

Optimal rates for estimating the covariance kernel from synchronously sampled functional data

Max Berger and Hajo Holzmann*

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science

Philipps-Universität Marburg

{mberger, holzmann}@mathematik.uni-marburg.de

July 19, 2024

Abstract

We obtain minimax-optimal convergence rates in the supremum norm, including information-theoretic lower bounds, for estimating the covariance kernel of a stochastic process which is repeatedly observed at discrete, synchronous design points. In particular, for dense design we obtain the \sqrt{n} -rate of convergence in the supremum norm without additional logarithmic factors which typically occur in the results in the literature. Surprisingly, in the transition from dense to sparse design the rates do not reflect the two-dimensional nature of the covariance kernel but correspond to those for univariate mean function estimation. Our estimation method can make use of higher-order smoothness of the covariance kernel away from the diagonal, and does not require the same smoothness on the diagonal itself. Hence, as in Mohammadi and Panaretos (2024) we can cover covariance kernels of processes with rough sample paths. Moreover, the estimator does not use mean function estimation to form residuals, and no smoothness assumptions on the mean have to be imposed. In the dense case we also obtain a central limit theorem in the supremum norm, which can be used as the basis for the construction of uniform confidence sets. Simulations and real-data applications illustrate the practical usefulness of the methods.

Keywords. Covariance kernel; functional data; optimal rates of convergence; supremum norm; synchronously sample data

1 Introduction

Mean function and covariance kernel are the two most-important parameters of a stochastic process having finite second moments. Estimates of the covariance kernel of a repeatedly observed stochastic process allow to assess its variability, in particular through the associated principle component functions (Cai and Yuan, 2010; Hall and Hosseini-Nasab, 2009; Ramsay and Silverman, 1998). Further, the smoothness of the paths of a Gaussian process is closely related to the smoothness of the covariance kernel on the diagonal (Azmoodeh et al., 2014). Therefore, estimates of the covariance kernel allow to draw conclusions on the path properties of the observed process.

In the setting of functional data analysis, stochastic processes are repeatedly observed at discrete locations and potentially with additional observation errors (Wang et al., 2016; Cai and Yuan, 2011). A deterministic, synchronous design refers to fixed, non-random observation points which are equal across functions. It typically arises for machine recorded data, such as weather data

*Corresponding author. Prof. Dr. Hajo Holzmann, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Hans-Meerweinstr., 35032 Marburg, Germany

at regular time intervals at weather stations. In contrast, in random, asynchronous designs observation points are realizations of independent random variables.

Estimating the covariance kernel has been intensely investigated in the literature for both types of designs. For the random asynchronous design, Li and Hsing (2010); Zhang and Wang (2016); Hall et al. (2006); Xiao (2020); Mohammadi and Panaretos (2024) obtain rates of convergence in L_2 and also in the supremum norm under Hölder smoothness assumptions on the covariance kernel. Cai and Yuan (2010) derive optimal rates in the random design setting under the assumptions that the sample paths of the process are contained in a particular reproducing kernel Hilbert space.

For fixed synchronous design there are fewer contributions. Cardot et al. (2013) give a consistency result in the supremum norm, and Xiao (2020) presents rates in L_2 and in the sup-norm for spline estimators over Hölder smoothness classes.

In the present paper we comprehensively analyse estimates of the covariance kernel for fixed synchronous design. We obtain optimal rates of convergence in a minimax sense over Hölder smoothness classes, including information theoretic lower bounds. In our analysis we focus on the supremum norm instead of the simpler L_2 norm, since it corresponds to the visualization of the estimation error and forms the basis for the construction of uniform confidence bands. In particular, for dense design we obtain the \sqrt{n} rate of convergence in the supremum norm and also the associated central limit theorem without the additional logarithmic factors, which are prevalent in the literature (Xiao, 2020; Li and Hsing, 2010; Zhang and Wang, 2016; Mohammadi and Panaretos, 2024). Our method can make use of higher-order smoothness of the covariance kernel away from the diagonal, and does not require the same amount of smoothness on the diagonal itself. Thus, as in Mohammadi and Panaretos (2024) our results apply to covariance kernels of processes with relatively rough, in particular non-differentiable sample paths. Notably, our estimator does not require mean estimation and forming residuals. Hence virtually no smoothness assumptions on the mean function are required, in contrast to e.g. Xiao (2020). In the transition from dense to sparse design the optimal rates that we obtain do not reflect the two-dimensional nature of the covariance kernel but correspond to those for univariate mean function estimation as presented in Berger et al. (2024). A similar phenomenon has been observed in Cai and Yuan (2010); Hall et al. (2006) but for somewhat different settings. The matching lower bounds, in particular in the sparse-to-dense transition regime, require novel and technically involved arguments.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the model as well as our estimator, a modification of the local polynomial estimator restricted to observation pairs above the diagonal. Section 3 contains our main results: upper and matching lower bounds for the rate of convergence in the supremum norm. These are complemented by a central limit theorem in the space of continuous functions in Section 3.3. Section 4 contains simulations and a real-data application. In the simulations in Section 4.1 we investigate the effect of the choice of the bandwidth and propose a cross-validation scheme for bandwidth selection. Further we simulate the contribution to the sup-norm error of various components in the error decomposition, thus illustrating our theoretical analysis. Moreover we demonstrate numerically the need to leave out empirical variances of the data points and to restrict smoothing to the upper triangle for covariance kernels which are not globally smooth. In Section 4.2 we provide an application to a data set of daily temperature series, and discuss how estimates of the standard deviation curves and the correlation functions vary over the year. Section 5 concludes. Proofs of the main results are gathered in Section 6. The supplementary appendix contains further technical material. An R package `biLocPol` can be found on [Github](#), together with the [R-Code](#) used for the data in this paper.

We conclude the introduction by introducing some relevant notation. For sequences $(p_n), (q_n)$ tending to infinity, we write $p_n \lesssim q_n$, if $p_n = \mathcal{O}(q_n)$, $p_n \simeq q_n$ if $p_n \lesssim q_n$ and $q_n \lesssim p_n$, and $p_n \ll q_n$, if $p_n = o(q_n)$. $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}, h \in (h_1, h_0]}$ denotes stochastic convergence uniformly for $h \in (h_1, h_0]$. Finally, $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the supremum norm, where the domain becomes clear from the context.

2 The model, smoothness classes and linear estimators

Let the observed data $(Y_{i,j}, x_j)$ be distributed according to the model (Berger et al., 2024; Cai and Yuan, 2011)

$$Y_{i,j} = \mu(x_j) + Z_i(x_j) + \varepsilon_{i,j}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \quad (1)$$

where $Y_{i,j}$ are real-valued response variables and the $x_j \in \mathbb{R}$ are known non-random design points which are assumed to be ordered as $x_1 < \dots < x_p$. The processes Z_1, \dots, Z_n are i.i.d. copies of a mean-zero, square integrable random process Z with an unknown covariance kernel $\Gamma(x, y) = \mathbb{E}[Z(x)Z(y)]$, the estimation of which we shall focus on in this paper. The errors $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ are independent with mean zero and are also independent of the Z_i , and the mean function μ is unknown. The index set of Z is assumed to be an interval which we take as $[0, 1]$ in the following. The number of design points $p := p_n$ as well as the design points $x_j = x_j(p, n)$ themselves depend on the number n of functions which are observed.

Following the ideas in Mohammadi and Panaretos (2024), by symmetry $\Gamma(x, y) = \Gamma(y, x)$ and it suffices to estimate Γ on the upper triangle

$$T := \{(x, y)^\top \in [0, 1]^2 \mid x \leq y\}. \quad (2)$$

As estimator for Γ at $(x, y) \in T$ we consider

$$\hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h) := \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) (Y_{i,j} Y_{i,k} - \bar{Y}_{n,j} \bar{Y}_{n,k}), \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{Y}_{n,j} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_{i,j}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $h > 0$ is a bandwidth parameter and $w_{j,k}(x, y; h) = w_{j,k;p}(x, y; h; x_1, \dots, x_p)$ are weights, assumptions on which are listed in Section 3. Note that we leave out the diagonal ($j = k$) in order to avoid bias induced by the squared errors $\varepsilon_{i,j}^2$, and furthermore that following Mohammadi and Panaretos (2024) we build the estimator with observation pairs above the diagonal $j < k$ to avoid the potential lower smoothness of the covariance kernel on the diagonal. Let us also stress that the estimator does not require an estimator $\hat{\mu}_n$ of the mean function μ to form residuals $Y_{i,j} - \hat{\mu}_n(x_j)$. Indeed, the observed covariance matrix and hence $\hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h)$ are independent of μ , hence no assumptions on μ are required, see also the discussion in Remark 6. For $x', y' \in [0, 1]$ with $x' > y'$ we simply set $\hat{\Gamma}_n(x', y'; h) := \hat{\Gamma}_n(y', x'; h)$. Then

$$\|\hat{\Gamma}_n(\cdot; h) - \Gamma\|_\infty = \sup_{x, y \in [0, 1]} |\hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h) - \hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y)| = \sup_{(x, y) \in T} |\hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h) - \hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y)|,$$

so that we may focus on the analysis of the estimator on T .

