

# The Effective Number of Parameters in Kernel Density Estimation

Sofia Guglielmini\*    Igor Volobouev†    A. Alexandre Trindade‡

June 21, 2024

## Abstract

The quest for a formula that satisfactorily measures the effective degrees of freedom in kernel density estimation (KDE) is a long standing problem with few solutions. Starting from the orthogonal polynomial sequence (OPS) expansion for the ratio of the empirical to the oracle density, we show how convolution with the kernel leads to a new OPS with respect to which one may express the resulting KDE. The expansion coefficients of the two OPS systems can then be related via a kernel sensitivity matrix, and this then naturally leads to a definition of effective parameters by taking the trace of a symmetrized positive semi-definite normalized version. The resulting effective degrees of freedom (EDoF) formula is an oracle-based quantity; the first ever proposed in the literature. Asymptotic properties of the empirical EDoF are worked out through influence functions. Numerical investigations confirm the theoretical insights.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $F(x)$  and  $f(x)$  be respectively the cumulative distribution and density functions of the continuous random variable  $X$ , supported on the interval  $[a, b]$ . (Although we allow  $a$  and  $b$  to be infinite in the general problem formulation, some results will require a compact support.) Kernel-based methods essentially smooth  $f(x)$  according to a chosen kernel  $K(x, y)$ , resulting in

$$f_K(y) = \int K(x, y)f(x)dx = \mathbb{E}K(X, y). \quad (1)$$

---

\*KU Leuven, Faculty of Economics and Business, Naamsestraat 69, 3000 Leuven, Belgium, sofia.guglielmini@kuleuven.be

†Texas Tech University, Department of Department of Physics and Astronomy, Lubbock TX 79409-1042, U.S.A., i.volobouev@ttu.edu

‡Texas Tech University, Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Lubbock TX 79409-1042, U.S.A., alex.trindade@ttu.edu

Given an independent and identically distributed (iid) sample  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  from  $X$ , kernel density estimation (KDE) (Scott, 2015) involves replacing the oracle density with the empirical in (1):

$$\hat{f}(y) = \int K(x, y)\rho(x)dx = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K(x_i, y), \quad (2)$$

where  $\rho(x)$  is the empirical density expressed in terms of the Dirac delta function:

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta(x - x_i). \quad (3)$$

We take  $K(x, y)$  to be a generalized kernel, not necessarily of the *convolution* type

$$K_h(x, y) = \frac{1}{h} K\left(\frac{y-x}{h}\right) := K_h(y-x), \quad (4)$$

adding the subscript  $h$  when it is desirable to emphasize its dependence on the bandwidth tuning parameter  $h$ . We require the kernel to possess a few essential properties.

P1: *Normalization.*  $\int K(x, y)dy = 1$  for every  $x$  (so that  $\hat{f}(y)$  is normalized).

P2: *Finite displacement.* for any function  $g(x)$  supported on a finite interval  $[a, b]$ , the function  $g_K(y) \equiv \int K(x, y)g(x)dx$  is supported on some interval  $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}]$  which is also finite.

The following less essential properties may also be useful and/or desirable.

P3: *Non-negativity:*  $K(x, y) \geq 0$  for every  $x$  and  $y$ . This ensures that the smoothed density is non-negative.

P4: *Double stochasticity:*  $\int K(x, y)dx = \int K(x, z)dx$  for every  $y$  and  $z$ . This ensures that the uniform density remains uniform when smoothed.

P5: *Bona fide smoother:* for any probability density  $g(x)$ , the entropy of  $g_K(y)$  is not decreasing in comparison with the entropy of  $g(x)$ . It would be interesting to understand in detail what kind of restrictions this property imposes.

The aim of this paper is to devise an expression for the *effective degrees of freedom* (EDoF) in such kernel-based density estimation procedures.

## 2 Effective Degrees of Freedom: Oracle Version

As in the Introduction, let  $f(x)$  be the (oracle) density of  $X$  supported on the interval  $[a, b]$ . The essence of our idea to devise an expression for EDoF, is to introduce an

orthogonal polynomial sequence (OPS)  $\{P_j, j = 0, 1, \dots\}$ , that is orthonormal with respect to a weight function comprised of  $f(x)$  itself. This leads to the representation:

$$\int_a^b P_k(x)P_j(x)f(x)dx = \delta_{kj}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\delta_{jk}$  denotes the Kronecker delta. Note that  $P_0(x) = 1$  and  $P_j(x)$  is of degree  $j$  (Gautschi, 2004). According to the Weierstrass approximation theorem, the OPS defined by (5) represents a complete basis for all continuous square-integrable functions on  $[a, b]$ . For unbounded intervals, the OPS can usually be constructed if all moments are finite, but the completeness property may or may not hold; see Simon (2010) for a detailed exposition. To ensure completeness, we restrict attention to compact intervals.

Expanding the ratio of the empirical density function to the oracle density in terms of the OPS, we can formally write

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta(x - x_i) = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k P_k(x) \right) f(x), \quad (6)$$

where the expansion coefficients are obtained from

$$c_j = \int_a^b \rho(x)P_j(x)dx = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n P_j(x_i), \quad (7)$$

and it can be shown straightforwardly that

$$\mathbb{E}(c_j) = \delta_{j0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Cov}(c_k, c_j) = \frac{\delta_{kj} - \delta_{k0}\delta_{j0}}{n}. \quad (8)$$

Note that from (2) we can now write

$$\hat{f}(y) = \int K(x, y)\rho(x)dx = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \int_a^b K(x, y)P_k(x)f(x)dx,$$

yielding an OPS expansion for the KDE in terms of random zero-mean and uncorrelated coefficients (for  $k \geq 1$  since  $c_0 = 1$ ).

