\bar{f}_Z^2}{\underline{f}_Z} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{M}_G \mathbb{M}_{\{\varphi\}} (\text{TV}_G + \mathbb{M}_G \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \text{TV}_{\{\varphi\}, \text{Supp}(g)})}{n^{\frac{1}{2d+2}}}} \sqrt{t + (d+1) \log n} +$$

$$C_{d,\varphi} \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{M}_G \mathbb{M}_{\{\varphi\}}}{n}} \min \left\{ \sqrt{\log(n) \mathbb{M}_G \mathbb{M}_{\{\varphi\}}}, \sqrt{\frac{(2\sqrt{d})^{d-1} \bar{f}_Z^{d+1}}{\underline{f}_Z^d} (\mathbb{K}_G + \mathbb{M}_G \mathbb{K}_{\{\varphi\}})} \right\} (t + (d+1) \log n),$$

where  $C_{d,\varphi,1}$  is a quantity that only depends on  $d$  and  $\varphi$ . And  $\{X_n(h) : h \in \mathcal{H}_2\}$  admits a Gaussian strong approximation with rate function

$$C_{d,\varphi,2} \sqrt{\frac{d\bar{f}_Z^2}{\underline{f}_Z} \frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{M}_G \text{TV}'}}{n^{\frac{1}{2d+2}}} \sqrt{t + (d+1) \log n} + C_{d,\varphi,2} \frac{\mathbb{M}_G \mathbb{M}_{\{\varphi\}}}{\sqrt{n}} (t + (d+1) \log n),$$

where  $\text{TV}' = (\text{TV}_{\mathcal{G}, [0,1]^d} + 2\mathbb{E}_G) \|\det(\nabla T)^{-1}\|_\infty \|\nabla T\|_{\text{op}} \|\cdot\|_\infty$ , and again  $C_{d,\varphi,2}$  is a quantity that only depends on  $d$  and  $\varphi$ .  $\square$

### SA-III.25 Proof of Example SA.2

Besides the properties given in the proof of Example SA.1, using product rule we can show  $L_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1} \lesssim L_G \mathbb{M}_{\mathcal{R}_1} + \mathbb{M}_G L_{\mathcal{R}_1} L_{\{\varphi\}} + \mathbb{M}_G L_{\mathcal{V}_1} \lesssim b^{-d/2-1}$ , and by Lemma SA.12,  $L_{\mathcal{H}_1} \lesssim L_{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_1} \bar{f}_Z / \underline{f}_Z$ . The result follows from application of Theorem SA.1.  $\square$

### SA-III.26 Proof of Example SA.3

The conditions of  $\mathcal{G}$  can be verified from Part (1) Properties of  $\mathcal{G}$  in Section SA.1. It is easy to check that  $\mathcal{R}_1$  satisfies (ii)(b) in Theorem 3 with  $c_{\mathcal{R}_1} = 1$ ,  $d_{\mathcal{R}_1} = 1$  and  $\alpha = 1$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{R}_2$  satisfies (ii) (a) in Theorem 3, and we can take  $c_{\mathcal{R}_2}$  to be some absolute constant and  $d_{\mathcal{R}_2} = 2$  by van der Vaart and Wellner (2013, Theorem 2.6.7). The results then follow from Theorem 3.

### SA-III.27 Proof of Example 3

In this section, we verify the rates claimed in this section. Recall  $\mathcal{G} = \{k_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}\}$  with  $k_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{u}) = L^{-1/2} \sum_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_l) \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{u} \in \Delta_l) / \mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)$ . Since  $\{\Delta_l : 0 \leq l < L\}$  is a quasi-uniform partition of  $\mathcal{X}$ , there exists constants  $C_1 > 0$  and  $C_2 > 0$  not depending on  $L$  such that

$$C_1 L^{-1} \leq \mathbb{P}(\Delta_l) \leq C_2 L^{-1}, \quad 0 \leq l < L.$$

This gives  $\mathbb{M}_G \lesssim L^{1/2}$ .