Example 1 (Local polynomial estimator). We shall show that restricted bivariate local polynomial estimators of order $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, that is the first coordinate $(\hat{\vartheta}(x, y))_1$ of the vector

$$\hat{\vartheta}(x, y) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\vartheta} \sum_{j < k}^p \left(z_{i,j;n} - \vartheta^\top U_m \begin{pmatrix} (x_j - x)/h \\ (x_k - y)/h \end{pmatrix} \right)^2 K \begin{pmatrix} (x_j - x)/h \\ (x_k - y)/h \end{pmatrix}, \quad x \leq y, \quad (4)$$

where we denote $z_{i,j;n} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_{i,j} Y_{i,k} - \bar{Y}_{n,j} \bar{Y}_{n,k})$ are linear estimators under mild assumptions and satisfy our requirements in Assumption 3 in the next section. Here, K is a bivariate non-negative kernel, $h > 0$ is a bandwidth and $U_m: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N_m}$ with $N_m := \frac{(m+1)(m+2)}{2}$ is a vector containing the monomials up to order m , with the constant as first entry, that is

$$U_m(u_1, u_2) := (1, P_1(u_1, u_2), \dots, P_m(u_1, u_2))^\top, \quad u_1, u_2 \in [0, 1],$$

where

$$P_l(u_1, u_2) := \left(\frac{u_1^l}{l!}, \frac{u_1^{l-1} u_2}{(l-1)!}, \frac{u_1^{l-2} u_2^2}{(l-2)!}, \dots, \frac{u_2^l}{l!} \right), \quad u_1, u_2 \in [0, 1].$$

Now let us turn to the assumptions that we impose on the process Z and its covariance function. A function $f: T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Hölder-smooth with order $\gamma > 0$ if for all indices $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$ with $|\beta| = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \leq \lfloor \gamma \rfloor = \max\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid k < \gamma\} =: k$, the partial derivatives $D^\beta f(x) = \partial_1^{\beta_1} \partial_2^{\beta_2} f(x)$ exist and if the Hölder-norm given by

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}, \gamma} := \max_{|\beta| \leq k} \sup_{w \in T} |D^\beta f(w)| + \max_{|\beta|=k} \sup_{v, w \in T, v \neq w} \frac{|D^\beta f(v) - D^\beta f(w)|}{\|v - w\|_\infty^{\gamma-k}}$$

is finite. Define the Hölder class with parameters $\gamma > 0$ and $L > 0$ on T by

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\gamma, L) = \{f: T \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}, \gamma} \leq L\}. \quad (5)$$

Note that a symmetric function f on $[0, 1]^2$ can be contained in $\mathcal{H}_T(\gamma, L)$ for $\gamma > 1$ even if f is not partially differentiable on the diagonal of $[0, 1]^2$ and hence not Hölder smooth of order greater than 1 on $[0, 1]^2$. Roughly speaking, smoothness of the covariance kernel of a centered Gaussian process of order $2k$ in the neighborhood of the diagonal of $[0, 1]^2$ implies smoothness of the paths of order k (Azaïs and Wschebor, 2009, Section 1.4). Thus, as stressed in Mohammadi and Panaretos (2024) processes with relatively rough sample paths such as the Brownian motion do not have covariance kernels which are smooth on $[0, 1]^2$. However, as is the case for Brownian motion, these kernels can still be smooth on T , and our estimator will be able to make use of higher order smoothness of Γ restricted to T .

For the process Z we further assume that $\mathbb{E}[Z(0)^4] < \infty$ and that the paths are Hölder continuous of some potentially low order: there exists $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and a random variable $M = M_Z > 0$ with $\mathbb{E}[M^4] < \infty$ such that

$$|Z(x) - Z(y)| \leq M |x - y|^\beta, \quad x, y \in [0, 1] \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (6)$$

Given $C_Z > 0$ and $0 < \beta_0 \leq 1$, we consider the class of processes

$$\mathcal{P}(\gamma) := \mathcal{P}(\gamma; L, \beta_0, C_Z) = \{Z: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ centered random process} \mid \exists \beta \in [\beta_0, 1] \text{ and } M \text{ s.t.} \\ \mathbb{E}[M^4] + \mathbb{E}[Z(0)^4] \leq C_Z, (6) \text{ holds and } \Gamma|_T \in \mathcal{H}_T(\gamma, L)\}. \quad (7)$$

Example 2 (Gaussian processes). If Z has covariance function Γ which satisfies $\Gamma|_T \in \mathcal{H}_T(\gamma, L)$, then

$$d_Z(x, y) := \mathbb{E}[(Z(x) - Z(y))^2] \leq C(\gamma, L) |x - y|^{\min(\gamma, 1)}.$$

Hence Theorem 1 in Azmoodeh et al. (2014) implies that for a (centered) Gaussian process Z with $\Gamma|_T \in \mathcal{H}_T(\gamma, L)$ the sample paths satisfy (6) for each $\beta < \min(\gamma, 1)/2$, and the fourth moment of the Hölder constant M can be bounded in terms of β, γ and L . Since the rate of convergence for estimating Γ will not depend on β_0 , our results therefore also apply to the class

$$\mathcal{P}_G(\gamma) := \mathcal{P}_G(\gamma; L) = \{Z: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ centered Gaussian process} \mid \Gamma|_T \in \mathcal{H}_T(\gamma, L)\}. \quad (8)$$

3 Optimal rates of convergence for covariance kernel estimation and asymptotic normality

3.1 Upper bounds

To derive the upper bounds consider the following assumptions on the design and the distribution of the errors.

Assumption 1 (Design Assumption). There is a constant $C_3 > 0$ such that for each $x \in T$ and $h > 0$ we have that

$$\text{card} \{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \mid x_j \in [x - h, x + h]\} \leq C_3 p h.$$

Assumption 2 (Sub-Gaussian errors). The random variables $\{\varepsilon_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$ are independent and independent of the processes Z_1, \dots, Z_n . Further we assume that the distribution of $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ is sub-Gaussian, and setting $\sigma_{i,j}^2 := \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{i,j}^2]$ we have that $\sigma^2 := \sup_n \max_{i,j} \sigma_{i,j}^2 < \infty$ and that there exists $\zeta \geq 1$ such that $\zeta^2 \sigma_{i,j}^2$ is an upper bound for the sub-Gaussian norm of $\varepsilon_{i,j}$.

For the weights of the linear estimator in (3) we require the following properties, which are checked for the restricted form of the local polynomial weights of Example 1 in Section D in the supplementary appendix.

Assumption 3. There is a $c > 0$ and a $h_0 > 0$ such that for sufficiently large p , the following holds for all $h \in (c/p, h_0]$ for constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ which are independent of n, p, h and $(x, y) \in T$.

(W1) The weights reproduce polynomials of a degree $\zeta \geq 0$, that is for $x, y \in T$,

$$\sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) = 1, \quad \sum_{j < k}^p (x_j - x)^{r_1} (x_k - y)^{r_2} w_{j,k}(x, y; h) = 0,$$

for $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ s.t. $r_1 + r_2 \leq \zeta$.

(W2) We have $w_{j,k}(x, y; h) = 0$ if $\max(|x_j - x|, |x_k - y|) > h$ with $(x, y) \in T$.

(W3) For the absolute values of the weights $\max_{1 \leq j < k \leq p} |w_{j,k}(x, y; h)| \leq C_1 (ph)^{-2}$, $x \leq y$.

(W4) For a Lipschitz constant $C_2 > 0$ it holds that

$$|w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)| \leq \frac{C_2}{(ph)^2} \left(\frac{\max(|x - x'|, |y - y'|)}{h} \wedge 1 \right), \quad x \leq y, x' \leq y'.$$

Theorem 3. Consider model (1) under Assumptions 1 and 2. Suppose that for given $\gamma > 0$ the weights in the linear estimator $\hat{\Gamma}_n(\cdot; h)$ for the covariance kernel Γ in (3) satisfy Assumption 3 with $\zeta = \lfloor \gamma \rfloor$. Then for $0 < \beta_0 \leq 1$ and $L, C_Z > 0$ we have that

$$\sup_{h \in (c/p, h_0]} \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma; L, \beta_0, C_Z)} a_{n,p,h}^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{\Gamma}_n(\cdot; h) - \Gamma \right\|_{\infty} \right] = \mathcal{O}(1),$$

where

$$a_{n,p,h} = \max \left(h^{\gamma}, \left(\frac{\log(h^{-1})}{np} \right)^{1/2}, n^{-1/2} \right). \quad (9)$$

Hence by setting $h^* \sim \max \left(c/p, \left(\frac{\log(np)}{np} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}} \right)$ we obtain

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma; L, \beta_0, C_Z)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \hat{\Gamma}_n(\cdot; h^*) - \Gamma \right\|_{\infty} \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(p^{-\gamma} + \left(\frac{\log(np)}{np} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2\gamma+1}} + n^{-1/2} \right). \quad (10)$$

Furthermore, in both upper bounds the class $\mathcal{P}(\gamma) = \mathcal{P}(\gamma; L, \beta_0, C_Z)$ can be replaced by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma; L)$ in (8).

The proof is given in Section 6.1.

Remark 4 (Comments on the rate of convergence). The rate in (10) consists of a discretization bias $p^{-\gamma}$, the $1/\sqrt{n}$ rate arising from the contribution of the processes Z_i as well as the intermediate term involving the errors which is specific to the use of the supremum norm. Overall (10) is analogous to the rate obtained for the mean function in one dimension $d = 1$ in Berger et al. (2024). Somewhat surprisingly, the fact that $\hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h)$ is a bivariate function neither

influences the rate arising from the discretization bias $p^{-\gamma}$ nor that from the observation errors, $(\log(np)/(np))^{\gamma/(2\gamma+1)}$, where a factor $2\gamma + 2$ would be expected in the denominator of the exponent. This seems to be an improvement of the rates of covariance kernel estimation obtained in Li and Hsing (2010); Zhang and Wang (2016), and is reminiscent of the one-dimensional rates obtained in Cai and Yuan (2010); Hall et al. (2006) for the principal component functions. In particular, the discussions regarding the regimes in the rate (10) as well as a choice of h independent of the smoothness γ from Berger et al. (2024, Remarks 4 and 5) apply to this setting as well.

Remark 5 (Error decomposition and proof techniques). In Lemma 11 in the appendix we derive an error decomposition of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h) - \Gamma(x, y) &= \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k} + \text{higher order terms} \right. \\ &+ \Gamma(x_j, x_k) - \Gamma(x, y) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i(x_j) \epsilon_{i,k} + Z_i(x_k) \epsilon_{i,j}) + \left. \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i(x_j) Z_i(x_k) - \Gamma(x_j, x_k)) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The first term in (11) is bounded by h^γ by using the property (W1) of the weights and standard estimates. The third term in (11) induces the $1/\sqrt{n}$ rate by using $\mathbb{E}[\|n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i(\cdot) Z_i(\cdot) - \Gamma\|_\infty] = \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$ as well as the boundedness of sums of absolute values of the weights. The intermediate term in (11) which captures the interplay between processes and errors gives the rate $(\log(h^{-1})/(nph))^{1/2}$, resulting in the overall bound (9). The term in the line above (11) involving products of errors is analyzed using the Hanson-Wright inequality and can be bounded by $(\log(h^{-1})/(n(ph)^2))^{1/2}$, and since $p^{-1} \lesssim h$ is negligible. A detailed proof is contained in Section 6.

