

Some facts about the optimality of the LSE in the Gaussian sequence model with convex constraint

Akshay Prasad and Matey Neykov

Department of Statistics & Data Science, Carnegie Mellon University
 Department of Statistics and Data Science, Northwestern University

aprasada@andrew.cmu.edu, mneykov@northwestern.edu

Abstract

We consider a convex constrained Gaussian sequence model and characterize necessary and sufficient conditions for the least squares estimator (LSE) to be optimal in a minimax sense. For a closed convex set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ we observe $Y = \mu + \xi$ for $\xi \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I}_n)$ and $\mu \in K$ and aim to estimate μ . We characterize the worst case risk of the LSE in multiple ways by analyzing the behavior of the local Gaussian width on K . We demonstrate that optimality is equivalent to a Lipschitz property of the local Gaussian width mapping. We also provide theoretical algorithms that search for the worst case risk. We then provide examples showing optimality or suboptimality of the LSE on various sets, including ℓ_p balls for $p \in [1, 2]$, pyramids, solids of revolution, and multivariate isotonic regression, among others.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Related Literature	3
1.2	Notation and Definitions	3
1.3	Organization	4
2	Main Results	5
2.1	Sufficient conditions on the worst case performance of the LSE	5
2.2	Characterizations of the worst case rate of the LSE	10
2.3	Algorithms searching for the worst case rate of the LSE on bounded sets	12
2.3.1	A local packing algorithm	13
2.3.2	A global packing algorithm	14
3	Examples	15
3.1	Examples with optimal LSE	16
3.1.1	Isotonic regression with known total variation bound	16
3.1.2	Multivariate Isotonic Regression	17
3.1.3	Hyperrectangle Example	19
3.1.4	Subspace (Linear Regression)	20
3.1.5	ℓ_1 ball and ℓ_2 balls: LSE is optimal	20
3.2	Examples with suboptimal LSE	21
3.2.1	Pyramid Example	21
3.2.2	Multivariate Isotonic Regression with $\sigma > 1/\sqrt{n}$	22
3.2.3	Solid of Revolution	22
3.2.4	A general lower bound (prelude to ellipsoids)	23

3.2.5	A necessary condition for optimality on ellipsoids	24
3.2.6	ℓ_p balls for $p \in (1, 2)$	25
4	Discussion	26
5	Funding	26
A	Proofs for Section 1 (Introduction)	29
B	Proofs for Section 2 (Main Results)	30
B.1	Proofs for Section 2.1	32
B.2	Proofs for Section 2.2	34
B.3	Proofs for Section 2.3	42
C	Proofs for Section 3 (Examples)	48
C.1	Proofs for Section 3.1	48
C.2	Proofs for Section 3.2	55

1 Introduction

In this paper we focus on the Gaussian sequence model problem. Specifically, we observe a single observation $Y = \mu + \xi$, where $\xi \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I}_n)$ is a multivariate Gaussian noise and $\mu \in K$ where $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a known closed convex constraint. Our goal is to estimate the vector μ taking into account the convex constraint, with the hope that our estimator will be optimal and computationally tractable. A popular estimator in this setting is the Least Squares Estimator (LSE) which essentially projects the observation Y onto the convex constraint. In detail, the LSE is given by

$$\hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu}(Y) := \operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in K} \|Y - \nu\|^2, \tag{1.1}$$

where we abbreviated the Euclidean norm by $\|\cdot\|$. By definition, we have that $\hat{\mu}$ is the Euclidean projection of Y onto the set K which is sometimes denoted by $\Pi_K Y$. The LSE is perhaps one of the most intuitive estimators for this problem (it is also the maximum likelihood estimator); in addition, the LSE can be solved for a variety of sets K as Euclidean projection is a well studied convex problem and there exist plenty of methods which can calculate $\hat{\mu}$. Unfortunately, it is known that there exist sets K for which the LSE is far from optimal in the worst case. Our goal in this paper is to give some insights into when is $\hat{\mu}$ an “optimal” estimator. Here we will measure optimality with respect to the expected squared ℓ_2 loss. Taking a worst case perspective we would like to compare $\sup_{\mu \in K} \mathbb{E}_{\mu} \|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2$ to the minimax optimal rate, i.e., up to constants the expression $\inf_{\hat{\nu}} \sup_{\mu \in K} \mathbb{E}_{\mu} \|\hat{\nu}(Y) - \mu\|^2$, with the infimum taken with respect to all measurable functions (i.e., estimators) of the data. Recently, the minimax rate in this problem was characterized in terms of the local geometry of the set K [Neykov, 2022]. On the other hand, Chatterjee [2014] characterized the expression $\mathbb{E} \|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2$ for any point $\mu \in K$. It may appear that the problem we posed above is nearly solved. The only thing one needs to do is to somehow add a $\sup_{\mu \in K}$ in front of Chatterjee [2014]’s variational formula (see (2.1) below) and compare that to the minimax rate. However, this turns out to be more challenging than one may anticipate, as we hope to convince the reader in Section 2.

1.1 Related Literature

While Chatterjee [2014] does not establish LSE optimality conditions in full generality, the work does demonstrate that the LSE satisfies an admissibility condition (see Chatterjee [2014, Theorem 1.4], Chen et al. [2017], Kur et al. [2023]). That is, up to some universal constant, for any arbitrary estimator $\tilde{\mu}$, there exists a $\mu \in K$ for which the LSE has a lower risk than the arbitrary estimator up to that universal constant. This means any LSE is preferable for some region of the parameter space. Our paper on the other hand focuses on the worst case risk of the LSE.

The optimality of the LSE is well known for a wide class of examples. For isotonic regression, Zhang [2002], Bellec [2018] demonstrate upper bounds on the LSE risk that match the minimax lower bound from Bellec and Tsybakov [2015, Corollary 5]. In multivariate isotonic regression, Deng and Zhang [2020] propose a block estimator that outperforms the LSE in certain cases. Wei et al. [2020] establishes LSE optimality for ellipsoid estimation problems under regularity assumptions that hold for Sobolev ellipsoids with smoothness parameter $\alpha > 1/2$. Suboptimal examples can be found in Zhang [2013], Chatterjee [2014].

An example of our set-up is non-parametric regression with fixed design, i.e.,

$$K = \{(f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n)) : f \in \mathcal{F}\},$$

where the x_i are fixed points and \mathcal{F} is a convex class of functions. Kur et al. [2020b] give suboptimality results for the LSE in non-Donsker regimes, where the logarithm of the metric entropy has rate $\delta^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha > 2$. Han [2021] further investigates the non-Donsker setting, and under a stronger assumption on the entropy of the function class, aims to close the gap between the upper and lower bounds on the LSE risk that derives from an entropy integral condition [Birgé and Massart, 1993]. Kur et al. [2020a] establishes suboptimality when the domain of functions in \mathcal{F} is a polytope of dimension at least 5, with applications to convex function classes with Lipschitz or boundedness constraints. Kur et al. [2023], who also give a generalization of the admissibility result from Chatterjee [2014], demonstrates that suboptimality emerges from the bias portion of the risk following a bias-variance decomposition.

1.2 Notation and Definitions

We define $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We write $a \lesssim b$ if for some absolute constant $C > 0$ we have $a \leq Cb$, and similarly define \gtrsim . We write $a \asymp b$ if $a \lesssim b$ and $b \lesssim a$ both hold, for possibly different constants. Unless otherwise specified, we operate on sets $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and use $\|\cdot\|_2$ to denote the Euclidean ℓ_2 -norm on \mathbb{R}^n , dropping the subscript when clear. For any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we define $B(\theta, \varepsilon) = \{\theta' \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\theta - \theta'\|_2 \leq \varepsilon\}$. We define $\mathbb{R}^+ = (0, \infty)$. We write the $n \times n$ identity matrix as \mathbb{I}_n . We denote by d the diameter of K , i.e., $d := \text{diam}(K) := \sup\{\|\theta - \theta'\|_2 : \theta, \theta' \in K\}$.

Definition 1.1 (Packing Sets and Global Entropy). *An ε -packing of the (totally) bounded set $T \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to $\|\cdot\|_2$, is a set $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M\} \subset T$ such that $\|\theta_i - \theta_j\|_2 > \varepsilon$. The ε -packing number $M(\varepsilon, T)$ is the cardinality of the largest ε -packing of T . The ε -packing global entropy of T is simply the number $\log M(\varepsilon, T)$.*

Definition 1.2 (Local Entropy). *Let $c^* \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be a sufficiently large absolute constant.¹ Define*

$$M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) = \sup_{\theta \in K} M(\varepsilon/c^*, B(\theta, \varepsilon) \cap K),$$

¹We also reserve c^* to refer to this constant throughout this paper.

i.e., the largest (ε/c^*) -packing of a set of the form $B(\theta, \varepsilon) \cap K$. We refer to $\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ as local entropy of K . Sometimes we will use $M_K^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ if we the set K is not clear from the context.

Definition 1.3 ((Local) Gaussian Width). *The Gaussian width of a set $T \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by $w(T) = \mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \in T} \langle x, t \rangle]$ where $x \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)$. Let $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and consider the set $B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K$. Then the local Gaussian width at μ is the function defined as $w_{K, \mu}(\varepsilon) = w(B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K)$. When the set K is clear from the context we will simply denote $w_{K, \mu}(\varepsilon)$ with $w_\mu(\varepsilon)$.*

Neykov [2022] characterized up to absolute constant factors the minimax rate. It turns out that $\inf_{\hat{\nu}} \sup_{\mu \in K} \mathbb{E}_\mu \|\hat{\nu}(Y) - \mu\|_2^2 \asymp \varepsilon^{*2} \wedge d^2$, where

$$\varepsilon^* := \sup\{\varepsilon : \varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)\}. \quad (1.2)$$

In fact, we can show $\varepsilon^* \lesssim d$. To see this, take $\varepsilon \geq (c^* + \kappa)d$ for any $\kappa > 0$. Then $\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) = 0$, since for any $\mu \in K$, if we pack $K \cap B(\mu, (c^* + \kappa)d) = K$ using points of distance at least $\frac{c^* + \kappa}{c^*}d > d$ apart, there can only be one point in the packing. This implies by (1.2) that $\varepsilon^* \leq \varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon \geq (c^* + \kappa)d$, implying $(c^* + \kappa)d$. Hence $\varepsilon^* \wedge d \asymp \varepsilon^*$.

We will now show a quick universal lower bound on the minimax rate which will be useful later on. In addition, we show a different lower bound on rate involving the Gaussian width of the set K in the appendix (see Lemma A.1).

Lemma 1.4 (Minimax Rate Bound). *The minimax rate ε^* satisfies $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$.*

Proof. First suppose $d \geq \sigma$. Now let κ satisfy $\kappa > \max(2, \sqrt{1/\log 2})$. Then taking $\varepsilon = \sigma/\kappa \leq \frac{d}{\kappa} \leq d/2$, we can place a ball of radius ε centered at a point in K where there exists a diameter of that ball of length $2\varepsilon < d$ contained inside K . By picking equispaced points along the diameter of this ball, we conclude that $\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) > \log 2$ (provided c^* is sufficiently large). So we have $\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 = 1/\kappa^2 < \log 2 \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$. Thus, $\varepsilon^* \geq \sigma/\kappa$ by its definition as a supremum, so that $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \geq \sigma \wedge d$. Suppose on the other hand that $d < \sigma$. Then fitting a diameter (of some ball) of length $\varepsilon = d/3$ inside K , we can ensure $\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) > \log 2$ while also having

$$\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sigma^2} = \frac{d^2}{9\sigma^2} < \frac{\sigma^2}{9\sigma^2} = \frac{1}{9} < \log 2.$$

This proves $\varepsilon^* \geq d/3$, so that $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim d \geq \sigma \wedge d$. In either case, $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$. \square

Another useful property is invariance of the minimax rate to the constants used inside or outside the local metric entropy term, as the following lemma shows. The proof relies on the fact that $\varepsilon \mapsto M_K^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ is non-increasing for convex sets K , as established in Neykov [2022, Lemma II.8].

Lemma 1.5 (Equivalent Forms of Information Theoretic Lower Bound). *Define $\varepsilon^\dagger = \sup\{\varepsilon > 0 : \varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq C_1 \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon)\}$ for any fixed $C_1, C_2 > 0$. Then we have $\varepsilon^* \asymp \varepsilon^\dagger$, where $\varepsilon^* = \sup\{\varepsilon : \varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)\}$.*

1.3 Organization

In Section 2, we begin by introducing a variational quantity from Chatterjee [2014] related to the least squares error. We use the relationship between the two to then derive bounds on the worst case LSE error. We then characterize a sufficient condition for the LSE to be minimax optimal.

Then we derive numerous other variational formulas that let us bound the worst case LSE rate. Section 2.3 develops two theoretical algorithms that aim to find this worst case LSE rate provided the set K is bounded, using some of the variational quantities we defined.

Section 3 is split into two parts. First, we illustrate numerous examples where the LSE is minimax optimal, or nearly so. This includes isotonic regression in both univariate and multivariate settings, hyper-rectangles, subspaces, and ℓ_p balls for $p \in \{1, 2\}$. We then show examples where the LSE is suboptimal, including pyramids, multivariate isotonic regression when the noise is too large, solids of revolution, ellipsoids, and ℓ_p balls for $p \in (1, 2)$.

Most of the proofs reside in the appendix, organized by section.

2 Main Results

According to Chatterjee [2014, Theorem 1.1] the maximizer of

$$\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) := \operatorname{argmax}_\varepsilon \sigma w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2, \quad (2.1)$$

is very related (i.e., in some sense it controls) the risk $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2$ where $\hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu}(Y)$ is the LSE defined in (1.1). This fact can also be seen in the following lemma, which follows a similar logic to Chatterjee [2014, Corollary 1.2]. For completeness, we give the full proof in the appendix.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose $\varepsilon_\mu \geq C\sigma$: then $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_\mu^2$. On the other hand, if $\varepsilon_\mu < C\sigma$, then $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2$, where \gtrsim, \asymp and \lesssim hide universal constants and $C > 0$ is another universal constant (some values of the constants are calculated in the proof of the lemma).*

We now define $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) := \sup_{\mu \in K} \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$. When the context is clear, we drop the σ from ε_μ or $\overline{\varepsilon}_K$. The following lemmas give some additional properties of $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ that we use in Section 2.3 where we give algorithms to find the worst case LSE rate.

Lemma 2.2. $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq d$ where d is the diameter of K .

Proof. Fix any $\mu \in K$, and let $\delta > d$. Note that $w_\mu(\delta) = w_\mu(d) = w(K)$ since $B(\mu, d) \cap K = B(\mu, \delta) \cap K = K$. Thus,

$$\sigma w_\mu(\delta) - \delta^2/2 < \sigma w_\mu(d) - d^2/2.$$

Hence $\operatorname{argmax}_\varepsilon [\sigma w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2] \leq d$. Since this holds for all $\mu \in K$, we have $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq d$. \square

Lemma 2.3. *The map $\sigma \mapsto \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ is non-decreasing on $[0, \infty)$. If $c \geq 1$, then $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \overline{\varepsilon}_K(c\sigma) \leq c\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$. If $c < 1$, then $c\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \overline{\varepsilon}_K(c\sigma) \leq \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$.*

2.1 Sufficient conditions on the worst case performance of the LSE

We now consider the worst case risk of the LSE estimator and prove some simple bounds. Let

$$\varepsilon_K^2(\sigma) = \varepsilon_K^2 := \sup_{\mu \in K} \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2,$$

denote the worst case risk for the LSE estimator $\hat{\mu}$. It is clear that since $\hat{\mu} \in K$ we have that $\varepsilon_K \leq \operatorname{diam}(K) =: d$. We will now establish the following upper bound on ε_K .

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\bar{\varepsilon} := \sup_\varepsilon \{\varepsilon^2/(2\sigma) \leq \sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon)\}$. Then $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon} \wedge d$.*

Proof. Since $\varepsilon_K \lesssim d$ always holds, it suffices to show $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}$. Recall we set $\bar{\varepsilon}_K = \sup_{\mu \in K} \varepsilon_\mu$, where $\varepsilon_\mu = \operatorname{argmax}_\varepsilon \sigma w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2$. Observe now that for every $\mu \in K$, we have $\sigma w_\mu(2\bar{\varepsilon}) - 2\bar{\varepsilon}^2 < 0$, and thus by Chatterjee [2014, Proposition 1.3] we have $2\bar{\varepsilon} > \bar{\varepsilon}_K$. We will now relate $\bar{\varepsilon}_K$ to ε_K .

Case 1: Suppose $\bar{\varepsilon}_K \gtrsim \sigma$. Now pick $\tilde{\mu}$ that maximizes $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2$. This leads to two subcases.

Case 1(a): Suppose $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \gtrsim \sigma$. Then by definition of $\tilde{\mu}$ and $\bar{\varepsilon}_K$ along with Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}}^2 \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}_K^2.$$

But we showed $\bar{\varepsilon}_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}$, so we conclude $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}$ as claimed.

Case 1(b): Suppose $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \lesssim \sigma$. Then by Lemma 2.1 and our Case 1 assumption,

$$\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}_K^2 \lesssim 4\bar{\varepsilon}^2.$$

This concludes Case 1.

Case 2: Suppose $\bar{\varepsilon}_K \lesssim \sigma$. This means for any $\mu \in K$, $\varepsilon_\mu \lesssim \sigma$ which in turn implies for all μ that $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| \lesssim \sigma$ by Lemma 2.1. Hence $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma$.

Case 2(a): Now suppose furthermore that $d \geq \frac{2\sigma(n+1)}{n\sqrt{2\pi}}$. We claim this implies $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sigma$ which would prove $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \varepsilon_K$ since $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma$ in Case 2. To see that $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sigma$, notice that K contains a diameter of length $2\sigma/\kappa$ (for a sufficiently large absolute constant κ). Thus by Vershynin [2018, Proposition 7.5.2(vi)], $\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\sigma/\kappa) \geq 2\sigma/(\kappa\sqrt{2\pi})$. Now for sufficiently large κ we have $\sigma/(2\kappa^2) \leq 2\sigma/(\kappa\sqrt{2\pi})$, so that $\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^2/2\sigma$ holds for $\varepsilon = \sigma/\kappa$. But then $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq \sigma/\kappa$ being a supremum of such ε . Hence $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}$ as desired.

Case 2(b): Suppose next that $d \leq \frac{2\sigma(n+1)}{n\sqrt{2\pi}}$. By Jung's theorem, there exists $\mu \in K$ such that

$$w_\mu\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}}d\right) = w(K) \geq d/\sqrt{2\pi}.$$

Using the assumption on d , we have $\frac{nd^2}{2(n+1)(2\sigma)} \leq d/(2\sqrt{2\pi})$ which implies that $w_\mu(\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^2/2\sigma$ for $\varepsilon = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}}d \lesssim d$. Therefore, $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim d$ due to its definition as a supremum, and since $d \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon} \wedge d \leq d$, we have $\varepsilon_K \lesssim d \asymp \bar{\varepsilon} \wedge d$. \square

Remark 2.5. It should be noted that Proposition 2.4 is simply an upper bound on the rate of the LSE. We will later see an example where this upper bound is very suboptimal.

Corollary 2.6. Suppose that $\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \lesssim \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(c\varepsilon)}$ for all $\varepsilon \leq d$. Then the LSE is minimax optimal for all σ . For (centrally) symmetric sets it suffices to look around the 0 point only (both for the maximal local Gaussian width and for the local entropy).

Proof. For each μ the map $\varepsilon \mapsto w_\mu(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon$ is non-increasing, hence $\varepsilon \mapsto \sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon$ is also non-increasing. To see this, note that for $\varepsilon < \delta$, since $w_\mu(0) = 0$, we have

$$w_\mu(\varepsilon) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta} \cdot w_\mu(\delta) + (1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\delta}) \cdot w_\mu(0)$$

by concavity of $\varepsilon \mapsto w_\mu(\varepsilon)$ [Chatterjee, 2014, Proof of Theorem 1.1], which implies $w_\mu(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \geq w_\mu(\delta)/\delta$.

Recall Proposition 2.4 and the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$ and note that $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon} \wedge d \leq d$. This means for some $c' > 0$, $c'\varepsilon_K \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$. Moreover, by definition $\bar{\varepsilon}/(2\sigma) \leq \sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\bar{\varepsilon})/\bar{\varepsilon}$. Using these facts and the aforementioned non-increasing property of $\varepsilon \mapsto \sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon$, we have

$$\frac{c'\varepsilon_K}{2\sigma} \leq \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{2\sigma} \leq \frac{\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\bar{\varepsilon})}{\bar{\varepsilon}} \leq \frac{\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(c'\varepsilon_K)}{c'\varepsilon_K}.$$

If $c' > 1$, then $\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(c'\varepsilon_K)/(c'\varepsilon_K) \leq \sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon_K)/\varepsilon_K$ again by the non-increasing property so that $\varepsilon_K/2\sigma \lesssim \sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon_K)/\varepsilon_K$. Then using our assumption, $\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \lesssim \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(c\varepsilon)}$ holds for ε_K since $\varepsilon_K \leq d$. Hence

$$\frac{\varepsilon_K}{2\sigma} \lesssim \frac{\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon_K)}{\varepsilon_K} \lesssim \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(c\varepsilon_K)}.$$

Thus, $\varepsilon_K^2/\sigma^2 \lesssim \log M^{\text{loc}}(c\varepsilon_K)$, which by Lemma 1.5 implies $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \varepsilon_K$, i.e., the LSE is minimax optimal.

On the other hand, if $c' \leq 1$, then we have $\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(c'\varepsilon_K) \leq \sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon_K)$, therefore

$$\frac{\varepsilon_K}{2\sigma} \leq \frac{\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(c'\varepsilon_K)}{c'\varepsilon_K} \leq \frac{\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon_K)}{c'\varepsilon_K} \lesssim \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(c\varepsilon_K)}.$$

Once more we have $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \varepsilon_K$.

To see the last implication, let K be a centrally symmetric set and suppose we have $w_0(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \lesssim \sqrt{\log M(c\varepsilon/c^*, B(0, c\varepsilon) \cap K)}$ for all $\varepsilon \leq d$. Pick any $\mu \in K$. Note that

$$[\alpha B(\nu, \varepsilon) \cap K] + [(1 - \alpha)B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K] \subseteq B(\alpha\nu + (1 - \alpha)\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K.$$

Taking $\nu = -\mu$ and $\alpha = 1/2$ and using symmetry, we have $B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K \subseteq B(0, \varepsilon) \cap K$, proving that $\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \leq w_0(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon$.

We then consider the local entropy. Let $\nu \in K$ be arbitrary, and let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_M$ be maximal $c\varepsilon/c^*$ packing of $B(\nu, c\varepsilon) \cap K$. Note that for a centrally symmetric set the points $(\theta_i - \nu)/2$ form a $c\varepsilon/(2c^*)$ packing of $B(0, c\varepsilon/2) \cap K$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \log M^{\text{loc}}(c\varepsilon) &= \sup_{\nu \in K} \log M(c\varepsilon/c^*, B(0, c\varepsilon) \cap K) \\ &\leq \log M(c\varepsilon/(2c^*), B(0, c\varepsilon/2) \cap K) \\ &\leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(c\varepsilon/2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sup_{\mu \in K} w_\mu(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \leq \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(c\varepsilon/2)}$ proving our hypothesis need only check the zero point of a centrally symmetric set. \square

Remark 2.7. One may conjecture that the condition in Corollary 2.6 is also necessary. We will see a counterexample in Section 3.1.3 with hyper-rectangles. We also consider ellipsoids and derive a necessary condition similar in spirit to the corollary.

Remark 2.8. Another quick corollary to Proposition 2.4 is that $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sqrt{2\sigma} \sqrt{w(K)}$ by trivially bounding $w_\mu(\varepsilon) \leq w(K)$. This bound is achievable for some sets K , and we will see an example of this later on.

Proposition 2.4 can be extended to a slightly more general upper bound. Suppose we are interested in the worst case risk over the set $K' \subseteq K$ which is a convex subset of K . In other words let

$$\varepsilon_{K';K}^2 := \sup_{\mu \in K'} \mathbb{E} \|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \quad (2.2)$$

denote the worst case risk for the LSE estimator $\hat{\mu}$. We will now establish the following:

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\bar{\varepsilon}_{K';K} := \sup_{\varepsilon} \{\varepsilon^2 / (2\sigma) \leq \sup_{\mu \in K'} w_{K,\mu}(\varepsilon)\}$. Then we have $\varepsilon_{K';K} \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}_{K';K}$.*

Since the proof of Proposition 2.9 is almost identical to that of Proposition 2.4 we defer it to the appendix. So far we saw some sufficient conditions for the worst case performance of the LSE. We will now derive (a similar in spirit result to) the celebrated result of Birgé and Massart [1993] using Proposition 2.4. For a related result see Wainwright [2019, Corollary 13.7].

Corollary 2.10. *Suppose $\sigma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. If ε is such that $\int_{(c'/16)\varepsilon^2}^{2\varepsilon} \sqrt{\log M(t, K)} dt \lesssim \sqrt{n}\varepsilon^2$, then $\varepsilon \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}$, where $\bar{\varepsilon}$ is defined in Proposition 2.4, and c' is an absolute constant.*

Proof. Using Dudley's entropy bound (see Wainwright [2019, Theorem 5.22]), we know that for any fixed c we have

$$w_{\mu}(\varepsilon) \leq 2\sqrt{n}c^2\varepsilon^2 + C \int_{c^2c'\varepsilon^2}^{2\varepsilon} \sqrt{\log M(t, B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K)} dt,$$

where c', C are absolute constants. We can now bound

$$\log M(t, B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K) \leq \log M(t, K),$$

which makes the bound independent of μ . Let $c = 1/4$. Thus,

$$\sigma \sup_{\mu} w_{\mu}(\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^2/8 + C/\sqrt{n} \int_{c'/16\varepsilon^2}^{2\varepsilon} \sqrt{\log M(t, K)} dt,$$

so as long as $\int_{c'/16\varepsilon^2}^{2\varepsilon} \sqrt{\log M(t, K)} dt \lesssim \sqrt{n}\varepsilon^2$, we have $\sigma \sup_{\mu} w_{\mu}(\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon^2 C'$ for some absolute constant $C' > 1$. This implies $\varepsilon \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}$. To see this, first observe that $\varepsilon \mapsto \frac{\sup_{\mu} w_{\mu}(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}$ is non-increasing. Therefore,

$$\frac{\sup_{\mu} w_{\mu}(2C'\varepsilon)}{2C'\varepsilon} \leq \frac{\sup_{\mu} w_{\mu}(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{\varepsilon C'}{\sigma}.$$

Rearranging, $\sup_{\mu} w_{\mu}(\varepsilon) \leq \frac{(2\varepsilon C')^2}{2\sigma}$, but by definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$, we must have $\bar{\varepsilon} \leq 2C'\varepsilon$. \square

The next set of results bound the LSE with a geometric average of the minimax rate and a trivial estimator up to some logarithmic factors. Define $\underline{\varepsilon} = \sup_{\varepsilon} \{\varepsilon^2 / (2\sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\delta \leq \varepsilon} \delta / c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)}\}$. We first compare ε_K to $\underline{\varepsilon}$ up to log factors (Theorem 2.11) and then derive the geometric average result (Corollary 2.12). Remark 2.13 examines the sharpness of the bound and connects the results to a Donsker-regime assumption.

Theorem 2.11. Let $C_n = 4C \left(1 + \log_{c^*} \sqrt{2\pi n}\right)^{3/2}$, where $C > 1$ and c^* are sufficiently large absolute constants (where c^* is the constant from the definition of local entropy). Then $\varepsilon_K \lesssim (4C_n \underline{\varepsilon}) \wedge d$.

Corollary 2.12. The following inequality always holds for the LSE:

$$\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sqrt{\sigma} C_n (\sqrt{\varepsilon^*} \sqrt[4]{n}).$$

Proof. We first let $\delta^* := \sup_{\delta \leq \underline{\varepsilon}} \delta \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)}$.

Case 1: $\delta^* > \varepsilon^*$. Then using that $\delta^* \leq \underline{\varepsilon}$, the non-decreasing property of $\varepsilon \mapsto \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$, along with the definition of ε^* , we obtain

$$\delta^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta^*)} \leq \underline{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon^*)} \asymp \underline{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^* / \sigma.$$

Using the definition of $\underline{\varepsilon}$, we can show $\underline{\varepsilon} \lesssim \varepsilon^*$ since

$$\underline{\varepsilon}^2 / (2\sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2c^*} \delta^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta^*)} \lesssim \underline{\varepsilon} \varepsilon^* / \sigma.$$

By Theorem 2.11, we obtain

$$\varepsilon_K \lesssim C_n \underline{\varepsilon} \lesssim C_n \varepsilon^* = C_n \sqrt{\varepsilon^*} \sqrt{\varepsilon^*} \lesssim C_n \sqrt{\varepsilon^*} \sqrt[4]{n} \sqrt{\sigma},$$

where we use the fact that $\varepsilon^* \leq \sqrt{n}\sigma$ (which follows since the minimax estimator is at least better than using Y as an estimator of μ , and this estimator has error rate $n\sigma^2$).