$$\mathbb{E}_G = \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{0 \leq l < L} \frac{\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x} \in \Delta_l) \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l)}{\mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)} \right| \right] = \max_{0 \leq l < L} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \frac{\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{x}_i \in \Delta_l)}{\mathbb{P}_X(\Delta_l)} \right| \right] = L^{-1/2}.$$

For any  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ,  $N_{\mathcal{G}}(\varepsilon) \leq \text{Card}(\mathcal{G}) = L \leq L\varepsilon^{-1}$ . Hence we can take  $c_{\mathcal{G}} = L$  and  $d_{\mathcal{G}} = 1$ .  $\mathcal{R}_1$  is the singleton of identity function, hence obviously we can take  $c_{\mathcal{R}_1} = 1$  and  $d_{\mathcal{R}_1} = 1$ . For  $\mathcal{R}_2$ , observe that it is a VC sub-graph class of VC-index 2. Hence by [van der Vaart and Wellner \(2013, Theorem 2.6.7\)](#),  $\mathcal{R}_2$  is also a VC-type class with  $d_{\mathcal{R}_2} = 2$  and  $c_{\mathcal{R}_2}$  some absolute constant. The claimed results then follow from application of Theorem 4.

### SA-III.28 Proof of Theorem 3

We first make a reduction via Rosenblatt transformation. Take  $\mathbf{u}_i = \phi_X(\mathbf{x}_i)$  where  $\phi_X$  is defined as in Lemma SA.12. And define  $\tilde{g} = g \circ \phi_X^{-1}$  for each  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  and consider  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \{\tilde{g} : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ . Then

$$R_n(g, r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i)r(y_i)] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{g}(\mathbf{u}_i)r(y_i) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{g}(\mathbf{u}_i)r(y_i)] =: \tilde{R}_n(\tilde{g}, r),$$

for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}, r \in \mathcal{R}$ . Denote by  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$  the law of  $(\mathbf{u}_i, y_i)$ . Consider  $\mathcal{A}_{M,N}(\tilde{\mathbb{P}}, 1)$ , the axis-aligned iterative splitting of depth  $M$  for the main space  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and depth  $N$  for the multiplier subspace, with respect to  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ . Denote  $\mathcal{E}_{M+N} := \{\mathbb{1}(\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}) : 0 \leq l < 2^M, 0 \leq m < 2^N\}$  where  $\mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,0,m}$ 's are the base level cells given in Definition SA.4. By Lemma SA.12 and Lemma SA.13, it is possible to take a  $\delta M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} N^\alpha = \delta M_{\mathcal{G}} N^\alpha$ -net of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}$ ,  $(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta$ , with cardinality no greater than  $N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) := \sup_P N(\mathcal{G}, e_P, \delta M_{\mathcal{G}}/\sqrt{2}) \sup_Q N(\mathcal{R}, e_Q, \delta \|M_{\mathcal{R}}\|_{Q,2}/\sqrt{2})$  where  $\sup_P$  is taken over all finite discrete measures on  $[0, 1]^d$  and  $\sup_Q$  is taken over all finite discrete measures on  $\mathbb{R}$ . By Lemma SA.19, on a possibly enlarged probability space there exists a mean-zero Gaussian process  $Z_n^R$  indexed by  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R} \cup \Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{E}_{M+N}$  with almost sure continuous sample path such that

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_n^R(g)Z_n^R(f)] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{R}_n(g)\tilde{R}_n(f)], \quad \forall g, f \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R} \cup \Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{E}_{M+N},$$

and for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\Pi_2 \tilde{R}_n - \Pi_2 Z_n^R\|_{(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} M_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}}{n} t} + C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})}}{n} t}\right) \leq 2N_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta)e^{-t}, \quad (\text{SA-22})$$

where

$$\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})} = \sup_{f \in \Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})} \min \left\{ \sup_{(j,k)} \left[ \sum_{j' < j} (j-j')(j-j'+1)2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \tilde{\beta}_{j',k'}^2(f) \right], \|f\|_\infty^2(M+N) \right\}.$$