Remark 6 (Effect of mean function estimation). The mean function μ cancels out when forming the estimator (3). Therefore, no assumptions are required on μ , and we could of course include a \sup_μ in the statements of the upper bounds. This is in contrast to most approaches in the literature which rely on an initial estimate of the mean and forming residuals (Zhang and Wang, 2016; Li and Hsing, 2010; Xiao, 2020). However, this feature seems to be particular to the synchronous design that we consider. If design points are asynchronous (e.g. realizations of random time points), it appears that also estimating the mean cannot be avoided. We are not aware that the precise effect of mean function estimation on covariance kernel estimation, similar to nonparametric variance function estimation in nonparametric regression (Wang et al., 2008), has been investigated in the literature.

3.2 Lower Bounds

Now let us turn to corresponding lower bounds. Intuitively since covariance kernel estimation should be at least as hard as mean function estimation, and since the rate in (10) corresponds to the optimal rate for mean function estimation in one dimensions $d = 1$ (Berger et al., 2024), optimality of the rates is not surprising. However, the proofs in particular for the intermediate term in (10) are much more involved than for the mean function.

We require the following more restrictive design assumption.

Assumption 4 (Design). Let the points x_1, \dots, x_p be given by the equations

$$\int_0^{x_j} f(t) dt = \frac{j - 0.5}{p}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p,$$

where $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous density that is bounded by $0 < f_{\min} \leq f(t) \leq f_{\max} < \infty$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

In Berger et al. (2024) it is shown that Assumption 4 implies Assumption 1.

Theorem 7. Assume that in model (1) the errors $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_0^2)$ - distributed, $\sigma_0^2 > 0$, and that the design points x_1, \dots, x_p satisfy Assumption 4. Then setting

$$a_{n,p} = p^{-\gamma} + \left(\frac{\log(np)}{np} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2\gamma+1}} + n^{-1/2}$$

we have that

$$\liminf_{n,p \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}} \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{G}}(\gamma; L)} a_{n,p}^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p} - \Gamma\|_{\infty} \right] > 0,$$

where the infimum is taken over all estimators $\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}$ of Γ .

The proof is provided in Section 6.2.

Remark 8 (Comments on proof). To obtain lower bounds one needs to construct hypothesis functions with appropriate distance in the supremum norm but for which the associated distributions of the observations are sufficiently close in a suitable sense. For Gaussian distributions which differ only in location, one can conveniently use the Kullback-Leibler divergence since it amounts to the scaled squared Euclidean distance of the location parameters. For Gaussian distributions which differ only in scale the Kullback-Leibler divergence leads to a sub-optimal order $|\sigma_1^2 - \sigma_2^2|$ instead of $(\sigma_1^2 - \sigma_2^2)^2$ which can be achieved e.g. by the Hellinger distance. Brown and Levine (2007) base their arguments for the lower bounds of the pointwise risk in nonparametric variance estimation on the Hellinger distance. However, for the supremum norm in our setting to achieve the logarithmic factor in $(\log(np)/(np))^{\frac{\gamma}{2\gamma+1}}$ in the lower bound requires an increasing number of hypotheses, and it seems that the Hellinger distance cannot be used. Therefore we develop novel arguments and work directly with a criterion based on the likelihood ratio as given in Tsybakov (2004, Theorem 2.4).

3.3 Asymptotic normality

To derive the asymptotic normality of the estimator (3) we need the following smoothness assumption on the fourth moment function.

Assumption 5 (Fourth moment function). The fourth moment function

$$R(x, y, s, t) := \mathbb{E}[Z(x)Z(y)Z(s)Z(t)] - \Gamma(x, y)\Gamma(s, t), \quad x, y, s, t \in [0, 1], \quad (12)$$

of the process Z is Hölder smooth of some positive order: $R \in \mathcal{H}_{[0,1]^2}(\zeta, \tilde{L})$ for some $0 < \zeta \leq 1$ and $\tilde{L} > 0$.

Theorem 9. In model (1) under Assumptions 2 and 5, consider the linear estimator in (3) with weights satisfying Assumption 3 with $\zeta = \lfloor \gamma \rfloor$. Further suppose that for some $\delta > 0$ we have that $p \gtrsim n^{1/(2\gamma)} \log(n)^{1+2\delta}$. Then for all sequences of smoothing parameters $h = h_n$ in

$$H_n := [\log(n)^{1+\delta}/p, n^{-1/(2\gamma)} \log(n)^{-\delta}]$$

it holds that

$$\sqrt{n} (\hat{c}_{n,h} - \Gamma) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{G}(0, R), \quad (13)$$

where \mathcal{G} is a real-valued Gaussian process on $[0, 1]^2$ with covariance operator R given in (12).

The proof is deferred to Section B in the supplementary appendix.

Remark 10. The asymptotic covariance operator R is as in the case with continuous and error-free observations, see e.g. Dette et al. (2020, Theorem 2.1).

4 Simulations and real-data illustration

In this section we present simulation results for our methods and give a real-data application. First in Section 4.1 we illustrate the finite sample effect of the choice of the bandwidth and propose and investigate a cross validation procedure to select a bandwidth. Further we simulate the size in the sup-norm of the terms in the error decomposition in (11) which the rate in Theorem 3 relies on. Finally we compare the proposed estimator which uses only the empirical covariances above the diagonal to a more conventional bivariate local polynomial estimator which still leaves out the diagonal terms to reduce variability resulting from the errors but otherwise smooths over the diagonal. In Section 4.2 we give an illustration to daily temperature curves in Nuremberg, in which we show how standard deviation and correlation functions resulting from our estimate of the covariance vary over the year. The R-code regarding the simulations and the real data examples can be found in the Github repository [mbrgr/Optimal-Rates-Covariance-Estimation-in-FDA](#). The implementation of the calculation of the weights of the bivariate local polynomial estimator and the estimator itself can be found in the `biLocPol` package, which is also available on Github in the repository [mbrgr/biLocPol](#).

4.1 Simulations

For most of the simulations we consider the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process

$$Z_t = \sigma \int_0^t \exp(-\theta(t-s)) dB_s$$




Figure 1: Covariance kernel Γ_{OU} in (14) with parameters $\theta = 3$ and $\sigma = 2$. The scatter plot shows $(x_j, x_k, z_{j,k})$ with $p = 40$ and $n = 100$, and normally distributed errors with standard deviation 0.75. The influence of the additional error variance is clearly visible on the diagonal of the covariance kernel.




Figure 2: Comparison of the estimators (blue to red plane) $\hat{\Gamma}_{100,40}^{0.3,1}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_{100,40}^{\neq,0.2,1}$ on the covariance kernel Γ_{OU} based on the observations of Figure 1.

with parameters $\theta = 3$ and $\sigma = 2$, and where $(B_s)_{s \geq 0}$ is a standard Brownian motion. It has covariance kernel given by

$$\Gamma_{\text{OU}}(s, t) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\theta} \left(\exp(-\theta|t - s|) - \exp(-\theta(s + t)) \right), \quad (14)$$

which has a kink on the diagonal. The mean function μ in model (1) is set to 0 since it is ancillary in forming the estimator, and the errors $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ are centered, normally distributed with standard deviation $\sigma_\varepsilon = 0.75$. The grid points are equidistant at $x_j = (j - 1/2)/p$, $j = 1, \dots, p$.

Figure 1 contains two plots of the covariance kernel in (14) together with a scatter plot $(x_j, x_k, z_{j,k})$ of the empirical covariances $z_{j,k} = (n - 1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_{i,j}Y_{i,k} - \bar{Y}_j\bar{Y}_k)$, $1 \leq j, k \leq p$ of the observations, for a particular sample with $p = 40$ and $n = 100$. One observes that the covariance kernel (14) is not smooth on the diagonal, and that the empirical covariances deviate strongly from the underlying covariance kernel on the diagonal due to the additional variance from the observation errors $\varepsilon_{i,j}$. For this sample, our variant of the local polynomial estimator (4) of order $m = 1$ (local linear) with bandwidth $h = 0.3$, denoted as $\hat{\Gamma}_{100,40}^{0.3,1}$, is displayed in Figure 2a together with the true underlying covariance kernel. For comparison in Figure 2b we display the result for the estimator

$$\hat{\Gamma}_n^{\neq}(x, y; h) := \frac{1}{n - 1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) (Y_{i,j}Y_{i,k} - \bar{Y}_{n,j}\bar{Y}_{n,k}), \quad (15)$$

with local polynomial weights, which only excludes empirical variances but otherwise smooths over the diagonal. We again use $m = 1$ and $h = 0.2$, resulting in $\hat{\Gamma}_{100,40}^{\neq,0.2,1}$. This estimator displays a substantial bias due to the kink of the true covariance kernel along the diagonal.

Bandwidth selection

First we investigate the effect of bandwidth selection on the performance of our variant (4) of the local polynomial estimator, where we restrict ourselves to order $m = 1$, for sample size $n = 400$ and $p \in \{15, 25, 50, 75, 100\}$. For each value of p we use $N = 1000$ repetitions and calculate the supremum norm error of $\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}$ for h varying over a grid of bandwidths up to 1. The results are displayed as curves in h in Figure 3. Similar results for $n = 50$, $n = 100$ and $n = 200$ are given in the supplementary appendix E in Figure 13. One observes that smoothing is an important part of estimation but should not be overdone. In our setting, for $n = 400$ the bandwidths that lead to the smallest overall error become slightly smaller with increasing p and are always between 0.2 and 0.4.

Next we investigate a K -fold cross validation procedure for selecting h . We proceed as follows: The n observed curves are split randomly into K groups of approximately the same size. One




Figure 3: Supremum norm error of our estimator with $m = 1$ for estimating the covariance kernel of the OU-process (14) with different bandwidths h .




Figure 4: Results of bandwidth selection with five fold cross validation in the same simulation setup as in Figure 3.