At this point introduce an OPS with the weight  $f_K(y)$  defined by (1). Assuming that  $f_K(y)$  is supported on the interval  $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}]$ , the polynomials  $\{Q_j\}$  in this sequence are once again defined by the orthonormality property

$$\int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} Q_k(y)Q_j(y)f_K(y)dy = \delta_{kj}, \quad (9)$$

with  $Q_0(y) = 1$ . In a similar fashion to what was done above, we can now expand (2) in terms of this sequence:

$$\hat{f}(y) = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k Q_k(y) \right) f_K(y). \quad (10)$$

The coefficients  $b_k$  for  $k \geq 1$  (since  $b_0 = 1$ ) represent the *degrees of freedom* of  $\hat{f}(y)$ , and are given by

$$b_j = \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} Q_j(y) \hat{f}(y) dy = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k s_{jk}, \quad (11)$$

where the  $s_{jk}$  are the  $(j, k)$  elements of the *kernel sensitivity matrix*  $S$ , defined as:

$$s_{jk} = \int_a^b \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} K(x, y) Q_j(y) P_k(x) f(x) dy dx. \quad (12)$$

In terms of this matrix, the (infinite) vectors of coefficients (7) and (11), representing the empirical density and the KDE respectively, are related via  $\vec{b} = S\vec{c}$ . The term *sensitivity* is used in the sense of Ye (1998), who proposes that a general definition of EDoF for predicted or fitted values should measure the degree to which these change in relation to small perturbations in observed values.

Note that the covariance matrices of  $\vec{b}$  and  $\vec{c}$ ,  $\Sigma_b$  and  $\Sigma_c$ , are related by  $\Sigma_b = S\Sigma_c S^T$ , where the elements of  $\Sigma_c$  are given by (8). Integrating (12) over  $y$  first with  $Q_0(y) = 1$  and using the kernel normalization property, we see that  $s_{0k} = \delta_{0k}$ . Similarly,  $s_{j0} = \delta_{j0}$  (integrate over  $x$  first, obtain  $f_K(y)$ , and use (9)). This means that both the first row and column of the kernel sensitivity matrix are zero, except for the element  $s_{00} = 1$ . As  $\mathbb{V}(c_0) = 0$ , this leads to 0 everywhere in the first row and column of  $\Sigma_b$ . Thus, it suffices to focus attention on  $\tilde{S}$ , the kernel sensitivity matrix with the first row and column removed. Likewise, define  $\tilde{\Sigma}_b$  and  $\tilde{\Sigma}_c$  to be corresponding covariance matrices of  $\vec{b}$  and  $\vec{c}$  with the first row and column removed.

Borrowing the idea from Ye (1998) and Hastie et al. (2009, §7.6) that the effective number of parameters in a general smoothing problem is proportional to the sum of the covariances between each observed value and the corresponding fitted value (heuristically embodied by the elements of  $\vec{c}$  and  $\vec{b}$ , respectively), leads to a possible definition of EDoF based on:

$$\text{Cov}(\vec{b}, \vec{c}) = \text{Cov}(S\vec{c}, \vec{c}) = \frac{1}{n} S.$$

A more precise definition would involve: (i) elimination of the superfluous first row and column, (ii) symmetrizing, thus ensuring positive semi-definiteness, (iii) applying the trace operator, thus summing all individual contributions, and (iv) normalizing, through scaling by the covariance of  $\vec{c}$ . This leads to our proposed KDE-based estimate of the density  $f$  with kernel  $K$ :

$$\text{EDoF} := \nu = n \text{Tr}(\tilde{\Sigma}_b) = \text{Tr}(\tilde{S}\tilde{S}^T) = \sum_{j,k=1}^{\infty} s_{jk}^2 = \sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} s_{jk}^2 - 1. \quad (13)$$

Viewing  $\tilde{S}$  as a *smoothing* matrix, the second trace formulation of this expression also coincides with a definition for EDoF proposed earlier by Buja et al. (1989) in

the context of linear smoothers. In words, the key idea is to consider the system as a collection of independent "noise sources" (polynomial terms in the empirical density expansion), and calculate EDoF by considering how these noise sources are suppressed by smoothing. While formally the matrix  $\tilde{S}$  is infinite dimensional, in practice elements with large row and column numbers appear to decay to zero quite quickly. Therefore, for practical purposes it is sufficient to truncate  $\tilde{S}$  up to some reasonably low finite dimension.

Instead of approximating  $f$  with an OPS defined on  $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}]$ , an interesting alternative to (10) is obtained by mapping to the unit interval via the  $\{L_k\}$ , Legendre polynomials orthonormal on  $[0, 1]$ , so that

$$\hat{f}(y) = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k L_k(F_K(y)) \right) f_K(y), \quad (14)$$

where  $F_K(y)$  is the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of  $f_K(y)$ . The expression in parentheses of (14) is known as the *comparison density* (Thas et al., 2010, Ch. 2). Performing the transformation  $z = F_K(y)$ , and noting that  $L_0(z) = 1$  and  $b_0 = \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} \hat{f}(y) dy = 1$ , (11) becomes

$$b_j = \int_0^1 L_j(z) \frac{\hat{f}(F_K^{-1}(z))}{f_K(F_K^{-1}(z))} dz = \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} L_j(F_K(y)) \hat{f}(y) dy. \quad (15)$$

Paralleling the development in (11) and (12), the elements of the kernel sensitivity matrix can be alternatively defined by substituting  $Q_j(y) = L_j(F_K(y))$ :

$$s_{jk} = \int_a^b \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} K(x, y) L_j(F_K(y)) P_k(x) f(x) dy dx. \quad (16)$$

Using this expression, we can relax the finite displacement kernel property P2, as long as it can be assumed that the "actual" comparison density in (15) is continuous and finite for all  $z \in [0, 1]$ , so that the Weierstrass approximation theorem holds. Now note that for this definition the results  $s_{0k} = \delta_{0k}$  and  $s_{j0} = \delta_{j0}$  remain true, so that the corresponding EDoF can still be defined by (13).

It is interesting to compare the computational challenges involved in using (12) vs. 16. In the latter, the terms  $Q_j(y)$  are replaced by  $L_j(F_K(y))$ . While it is easy to compute the  $\{L_j\}$  (the recurrence coefficients of Legendre polynomials are well known), it is difficult to compute  $F_K(y)$  quickly and accurately due to issues with numerical indefinite integration. On the other hand, evaluation of (12) requires the recurrence coefficients for the OPS  $\{Q_j\}$ , which imposes a computational burden of a different kind (numerically stable OPS construction methods and various OPS-related algorithms are discussed, for example, in Gautschi (2004)).