Case 2: $\delta^* \leq \varepsilon^*$. Then we have $\delta^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta^*)} \lesssim \varepsilon^* \sqrt{n}$. Here we use the fact that $\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta^*) \lesssim n$. To see this, note that $M^{\text{loc}}(\delta^*) \leq M(\delta^*/c^*, B(\theta, \delta^*)) \lesssim (1 + c^*)^n$ using the well-known metric entropy of a scaled ℓ_2 -ball. Hence

$$\varepsilon_K \lesssim C_n \underline{\varepsilon} \lesssim C_n \sqrt{\sigma \cdot (\delta^*/c^*)} \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta^*)} \lesssim C_n \sqrt{\varepsilon^*} \sqrt[4]{n} \sqrt{\sigma}.$$

□

Remark 2.13. We will see later that without further assumptions on K this bound is sharp up to the logarithmic factors, i.e., there exist sets K for which the bound is met with equality dropping the log factors and constant terms (Section 3.2.5). For now, it suffices to say that the bound is sharp when $\sigma \ll 1/\sqrt{n}$, and K is the unit ℓ_2 ball².

Note that the rate $\sqrt{\varepsilon^*} \sqrt{\sigma} \sqrt[4]{n}$ is the geometric mean of the optimal rate, and a trivial rate (which is achieved by using the observation Y as the estimator of the mean). So the rate of the LSE is always not worse than this geometric mean. Furthermore, when $\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta) \asymp \delta^{-\alpha}$ for some $\alpha < 2$, the supremum $\sup_{\delta \leq \underline{\varepsilon}} \delta \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)} \asymp (\varepsilon/c^*) \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ and hence (upon equating this to $\varepsilon^2/(2\sigma)$ we realize that), the LSE is minimax optimal up to logarithmic factors for all σ . This latter assumption is known as the ‘‘Donsker regime,’’ although it is typically assumed that the global entropy scales like $\delta^{-\alpha}$ which is a stronger requirement than the same assumption on the local entropy (see e.g., Lemma 3.1).

²The minimax rate on the squared level for the unit ℓ_2 ball is given by $\min(1, n\sigma^2)$ [see Zhang, 2013, e.g.].

2.2 Characterizations of the worst case rate of the LSE

We will now see a series of results which attempt to characterize (up to constants) the worst case risk of the LSE. A first proper characterization of the risk is given by the following result.

Theorem 2.14. *Define*

$$\bar{\varepsilon} := \sup_{\varepsilon} \left\{ \varepsilon : \sup_{\mu \in K} \left[w_{\mu}(C\varepsilon) - w_{\mu}(c\varepsilon) \right] \geq \frac{(C^2 - c^2)\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma} \right\},$$

for any two fixed constants $C > 1 > c > 0$. Then $\varepsilon_K \asymp \bar{\varepsilon}$ if $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sigma$ for some sufficiently large constants, otherwise $\varepsilon_K \asymp \sigma \wedge d$.

In the proof of Theorem 2.14 and several later results, we use Chatterjee [2014, Proposition 1.3] to bound $\varepsilon_{\mu}(\sigma)$. That proposition notes that $\mu \mapsto w_{\mu}(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/(2\sigma)$ is a concave mapping, and as a consequence, if $\alpha \geq \beta > 0$ and

$$w_{\mu}(\alpha) - \alpha^2/(2\sigma) \geq w_{\mu}(\beta) - \beta^2/(2\sigma),$$

then $\varepsilon_{\mu} \geq \beta$. If on the other hand $w_{\mu}(\alpha) - \alpha^2/(2\sigma) \leq w_{\mu}(\beta) - \beta^2/(2\sigma)$, then $\varepsilon_{\mu} \leq \alpha$. Choosing $\mu \in K$ and $\alpha, \beta > 0$ appropriately will give us the desired bounds on $\varepsilon_{\mu}(\sigma)$, and therefore $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ and ε_K with the help of Lemma 2.1.

Our next characterization is the following theorem, which we later use in Lemma 3.16 to prove suboptimality of the LSE for ℓ_p balls with $p \in (1, 2)$.

Theorem 2.15. *Let*

$$\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) := \sup_{\varepsilon} \left\{ \varepsilon : \sup_{\mu \in K} \left[w_{\mu}(\varepsilon) - \inf_{\nu \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} w_{\nu}(\varepsilon/c) \right] \geq \left(4 + \frac{4}{c} \right) \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma} \right\}.$$

Set $\sigma' = 4c\sigma/(c-1)$. Then if $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$ for a sufficiently large constant, we have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c \leq \varepsilon_K(\sigma) \leq \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$; if $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$, we have $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$.

A similar result to the one above can be given by the next theorem. We later apply it to demonstrate optimality for subspaces (Section 3.1.4) and suboptimality for pyramids (Lemma 3.11).

Theorem 2.16. *Define*

$$\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) := \sup_{\varepsilon} \left\{ \varepsilon : \sup_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \in K: \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \leq 2\varepsilon} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) - C\varepsilon^2/(2\sigma) + L/c^* \cdot \varepsilon \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)} \geq 0 \right\}$$

where $C = 2[(2 + 1/c^*)^2 - 1/c^{*2}] = 8 + 8/c^*$ for some $c^* > 1$, and L is an absolute constant.

Then if $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$ for a sufficiently big constant we have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c^* \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma) \leq \bar{\varepsilon}(C\sigma/(1 - 1/c^{*2}))$, on the other hand if $\bar{\varepsilon}(C\sigma/(1 - 1/c^{*2})) \lesssim \sigma$, it follows that $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$.

To prove this theorem, we additionally define

$$\underline{\varepsilon}^* = \sup\{\varepsilon > 0 : C^2\varepsilon^2/(4\sigma^2) \leq (L/c^*)^2 \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Luckily up to constants this is the information theoretic lower bound defined in (1.2), as we proved in Lemma 1.5.

Remark 2.17. We have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \geq \underline{\varepsilon}^* \asymp \varepsilon^*$. To see this, pick any $\varepsilon \leq \underline{\varepsilon}^*$. By definition of $\underline{\varepsilon}^*$, we have $L/c^* \cdot \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)} - C\varepsilon/2\sigma > 0$, and by choosing ν_1, ν_2 appropriately, the expression we take the supremum over in $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ is non-negative. By definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ as a supremum, we know $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon$. Thus for any such $\varepsilon \leq \underline{\varepsilon}^*$, we can show that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon$, which implies $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \geq \underline{\varepsilon}^*$.

In our next set of results, we analyze the Lipschitz constant of the map $\nu \mapsto w_\nu(\varepsilon)$ over K , noting that this map is always Lipschitz (Remark 2.18). It turns out this Lipschitz constant controls the worst case LSE rate ε_K (Theorem 2.19) and thus yields an equivalent condition for LSE optimality (Corollary 2.21). We conclude the section by observing some easier ways to prove this map is Lipschitz (Remark 2.22). We apply Theorem 2.19 in our solids of revolution suboptimality result (Lemma 3.13), and both this theorem and Corollary 2.21 trivially yield an optimality result for subspaces (Section 3.1.4).

Remark 2.18. The mapping $\nu \mapsto w_\nu(\varepsilon)$ is Lipschitz over K .

Proof. Suppose for a fixed Gaussian vector ξ , x achieves the max $\langle \xi, x \rangle$ over $x \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K$ (as usual if such a vector does not exist, i.e., the maximum is unattainable, the same reasoning works with a modified limiting argument). Then one can see that the vector

$$y' = \frac{\varepsilon}{\|\mu - \nu\| + \varepsilon} \cdot x + \frac{\|\mu - \nu\|}{\|\mu - \nu\| + \varepsilon} \cdot \nu$$

is in the set $B(\nu, \varepsilon) \cap K$ since $y' \in K$ and $\|y' - \nu\| = \frac{\varepsilon}{\|\mu - \nu\| + \varepsilon} \cdot \|x - \nu\| \leq \varepsilon$. Using that $w_\nu(\varepsilon) \geq \mathbb{E}_\xi \langle \xi, y' \rangle$ and expanding the definition of y' , we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_\mu(\varepsilon) - w_\nu(\varepsilon) &\leq \mathbb{E}_\xi \langle \xi, x \rangle - \mathbb{E}_\xi \langle \xi, y' \rangle \leq \frac{\|\mu - \nu\|}{\|\mu - \nu\| + \varepsilon} (\mathbb{E}_\xi \langle \xi, x \rangle - \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_\xi \langle \xi, \nu \rangle}_{=0}) \\ &= \frac{\|\mu - \nu\| \cdot w_\mu(\varepsilon)}{\|\mu - \nu\| + \varepsilon} \leq \frac{\|\mu - \nu\| w_\mu(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \leq \sqrt{n} \|\mu - \nu\|. \end{aligned}$$

The final inequality used Vershynin [2018, Proposition 7.5.2(vi)]. Now, take $\alpha\mu + (1 - \alpha)\nu$. We have

$$\alpha(w_\mu(\varepsilon) - w_\nu(\varepsilon)) \leq w_{\alpha\mu + (1-\alpha)\nu}(\varepsilon) - w_\nu(\varepsilon) \leq \alpha \|\mu - \nu\| \cdot \frac{w_{\alpha\mu + (1-\alpha)\nu}(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}.$$

Thus dividing by α and taking $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ (and noting that by its Lipschitz condition, the map $\alpha \rightarrow w_{\alpha\mu + (1-\alpha)\nu}(\varepsilon)$ is continuous) shows that

$$|w_\mu(\varepsilon) - w_\nu(\varepsilon)| \leq \|\mu - \nu\| \cdot \frac{w_\nu(\varepsilon) \wedge w_\mu(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \leq \sqrt{n} \|\mu - \nu\|. \quad (2.4)$$

□

Equipped with this fact, we now define a quantity $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ which encodes the tightest such Lipschitz constant of our map, and then relate it to $\varepsilon_K(\sigma)$.

Theorem 2.19. Define

$$\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) = \sup_{\varepsilon} \left\{ \varepsilon : \sup_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \in K} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) - \frac{C\varepsilon \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma} + \frac{L}{c^*} \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)} \geq 0 \right\},$$

where $C = 1 + \frac{2}{c^*}$ and L is a sufficiently large absolute constant. We further require that $c^* > 2$. Set $\sigma' = 4C\sigma/(1 - 4/c^{*2})$. Then $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$. If $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$ for a sufficiently big constant, we also have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c^* \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$. If $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$, then $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$.

The proof relies on the following simple lemma.

Lemma 2.20. *For every ε , the map $\nu \mapsto w_\nu(\varepsilon)$ is concave over K .³*

Proof. Let $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in K$ and $\nu_3 = \alpha\nu_1 + (1 - \alpha)\nu_2 \in K$. Then we have that $B(\nu_3, \varepsilon) \cap K \supset \alpha(B(\nu_1, \varepsilon) \cap K) + (1 - \alpha)(B(\nu_2, \varepsilon) \cap K)$, so we can use [Vershynin \[2018, Proposition 7.5.2\(iv\)\]](#) to claim that

$$w(B(\nu_3, \varepsilon) \cap K) \geq w(\alpha(B(\nu_1, \varepsilon) \cap K) + (1 - \alpha)(B(\nu_2, \varepsilon) \cap K)) = \alpha w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon) + (1 - \alpha)w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon).$$

□

The next corollary applies Theorem 2.19 to obtain an elegant characterization of LSE optimality.

Corollary 2.21. *Fix σ . Then the LSE is minimax optimal if and only if the map $\mu \mapsto w_\mu(\varepsilon)$ is (ε/σ) -Lipschitz up to constants for all $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^*(\sigma)$.*

Remark 2.22. *Nguyen and Khanh [2020] demonstrate that to show a convex (or concave) function is Lipschitz, it suffices to show it is locally Lipschitz near boundary points. Combined with Corollary 2.21, we obtain a potentially easier way to verify the Lipschitz property of the mapping $\mu \mapsto w_\mu(\varepsilon)$ and thus the optimality of the LSE.*

2.3 Algorithms searching for the worst case rate of the LSE on bounded sets

The theorems above, in particular Theorems 2.15 and 2.16, inspire theoretical algorithms for searching for worst case rate for the LSE for bounded sets K . Our Algorithm 2 below is based on local packings while Algorithm 3 instead uses global packings. Since both algorithms make usage of evaluating the map $\nu \mapsto w_\nu(\varepsilon)$, before we introduce them we will illustrate how one can evaluate the map $\nu \mapsto w_\nu(\varepsilon)$ on a given closed convex body K , where it is assumed that we have a separation oracle for K . A separation oracle for K is a function $\mathcal{O}_K: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathcal{O}_K(\nu) = 0$ if $\nu \in K$ and if $\nu \notin K$, $\mathcal{O}_K(\nu) = a$ where $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is such that $a^\top \nu > a^\top \mu$ for all points $\mu \in K$. The next lemma states that if one can compute the LSE for K then assuming a separation oracle for K is not a stringent assumption.

Lemma 2.23. *If one can project on K , i.e., one can calculate $\Pi_K \nu$ for any $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then one has a separation oracle on K .*

Proof. Define $\mathcal{O}_K(\nu) = \nu - \Pi_K \nu$ for all $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then $\mathcal{O}_K(\nu) = 0$ for all $\nu \in K$. If $\nu \notin K$, observe that for any $\mu \in K$ we have $(\nu - \Pi_K \nu)^\top (\nu - \mu) > 0$. This follows by [Bellec \[2018, equation \(1.19\)\]](#) since

$$(\nu - \Pi_K \nu)(\mu - \nu) + \|\nu - \Pi_K \nu\|^2 = (\nu - \Pi_K \nu)^\top (\mu - \Pi_K(\nu)) \leq 0,$$

and also that $\|\nu - \Pi_K \nu\| > 0$ since $\nu \notin K$. □

³What is more, one can easily see that the map $(\varepsilon, \nu) \mapsto w_\nu(\varepsilon)$ is concave. The proof is nearly identical to the proof of the original statement so we omit it. We will however use this result later on.

The idea for calculating the width $w_\nu(\varepsilon)$ is simple, and we summarize it in Algorithm 1. We will sample N points $\xi_i \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)$, $i \in [N]$. Assume for a moment we can calculate the values of $\sup_{\eta \in B(\nu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi_i, \eta - \nu \rangle$. We will then average all these values as an estimate of $w_\nu(\varepsilon)$. This strategy works because of the celebrated concentration inequality of Lipschitz functions of Gaussian variables [e.g., [Wainwright, 2019](#), Theorem 2.26]. We can show from the definition of the supremum that the map $x \mapsto \sup_{\eta \in B(\nu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle x, \eta - \nu \rangle$ is ε -Lipschitz. The theorem states that $\langle \xi_i, \eta_i^* - \nu \rangle$ (where η_i^* denotes the maximum of $\sup_{\eta \in B(\nu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi_i, \eta - \nu \rangle$) is a sub-Gaussian random variable with variance proxy ε^2 , hence satisfies the concentration inequality:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|N^{-1} \sum_{i \in [N]} \langle \xi_i, \eta_i^* - \nu \rangle - w_\nu(\varepsilon)\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp(-Nt^2/(2\varepsilon^2)).$$

Thus if one wants to approximate $w_\nu(\varepsilon)$ to precision t with probability at least $1 - \delta$, then one needs at most $N = 2\varepsilon^2 \log(2/\delta)/t^2$.

To solve $\sup_{\eta \in B(\nu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi_i, \eta - \nu \rangle$ for a fixed ξ given a separation oracle for K , we use the ellipsoid algorithm [[Grötschel et al., 2012](#), Chapter 3]. At each iteration, we must either find a separation oracle for $B(\nu, \varepsilon)$ (which is trivial by Lemma 2.23), or a separation oracle for K . If the point η happens to be in the set $B(\nu, \varepsilon) \cap K$ then one simply needs to take the gradient of $-\langle \xi, \eta - \nu \rangle$ with respect to η which is also trivial.

Algorithm 1: Local Gaussian Width Algorithm

Input: K a compact convex set in \mathbb{R}^n , a separation oracle \mathcal{O}_K for K , a point $\nu \in K$, $\varepsilon > 0$, desired precision t and probability $1 - \delta$.

- 1 Let \mathcal{E} be a subroutine that can solve $\arg \sup_{\eta \in B(\nu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi, \eta - \nu \rangle$ given \mathcal{O}_K ;
 - 2 Set $N = \lceil 2\varepsilon^2 \log(2/\delta)/t^2 \rceil$;
 - 3 Draw $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)$;
 - 4 Compute using $\eta_i^* = \arg \sup_{\eta \in B(\nu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi_i, \eta - \nu \rangle$ for $i = 1, \dots, N$ using \mathcal{E} ;
 - 5 Set $\widehat{w}_\nu(\varepsilon) = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in [N]} \langle \xi_i, \eta_i^* - \nu \rangle$;
 - 6 **return** $\widehat{w}_\nu(\varepsilon)$
-

2.3.1 A local packing algorithm

Suppose K is a compact convex set. Let $d = \text{diam}(K)$. Let $c^* > 4$ in the definition of the local metric entropy, and set $C = 4 - \frac{1}{c^{*2}}$. We now consider partitioning K in the following way. Begin by fixing an arbitrary point $\nu^* \in K$ (its location is inconsequential). Maximally pack the set $B(\nu^*, d) \cap K = K$ at a distance d/c^* . Next, for each point ν_i^* in that packing set, consider maximally packing the set $B(\nu_i^*, d/2) \cap K$ at a distance $d/(2c^*)$. Continue the process infinitely, obtaining an infinite tree of packing sets. At the k th level, the number of descendants is bounded by $M^{\text{loc}}(d/2^{k-1})$.

Following this packing set construction, we proceed with our algorithm starting with level $k = 1$. Algorithm 2 considers the difference between $w(B(\nu^*, d/2^{k-1}) \cap K)$ and the smallest possible point from the children of ν^* , i.e., $\min_i w(B(\nu_i^*, d/(2^{k-1}c^*)) \cap K)$. If that difference is bigger than $Cd^2/(2\sigma)$ then the algorithm stops and outputs d/c^* . If not, it proceeds to look at all children of ν^* in the same way but replacing d with $d/2$. For example, if we take ν_i^* the algorithm

Algorithm 2: Local Packing Algorithm

Input: Compact convex set K , diameter d , constant c^* from definition of local metric entropy

1 **Function** ChildrenDistance($\nu \in K, k \in \mathbb{N}$):

2 $\delta \leftarrow \frac{d}{2^{k-1}c^*};$

3 Form a maximal δ -packing set $\{\nu_1^k, \nu_2^k, \dots, \nu_M^k\}$ of the set $B(\nu, \delta c^*) \cap K$ where
 $M = M(\delta, B(\nu, \delta c^*) \cap K);$

4 Solve $\nu_i^{k*} = \operatorname{argmin}_i w_{\nu_i^k}(\delta);$

5 $\Psi \leftarrow w_\nu(\delta c^*) - w_{\nu_i^{k*}}(\delta);$

6 $T \leftarrow C(\delta c^*)^2/(2\sigma);$

7 **return** $\Psi - T;$

8 Initialize $\nu^* \in K;$

9 Set $\phi(\nu^*) = 1;$ /* Track the level of any node ν in the tree */

10 Let $Q = (\nu^*)$ be an ordered queue;

11 **while** Q is not empty **do**

12 Remove the point ν at the end of the $Q;$

13 Compute $\gamma = \text{ChildrenDistance}(\nu, \phi(\nu))$ and the packing set therein;

14 Define $\beta = \frac{d}{2^{\phi(\nu)-1}c^*};$

15 **if** $\gamma > 0$ **then**

16 **return** β

17 **else**

18 For each child node ν_i in the packing set, set $\phi(\nu_i) = \phi(\nu) + 1;$

19 Add each ν_i to the start of $Q;$

looks at the difference between $w(B(\nu_i^*, d/2^{2-1}) \cap K)$ and the smallest possible difference from its children. If the algorithm finds a point bigger than $C(d/2)^2/(2\sigma)$, the algorithm terminates and outputs $d/(2c^*)$. Else it continues to look at the children of children and so on, in a breadth first search manner.

The following theorem (which uses Lemma B.2 in the Appendix) states our resulting bounds on $\varepsilon_K(\sigma)$ depending on how many iterations it takes for the algorithm to terminate.

Theorem 2.24. Define $c' = \frac{(2c^*-4)(4c^*-1/c^*)}{(c^*-4)c^*}$ for some $c^* > 4$.

(1) Suppose Algorithm 2 terminates after k iterations. Then $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim d/(2^{k-1}c^*)$.

(2) Suppose Algorithm 2 does not terminate within k iterations.

(a) If $\sigma \geq c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$, then $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$.

(b) If $\sigma \leq c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$, then $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$.

2.3.2 A global packing algorithm

In this subsection, we present a global packing algorithm based on Theorem 2.16. We use the same absolute constants L, c^* , and C from the theorem. For a fixed $\sigma > 0$, Algorithm 3 (if it does not

Algorithm 3: Global Packing Algorithm

Input: K a convex set, $\sigma > 0$, absolute constants $c^*, L > 0$, and $C = 8 + 8/c^*$.

- 1 Initialize $\varepsilon \leftarrow 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*$ where $\underline{\varepsilon}^*$ is defined in (2.3);
- 2 $\delta \leftarrow \varepsilon^3 / (4c^* \sup_{\eta \in K} w_\eta(\varepsilon/c^*)\sigma) \wedge \varepsilon$;
- 3 Form a maximal δ -packing set $\{\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_M\}$ of K , where $M = M(\delta, K)$;
- 4 $\Psi \leftarrow \max_{i \in [M]} \sup_{\nu' \in B(\nu_i, 2\varepsilon - \delta) \cap K} w_{\nu'}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_i}(\varepsilon/c^*)$;
- 5 $T \leftarrow C\varepsilon^2 / (2\sigma) - (L/c^*) \cdot \varepsilon \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}$;
- 6 **while** $\Psi \geq T$ **do**
- 7 $\varepsilon \leftarrow 2\varepsilon$;
- 8 Update δ ;
- 9 Update maximal δ -packing set $\{\nu_1, \dots, \nu_M\}$ of K with $M = M(\delta, K)$;
- 10 Update Ψ and T ;
- 11 **return** ε

immediately terminate) produces an ε that will either match ε_K or upper bound it. The algorithm accomplishes this by repeatedly forming δ -packing sets of K with $\delta = (\varepsilon^3 / (4c^* \sup_{\eta \in K} w_\eta(\varepsilon/c^*)\sigma)) \wedge \varepsilon$, and doubling ε until a certain condition is met.

In computing Ψ from the algorithm, we must solve the problem $\sup_{\nu' \in K \cap B(\nu_i, 2\varepsilon - \delta)} w_{\nu'}(\varepsilon/c^*)$ for each i . This is a maximization of a concave function over a convex set and in principle is computationally tractable.

Our main result is stated in Theorem 2.25, which relates the output ε of Algorithm 3 to $\varepsilon_K(\sigma)$. The proof uses Lemma B.4 to compare ε to $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$, and that lemma in turn relies on Lemma B.3 to bound ε depending on whether $\Psi < T$ or $\Psi \geq T$ (the algorithm's stopping conditions).

Theorem 2.25. *Suppose Algorithm 3 does not terminate on initialization, and let ε be the output of the algorithm. Then the following hold:*

- (1) If $d \lesssim \sigma$, then $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp d \lesssim \varepsilon$.
- (2) If $d \gtrsim \sigma$ and $\sigma \geq \varepsilon$, then $\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$.
- (3) If $d \gtrsim \sigma$ and $\sigma \leq \varepsilon$, we have $\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$.

If Algorithm 3 does terminate on initialization, $\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$.

3 Examples

In this section, we consider several examples in order to illustrate the utility of the theory we laid out in Section 2. While some of the examples we consider are well known, the techniques we use to obtain these results are mostly distinct from existing techniques. In addition, we also exhibit many new results including counterexamples to Corollary 2.6 and Proposition 2.4, and new classes of examples where the LSE is suboptimal. A very useful tool for studying the local entropy was proved by Yang and Barron [1999] in their Lemma 3. Since we will be using it repeatedly, we restate it here.

Lemma 3.1 ([Yang and Barron, 1999, Lemma 3]). *For any set K we have,*

$$\log M(\varepsilon/c^*, K) - \log M(\varepsilon, K) \leq \log M_K^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \leq \log M(\varepsilon/c^*, K). \quad (3.1)$$

3.1 Examples with optimal LSE

We begin with several examples where the LSE is (nearly) minimax optimal.

3.1.1 Isotonic regression with known total variation bound

In this section, we consider the isotonic estimator with known total variation bound. The case with unknown total variation bound, i.e., $S^\uparrow = \{\mu : \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_n\}$, was essentially analyzed by Chatterjee [2014] and he showed in his equation (51) that for any $\mu \in S^\uparrow$, we have

$$w_{S^\uparrow, \mu}(\varepsilon) \leq C \sqrt{\max(\mu_n - \mu_1, 1) \varepsilon n^{1/2} + \varepsilon^2/4}.$$

Set $V = \mu_n - \mu_1$. Using Proposition 2.9 with $\sigma = 1$ we have that the worst case rate of the LSE is upper bounded by ε^2 where ε solves $\sup\{\varepsilon > 0 : \varepsilon^2/2 \leq C \sqrt{\max(V, 1) \varepsilon n^{1/2} + \varepsilon^2/4}\}$, which implies that $\varepsilon \asymp n^{1/6} (V \vee 1)^{1/3}$.

We now consider the case with known total variation bound. Consider the set

$$S_V^\uparrow := \{\mu : \mu_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq \dots \leq \mu_n, \mu_n - \mu_1 \leq V\},$$

for some $V \in \mathbb{R}$. Importantly, we assume the value of V or some appropriate upper bound is known to the statistician so that she can fit the LSE on the set S_V^\uparrow .

We will need to calculate the local entropy of the set S_V^\uparrow . Take any point $\mu^* \in S_V^\uparrow$. We need to pack at a distance ε/c the set $S_{\mu^*}^\uparrow(V) := \{\mu : \mu \in S_V^\uparrow, \|\mu - \mu^*\| \leq \varepsilon\}$.

Suppose now that $\mu_1 - \mu_1^* =: \delta < -V$. Then we have $\mu_1^* \geq \mu_1 - \delta \geq \mu_1 + V \geq \mu_n$. Thus

$$\varepsilon^2 \geq \sum_{i \in [n]} (\mu_i - \mu_i^*)^2 \geq n(-\delta - V)^2,$$

and therefore $-\delta \leq V + \varepsilon/\sqrt{n}$, and hence $\mu_1^* - \mu_1 \leq V + \varepsilon/\sqrt{n}$. Similarly, one can show that $\mu_n \leq \mu_n^* + V + \varepsilon/\sqrt{n}$. By Chatterjee [2014, Lemma 4.20] we therefore have that

$$\log M(\varepsilon/c^*, S_{\mu^*}^\uparrow(V)) \leq \frac{3(V\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon)}{(\varepsilon/c^*)} = 3c^* \cdot \frac{V\sqrt{n} + \varepsilon}{\varepsilon}.$$

Since the above holds for any μ^* it is an upper bound on the local entropy by (3.1). Next we will show a lower bound on $\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$. To this end, we define the set $\mathcal{S}^\uparrow(a, b) = \{\mu : a \leq \mu_1 \leq \dots \leq \mu_n \leq b\}$. We are specifically interested in $\mathcal{S}^\uparrow(0, V) = \{\mu : 0 \leq \mu_1 \leq \dots \leq \mu_n \leq V\}$. First, we note that by Chatterjee [2014, Lemma 4.20], $\log M(\varepsilon, \mathcal{S}^\uparrow(a, b)) \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{n}(b-a)}{\varepsilon}$. On the other hand, one can show using Varshamov-Gilbert's bound that $\log M(\varepsilon, \mathcal{S}^\uparrow(a, b)) \gtrsim \frac{\sqrt{n}(b-a)}{\varepsilon}$ for values of $\varepsilon \gtrsim \frac{(b-a)}{\sqrt{n}}$. Formally we have:

Lemma 3.2. *We have that $\log M(\varepsilon, \mathcal{S}^\uparrow(a, b)) \gtrsim \frac{\sqrt{n}(b-a)}{\varepsilon}$, for $\varepsilon \gtrsim \frac{(b-a)}{\sqrt{n}}$.*

We give the proof of this result in the appendix. Hence by using bound (3.1) one can see that for sufficiently large c^* , $\log M_{S^\dagger(a,b)}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \asymp \frac{\sqrt{n}(b-a)}{\varepsilon}$ for $\varepsilon \gtrsim \frac{(b-a)}{\sqrt{n}}$. On the other hand, when $\varepsilon \lesssim \frac{(b-a)}{\sqrt{n}}$ the local entropy is trivially upper bounded by n [Wainwright, 2019, Example 5.8]. It follows that for $\varepsilon \gtrsim V/\sqrt{n}$ we have that the local entropy of the set $S^\dagger(0, V)$ which is smaller than the local entropy of the set S_V^\dagger is at least $\sqrt{n}V/\varepsilon$ up to constant factors. Considering the function $\varepsilon \mapsto \sup_{\delta \leq \varepsilon} \delta \sqrt{\log M_{S_V^\dagger}^{\text{loc}}(\delta)} \lesssim \min(\sqrt{\varepsilon\sqrt{n}V}, \sqrt{n}\varepsilon)$ for values of $\varepsilon \leq V\sqrt{n}$. Equating this to $\varepsilon^2/(2\sigma)$ we obtain $\varepsilon \asymp n^{1/6}V^{1/3}\sigma^{2/3} \wedge \sqrt{n}\sigma$. This matches the minimax rate that one can obtain from the equation $\log M_{S_V^\dagger}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \asymp \frac{\varepsilon^2}{\sigma^2}$ for $\varepsilon \leq V\sqrt{n}$. Thus we conclude that the LSE is minimax optimal (up to logarithmic factors). We note that it is known that the LSE is exactly minimax optimal (see Zhang [2002], Bellec [2018] for upper bounds and Bellec and Tsybakov [2015, Corollary 5] for lower bounds).