Figure 5: Results of bandwidth selection with five fold cross validation as in Figure 4 in a more detailed presentation.

of the groups is used as test data from which we calculate the empirical covariance matrix $(Z_{jk}^{\text{test},r})_{j,k=1,\dots,p}$. The empirical covariance matrix $(Z_{jk}^{\text{train},-r})_{j,k=1,\dots,p}$, $r = 1, \dots, K$, based on the remaining $K - 1$ groups will be used as input data to our estimator. The procedure requires a grid of bandwidths h_l , $l = 1, \dots, m$ and for every bandwidth h_l we evaluate the local polynomial estimator in (4) K -times with each group once as the test set. We take the mean of the K sup norm errors for each bandwidth h_l ,

$$\text{CV}(h_l) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{r=1}^K \max_{1 \leq j < k \leq p} |\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}(x_j, x_k; h_l, Z_{j,k}^{\text{train},-r}) - Z_{j,k}^{\text{test},r}|.$$

Finally we choose the bandwidth with the minimal average sup-norm error,

$$h^{\text{cv}} = \text{argmin} \{ \text{CV}(h_l) \mid h_l, l = 1, \dots, m \}.$$

We repeat this procedure $N = 1000$ times for $n = 400$ and each $p \in \{15, 25, 50, 75, 100\}$. The results are displayed in Figures 4 and 5. Overall, when compared to the optimal bandwidths visible in Figure 3, the cross-validation procedure chooses reasonable but somewhat large bandwidths, which may reflect the additional variability from the estimate in the test data.




Figure 6: Error Decomposition of $\|\hat{\Gamma}_n - \Gamma_{OU}\|_\infty$ where **dsc** is (17), **eps** is (16), **mix** is (19), **prc** is (18) and **sup** is the overall supremum error of the estimator. The terms in (20) are not included.

Contribution of terms in the error decomposition

Next we empirically examine the order that the various terms in the error decomposition (11) have in the supremum norm. Again for each combination of $n \in \{100, 200, 400\}$ and $p \in \{15, 25, 50, 100\}$ we simulate $N = 1000$ repetitions, where we use optimal bandwidths $h_{n,p}$ for the overall supremum-norm error determined by a grid search. The results are displayed in Figure 6. Overall, the main contribution to the sup-norm error is from the term involving the processes Z_i , which of course decays in n but is not sensitive to p . The other terms also decrease somewhat with increasing p . Note that individual errors do not add up to the overall error which is plausible since (11) is an upper bound resulting from the triangle inequality.

Comparison of $\hat{\Gamma}_n$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_n^\neq$ in (15)

Finally let us compare our estimator $\hat{\Gamma}_n$ in more detail with the estimator $\hat{\Gamma}_n^\neq$ in (15) which uses smoothing over the diagonal. Recall the notation $\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}^{h,m}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}^{\neq,h,m}$, where m is the order of the local polynomial and h is the bandwidth.

In addition to the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process which has a kink on the diagonal we also consider simulations from the following process

$$\tilde{Z}(x, y) := \frac{2}{3} N_1 \sin(\pi x) + \sqrt{2} \frac{2}{3} \cos(5\pi y/5),$$

where N_1 and N_2 are independent standard normal distributed random variables. \tilde{Z} has a smooth covariance kernel given by

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(x, y) = \frac{4}{9} \sin(\pi x) \sin(\pi y) + \frac{8}{9} \cos(4\pi x/5) \cos(4\pi y/5).$$

Figure 7 displays estimates of the kernel $\tilde{\Gamma}$ for a particular sample with $n = 100$ and $p = 40$ using $\hat{\Gamma}_{100,40}^{0.2,1}$ (Figure 7a) as well as using $\hat{\Gamma}_{100,40}^{\neq,0.2,1}$ (Figure 7b). While the overall quality of estimation appears to be similar, $\hat{\Gamma}_{100,40}^{0.2,1}$ has a slight artificial kink on the diagonal.

Finally we use $N = 1000$ repeated simulations for $n = 100$ and $p = 50$ for estimating Γ_{OU} as well as $\tilde{\Gamma}$ with both $\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}^{h,m}$ and $\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}^{\neq,h,m}$, for $m = 0, 1, 2$ and for a grid of bandwidths. The results are displayed in Figure 8a for estimating Γ_{OU} and in Figure 8b for $\tilde{\Gamma}$. For the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process Γ_{OU} the estimators perform similarly for $m = 0$ but there are major differences for the local linear ($m = 1$) and local quadratic ($m = 2$) case. In particular using the local linear

estimator $\Gamma_n^{\neq,1}$ is way worse than $\hat{\Gamma}_n^1$. Note that in this case not much smoothing is necessary. In Figure 8b the target kernel is smooth on the whole of $[0,1]^2$ and needs more smoothing to obtain good results. Here both estimators should have the same rates of convergence, which is confirmed in the numerical example. A further advantage of $\hat{\Gamma}_n$ in comparison to $\hat{\Gamma}_n^{\neq}$ is the lower computational cost, since only $p(p-1)/2$ observations (instead of $p(p-1)$) are needed.

4.2 Weather data in Nuremberg

We consider daily temperature curves in each month from the years 2002 up to 2022. The data is obtained from the *Deutscher Wetter Dienst (DWD)* at [\[Link\]](#). This particular data set was already used in Berger et al. (2024) to investigate the effect of sparse or dense design on the mean estimation. The observations on each day are taken on a ten minute grid. To reduce the day to day time-series dependency only every third or fourth day, the 1, 4, 8, 12, 15, 18, 22, 25 and 29th of every month, was used. This results in around $n = 180$ observations for each month, except for February where $n = 165$. Figure 9 shows the daily weather curves for January and August. We use our estimator in (3) for the covariance kernel and derive estimates of the standard deviation curves as well as of the correlation surfaces. Results for the standard deviation curves with the bandwidths 144, 288, 720 for the months January and August can be seen in Figure 10. Since a day has 1440 minutes the bandwidths 144, 288, 720 are equivalent to 0.1, 0.2, 0.5 on the unit interval. Next to the notable temperature difference the standard deviation structure seems to be different as well: The winter days have higher standard deviations at night, while the summer days vary more across day time. Although the smoothing with $h = 720$ seems a little much, the results are still reasonable. Overall the months from February to April have the highest standard deviations. Warm days are the reason for the characteristic bump in the summer months, which are not visible in the cold months from December to February. In December and January the highest standard deviation is in the night due to extremely cold nights, which can be seen in Figure 9a.

In Figure 11 we display estimates of the correlation function with bandwidth $h = 288$ for January and August. The winter days in January have a higher correlation of the temperature during the night and day compared to the summer month August. However in August the temperature in




Figure 7: Estimation (red/blue) of the covariance kernel $\tilde{\Gamma}$. For $\hat{\Gamma}_{100,40}^{0.2,1}$ a small artificial kink appears on the diagonal of the estimator. The overall estimation quality seems about equal.




Figure 8: Estimation of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ with $\hat{\Gamma}_n$ ('mir': mirrored) and with $\hat{\Gamma}_n^{\neq, m}$ ('wd': without diagonal) for different bandwidths.

the morning correlates highly with the day time temperature. Again this is in line with Figure 9. When making these estimations it is crucial to take care of the dependency structure of consecutive days, otherwise a high additional time-series correlation in the corners is captured in the estimate.




Figure 9: Temperature curves in January measured in 10 minute intervals from 2002 until 2022. Note that the y -axis differ.

5 Conclusions and discussion

Local polynomial estimators also yield estimates of derivatives. As discussed in Example 2, existence of global derivatives of the covariance kernel are intrinsically related to smoothness of the paths of the process, in particular for Gaussian processes. Dai et al. (2018) discuss estimation of the covariance kernel of derivatives of the underlying processes, and Hassan and Hosseini-Nasab (2021) give upper bounds for mean function derivative estimation in FDA. Apart from estimating derivatives, our methods can form the basis for inference of smoothness of the covariance kernel on the diagonal, and hence for smoothness of the paths. For example, existence of global partial derivatives implies $\partial_x c(x, x) = \partial_y c(x, x)$, which can be tested by using derivative estimators resulting from our method. As another application, the roughness parameter function $\tau(x) = \partial_x \partial_y c(x, x)$ in Liebl and Reimherr (2019) can be estimated in settings with observation errors by using our estimation method.

As the real-data example shows, extensions of our method to time series data would be of quite some interest. Parameter estimation of mean and covariance kernel and related inference methods under the supremum norm have been intensely investigated in recent years (Dette et al., 2020; Dette and Wu, 2021; Dette and Kokot, 2022). Here however it is commonly assumed that full paths of the processes are observed without errors, and results for discrete observations covering the time series setting seem to be missing in the literature.

Estimates of the covariance kernel serve as the basis for estimating the principle component functions. Here most results are in L_2 (Cai and Yuan, 2010; Hall et al., 2006; Xiao, 2020). Li and Hsing (2010) have rates in the supremum norm based on the expansions developed in Hall and Hosseini-Nasab (2009). Rate optimality and a CLT in case of synchronous design would certainly be of interest when estimating the principle component functions.

6 Proofs

6.1 Proof of Theorem 3

First let us make the error decomposition in Remark 5 precise.

Lemma 11 (Error decomposition). *For the estimator $\hat{\Gamma}_n(\cdot, \cdot; h)$ in (3), if the weights satisfy*




Figure 10: Estimation of the standard deviation of the temperatures during January and August.




Figure 11: Estimation of the correlation of the temperature during the day. Note that the z-axis on the left ranges from 0.6 to 1 and on the right from 0.4 to 1.

(W1) for some $\zeta > 0$ then we have the error decomposition

$$\hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h) - \Gamma(x, y) = \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k} \right. \quad (16)$$

$$\left. + \Gamma(x_j, x_k) - \Gamma(x, y) \right] \quad (17)$$

$$\left. + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i(x_j) Z_i(x_k) - \Gamma(x_j, x_k)) \right] \quad (18)$$

$$\left. + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i(x_j) \epsilon_{i,k} + Z_i(x_k) \epsilon_{i,j}) \right] \quad (19)$$

$$\left. - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq l}^n (\epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{l,k} + Z_i(x_j) Z_l(x_k) + Z_i(x_j) \epsilon_{l,k} + \epsilon_{i,j} Z_l(x_k)) \right]. \quad (20)$$

The proof of Lemma 11 is provided in the supplementary appendix in Section A.