Since (16) involved making a change in the  $y$  variable of (12), a similar switch to the comparison density can be made for the  $x$  variable instead via the transformation

$z = F(x)$  (the cdf of  $X$ ). Therefore, two additional definitions of the kernel sensitivity matrix are given by

$$s_{jk} = \int_a^b \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} K(x, y) Q_j(y) L_k(F(x)) f(x) dy dx, \quad (17)$$

and

$$s_{jk} = \int_a^b \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} K(x, y) L_j(F_K(y)) L_k(F(x)) f(x) dy dx. \quad (18)$$

While it still makes sense to define EDoF resulting from these four different versions of  $\tilde{S}$  according to (13), it is not immediately obvious whether they will result in the same value for  $\nu$ . The generalized Parseval Identity of Lemma 1 settles this issue in the affirmative, by noting that the four versions of  $s_{jk}$  given by (12), (16), (17), and (18), are of the type in (19) with  $g(x, y) = K^2(x, y)/f_K(y)$ .

**Lemma 1** (Bivariate Parseval Identity). *Let  $g(x, y)$  be a continuous real-valued function supported on the Cartesian product of the closed sets  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and let  $\{P_k(x)Q_k(y)\}$ ,  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , be a complete bivariate OPS which is orthonormal with respect to respective weighting functions  $dF_P(x) = f_P(x)dx$  and  $dF_Q(y) = f_Q(y)dy$ , with corresponding supports  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Consider the expression*

$$s_{jk} = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} g(x, y) P_j(x) Q_k(y) dF_P(x) dF_Q(y). \quad (19)$$

Then, we have the bivariate Parseval Identity:

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} g^2(x, y) dF_P(x) dF_Q(y) = \sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} s_{jk}^2. \quad (20)$$

*Proof.* Since  $\{P_k(x)Q_k(y)\}$  forms a complete system, we can appeal to the approximation:

$$g(x, y) \approx \hat{g}_N(x, y) = \sum_{j,k=0}^N s_{jk} P_j(x) Q_k(y), \quad (21)$$

with the property that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} [\hat{g}_N(x, y) - g(x, y)]^2 dF_P(x) dF_Q(y) = 0.$$

A proof of this in the univariate case can be found in, for example, (Severini, 2005, Ch. 10). The bivariate (and indeed multivariate) case follows by a similar argument. The result hinges crucially on the completeness of the OPS and the so-called Stone-Weierstrass Theorem. This theorem is now known to hold in general when applied to any continuous real-valued function supported on a compact Hausdorff space (Lax, 2002, Ch. 13), which includes any closed subset of (finite dimensional) Euclidean

space. With this setup in place, derivation of the generalized Parseval Identity is straightforward, by noting that both

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} \widehat{g}^2(x, y) dF_P(x) dF_Q(y) = \sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} s_{jk}^2 = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \int_{\mathcal{X}} g(x, y) \widehat{g}(x, y) dF_P(x) dF_Q(y),$$

yield the same result as (20).  $\square$

The final issue to settle in this section is to obtain a more closed-form expression for  $\nu$ , i.e., one that might be more amenable to explicit computation.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $f(x)$  be the density function of the continuous random variable  $X$  supported on the compact interval  $[a, b]$ , and  $f_K(y)$  its regularization in (1), supported on  $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}]$ , by convolution with a kernel  $K(x, y)$  satisfying properties P1 and P2. Let further  $\{P_j(x)\}$  and  $\{Q_j(y)\}$  be the OPS systems with respect to the weight functions  $f(x)$  and  $f_K(y)$  respectively, and which satisfy the completeness condition of Lemma 1. Consider the expression for  $\nu$  defined by (13), where the elements of the sensitivity matrix are given by (12). Then, we have that:*

$$\nu = \int_a^b \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} \frac{K^2(x, y)}{f_K(y)} f(x) dy dx - 1. \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* Noting the equivalence of the four versions of  $s_{jk}$ , make the substitutions  $w = F(x)$  and  $z = F_K(y)$  in (18), whence  $f(x)dx = dw$  and  $f_K(y)dy = dz$ , resulting in Legendre OPS's on  $[0, 1]$ , so that the sensitivity matrix elements become:

$$s_{jk} = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \frac{K(x(w), y(z))}{f_K(y(z))} L_j(z) L_k(w) dw dz. \quad (23)$$

Now apply Lemma 1 with  $g(w, z) = K(x(w), y(z))/f_K(y(z))$  to obtain

$$\sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} s_{jk}^2 = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 g^2(w, z) dw dz,$$

so that,

$$\nu = \sum_{j,k=1}^{\infty} s_{jk}^2 = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 g^2(w, z) dw dz - 1.$$

Switching back to the original  $x$  and  $y$  variables yields the result in (22).  $\square$

### 3 Effective Degrees of Freedom: Empirical Version

Without knowledge of the oracle density  $f(x)$ , we can apply the same procedure in which  $f(x)$  is replaced everywhere by the empirical density  $\rho(x)$ . This means that

the OPS  $\{P_j\}$  will be orthogonal with the weight function  $\rho(x)$ , and consequently, the OPS  $\{Q_j\}$  will be orthogonal with the weight function  $\hat{f}(y)$ , which is the empirical replacement for  $f_K(y)$ . Otherwise, the definition of the kernel sensitivity matrix remains unchanged. The net effect of this is that the empirical EDoF,  $\hat{\nu}$ , becomes simply the plug-in estimate for (22):

$$\hat{\nu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} \frac{K^2(x_i, y)}{\hat{f}(y)} dy - 1. \quad (24)$$

For the asymptotics and all results below, we now make it explicit that the kernel is parametrized by bandwidth  $h$ . Denote the oracle and empirical versions of  $\theta = 1 + \nu$  also with the subscript  $h$ :

$$\theta_h = 1 + \nu_h = \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} \left\{ \frac{\int_a^b K_h^2(x, y) f(x) dx}{\int_a^b K_h(x, y) f(x) dx} \right\} dy = \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} \frac{\mathbb{E}K_h^2(X, y)}{\mathbb{E}K_h(X, y)} dy = \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} \frac{\mu_{2,h}(y)}{\mu_{1,h}(y)} dy, \quad (25)$$

and

$$\hat{\theta}_h = 1 + \hat{\nu}_h = \int_{\tilde{a}}^{\tilde{b}} \frac{\hat{\mu}_{2,h}(y)}{\hat{\mu}_{1,h}(y)} dy, \quad (26)$$

where we use the notation:

$$\mu_{j,h}(y) = \mathbb{E}K_h^j(X, y), \quad \mu_{jk,h}(w, z) = \mathbb{E}K_h^j(X, w)K_h^k(X, z),$$

with corresponding empirical counterparts:

$$\hat{\mu}_{j,h}(y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_h^j(x_i, y), \quad \hat{\mu}_{jk,h}(w, z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_h^j(x_i, w)K_h^k(x_i, z).$$

**Remark 1.** Note that  $\mu_{1,h}(y) \equiv f_K(y)$ , and if  $f(x)$  is supported on  $[a, b]$ , then  $\mu_{j,h}(y)$  is supported on  $[\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}]$ , with  $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} [\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}] = [a, b]$ .