3.1.2 Multivariate Isotonic Regression

To generalize the single variable isotonic regression example (but with known total variation), we follow the set-up of Han et al. [2019]. Let $\mathbb{L}_{p,n} = \prod_{j=1}^p \{\frac{1}{n^{1/p}}, \frac{2}{n^{1/p}}, \dots, 1\}$ be the lattice with $(n^{1/p})^p = n$ points in \mathbb{R}^p . For $p = 1$, these are just the equispaced points from 0 to 1 of distance n^{-1} apart. We will consider p to be a fixed constant that does not scale with n .

Let $\mathcal{F}_p = \{f: [0, 1]^p \rightarrow [0, 1], f \text{ non-decreasing in each variable}\}$, where by non-decreasing in each variable we mean that

$$f(z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_p) \leq f(z_1, \dots, z_{i-1}, z_i + y_i, z_{i+1}, \dots, z_p)$$

for any $(z_1, \dots, z_p) \in [0, 1]^p$, $y_i > 0$, and $1 \leq i \leq p$. We are interested in the set of evaluations of monotone function on the lattice, i.e.,

$$Q_{a,b} = \{(f(l_1), f(l_2), \dots, f(l_n)) \mid f: [0, 1]^p \rightarrow [a, b] \text{ non-decreasing in each variable}\}$$

where l_1, \dots, l_n are the distinct elements of $\mathbb{L}_{p,n}$. For $a = 0$ and $b = 1$, $Q_{0,1}$ is the set of tuples of evaluations of functions in \mathcal{F}_p .

Let us compute an upper bound on the log metric entropy of $Q_{a,b}$ by using the log-entropy of \mathcal{F}_p , as is done in Chatterjee [2014, Lemma 4.20] in a univariate case. We are using the packing numbers which are up to absolute constants of the same order as the covering numbers used in [Chatterjee, 2014] and [Gao and Wellner, 2007]. Here we use the L^2 -norm with Lebesgue measure in p -dimensions in the metric entropy calculations for \mathcal{F}_p .

Lemma 3.3 ([Gao and Wellner, 2007, Theorem 1.1]). *There is an absolute constant C such that if $p > 2$, we have*

$$\log M(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_p) \leq C\varepsilon^{-2(p-1)}.$$

If $p = 2$, then

$$\log M(\varepsilon, \mathcal{F}_p) \leq C\varepsilon^{-2}(\log 1/\varepsilon)^2.$$

Using this result, we will obtain the following:

Lemma 3.4. *Let $Q_{a,b}$ be the set of evaluations of monotone functions on the lattice defined above. Then for $p > 2$, we have*

$$\log M(\varepsilon, Q_{a,b}) \leq C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2(p-1)}$$

for some absolute constant C . For $p = 2$, we have

$$\log M(\varepsilon, Q_{a,b}) \leq C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2} \left(\log \frac{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)}{\varepsilon} \right)^2.$$

The proof is broadly similar to [Chatterjee \[2014\]](#) except instead of constructing monotone step functions on the real-line, we construct a multivariate analogue on $[0, 1]^p$. We will upper bound the cardinality of a minimal ε -covering of $Q_{a,b}$, which therefore bounds the cardinality of a maximal ε -packing of $Q_{a,b}$.

Next, we derive in [Lemma 3.5](#) a lower bound on $\log M(\varepsilon, Q_{a,b})$ following the technique in [Gao and Wellner \[2007, Proposition 2.1\]](#). The proof involves partitioning $[0, 1]^p$ into cubes of side length ε and constructing many piece-wise monotone functions whose values disagree with each other on sufficiently many cubes (equivalently, binary strings in some dimension that have sufficiently high Hamming distances between each other).

Lemma 3.5. *Let $Q_{a,b}$ be the set of evaluations of monotone functions on the lattice defined above. Then for $p \geq 2$, if $\varepsilon \gtrsim \sqrt{n/n^{1/p}}$, then $\log M(\varepsilon, Q_{0,1}) \gtrsim \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}} \right)^{-2(p-1)}$. Moreover, for $\frac{\varepsilon}{b-a} \gtrsim \sqrt{n/n^{1/p}}$, we have $\log M(\varepsilon, Q_{a,b}) \gtrsim \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2(p-1)}$.*

To summarize the results of these two lemmas, when $\frac{\varepsilon}{b-a} \gtrsim \sqrt{n/n^{1/p}}$, we have for $p \geq 2$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2(p-1)} &\lesssim \log M(\varepsilon, Q_{a,b}) & (3.2) \\ &\lesssim \begin{cases} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2} \left(\log \frac{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 & p = 2 \\ \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2(p-1)} & p > 2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In the following lemma, we use the bound [\(3.1\)](#) to derive the local metric entropy from the global entropy results when $p > 2$.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose $\frac{\varepsilon}{b-a} \gtrsim \sqrt{n/n^{1/p}}$ and $p > 2$. Then for sufficiently large c^* , $\log M_{Q_{a,b}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \asymp \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2(p-1)}$.*

Using this result, we give an example of the least squares estimator achieving the minimax rate up to logarithmic factors. Consider the set $Q_{a,b}$ where $a = -b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, and take $\sigma \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. Then we have for $\frac{1}{n^{1/2p}} \lesssim \varepsilon \lesssim 1$ (noting that the packing set has cardinality 1 when ε is larger than the diameter) and $p > 2$ that

$$\log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \asymp \varepsilon^{-2(p-1)}. \quad (3.3)$$

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose $p > 2$. Take $1/\sqrt{n} \leq \sigma \leq 1$. Then minimax rate $\varepsilon^* = \sup\{\varepsilon : \varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)\}$ satisfies $\varepsilon^* \asymp \sigma^{1/p}$. If $\sigma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, then the LSE rate satisfies $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma^{1/p} \log^2(n)$.*

Thus, we have shown for $p > 2$ the LSE achieves the minimax rate up to a logarithmic factor when $\sigma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. We later show in Section 3.2.2 that if $\sigma > \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, the LSE is suboptimal for some values of σ . In an improvement to the LSE, [Deng and Zhang \[2020\]](#) propose a computationally-tractable block estimator that actually achieves the minimax rate for a range of σ without the logarithmic factor under some moment conditions on the noise term.

3.1.3 Hyperrectangle Example

We will first argue that the LSE is optimal on any hyperrectangle. This appears to be a folklore fact, but since we could not find a reference containing a proof we attach an argument for completeness. Since it is hard to evaluate the local widths for arbitrary hyperrectangles we use other means. First observe that without loss of generality we may assume that the hyperrectangle is axis aligned. This is because, the LSE is invariant to shifts and rotations. Let $H := \prod_{i=1}^n [-a_i/2, a_i/2]$ for some positive real numbers $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$, where we assume without loss of generality that $a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_n$.

First observe that the minimization $\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \nu_i)^2$ subject to $\nu \in H$ splits into minimizations $\hat{\nu}_i := \min_{\nu_i \in [-a_i/2, a_i/2]} (Y_i - \nu_i)^2$. In the one dimensional case with convex set $K = [-a_i/2, a_i/2]$ the estimator defined by [Neykov \[2022\]](#) coincides with $\hat{\nu}_i$ (see Lemma C.1). It follows from [Neykov \[2022, Corollary III.1\]](#) (see also [Donoho et al. \[1990\]](#)) that $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\nu}_i - \mu_i)^2 \asymp \min(a_i^2, \sigma^2)$, a fact which is also easy to directly verify. Thus the LSE has risk

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\nu} - \mu\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(\hat{\nu}_i - \mu_i)^2 \asymp \sum_{i=1}^n \min(a_i^2, \sigma^2) \asymp [(k+2)\sigma^2 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2], \quad (3.4)$$

where $k \in \{0, n-1\}$ is such that $(k+1)\sigma^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} a_i^2$ and $(k+2)\sigma^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} a_i^2$. The last implication is proven in the subsequent lemma. But [Neykov \[2022, Section III.A\]](#) establishes $[(k+2)\sigma^2 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2]$ as the minimax rate in n dimensions, proving optimality of the LSE. Note that we did not directly apply Corollary III.1 to the n -dimensional optimization since we would have to establish the estimator from [Neykov \[2022\]](#) in \mathbb{R}^n coincides with the LSE, which may not be true.

Lemma 3.8. *We have $\sum_{i=1}^n \min(a_i^2, \sigma^2) \asymp [(k+2)\sigma^2 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2]$ where k is as defined above.*

Consider now H given by $a_i = 1/\sqrt{n}$ for $i \leq n-1$ and $a_n = C \gg 1$. Set $\sigma = 1$. Take a ball centered at the 0 point of radius $2c^* > 1$ for c^* being the absolute constant in [Neykov \[2022\]](#). Consider the width of this ball intersected with H , i.e., $w_{H,0}(2c^*) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{x \in H, \|x\| \leq 2c^*} \langle x, \xi \rangle$. Take $x_i = \text{sign}(\xi_i)/(2\sqrt{n})$. That shows that the width is at least $\gtrsim \sqrt{n}$. On the other hand, consider packing the ball of radius $2c^*$ intersected with H at a distance $2c^*/c^* = 2$, i.e., computing $M_H^{\text{loc}}(2c^*)$. Observe that the intersection of the ball and H is fully contained in a hyperrectangle H' of side lengths $1/\sqrt{n} \times 1/\sqrt{n} \times \dots \times 1/\sqrt{n} \times 4c^*$, so $M_H^{\text{loc}}(2c^*) \leq M_{H'}^{\text{loc}}(2c^*)$. Partition H' into hypercubes of side length $1/\sqrt{n}$ along the long edge of H' , with possibly a region left-over of diameter ≤ 1 . We can fit at most $\lceil 4c^*/(1/\sqrt{n}) \rceil \leq 4c^* \sqrt{n} + 1$ hypercubes inside H' . Note that each of these hypercubes of side length $1/\sqrt{n}$ can have at most 1 point from the packing set since its diameter is bounded by 1. This means $\log M_H^{\text{loc}}(2c^*) \leq \log M_{H'}^{\text{loc}}(2c^*) \lesssim \log n$. Thus $w_{H,0}(2c^*)/2c^* \gtrsim \sqrt{n} \gg \sqrt{\log n} \gtrsim \sqrt{\log M_H^{\text{loc}}(2c^*)}$, noting that $2c^*$ is smaller than the diameter

since we take $C \gg 1$. Thus, the sufficient condition from Corollary 2.6 is not necessary for LSE optimality.

The same example can serve to show that the condition of Proposition 2.4 is only a sufficient condition. Suppose $a_n = C \geq \sqrt[4]{n}$ and recall $\sigma = 1$. Then since for constant ε the width is at least proportional to \sqrt{n} then $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sqrt[4]{n}$, and hence Proposition 2.4 gives a prediction which is far away from the true LSE rate which is constant in this case (see (3.4)).

3.1.4 Subspace (Linear Regression)

Suppose we are given a linear regression model $Y = X\beta + \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I}_p)$ and X is an arbitrarily fixed design matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$. This is a special case of our setting where we can consider $K = \text{col}(X)$ to be a fixed p -dimensional subspace in \mathbb{R}^n . It is very simple to see that $w_\mu(\varepsilon) = w_\nu(\varepsilon)$ for any $\mu, \nu \in K$, so that the LSE will be minimax optimal by Theorem 2.19 (or Theorem 2.16). This is a significant (albeit well known) result. It says that for any fixed design X , the least squares procedure (aka linear regression) is optimal in terms of in sample squared prediction error as long as $p \leq n$. Here by in sample prediction error we mean $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \|X(\hat{\beta} - \beta)\|_2^2$, where we assume $\mu = X\beta \in \text{col}(X)$, and the least squares estimate $\hat{\mu} \in \text{col}(X)$ is $\hat{\mu} = X\hat{\beta}$ where $\hat{\beta} \in \text{argmin}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|Y - X\gamma\|_2^2$. To see how this result can be derived using other means, one can consult Example 13.8, Exercise 13.2 and Example 15.14 in Wainwright [2019].

3.1.5 ℓ_1 ball and ℓ_2 balls: LSE is optimal

Let $K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_1 \leq 1\}$ be the ℓ_1 ball. Then $w_{K,0}(\varepsilon) \asymp \sqrt{\log(en(\varepsilon^2 \wedge 1))} \wedge \varepsilon\sqrt{n}$ as stated in Bellec [2019]. The following lemma states the local entropy and is proven by combining Lemma 3.1 along with the global entropy.

Lemma 3.9. *The local metric entropy of the ℓ_1 ball satisfies*

$$\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \asymp \begin{cases} \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2} & \varepsilon \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{n} \\ n & \varepsilon \lesssim 1/\sqrt{n} \text{ or } \varepsilon \asymp 1/\sqrt{n}, \end{cases}$$

provided c^* is taken sufficiently large.

We now apply Corollary 2.6 by verifying that $w_{K,0}(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \lesssim \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}$ using Lemma 3.9. When $\varepsilon \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{n}$,

$$w_{K,0}(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \asymp \sqrt{n} \wedge \frac{\sqrt{\log(en(\varepsilon^2 \wedge 1))}}{\varepsilon} \lesssim \sqrt{n} \wedge \frac{\sqrt{\log(n\varepsilon^2)}}{\varepsilon} \lesssim \frac{\sqrt{\log(n\varepsilon^2)}}{\varepsilon} \asymp \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}.$$

When $\varepsilon \lesssim 1/\sqrt{n}$,

$$w_{K,0}(\varepsilon)/\varepsilon \asymp \sqrt{n} \wedge \frac{\sqrt{\log(en(\varepsilon^2 \wedge 1))}}{\varepsilon} \lesssim \sqrt{n} \lesssim \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}.$$

Thus the LSE is minimax optimal for all σ .

Next, we let $K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_2 \leq 1\} = B(0, 1)$ be the ℓ_2 ball. We consider $\varepsilon < 1$. Observe that

$$\frac{w_{K,0}(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} = \frac{w(B(0, \varepsilon) \cap K)}{\varepsilon} = \frac{w(B(0, \varepsilon))}{\varepsilon} \lesssim \frac{\varepsilon \cdot \sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon} = \sqrt{n}.$$

On the other hand, using scaling properties of the metric entropy of a set along with [Vershynin \[2018, Corollary 4.2.13\]](#)

$$\log M(\varepsilon/c^*, B(0, \varepsilon) \cap K) = \log M(\varepsilon/c^*, B(0, \varepsilon)) = \log M(1/c^*, B(0, 1)) \gtrsim n \log c^*.$$

Thus, $\frac{w_{K,0}(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \lesssim \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}$, verifying that the LSE is minimax optimal for all σ .

3.2 Examples with suboptimal LSE

Here we attach several examples to illustrate the suboptimality of the LSE. Examples of this nature have previously appeared in [Chatterjee \[2014\]](#), [Zhang \[2013\]](#). Below, when we say that the LSE is suboptimal, we mean that there exist values of σ for which the LSE does not achieve the minimax optimal rate. It is easy to see ([Proposition 3.10](#)) that the LSE is always optimal for either very small or large values of σ .

Proposition 3.10. *Let r be the largest radius of a ball fully embedded in K . Then the LSE is minimax optimal if either $\sigma \lesssim r/\sqrt{n}$ or $\sigma \gtrsim d$.*

Proof. Suppose the ball we chose is centered at $\mu \in K$. Take $\varepsilon = \sqrt{n}\sigma \lesssim r$. Then $\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 = n$, while

$$\log M_K^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \gtrsim \log M^{\text{loc}}(r) \geq \log M(r/c^*, \overbrace{B(\mu, r)}^{=B(\mu, r)} \cap K) \gtrsim n,$$

following the argument we used in [Section 3.1.5](#) for the ℓ_2 ball. Hence $\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \lesssim \log M_K^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$, so $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \varepsilon = \sqrt{n}\sigma$. On the other hand, as we argued in the proof of [Corollary 2.12](#), we know $\varepsilon^* \lesssim \sqrt{n}\sigma$ (use the trivial estimator of Y). Hence $\varepsilon^* \asymp \sqrt{n}\sigma$. But the LSE is also always better than the trivial estimator Y (projections onto convex sets move closer to any point in the set), so $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sqrt{n}\sigma$. Thus, the LSE is minimax optimal for $\sigma \lesssim r/\sqrt{n}$.

For our second claim, using [Lemma 1.4](#), we have $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d \asymp d$ but also $\varepsilon^* \lesssim d$, so $\varepsilon^* \asymp d$ while $\varepsilon_K \lesssim d$. \square

3.2.1 Pyramid Example

Assume $\sigma = 1$. Let v be an orthogonal vector to the convex set $K \subset v^\perp$, and assume $w(K) \geq \text{diam}^2(K) \geq 1$, and $\|v\|_2 \geq \text{diam}(K) + c$. Assume further that K is symmetric (i.e., if $k \in K$, $-k \in K$). Consider the set $P = \cup_{\alpha \in [0,1]} [\alpha v + (1-\alpha)K]$. It is simple to see P is a convex set, in fact a pyramid.

Lemma 3.11. *For sufficiently large c and assuming $w(K) \gtrsim \|v\|_2^2$, the worst case LSE risk ε_P^2 satisfies $\varepsilon_P \gtrsim \|v\|_2$.*

On the other hand, there exists a simple estimator that achieves a better rate of convergence. Suppose $Y = p + \xi$ where $p = \alpha v + (1-\alpha)k \in P$ and $\xi \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \mathbb{I}_n)$. Consider the linear projection $P_v Y$ of Y onto v (i.e., $P_v = vv^T/\|v\|^2$), so that $P_v Y = \alpha v + P_v \xi$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|P_v Y - p\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E}\|\alpha v + P_v \xi - (\alpha v + (1-\alpha)k)\|_2^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\|P_v \xi - (1-\alpha)k\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\|P_v \xi\|_2^2 + (1-\alpha)^2 \text{diam}(K)^2 \\ &\leq 1 + \text{diam}(K)^2 \ll \|v\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we used $\sup_{k \in K} \|k\|_2^2 \leq \text{diam}(K)^2$, which holds since $0 \in \text{relint } K$.

3.2.2 Multivariate Isotonic Regression with $\sigma > 1/\sqrt{n}$

We return to the multivariate isotonic regression setting, where now we take $\sigma > 1/\sqrt{n}$ and $p > 2$ and show the LSE is suboptimal. Our result relies on analyzing the local Gaussian width at the 0 point (Lemma C.2 and Lemma C.3 in the appendix) by mimicking the proof of Han et al. [2019, Proposition 5]. The authors consider a more general set than $Q_{a,b}$, though, with no restrictions on the range.

Lemma 3.12. *Set $K = Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and set $p > 2$. Then for*

$$\sigma \in \left(\max \left\{ n^{-1/2}, n^{(2-p)/(2p-2)} (\log n)^{4p/(p-1)} \right\}, n^{-1/2+1/p} \right),$$

the LSE rate ε_K^2 exceeds the minimax rate $\sigma^{2/p}$.

Proof. Recall from Section 3.1.2 that the minimax rate was shown to be $\sigma^{2/p}$ when $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \lesssim \sigma \lesssim 1$. Note that we will pick $\sigma \lesssim n^{-1/2+1/p} < 1$ for $p > 2$. Using Lemma C.2 and Lemma C.3 and taking $c = \frac{1}{\log^4 n}$, we conclude $w_0(t) - w_0(ct) \gtrsim n^{1/2-1/p}t$. If we further assume $n^{1/2-1/p}\sigma < 1$ (i.e., assume that $\sigma \in (n^{-1/2}, n^{-1/2+1/p})$, which is a non-empty set) and take $t \asymp n^{1/2-1/p}\sigma$, then

$$w_0(t) - w_0(ct) \geq t^2/\sigma \geq t^2(1 - c^2)/\sigma.$$

Hence we have

$$w_0(t) - t^2/\sigma \geq w_0(ct) - t^2c^2/\sigma,$$

which by the concavity of $t \mapsto w_0(t) - t^2/\sigma$ implies that $\varepsilon_0 \geq ct$ (where ε_0 is defined as in (2.1)). Thus, since $\sigma > 1/\sqrt{n}$, it follows that

$$\varepsilon_0 \gtrsim ct \asymp cn^{1/2-1/p}\sigma > \sigma.$$

The last inequality follows for sufficiently large n since $n^{1/2-1/p}$ grows much faster than $(\log n)^4$.

Then, by Lemma 2.1, $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - 0\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_0^2$, which implies $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \varepsilon_0$. Since $\varepsilon_0^2 \gtrsim c^2t^2$, we have $\varepsilon_K^2 \gtrsim c^2n^{1-2/p}\sigma^2$. This quantity $\gg \sigma^{2/p}$ whenever $\sigma \gg n^{(2-p)/(2p-2)}(\log n)^{4p/(p-1)}$. One can verify that

$$n^{(2-p)/(2p-2)}(\log n)^{4p/(p-1)} \ll n^{-1/2+1/p}, \quad (3.5)$$

since it is of the form $n^{\beta_1}(\log n)^{\beta_2} \ll n^{\beta_3}$ where $0 < \beta_1 < \beta_3$ for $p > 2$ and the logarithmic factor grows slower than n^{β_1} . This implies the interval in the statement of the lemma is non-empty. Thus, we may pick $\sigma > 1/\sqrt{n}$ such that $n^{1/2-1/p}\sigma < 1$ and $\sigma \ll n^{(2-p)/(2p-2)}(\log n)^{4p/(p-1)}$, implying $\varepsilon_K(\sigma)^2 \gg \sigma^{2/p}$. Thus, the LSE is suboptimal for such σ . \square

3.2.3 Solid of Revolution

Let $f: [0, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be concave, satisfy $f(0) = f(b) = 0$, and satisfy $f(x) = f(b-x)$ for $x \leq b/2$ (i.e., symmetric about $b/2$). We assume $b/4 \gg f(b/2)$ and that

$$f(b/2) > f(b/4) + \frac{b}{4\sqrt{2\pi(n-1)}},$$

i.e., the secant line between the points at $x = b/4$ and $x = b/2$ has slope at least $\frac{1}{8\sqrt{2\pi(n-1)}}$. To define the solid of revolution in \mathbb{R}^n , for any $x \in [0, b]$, form an $(n-1)$ -dimensional ball B_x belonging to e_1^\perp where e_1 is the $(1, 0, \dots, 0)$ unit vector with radius $f(x)$. Let $K = \bigcup_x (\{x\} \times B_x)$.

Lemma 3.13. *The worst case LSE risk for the solid of revolution K satisfies $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim b$.*

On the other hand, given $y = \mu + \xi$ where $\mu \in K$, consider the estimator $\hat{y} = \langle y, e_1 \rangle e_1$ that projects y onto the x -axis. Then decomposing $\mu = \langle \mu, e_1 \rangle e_1 + (\mu - \langle \mu, e_1 \rangle e_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu - \langle y, e_1 \rangle e_1\|_2^2 &= \|(\langle \mu, e_1 \rangle - \langle y, e_1 \rangle) e_1\|_2^2 + \|\mu - \langle \mu, e_1 \rangle e_1\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \|\langle \xi, e_1 \rangle e_1\|_2^2 + [f(b/2)]^2 \\ &= \langle \xi, e_1 \rangle^2 + [f(b/2)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality came from noting that $(\mu - \langle \mu, e_1 \rangle e_1)$ lies in $e_1^\perp \cap K$, and any such point is no more than distance $f(b/2)$ from the x -axis. So in expectation, we have $\mathbb{E}\|\mu - \langle y, e_1 \rangle e_1\|_2^2 \leq 1 + [f(b/2)]^2 \ll 1 + b^2/8$. Thus, $\varepsilon_K^2 \gtrsim b^2$ while $\mathbb{E}\|\mu - \hat{y}\|_2^2 \ll 1 + b^2$.

3.2.4 A general lower bound (prelude to ellipsoids)

In this section, we derive a lower bound on the LSE rate for a broad class of sets K that are pre-images of smooth functions, which in turn are transformations of Minkowski gauges. Later, we specialize our result to the case of ellipsoids.

Suppose we are given a convex set of the type $K = \{x : G(x) \leq 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, where $G : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a twice continuously differentiable non-negative convex function with $G(0) = 0$. Suppose that the Hessian of G admits a lower bound on K , i.e., for all $x \in K$ we have $H(x) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y y^\top} G(y) \Big|_{y=x} \succeq M \succ 0$, for some symmetric and strictly positive-definite matrix M (so that G is strongly convex). Take any boundary point $x \in \text{bd} K$, i.e., such that $G(x) = 1$. We know that $\nabla G(x)^\top x \geq \nabla G(x)^\top y$ for all $y \in K$, or in other words, the gradient $\nabla G(x)$ is an outward normal to K . However, under our assumptions above, we actually know more about the set K . We know that

$$\begin{aligned} G(y) &= G(x) + \nabla G(x)^\top (y - x) + (y - x)^\top H(\tilde{x})(y - x)/2 \\ &\geq G(x) + \nabla G(x)^\top (y - x) + (x - y)^\top M(x - y)/2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $\tilde{x} = \alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y$ for some $\alpha \in [0, 1]$. Since x is a boundary point, we conclude that

$$\nabla G(x)^\top (x - y) \geq (x - y)^\top M(x - y)/2$$

for all $y \in K$. We will also argue that under these assumptions that the set K is compact. It is clear by the continuity of G that K is closed. To show that it is bounded write

$$1 \geq G(y) \geq G(0) + \nabla G(0)^\top (y) + y^\top M y/2.$$

But, since 0 is a point of minimum, we have $G(0) = 0$ and $\nabla G(0) = 0$, so that $y^\top M y/2 \leq G(y) \leq 1$. Thus, since M is strictly positive-definite, the set K is bounded. Denote by d the finite diameter of K .

Suppose we now select the boundary point with the smallest gradient, i.e., let $x \in \text{bd} K$ be a point such that $\|\nabla G(x)\|_2$ is minimized. This smallest gradient will not be a zero vector since $0 = G(0) \geq G(x) - \nabla G(x)^\top x = 1 - \nabla G(x)^\top x$. Then we can conclude that there exists some outward normal vector at x given by $x^* = \frac{\nabla G(x)}{\|\nabla G(x)\|_2}$, such that for all $y \in K$ we have

$$\langle x^*, x - y \rangle \geq (x - y)^\top \tilde{M}(x - y)/2, \tag{3.7}$$

where $\tilde{M} = M/\|\nabla G(x)\|_2$.

We now lower bound $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ for suitable σ using these vectors x and x^* , where we defined $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ as a supremum over $\mu \in K$ of the term $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$ defined in (2.1).

Lemma 3.14. *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ be the vector of eigenvalues of $\tilde{M}/2$. Given the assumptions listed above on the set K , G , the Hessian of G , we have that $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \gtrsim w^2(K)/\sum(1/\lambda_i)$ for $\sigma \gtrsim d^2/(w(K))$.*

3.2.5 A necessary condition for optimality on ellipsoids

We now specialize the scenario in the previous section to ellipsoids. That is, suppose we are given $K = \{x : \|Dx\|_2^2 \leq 1\}$ with D is a diagonal positive-definite matrix, i.e., we take $G(x) = \|Dx\|_2^2$ in the notation of Section 3.2.4. Let the diagonal entries of D be given by $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_n$. We again derive a lower bound on $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ and obtain a necessary condition for optimality of the LSE similar to the sufficient condition in Corollary 2.6.

Lemma 3.15. *Suppose we have the ellipsoid $K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|Dx\|_2^2 \leq 1\}$ where D is a positive definite diagonal matrix with entries $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_n$. Define $\delta_{n-k} = 1/d_{n-k}$ for any $k \in \{0\} \cup [n-1]$. Then for each such k , there exists a point $\nu \in K$ such that $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon_\nu(\sigma) \gtrsim \delta_{n-k}$, for values of $\sigma \gtrsim \delta_{n-k}^2/w_0(\delta_{n-k})$ for a sufficiently large absolute constant. Moreover, if the LSE is minimax optimal for K for all σ , then for all $k \in \{0\} \cup [n-1]$ we must have*

$$w_0(\delta_{n-k}) \lesssim \delta_{n-k} \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(c\delta_{n-k})},$$

for sufficiently large absolute constant and sufficiently small $c > 0$.