Next observe that combining (W3) and Assumption 1 yields for $(x, y)^\top \in T$ that

(W5) For a constant $C_4 > 0$ the sum of the absolute values of the weights $\sum_{j < k}^p |w_{j,k}(x, y; h)| \leq C_4$.

Lemma 12 (Upper Bounds for the rates of convergence). *Given $0 < \beta_0 \leq 1$ and $\gamma, L, C_Z > 0$, for the estimator $\hat{\Gamma}_n(\cdot, \cdot; h)$ in (3) with n and p large enough the following rates of convergence hold, where we abbreviate $\mathcal{P}(\gamma) = \mathcal{P}(\gamma; L, \beta_0, C_Z)$.*

i) If the weights satisfy (W1) with $\zeta = \lfloor \gamma \rfloor$, (W2) of Assumption 3 and (W5), then

$$\sup_{h \in (c/p, h_0]} \sup_{Z \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma)} \sup_{(x, y) \in T} h^{-\gamma} \left| \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) (\hat{\Gamma}_n(x_j, x_k; h) - \Gamma(x, y)) \right| = \mathcal{O}(1),$$

with constants $h_0, c > 0$ according to Assumption 3.

ii) If the weights satisfy (W2), (W3) and (W4), then under Assumption 1 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(x,y)\in T}\left|\sum_{j<k}^p w_{j,k}(x,y;h)\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j}\epsilon_{i,k}\right|\right] &= \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(np)}{n(ph)^2}}\right), \\ \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(x,y)\in T}\left|\sum_{j<k}^p w_{j,k}(x,y;h)\sum_{i,l=1}^n \frac{\epsilon_{i,j}\epsilon_{l,k}}{n(n-1)}\right|\right] &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log(np)}{nph}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the constants in the \mathcal{O} terms can be chosen uniformly for $h \in (c/p, h_0]$.

iii) If the weights satisfy (W5), then

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{h\in(c/p,h_0]}\sup_{Z\in\mathcal{P}(\gamma)}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(x,y)\in T}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j<k}^p w_{j,k}(x,y;h)\sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i(x_j)Z_i(x_k) - \Gamma(x_j, x_k))\right|\right] &= \mathcal{O}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \\ \sup_{h\in(c/p,h_0]}\sup_{Z\in\mathcal{P}(\gamma)}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(x,y)\in T}\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j<k}^p w_{j,k}(x,y;h)\sum_{i,l=1}^n \frac{Z_i(x_j)Z_l(x_k)}{n-1}\right|\right] &= \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

iv) If the weights satisfy (W2), (W3) and (W4) and Assumption 1, then

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{Z\in\mathcal{P}(\gamma)}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(x,y)\in T}\left|\sum_{j<k}^p w_{j,k}(x,y;h)\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i(x_j)\epsilon_{i,k}\right|\right] &= \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(h^{-1})}{nph}}\right), \\ \sup_{Z\in\mathcal{P}(\gamma)}\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(x,y)\in T}\left|\sum_{j<k}^p w_{j,k}(x,y;h)\sum_{i\neq l}^n \frac{Z_i(x_j)\epsilon_{l,k}}{n(n-1)}\right|\right] &= \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(h^{-1})}{nph}}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the constants in the \mathcal{O} terms can be chosen uniformly for $h \in (c/p, h_0]$.

Proof of Lemma 12. i). The rate of bias term (17) is obtained by standard arguments. For convenience these are detailed in the supplementary appendix, Section A.

ii). We show the bound for the first term in ii), the second is dealt with in the supplementary appendix, Section A. To deal with the quadratic form

$$E_{n,p,h}(x,y) = \sum_{j<k}^p w_{j,k}(x,y;h)\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j}\epsilon_{i,k} \quad (21)$$

the main ingredient is the higher dimensional Hanson-Wright inequality (Vershynin, 2018, p. 142) which is stated in Lemma 13 at the end of this section. This is combined with a discretisation technique and the Lipschitz-continuity of the weights, property (W4).

Given $\delta > 0$ choose a δ -cover $I_\delta = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{\lfloor \sqrt{C_T/\delta} \rfloor}\}^2$ of T of cardinality C_T/δ^2 for an appropriate constant $C_T > 0$. We estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\|E_{n,p,h}\|_\infty &= \sup_{z'\in I_\delta}\sup_{\substack{z\in T, \\ \|z-z'\|\leq\delta}}|E_{n,p,h}(z)| \\ &\leq \sup_{z'\in I_\delta}\sup_{\substack{z\in T, \\ \|z-z'\|\leq\delta}}\left(|E_{n,p,h}(z) - E_{n,p,h}(z')| + |E_{n,p,h}(z')|\right) \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{z,z'\in T, \\ \|z-z'\|\leq\delta}}|E_{n,p,h}(z) - E_{n,p,h}(z')| + \sup_{z'\in I_\delta}|E_{n,p,h}(z')|. \quad (22)\end{aligned}$$

For the first term, setting $\epsilon_j := (\epsilon_{1,j}, \dots, \epsilon_{n,j})^\top$, by (W4) and Assumption 1 we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\substack{z,z'\in T, \\ \|z-z'\|\leq\delta}}|E_{n,p,h}(z) - E_{n,p,h}(z')|\right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\substack{z, z' \in T, \\ \|z - z'\| \leq \delta}} \left| \sum_{j < k}^p (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) \langle \epsilon_j, \epsilon_k \rangle \right| \right] \\
&\leq n^{-1} 2 C_2 C_3 \delta h^{-1} \mathbb{E} |\langle \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \rangle| \quad (\text{by (W4) and Assumption 1}) \\
&\leq 2 C_2 C_3 \delta h^{-1} \sigma^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/(nph)), \quad (\mathbb{E} |\langle \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \rangle| \leq n\sigma^2, \delta := 1/(np))
\end{aligned}$$

where for the last inequality we take $\delta := 1/(np)$.

As for the second term in (22), in order to apply the Hanson-Wright inequality, Lemma 13, we need to find upper bounds for the Frobenius and operator norm of the matrix

$$A = (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \mathbf{1}_{j < k})_{j,k=1,\dots,p} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}.$$

From the properties (W3) and (W5) of the weights the Frobenius-norm satisfies

$$\|A\|_F^2 = \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h)^2 \leq \frac{C_1 C_4}{(ph)^2}, \quad (23)$$

For the operator-norm $\|A\|_{\text{op}} = \max_{j=1,\dots,p} s_j$, where $s_j, j = 1, \dots, p$, are the singular values of A , we have that

$$\|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq (\|A\|_1 \|A\|_\infty)^{1/2} \leq \frac{C_1 C_3}{ph}, \quad (24)$$

where writing $z = (x, y)$ we may bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A\|_1 &= \max_k \sum_j |w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \mathbf{1}_{j < k}| \leq C_1 C_3 (ph)^{-1}, \\
\|A\|_\infty &= \max_j \sum_k |w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \mathbf{1}_{j < k}| \leq C_1 C_3 (ph)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 1 and (W5). See (Turkmen and Civciv, 2007) for a proof of the first inequality in (24). Then the statement of the Hanson-Wright inequality (Lemma 13) yields

$$\mathbb{P}(|E_{n,p,h}(z)| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\tilde{c} \min \left(\frac{t^2 n (ph)^2}{K^4 C_1 C_4}, \frac{t n p h}{K^2 C_1 C_3} \right) \right),$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n(ph)^2}{\log(np)}} |E_{n,p,h}(x, y)| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t}{C} \min \left(\log(np), \sqrt{n \log(np)} \right) \right) \quad (25)$$

with $C := K^4 C_1 \max(C_4, C_3)/\tilde{c}$ and $t \geq 1$. First we consider the case $\log(np) \lesssim n$. Taking $\eta \geq 1$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(x,y)^\top \in I_\delta} \left| \sqrt{\frac{n(ph)^2}{\log(np)}} E_{n,p,h}(x, y) \right| \right] &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{(x,y)^\top \in I_\delta} \sqrt{\frac{n(ph)^2}{\log(np)}} |E_{n,p,h}(x, y)| \geq t \right) dt \\
&\leq \eta + \sum_{(x,y)^\top \in I_\delta} \int_\eta^\infty \mathbb{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n(ph)^2}{\log(np)}} |E_{n,p,h}(x, y)| \geq t \right) dt \\
&\leq \eta + 2 C_I (np)^2 \int_\eta^\infty \exp \left(-\frac{t \log(np)}{C} \right) dt \\
&= \eta + 2 C_I C \frac{(np)^{2-\eta/C}}{\log(np)} = \mathcal{O} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log(np)} \right), \quad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

by choosing $\eta = 2C$. Since $1/(np h) \leq \sqrt{\log(np)/(np^2 h^2)}$ we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|E_{n,p,h}\|_\infty \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(np)}{n(p h)^2}} \right). \quad (27)$$

In the case where p grows exponentially in n , meaning $\log(np) \gtrsim n$, the same calculations lead to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(x,y)^\top \in I_\delta} \left| \sqrt{\frac{n(p h)^2}{\log(np)}} E_{n,p,h}(x,y) \right| \right] \leq \eta + 2C_I C \frac{(np)^2}{\sqrt{n \log(np)}} \exp \left(-\frac{\eta}{C} n \right).$$

By choosing η large enough such that $p^2 \lesssim \exp(-n\eta/c)$ we get (27) which concludes the proof of the first statement of *ii*).

iii). Again we focus on the first bound, the second can be obtained similarly, details are provided in Section A in the supplementary appendix. First note that by (W5), we may bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(x,y) \in T} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x,y;h) \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i(x_j)Z_i(x_k) - \Gamma(x_j, x_k)) \right| \right] \\ & \leq C_4 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(x,y) \in T} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i(x)Z_i(y) - \Gamma(x,y)) \right| \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

To bound (28) we shall apply the maximal inequality Pollard (1990, Section 7, display (7.10)), see also Berger et al. (2024, Lemma 4). By definition of the class of processes $Z_i \in \mathcal{P}(\gamma; L, \beta_0, C_Z)$, we have $\Gamma \in \mathcal{H}_T(\gamma, L)$ so that Γ is uniformly upper bounded by L , and $|Z_i(x)| \leq |Z_i(0)| + M_i$. Therefore a square-integrable envelope $\Phi_{n,i}$ of $(Z_i(x)Z_i(y) - \Gamma(x,y))/\sqrt{n}$ is given by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |Z_i(x)Z_i(y) - \Gamma(x,y)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (2Z_i^2(0) + 2M_i^2 + L) =: \Phi_{n,i}.$$

To check the assumption of manageability of $(Z_i(x)Z_i(y) - \Gamma(x,y))/\sqrt{n}$ in the sense of (Pollard, 1990, see Definition 7.9, p. 38), see also Berger et al. (2024, Section 8.3), we note that from the Hölder continuity of Γ as well as of the paths of Z_i in (6) the triangle inequality gives

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| Z_i(x)Z_i(y) - \Gamma(x,y) - (Z_i(x')Z_i(y') - \Gamma(x',y')) \right| \leq 2\Phi_{n,i} \max(|x-x'|, |y-y'|)^{\min(\beta, \gamma)}.$$

Then Berger et al. (2024, Lemma 3) implies manageability.