Let  $f \in \Pi_2(\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \times \mathcal{R})$ . Then there exists  $g \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $r \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $f = \Pi_2[g, r]$ . Since  $f$  is already piecewise-constant, by definition of  $\beta_{j,k}$ 's and  $\eta_{j,k}$ 's, we know  $\tilde{\beta}_{l,m}(f) = \tilde{\eta}_{l,m}(g, r)$ . Fix  $(j, k)$ . We consider two cases. **Case 1:**  $j > N$ . Then by the design of cell expansions (Section SA-III.1),  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k} \times \mathbb{R}$ . By definition of  $\eta_{l,m}$ , for any  $N \leq j' \leq j$ , we have  $(j-j')(j-j'+1)2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} \tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}^2(g, r) = 0$ . Now consider

$0 \leq j' < N$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}(g, r)| \\
&= \sum_{l: \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}} \sum_{0 \leq m < 2^{j'}} |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}] \cdot |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m}] \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m+1}]| \\
&\leq C_\alpha \sum_{l: \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{j-N,k}} |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}]| N^\alpha \leq C_\alpha 2^{j-N} \mathbf{M}_g N^\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j' < j} (j - j')(j - j' + 1) 2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}(g, r)| \leq \sum_{j' < j} (j - j')(j - j' + 1) 2^{j'-N} \mathbf{M}_g N^\alpha \lesssim \mathbf{M}_g N^\alpha.$$

Case 2:  $j \leq N$ . Then  $\mathcal{C}_{j,k} = \mathcal{X}_{0,l} \times \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}$ . Hence for any  $0 \leq j' \leq j$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}(g, r)| &= |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}]| \sum_{m': \mathcal{Y}_{l,j',m'} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_{l,j,m}} |\mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m}] \\
&\quad - \mathbb{E}[r(y_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y}_{l,j-1,2m+1}]| \\
&\leq C_\alpha |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{x}_i) | \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_{0,l}]| N^\alpha \leq C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_g N^\alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{j' < j} (j - j')(j - j' + 1) 2^{j'-j} \sum_{k': \mathcal{C}_{j',k'} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{j,k}} |\tilde{\eta}_{j',k'}(g, r)| \leq C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_g N^\alpha.$$

Moreover, for all  $(j, k)$ , we have  $\tilde{\beta}_{j,k}(g, r) \leq C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_g N^\alpha$ . Hence  $\mathbf{C}_{\Pi_2(\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \times \mathcal{R})} \leq (C_\alpha \mathbf{M}_g N^\alpha)^2$ . Plug in Equation SA-22, we get for all  $t > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \left\| \Pi_2 \tilde{R}_n - \Pi_2 Z_n^R \right\|_{(\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} > C_\alpha \sqrt{\frac{N^{2\alpha+1} 2^M \mathbf{E}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}} \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}}^2}{n}} t + C_\alpha^2 \frac{\mathbf{M}_g N^\alpha}{\sqrt{n}} t \right) \leq 2\mathbf{N}_{\mathfrak{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) e^{-t}. \quad (\text{SA-23})$$

For projection error, by Lemma SA.24, for all  $t > N$ , with probability at least  $1 - 8\mathbf{N}_{\mathfrak{G} \times \mathcal{R}}(\delta) n e^{-t}$ ,

$$\left\| \tilde{R}_n - \Pi_2 \tilde{R}_n \right\|_{(\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} + \left\| Z_n^R - \Pi_2 Z_n^R \right\|_{(\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} \leq C_\alpha \left[ \sqrt{\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} t^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \sqrt{N^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathfrak{G}} + 2^{-N} \mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}}^2} t^{\alpha+\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\mathbf{M}_g}{\sqrt{n}} t^{\alpha+1} \right], \quad (\text{SA-24})$$

where  $C_\alpha$  is a constant that only depends on  $\alpha$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} &= \min\{2\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}, \mathbf{L}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty\} 2^M \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{V}) \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty \mathbf{TV}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}} \lesssim \min\{\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}, 2^{-\frac{M}{d}} \mathbf{L}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}\} 2^{-\frac{M}{d}} \mathbf{TV}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{R}}}, \\
\mathbf{V}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}} &= \min\{2\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}}, \mathbf{L}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}} \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty\} 2^M \mathbf{m}(\mathcal{V}) \|\mathcal{V}\|_\infty \mathbf{TV}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}} \lesssim \min\{\mathbf{M}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}}, 2^{-\frac{M}{d}} \mathbf{L}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}}\} 2^{-\frac{M}{d}} \mathbf{TV}_{\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote  $\widetilde{\mathbf{TV}} = \max\{\mathbf{TV}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}, \mathbf{TV}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{V}_x}\}$  and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{L}} = \max\{\mathbf{L}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}, \mathbf{L}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}\mathcal{V}_x}\}$ . We balance the errors in Equations SA-23 and SA-24 by choosing