Let us now construct some examples of ellipsoids with a suboptimal LSE using this lemma. Take $\delta = 1/d_n \asymp \text{diam}(K)$. By Lemma 3.15 we know that for values of $\sigma = 1/(d_n^2 \sqrt{\sum 1/d_i^2})$ we have that $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \delta$, where we used Wainwright [2019, Exercise 5.9] to write $w_0(\delta) = w(K) \asymp \sqrt{\sum 1/d_i^2}$. Suppose further that

$$\delta \gtrsim \sigma = 1 / \left(d_n^2 \sqrt{\sum 1/d_i^2} \right)$$

so that by Lemma 2.1 we can claim that $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \delta \asymp \text{diam}(K)$. But since $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim \text{diam}(K)$ always holds, this means $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \delta \asymp \text{diam}(K)$. On the other hand, the minimax rate for ellipsoids, stated in Neykov [2022], is (where in his notation $a_i = 1/d_i^2$ and $d_0 = \infty$) is given by $(k+1)\sigma^2 \wedge \text{diam}(K)^2$ if $1/d_{n-k}^2 \leq (k+1)\sigma^2$ but $1/d_{n-k+1}^2 > k\sigma^2$, and is $\text{diam}(K)^2$ if $1/d_n^2 \leq \sigma^2$.

Let us ensure that we choose k and the d_i so that the minimax rate is given by $(k+1)\sigma^2$ with $k = 1$. It is clear that $\sigma < 1/d_n$. Suppose now that $d_1/\sqrt{n} \ll d_n \ll d_{n-1}$ and in addition $1/d_{n-1}^2 \leq 2\sigma^2$ which is equivalent to $\sum \frac{1}{d_i^2} \leq \frac{4d_{n-1}^2}{d_n^4}$. Then $k = 1$ satisfies the stated conditions in the minimax rate in the first scenario. Note that $d_1/\sqrt{n} \ll d_n$ implies $2\sigma^2 \ll 1/d_n^2 \asymp \text{diam}(K)^2$. It follows that the minimax rate would be at most $\frac{2}{d_n^4 \sum 1/d_i^2} = 2\sigma^2 \ll 1/d_n^2 \asymp \text{diam}(K)^2 \asymp \delta^2$, while we showed δ^2 is the worst case rate for the LSE.

One can construct multiple such examples. One example is given in Zhang [2013] with $d_i = 1$ for $i < n$ and $d_n = 1/\sqrt[4]{n}$, where the lower bound on the worst case rate of the LSE is established

with a bare hands argument. It is simple to check that $\sigma \asymp 1$ for this example, while the worst case rate for the LSE is $\varepsilon_K^2 \asymp \text{diam}(K)^2 \asymp n^{1/2}$. Since for this example $w(K) \asymp \sqrt{n}$, and $\sigma \asymp 1$, we obtain an example where the bound $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sqrt{2\sigma} \sqrt{w(K)}$ from Remark 2.8 is tight. One can also check that $\varepsilon^* \asymp 1$, which means the bound from Corollary 2.12 of $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sqrt{\sigma} \sqrt{\varepsilon^*} C_n \sqrt[4]{n}$ is tight (without the logarithmic factors from C_n), as we mentioned in Remark 2.13.

We provide another example which does not even require $d_{n-1} \gg d_n$. Consider the Sobolev type ellipsoid with $d_k = (n - k + 1)^\alpha$ for $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. Then we can calculate $\sigma \asymp \sqrt{n^{-1+2\alpha}} \ll 1 \asymp \text{diam}(K)$. The conditions $1/d_{n-k}^2 \leq (k+1)\sigma^2$ but $1/d_{n-k+1}^2 > k\sigma^2$ are equivalent to $(k+1)^{1+2\alpha} \geq \sigma^{-2} \geq k^{1+2\alpha}$, so we take $k = \lceil n^{(1-2\alpha)/(1+2\alpha)} \rceil$. Hence the minimax rate is

$$\lceil n^{(1-2\alpha)/(1+2\alpha)} \rceil n^{-1+2\alpha} \asymp n^{-2\alpha(1-2\alpha)/(1+2\alpha)} \ll 1 \asymp \varepsilon_K(\sigma)^2.$$

This result complements that of Wei et al. [2020] who consider the $\alpha > 1/2$ case by contrast and demonstrate optimality of the LSE.

3.2.6 ℓ_p balls for $p \in (1, 2)$

In order to show the suboptimality of the LSE for the ℓ_p unit ball for a fixed $p \in (1, 2)$, we first take a detour and prove a general bound on the LSE rate for a strongly convex body.

Recall that the body K is called strongly convex if there exists a constant k such that for any $\mu, \nu \in K$ and any $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ we have that $B(\lambda\mu + (1-\lambda)\nu, k\lambda(1-\lambda)\|\mu - \nu\|^2) \subset K$. Let μ and ν be opposite ends of a diameter of K and pick $\lambda = 1/2$. Then, by strong convexity, $B((\mu + \nu)/2, kd^2/4) \subseteq K$ so that $2kd^2/4 < d$. Rearranging $k < 2d^{-1}$.

Lemma 3.16. *Let K be a strongly convex body with parameter k . Suppose $\sigma \asymp (k\sqrt{n})^{-1}$. Then $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim d$.*

Returning to ℓ_p balls for $p \in (1, 2)$, by Garber and Hazan [2015, Corollary 1], we know that ℓ_p unit balls are $k = (p-1)n^{1/2-1/p}$ strongly convex. It follows that for $\sigma \asymp 1/n^{1-1/p}$, we have $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim d$ from Lemma 3.16. But since also $\varepsilon_K \lesssim d$, we conclude $\varepsilon_K \asymp d$ up to constants. Now, it is easy to verify that the diameter of the ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 -balls are both 2, and since for any $p \in (1, 2)$, we have that the unit ℓ_1 ball is a subset of the unit ℓ_p -ball which is a subset of the ℓ_2 -ball, it follows that $d \asymp 1$.

On the other hand, following Section III.E of Neykov [2022] (formally this section treats convex weak ℓ_p balls but since the packing numbers are the same it applies to ℓ_p balls as well) we know that the minimax rate satisfies $\varepsilon^*(\sigma) \asymp \sigma^{1-p/2}(\log n)^{(2-p)/4} \wedge \text{diam}(K)$ for values of σ satisfying $\log(n\sigma^p(\log n)^{p/2}) \asymp \log n$ and $\sigma^{(4-2p)/4}(\log n)^{(2-p)/4} \gtrsim n^{1/2-1/p}$.

Observe that for $\sigma \asymp 1/n^{1-1/p}$ we have $\sigma^{1-p/2}(\log n)^{(2-p)/4} \ll \text{diam}(K) \asymp 1$ which implies $\varepsilon^*(\sigma) \ll 1$ provided the two other conditions hold. To see this, first note that $\log n \ll n^\alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$. Thus,

$$\sigma^{1-p/2}(\log n)^{(2-p)/4} \asymp n^{1/p-3/2+p/2}(\log n)^{(2-p)/4} \ll n^{1/p-3/2+p/2+\alpha/2-\alpha p/4}.$$

Hence if we take $0 < \alpha < \frac{1/p-3/2+p/2}{p/4-1/2}$, then the right-hand side is of the form n^β for $\beta < 0$, and thus $\ll 1$. Note that $p/4 - 1/2 < 0$ and $1/p - 3/2 + p/2 = (p-2)(p-1)/2p < 0$ for $p \in (1, 2)$, so that $\frac{1/p-3/2+p/2}{p/4-1/2} > 0$ and such an α therefore exists.

We must check that $\sigma \asymp 1/n^{1-1/p}$ satisfies the two other conditions. First

$$\log(n\sigma^p(\log n)^{p/2}) = \log(n^{2-p}(\log n)^{p/2}) \asymp \log n.$$

Next, using the fact that $(\log n)^{(2-p)/4} \gtrsim 1$ and substituting $\sigma \asymp 1/n^{1-1/p}$, we have

$$\sigma^{(4-2p)/4}(\log n)^{(2-p)/4} \gtrsim n^{1/p-3/2+p/2} \geq n^{1/2-1/p},$$

where the final inequality follows since $p/2 + 2/p \geq 2$ for any $p > 0$ (using the AM-GM inequality). This proves that $\varepsilon^*(\sigma) \ll 1$ while by the previous Lemma, $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp 1$. It follows that for $p \in (1, 2)$, the LSE is suboptimal for ℓ_p balls for $\sigma \asymp 1/n^{1-1/p}$.

4 Discussion

We have established numerous necessary or sufficient conditions for minimax optimality of the constrained least squares estimator in the convex Gaussian sequence model setting. Our techniques focused on the local behavior of the Gaussian width and metric entropy of the set. Our results led to theoretical algorithms that bound the worst case LSE rate. We then provided a series of examples where the LSE is minimax optimal or suboptimal for noise σ chosen in an appropriate range. Our examples included isotonic regression in both one and many dimensions, hyper-rectangles, ellipsoids, and ℓ_p balls with $p \in [1, 2]$.

Future work could consider extensions to handle estimation with sub-Gaussian noise, which may clash with our use of the Gaussian width following Chatterjee [2014]. Moreover, our examples with ℓ_p balls could be extended for the $p > 2$ case. While a formidable task, our examples of LSE-suboptimality underscore the need for a general algorithm to replace the LSE while remaining computationally tractable.

5 Funding

The authors report no financial conflicts of interest.

References

- M. Beauchamp. On numerical computation for the distribution of the convolution of N independent rectified Gaussian variables. *Journal de la Societe Française de Statistique*, 159(1):88–111, 2018.
- P. C. Bellec. Sharp oracle inequalities for least squares estimators in shape restricted regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(2):745–780, 2018.
- P. C. Bellec. Localized Gaussian width of M -convex hulls with applications to Lasso and convex aggregation. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):3016 – 3040, 2019. doi: 10.3150/18-BEJ1078.
- P. C. Bellec and A. B. Tsybakov. Sharp oracle bounds for monotone and convex regression through aggregation. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 16:1879–1892, 2015.
- L. Birgé and P. Massart. Rates of convergence for minimum contrast estimators. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 97:113–150, 1993.
- V. Chandrasekaran, B. Recht, P. A. Parrilo, and A. S. Willsky. The convex geometry of linear inverse problems. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 12(6):805–849, Oct. 2012. ISSN 1615-3383. doi: 10.1007/s10208-012-9135-7.

- S. Chatterjee. A new perspective on least squares under convex constraint. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(6):2340–2381, 2014.
- X. Chen, A. Guntuboyina, and Y. Zhang. A note on the approximate admissibility of regularized estimators in the Gaussian sequence model. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 11(2):4746 – 4768, 2017. doi: 10.1214/17-EJS1354.
- H. Deng and C.-H. Zhang. Isotonic regression in multi-dimensional spaces and graphs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(6):3672 – 3698, 2020. doi: 10.1214/20-AOS1947.
- D. L. Donoho, R. C. Liu, and B. MacGibbon. Minimax risk over hyperrectangles, and implications. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1416–1437, 1990.
- F. Gao and J. A. Wellner. Entropy estimate for high-dimensional monotonic functions. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 98(9):1751–1764, 2007. ISSN 0047-259X. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2006.09.003>.
- D. Garber and E. Hazan. Faster rates for the frank-wolfe method over strongly-convex sets. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 541–549. PMLR, 2015.
- M. Grötschel, L. Lovasz, and A. Schrijver. *Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization*. Algorithms and Combinatorics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. ISBN 9783642978814.
- Q. Han. Set structured global empirical risk minimizers are rate optimal in general dimensions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(5):2642 – 2671, 2021. doi: 10.1214/21-AOS2049.
- Q. Han, T. Wang, S. Chatterjee, and R. J. Samworth. Isotonic regression in general dimensions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(5):2440 – 2471, 2019. doi: 10.1214/18-AOS1753.
- G. Kur, F. Gao, A. Guntuboyina, and B. Sen. Convex regression in multidimensions: Suboptimality of least squares estimators, 2020a.
- G. Kur, A. Rakhlin, and A. Guntuboyina. On suboptimality of least squares with application to estimation of convex bodies. In J. Abernethy and S. Agarwal, editors, *Proceedings of Thirty Third Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 125 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2406–2424. PMLR, 09–12 Jul 2020b.
- G. Kur, E. Putterman, and A. Rakhlin. On the variance, admissibility, and stability of empirical risk minimization. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 37527–37539. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023.
- M. Neykov. On the minimax rate of the gaussian sequence model under bounded convex constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(2):1244–1260, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2022.3213141.
- B. T. Nguyen and P. D. Khanh. Lipschitz continuity of convex functions. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 84(2):1623–1640, June 2020. doi: 10.1007/s00245-020-09689-w.
- P. Rigollet and J.-C. Hütter. High-dimensional statistics, 2023.

- M. Talagrand. *Upper and Lower Bounds for Stochastic Processes: Modern Methods and Classical Problems*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge / A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2014. ISBN 9783642540752.
- R. Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- M. J. Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Y. Wei, B. Fang, and M. J. Wainwright. From gauss to kolmogorov: Localized measures of complexity for ellipses. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 14(2):2988–3031, 2020.
- Y. Yang and A. Barron. Information-theoretic determination of minimax rates of convergence. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1564–1599, 1999.
- C.-H. Zhang. Risk bounds in isotonic regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 30(2):528–555, 2002.
- L. Zhang. Nearly optimal minimax estimator for high-dimensional sparse linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(4):2149–2175, 2013.

A Proofs for Section 1 (Introduction)

Lemma A.1 (Generic Lower Bound on the Minimax Rate). *For a closed convex body K with diameter d , we have that $\varepsilon^{*2} \gtrsim \min(w(K)^2/n, \sigma^2 \cdot w(K)^2/d^2)$. This bound is sharp for an Euclidean ball.*

Proof of Lemma A.1. Define the spherical width $w^s(K)$ of K as $\mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim N(\bar{0}, \mathbb{I}_n)} \sup_{t \in K} \langle t, \xi / \|\xi\| \rangle$. We will show this lower bound on the rate by using the Dvoretzky-Milman theorem. It states that for a convex body K , for $m \lesssim \eta^2 w(K)^2/d^2$ a random projection P onto an m -dimensional subspace satisfies $(1-\eta)B \subset PK \subseteq (1+\eta)B$, where B is a ball of radius $w^s(K) \asymp w(K)/\sqrt{n}$ [Vershynin, 2018, Exercise 11.3.9]. It follows that the minimax rate is always at least $\min(w(K)^2/n, w(K)^2/d^2\sigma^2)$. This is because one can select a point $(Pv, P^\perp v)$ for $v \in K$ such that Pv is the center of a $(1-\eta)B$ (so that when we draw a ball of radius $\varepsilon < w^s(K)$ its projection will be completely in the ball $(1-\eta)B$). Then if $\varepsilon \lesssim \min(w(K)/\sqrt{n}, w(K)/d\sigma)$, we can construct a packing set by just taking points in the sphere $(Pv^i, P^\perp v^i)$ so that $\|v^i - v^j\| \geq \|Pv^i - Pv^j\| \geq \varepsilon/c$. These points will be at least exponential in the dimension which is $\exp(cw(K)^2/d^2)$, and hence since $\varepsilon/\sigma \leq \sqrt{w(K)^2/d^2}$ we have that $\varepsilon^{*2} \gtrsim \min(w(K)^2/n, w(K)^2/d^2\sigma^2)$. \square

Proof of Lemma 1.5. Define $S(C_1, C_2) = \{\varepsilon > 0 : \varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq C_1 \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon)\}$, so that our goal is to show that $\sup S(C_1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(1, 1)$ for all $C_1, C_2 > 0$.

First, we prove that $\sup S(1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(1, 1)$ for all $C_2 > 0$. Suppose $C_2 < 1$. Pick $\varepsilon \in S(1, C_2)$, so that $\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon)$. Then multiplying by C_2^2 and using $C_2 < 1$ we have

$$(C_2\varepsilon)^2/\sigma^2 \leq C_2^2 \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon) < \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon).$$

Thus $C_2\varepsilon \in S(1, 1)$, so $\sup S(1, 1) \geq C_2\varepsilon$. Since this holds for any $\varepsilon \in S(1, C_2)$, we have $\sup S(1, 1) \gtrsim \sup S(1, C_2)$. On the other hand, pick $\varepsilon \in S(1, 1)$. Since $M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ is non-increasing in ε , we have

$$\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon),$$

proving that $\varepsilon \in S(1, C_2)$. As this shows $S(1, 1) \subseteq S(1, C_2)$, we have $\sup S(1, C_2) \geq \sup S(1, 1)$. This proves that $\sup S(1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(1, 1)$ when $C_2 < 1$.

Suppose instead that $C_2 \geq 1$. Then picking any $\varepsilon \in S(1, C_2)$, we have by the non-increasing property of $M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ that

$$\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon) \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon).$$

Then $\varepsilon \in S(1, 1)$, showing that $S(1, C_2) \subseteq S(1, 1)$ and thus $\sup S(1, 1) \geq \sup S(1, C_2)$. On the other hand, pick $\varepsilon \in S(1, 1)$ so that $\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$. Then

$$(\varepsilon/C_2)^2/\sigma \leq \varepsilon^2/\sigma \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) = \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2 \cdot \varepsilon/C_2).$$

Hence $\varepsilon/C_2 \in S(1, C_2)$, so that $\sup S(1, C_2) \geq \varepsilon/C_2$. This holds for all $\varepsilon \in S(1, 1)$, so $\sup S(1, C_2) \gtrsim \sup S(1, 1)$, proving that $\sup S(1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(1, 1)$ when $C_2 \geq 1$.

We have thus proved that $\sup S(1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(1, 1)$ for all $C_2 > 0$. It suffices to now prove that $\sup S(C_1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(1, C_2)$ for all $C_1, C_2 > 0$.

As before, first suppose $C_1 < 1$. That $S(C_1, C_2) \subseteq S(1, C_2)$ is clear since $C_1 \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon) \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon)$, so we have $\sup S(1, C_2) \geq \sup S(C_1, C_2)$. On the other hand, if $\varepsilon \in S(1, C_2)$, then by the non-increasing property of $M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon)$,

$$(\sqrt{C_1}\varepsilon)^2/\sigma^2 = C_1 \cdot \varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq C_1 \cdot \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon) \leq C_1 \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2(\sqrt{C_1}\varepsilon)).$$

Thus $\sqrt{C_1}\varepsilon \in S(C_1, C_2)$, so $\sup S(C_1, C_2) \geq \sqrt{C_1}\varepsilon$ for all $\varepsilon \in S(1, C_2)$. This proves $\sup S(C_1, C_2) \gtrsim \sup S(1, C_2)$, so that $\sup S(1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(C_1, C_2)$ when $C_1 < 1$.

Finally, if $C_1 \geq 1$, we immediately get $S(1, C_2) \subseteq S(C_1, C_2)$ since $\log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon) \leq C_1 \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon)$ so that $\sup S(C_1, C_2) \geq \sup S(1, C_2)$. On the other hand, for any $\varepsilon \in S(C_1, C_2)$, we have

$$(\varepsilon/\sqrt{C_1})^2/\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{C_1} \cdot \varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(C_2\varepsilon).$$

Hence $\varepsilon/\sqrt{C_1} \in S(1, C_2)$, proving that $\sup S(1, C_2) \geq \varepsilon/\sqrt{C_1}$ for all $\varepsilon \in S(C_1, C_2)$. So $\sup S(1, C_2) \gtrsim \sup S(C_1, C_2)$ and hence $\sup S(1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(C_1, C_2)$ when $C_1 \geq 1$.

This proves $\sup S(C_1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(1, C_2)$ for all $C_1, C_2 > 0$ and we already showed $\sup S(1, C_2) \asymp S(1, 1)$ for all $C_2 > 0$. This proves that $\varepsilon^\dagger = \sup S(C_1, C_2) \asymp \sup S(1, 1) = \varepsilon^*$ for all $C_1, C_2 > 0$. \square

B Proofs for Section 2 (Main Results)

Proof of Lemma 2.1. We will need the following restatement (to include an arbitrary σ) of Chatterjee [2014, Theorem 1.1].

Theorem B.1 (Theorem 1.1 of Chatterjee [2014]). *For any $x \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| - \varepsilon_\mu| \geq x\sqrt{\varepsilon_\mu}) \leq 3 \exp\left(-\frac{x^4}{32\sigma^2(1+x/\sqrt{\varepsilon_\mu})^2}\right). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We now prove the lemma. Let $C = \int 6x \exp(-x^4/(32(1+x)^2)) dx > 1$. Suppose now $\varepsilon_\mu \geq 4C\sigma > \sigma$. Then by the bound above we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| - \varepsilon_\mu| \geq x\sqrt{\varepsilon_\mu}) \leq 3 \exp\left(-\frac{x^4}{32\sigma^2(1+x/\sqrt{\sigma})^2}\right),$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E}((\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| - \varepsilon_\mu)^2/\varepsilon_\mu) \leq \int_0^\infty 6x \exp\left(-\frac{x^4}{32\sigma^2(1+x/\sqrt{\sigma})^2}\right) dx = C\sigma.$$

Rearranging and using the fact that $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2}$ by Jensen's inequality, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 - 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2}\varepsilon_\mu + \varepsilon_\mu^2 - C\sigma\varepsilon_\mu \leq 0.$$

Thus $\varepsilon_\mu - \sqrt{C\sigma\varepsilon_\mu} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2} \leq \varepsilon_\mu + \sqrt{C\sigma\varepsilon_\mu}$. Since by assumption $\sqrt{C\sigma\varepsilon_\mu} \leq \varepsilon_\mu/2$ we conclude that $\varepsilon_\mu^2/4 \leq \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \leq 9\varepsilon_\mu^2/4$.

On the other hand, suppose $\varepsilon_\mu < 4C\sigma$. Then setting $z = x\sqrt{\varepsilon_\mu}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(|\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| - \varepsilon_\mu| \geq z) \leq 3 \exp\left(-\frac{z^4}{32\sigma^2(\varepsilon_\mu + z)^2}\right) \leq 3 \exp\left(-\frac{z^4}{32\sigma^2(4C\sigma + z)^2}\right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}((\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| - \varepsilon_\mu)^2) &\leq \int_0^\infty 6z \exp\left(-\frac{z^4}{32\sigma^2(4C\sigma + z)^2}\right) dz \\ &= \sigma^2 \int_0^\infty 6t \exp\left(-\frac{t^4}{32(4C + t)^2}\right) dt = C'\sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 - 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2}\varepsilon_\mu + \varepsilon_\mu^2 - C'\sigma^2 \leq 0.$$

which implies that $\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2} \leq \varepsilon_\mu + \sqrt{C'}\sigma \leq C''\sigma$, which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 2.3. To prove our first claim, it suffices to show for any $\mu \in K$ that $\sigma \mapsto \overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma)$ is non-decreasing on $[0, \infty)$. We first consider the case where K is not a singleton set and restrict to $\sigma > 0$. We must first verify some technicalities about the subgradient. Fix $\mu \in K$ and pick any $\sigma > 0$. Let $\partial w_\mu(\varepsilon)$ be the subgradient of the map $\varepsilon \mapsto w_\mu(\varepsilon)$. This mapping is proper (i.e., finite everywhere) and concave, so the subgradient will exist in the interior of the domain of $w_\mu(\varepsilon)$ which is $(0, \infty)$.

We now verify that $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$ is in the interior of this domain, i.e., $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) > 0$. To see this, observe that $w_\mu(\varepsilon) \gtrsim \varepsilon \wedge d > 0$ by Vershynin [2018, Proposition 7.5.2(vi)]. Then for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\sigma \cdot w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2 \gtrsim \sigma \cdot \varepsilon - \varepsilon^2/2 > 0 = \sigma \cdot w_\mu(0) - 0^2/2.$$

In other words, $0 \notin \operatorname{argmax}_\varepsilon[\sigma \cdot w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2]$ so $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) > 0$. This ensures $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$ is in the interior of the domain of $w_\mu(\varepsilon)$, i.e., $(0, \infty)$, and the subgradient exists at this point. Moreover, since $\varepsilon \mapsto w_\mu(\varepsilon)$ is concave, the subgradient is indeed monotone non-increasing in ε .

We now prove $\sigma \mapsto \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$ is non-decreasing on $(0, \infty)$. Observe that $\operatorname{argmax}_\varepsilon[\sigma \cdot w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2]$ is achieved at $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$ which satisfies $\sigma \cdot \partial w_\mu(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$. Suppose $0 < \sigma < \sigma'$. We wish to show $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma')$. Suppose not, i.e., $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) > \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma')$. Then we have

$$\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma') = \sigma' \cdot \partial w_\mu(\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma')) \geq \sigma' \cdot \partial w_\mu(\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)) \geq \sigma \cdot \partial w_\mu(\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)) = \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma),$$

which is a contradiction. So we must have $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma')$. Thus, the map $\sigma \mapsto \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$ is non-decreasing on $(0, \infty)$ so long as K is not a singleton set.

Let us now handle the case where K is a singleton set and show the mapping is non-decreasing on $(0, \infty)$. Well, we must have $w_\mu(\varepsilon) = 0$ for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$. Hence

$$\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) = \operatorname{argmax}_\varepsilon[\sigma w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2] = \operatorname{argmax}_\varepsilon[-\varepsilon^2/2] = 0. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

This holds for any σ , hence $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) = 0 \leq 0 = \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma')$ for any $0 < \sigma < \sigma'$. Our map is thus non-decreasing on $(0, \infty)$ without the non-singleton restriction.

Let us now show the non-decreasing property extends to $[0, \infty)$. We again start with the non-singleton case for K . Notice that by similar logic to (B.2), we have $\varepsilon_\mu(0) = 0$. Next, for $\sigma' > 0$, recall we showed previously that $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma') > 0$, i.e., lies in the interior of the domain of $w_\mu(\varepsilon)$. Hence $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma') > \varepsilon_\mu(0)$. This proves $\sigma \mapsto \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$ is non-decreasing on $[0, \infty)$ provided K is not a singleton.

Finally, we suppose K is a singleton set and show the mapping is non-decreasing on $[0, \infty)$. We still have $\varepsilon_\mu(0) = 0$, and by our previous argument in (B.2), $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma') = 0$ for any $\sigma' > 0$. Thus, trivially, $\varepsilon_\mu(0) \leq \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma')$ for any $\sigma' > 0$, verifying $\sigma \mapsto \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$ is non-decreasing on $[0, \infty)$ regardless of the singleton status of K . This completes our proof that the map $\sigma \mapsto \overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma)$ is non-decreasing on $[0, \infty)$.

For our next claim, let $c > 1$. If either $\sigma = 0$ or K is a singleton set, the desired inequality is trivial. Otherwise, suppose $\sigma > 0$ and K is not a singleton set. We have established that for any

μ , the subgradient is monotone non-increasing in ε . Using our first order subgradient condition $\sigma \cdot \partial w_\mu(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$ and the fact that $\varepsilon_\mu(c\sigma) \geq \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$, it follows that

$$\varepsilon_\mu(c\sigma) = c\sigma \cdot \partial w_\mu(\varepsilon_\mu(c\sigma)) \leq c \cdot \sigma \cdot \partial w_\mu(\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)) = c \cdot \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma).$$

Taking the sup over $\mu \in K$, we have $\overline{\varepsilon_K}(c\sigma) \leq c\overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma)$, and since we already showed $\sigma \mapsto \overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma)$ is non-decreasing, we also have $\overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma) \leq \overline{\varepsilon_K}(c\sigma)$.

Suppose instead $c < 1$. Then using our previous result applied to $c^{-1} > 1$,

$$\overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma) = \overline{\varepsilon_K}(c^{-1} \cdot c\sigma) \leq c^{-1}\overline{\varepsilon_K}(c\sigma),$$

or equivalently $c\overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma) \leq \overline{\varepsilon_K}(c\sigma)$. We also have $\overline{\varepsilon_K}(c\sigma) \leq \overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma)$ again since $\sigma \mapsto \overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma)$ is non-decreasing. This proves our final claim. \square

B.1 Proofs for Section 2.1

Proof of Proposition 2.9. Let $\overline{\varepsilon_{K';K}} = \sup_{\mu \in K'} \varepsilon_\mu$, where $\varepsilon_\mu = \operatorname{argmax}_\varepsilon \sigma w_{K,\mu}(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2$. For brevity, we set $\overline{\varepsilon} = \overline{\varepsilon_{K';K}}$. Observe now that for every $\mu \in K'$, we have $\sigma \cdot w_{K,\mu}(2\overline{\varepsilon}) - 2\overline{\varepsilon}^2 < 0$, and thus by Chatterjee [2014, Proposition 1.3] we have $2\overline{\varepsilon} > \overline{\varepsilon_{K';K}}$.

We will now relate $\overline{\varepsilon_{K';K}}$ to $\varepsilon_{K';K}$.

Case 1: Suppose $\overline{\varepsilon_{K';K}} \gtrsim \sigma$. Pick $\tilde{\mu} \in K'$ that maximizes $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2$.

Case 1(a): Suppose $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \gtrsim \sigma$. Then by Lemma 2.1 and definition of $\overline{\varepsilon_{K';K}}$, we have

$$\varepsilon_{K',K}^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}}^2 \lesssim \overline{\varepsilon_{K';K}}^2 < 4\overline{\varepsilon}^2$$

as required.