Now Pollard (1990, Section 7, display (7.10)), see also Berger et al. (2024, Lemma 4), implies that (28) is upper bounded by

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\Phi_{i,n}] \leq \text{const.}$$

uniformly over the function class $\mathcal{P}(\gamma; L, \beta_0, C_Z)$.

iv). Again we focus on the first bound, for the second details are provided in Section A in the appendix. Given $\mathbf{z} = (z_{i,j})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, p$ let

$$S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x,y) := \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x,y;h) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k}.$$

By conditioning on $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_i(x_j))$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup |S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x,y)|] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\sup |S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x,y)| | \mathbf{Z}]] = g(\mathbf{Z}), \quad g(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(x,y) \in T} |S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x,y)| \right].$$

To apply Dudley's entropy bound (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, p. 100) we show that for given \mathbf{z} the process $S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x, y)$ is sub-Gaussian with respect to the semi norm

$$d_{|\mathbf{z}}((x, y), (x', y')) = \zeta \mathbb{E}[(S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x, y) - S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x', y'))^2]^{1/2}, \quad (x, y), (x', y') \in T,$$

where $\zeta > 0$ is as in Assumption 2. From Assumption 2, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\lambda \left(S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x, y) - S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x', y') \right) \right) \right] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{k=2}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\lambda \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) \frac{z_{i,j}}{n} \right) \epsilon_{i,k} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{2} \sigma^2 \zeta^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=2}^p \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) \frac{z_{i,j}}{n} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\frac{\lambda^2}{2} d_{|\mathbf{z}}^2((x, y), (x', y')) \right). \end{aligned}$$

To upper bound $d_{|\mathbf{z}}^2((x, y), (x', y'))$, note that by Assumption 1 and (W2) for at most $2C_3ph$ indices j and k respectively the increment of the weights can be non-zero. Using the property (W4) for these differences we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} d_{|\mathbf{z}}^2((x, y), (x', y')) &\leq \zeta^2 \sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^n 2C_3ph \left(2C_3ph \frac{1}{(ph)^2} C_2 \left(\frac{\max(|x-x'|, |y-y'|)}{h} \wedge 1 \right) \frac{m_i}{n} \right)^2 \\ &\leq 8C_2^2 C_3^3 \frac{\zeta^2 \sigma^2}{n^2 ph} \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^2 \left(\frac{\max(|x-x'|, |y-y'|)}{h} \wedge 1 \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The diameter of $[0, 1]^2$ under $d_{|\mathbf{z}}$ is then upper bounded by

$$\text{diam}_{d_{|\mathbf{z}}}([0, 1]^2) = \sup_{x, x', y, y' \in [0, 1]} d_{|\mathbf{z}}^2((x, y)^\top, (x', y')^\top) \leq 8C_2^2 C_3^3 \frac{\zeta^2 \sigma^2}{n^2 ph} \sum_{i=1}^n m_i^2 := \Delta_{\mathbf{m}},$$

where $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)^\top$, and the packing number is upper bounded by

$$D([0, 1]^2, \delta; d_{|\mathbf{z}}) \leq \frac{\Delta_{\mathbf{m}}}{\delta^2 h^2}.$$

Dudley's entropy bound for sub-Gaussian processes (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996, p. 100) yields for $(x_0, y_0) \in T$ that

$$g(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(x, y) \in T} |S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x, y)| \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[|S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x_0, y_0)| \right] + K \int_0^{\text{diam}_{d_{|\mathbf{z}}}([0, 1]^2)} \sqrt{\log \left(D([0, 1]^2, \delta) \right)} d\delta. \quad (30)$$

Using $\int_0^a \sqrt{\log(x^{-1})} dx = a\sqrt{-\log(a)} + a/(2\sqrt{-\log(a)})$ for $0 < a < 1$ and the above bound on the packing number we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\text{diam}_{d_{|\mathbf{z}}}([0, 1]^2)} \sqrt{\log \left(D([0, 1]^2, \delta) \right)} d\delta &\leq \int_0^{\Delta_{\mathbf{m}}^{1/2}} \sqrt{\log \left(\Delta_{\mathbf{m}} \cdot (\delta h)^{-2} \right)} d\delta \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2\Delta_{\mathbf{m}}}}{h} \int_0^h \sqrt{\log(\delta^{-1})} d\delta \\ &= \sqrt{2\Delta_{\mathbf{m}}} \left(\sqrt{-\log(h)} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{-\log(h)}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

A computation to that leading to (29) gives the bound

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x_0, y_0)| \right] \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left[|S_{|\mathbf{z}}(x_0, y_0)|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \leq \Delta_{\mathbf{m}}^{1/2}, \quad (32)$$

Inserting this bound and (31) into (30) yields

$$g(\mathbf{z}) \leq \sqrt{\Delta_m} + K \cdot \sqrt{2\Delta_m} \cdot \left(\sqrt{-\log(h)} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log(h)}} \right)$$

Now from (6) it follows that $Z_i(x_j) \leq |Z_i(0)| + M_i$ a.s.. Replacing the deterministic m_i by $|Z_i(0)| + M_i$, using $\mathbb{E}[(|Z_i(0)| + M_i)^2] \leq 2\mathbb{E}[Z_i(0)^2 + M_i^2] \leq 2C_Z < \infty$ and Jensen's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\sqrt{\Delta_{|\mathbf{Z}(0)|+\mathbf{M}}}] &\leq \mathbb{E}_Z[\Delta_{|\mathbf{Z}(0)|+\mathbf{M}}]^{1/2} = \left(C_2^2 C_3^3 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{E}[(|Z_i(0)| + M_i)^2] \frac{\sigma^2}{p h}}{n^2} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{2C_Z C_2^2 C_3^3 \sigma^2}{n p h} \right)^{1/2} = \mathcal{O}((n p h)^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

so that overall

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x,y} |S(x,y)| \mid \mathbf{Z} \right] \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\Delta_{|\mathbf{Z}(0)|+\mathbf{M}}} \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{2\Delta_{|\mathbf{Z}(0)|+\mathbf{M}}} \right] \left(\sqrt{-\log(h)} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log(h)}} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n p h}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(h^{-1})}{n p h}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3. Follows by the upper bounds for the rates of convergence from Lemma 12 with $h = \mathcal{O}(p^{-1})$ for any feasible sequence h . □

To conclude this section we state the Hanson-Wright-Inequality used in the above proof, and give an upper bound for the maximal singular value of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ in terms of matrix norms.

Lemma 13 (Higher dimensional Hanson-Wright inequality). *Let X_1, \dots, X_p be independent, mean-zero, sub-Gaussian random vectors in \mathbb{R}^n . Further let $A = (a_{j,k}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ be a matrix. For any $t \geq 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{j,k=1}^p a_{j,k} \langle X_j, X_k \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^p a_{j,j} \mathbb{E} \langle X_j, X_j \rangle \right| \geq t \right) & \tag{33} \\ & \leq 2 \exp \left(- \tilde{c} \min \left(\frac{t^2}{n K^4 \|A\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{K^2 \|A\|_{\text{op}}} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the Orlicz-norm $\max_i \|X_i\|_{\phi_2} = K < \infty$, $\|A\|_F^2 = \sum_{j,k} a_{j,k}^2$ and $\|A\|_{\text{op}} = \max_i s_i$, where $s_i, i = 1 \dots, p$, are the singular values of A and $\tilde{c} > 0$ is a constant.

Proof. Follow the proof of (Vershynin, 2018, Theorem 6.2.1, p. 139ff) and replace $X^\top A X$ and λ by $X_k^\top A X_k$ and λ/d respectively. Make use of independence then. □

6.2 Proof of Theorem 7

Proof of Theorem 7. In the proof we rely on the reduction to hypothesis testing as presented e.g. in Tsybakov (2004, section 2). In all hypothesis models we set $\mu = 0$.

For the lower bound $p^{-\gamma}$, using the method of two sequences of hypotheses functions we set $Z_{i;0} = 0$ and construct $Z_{i;1,p}$ such that its covariance kernel, $\Gamma_{1,p}$, satisfies

$$\|\Gamma_{1,p}\|_\infty \geq c p^{-\gamma}$$

for some constant $c > 0$ and that $Z_{i;1,p}(x_j) = 0$ at all design points x_j , so that the distribution of the observations for $Z_{i;0}$ and $Z_{i;1,p}$ coincide.

Observing Assumption 4 for a constant $\tilde{L} > 0$ to be specified we set

$$g_p(x) = g(x) = \tilde{L} \left(\frac{1}{pf_{\max}} \right)^{\gamma/2} \exp \left(- \frac{1}{1-x^2} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{|x|<1\}}.$$

and for some fixed $1 \leq l \leq p-1$ let

$$Z_{i;1,p}(x) = W_i g((2pf_{\max})(x - (x_l + x_{l+1})/2)),$$

where $W_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, which are taken independent over i .