To get a finite sample approximation to the uncertainty of  $\hat{\theta}_h$ , we can take the limit as only  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , while  $h$  is fixed. This is easiest to derive using influence functions (IFs) and the nonparametric delta method (Wasserman, 2006, Ch 2). In order to proceed, define the following linear functionals, and their corresponding IFs:

$$\begin{aligned} t_1(F; y) = \mu_{1,h}(y) &= \int K_h(x, y) dF(x), & L_1(x; y) &= K_h(x, y) - t_1(F; y) \\ t_2(F; y) = \mu_{2,h}(y) &= \int K_h^2(x, y) dF(x), & L_2(x, y) &= K_h^2(x, y) - t_2(F; y) \\ t_3(F) &= \int \log \mu_{1,h}(y) dF(y), & L_3(x) &= \log \mu_{1,h}(x) - t_3(F). \end{aligned}$$

Note that both  $t_1(F; y)$  and  $t_2(F; y)$  depend on  $y$ . For such statistical functionals which contain also an argument  $y$ ,  $t(F; y)$ , Kim and Scott (2012) define the IF at  $x$  as the following Gateaux derivative:

$$L(x; y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} t((1 - \epsilon)F + \epsilon H_x; y)|_{\epsilon=0}, \quad (27)$$

where  $H_x$  denotes the Heavyside step function at  $x$ . The empirical version,  $\ell(x; y)$ , is obtained by replacing  $F$  with the empirical cdf  $\hat{F}$ . The following theorem derives the IF for  $t_4(F) = \theta_h$ , and the accompanying limit theorem under the  $n \rightarrow \infty$  regime.

**Theorem 2** (IF and CLT for  $\hat{\theta}_h$ ). *The IF for  $t_4(F) = \theta_h$  is:*

$$L_4(x) = \int_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} L_4(x; y) dy, \quad L_4(x; y) = \frac{K_h^2(x, y)}{\mu_{1,h}(y)} - \frac{\mu_{2,h}(y)}{\mu_{1,h}^2(y)} K_h(x, y).$$

Moreover, under the  $n \rightarrow \infty$  regime (with  $h$  fixed), and provided  $\omega_h^2 < \infty$ , we have the following asymptotic normality result:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_h - \theta_h) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \omega_h^2), \quad \omega_h^2 = \int_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} \int_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} \frac{\gamma(w, z)}{\mu_{1,h}(w)\mu_{1,h}(z)} dw dz,$$

where

$$\gamma(w, z) = \mu_{22,h}(w, z) - \frac{\mu_{2,h}(w)}{\mu_{1,h}(w)} \mu_{12,h}(w, z) - \frac{\mu_{2,h}(z)}{\mu_{1,h}(z)} \mu_{21,h}(w, z) + \frac{\mu_{2,h}(w)\mu_{2,h}(z)}{\mu_{1,h}(w)\mu_{1,h}(z)} \mu_{11,h}(w, z).$$

*Proof.* For notational simplicity, we suppress the dependence on  $h$ . We start with the IF for  $r(y) = \mu_2(y)/\mu_1(y)$ , call it  $L_4(x; y)$ , which is obtained by applying the chain rule:

$$L_4(x; y) = \frac{\partial r(y)}{\partial \mu_1(y)} L_1(x; y) + \frac{\partial r(y)}{\partial \mu_2(y)} L_2(x; y) = \frac{K_h^2(x, y)}{\mu_1(y)} - \frac{\mu_2(y)}{\mu_1(y)^2} K_h(x, y).$$

The ultimate goal is the IF for  $t_4(F) = \int r(y) dy$ . Since the Gateaux derivative in (27) can be interchanged with the integral, we obtain:

$$L_4(x) = \int_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} L_4(x; y) dy.$$

The Nonparametric Delta Method then gives the stated asymptotic distribution, where:

$$\omega_h^2 = \mathbb{E}_F L_4(X)^2 = \int_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} \int_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} \mathbb{E}_F \{L_4(X; w)L_4(X; z)\} dw dz.$$

(Note: empirical IFs are obtained by replacing  $F \mapsto \hat{F}$ , whence  $L(\cdot) \mapsto \ell(\cdot)$ .)  $\square$

Using this result, we can approximate the variance of the empirical EDoF in (24) as:

$$\mathbb{V}(\hat{\nu}) \approx \frac{\hat{\omega}^2}{n}, \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\omega}^2 = \int_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} \int_{\bar{a}}^{\bar{b}} \frac{\hat{\gamma}(w, z)}{\hat{\mu}_{1,h}(w)\hat{\mu}_{1,h}(z)} dw dz.$$

## 4 Connections With Other Versions of Empirical Effective Degrees of Freedom

As far as we can ascertain, there are only two references dealing with EDoF explicitly for KDE, namely Loader (1999), and McCloud and Parmeter (2020), neither of them postulating an oracle version. The approach of Loader (1999) is to approximate the local likelihood cross-validation criterion involving the sum of leave-one-out log-density estimates, by the sum of log-density estimates minus an additional term, which naturally assumes the role of a penalty factor in an information criterion based paradigm (e.g., AIC, BIC). The idea of McCloud and Parmeter (2020) is to transform the usual KDE in order to mimic a regression estimate, thus allowing for the extraction of a hat (or projection) matrix whose trace can be used to define the EDoF. There are close parallels between these developments and our proposed empirical EDoF in (24), as we will now demonstrate.