Case 1(b): Suppose $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \lesssim \sigma$. Then by Lemma 2.1 and our assumption for Case 1,

$$\varepsilon_{K',K}^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 \lesssim \overline{\varepsilon_{K';K}}^2 < 4\overline{\varepsilon}^2.$$

Case 2: Suppose $\overline{\varepsilon_{K';K}} \lesssim \sigma$. This means for any $\mu \in K'$, $\varepsilon_\mu \lesssim \sigma$. Hence $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2$ by Lemma 2.1 for all $\mu \in K'$, so that $\varepsilon_{K';K} \lesssim \sigma$. We now consider two subcases.

Case 2(a): Suppose $d \geq \frac{2\sigma(n+1)}{n\sqrt{2\pi}} \gtrsim \sigma$, where $d = \operatorname{diam}(K')$. We show this implies $\overline{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sigma$ which proves $\varepsilon_{K';K} \lesssim \overline{\varepsilon}$.

Note that K' contains a diameter of length $2\sigma/\kappa$ (for a sufficiently large absolute constant κ). Thus, by Vershynin [2018, Proposition 7.5.2(vi)],

$$\sup_{\mu \in K'} w_{K,\mu}(\sigma/\kappa) \geq \sup_{\mu \in K'} w_{K',\mu}(\sigma/\kappa) \geq 2\sigma/(\kappa\sqrt{2\pi}).$$

Since for sufficiently large κ we have $\sigma/(2\kappa^2) \leq 2\sigma/(\kappa\sqrt{2\pi})$, it follows that $\sup_{\mu \in K'} w_{K,\mu}(\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^2/2\sigma$ for $\varepsilon = \sigma/\kappa$. By definition of $\overline{\varepsilon}$ as a supremum of such ε , we have $\overline{\varepsilon} \geq \sigma/\kappa$. This completes the case when $d \gtrsim \sigma$.

Case 2(b): Suppose $d \leq \frac{2\sigma(n+1)}{n\sqrt{2\pi}}$. Then by the fact that $K' \subseteq K$ followed by Jung's theorem, for some $\mu \in K'$ we have

$$w_{K,\mu} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}} d \right) \geq w_{K',\mu} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}} d \right) = w(K') \geq d/\sqrt{2\pi}.$$

Notice that $\frac{n}{2(n+1)} \cdot \frac{d^2}{2\sigma} \leq \frac{d}{2\sqrt{2\pi}}$ so we have $w_{K,\mu}(\varepsilon) \geq \varepsilon^2/2\sigma$ for $\varepsilon = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}} \cdot d$. Therefore $\overline{\varepsilon} \gtrsim d$, and as $\varepsilon_{K',K} \lesssim d$, we have $\varepsilon_{K',K} \lesssim \overline{\varepsilon}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.11. To argue this, we will use the well known technique for the reverse Sudakov minoration estimate [see the proof of Theorem 8.1.13 [Vershynin, 2018](#), e.g.]. We will spell out all details to be self-contained and also because we will be using a different dyadic scale (multiplying by c^* rather than 2), and finally we will be using local packings instead of global ones.

Fix $\mu \in K$. We start at level ε and build an ε/c^* maximal packing set of $B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K$. Let this packing set be \mathcal{P}_1 . Next for any point $\mu_i \in \mathcal{P}_1$ we build an ε/c^{*2} packing set of $B(\mu_i, \varepsilon/c^*) \cap K$. Observe that the number of points in the second level is at most $M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/c^*)$. We continue this process. Note that on the k th level we have obtained an ε/c^{*k} covering set of $B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K$. This can be seen by induction. For the first level this is true by the fact that we consider a maximal packing. Suppose it is true for level $k-1$. Since we have a covering of a point $\nu \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K$ will fall in an $\varepsilon/c^{*(k-1)}$ ball centered at the $k-1$ level. Hence since we do a maximal packing we will cover this point at ε/c^{*k} on the next level. Also by induction it is clear that on the k th level we have $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/c^{*i})$ points.

We now do the chaining argument. Let k be defined as the maximum integer so that $\varepsilon c^{*-k} \geq \frac{w(B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K)}{2c^* \sqrt{n}}$. By [Vershynin \[2018, Proposition 7.5.2\(vi\)\]](#) we have $w_\mu(\varepsilon) \geq \text{diam}(B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K) / \sqrt{2\pi} \geq \frac{2\varepsilon \wedge d}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$, where $d = \text{diam}(K)$. It follows that

$$k \leq \log_{c^*} \frac{\varepsilon 2c^* \sqrt{2\pi n}}{2\varepsilon \wedge d}$$

We now write

$$w_\mu(\varepsilon) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\nu \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi, \nu \rangle = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\nu \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi, \nu - \mu \rangle,$$

so that $\langle \xi, \nu - \mu \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^k \langle \xi, \nu_j - \nu_{j-1} \rangle + \langle \xi, \nu - \nu_k \rangle$, where $\nu_0 = \mu$, and ν_j is the closest point to ν from the j th packing set which we have constructed. Taking sup over ν and expectation we need to bound

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E} \sup_{\nu \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi, \nu_j - \nu_{j-1} \rangle + \mathbb{E} \sup_{\nu \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi, \nu - \nu_k \rangle$$

Take now the first k terms. We have $\|\nu_j - \nu_{j-1}\| \leq \|\nu_j - \nu\| + \|\nu - \nu_{j-1}\| \leq \varepsilon/c^{*j} + \varepsilon/c^{*(j-1)} \leq (c^* + 1)\varepsilon/c^{*j}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\nu \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi, \nu_j - \nu_{j-1} \rangle &\leq C\varepsilon/c^{*j} \sqrt{\log \prod_{l=0}^{j-1} M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/c^{*l})} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon/c^{*j} \sqrt{j \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/c^{*j-1})} \\ &\leq C\varepsilon/c^{*j} \sqrt{k \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/c^{*j-1})}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\varepsilon \mapsto \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ is non-increasing [[Neykov, 2022](#), Lemma II.8] and C is an absolute constant $C > 1$ (depending on c^* which is a sufficiently large fixed constant).

Regarding the last term, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\nu \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi, \nu - \nu_k \rangle \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{c^{*k}} \mathbb{E} \|\xi\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{c^{*k}} \sqrt{n} \leq w(B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K) / 2.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w_\mu(\varepsilon) &\leq 2C/c^* \sqrt{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \varepsilon/c^{*j-1} \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/c^{*j-1})} \\ &\leq 2C \left(\log_{c^*} \frac{\varepsilon 2c^* \sqrt{2\pi n}}{2\varepsilon \wedge d} \right)^{3/2} \sup_{\delta \leq \varepsilon} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note this holds for all $\mu \in K$. Observe that if ε is such that the right-hand side above is smaller than $\varepsilon^2/(2\sigma)$ we will have an upper bound on ε_K (up to constant factors). Take as an upper bound $\varepsilon = 2C_n \underline{\varepsilon}$, and assume at first that $4C_n \underline{\varepsilon} \leq d$, where for brevity we put $C_n = 4C \left(\log_{c^*} c^* \sqrt{2\pi n} \right)^{3/2}$. We need to show that:

$$C_n \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\delta \leq \varepsilon} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)} \leq \varepsilon^2/(2\sigma).$$

We know that $(2\underline{\varepsilon})^2/(2\sigma) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\delta \leq 2\underline{\varepsilon}} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)}$, so that

$$(2C_n \underline{\varepsilon})^2/(2\sigma) \geq C_n^2 \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\delta \leq 2\underline{\varepsilon}} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\delta \leq 2C_n \underline{\varepsilon}} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)} &\leq \max \left(\sup_{\delta \leq 2\underline{\varepsilon}} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)}, \sup_{2\underline{\varepsilon} < \delta \leq 2C_n \underline{\varepsilon}} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)} \right) \\ &\leq \max \left(\sup_{\delta \leq 2\underline{\varepsilon}} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)}, 2C_n \underline{\varepsilon}/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(2\underline{\varepsilon})} \right) \\ &\leq C_n \sup_{\delta \leq 2\underline{\varepsilon}} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we are using $C_n \geq 1$ and that for convex sets the map $\varepsilon \mapsto \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}$ is non-increasing [Neykov, 2022, Lemma II.8]. Hence we showed

$$(2C_n \underline{\varepsilon})^2/(2\sigma) \geq C_n \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\delta \leq 2C_n \underline{\varepsilon}} \delta/c^* \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta)}.$$

Now if $4C_n \underline{\varepsilon} > d$ we know that d is an upper bound on the rate. □

B.2 Proofs for Section 2.2

Proof of Theorem 2.14. Observe that there exists a point $\mu \in K$ such that

$$w_\mu(C\bar{\varepsilon}) - w_\mu(c\bar{\varepsilon}) \geq \frac{(C^2 - c^2)\bar{\varepsilon}^2}{2\sigma},$$

which implies that $\varepsilon_\mu \geq c\bar{\varepsilon}$ (by the concavity of $w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/(2\sigma)$ and Chatterjee [2014, Proposition 1.3] as previously discussed). Hence $\sup_\mu \varepsilon_\mu \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}$. On the other hand, for any $\kappa > 0$ we have for all $\mu \in K$ that

$$w_\mu((1+\kappa)C\bar{\varepsilon}) - w_\mu((1+\kappa)c\bar{\varepsilon}) \leq \frac{(1+\kappa)^2(C^2 - c^2)\bar{\varepsilon}^2}{2\sigma},$$

which implies once more by concavity that for all μ , $\varepsilon_\mu \leq (1+\kappa)C\bar{\varepsilon}$. Letting $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ shows that $\varepsilon_\mu \leq C\bar{\varepsilon}$ for all μ , i.e., $\sup_\mu \varepsilon_\mu \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}$. Thus, $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \asymp \bar{\varepsilon}$ where we recall $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) = \sup_{\mu \in K} \varepsilon_\mu$.

Case 1: Suppose $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sigma$. Then we have $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$ because $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \asymp \bar{\varepsilon}$. Now pick the $\mu \in K$ that maximizes ε_μ , so that $\varepsilon_\mu \gtrsim \sigma$. Then, by Lemma 2.1, we have $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_\mu^2 = \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)^2$. Taking a supremum on the left-hand side, we conclude $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$. Now instead pick $\mu' \in K$ that maximizes $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu'\|^2$. We consider two subcases.

Case 1(a): Suppose $\varepsilon_{\mu'} \gtrsim \sigma$. Then

$$\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu'\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_{\mu'}^2 \leq \sup_\mu \varepsilon_\mu^2 = \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)^2$$

by Lemma 2.1, hence $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$. But we showed for Case 1 that $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$. Thus, we have $\varepsilon_K \asymp \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ and as we proved earlier that $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \asymp \bar{\varepsilon}$, we conclude $\varepsilon_K \asymp \bar{\varepsilon}$.

Case 1(b): Suppose $\varepsilon_{\mu'} \lesssim \sigma$. Then by Lemma 2.1, $\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu'\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2$. But we assumed in Case 1 that $\sigma \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}$, so $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}$. It remains to show $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}$. Well we showed for Case 1 that $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ and we also proved $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \asymp \bar{\varepsilon}$. Thus $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}$. This proves $\varepsilon_K \asymp \bar{\varepsilon}$.

Case 2: Suppose $\bar{\varepsilon} \lesssim \sigma$. We showed above that $\varepsilon_\mu \leq C\bar{\varepsilon}$ for all $\mu \in K$. So for all $\mu \in K$, we have $\varepsilon_\mu \lesssim \sigma$, which by Lemma 2.1 implies $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2$ for all $\mu \in K$. So $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma$, and clearly $\varepsilon_K \lesssim d$. Thus $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma \wedge d$. Furthermore, by Lemma 1.4 and the minimax rate being a lower bound on the worst case LSE rate, we have $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$. Thus $\varepsilon_K \asymp \sigma \wedge d$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.15. We first prove that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c \leq \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \bar{\varepsilon}(4c\sigma/(c-1))$. Pick $\mu \in K$ and ν^* achieving the supremum and infimum, respectively, in the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\nu^*}((2+1/c)\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) - \frac{(2+1/c)^2\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)^2}{2\sigma} &\geq w_\mu(\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) - \frac{(2+1/c)^2\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)^2}{2\sigma} \\ &\geq w_{\nu^*}(\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c) - \frac{(\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c)^2}{2\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows since $B(\mu, \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)) \subset B(\nu^*, (2+1/c)\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma))$ and the second from the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$. Hence by concavity we have $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \geq \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c$.

Now define $\sigma' := 4c\sigma/(c-1) > \sigma$. Then we know that for all $\mu \in K$ and all $\kappa > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} w_\mu((1+\kappa)\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')) - w_\mu((1+\kappa)\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')/c) &\leq \frac{(4+4/c)(1+\kappa)^2\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2}{2\sigma'} \\ &= \frac{(1-1/c^2)(1+\kappa)^2\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2}{2\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$w_\mu((1+\kappa)\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')) - \frac{(1+\kappa)^2\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2}{2\sigma} \leq w_\mu((1+\kappa)\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')/c) - \frac{(1/c^2)(1+\kappa)^2\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2}{2\sigma},$$

which shows that $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \lesssim (1 + \kappa)\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$. Taking $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ shows that $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$. Thus,

$$\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c \leq \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \overline{\varepsilon}(4c\sigma/(c-1)). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Case 1: Suppose $\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$. Then $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$ by (B.3). Then picking $\mu \in K$ that maximizes ε_μ , we have $\varepsilon_\mu \gtrsim \sigma$, so that by Lemma 2.1, $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_\mu^2 = \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)^2$. Taking a supremum over all μ and again using (B.3), we conclude $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \geq \overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c$. It remains to show for Case 1 that $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$. Well, let $\tilde{\mu}$ maximize $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2$.

Case 1(a): If $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \gtrsim \sigma$, then by Lemma 2.1

$$\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}}^2 \leq \sup_{\mu} \varepsilon_\mu^2 = \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)^2 \lesssim \overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2.$$

Case 1(b): If $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \lesssim \sigma$, then by Lemma 2.1

$$\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 \lesssim \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)^2 \lesssim \overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2.$$

This proves in Case 1 that

$$\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/c \lesssim \varepsilon_K \lesssim \overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma').$$

Case 2: Now suppose $\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$. Then $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \lesssim \sigma$ by (B.3). This means for all $\mu \in K$ that $\varepsilon_\mu \lesssim \sigma$ which in turn implies for all $\mu \in K$ that $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2$ by Lemma 2.1. Thus $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma$, and that $\varepsilon_K \lesssim d$ is clear. Hence $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma \wedge d$. Then by Lemma 1.4 and the minimax rate being a lower bound on the worst case LSE rate, we have $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$. Thus, $\varepsilon_K \asymp \sigma \wedge d$ when $\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.16. We abbreviate $\overline{\varepsilon} = \overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ and always explicitly write out the σ' when we mean $\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$.

Case 1: Suppose $\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$. We first derive the upper bound of $\varepsilon_K(\sigma)$. Take $\varepsilon' = (1 + \kappa)\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$ where $\sigma' = \frac{C}{1-1/c^*} \cdot \sigma$ and $\kappa > 0$. For any $\mu \in K$, consider the set $B(\mu, \varepsilon') \cap K$. We have that

$$\sup_{\nu_1 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon') \cap K} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon'/c^*) - \inf_{\nu_2 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon') \cap K} w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon'/c^*) \leq C\varepsilon'^2/2\sigma' - (L/c^*)\varepsilon' \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon')}.$$

Now by Talagrand [2014, Exercise 2.4.11], we know that

$$\sup_{\nu_1 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon') \cap K} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon'/c^*) + (L/c^*)\varepsilon' \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon')} \geq w_\mu(\varepsilon').$$

On the other hand clearly

$$\inf_{\nu_2 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon') \cap K} w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon'/c^*) \leq w_\mu(\varepsilon'/c^*),$$

and combining these three bounds, we have

$$w_\mu(\varepsilon') - w_\mu(\varepsilon'/c^*) \leq C\varepsilon'^2/2\sigma'.$$

This implies that

$$w_\mu(\varepsilon') - \frac{\varepsilon'^2}{2\sigma} \leq w_\mu(\varepsilon'/c^*) - \frac{(\varepsilon'/c^*)^2}{2\sigma},$$

so that $\varepsilon' \geq \varepsilon_\mu$. Taking $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ shows that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \geq \varepsilon_\mu$. Since this holds for all $\mu \in K$, we have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \geq \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$, and this will also hold for Case 2. Note that $\sigma' > \sigma$, and so if ε satisfies the condition in the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$, then it satisfies the condition in the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$. Thus, $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \geq \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$. Since we require $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$, we thus have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \gtrsim \sigma$.

Now, taking $\tilde{\mu}$ to maximize $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|$, if $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \gtrsim \sigma$, then by Lemma 2.1

$$\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}}^2 \leq \sup_{\mu} \varepsilon_{\mu}^2 = \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)^2 \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2.$$

On the other hand, if $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \lesssim \sigma$, then by Lemma 2.1 we have

$$\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \leq \sigma^2 \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2.$$

This completes the proof that if $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sigma$, then $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$.

Let us now show $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$. Observe that $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq \underline{\varepsilon}^*$ as shown in Remark 2.17.

Case 1(a): Suppose $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*$. Then using the definition of $\underline{\varepsilon}^*$ along with the non-increasing property of $\eta \mapsto \log M^{\text{loc}}(\eta)$ established in Neykov [2022, Lemma II.8], we have

$$\frac{C^2(\bar{\varepsilon}/2)^2}{4\sigma^2} \geq (L/c^*)^2 \log M^{\text{loc}}(\bar{\varepsilon}/2) \geq (L/c^*)^2 \log M^{\text{loc}}(\bar{\varepsilon}).$$

Taking square roots and multiplying by $\bar{\varepsilon}$, we obtain

$$\frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}^2}{2\sigma} \geq 2(L/c^*)\bar{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\bar{\varepsilon})},$$

so that

$$\frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}^2}{2\sigma} - (L/c^*)\bar{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\bar{\varepsilon})} > \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}^2}{2\sigma}. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Now pick ν_1, ν_2 that achieves the supremum in the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$, using the fact that $B(\nu_1, \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) \subseteq B(\nu_2, 2\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)$ to conclude $w_{\nu_2}(2\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) \geq w_{\nu_1}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)$. Using this fact along with our definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$, C and (B.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\nu_2}(2\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - (2 + 1/c^*)^2 \bar{\varepsilon}^2 / (2\sigma) &\geq w_{\nu_1}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - (2 + 1/c^*)^2 \bar{\varepsilon}^2 / (2\sigma) \\ &\geq w_{\nu_2}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - \bar{\varepsilon}^2 / (2c^{*2}\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

This implies by concavity of $\varepsilon \mapsto w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma}$ that $\varepsilon_{\nu_2} \geq \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*$. Thus, since $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sigma$, we have $\varepsilon_{\nu_2} \gtrsim \sigma$. By Lemma 2.1, $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \nu_2\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_{\nu_2}^2 \geq \bar{\varepsilon}^2/c^{*2}$. Taking the supremum, we have $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}$ as claimed.

Case 1(b): Suppose $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (\underline{\varepsilon}^*, 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*)$. Then by Lemma 1.5 we have $\bar{\varepsilon} \asymp \underline{\varepsilon}^* \asymp \varepsilon^*$, i.e., $\bar{\varepsilon}$ is the minimax rate up to constants. In this case, $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}$, since the minimax rate is in particular upper-bounded by the LSE rate $\varepsilon_K(\sigma)$.

Thus, to summarize Case 1, when $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$, we have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \lesssim \varepsilon_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$.

Case 2: Suppose $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$. Then since $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \geq \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ (proved in Case 1 without using the $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \gtrsim \sigma$ assumption) we have $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \lesssim \sigma$. Well if for all $\mu \in K$ we have $\varepsilon_\mu \lesssim \sigma$, we have by Lemma 2.1 that $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2$ for all $\mu \in K$, i.e., $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma$. Moreover, since clearly $\varepsilon_K \lesssim d$, we have $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma \wedge d$.

It remains to show $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$. By Lemma 1.4 and the minimax rate being a lower bound on the worst case LSE rate, we have $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$. Thus $\varepsilon_K \asymp \sigma \wedge d$. This proves that when $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$, we have $\varepsilon_K \asymp \sigma \wedge d$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.19. The structure of our proof is as follows: In Part I, we show that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$ when $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$. In Part II, we show that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ (where $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$ was defined following Lemma 2.1). In Part III, we use the result of Part II to show that $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$ and also that if $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$, then $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$.

Part I: We prove that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$ when $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$. For this direction, we abbreviate $\bar{\varepsilon} := \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$. Define

$$\underline{\varepsilon}^* := \sup\{\varepsilon > 0 : C^2\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq (L/c^*)^2 \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)\}.$$

Again by Lemma 1.5, $\underline{\varepsilon}^* \asymp \varepsilon^*$. Note that $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq \underline{\varepsilon}^*$ by near identical reasoning to Remark 2.17, so we consider the cases where $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (\underline{\varepsilon}^*, 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*)$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*$.

If $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (\underline{\varepsilon}^*, 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*)$, then $\bar{\varepsilon} \asymp \underline{\varepsilon}^* \asymp \varepsilon^*$, i.e., $\bar{\varepsilon}$ is the minimax rate up to constants. In this case, $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ as desired, since the minimax rate is a lower bound on the worst case LSE rate.

We consider the remaining case where $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*$. Then an argument similar to that used in Theorem 2.16 (to derive (B.4)) shows that $C\bar{\varepsilon}/\sigma > 2(L/c^*)\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\bar{\varepsilon})}$, and therefore

$$\frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma} - L/c^* \cdot \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\bar{\varepsilon})} > \frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{2\sigma}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Next suppose that we can find ν_1 and ν_2 achieving the supremum in the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$. We consider two subcases and in both demonstrate that $\bar{\varepsilon} \lesssim \varepsilon_{\nu_2}$.

Case 1: Suppose $\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| > \bar{\varepsilon}$. Then we can find a point $\nu_3 = \alpha\nu_1 + (1 - \alpha)\nu_2$ such that $\|\nu_3 - \nu_2\| = \alpha\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| = \bar{\varepsilon}$, i.e., by taking $\alpha = \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|} \in (0, 1)$. On the other hand, by the concavity of $\nu \mapsto w_\nu(\varepsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\nu_3}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) &\geq \alpha(w_{\nu_1}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)) \\ &\geq \frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}^2}{\sigma} - L/c^* \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\bar{\varepsilon})} \\ &\geq \frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}^2}{2\sigma}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where the second inequality used the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$ and α and the third our assumption that $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq 2\underline{\varepsilon}$ which implies (B.5). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\nu_2}(\|\nu_3 - \nu_2\| + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - \frac{(\|\nu_3 - \nu_2\| + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} &\geq w_{\nu_3}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - \frac{(\|\nu_3 - \nu_2\| + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} \\ &\geq w_{\nu_2}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) + \frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}^2}{2\sigma} - \frac{(\|\nu_3 - \nu_2\| + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} \\ &= w_{\nu_2}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) + \frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}^2}{2\sigma} - \frac{(\bar{\varepsilon} + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} \\ &= w_{\nu_2}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - \frac{(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality came from $B(\nu_3, \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) \subseteq B(\nu_2, \|\nu_3 - \nu_2\| + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)$ which allowed us to compare the Gaussian width terms. The second used (B.6) and the third that $\bar{\varepsilon} = \|\nu_3 - \nu_2\|$. The final line holds since $C = 1 + \frac{2}{c^*}$. Then by concavity of $\varepsilon \mapsto w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2\sigma$, our resulting inequality shows that $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon_{\nu_2} \geq \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*$.

Case 2: Suppose $\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
w_{\nu_2}(\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*}) - \frac{(\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*})^2}{2\sigma} &\geq w_{\nu_1}(\frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*}) - \frac{(\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*})^2}{2\sigma} \\
&\geq w_{\nu_2}(\frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*}) + \frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma} \\
&\quad - \frac{L}{c^*}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)} - \frac{(\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*})^2}{2\sigma} \\
&\geq w_{\nu_2}(\frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*}) + \frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{2\sigma} - \frac{(\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*})^2}{2\sigma} \\
&\geq w_{\nu_2}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - \frac{(\frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*})^2}{2\sigma},
\end{aligned}$$

As in Case 1, the first inequality used $B(\nu_1, \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*}) \subseteq B(\nu_2, \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| + \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{c^*})$, the second used the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$, and the third our result (B.5). For the last inequality, we note that $\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{2\sigma} - \frac{(\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} &= \frac{C\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{2\sigma} - \frac{\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|^2}{2\sigma} - \frac{(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma} - \frac{(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} \\
&= \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma} \cdot \underbrace{\left(\frac{C}{2} - \frac{1}{c^*}\right)}_{=1/2} - \frac{\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|^2}{2\sigma} - \frac{(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} \\
&= \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{2\sigma} - \frac{\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|^2}{2\sigma} - \frac{(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} \\
&\geq \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{2\sigma} - \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{2\sigma} - \frac{(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} \\
&= -\frac{(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $w_{\nu_2}(\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - \frac{(\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| + \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} \geq w_{\nu_2}(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*) - \frac{(\bar{\varepsilon}/c^*)^2}{2\sigma}$ which implies by concavity of $\varepsilon \mapsto w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2\sigma$ that $\varepsilon_{\nu_2} \geq \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*$. This completes Case 2.

Thus, we have shown for both Case 1 and Case 2 of the setting where $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq 2\varepsilon^*$ that $\varepsilon_{\nu_2} \geq \bar{\varepsilon}/c^*$. Now if $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sigma$ as we assumed, we have $\varepsilon_{\nu_2} \gtrsim \sigma$. Hence by Lemma 2.1

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \nu_2\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_{\nu_2}^2 \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}^2.$$

Taking the sup over ν_2 , we conclude $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}$ as desired.

This proves that when $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$, then no matter if $\bar{\varepsilon} \in (\underline{\varepsilon}^*, 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*)$ or $\bar{\varepsilon} \geq 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*$ (for which we had Case 1 and Case 2), we have $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$

Part II. Next, we prove that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$. Take $\varepsilon' = (1 + \kappa)\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$ where $\sigma' = \frac{4C}{1-4/c^{*2}} \cdot \sigma$ and $\kappa > 0$ is an arbitrary constant. For any $\mu \in K$, consider the set $B(\mu, \varepsilon') \cap K$. Pack the set $B(\mu, \varepsilon') \cap K$ maximally at distance ε'/c^* . Choose the point ν_1 in the packing that maximizes $w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon'/c^*)$. By Talagrand [2014, Exercise 2.4.11], we know that

$$w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon'/c^*) + \frac{\tilde{L}}{c^*} \cdot \varepsilon' \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon')} \geq w_{\mu}(\varepsilon') \quad (\text{B.7})$$

for a sufficiently large absolute constant \tilde{L} .

Similarly, pick ν_2 in the packing to minimize $w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon'/c^*)$. It should satisfy

$$w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon'/c^*) \leq w_\mu(2\varepsilon'/c^*) \quad (\text{B.8})$$

since in particular, if ν_3 is the point in the packing set closest to μ , we have $w_{\nu_3}(\varepsilon'/c^*) \leq w_\mu(2\varepsilon'/c^*)$ as $B(\nu_3, \varepsilon'/c^*) \subseteq B(\mu, 2\varepsilon'/c^*)$. Observe also that we can always assume that $\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \geq \varepsilon'/c^*$ since if the two coincide, we can take them to be any other two points. That is, unless the packing contains one single point which would imply that $\varepsilon' \gtrsim \text{diam}(K) \gtrsim \varepsilon_K$, which in turn yields our that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \gtrsim \varepsilon_K$ by taking $\kappa \rightarrow 0$. And, to finish the case where the packing is just a single point, if $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') < \sigma$, this means $\varepsilon' \lesssim \sigma$ so that $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma$. So $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma \wedge d$. But also $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$ by Lemma 1.4, showing $\varepsilon_K \asymp \sigma \wedge d$. We now return to the original case where $\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \geq \varepsilon'/c^*$. Further, since we are packing $B(\mu, \varepsilon') \cap K$, we have $\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \leq 2\varepsilon'$. Additionally, by definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$ as a supremum and the fact that $\varepsilon' > \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$,

$$w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon'/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon'/c^*) \leq \frac{C\varepsilon'\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma'} - \frac{L}{c^*}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon')}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

Combining (B.7), (B.8), and (B.9) along with $\varepsilon'/c^* \leq \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \leq 2\varepsilon'$, we conclude that so long as $L \geq c^*\tilde{L}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_\mu(\varepsilon') - w_\mu(2\varepsilon'/c^*) &= (w_\mu(\varepsilon') - w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon'/c^*)) + (w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon'/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon'/c^*)) + \\ &\quad + \underbrace{(w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon'/c^*) - w_\mu(2\varepsilon'/c^*))}_{\leq 0} \\ &\leq \frac{\tilde{L}}{c^*}\varepsilon'\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon')} + \frac{C\varepsilon'\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma'} - \frac{L}{c^*}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon')} \\ &= \frac{1}{c^*}\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon')} \cdot (\tilde{L}\varepsilon' - L\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|) + \underbrace{\frac{C\varepsilon'\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma'}}_{\leq 2C\varepsilon'^2/\sigma'} \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon'}{c^*}\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon')} \cdot \underbrace{(\tilde{L}\varepsilon' - L\varepsilon'/c^*)}_{\leq 0} + \frac{2C\varepsilon'^2}{\sigma'} \\ &\leq \frac{2C\varepsilon'^2}{\sigma'} \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon'^2}{2\sigma} - \frac{(2\varepsilon'/c^*)^2}{2\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

This implies for our choice of σ' that

$$w_\mu(\varepsilon') - \frac{\varepsilon'^2}{2\sigma} \leq w_\mu(2\varepsilon'/c^*) - \frac{(2\varepsilon'/c^*)^2}{2\sigma}.$$

Using concavity of $\varepsilon \mapsto w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma}$ and the fact that $\varepsilon' > 2\varepsilon'/c^*$ for $c^* > 2$, we conclude $\varepsilon' \gtrsim \varepsilon_\mu$. Taking $\kappa \rightarrow 0$, we have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \gtrsim \varepsilon_\mu$. Since this holds for any $\mu \in K$, we have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$.