By Assumption 4, as the distance between design points is at least pf_{\max} it follows that $Z_{i;1,p}(x_j) = 0$ at all design points. Furthermore, the covariance kernel of $Z_{i;1,p}$ is

$$\Gamma_{1,p}(x, y) = \tilde{L}^2 \left(\frac{1}{pf_{\max}} \right)^{\gamma} \exp \left(- \frac{1}{1-\tilde{x}^2} \right) \exp \left(- \frac{1}{1-\tilde{y}^2} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{|\tilde{x}|<1, |\tilde{y}|<1\}},$$

where we set

$$\tilde{x} = (2pf_{\max})(x - (x_l + x_{l+1})/2), \quad \tilde{y} = (2pf_{\max})(y - (x_l + x_{l+1})/2).$$

At $x = y = (x_l + x_{l+1})/2$ this results in a value of

$$\Gamma_{1,p}((x_l + x_{l+1})/2, (x_l + x_{l+1})/2) = \tilde{L}^2 \left(\frac{1}{pf_{\max}} \right)^{\gamma} e^{-2},$$

so that $\|\Gamma_0 - \Gamma_{1,p}\|_{\infty} \geq cp^{-\gamma}$ holds true. Finally, using the chain rule and the fact that all derivatives of the bump function in the definition of g are uniformly bounded, $\Gamma_{1,p}$ is γ -Hölder smooth with constant proportional to \tilde{L}^2 , which can be adjusted to yield the Hölder norm L . This concludes the proof for the lower bound $p^{-\gamma}$.

For the lower bound of order $n^{-1/2}$, first consider vanishing errors $\epsilon_{i,j}$, and set $Z_i = \sigma W_i$ with $W_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and unknown variance $\sigma^2 \leq C_Z$. Then estimating the covariance kernel amounts to estimating the unknown variance in a normal sample of size n , for which the rate is $n^{-1/2}$. Since the model with observational errors is less informative, we keep the lower bound.

Finally, let us turn to the lower bound of order $(\log(np)/(np))^{\gamma/(2\gamma+1)}$. Since we already showed a lower bound of order $p^{-\gamma}$ we may assume that

$$p^{-\gamma} \lesssim (\log(np)/(np))^{\gamma/(2\gamma+1)}. \quad (34)$$

We shall apply (Tsybakov, 2004, Theorem 2.4), and thus need to specify hypotheses $\Gamma_l \in \mathcal{H}(\gamma, L)$, $l = 1, \dots, N_{n,p}$, $N_{n,p} \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\|\Gamma_l - \Gamma_k\| \geq 2s_{n,p} > 0$ for $0 \leq j < k \leq N_{n,p}$ for a positive sequence $(s_{n,p})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then if there exist sequences $(\tau_{n,p})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\alpha_{n,p})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with

$$\frac{1}{N_{n,p}} \sum_{l=1}^{N_{n,p}} \mathbb{P}_l \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}_0}{d\mathbb{P}_l} \geq \tau_{n,p} \right) \geq 1 - \alpha_{n,p}, \quad (35)$$

it holds that

$$\inf_{\hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}} \sup_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{H}(\gamma, L)} \mathbb{P}_{\Gamma}(\|\Gamma - \hat{\Gamma}_{n,p}\|_{\infty} \geq s_{n,p}) \geq \frac{\tau_{n,p} N_{n,p}}{1 + \tau_{n,p} N_{n,p}} (1 - \alpha_{n,p}). \quad (36)$$

For sufficiently small c_i , $i = 0, 1$ we take

$$N_{n,p} = \left\lceil c_0 \left(\frac{np}{\log(np)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}} \right\rceil, \quad h_{n,p} = N_{n,p}^{-1}, \quad s_{n,p} := c_1 h_{n,p}^{\gamma},$$

and for \tilde{L} to be specified we let

$$\tilde{g}(x) = \tilde{L}(h_{n,p}/2)^{\gamma} \exp \left(- (1-x^2)^{-1} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{|x|<1\}}$$

Then for $l \in \{1, \dots, N_{n,p}\}$ we set

$$Z_{i;l}(x) = W_i \left(1 + \tilde{g}(2(x - z_l)/h_{n,p})\right), \quad z_l = (l - 1/2)/N_{n,p},$$

where W_i are independent, standard normally distributed random variables, and $Z_{i;0}(x) = W_i$. By setting

$$\tilde{x}_l = 2(x - z_l)/h_{n,p}, \quad \tilde{y}_l = 2(y - z_l)/h_{n,p}, \quad g(x) := \tilde{g}(\tilde{x}_l), \quad (37)$$

the covariance kernel of $Z_{i;l}$ can be written as

$$\Gamma_l(x, y) = (1 + g(\tilde{x}_l))(1 + g(\tilde{y}_l)).$$

Using the chain rule one checks γ -Hölder smoothness of each $\Gamma_l(x, y)$ for suitable choice of \tilde{L} (depending on L and c_0). Further, by construction it holds that $\text{supp}(\Gamma_l) = (l/N_{n,p}, (l+1)/N_{n,p})^2$ and therefore the Γ_l have disjoint supports in $[0, 1]^2$, so that $\|\Gamma_l - \Gamma_r\|_\infty \geq 2s_{n,p}$ for all $l \neq r$, and c_1 sufficiently small (depending on c_0).

Let $\mathbb{P}_l^{(n)}$ be the joint normal distribution of the observations $(Z_{1;l}(x_1) + \epsilon_{1,1}, \dots, Z_{1;l}(x_p) + \epsilon_{1,p}), \dots, (Z_{n;l}(x_1) + \epsilon_{n,1}, \dots, Z_{n;l}(x_p) + \epsilon_{n,p})$. For $l = 0$ the marginal distributions are given by $\mathbb{P}_{i;0} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$, $\Sigma_0 := \mathbf{1}_{p \times p} + \mathbf{I}_p$, with $\mathbf{1}_{p \times p} := \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p^\top$ being the $p \times p$ matrix where all entries are equal to 1. For $l \in \{1, \dots, N_{n,p}\}$ the distribution of $Z_{i;l}$, $l = 1, \dots, N_{n,p}$, is given by $\mathbb{P}_{i;l} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_l)$, $\Sigma_l := \tilde{\Sigma}_l + \mathbf{I}_p$, where $\tilde{\Sigma}_l = vv^\top$, with $v_j := (v_l)_j = 1 + g(\tilde{x}_{j,l}) = 1 + g(x_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, where g is defined in (37). In order to calculate the likelihood ratio of $\mathbb{P}_l^{(n)}$ and $\mathbb{P}_0^{(n)}$ we need the inverse and determinants of Σ_l and Σ_0 . By the matrix determinant Lemma $\det \Sigma_0 = 1 + p$, and $\det \Sigma_l = 1 + \|v\|_2^2$, as well as

$$\Sigma_0^{-1} = \mathbf{I}_p - \frac{1}{p+1} \mathbf{1}_{p \times p}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_l^{-1} = \mathbf{I}_p - \frac{vv^\top}{\|v\|_2^2 + 1}.$$

In Lemma 14 in the supplementary appendix it is shown that the symmetric square root of Σ_l is given by

$$\Sigma_l^{1/2} = \mathbf{I}_p + \frac{\sqrt{1 + \|v\|_2^2} - 1}{\|v\|_2^2} vv^\top.$$

For independent $Z_i \sim \mathcal{N}_p(0, \mathbf{I}_p)$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_l^{(n)} \left(\log \frac{d\mathbb{P}_l^{(n)}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{(n)}} > \log \frac{1}{\tau} \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{n}{2} \log \frac{\det \Sigma_0}{\det \Sigma_l} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i^\top \Sigma_l^{1/2} (\Sigma_0^{-1} - \Sigma_l^{-1}) \Sigma_l^{1/2} Z_i > \log \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i^\top \left(vv^\top - \Sigma_l^{1/2} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{p \times p}}{p+1} \Sigma_l^{1/2} \right) Z_i > 2 \log \frac{1}{\tau} + n \log \frac{\det \Sigma_l}{\det \Sigma_0} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Setting

$$A := vv^\top - \Sigma_l^{1/2} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{p \times p}}{p+1} \Sigma_l^{1/2}$$

the Hanson-Wright inequality (Lemma 13) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_l^{(n)} \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}_0^{(n)}}{d\mathbb{P}_l^{(n)}} \geq \tau_n \right) &= 1 - \mathbb{P}_l^{(n)} \left(\log \left(\frac{d\mathbb{P}_l^{(n)}}{d\mathbb{P}_0^{(n)}} \right) > \log \frac{1}{\tau_{n,p}} \right) \\ &= 1 - \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i^\top A Z_i - n \text{tr}(A) > 2 \log \frac{1}{\tau_{n,p}} + n \left(\log \left(\frac{\det \Sigma_l}{\det \Sigma_0} \right) - \text{tr}(A) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j,k=1}^p a_{j,k} \langle \mathbf{Z}^{(j)}, \mathbf{Z}^{(k)} \rangle - n \operatorname{tr}(A) > t\right) \\
&\geq 1 - \exp\left(-c \min\left(\frac{t^2}{n \|A\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{\|A\|_{\text{op}}}\right)\right), \tag{39}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c > 0$ and $t := 2 \log(\tau_{n,p}^{-1}) + n(\log(\det \Sigma_l / \det \Sigma_0) - \operatorname{tr}(A))$. By choosing $\tau_{n,p} = \exp(-\frac{np}{p+1} \sum_{k=1}^p g^2(x_k))$ Lemma 18 in the supplementary appendix shows that

$$\tau_{n,p} \gtrsim (np)^{-\tilde{C}^L}, \quad t \simeq \log(np), \quad \|A\|_F^2 \simeq \frac{\log(np)}{n}, \quad \|A\|_{\text{op}} \simeq \left(\frac{\log(np)}{n}\right)^{1/2}, \tag{40}$$

where $\tilde{C}^L > 0$ can be made large for large L . Plugging the rates into (39) yields

$$\exp\left(-\tilde{c} \min\left(\frac{t^2}{n \|A\|_F^2}, \frac{t}{\|A\|_{\text{op}}}\right)\right) \simeq \frac{1}{np}.$$