Loader (1999, Ch. 5) defines two kinds of empirical EDoF:

$$\hat{\nu}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{infl}(x_i), \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\nu}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{vari}(x_i).$$

Since local likelihood density estimation of order zero, the so-called “local constant” approximation, coincides with boundary-corrected KDE, these versions are directly applicable here. We now attempt to reformulate them in more recognizable terms. While the definition of  $\text{infl}(x_i)$  in equation (5.14) of Loader (1999) is not intuitively obvious, the equation immediately below it states that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \log f_{-i}(x_i) \approx \sum_{i=1}^n \log \hat{f}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \text{infl}(x_i) + 1, \quad (28)$$

where  $\hat{f}_{-i}(x_i)$  denotes the density estimate at  $x_i$  with this observation deleted. We can therefore work back to  $\text{infl}(x_i)$  by examining the difference  $\log \hat{f}(x_i) - \log \hat{f}_{-i}(x_i)$ . Starting from  $\hat{f}(y)$  in (2), note that

$$\hat{f}_{-i}(y) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n K(x_j, y) = \frac{n}{n-1} \left[ \hat{f}(y) - \frac{1}{n} K(x_i, y) \right],$$

whence

$$\hat{f}(y) - \hat{f}_{-i}(y) = \frac{K(x_i, y) - \hat{f}(y)}{n-1}.$$

Using a first order Taylor expansion of  $\log \hat{f}_{-i}(x_i)$  about  $\log \hat{f}(x_i)$ , we see that

$$\log \hat{f}_{-i}(x_i) \approx \log \hat{f}(x_i) - \frac{1}{\hat{f}(x_i)} \left( \hat{f}(x_i) - \hat{f}_{-i}(x_i) \right),$$

whence

$$\log \hat{f}(x_i) - \log \hat{f}_{-i}(x_i) \approx \frac{1}{n-1} \frac{K(x_i, x_i)}{\hat{f}(x_i)} - \frac{1}{n-1},$$

so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \log \hat{f}(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n \log \hat{f}_{-i}(x_i) \approx \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{K(x_i, x_i)}{\hat{f}(x_i)} - \frac{n}{n-1}.$$

According to (28) this should equal  $\hat{\nu}_1 - 1$ , and therefore

$$\hat{\nu}_1 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{K(x_i, x_i)}{\hat{f}(x_i)} + \left(1 - \frac{n}{n-1}\right).$$

Dropping the term in parentheses (which is essentially zero and otherwise inconsequential for the purposes of kernel tuning parameter selection), and multiplying the result by the asymptotically innocuous factor  $(n-1)/n$ , yields

$$\hat{\nu}_1 \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{K(x_i, x_i)}{\hat{f}(x_i)} = \hat{\nu}_3, \quad (29)$$

where  $\hat{\nu}_3$  is exactly the EDofF proposed by McCloud and Parmeter (2020).

According to Loader (1999) (and in particular the discussion in Section 5.4.3),  $\text{vari}(x_i)$  used in his definition of  $\hat{\nu}_2$  is actually the variance of  $\log \hat{f}(x_i)$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{V} \log \hat{f}(y)$  evaluated at  $y = x_i$ . Assuming  $\hat{f}(x_i) > 0$ , the Delta Method gives the following approximation:

$$\text{vari}(x_i) = \mathbb{V} \log \hat{f}(x_i) \approx \frac{\mathbb{V} \hat{f}(x_i)}{\left[\mathbb{E} \hat{f}(x_i)\right]^2}. \quad (30)$$

Now, seeking expressions for the first two moments of  $\hat{f}(x_i)$ , note that

$$\mathbb{E} \hat{f}(y) = \int K(x, y) f(x) dx = f_K(y),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \hat{f}^2(y) &= \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i,j=1}^n K(x_i, y) K(x_j, y) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \left[ n \int K^2(x, y) f(x) dx + (n^2 - n) f_K^2(y) \right], \end{aligned}$$

which leads to the simplification

$$\mathbb{V} \hat{f}(y) = \frac{1}{n} \left[ \int K^2(x, y) f(x) dx - f_K^2(y) \right].$$

As  $f(x)$  is unknown, further approximations must be made. In the “local constant” estimation paradigm, Loader (1999) makes the approximations:

$$\mathbb{E}\hat{f}(y) \approx \hat{f}(y), \quad \text{and} \quad \int K^2(x, y)f(x)dx \approx \hat{f}(y) \int K^2(x, y)dx.$$

whence (30) becomes

$$\text{vari}(x_i) \approx \frac{1}{n\hat{f}(x_i)} \int K^2(x, x_i)dx - \frac{1}{n}.$$

This results in an expression for  $\hat{\nu}_2$  that is similar to our proposed empirical EDoF:

$$\hat{\nu}_2 \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int \frac{K^2(x, x_i)dx}{\hat{f}(x_i)} - 1 \approx \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int \frac{K^2(x_i, y)}{\hat{f}(y)} dy - 1 = \hat{\nu} \quad (31)$$

The formula given in Loader (1999) actually includes additionally a boundary correction factor which does not appear here (see e.g., Loader’s Example 5.10). Instead, we assume that  $K(x, y)$  is already boundary-corrected (see Section 6).

## 5 Exact Calculations: the All-Gaussian Case

Although the formula for  $\nu$  in (13) is not generally amenable to explicit calculation, we have found one exception which sheds additional light on the meaning of EDoF. This is the case where the density of  $X$  is  $f(x) \equiv \phi(x; \sigma)$ , corresponding to a  $N(0, \sigma^2)$ , and the kernel is of the convolution type in (4) with  $K(z) = \phi(z)$  the density of a standard normal. Since the convolution of  $\phi(x; \sigma)$  with  $K_h(y - x) = \phi(y - x; h)$ , a Gaussian of variance  $\sigma^2$  with a Gaussian of variance  $h^2$ , results in another Gaussian, the density of the oracle convolution corresponds to a normal with mean zero and variance  $\tau^2 = \sigma^2 + h^2$ , i.e.,  $f_K(y) = \phi(y; \tau)$ .