Part III: Finally, we show that $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')$ and if $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$, then $\varepsilon_K \asymp \sigma \wedge d$.

We start with the first claim. Let $\tilde{\mu} \in K$ maximize $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2$. Suppose $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \gtrsim \sigma$. Then using the definition of $\tilde{\mu}$, Lemma 2.1, and the result of Part II, we have

$$\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \asymp \varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}}^2 \lesssim \sup_{\mu} \varepsilon_{\mu}^2 = \bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)^2 \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2.$$

On the other hand, if $\varepsilon_{\tilde{\mu}} \lesssim \sigma$, then by Lemma 2.1

$$\varepsilon_K^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}\|^2 \lesssim \sigma^2.$$

But also $\varepsilon_K^2 \lesssim d^2$ hence $\varepsilon_K^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 \wedge d^2$. Now recall from Part I that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \geq \underline{\varepsilon}^*$. Using these facts along with Lemma 1.4 to relate $\underline{\varepsilon}^*$ (which is the minimax rate up to constants) to $\sigma \wedge d$, we obtain

$$\varepsilon_K^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 \wedge d^2 \lesssim (\underline{\varepsilon}^*)^2 \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma')^2.$$

We now prove the final claim. If $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$, we have from Part II that $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$. By Lemma 2.1, this implies $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma$ and since $\varepsilon_K \leq d$ as previously argued, we conclude $\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sigma \wedge d$. Then again by Lemma 1.4 and the minimax rate being a lower bound on the worst case LSE rate, we have $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$. Hence if $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \lesssim \sigma$, then $\varepsilon_K \asymp \sigma \wedge d$. This concludes Part III, which in conjunction with Part I, completes the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.21. We first prove two intermediate claims.

Claim 1: $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon^*$. Proof: if $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^*$, then $\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)} \geq \varepsilon/\sigma$ by definition of ε^* . Assuming ν_1, ν_2 are chosen without loss of generality so that $w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) \geq w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) &- \frac{C\varepsilon\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma} + L/c^*\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)} \\ &\geq w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) - \frac{C\varepsilon\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|}{\sigma} + \frac{L\varepsilon}{c^*\sigma}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \\ &= w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) + \bar{C}\varepsilon/\sigma \cdot \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

provided L is sufficiently large. This implies the condition in the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ holds, so $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon$. This holds for all $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^*$, so we conclude $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon^*$.

Claim 2: Suppose the map $\mu \mapsto w_\mu(\varepsilon/c^*)$ has a Lipschitz constant $\bar{C}\varepsilon/\sigma$ for all $\varepsilon > \varepsilon^*$ for some constant \bar{C} . Then $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \lesssim \varepsilon^*$. Proof: Since $\varepsilon > \varepsilon^*$, note that $(\varepsilon/\sigma)\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \geq \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}$ by definition of ε^* . Hence for sufficiently small \bar{C} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*)| &\leq \frac{\bar{C}\varepsilon}{\sigma}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \\ &\lesssim \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| - \frac{L\varepsilon}{c^*\sigma}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\sigma}\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| - L/c^*\|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|\sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon$ by definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$ in Theorem 2.19, but since this holds for all $\varepsilon > \varepsilon^*$, this implies $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon^*$.

Using these claims, let us prove our main claim. Suppose the map has a Lipschitz constant ε/σ up to constants for all $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^*$. Now let $\sigma' = \sigma \cdot \frac{4C}{1-4/c^{*2}} \asymp \sigma$. Let $\varepsilon^*(\sigma')$ be as defined in (1.2) but with σ' replacing σ . By Lemma 1.5 that $\varepsilon^* \asymp \varepsilon^*(\sigma')$. Thus, we conclude that the map has a Lipschitz constant ε/σ' (up to constants) for all $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^*(\sigma')$. Then combining Claim 1 and Claim 2, we know $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \asymp \varepsilon^*(\sigma') \asymp \varepsilon^*$. But by the theorem we have $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma') \asymp \varepsilon^*$. Thus the LSE is minimax optimal.

Conversely, suppose the LSE is minimax optimal. Suppose $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$. Then by the Theorem $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \varepsilon^*$. Note that $\mu \mapsto w_\mu(\varepsilon)$ must be $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/\sigma$ -Lipschitz by definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}$, since increasing the Lipschitz constant preserves the Lipschitz property, we know the map is ε^*/σ -Lipschitz. Hence, for any $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^*$, the map is ε/σ -Lipschitz.

Suppose instead $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \lesssim \sigma$, so that the mapping has a Lipschitz constant $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/\sigma \lesssim 1$. If we can show $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma$, so that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)/\sigma \lesssim 1 \lesssim \varepsilon^*/\sigma$, then the mapping will also be Lipschitz with constant ε^*/σ , hence ε/σ -Lipschitz for any $\varepsilon > \varepsilon^*$. Well, by Claim 1, $\varepsilon^* \lesssim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \lesssim \sigma$. But also $\varepsilon^* \lesssim d$, so $\varepsilon^* \lesssim \sigma \wedge d$. We also know from Lemma 1.4 that $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$, so in fact $\varepsilon^* \asymp \sigma \wedge d$. Now if $\sigma \lesssim d$, then this means $\varepsilon^* \asymp \sigma$, so certainly $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma$. Suppose $\sigma \gtrsim d$, so that $\varepsilon^* \asymp d$. Well observe that if $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^*$, i.e., $\varepsilon \gtrsim d$ (with a constant larger than 1), then

$$w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon) = w(K) - w(K) = 0 \lesssim (\varepsilon/\sigma) \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\|_2.$$

Here we used that $B(\nu_1, d) \cap K = B(\nu_2, d) \cap K = K$. Hence the mapping is ε/σ -Lipschitz for all $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^*$ as required. \square

B.3 Proofs for Section 2.3

Lemma B.2. Let $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) = \sup_{\mu \in K} \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)$ where ε_μ is as defined in (2.1). Set $c' = \frac{(2c^*-4)(4c^*-1/c^*)}{(c^*-4)c^*}$ for some $c^* > 4$.

- (1) If Algorithm 2 terminates after k iterations of the **while** loop, it returns $\varepsilon = \frac{d}{2^{k-1}c^*}$ and satisfies $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon$.
- (2) If Algorithm 2 does not terminate within k iterations, then we have $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$.

Proof of Lemma B.2. Suppose that Algorithm 2 has terminated on the k th level of the infinite tree, i.e., has returned $d/(2^{k-1}c^*)$. Then for some $\mu, \nu \in K$ such that $\|\mu - \nu\| \leq d/2^{k-1}$, we have

$$w_\mu\left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}}\right) - w_\nu\left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}c^*}\right) \geq \frac{C(d/2^{k-1})^2}{2\sigma}.$$

Using the fact that $B(\mu, d/2^{k-1}) \subseteq B(\nu, d/2^{k-2})$,

$$w_\nu\left(\frac{d}{2^{k-2}}\right) \geq w_\mu\left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}}\right) \geq w_\nu\left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}c^*}\right) + \frac{C(d/2^{k-1})^2}{2\sigma}.$$

Then since $C = 4 - \frac{1}{c^{*2}} = \frac{4c^{*2}-1}{c^{*2}}$, rearranging yields

$$w_\nu\left(\frac{d}{2^{k-2}}\right) - \frac{(d/2^{k-2})^2}{2\sigma} \geq w_\nu\left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}c^*}\right) - \frac{(d/(2^{k-1}c^*))^2}{2\sigma}.$$

By our usual concavity argument with $\varepsilon \mapsto w_\nu(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2\sigma$ and that $d/2^{k-2} \geq d/(2^{k-1}c^*)$, we have $\bar{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon_\nu \geq d/(c^*2^{k-1})$. This proves (1).

We will now prove (2). Suppose the algorithm has run for at least $k+1$ steps. This means for any $j \leq k$ level we haven't found any points that satisfy the given inequality. Take any $\mu \in K$. Recall that at the $(k-1)$ th step of the algorithm, we formed $d/(c^*2^{k-2})$ -packing sets of $B(\cdot, d/2^{k-2}) \cap K$, whose elements populate the k th level of the tree. Note that at any level j of the tree, the union

of the balls of radius $d/2^{j-1}$ cover K . To prove this, repeat the induction argument in the proof of Theorem 2.11. Hence μ belongs to one of the $B(\cdot, d/2^{k-2}) \cap K$ and thus there is some $\nu \in K$ from one of the packing sets satisfying $\|\mu - \nu\|_2 \leq d/(c^*2^{k-2})$. The packing process at level k then forms a $d/(c^*2^{k-1})$ -packing of $B(\nu, d/2^{k-1}) \cap K$, so we may pick some $\nu' \in K$ such that $\|\nu' - \mu\|_2 \leq d/(c^*2^{k-1})$.

Then $\Phi \leq T$ for this particular packing of $B(\nu, d/2^{k-1}) \cap K$, i.e.,

$$w_\nu \left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}} \right) - w_{\nu'} \left(\frac{d}{c^*2^{k-1}} \right) \leq C \frac{(d/2^{k-1})^2}{2\sigma}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

But since $B(\mu, d/2^{k-1} - d/(c^*2^{k-2})) \subseteq B(\nu, d/2^{k-1})$, we have

$$w_\nu \left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}} \right) \geq w_\mu \left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}} - \frac{d}{c^*2^{k-2}} \right). \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Next, since $B(\nu', d/(c^*2^{k-1})) \subseteq B(\mu, d/(c^*2^{k-2}))$,

$$w_{\nu'} \left(\frac{d}{c^*2^{k-1}} \right) \leq w_\mu \left(\frac{d}{c^*2^{k-2}} \right). \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Combining (B.10), (B.11), and (B.12), we have

$$w_\mu \left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}} - \frac{d}{c^*2^{k-2}} \right) - w_\mu \left(\frac{d}{c^*2^{k-2}} \right) \leq C \frac{(d/2^{k-1})^2}{2\sigma}.$$

Now define $\sigma' = \left(\frac{c^*-4}{c^*} \right) \cdot \frac{\sigma}{c} = \frac{c^*-4}{4c^{*-1}/c^*} \cdot \sigma$. Rearranging, we obtain that

$$w_\mu \left(\frac{d}{2^{k-1}} - \frac{d}{c^*2^{k-2}} \right) - \frac{(d/2^{k-1} - d/(c^*2^{k-2}))^2}{2\sigma'} \leq w_\mu \left(\frac{d}{c^*2^{k-2}} \right) - \frac{(d/(c^*2^{k-2}))^2}{2\sigma'}.$$

Note that $d/2^{k-1} - d/(c^*2^{k-2}) > d/(c^*2^{k-2})$ since $c^* > 4$. Consequently, by our same concavity argument as before but with σ' , we conclude $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma') \leq d/2^{k-1} - d/(c^*2^{k-2})$. Since $\mu \in K$ was chosen arbitrarily, taking the supremum we conclude

$$\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma') \leq d/2^{k-1} - d/(c^*2^{k-2}) = \frac{d(2c^* - 4)}{c^*2^k}.$$

Now, observe that $\sigma' = c\sigma$ where $c = \frac{c^*-4}{4c^{*-1}/c^*} < 1$. Hence by Lemma 2.3, we have

$$\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq c^{-1} \overline{\varepsilon}_K(c\sigma) = c^{-1} \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma') \leq c^{-1} \cdot \left[\frac{d(2c^* - 4)}{c^*2^k} \right] = \frac{(2c^* - 4)(4c^* - 1/c^*)}{(c^* - 4)c^*} \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.24. Suppose the algorithm terminates after k iterations. By Lemma B.2, this implies $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \geq d/(2^{k-1}c^*)$. We now consider two cases.

First, suppose $\sigma \lesssim d/(2^{k-1}c^*)$. Then for some $\mu \in K$, we have $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \geq d/(2^{k-1}c^*) \gtrsim \sigma$, so by Lemma 2.1,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \asymp \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)^2 \gtrsim d^2/(2^{k-1}c^*)^2.$$

Taking the supremum, we conclude $\varepsilon_K^2 \gtrsim d^2/(2^{k-1}c^*)^2$, verifying our first claim in this case.

On the other hand, suppose $\sigma \gtrsim d/(2^{k-1}c^*)$. Recall that $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \varepsilon^*(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$ by Lemma 1.4, where $\varepsilon^*(\sigma)$ is the minimax rate. But $\sigma \wedge d \gtrsim d/(2^{k-1}c^*)$. Hence $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim d/(2^{k-1}c^*)$. This proves (1).

We next prove (2). Suppose the algorithm does not terminate within k iterations. Then by Lemma B.2, we have $\overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma) \leq c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$. We again consider two scenarios.

Consider the scenario (a) in (2), where $\sigma \geq c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$. Then for any $\mu \in K$,

$$\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \leq c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k} \leq \sigma,$$

which in turn implies by Lemma 2.1 that for all $\mu \in K$ we have $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \lesssim \sigma^2$. Hence $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim \sigma$, and we always have $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim d$. On the other hand, by Lemma 1.4 we know $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \varepsilon^*(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$. Thus $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$, proving (a) in (2).

For scenario (b) in (2), suppose $\sigma \leq c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$. We claim $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$. Suppose not. Then for any absolute constant $C' > 0$, we have $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) > C' \cdot c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$, which implies $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \geq C'\sigma$.

Take the μ that maximizes $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2$. We claim for this $\mu \in K$, $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$. If not, we would have $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \lesssim \sigma$. Then by Lemma 2.1,

$$\varepsilon_K(\sigma)^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \lesssim \sigma^2.$$

But this contradicts $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \geq C'\sigma$ for a sufficiently large choice of C' . Hence $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$ as we claimed.

Then by Lemma 2.1,

$$\varepsilon_K(\sigma)^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \asymp \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)^2 \leq \overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma)^2 \leq \left(c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}\right)^2.$$

But this contradicts our assumption from before that $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \geq C' \cdot c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$ for any $C' > 0$. Thus, $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim c' \cdot \frac{d}{2^k}$, proving (b) in (2). \square

Lemma B.3. *Let ε be the output of k steps of Algorithm 3, including $k = 0$ (initialization). Let $c^* > 1$ be given and set $c' = \frac{(1+c^{*2})}{c^{*2}(10+8/c^*)}$.*

(1) *If ε satisfies $\Psi \geq T$, then $\varepsilon/c^* \leq \varepsilon_{\nu_{i^*}} \leq \overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma)$.*

(2) *If ε satisfies $\Psi < T$, then $c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon$.*

Proof of Lemma B.3. We first prove (1). Suppose our update (or initial choice) of ε satisfies $\Psi \geq T$. As we showed in (B.4), $T \geq \frac{C\varepsilon^2}{4\sigma}$ since $\varepsilon \geq 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*$. We conclude that for some i^* we have

$$w_{\nu_{i^*}}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{c^*} + 2\varepsilon\right) - w_{\nu_{i^*}}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{c^*}\right) \geq \sup_{\nu' \in B(\nu_{i^*}, 2\varepsilon - \delta) \cap K} w_{\nu'}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{c^*}\right) - w_{\nu_{i^*}}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{c^*}\right) = \Psi \geq T = \frac{C\varepsilon^2}{4\sigma},$$

where the first inequality follows since

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{\nu' \in B(\nu_{i^*}, 2\varepsilon - \delta) \cap K} B(\nu', \varepsilon/c^*) \cap K &\subseteq B(\nu_{i^*}, \varepsilon/c^* + 2\varepsilon - \delta) \cap K \\ &\subseteq B(\nu_{i^*}, \varepsilon/c^* + 2\varepsilon) \cap K. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging, we obtain

$$w_{\nu_{i^*}}(\varepsilon/c^* + 2\varepsilon) - \frac{(\varepsilon/c^* + 2\varepsilon)^2}{2\sigma} \geq w_{\nu_{i^*}}(\varepsilon/c^*) - \frac{(\varepsilon/c^*)^2}{2\sigma}$$

which by concavity of $\varepsilon \mapsto w_{\nu_{i^*}}(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2\sigma$ implies that $\overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon_{\nu_{i^*}} \geq \varepsilon/c^*$, similar to the argument in Theorem 2.16. This proves (1).

Next, we prove (2). Suppose $\Psi < T$. We will first show that

$$\Psi \geq \sup_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \in K: \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \leq 2\varepsilon} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) - \varepsilon^2/\sigma. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Let ν_1^*, ν_2^* attain this supremum. Then note that the ν_2^* is at most δ away from one of the points ν_i in our packing set. Hence using (2.4) from Remark 2.18, for some i we have

$$|w_{\nu_i}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2^*}(\varepsilon/c^*)| \leq \delta c^* \cdot \sup_{\eta \in K} w_\eta(\varepsilon/c^*)/\varepsilon \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4\sigma} \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma}.$$

Next, since $\|\nu_2^* - \nu_i\| \leq \delta$ and $\|\nu_1^* - \nu_2^*\| \leq 2\varepsilon$, we have that $\|\nu_1^* - \nu_i\| \leq 2\varepsilon + \delta$. Then setting $\alpha = \frac{2\delta}{2\varepsilon + \delta} \in (0, 1)$ and taking $\zeta = \alpha\nu_i + (1 - \alpha)\nu_1^*$, we have $\zeta \in K \cap B(\nu_i, 2\varepsilon - \delta) \cap B(\nu_1^*, 2\delta)$. It follows again by (2.4) that

$$|w_\zeta(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_1^*}(\varepsilon/c^*)| \leq 2\delta c^* \cdot \sup_{\eta \in K} w_\eta(\varepsilon/c^*)/\varepsilon \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma}.$$

In particular, this implies $w_\zeta(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_1^*}(\varepsilon/c^*) \geq -\varepsilon^2/2\sigma$ and $w_{\nu_2^*}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_i}(\varepsilon/c^*) \geq -\varepsilon^2/2\sigma$.

By the definition of Ψ as a max and supremum followed by the preceding two (lower) bounds of $-\varepsilon^2/2\sigma$, we have

$$\Psi \geq w_\zeta(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_i}(\varepsilon/c^*) \geq w_{\nu_1^*}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2^*}(\varepsilon/c^*) - \varepsilon^2/\sigma.$$

Hence Ψ satisfies (B.13) as claimed.

Next, since $\Psi < T$, (B.13) implies

$$\sup_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \in K: \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \leq 2\varepsilon} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) - \varepsilon^2/\sigma < C\varepsilon^2/(2\sigma) - (L/c^*) \cdot \varepsilon \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}.$$

Pick any $\mu \in K$. Then we have

$$\sup_{\nu_1 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - \inf_{\nu_2 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) \leq \sup_{\nu_1, \nu_2 \in K: \|\nu_1 - \nu_2\| \leq 2\varepsilon} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*).$$

Combining the previous two inequalities,

$$\sup_{\nu_1 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) - \inf_{\nu_2 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) < \frac{(C+2)\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma} - (L/c) \cdot \varepsilon \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)}.$$

By Talagrand [2014, Exercise 2.4.11],

$$\sup_{\nu_1 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} w_{\nu_1}(\varepsilon/c^*) + (L/c^*)\varepsilon \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)} \geq w_\mu(\varepsilon).$$

On the other hand

$$\inf_{\nu_2 \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} w_{\nu_2}(\varepsilon/c^*) \leq w_\mu(\varepsilon/c^*),$$

and combining the previous three bounds, we have

$$w_\mu(\varepsilon) - w_\mu(\varepsilon/c^*) < \frac{(C+2)\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma}.$$

Taking $\sigma' = \frac{(1+c^*2)}{c^{*2}(C+2)} \cdot \sigma$, we have

$$w_\mu(\varepsilon) - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2\sigma'} < w_\mu(\varepsilon/c^*) - \frac{(\varepsilon/c^*)^2}{2\sigma'}.$$

By concavity again, $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma') \leq \varepsilon$, and since this holds for all $\mu \in K$, we have $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma') \leq \varepsilon$.

We now observe that $\sigma' = c\sigma$ for $c = \frac{(1+c^*2)}{c^{*2}(C+2)} < 1$ (noting that c^* can be taken to larger than 1 to imply this). Therefore, using Lemma 2.3,

$$\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq c^{-1}\overline{\varepsilon}_K(c\sigma) = c^{-1}\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma') \leq c^{-1}\varepsilon = \frac{c^{*2}(10+8/c^*)}{(1+c^*2)} \cdot \varepsilon.$$

Rearranging and recalling our definition of c' , we have $c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon$ and this holds for any ε satisfying $\Psi < T$. \square

Lemma B.4. *Let $c^* > 1$ be given and set $c' = \frac{(1+c^*2)}{c^{*2}(10+8/c^*)}$. Then Algorithm 3 satisfies the following:*

- (1) *Algorithm 3 will terminate in finitely many steps.*
- (2) *If Algorithm 3 does not immediately terminate, its output ε satisfies $c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon \leq 2c^* \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$.*
- (3) *If Algorithm 3 terminates on initialization, i.e., returns $\varepsilon = 2\underline{\varepsilon}^*$, then we have $c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$.*

Proof of Lemma B.4. Suppose at some step of the algorithm (possibly the initialization step), our ε satisfies $\Psi \geq T$. Then by (1) of Lemma B.3, we have $\varepsilon/c^* \leq \varepsilon_{\nu_{i^*}} \leq \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$. On the other hand, suppose we have run the algorithm until $\Psi < T$ and consider the output ε . Then by (2) of Lemma B.3, $c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon$.

This implies the algorithm must terminate (i.e., eventually $\Psi < T$), for suppose not. Then after sufficiently many iterations (each of which doubles ε), we have $\varepsilon > dc^*$, which implies $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) > d$, contradicting that $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq d$ from Lemma 2.2. Hence we have $\Psi < T$ after finitely many steps, proving (1).

We now prove (2) of our lemma. Suppose the algorithm terminates after strictly more than one step. Then the procedure doubles ε while it still satisfies a condition ($\Psi \geq T$) implying $\varepsilon/c^* \leq \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$, until the final update, after which $\Psi < T$ and $\varepsilon \geq c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)$. The final ε therefore satisfies

$$c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon \leq 2c^* \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma).$$

We finally prove (3). Suppose the algorithm terminates immediately, i.e., at the initialization step, $\Psi < T$. Then we have

$$c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon = 2\underline{\varepsilon}^* \asymp \varepsilon^* \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma).$$

The first inequality is just (2) of Lemma B.3, and the last two inequalities (up to constants) follow from Lemma 1.5 and the fact that the minimax rate is a lower bound on the LSE rate. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.25. For brevity, we set $c' = \frac{(1+c^*)}{c^{*2}(10+8/c^*)}$. We first prove (1). Suppose $d \lesssim \sigma$. Then $d \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d \asymp d$ by Lemma 1.4. So $\varepsilon^* \asymp d$, which means $\varepsilon_K \asymp d$ (or any estimator). Moreover, since we initialize ε to be the minimax rate up to constants and then increase it, we have $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \asymp d$.

We now prove (2) and (3). Suppose $d \gtrsim \sigma$. Then $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d \asymp \sigma$. But since $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^*$ (as we are doubling starting from a scaled version of the minimax rate), we have $\varepsilon \gtrsim \sigma$. This means $\overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \varepsilon \gtrsim \sigma$ by (2) of Lemma B.4. Then for some $\mu \in K$, $\varepsilon_\mu \gtrsim \varepsilon \gtrsim \sigma$. Then by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \asymp \varepsilon_\mu^2 \gtrsim \varepsilon^2.$$

Thus, $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \varepsilon$.

We then consider two subcases regarding σ . First suppose $\sigma \geq \varepsilon$, i.e., scenario (2). This means

$$c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon \leq \sigma$$

by Lemma B.4, since the algorithm did not terminate upon initialization. Then for any $\mu \in K$, $c' \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon \leq \sigma$, which in turn implies by Lemma 2.1 that for all $\mu \in K$ we have $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \lesssim \sigma^2$. Hence $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim \sigma$. But since $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim d$ always holds, and we know from Lemma 1.4 that $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$, we have $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$. But we also have $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d \asymp \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$, again using Lemma 1.4 and our argument from scenario (1) that $\varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon^*$. Thus, $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \varepsilon \gtrsim \varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$, proving (2).

Next, suppose $\sigma \leq \varepsilon$, i.e., scenario (3). We claim $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim \varepsilon$. Suppose to the contrary that $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \geq C' \cdot \varepsilon$ for any absolute constant $C' > 0$, which implies $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \geq C' \sigma$.

Take the $\mu \in K$ that maximizes $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2$. We claim for this $\mu \in K$, $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$. Suppose to the contrary $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \lesssim \sigma$. Then by Lemma 2.1,

$$\varepsilon_K(\sigma)^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \lesssim \sigma^2.$$

But this will contradict $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \geq C' \sigma$ (so long as C' is picked sufficiently large). Hence $\varepsilon_\mu(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$ as we claimed. So by Lemma 2.1 and Lemma B.4,

$$\varepsilon_K(\sigma)^2 = \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \asymp \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)^2 \leq \sup_{\mu \in K} \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)^2 = \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma)^2 \leq \varepsilon^2.$$

But this contradicts our assumption from before that $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \geq C' \cdot \varepsilon$ for any C' . Thus, $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim \varepsilon$. But recall that for both (2) and (3), we showed $\varepsilon \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$. Hence we have $\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$, proving (3).

For our final claim, we suppose Algorithm 3 terminates upon initialization. Recall that

$$c' \cdot \overline{\varepsilon}_K(\sigma) \leq \varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon^* \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma) \tag{B.14}$$

from (3) of Lemma B.4 and noting that ε is just the minimax rate. Suppose $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$ for a sufficiently large constant. Now take μ that maximizes $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2$. Well $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \gtrsim \sigma^2$. We claim $\varepsilon_\mu^2 \asymp \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2$. If $\varepsilon_\mu \gtrsim \sigma$, this immediately follows from Lemma 2.1. If $\varepsilon_\mu \lesssim \sigma$, then by Lemma 2.1 there exists a universal constant $C' > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \leq C' \sigma^2$. But we assumed $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$

for a sufficiently large constant, i.e., larger than C' , leading to a contradiction. So indeed $\varepsilon_\mu \gtrsim \sigma$, and using (B.14),

$$\varepsilon_K(\sigma)^2 = \mathbb{E} \|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2^2 \asymp \varepsilon_\mu^2 \leq \sup_{\mu \in K} \varepsilon_\mu(\sigma)^2 = \overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma)^2 \lesssim \varepsilon^2 \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma)^2.$$

This proves $\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon_K(\sigma)$.

Suppose instead $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim \sigma$. We always have $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \lesssim d$, and we have $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$ from Lemma 1.4. So $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$. But we also have $\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon^* \gtrsim \sigma \wedge d$ and $\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon^* \lesssim \varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$ since the minimax rate is always as good as the LSE, proving that $\varepsilon \asymp \varepsilon_K(\sigma) \asymp \sigma \wedge d$ as claimed. \square

C Proofs for Section 3 (Examples)

C.1 Proofs for Section 3.1

Proof of Lemma 3.2. We will take $a = 0, b = 1$ for simplicity. Suppose $\varepsilon \gtrsim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. Set $k = \varepsilon\sqrt{n} > 1$ and assume for simplicity both k and $n/k = \sqrt{n}/\varepsilon$ are integers. Now construct the vector

$$u = \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_k, \underbrace{(k/n, \dots, k/n)}_k, \underbrace{(2k/n, \dots, 2k/n)}_k, \dots, \underbrace{(1 - k/n, \dots, 1 - k/n)}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Now consider perturbing this vector by

$$v_\alpha = \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_k, \underbrace{(\alpha_1 k/n, \dots, \alpha_1 k/n)}_k, \underbrace{(\alpha_2 k/n, \dots, \alpha_2 k/n)}_k, \dots, \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_k,$$

where the vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{n/k-2}) \in \{0, 1\}^{n/k-2}$, noting that $u + v_\alpha$ is monotonic and have components in $[0, 1]$. By Varshamov-Gilbert's bound, we know that there exist at least $\exp((n/k - 2)/8)$ vectors from $\{0, 1\}^{n/k-2}$ such that the Hamming distance between any of them is at least $(n/k - 2)/8$. Given $\alpha, \alpha' \in \{0, 1\}^{n/k-2}$ with this property, note that

$$\|v_\alpha - v_{\alpha'}\|^2 \geq k(\varepsilon/\sqrt{n})^2(n/k - 2)/8 \gtrsim \varepsilon^2.$$

Therefore, there exist at least $\exp((n/k - 2)/8) \asymp \exp(\sqrt{n}/\varepsilon)$ vectors $u + v_\alpha$ that form an ε -packing set of $S^\uparrow(a, b)$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.4. We present the $p > 2$ case only, with the $p = 2$ case identical except we swap the upper bound that appears in Gao and Wellner [2007, Theorem 1.1]. Let $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(\mu)}$ denote the L^2 -norm of a function on \mathbb{R}^p with respect to the Lebesgue measure in p -dimensions.