$$M = \min \left\{ \left\lceil \log_2 \left( \frac{n\mathbf{TV}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}}} \right) \right\rceil, \left\lceil \log_2 \left( \frac{n\widetilde{\mathbf{TV}}\widetilde{\mathbf{L}}}{\mathbf{E}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}\mathbf{M}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}} \right) \right\rceil \right\}, \quad N = \max \left\{ \left\lceil \log_2 \left( \frac{n\mathbf{M}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}^{d+1}}{\widetilde{\mathbf{TV}}\mathbf{E}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}} \right) \right\rceil, \left\lceil \log_2 \left( \frac{n^2\mathbf{M}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}^{2d+2}}{\widetilde{\mathbf{TV}}\widetilde{\mathbf{L}}^d\mathbf{E}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}^2} \right) \right\rceil \right\}.$$

Plug in Equations SA-23 and SA-24, and use the relation between  $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  in Lemma SA.12, we have for any  $t > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - 8\exp(-t)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_n - Z_n^R\|_{(\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{R})_\delta} &\leq \sqrt{d} \min \left\{ \left( \frac{\mathbf{c}_1^d \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{TV}^d \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}^{d+1}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2(d+1)}}, \left( \frac{\mathbf{c}_1^{\frac{d}{2}} \mathbf{c}_2^{\frac{d}{2}} \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}} \mathbf{TV}^{\frac{d}{2}} \mathbf{L}^{\frac{d}{2}}}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{d+2}} \right\} (t + \mathbf{c}_4 \log n + \log \mathbf{N}(\delta))^{\alpha + \frac{3}{2}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{G}}}{\sqrt{n}} (t + \mathbf{c}_4 \log n + \log \mathbf{N}(\delta))^{\alpha + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

The results the follows by the control on meshing error from Lemma SA.18.  $\square$

### SA-III.29 Proof of Theorem 4

By Lemma SA.13,  $N(\delta) \leq \mathbf{c}\delta^{-d}$ . The result follows by plugging in  $N(\delta)$  to Lemma SA.4.

## References

- Adamczak, R. (2008). “A tail inequality for suprema of unbounded empirical processes with applications to Markov chains,” *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 13(34), 1000–1034.
- Bretagnolle, J. and Massart, P. (1989). “Hungarian Constructions from the Nonasymptotic Viewpoint,” *Annals of Probability*, 17(1), 239–256.
- Brown, L. D., Cai, T. T., and Zhou, H. H. (2010). “Nonparametric regression in exponential families,” *Annals of Statistics*, 38(4), 2005–2046.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Chandak, R., Jansson, M., and Ma, X. (2024). “Local Polynomial Conditional Density Estimators,” *Bernoulli*.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K. (2014). “Gaussian approximation of suprema of empirical processes,” *Annals of Statistics*, 42(4), 1564–1597.
- De Giorgi, E. (1955). “Nuovi teoremi relativi alle misure  $(r - 1)$ -dimensionali in uno spazio ad  $r$  dimensioni,” *Ricerche Mat.*, 4, 95–113.
- Dudley, R. M. (2014). *Uniform central limit theorems*, 142: Cambridge university press.
- Giné, E. and Nickl, R. (2016). *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-dimensional Statistical Models*: Cambridge University Press.
- Rio, E. (1994). “Local Invariance Principles and Their Application to Density Estimation,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 98(1), 21–45.
- Sakhanenko, A. (1996). “Estimates for the accuracy of coupling in the central limit theorem,” *Siberian Mathematical Journal*, 37(4), 811–823.
- van der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. (2013). *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*: Springer Science & Business Media.