For this case, the polynomials  $P_k(x)$  orthonormal with weight  $\phi(x; \sigma)$  are

$$P_k(x) \equiv Hn_k(x, \sigma) = \frac{1}{2^{k/2}\sqrt{k!}} H_k\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right),$$

where the  $H_k(z)$  are the standard “physicist’s” Hermite polynomials orthogonal with weight function  $\exp\{-z^2\}$  Abramowitz and Stegun (1968, §22.2.14). The convolution of two Gaussians then facilitates the computation of the derived OPS  $\{Q_j\}$  orthonormal with respect to the weight  $\phi(y; \tau)$ , so that  $Q_j(y) = Hn_j(y, \tau)$ . The elements of the kernel sensitivity matrix defined by (12) therefore become:

$$s_{jk} = \frac{1}{2\pi h\sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} Hn_j(y, \tau) Hn_k(x, \sigma) \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{(x-y)^2}{2h^2}\right\} dx dy. \quad (32)$$

To compute this double integral, introduce the generating function for the standard Hermite polynomials:

$$g_{\text{st}}(z, s) = e^{2zs - s^2} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{s^n}{n!} H_n(z), \quad \text{so that} \quad H_k(z) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial s^k} g_{\text{st}}(z, s).$$

In a similar manner, introduce the function  $g(z, s, \sigma) = \exp\{(2zs - s^2)/(2\sigma^2)\}$ , whence

$$H_n(z, \sigma) = \frac{\sigma^k}{\sqrt{k!}} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial s^k} g(z, s, \sigma). \quad (33)$$

Exchanging the order of limits, differentiation, and integration, implies that (32) can be rewritten as

$$s_{jk} = \frac{\sigma^k (\sigma^2 + h^2)^{j/2}}{\sqrt{k!} \sqrt{j!}} \lim_{\substack{s \rightarrow 0 \\ p \rightarrow 0}} \frac{\partial^j \partial^k}{\partial s^j \partial p^k} \frac{1}{2\pi h \sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(y, s, \tau) g(x, p, \sigma) \exp \left\{ -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{(x-y)^2}{2h^2} \right\} dx dy.$$

With the notation  $\mu_y = sh^2/\tau^2$ , we see that the integral in the above reduces to integration of a bivariate Gaussian density over  $\mathbb{R}^2$  (which is unity) multiplied by a factor:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi h \sigma} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g(y, s, \tau) g(x, p, \sigma) \exp \left\{ -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{(x-y)^2}{2h^2} \right\} dx dy \\ &= e^{sp/\tau^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{h^2 - \sigma^2}{h^4 \sigma^2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{1}{\sigma^2} (x-p)^2 - \frac{2}{h^2} (x-p)(y - \mu_y) + \frac{1}{h^2} (y - \mu_y)^2 \right] \right\} dx dy \\ &= e^{sp/\tau^2}, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$s_{jk} = \frac{\sigma^k}{\sqrt{k!}} \frac{(\tau^2)^{j/2}}{\sqrt{j!}} \lim_{\substack{s \rightarrow 0 \\ p \rightarrow 0}} \frac{\partial^j \partial^k}{\partial s^j \partial p^k} e^{sp/\tau^2} = \frac{\sigma^k}{\sqrt{k!}} \frac{(\tau^2)^{j/2}}{\sqrt{j!}} \lim_{\substack{s \rightarrow 0 \\ p \rightarrow 0}} \frac{\partial^j \partial^k}{\partial s^j \partial p^k} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left( \frac{sp}{\tau^2} \right)^n.$$

Now, since

$$\lim_{\substack{s \rightarrow 0 \\ p \rightarrow 0}} \frac{\partial^j \partial^k}{\partial s^j \partial p^k} \frac{(sp)^n}{n!} = n! \delta_{jn} \delta_{kn} = n! \delta_{jk} \delta_{kn},$$

it follows immediately that

$$s_{jk} = \delta_{jk} \frac{\sigma^k}{\sqrt{k!}} \frac{(\tau^2)^{j/2}}{\sqrt{j!}} k! (\tau^2)^{-k} = \delta_{jk} \frac{\sigma^j}{(\tau^2)^{j/2}} = \left( 1 + \frac{h^2}{\sigma^2} \right)^{-j/2} \delta_{jk}.$$

That is, the sensitivity matrix in this case is diagonal and, therefore so is  $SS^T$ . According to (13), the corresponding EDoF for this all-Gaussian case,  $\nu_G(h)$ , is then simply:

$$\nu_G(h) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} s_{jj}^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 + \frac{h^2}{\sigma^2} \right)^{-j} = \frac{\sigma^2}{h^2}. \quad (34)$$

(Direct calculation according to (22) leads to the same result.)

Using, for example, the *asymptotic mean integrated squared error* (AMISE) normal scale plug-in rule for the bandwidth of  $\hat{h} = (4/3)^{1/5} \sigma n^{-1/5}$ , which assumes  $f$  to be (correctly in this case) normal with variance  $\sigma^2$ , implies  $\nu_G(\hat{h}) = (3/4)^{2/5} n^{2/5}$ . This begs the tantalizing question of whether there is a plug-in rule that minimizes the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence instead of the MISE. In view of the fact that likelihood cross-validation, as discussed by Hall (1987), is asymptotically equivalent to the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), a result derived by Stone (1977), such a plug-in rule would decrease the computational burden by an order of magnitude.

Explicit calculations in the spirit of an AIC-like derivation for this all-Gaussian case, suggest such a possibility. (Good detailed derivations of the classical AIC can be found in, e.g., Burnham and Anderson (2002) and Konishi and Kitagawa (2008).) Making explicit the dependence on  $h$ , begin by viewing the oracle convolution  $f_K(x|h)$  as the *model* for the sample  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Define the *model log-likelihood*:

$$\ell_0(h) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log f_K(x_i|h), \quad f_K(x|h) = \mathbb{E}K_h(x - X), \quad (35)$$

and the *empirical log-likelihood*:

$$\ell(h) = \sum_{i=1}^n \log \hat{f}(x_i|h), \quad \hat{f}(x|h) = \int \rho(y)K_h(x - y)dy = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_h(x - x_i). \quad (36)$$