We begin with $a = 0$ and $b = 1$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Take $\delta = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}}$. By Lemma 3.3, there exists a δ -covering \mathcal{G}_p of \mathcal{F}_p with $|\mathcal{G}_p| \leq C\delta^{-2(p-1)}$.

Now, for each $\mu \in Q_{0,1} \subseteq [0, 1]^n$, let us construct a corresponding $f^\mu \in \mathcal{F}_p$. We must partition the domain of f^μ , i.e., $[0, 1]^p$. Let

$$I^- = \{x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p) : x \in [0, 1]^p, \exists i \in \{1, \dots, p\} \text{ such that } x_i = 0\}.$$

Observe that each $l_1, \dots, l_n \in \mathbb{L}_{p,n}$ defines n cubes that partition $[0, 1]^p$; namely, if $l_j = \left(\frac{k_1^j}{n^{1/p}}, \dots, \frac{k_p^j}{n^{1/p}}\right)$ for $k_1^j, \dots, k_p^j \in \{1, \dots, n^{1/p}\}$, then we can define the corresponding cube $I_j = \prod_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{k_i^j - 1}{n^{1/p}}, \frac{k_i^j}{n^{1/p}}\right]$

that has l_j as its outermost corner. Let \mathcal{I}_n be the set of all n cubes, so that $[0, 1]^p = I^- \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^n I_j$. Thus, we define for all $x \in [0, 1]^p$ the function

$$f^\mu(x) = \begin{cases} \mu_j & \text{if } x \in I_j \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in I^- \end{cases}$$

Let us verify that f^μ is indeed an element of \mathcal{F}_p . Clearly $f^\mu(x)$ lies in $[0, 1]$ for all $x \in [0, 1]^p$. Let $e^i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be the unit vector with 1 in coordinate i and 0 in all other coordinates. To prove monotonicity, let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_p) \in [0, 1]^p$ and consider the following cases.

Suppose $x \in I^-$. Pick any $\alpha > 0$ and coordinate $s \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that $x + \alpha e^s \in [0, 1]^p$ (such an α and s must exist since x is not the all-ones vector). Then $x + \alpha e^s$ is in some cube I_j or still in I^- , so f^μ takes value $\mu_j \geq 0$ or 0 which is $\geq 0 = f^\mu(x)$ (preserving monotonicity).

Suppose $x \in I_j$ for some j , i.e., $x_i \in \left(\frac{k_i^j - 1}{n^{1/p}}, \frac{k_i^j}{n^{1/p}} \right]$ for each $1 \leq i \leq p$. Then $f^\mu(x) = \mu_j$.

Now again consider $x + \alpha e^s$ for some $s \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ where $\alpha > 0$ and $x + \alpha e^s \in [0, 1]^p$. Then $x + \alpha e^s$ belongs to some cube I_t where l_t has the same coordinates as l_j except a possibly larger s th coordinate, and $f^\mu(x + \alpha e^s) = \mu_t$. Since $\mu \in Q_{0,1}$, for some $g \in \mathcal{F}_p$, $\mu_t = g(l_t)$ and $\mu_j = g(l_j)$. But since l_t and l_j differ only in the s th coordinate and g is non-decreasing in each coordinate, we conclude $\mu_j \leq \mu_t$. So $f^\mu(x) \leq f^\mu(x + \alpha e^s)$. This verifies that $f^\mu \in \mathcal{F}_p$.

Recalling our δ -covering \mathcal{G}_p , for each $g \in \mathcal{G}_p$, if it exists, pick a single $\mu(g) \in Q$ such that $\|f^{\mu(g)} - g\|_{L^2(\mu)} < \delta$. We then produce a subset $Q'_{0,1} = \{\mu(g) : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$, with $|Q'_{0,1}| \leq |\mathcal{G}_p| \leq C\delta^{-2(p-1)}$.

Let us verify that $Q'_{0,1}$ is indeed an ε -covering of $Q_{0,1}$. Pick any $\mu \in Q_{0,1}$. Then f^μ is an element of \mathcal{F}_p , and since \mathcal{G}_p is a δ -covering of \mathcal{F}_p , there must exist $g \in \mathcal{G}_p$ such that $\|f^\mu - g\|_{L^2(\mu)} < \delta$. This also implies the existence of $\mu(g)$ in $Q'_{0,1}$ such that $\|f^{\mu(g)} - g\|_{L^2(\mu)} < \delta$, possibly even equal to μ itself. By the triangle inequality, $\|f^\mu - f^{\mu(g)}\|_{L^2(\mu)} < 2\delta$. Note that f^μ and $f^{\mu(g)}$ are constant on each cube I_1, \dots, I_n and each of those cube has volume $1/n$. Moreover, I^+ has volume 0 with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \underbrace{\|f^\mu - f^{\mu(g)}\|_{L^2(\mu)}^2}_{< 4\delta^2} &= \int_{[0,1]^p} (f^\mu(x) - f^{\mu(g)}(x))^2 d\mu(x) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \int_{I_j} (f^\mu(x) - f^{\mu(g)}(x))^2 d\mu(x) \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n [\mu_j - (\mu(g))_j]^2 \\ &= n^{-1} \|\mu - \mu(g)\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\|\mu - \mu(g)\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{n}\delta = \varepsilon$, so $Q'_{0,1}$ is indeed an ε -covering of $Q_{0,1}$ of cardinality bounded by $C\delta^{-2(p-1)} = C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}} \right)^{-2(p-1)}$. In the case $p = 2$, we instead have $|Q'_{0,1}| \leq C\delta^{-2}(\log 1/\delta)^2 = C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}} \right)^{-2} \left(\log \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{\varepsilon} \right)^2$. We have therefore upper-bounded the size of a minimal ε -covering of $Q_{0,1}$.

Now we consider arbitrary $a < b$, and again assume $p > 2$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the linear function $\phi(x) = \frac{x}{b-a} - \frac{a}{b-a}$ which satisfies $\phi(a) = 0$ and $\phi(b) = 1$ and has inverse $\phi^{-1}(x) = (b-a)x + a$.

Let $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ apply ϕ coordinate-wise, and let $\Phi^{-1}: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ apply ϕ^{-1} coordinate-wise instead. Observe that $\Phi(Q_{a,b}) \subseteq Q_{0,1}$ since if $f: [0, 1]^p \rightarrow [a, b]$ is non-decreasing in each variable, then $\phi \circ f: [0, 1]^p \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is still non-decreasing in each variable and thus belongs to \mathcal{F}_p . Therefore, applying the $a = 0, b = 1$ case with $\frac{\varepsilon}{b-a}$, there exists an $\frac{\varepsilon}{b-a}$ -covering $Q'_{a,b}$ of $Q_{0,1}$ and therefore of $\Phi(Q_{a,b})$ with $|Q'_{a,b}| \leq C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2(p-1)}$.

Now observe that $\Phi^{-1}(Q'_{a,b})$ is a subset of $Q_{a,b}$, with cardinality $|\Phi^{-1}(Q'_{a,b})| \leq C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2(p-1)}$.

Let us verify that $\Phi^{-1}(Q'_{a,b})$ is an ε -covering of $Q_{a,b}$. Pick any $\mu \in Q_{a,b}$. Then for some $f: [0, 1]^p \rightarrow [a, b]$ non-decreasing in each variable, $\mu = (f(l_1), \dots, f(l_n))$. Then $\Phi(\mu) \in \Phi(Q_{a,b})$ so there is some $\eta \in Q'_{a,b}$ with $\|\Phi(\mu) - \eta\|_2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{b-a}$. Taking the square of both sides and rearranging shows $\|\mu - \Phi^{-1}(\eta)\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$, with $\Phi^{-1}(\eta)$ belonging to the covering set $\Phi^{-1}(Q'_{a,b})$.

The $p = 2$ case is similar, and we instead obtain a covering of cardinality upper-bounded by $C \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)} \right)^{-2} \left(\log \frac{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)}{\varepsilon} \right)^2$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.5. We first prove the claim for $a = 0$ and $b = 1$. We re-use the notation from the proof of Lemma 3.4, recalling our cubes $\mathcal{I}_n = \{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$ of side lengths $1/n^{1/p}$ and volume $1/n$. We will show for $\varepsilon \gtrsim 1/n^{1/p}$ that $M \left(\sqrt{\frac{c_p n \varepsilon}{16}}, Q_{0,1} \right) \gtrsim 2^{c_p \varepsilon^{1-p/2}}$ where c_p is some constant depending on p . Performing a change of variables, this will imply $\log M(\varepsilon, Q_{0,1}) \gtrsim \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}} \right)^{-2(p-1)}$ for $\varepsilon \gtrsim \sqrt{\frac{n}{n^{1/p}}}$ as desired.

Assume $\varepsilon \gtrsim 1/n^{1/p}$. We assume $\varepsilon = 2^{-m}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, noting that $\varepsilon < 1$. For simplicity, we assume $n^{1/p} = k2^m$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., $\varepsilon = k/n^{1/p}$. This means the cubes in \mathcal{I}_n have side lengths $2^{-m}/k$. Let's instead partition $[0, 1]^p$ into a coarser set of cubes by taking cubes with side length 2^{-m} instead of $2^{-m}/k$. To do so, define $\varepsilon^{-p} = 2^{mp}$ cubes $\mathcal{J}_m = \{J_1, \dots, J_{2^{mp}}\}$ of the form $\prod_{i=1}^p (r_i \varepsilon, (r_i + 1) \varepsilon]$ where $r_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, 2^m - 1\}$. Each cube in \mathcal{J}_m contains exactly $k^p = n/2^{mp} \in \mathbb{N}$ cubes of \mathcal{I}_n , and the boundary of cubes in \mathcal{J}_m are a subset of boundaries of cubes in \mathcal{I}_n . Note that $[0, 1]^p$ can be partitioned as $I^- \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^{mp}} J_i$, where I^- was defined in the proof of Lemma 3.4.

Now, we partition the cubes in \mathcal{J}_m as follows: let $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m$ be the set of cubes with $\sum_{i=1}^p r_i = 2^m$, $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m^+$ the cubes with $\sum_{i=1}^p r_i > 2^m$, and $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m^-$ the cubes with $\sum_{i=1}^p r_i < 2^m$.

Consider the set \mathcal{G}_p of functions g on $[0, 1]^p$ such that g is either 1 or 0 in each cube in $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m$ and g is identically 0 on the cubes in $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m^-$ and identically 1 on the cubes in $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m^+$. We set g to be value 0 on the set I^- . Note that $|\mathcal{G}_p| = 2^{|\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m|}$.

Now let us prove that $\mathcal{G}_p \subset \mathcal{F}_p$. Observe that g taking value 0 on $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m^-$ and 1 on $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m^+$ does not violate monotonicity. This is because if g is 1 on a cube $\prod_{i=1}^p (r_i \varepsilon, (r_i + 1) \varepsilon] \in \overline{\mathcal{J}}_m^+$ with $\sum_{i=1}^p r_i > 2^m$, moving from that cube in the (positive) direction of coordinate s will never arrive at a cube in $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m^-$ since the value of r_i can only increase. So we cannot obtain the needed comparable point to conclude monotonicity was violated. By a near identical logic, g taking value 0 on $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m^-$ and 1 on a cube in $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m$ cannot lead to a violation. Similarly, a violation within $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m$ cannot occur. This is because if we are at a cube with $\sum_{i=1}^p r_i = 2^m$ (where g is either 0 or 1) and move along the positive s coordinate for any s , we will reach a cube with its defining coordinates satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^p r'_i > 2^m$. But g will be 1 on this new cube, meaning no violation occurred. Hence $\mathcal{G}_p \subset \mathcal{F}_p$. Lastly, g taking value 0 on I^- does not cause an issue. For if g takes value 1 at a point, it does not belong to I^- , i.e., that point does not have a 0 coordinate. But moving in the positive direction in

coordinate s will preserve this fact, so we cannot arrive at I^- , i.e., a violation cannot occur.

By a combinatorial bound on the number of weak compositions of an integer, we can show $|\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m| = c_p \cdot \varepsilon^{1-p}$, where c_p is a constant depending on p . To see this, note that the number of tuples (r_1, \dots, r_p) with $\sum_{i=1}^p r_i = 2^m = \varepsilon^{-1}$ is $\binom{\varepsilon^{-1}+p-1}{p-1}$ using a stars-and-bars style combinatorial argument. Using a well-known binomial coefficient bound,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\varepsilon^{-1})^{p-1}}{(p-1)^{p-1}} &\leq \frac{(\varepsilon^{-1}+p-1)^{p-1}}{(p-1)^{p-1}} \leq \binom{\varepsilon^{-1}+p-1}{p-1} \leq \frac{(\varepsilon^{-1}+p-1)^{p-1}}{(p-1)!} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \binom{p-1}{i} (p-1)^i (\varepsilon^{-1})^{p-1-i}}{(p-1)!} \leq \frac{(\varepsilon^{-1})^{p-1} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \binom{p-1}{i} (p-1)^i}{(p-1)!} \\ &= \frac{(\varepsilon^{-1})^{p-1} \cdot p^{p-1}}{(p-1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

The final inequality used that $\varepsilon^{-1} > 1$ so that $(\varepsilon^{-1})^{p-1} > (\varepsilon^{-1})^{p-1-i}$. Indeed, $|\overline{\mathcal{J}}_m| = c_p \cdot \varepsilon^{1-p}$ with c_p only depending on p as claimed.

Observe that there is a bijective correspondence between \mathcal{G}_p and $\{0,1\}^{c_p \varepsilon^{1-p}}$. We apply a Varshamov-Gilbert type bound to this set of binary strings, and equivalently \mathcal{G}_p , following the formulation of [Rigollet and Hütter \[2023, Lemma 4.12\]](#) with $\gamma = 1/4$. The lemma states that there exists $g_1, \dots, g_N \in \mathcal{G}_p$ with $N \geq 2^{c_p \varepsilon^{1-p}/(32 \log 2)}$ such that for any $i \neq j$, the functions g_i, g_j disagree on at least $\frac{c_p \varepsilon^{1-p}}{4}$ many cubes in \mathcal{J}_m . Let $\mathcal{J}_m^{i,j}$ be these cubes for each $i \neq j$. Since each cube of \mathcal{J}_m is partitioned into cubes of \mathcal{I}_n , we can define $\mathcal{I}_n^{i,j}$ as the cubes of \mathcal{I}_n on which g_i and g_j disagree, so that the cubes of $\mathcal{J}_m^{i,j}$ and $\mathcal{I}_n^{i,j}$ both partition the same region.

Each g_i defines a unique point $\mu_i = (g_i(l_1), \dots, g_i(l_n)) \in Q_{0,1} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ where l_1, \dots, l_n are the lattice points. Let us compute $\|\mu_i - \mu_j\|_2$ for $i \neq j$ to verify we have formed a packing set of $Q_{0,1}$. Note that $g_i - g_j$ is constant within any cube in \mathcal{I}_n , the difference being either 0 or 1. By counting the number of cubes such that $g_i(l) \neq g_j(l)$, we count the number of non-zero coordinates of $\mu_i - \mu_j$. Recalling that each cube in \mathcal{I}_n has volume n^{-1} and each cube in \mathcal{J}_m volume ε^p , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu_i - \mu_j\|_2^2 \cdot \frac{1}{n} &= \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_n^{i,j}} \int_I \underbrace{|g_i(x) - g_j(x)|^2}_{=1} dx = \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_m^{i,j}} \int_J \underbrace{|g_i(x) - g_j(x)|^2}_{=1} dx \\ &= \frac{c_p \varepsilon^{1-p}}{4} \cdot 1 \cdot \varepsilon^p = \frac{c_p \varepsilon}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|\mu_i - \mu_j\|_2 = \sqrt{\frac{c_p n \varepsilon}{4}}$. This implies $M\left(\sqrt{\frac{c_p n \varepsilon}{4}}, Q_{0,1}\right) \geq 2^{c_p \varepsilon^{1-p}/(32 \log 2)}$ for $\varepsilon \gtrsim \frac{1}{n^{1/p}}$, so that

$$\log M\left(\sqrt{\frac{c_p n \varepsilon}{4}}, Q_{0,1}\right) \geq \frac{c_p \varepsilon^{1-p}}{32}.$$

Perform a change of variables with $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \sqrt{\frac{c_p n \varepsilon}{4}}$ which satisfies $\tilde{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sqrt{n/n^{1/p}}$. Then

$$\log M(\tilde{\varepsilon}, Q_{0,1}) \geq \frac{c_p}{32} \cdot \left(\frac{4\tilde{\varepsilon}^2}{c_p n}\right)^{1-p} \gtrsim \left(\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)}.$$

Since $\varepsilon \gtrsim 1/n^{1/p}$ if and only if $\tilde{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sqrt{n/n^{1/p}}$, we have proven for all $\tilde{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \sqrt{n/n^{1/p}}$ that $\log M(\tilde{\varepsilon}, Q_{0,1}) \gtrsim \left(\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)}$.

Now we consider arbitrary $a < b$, and again assume $p \geq 2$. Suppose $\frac{\varepsilon}{b-a} \gtrsim \sqrt{n/n^{1/p}}$. Consider the linear function $\phi(x) = \frac{x}{b-a} - \frac{a}{b-a}$ which satisfies $\phi(a) = 0$ and $\phi(b) = 1$ and has inverse $\phi^{-1}(x) = (b-a)x + a$. Let $\Phi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ apply ϕ in each coordinate, and $\Phi^{-1}: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ apply ϕ^{-1} instead. It is easy to verify that $\Phi(Q_{a,b}) = Q_{0,1}$. Then by our prior result, there is some set $Q'_{a,b} \subseteq \Phi(Q_{a,b})$ with $\log |Q'_{a,b}| \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)}\right)^{-2(p-1)}$ such that for any $\mu, \mu' \in Q'_{a,b}$, we have $\|\mu - \mu'\|_2 \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{b-a}$.

Now observe that $\Phi^{-1}(Q'_{a,b})$ is a subset of $Q_{a,b}$, with cardinality satisfying $\log |\Phi^{-1}(Q'_{a,b})| \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)}\right)^{-2(p-1)}$. Moreover, by definition of Φ^{-1} , for any $\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\mu}' \in \Phi^{-1}(Q'_{a,b})$, we have $\|\tilde{\mu} - \tilde{\mu}'\|_2 \geq \varepsilon$. We have thus lower bounded the metric entropy of $Q_{a,b}$, i.e., provided $\frac{\varepsilon}{b-a} \gtrsim \sqrt{n/n^{1/p}}$, we have

$$\log M(\varepsilon, Q_{a,b}) \gtrsim \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}(b-a)}\right)^{-2(p-1)}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.6. We prove the $a = 0$ and $b = 1$ case since the argument is identical. From our global entropy result in (3.2), there exist constants $0 < c_1 < c_2$ such that

$$c_1 \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)} \leq \log M(\varepsilon, Q_{0,1}) \leq \log M(\varepsilon/c^*, Q_{0,1}) \leq c_2 \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2c^*\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)}$$

Assume $c^* > (c_1/c_2)^{\frac{1}{2(p-1)}}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(\varepsilon/c^*, Q_{0,1}) - \log M(\varepsilon, Q_{0,1}) &\geq c_2 \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2c^*\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)} - c_1 \cdot \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)} \\ &= \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)} \left[c_2 \cdot (c^*)^{2(p-1)} - c_1 \right] \\ &\gtrsim \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence using (3.1),

$$\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)} \lesssim \log M_{Q_{0,1}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \leq \log M(\varepsilon/c^*, Q_{0,1}) \lesssim \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^{-2(p-1)}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.7. Take $\varepsilon \asymp \sigma^{1/p}$, noting that this satisfies $\frac{1}{n^{1/2p}} \lesssim \varepsilon \lesssim 1$ by our assumption on σ . Then we can verify that $\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \asymp \sigma^{\frac{-2(p-1)}{p}} \asymp \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ using (3.3).

Thus $\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \asymp \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ using (3.3). Note that the minimum with 1 is needed as if $\sigma^{1/p}$ is larger than the diameter of K then the logarithm of local metric entropy becomes 0. Thus when $\varepsilon \asymp \sigma^{1/p}$, there exists absolute constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that $\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq C_2 \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ and $\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \geq C_1 \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$. Let us now show that this implies $\varepsilon^* \asymp \sigma^{1/p}$.

First, take $C > \max(1, \sqrt{C_2})$. Then by the non-increasing property of the metric entropy [Neykov, 2022, Lemma II.8], we have

$$\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \leq C_2 \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \leq C^2 \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/C),$$

which rearranges to $(\varepsilon/C)^2/\sigma^2 \leq \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/C)$. By definition as a supremum, we have $\varepsilon^* \geq \varepsilon/C$.

Then take $0 < C' < \min(1, \sqrt{C_1})$. Then by the non-increasing property of the metric entropy, we have

$$\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2 \geq C_1 \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \geq (C')^2 \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/C'),$$

which rearranges to $(\varepsilon/C')^2/\sigma^2 > \log M_{Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}}}^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon/C')$. By definition, we have $\varepsilon^* \leq \varepsilon/C'$. Thus, $\varepsilon^* \asymp \sigma^{1/p}$, and the minimax rate is given by $\varepsilon^{*2} \asymp \sigma^{2/p}$.

We now upper bound ε_K . Observe that $Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}} \subseteq B_2(2)$. Set $K = Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}} \cap B_2(2)$, and then using Remark 2.8 and Han et al. [2019, Proposition 5] (using $B_2(2)$ in place of $B_2(1)$ simply scales the result), for $\sigma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ we have

$$\varepsilon_K \lesssim \sqrt{\sigma \cdot w(K)} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot w(K)} \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot n^{1/2-1/p} \cdot \log^4(n)} = \sigma^{1/p} \log^2 n.$$

□

Lemma C.1. *Let $a > 0$ and consider $K = [-a, a]$. Then the estimator defined in Neykov [2022] is the projection $\Pi_K Y$, which is the constrained least squares estimator.*

Proof. First, observe that when $Y \in K$ and K is bounded, the estimator ν^* from Neykov [2022] will output Y . This can be seen from the proof of Lemma V.2 of Neykov [2022], where it is shown ν^* will be within distance $6(C+1)\|Y - \Pi_K Y\|_2$ from the projection $\Pi_K Y$. But in this case, $\Pi_K Y = Y$, so $\nu^* = \Pi_K Y = Y$.

Suppose $Y \notin [-a, a]$, and suppose without loss of generality that $Y > a$. Let ν_0 be an arbitrary point in K that starts the algorithm of Neykov [2022] and let c be the constant appearing in the local metric entropy. Let ν_k denote the k th update. We claim for each k , $|\nu_k - a| \leq d/2^k$ where $d = 2a$ is the diameter of K . This will prove that $\nu_k \rightarrow a$. We proceed by induction. For $k = 1$, observe that we form a d/c -packing of $B(\nu_0, d) \cap K = K$, and the first update ν_1 is the point closest to Y , and therefore to a . Since we form a (d/c) -maximal packing of K , this also implies a (d/c) -covering of K by the packing set points, so we must have $|\nu_1 - a| \leq d/c \leq d/2^1$, verifying the base case. Now suppose $|\nu_k - a| \leq d/2^k$ holds for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. To obtain ν_{k+1} , we form a $d/(2^k c)$ -packing of $B(\nu_k, d/2^k) \cap K$. Then ν_{k+1} will be the point closest to Y , and therefore a . Because $|\nu_k - a| \leq d/2^k$, we know $a \in B(\nu_k, d/2^k) \cap K$. Thus, a is within distance $d/(2^k c) \leq d/2^{k+1}$ of one of the points in the maximal packing set of $B(\nu_k, d/2^k) \cap K$, in particular ν_{k+1} . This completes the induction. □

Proof of Lemma 3.8. First, we show that $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 \lesssim (k+1)\sigma^2 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2$. It is trivial that

$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2$, and using the definition of k ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 + \sum_{i=n-k}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} a_i^2 + \sum_{i=n-k}^n \sigma^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} a_i^2 + (k+1)\sigma^2 \leq 2(k+2)\sigma^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 \lesssim (k+1)\sigma^2 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2$.

Now we show $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 \geq (k+1)\sigma^2 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2$. We consider two cases. First, suppose $a_{n-k}^2 < \sigma^2$. Then by ordering of the a_i and definition of k , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} a_i^2 \geq (k+1)\sigma^2 \gtrsim (k+1)\sigma^2 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2.$$

On the other hand, if $a_{n-k} \geq \sigma^2$ then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 \geq \sum_{i=n-k}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2 = (k+1)\sigma^2 \geq (k+1)\sigma^2 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2.$$

Thus, we have a lower bound on $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2 \wedge \sigma^2$ in both cases, so combined with our earlier upper bound, we obtain our claim. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.9. It is known [Section III.D [Neykov, 2022](#), e.g.] that the global entropy satisfies

$$\log M(\varepsilon, K) \asymp \begin{cases} \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2} & \varepsilon \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{n} \\ n & \varepsilon \asymp 1/\sqrt{n} \\ n \log \frac{1}{n\varepsilon^2} & \varepsilon \lesssim 1/\sqrt{n}. \end{cases}$$

Recall also the earlier result (3.1) which is due to [Yang and Barron \[1999\]](#). In the $\varepsilon \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{n}$ case, we assume $\varepsilon \geq c^{*2}/\sqrt{n}$, so that $\log(\varepsilon^2 n)/2 \log(c^{*2}) \geq 1$. From the global entropy result stated above, since both ε and ε/c^* are $\gtrsim 1/\sqrt{n}$, there exist absolute constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\log M(\varepsilon, K) \leq \log M(\varepsilon/c^*, K) \leq c_1 \cdot \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2}, \quad \log M(\varepsilon/c^*, K) \geq c_2 \cdot \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n/c^{*2})}{\varepsilon^2/c^{*2}}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Suppose c^* is taken sufficiently large such that $c_2 c^{*2}/2 > c_1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \log M(\varepsilon/c^*, K) - \log M(\varepsilon, K) &\geq c_2 \cdot \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n/c^{*2})}{\varepsilon^2/c^{*2}} - c_1 \cdot \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2} \\ &= (c_2 c^{*2} - c_1) \cdot \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2} - c_2 c^{*2} \cdot \frac{\log(c^{*2})}{\varepsilon^2} \\ &\geq (c_2 c^{*2} - c_1) \cdot \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2} - \frac{c_2 c^{*2} \log(c^{*2})}{\varepsilon^2} \cdot \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{2 \log(c^{*2})} \\ &= (c_2 c^{*2}/2 - c_1) \cdot \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (3.1),

$$(c_2 c^{*2}/2 - c_1) \cdot \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2} \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \leq \log M(\varepsilon/c^*, K) \lesssim \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Thus, $\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \asymp \frac{\log(\varepsilon^2 n)}{\varepsilon^2}$ when $\varepsilon \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{n}$ for a sufficiently large constant and with c^* chosen appropriately large.

Next, consider the case where $\varepsilon \leq c^{*2}/\sqrt{n}$, i.e., $\varepsilon \asymp 1/\sqrt{n}$ or $\varepsilon \lesssim 1/\sqrt{n}$. case. Since $\eta \mapsto \log M^{\text{loc}}(\eta)$ is non-increasing, we know

$$n \gtrsim \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon) \geq \log M^{\text{loc}}(c^{*2}/\sqrt{n}) \asymp \frac{\log((c^{*2}/\sqrt{n})^2 \cdot n)}{(c^{*2}/\sqrt{n})^2} \asymp n.$$

The first inequality was proven in Case 2 of the proof of Corollary 2.12. \square

C.2 Proofs for Section 3.2

Proof of Lemma 3.11. Consider the balls $B(0, \|v\|_2/2)$ and $B(v, \|v\|_2/2)$. We have $w(B(0, \|v\|_2/2) \cap P) \geq w(K)$ because $K \subseteq B(0, \|v\|_2/2) \cap P$: for any $k \in K$, using symmetry we have

$$\|k\|_2 = \frac{1}{2}\|k - (-k)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{diam}(K) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|v\|_2.$$

On the other hand, we can show that $B(v, \|v\|_2/2) \cap P$ is contained in the set $Q = \cup_{\beta \in [0,1]} [\beta v + (1-\beta)(v/2 + K/2)]$. To see this, suppose $x \in B(v, \|v\|_2/2) \cap P$. Then $x = \alpha v + (1-\alpha)k$ for some $k \in K$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and must satisfy $\|x - v\|_2 \leq \|v\|_2/2$. This implies

$$0 < (1-\alpha)\|v - k\|_2 = \|x - v\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\|v\|_2.$$

Since $\|v - k\|_2 = \sqrt{\|v\|_2^2 + \|k\|_2^2}$ by the Pythagorean theorem and orthogonality of v to K , we can show $1-\alpha \leq 1/2$, i.e., $\alpha \geq 1/2$, since

$$(1-\alpha)^2 \leq \frac{\|v\|_2^2}{4\|v - k\|_2^2} = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{\|v\|_2^2}{\|v\|_2^2 + \|k\|_2^2} \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Now take $\beta = 2(\alpha - 1/2) \in [0, 1]$, and write

$$x = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\beta}{2}\right)v + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\beta}{2}\right)k = \beta v + (1-\beta)\left(\frac{v}{2} + \frac{k}{2}\right) \in Q.$$

Therefore $w(Q) \geq w(B(v, \|v\|_2/2) \cap P)$

For any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, define $a_+ = \max(0, a)$. Then we compute

$$\begin{aligned} w(Q) &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{q \in Q} \langle \xi, q \rangle = \mathbb{E} \sup_{\beta \in [0,1], k \in K} \langle \xi, \beta v + (1-\beta)(v/2 + k/2) \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\beta \in [0,1]} \beta \langle \xi, v/2 \rangle + \langle \xi, v/2 \rangle + (1-\beta) \sup_{k \in K} \langle \xi, k/2 \rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\beta \in [0,1]} \beta \langle \xi, v/2 \rangle + (1-\beta) \sup_{k \in K} \langle \xi, k/2 \rangle \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{k \in K} \langle \xi, k/2 \rangle \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\beta \in [0,1]} \beta \langle \xi, v/2 \rangle - \beta \sup_{k \in K} \langle \xi, k/2 \rangle \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}w(K) + \mathbb{E} \left[\langle \xi, v/2 \rangle - \sup_{k \in K} \langle \xi, k/2 \rangle \right]_+ \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}w(K) + \mathbb{E}(\langle \xi, v/2 \rangle)_+ \\ &= \frac{1}{2}w(K) + \sqrt{2/\pi} \cdot \|v\|_2/4, \end{aligned}$$

where we evaluated the supremum at $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$ and used that $\sup_{k \in K} \langle \xi, k/2 \rangle \geq 0$ since $0 \in K$. The final line used properties of the rectified Gaussian distribution, proved in, e.g., [Beauchamp \[2018, Appendix A\]](#). Recall we assume $\|v\|_2^2 \lesssim w(K)$. We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} w_v(\|v\|_2/2) &= w(B(v, \|v\|_2/2) \cap P) \leq w(Q) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{2}w(K) + \|v\|_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}w(K) + \sqrt{w(K)}, \end{aligned}$$

noting our use of $w(K) \geq 1$ in the final line.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(\|v\|_2/2) - w_v(\|v\|_2/2) &\geq w(K) - w_v(\|v\|_2/2) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}w(K) - \sqrt{w(K)} \end{aligned}$$

So if $w(K)$ is sufficiently big, then $w_0(\|v\|_2/2) - w_v(\|v\|_2/2) \gtrsim w(K)$.

Hence we have for constants κ, C that

$$w_0(\|v\|_2/2) - w_v(\|v\|_2/2) \geq \kappa w(K) \geq C\|v\|_2^2.$$

Then recalling the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ in [Theorem 2.16](#) (take $\varepsilon = \|v\|_2/2$, $\nu_1 = v$, $\nu_2 = 0$, $c^* = 1$), we obtain $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \|v\|_2$. This implies for sufficiently large c (so that $\bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim 1 = \sigma$) that $\varepsilon_P \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon} \gtrsim \|v\|_2$. \square

Lemma C.2. *Set $K = Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ where $n^{1/p} \in \mathbb{N}$ for simplicity. Then for $0 < t < 1$, $w_{K,0}(t) \gtrsim tn^{1/2-1/p}$.*

Proof of Lemma C.2. By definition $w_{K,0}(t) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)} \sup_{q \in Q_{a,b} \cap B(0,t)} \langle \xi, q \rangle$ where $a = -b = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$. As in [Han et al. \[2019, Proposition 5\]](#), define $W = \{l \in \mathbb{L}_{p,n} : \sum_{j=1}^p [l]_j = 1\}$, $W^+ = \{l \in \mathbb{L}_{p,n} : \sum_{j=1}^p [l]_j > 1\}$, and $W^- = \{l \in \mathbb{L}_{p,n} : \sum_{j=1}^p [l]_j < 1\}$, where $[l]_j$ is the j th component of $l \in \mathbb{L}_{p,n} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$. For any realization of $\xi \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)$, where coordinate i corresponds to $l_i \in \mathbb{L}_{p,n}$, we define $\Theta(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$[\Theta(\xi)]_i = \begin{cases} 1/\sqrt{n} & \text{if } l_i \in W^+ \\ \text{sgn}(\xi_i)/\sqrt{n} & \text{if } l_i \in W \\ -1/\sqrt{n} & \text{if } l_i \in W^-. \end{cases}$$

Observe that $\|\Theta(\xi)\|_2 = 1$, and moreover $\Theta(\xi) \in Q_{a,b}$. Thus, since $t < 1$, we have $t\Theta(\xi) \in Q_{a,b} \cap B(0, t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)} \sup_{q \in Q_{a,b} \cap B(0,t)} \langle \xi, q \rangle &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)} \langle \xi, t\Theta(\xi) \rangle \\ &= \frac{t}{\sqrt{n}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)} \left[\sum_{l_i \in W^+} \xi_i - \sum_{l_i \in W^-} \xi_i + \sum_{l_i \in W} |\xi_i| \right] \\ &= \frac{t\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\pi n}} |W| \end{aligned}$$

The final line took the expectation of the ξ_i or $|\xi_i|$. As stated in Han et al. [2019], $|W| \geq \left(\frac{n^{1/p}-1}{p-1}\right)^{p-1}$, so we obtain

$$w_{K,0}(t) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)} \sup_{q \in Q_{a,b} \cap B(0,t)} \langle \xi, q \rangle \gtrsim \frac{tn^{1/2-1/p}}{(p-1)^{p-1}}.$$

□

Lemma C.3. *Set $K = Q_{-1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{n}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Then for $0 < c, t < 1$, we have $w_{K,0}(ct) \lesssim ctn^{1/2-1/p} \log^4(n)$.*

Proof of Lemma C.3. Observe that the set $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}_{p,n})$ considered in Proposition 5 of Han et al. [2019] is a cone. Hence

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}_{p,n}) \cap B(0, ct) = ct \cdot \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}_{p,n}) \cap B(0, 1).$$

Thus, $w(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}_{p,n}) \cap B(0, ct)) = ct \cdot w(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}_{p,n}) \cap B(0, 1))$. Thus, by Han et al. [2019, Proposition 5], we have

$$w(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}_{p,n}) \cap B(0, ct)) \lesssim ctn^{1/2-1/p} \log^4 n.$$

But $K \cap B(0, ct)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}_{p,n}) \cap B(0, ct)$, so

$$w_{K,0}(ct) \lesssim ctn^{1/2-1/p} \log^4 n.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 3.13. We define 4 sets and relate their Gaussian widths. Let $T_1 = B(0, b/4) \cap K$ and $T_2 = \bigcup_{x \in [0, b/4]} (\{x\} \times B_x)$. Then let $T_3 = B^{n-1}(b/2, f(b/2))$ where B^{n-1} is an $(n-1)$ -dimensional ball in e_1^\perp , which we center at $(b/2)e_1$ with radius $f(b/2)$, and lastly let $T_4 = B^{n-1}(b/2, b/4)$.

First, observe that $T_1 \subseteq T_2$. To see this, note that if $u \in T_1$, then $u \in K$ so that $u \in \{x\} \times B_x$ for some $x \in [0, b]$. This means the first coordinate of u is x . Hence $x \leq \|u\|_2 \leq b/4$ using that $u \in B(0, b/4)$, so indeed $u \in T_2$. Hence $w(T_1) \leq w(T_2)$.

Now let us compute $w(T_2)$. As T_2 is convex, the solution to $\sup_{x \in T_2} \langle x, g \rangle$ will lie on an extreme point of T_2 , i.e., $x = (c \cdot b/4) \cdot e_1 + f(c \cdot b/4) \cdot u$ for some $c \in [0, 1]$ and unit vector $u \in e_1^\perp$. Thus, letting $y_+ := \max(0, y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w(T_2) &= \mathbb{E}_g \sup_{x \in T_2} \langle x, g \rangle = \mathbb{E}_g \sup_{\substack{c \in [0, 1] \\ u \in e_1^\perp, \|u\|_2=1}} \langle (c \cdot b/4) \cdot e_1 + f(c \cdot b/4) \cdot u, g \rangle \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_g \sup_{u \in e_1^\perp, \|u\|_2=1} [(b/4) \langle e_1, g \rangle_+ + f(b/4) \langle u, g \rangle_+] \\ &\leq (b/4) \cdot \mathbb{E}_g \langle e_1, g \rangle_+ + f(b/4) \cdot \mathbb{E}_g \sup_{u \in e_1^\perp, \|u\|_2=1} \langle u, g \rangle_+ \\ &\leq \frac{b}{4\sqrt{2\pi}} + f(b/4)\sqrt{n-1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{n-1} \cdot f(b/2). \end{aligned}$$

In the fourth line, we note that $\sup_{u \in e_1^\perp, \|u\|_2=1} \langle u, g \rangle_+$ is achieved with $u = g^{-1}/\|g_{-1}\|$, where g^{-1} is the random vector in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} obtained from removing the first coordinate of g . Hence

$\mathbb{E}_g \sup_{u \in e_1^\perp, \|u\|_2=1} \langle u, g \rangle_+ = \mathbb{E}_g \|g_{-1}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n-1}$. In the same line, we also used that $\mathbb{E}_g \langle e_1, g \rangle_+ = \mathbb{E} \max(0, g_1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$ [see [Beauchamp, 2018](#), Appendix A]. The final inequality was from our assumption about the secant line.

Proceeding to T_3 , note this set has width $\sqrt{n-1} \cdot f(b/2)$ up to constants by [Vershynin \[2018, Example 7.5.7\]](#). Note that $T_3 \subset T_4$ since $b/4 > f(b/2)$. Putting our results together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w_{K,0}(b/4) &= w(T_1) \leq w(T_2) \leq \frac{b}{4\sqrt{2\pi}} + f(b/4)\sqrt{n-1} \\ &\leq \sqrt{n-1} \cdot f(b/2) \lesssim w(T_3) \leq w(T_4) = w_{K,b/2 \cdot e_1}(b/4). \end{aligned}$$

The final inequality used the fact that T_4 and $\{(b/2)e_1\} \times T_4$ have the same Gaussian width. This means

$$w_{K,b/2 \cdot e_1}(b/4) - w_{K,0}(b/4) \geq \sqrt{n-1} \cdot f(b/2) - \left(\frac{b}{4\sqrt{2\pi}} + f(b/4)\sqrt{n-1} \right).$$

For sufficiently large n and any constant $\bar{C} > 0$, we have

$$f(b/2) \cdot \sqrt{n-1} - \frac{b}{4\sqrt{2\pi}} - f(b/4) \cdot \sqrt{n-1} \geq \bar{C}b^2,$$

e.g., take $n \geq 1 + \left(\frac{\bar{C}b^2 + b/(4\sqrt{2\pi})}{f(b/2) - f(b/4)} \right)^2$. This implies $w_{K,b/2 \cdot e_1}(b/4) - w_{K,0}(b/4) \geq \bar{C}b^2$. Take $\sigma = 1$. Now consider the inequality defining $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ in [Theorem 2.19](#). Taking $\nu_1 = b/2 \cdot e_1$, $\nu_2 = 0$, and $\varepsilon = bc^*/4$, we can show that ε satisfies the condition in the definition of $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$, hence $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \geq \varepsilon \asymp b$. Noting that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim b \gtrsim \sigma$, we conclude $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim \bar{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim b$ by the theorem. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.14. We first show that if $\sigma \gtrsim d^2/w(K)$, then for all $y \in K$, we have $w_y(\varepsilon_y) \gtrsim w(K)$, where $\varepsilon_y = \operatorname{argmax}_\varepsilon [\sigma w_y(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^2/2]$. By Jung's theorem, setting $\kappa_n = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2(n+1)}} \asymp 1$, for some $\mu \in K$ we have $K \subset B(\mu, d \cdot \kappa_n)$. Using our Lipschitz result⁴ (2.4) and the fact that $\|y - \mu\| \leq d \cdot \kappa_n$, we have

$$w_y(d \cdot \kappa_n) \geq \frac{w_\mu(d \cdot \kappa_n)}{\|y - \mu\|/(d \cdot \kappa_n) + 1} \geq \frac{w_\mu(d \cdot \kappa_n)}{2} = w(K)/2.$$

Then by definition of ε_y we have

$$w_y(\varepsilon_y) - \varepsilon_y^2/2\sigma \geq w_y(d \cdot \kappa_n) - (d \cdot \kappa_n)^2/2\sigma \geq w(K)/2 - (d \cdot \kappa_n)^2/2\sigma.$$

Hence, for $\sigma \gtrsim d^2/w(K)$ we have $w_y(\varepsilon_y) \gtrsim w(K)$.

Next, recall we picked an $x \in \operatorname{bd} K$ that minimizes $\|\nabla G(x)\|_2$ and its associated x^* . We will now upper bound $w_x(\varepsilon_x)$, i.e., $\mathbb{E} \sup_{y \in K \cap B(x, \varepsilon_x)} \langle \xi, y \rangle = \mathbb{E} \sup_{y \in K \cap B(x, \varepsilon_x)} \langle \xi, y - x \rangle = \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in K'} \langle \xi, z \rangle$ where $K' = \{z : z + x \in K, \|z\| \leq \varepsilon_x\}$. Now write $\xi = \sum_i \alpha_i \mu_i$ and $z = \sum_i \alpha'_i \mu_i$ where μ_i are the normalized eigenvectors of $\widetilde{M}/2$. Recalling (3.7), observe that K' is a subset of $K'' = \{z : \|z\| \leq \varepsilon_x, -\langle x^*, z \rangle \geq z^T \widetilde{M} z / 2\}$. Thus, indexing K'' by α' in the supremum and using Cauchy-Schwarz, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_x(\varepsilon_x) &= \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in K'} \langle \xi, z \rangle \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{z \in K''} \langle \xi, z \rangle = \mathbb{E}_\xi \sup_{\alpha'} \sum_i \alpha_i \alpha'_i \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_\xi \sup_{\alpha'} \sqrt{\sum \alpha_i'^2 \lambda_i} \sqrt{\sum \alpha_i^2 / \lambda_i} \leq \sup_{\alpha'} \sqrt{\sum \alpha_i'^2 \lambda_i} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \sum \alpha_i^2 / \lambda_i}. \end{aligned}$$

⁴This can be rearranged to the form $w_\nu(\varepsilon) \geq \frac{w_\mu(\varepsilon)}{1 + \|\mu - \nu\|/\varepsilon}$.

Since $\mathbb{E}_\xi \alpha_i^2 = 1$ as the α_i are standard Gaussian random variables, we have

$$w_x(\varepsilon_x) \leq \sup_{\alpha'} \sqrt{\sum \alpha_i'^2 \lambda_i} \sqrt{\sum 1/\lambda_i}.$$

On the other hand $-\langle x^*, z \rangle \geq z^T \tilde{M} z / 2$ is equivalent to $\sum \alpha_i'^2 \lambda_i \leq -\sum \alpha_i' \langle \mu_i, x^* \rangle$, while $\|z\| \leq \varepsilon_x$ is equivalent to $\sum \alpha_i'^2 \leq \varepsilon_x^2$. Thus by another application of Cauchy-Schwarz we get

$$\begin{aligned} w_x(\varepsilon_x) &\leq \sup_{\alpha'} \sqrt{-\sum \alpha_i' \langle \mu_i, x^* \rangle} \sqrt{\sum 1/\lambda_i} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sqrt{\sum \alpha_i'^2} \sqrt{\sum \langle \mu_i, x^* \rangle^2}} \sqrt{\sum 1/\lambda_i} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\varepsilon_x} \sqrt{\sum 1/\lambda_i}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows $w(K) \lesssim w_x(\varepsilon_x) \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon_x} \sqrt{\sum 1/\lambda_i}$ provided $\sigma \gtrsim d^2/(w(K))$, and therefore that $\varepsilon_x \gtrsim w^2(K)/\sum(1/\lambda_i)$. So taking the supremum over $x \in K$, we have $\overline{\varepsilon_K}(\sigma) \gtrsim w^2(K)/\sum(1/\lambda_i)$ for $\sigma \gtrsim d^2/(w(K))$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.15. In Remark 2.18, we found for each $\mu, \nu \in K$ that $|w_\mu(\varepsilon) - w_\nu(\varepsilon)| \leq \|\mu - \nu\| \cdot \frac{w_\mu(\varepsilon) \wedge w_\nu(\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}$. Specializing to $\mu = 0$, we obtain $w_\nu(\varepsilon) \geq w_0(\varepsilon)/(\|\nu\|/\varepsilon + 1)$. Now pick $\nu = (0, \dots, 1/d_{n-k}, 0, \dots, 0)$, where all but coordinate $n-k$ is zero. Set $\delta = 1/d_{n-k}$, and set $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_\nu$ as defined in (2.1). Then we have $w_\nu(\delta) \geq w_0(\delta)/2$. Hence by taking $\sigma \gtrsim \frac{\delta^2}{w_0(\delta)}$ we obtain

$$w_\nu(\varepsilon_\nu) - \varepsilon_\nu^2/(2\sigma) \geq w_\nu(\delta) - \delta^2/(2\sigma) \geq w_0(\delta)/2 - \delta^2/(2\sigma) \gtrsim w_0(\delta).$$

For such σ , we have

$$w_\nu(\varepsilon_\nu) \gtrsim w_0(\delta). \tag{C.2}$$

Now we will attempt to control $w_\nu(\varepsilon_\nu)$ from above following a similar logic to before.

We need to calculate $\mathbb{E} \sup_{y \in K'} \langle \xi, y \rangle = \mathbb{E} \sup_{y \in K'} \langle \xi, y - \nu \rangle$ for $K' = \{y \in K : \|\nu - y\| \leq \varepsilon_\nu\}$. Using (3.6) we can verify that K' is a subset of

$$B(\nu, \varepsilon_\nu) \cap \{y \in K : \langle x^*, \nu - y \rangle \geq (\nu - y)^T \tilde{M} (\nu - y) / 2\},$$

where $x^* = \frac{\nabla G(\nu)}{\|\nabla G(\nu)\|}$ with $G(\nu) = \|D\nu\|_2^2$ and $\tilde{M} = 2D^2/\|\nabla G(\nu)\|$. Note $\nabla G(\nu) = 2D^2\nu = (0, 0, \dots, 2d_{n-k}, 0, \dots, 0)$, $x^* = (0, 0, \dots, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$, and $\tilde{M}/2$ is the diagonal matrix with element $d_i^2/(2d_{n-k})$ in entry (i, i) .

Let $y - \nu = z$. We need to optimize $\langle \xi, z \rangle$ given that $\|z\| \leq \varepsilon_\nu$, $-\langle x^*, z \rangle \geq z^T \tilde{M} z / 2$. We have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_z \langle \xi, z \rangle = \mathbb{E} \sup_z \left[\sum_{i=n-k}^n \xi_i z_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \xi_i z_i \right] \leq \varepsilon_\nu \sqrt{k+1} + \mathbb{E} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \xi_i^2 / \lambda_i} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} z_i^2 \lambda_i},$$

where $\lambda_i = d_i^2/(2d_{n-k})$. Bringing the expectation inside the square root, and noticing that $\mathbb{E}\xi_i^2 = 1$ we get

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_z \langle \xi, z \rangle \leq \varepsilon_\nu \sqrt{k+1} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \frac{2d_{n-k}}{d_i^2}} \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} z_i^2 \lambda_i}.$$

Now

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} z_i^2 \lambda_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n z_i^2 \lambda_i = z^T (\tilde{M}/2) z \leq -2 \langle x^*, z \rangle \leq 2\varepsilon_\nu.$$

Hence we conclude

$$w_0(\delta) \lesssim w_\nu(\varepsilon_\nu) \leq \mathbb{E} \sup_z \langle \xi, z \rangle \leq \varepsilon_\nu \sqrt{k+1} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \frac{2d_{n-k}}{d_i^2}} \cdot \sqrt{2\varepsilon_\nu}. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Now we note several facts. The set $B(0, \delta) \cap K$ is all x such that $\|Dx\|_2 \leq 1$, and $\|x\| \leq \delta$. Note that if $\|D'x\| \leq 1$ then $\|Dx\|_2 \leq 1$, where $d'_i = d_i$ for $i \leq n-k-1$ and $d'_i = 1/\delta$ for $i \geq n-k$. Moreover, $\|D'x\| \leq 1$ implies $\|x\| \leq \delta$. Thus using [Wainwright \[2019, Exercise 5.9\]](#) to compute the Gaussian width, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(\delta) &= w(B(0, \delta) \cap K) \geq w(\{x : \|D'x\| \leq 1\}) \gtrsim \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{d_i'^2}} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \frac{1}{d_i^2} + \sum_{i=n-k}^n \delta^2} \\ &\gtrsim \delta \cdot \sqrt{k+1} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \frac{1}{d_i^2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

where in the last step we used that $\sqrt{a+b} \geq (\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b})/\sqrt{2}$ for $a, b \geq 0$.

Combining this result with our upper bound on $w_0(\delta)$ from (C.3), we conclude

$$\varepsilon_\nu \sqrt{k+1} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \frac{2d_{n-k}}{d_i^2}} \cdot \sqrt{2\varepsilon_\nu} \gtrsim \delta \cdot \sqrt{k+1} + \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \frac{1}{d_i^2}}.$$

From the above we have that either $\varepsilon_\nu \sqrt{k+1} \gtrsim \delta \sqrt{k+1}$ or $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \frac{2d_{n-k}}{d_i^2}} \cdot \sqrt{2\varepsilon_\nu} \gtrsim \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \frac{1}{d_i^2}}$; in the first case, we conclude that $\varepsilon_\nu \gtrsim \delta$; in the second case we obtain $2\varepsilon_\nu \gtrsim (1/2d_{n-k}) \asymp \delta$. This proves the first claim.

Next, suppose the LSE is minimal optimal for K for all σ . Take $\sigma \asymp \delta^2/w_0(\delta)$. First, suppose $\delta \gtrsim \sigma$ for a sufficiently large constant, which means $\varepsilon_\nu \gtrsim \sigma$. Thus by [Lemma 2.1](#) we have that $\mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \nu\|_2^2 \gtrsim \varepsilon_\nu^2$.

Using (1.2), observe that the minimax rate ε^* for this value of σ satisfies

$$\varepsilon^{*2} \delta^{-4} w_0^2(\delta) \asymp \varepsilon^{*2} / \sigma^2 \lesssim \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon^*). \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Furthermore, if the LSE is minimax optimal, we have $\varepsilon^{*2} \gtrsim \mathbb{E}\|\hat{\mu} - \nu\|_2^2 \gtrsim \varepsilon_\nu^2 \gtrsim \delta^2 = 1/d_{n-k}^2$. Noting then that $\log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon^*) \leq \log M^{\text{loc}}(c\delta)$ since $\varepsilon \mapsto \log M^{\text{loc}}(\varepsilon)$ is non-increasing. And also $\varepsilon^{*2} \delta^{-4} w_0^2(\delta) \gtrsim \delta^{-2} w_0^2(\delta)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\delta^{-1} w_0(\delta) \lesssim \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(c\delta)},$$

for some absolute constant c .

We now assume $\delta \lesssim \sigma$, i.e., $1/d_{n-k} \lesssim \delta^2/w_0(\delta)$ for a sufficiently large absolute constant. Rearranging, $w_0(\delta)/\delta \lesssim 1 \leq \sqrt{\log M^{\text{loc}}(c\delta)}$ since $\delta \leq d$ for some $c < 1$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.16. Note that if $\sigma \gtrsim d$, then by Lemma 1.4 the minimax rate satisfies $\varepsilon^* \gtrsim d$ which implies the LSE satisfies $\varepsilon_K \gtrsim d$. Now consider the case where $\sigma \lesssim d$.

We fix $c > 4$, $\kappa \in (1/c, 1 - 2/c)$, and pick any ε such that $d \lesssim \varepsilon \lesssim (d/2) \wedge \frac{d}{2(\kappa+1/c)}$. Take a point $\mu \in K$ which is a midpoint of a diameter. Pick $\nu', \nu'' \in K$ such that $\|\mu - \nu'\| = \|\mu - \nu''\| = \kappa\varepsilon < d/2$ and $\mu = \frac{\nu' + \nu''}{2}$. Note that $\|\nu' - \nu''\| = 2\kappa\varepsilon$. Define for some fixed $\xi \sim N(0, \mathbb{I}_n)$ the points

$$u' = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in B(\nu', \varepsilon/c) \cap K} \langle \xi, x \rangle, \quad u'' = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in B(\nu'', \varepsilon/c) \cap K} \langle \xi, x \rangle$$

in K . Take $\lambda = 1/2$ and apply strong convexity to u', u'' to conclude $B((u' + u'')/2, k\|u' - u''\|_2^2/4) \subset K$. Then we use the definition of u', u'' as belonging to a ball of radius ε/c centered at ν', ν'' with repeated applications of the triangle inequality to obtain

$$2\kappa\varepsilon + 2\varepsilon/c \geq \overbrace{\|\nu' - \nu''\|}^{=2\kappa\varepsilon} + \overbrace{\|u' - \nu'\|}^{\leq \varepsilon/c} + \overbrace{\|u'' - \nu''\|}^{\leq \varepsilon/c} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \|\nu' - \nu''\| + \|u' - \nu'\| + \|u'' - \nu''\| \\ &= \|u' - u''\| \\ &\geq \|\nu' - \nu''\| - \|\nu' - u'\| - \|u'' - \nu''\| \\ &\geq 2\varepsilon\kappa - 2\varepsilon/c. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Consider the point $u = (u' + u'')/2 + (\xi/\|\xi\|) \cdot k\|u' - u''\|_2^2/4$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - \mu\| &\leq 1/2\|u' - \nu'\| + 1/2\|u'' - \nu''\| + k\|u' - u''\|_2^2/4 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \varepsilon/c + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \varepsilon/c + k(\varepsilon\kappa + \varepsilon/c)^2 \\ &= \varepsilon/c + k(\varepsilon\kappa + \varepsilon/c)^2 \\ &\leq \varepsilon/c + 2d^{-1}(\varepsilon\kappa + \varepsilon/c)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The first line used the triangle inequality and that $\mu = \frac{\nu' + \nu''}{2}$. The second line used the definition of u', u'' as belonging to a ball of radius ε/c centered at ν', ν'' , respectively, along with our result from (C.6). The final line used $k < 2d^{-1}$. Since $\varepsilon < \frac{d}{2(\kappa+1/c)}$ and $\kappa + 2/c < 1$, we have $\|u - \mu\| < 2\varepsilon/c + \kappa\varepsilon < \varepsilon$. Hence $u \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K$.

Then using that $u \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K$ along with (C.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{x \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} \langle \xi, x \rangle &\geq \langle \xi, u \rangle = \langle \xi, (u' + u'')/2 \rangle + k\|\xi\|\|u' - u''\|_2^2/4 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}\langle \xi, u' \rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle \xi, u'' \rangle + k\|\xi\|(\varepsilon\kappa - \varepsilon/c)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation with respect to ξ we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_\mu(\varepsilon) &\geq 1/2 \cdot w_{\nu'}(\varepsilon/c) + 1/2 \cdot w_{\nu''}(\varepsilon/c) + \mathbb{E}\|\xi\|k(\varepsilon\kappa - \varepsilon/c)^2 \\ &\gtrsim \inf_{x \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} w_x(\varepsilon/c) + \sqrt{n}k\varepsilon^2(\kappa - 1/c)^2. \end{aligned}$$

We used the fact that $\|\nu' - \mu\|, \|\nu'' - \mu\| \leq \varepsilon$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\xi\| \gtrsim \sqrt{n}$ (see [Chandrasekaran et al. \[2012, Section 3.1\]](#)).

Now assume $\sigma \asymp (k\sqrt{n})^{-1}$ which implies $\sigma \gtrsim d/\sqrt{n}$ since $k < 4d^{-1}$. This implies

$$w_\mu(\varepsilon) \gtrsim \inf_{x \in B(\mu, \varepsilon) \cap K} w_x(\varepsilon/c) + \overline{C}\varepsilon^2/2\sigma$$

for some constant $\overline{C} > 0$. Then by definition of $\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma)$ in [Theorem 2.15](#) we conclude $\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \varepsilon \asymp d$. As we have $d \gtrsim \sigma$, we have $\overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim \sigma$ which by [Theorem 2.15](#) implies $\varepsilon_K(\sigma) \gtrsim \overline{\varepsilon}(\sigma) \gtrsim d$. \square