**Lemma 2.** *Consider the all-Gaussian case described at the beginning of the section, leading up to the definition of the Hermite polynomials in (33), and the model and empirical log-likelihoods in (35) and (36), respectively. Then, an  $O(n^{-1/2})$  approximation to  $\log \hat{f}(x|h)$  yields:*

$$\ell(h) \approx \ell_0(h) + n \lim_{\substack{s \rightarrow 0 \\ p \rightarrow 0}} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_m c_k \frac{\sigma^m}{\sqrt{m!}} \frac{\sigma^k}{\sqrt{k!}} \frac{\partial^m}{\partial p^m} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial s^k} q(s, p, \sigma, h), \quad (37)$$

where

$$q(s, p, \sigma, h) = \exp \left\{ \frac{s [h^2(2p - s) + 2p\sigma^2]}{2\tau^4} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Since in this case

$$\hat{f}(x|h) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(t)\phi(x - y; h)dy,$$

using the generating function  $g(x, s, \sigma)$  for  $Hn_k(x, \sigma)$ , one obtains

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(y; \sigma)Hn_k(y, \sigma)\phi(x - y; h)dy = \frac{\sigma^k}{\sqrt{k!}} \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^k}{ds^k} \phi(x - s; \tau), \quad (38)$$

so that,

$$\hat{f}(x|h) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \frac{\sigma^k}{\sqrt{k!}} \frac{d^k}{ds^k} \phi(x-s; \tau).$$

As  $c_0 = 1$  and the remaining  $\{c_k\}$  are  $O(n^{-1/2})$ , we can expand  $\log \hat{f}(x|h)$  to first order in  $n^{-1/2}$  about the point  $f_K(x|h) = \phi(x; \tau)$ , resulting in the approximation

$$\log \hat{f}(x|h) \approx \log \phi(x; \tau) + \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\phi(x; \tau)} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k \frac{\sigma^k}{\sqrt{k!}} \frac{d^k}{ds^k} \phi(x-s; \tau) \right\}. \quad (39)$$

Now, since

$$\ell(h) = n \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \rho(x) \log \hat{f}(x|h) dx,$$

substitution of (39) into this expression leads to the final result, upon noticing that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\phi(x; \tau)} \phi(x; \sigma) g(x, p, \sigma) \phi(x-s; \tau) dx = q(s, p, \sigma, h).$$

□

Now, the KL distance between  $f(x)$  and  $f_K(x|h)$  (truth and model) is, modulo a constant that is independent of  $h$ ,

$$\text{KL distance} = \text{constant} - \mathbb{E} \log f_K(X|h),$$

and the objective is therefore to choose  $h = h^*$  so as to maximize  $\mathbb{E} \log f_K(X|h)$ . Since we do not have access to  $f_K(x|h)$ , we can equivalently maximize  $n \mathbb{E} \log f_K(X|h) = \mathbb{E} \ell_0(h)$ . Thus, our *Target* (to maximize) is:

$$\text{Target} = \mathbb{E} \ell_0(h).$$

As in the derivation of AIC, the empirical log-likelihood  $\ell(h)$  will now be shown to provide a way to estimate the Target. From Lemma 2, a first order Taylor series approximation to  $\ell(h)$  leads to (37). Now take expectations of both sides. Taking into consideration that the  $\{c_k\}$  are distributed with means and covariances given by (8), note that  $\mathbb{E}(c_m c_k) = \delta_{mk}/n$ , so that (37) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \ell(h) &\approx \mathbb{E} \ell_0(h) + \lim_{\substack{s \rightarrow 0 \\ p \rightarrow 0}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma^{2k}}{k!} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial p^k} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial s^k} q(s, p, \sigma, h) = \mathbb{E} \ell_0(h) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau^2} \right)^k \\ &= \text{Target} + \frac{\sigma^2}{h^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since the bias of  $\ell(h)$  as an estimate of the Target is  $\nu_G(h) = \sigma^2/h^2$ , a (first order) unbiased estimate leads to the AIC-like quantity:

$$\text{AIC}(h) = \nu_G(h) - \ell(h).$$

The fact that this coincides exactly with the classical AIC paradigm which minimizes the number of model parameters minus the empirical log-likelihood, provides further corroboration that this may indeed be an appropriate definition of EDofF.


## 6 Numerical Studies

In the subsections below, we detail some numerical studies that were carried out in order to investigate various characteristics of the proposed EDoF; these would otherwise be difficult (if not impossible) to unveil analytically. In practical implementation, we have found it expedient to utilize the KDE method based on the diffusion kernels investigated by Botev et al. (2010). These generalized kernels are especially useful in compact supports due to their automatic boundary correction properties, and satisfy all the properties P1 through P5 mentioned in the Introduction. Computation of the integral in (24) that defines the empirical EDoF, is then facilitated by the fact that the supports of  $f$  and  $f_K$  coincide, i.e.,  $a = \tilde{a}$  and  $b = \tilde{b}$ .

The choices for the oracle densities  $f(x)$  in these studies were taken to be the following.

- (i) A 20%/80% mixture of a Gaussian with mean 0.4 and standard deviation 0.07, and an exponential with scale parameter 0.4. The resulting mixture was then truncated at its 0.99 quantile, resulting in a density supported approximately over  $[0, 2]$ .
- (ii) A 50%/50% mixture of two Gaussians, both with standard deviation 0.5, and means  $\pm 1.5$ . The resulting symmetric and bimodal density was then truncated between its 0.005 and 0.995 quantiles.

These densities are displayed in Figure 1. Diffusion kernels were used to produce all the KDEs in the ensuing numerical studies whose densities are compactly supported. For the normal density study, the Gaussian kernel was employed.



(a) Normal-Exponential mixture.

(b) Normal-Normal mixture.

Figure 1: The two densities used in the numerical studies.

## 6.1 Behaviour of oracle and empirical EDoF

In this study we analyzed how the oracle and empirical EDoF measures behave as functions of the bandwidth. From a sample of  $n = 2000$  data points, we considered a range of bandwidths centered around the AMISE-optimal value, and constructed the KDE based on each bandwidth. For each KDE, we then obtain the oracle and empirical EDoF measures defined in (22) and (24). The upper panels of Figure 2 show, on a logarithmic scale, how both measures decrease monotonically as the bandwidth increases, thus confirming the proposed EDoF definition to be a sensible measure of model complexity.

## 6.2 Behaviour of kernel sensitivity matrix

We investigated the diagonal elements of the symmetrized kernel sensitivity matrix  $\tilde{S}\tilde{S}^T$ , whose trace comprises the definition of EDoF in (13), as a function of the matrix dimension. The maximum values for the OPS degrees were set at 50 and 150, for the Normal-Exponential and Normal-Normal mixtures, respectively. (Since a given OPS degree determines the matrix dimension, these maximum degrees are also the maximum matrix dimensions.) These maximum degrees are chosen at the onset of numerical instabilities in the calculation of the recurrence coefficients for the OPS that uses the sample empirical density function as the weight. The lower panels of Figure 2 tipify the results, with the diagonals decaying rapidly to zero.

## 6.3 Bias and variance of EDoF

Here we generated 1,000 replicates from the distributions over a representative set of sample sizes ranging from  $n = 200$  to  $n = 10,000$ . For a given sample size, we then obtain the (empirical) bias and the variance of the empirical EDoF,  $\hat{\nu}$ . The oracle values of  $\nu$  are computed with the AMISE-optimal value for the bandwidth (based on the oracle density itself). The results are displayed in Figure 3 as a function of sample size (logarithmic scale). The panels show the expected result that both bias and variance gradually decrease as sample size increases, with larger magnitudes in the Normal-Exponential case. Interestingly, the bias is negative in both cases. The lower panels display also the theoretical variance obtained from the asymptotic normality result of Theorem 2.

## 6.4 Optimal penalty factors for information criterion-based bandwidth selection

A major impetus of this work was the question of whether an information criterion-based approach would be feasible as an alternative to more traditional plug-in and MISE-based bandwidth selection rules. As demonstrated in Section 5 in the AIC-like derivation, the proposed EDoF emerges naturally as a bias-correction term when




Figure 2: Behaviour of oracle and empirical EDoF as a function of bandwidth (upper panels), and of the diagonals of the symmetrized kernel sensitivity matrix as a function of matrix dimension (lower panels). The bandwidth values in the lower panels were set at  $h = 0.8$  and  $h = 0.048$ , for the Normal-Exponential and Normal-Normal mixtures, respectively. (All empirical results are based on a sample size of  $n = 2000$ .)

the log-likelihood is used to measure the KL discrepancy between the true model and the KDE. However, the penalty factor only accounts for EDoF, and is therefore devoid of an explicit sample size dependence. BIC on the other hand, suggests a sample size-dependent factor to be more appropriate. Therefore, we now focus on the development of an optimized AIC-like criterion for bandwidth selection. That is, in the notation of Section 5, we seek to investigate the penalty factors  $p$  that minimize

$$AIC(h) = p\nu(h) - \ell(h).$$

Through numerical studies, we obtained for each of three distributions (the two mixtures as well as the standard normal), and for a range of sample sizes  $n$ , the bandwidth value that minimizes the KL distance between the KDE and the true




Figure 3: Empirical bias (upper panels), and variance (lower panels, in logarithmic scale) of the empirical EDoF, as a function of sample size. The lower panels display also the theoretical variance.

density. Motivated by AMISE optimality considerations, we then fit the bandwidth as a polynomial function of  $x = n^{-1/5}$ . The fitting is via weighted least-squares with weights inversely proportional to the bandwidth uncertainty (itself assumed to be proportional to the bandwidth). We thus have a function which, for a given distribution and sample size, returns the KL-optimal value for the KDE bandwidth  $h^*$ . For example, for the  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , we obtained the cubic  $h^* = 1.2463x - 0.5902x^2 + 0.7349x^3$ .

We now differentiate  $AIC(h)$  with respect to  $h$ , evaluate it at the KL-optimal bandwidth, and aim to find the penalty factor which minimizes it. That is, we solved for  $p$  in the equation:

$$\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial h} AIC(h) \right|_{h=h^*} = 0.$$

Derivatives of  $\ell(h)$  and  $\nu(h)$  were obtained numerically. (The Gaussian case is facilitated by the fact that from (34) one has that  $\partial\nu(h)/\partial h = -2\sigma^2/h^3$ .) The results, displayed in Figure 4, suggest some dependence of the optimal factor on sample size.




Figure 4: Optimal AIC penalty factor for bandwidth selection as a function of sample size (logarithmic scale).

## References

- Abramowitz, M. and Stegun, I. A. (1968). *Handbook of mathematical functions with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables*. US Government printing office (National Bureau of Standards).
- Botev, Z. I., Grotowski, J. F., and Kroese, D. P. (2010). Kernel density estimation via diffusion. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(5):2916–2957.

- Buja, A., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (1989). Linear smoothers and additive models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 17:453–510.
- Burnham, K. P. and Anderson, D. R. (2002). *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information Theoretic Approach*. Springer, 2nd edition.
- Gautschi, W. (2004). *Orthogonal Polynomials: Computation and Approximation*. Oxford University Press.
- Hall, P. (1987). On kullback-leibler loss and density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1491–1519.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J. H., and Friedman, J. H. (2009). *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*. Springer, 2nd edition.
- Kim, J. and Scott, C. D. (2012). Robust kernel density estimation. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):2529–2565.
- Konishi, S. and Kitagawa, G. (2008). *Information criteria and statistical modeling*. Springer.
- Lax, P. D. (2002). *Functional analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Loader, C. (1999). *Local Regression and Likelihood*. Springer.
- McCloud, N. and Parmeter, C. F. (2020). Determining the number of effective parameters in kernel density estimation. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 143:106843.
- Scott, D. W. (2015). *Multivariate density estimation: theory, practice, and visualization*. John Wiley & Sons, 2nd edition.
- Severini, T. A. (2005). *Elements of distribution theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, B. (2010). *Szego’s Theorem and Its Descendants: Spectral Theory for  $L^2$  Perturbations of Orthogonal Polynomials*. Princeton university press.
- Stone, M. (1977). An asymptotic equivalence of choice of model by cross-validation and akaike’s criterion. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 39(1):44–47.
- Thas, O. et al. (2010). *Comparing Distributions*. Springer.
- Wasserman, L. (2006). *All of nonparametric statistics*. Springer.
- Ye, J. (1998). On measuring and correcting the effects of data mining and model selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 93(441):120–131.