Therefore we can set $\alpha_{n,p} \simeq (np)^{-1}$ in (35) and get $1 - \alpha_{n,p} > 0$. Further we have $\tau_{n,p} N_{n,p} \rightarrow \infty$ by choosing L (and therefore \tilde{C}^L) sufficiently small. Using this in (36) yields the claim. \square

References

- Azaïs, J.-M. and M. Wschebor (2009). *Level sets and extrema of random processes and fields*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Azmoodeh, E., T. Sottinen, L. Viitasaari, and A. Yazigi (2014). Necessary and sufficient conditions for hölder continuity of gaussian processes. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 94, 230–235.
- Berger, M., P. Hermann, and H. Holzmänn (2024). From dense to sparse design: Optimal rates under the supremum norm for estimating the mean function in functional data analysis. *Bernoulli*, to appear; *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04550*.
- Brown, L. D. and M. Levine (2007). Variance estimation in nonparametric regression via the difference sequence method. *The Annals of Statistics* 35(5), 2219–2232.
- Cai, T. and M. Yuan (2010). Nonparametric covariance function estimation for functional and longitudinal data. *University of Pennsylvania and Georgia institute of technology*.
- Cai, T. T. and M. Yuan (2011). Optimal estimation of the mean function based on discretely sampled functional data: Phase transition. *The annals of statistics* 39(5), 2330–2355.
- Cardot, H., D. Degras, and E. Jossierand (2013). Confidence bands for Horvitz-Thompson estimators using sampled noisy functional data. *Bernoulli* 19(5A), 2067–2097.
- Dai, X., H.-G. Müller, and W. Tao (2018). Derivative principal component analysis for representing the time dynamics of longitudinal and functional data. *Stat. Sin.* 28(3), 1583–1609.
- Dette, H. and K. Kokot (2022). Detecting relevant differences in the covariance operators of functional time series: a sup-norm approach. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 74(2), 195–231.
- Dette, H., K. Kokot, and A. Aue (2020). Functional data analysis in the banach space of continuous functions. *The Annals of Statistics* 48(2), 1168–1192.
- Dette, H. and W. Wu (2021). Confidence surfaces for the mean of locally stationary functional time series. *Preprint Bochum university*.

- Hall, P. and M. Hosseini-Nasab (2009). Theory for high-order bounds in functional principal components analysis. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Volume 146, pp. 225–256. Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, P., H.-G. Müller, and J.-L. Wang (2006). Properties of principal component methods for functional and longitudinal data analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1493–1517.
- Hassan, S. G.-J. and S. M. E. Hosseini-Nasab (2021). On mean derivative estimation of longitudinal and functional data: from sparse to dense. *Stat. Pap.* 62(4), 2047–2066.
- Li, Y. and T. Hsing (2010). Uniform convergence rates for nonparametric regression and principal component analysis in functional/longitudinal data. *The Annals of Statistics* 38(6), 3321–3351.
- Liebl, D. and M. Reimherr (2019). Fast and fair simultaneous confidence bands for functional parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.00131*.
- Mohammadi, N. and V. M. Panaretos (2024). Functional data analysis with rough sample paths? *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 36(1), 4–22.
- Pollard, D. (1990). Empirical processes: theory and applications. In *NSF-CBMS regional conference series in probability and statistics*, pp. i–86. JSTOR.
- Ramsay, J. and B. Silverman (1998). Functional data analysis. springer series in statistics.
- Tsybakov, A. B. (2004). *Introduction to nonparametric estimation, 2009*, Volume 9.
- Turkmen, R. and H. Civciv (2007). Some bounds for the singular values of matrices. *Applied Mathematical Sciences* 1(49), 2443–2449.
- van der Vaart, A. and J. Wellner (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Vershynin, R. (2018). *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, Volume 47. Cambridge university press.
- Wang, J.-L., J.-M. Chiou, and H.-G. Müller (2016). Functional data analysis. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* 3, 257–295.
- Wang, L., L. D. Brown, and T. Cai (2008). Effect of mean on variance function estimation in nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics* 36(2), 646–664.
- Xiao, L. (2020). Asymptotic properties of penalized splines for functional data. *Bernoulli* 26(4), 2847–2875.
- Zhang, X. and J.-L. Wang (2016). From sparse to dense functional data and beyond. *The Annals of Statistics* 44(5), 2281–2321.

A Supplement: Additional proofs for the upper bound: Lemmas 11 and 12

Proof of Lemma 11. Plugging the representation of the observations $Y_{i,j}$ and $\bar{Y}_{n,j}$ into the estimator $\hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h)$ in (3) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h) &= \frac{1}{n-1} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) (Y_{i,j} Y_{i,k} - \bar{Y}_{n,j} \bar{Y}_{n,k}) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \left[(Z_{i,j} Z_{i,k} + \epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k} + Z_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k} + \epsilon_{i,j} Z_{i,k} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mu(x_j) (Z_{i,k} + \epsilon_{i,k}) + (Z_{i,j} + \epsilon_{i,j}) \mu(x_k) \right) \\
&\quad - \left(\bar{Z}_{n,j} \bar{Z}_{n,k} + \bar{\epsilon}_{n,j} \bar{\epsilon}_{n,k} + \bar{Z}_{n,j} \bar{\epsilon}_{n,k} + \bar{\epsilon}_{n,j} \bar{Z}_{n,k} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mu(x_j) (\bar{Z}_{n,k} + \bar{\epsilon}_{n,k}) + (\bar{Z}_{n,j} + \bar{\epsilon}_{n,j}) \mu(x_k) \right) \Big] \\
&= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \left[(\epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k} - \bar{\epsilon}_{n,j} \bar{\epsilon}_{n,k}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (Z_{i,j} Z_{i,k} - \bar{Z}_{n,j} \bar{Z}_{n,k}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (Z_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k} - \bar{Z}_{n,j} \bar{\epsilon}_{n,k}) + (\epsilon_{i,j} Z_{i,k} - \bar{\epsilon}_{n,j} \bar{Z}_{n,k}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mu(x_j) (Z_{i,k} - \bar{Z}_{n,k} + \epsilon_{i,k} - \bar{\epsilon}_{n,k}) + (Z_{i,j} - \bar{Z}_{n,j} + \epsilon_{i,j} - \bar{\epsilon}_{n,j}) \mu(x_k) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Let $U_{i,j}$ be a placeholder for $\epsilon_{i,j}$ or $Z_{i,j}$. In order to summarize the last display we use

$$\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n U_{i,k} - \frac{n}{n-1} \bar{U}_{n,k} = 0$$

and therefore the last row vanishes. For the first three rows we use

$$\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n U_{i,j} U_{i,k} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{l,r=1}^n U_{l,j} U_{r,k} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n U_{i,j} U_{i,k} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{l \neq r}^n U_{l,j} U_{r,k},$$

for $Z_{i,j} Z_{i,k}$, $\epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k}$ and $Z_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k}$ respectively. By adding $\pm \Gamma(x_j, x_k)$ this yields the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Gamma}_n(x, y; h) &= \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \left[\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k} - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{l \neq r}^n \epsilon_{l,j} \epsilon_{r,k} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_{i,j} Z_{i,k} - \Gamma(x_j, x_k)) - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq l}^n Z_{i,j} Z_{l,k} + \Gamma(x_j, x_k) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k} + Z_{i,k} \epsilon_{i,j}) - \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{l \neq r}^n (Z_{l,j} \epsilon_{r,k} + Z_{l,k} \epsilon_{r,j}) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting $\Gamma(x, y)$ yields the claim together with (W1). \square

Proof of Lemma 12, i). For the bias we use a Taylor expansion and the fact that the weights of the estimator reproduce polynomials of the certain degree $\zeta = \lfloor \gamma \rfloor$. We get for certain $\theta_{1,k}, \theta_{2,k} \in [0, 1]$ s.t. $\tau_j^{(1)} := x + \theta_{1,k}(x_j - x) \in [0, 1]$ and $\tau_k^{(2)} := y + \theta_{2,k}(x_k - y) \in [0, 1]$

$$\sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \Gamma(x_j, x_k) - \Gamma(x, y) = \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) (\Gamma(x_j, x_k) - \Gamma(x, y)) \quad (\text{by (W1)})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \left(\sum_{\substack{|r|=1, \\ r=(r_1, r_2)}}^{\zeta-1} \frac{\partial^{|r|} \Gamma(x, y)}{(\partial x)^{r_1} (\partial y)^{r_2}} \frac{(x_j - x)^{r_1} (x_k - y)^{r_2}}{r_1! r_2!} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{|r|=\zeta \\ r=(r_1, r_2)}} \frac{\partial^{|r|} \Gamma(\tau_j^{(1)}, \tau_k^{(2)})}{(\partial x)^{r_1} (\partial y)^{r_2}} \frac{(x_j - x)^{r_1} (x_k - y)^{r_2}}{r_1! r_2!} \right) \\
&= \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \left(\sum_{|r|=\zeta} \left(\frac{\partial^{|r|} \Gamma(x, y)}{(\partial x)^{r_1} (\partial y)^{r_2}} - \frac{\partial^{|r|} \Gamma(\tau_j^{(1)}, \tau_k^{(2)})}{(\partial x)^{r_1} (\partial y)^{r_2}} \right) \frac{(x_j - x)^{r_1} (x_k - y)^{r_2}}{r_1! r_2!} \right) \\
&\hspace{15em} \text{(by (W1))} \\
&\leq \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \sum_{|r|=\zeta} \max(x_j - x, x_k - y)^{\gamma - \zeta} \frac{(x_j - x)^{r_1} (x_k - y)^{r_2}}{r_1! r_2!} \\
&\leq \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \max(x_j - x, x_k - y)^\gamma \sum_{|r|=\zeta} \frac{1}{r!} \\
&\leq h^\gamma \sum_{|r|=\zeta} \frac{C_1}{r!} = \mathcal{O}(h^\gamma). \hspace{15em} \text{(by (W5))}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 12 ii), second bound. We rewrite the term

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{l \neq r}^n \epsilon_{l,j} \epsilon_{r,k} &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \left[\sum_{i,l=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{l,k} - \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{i,k} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \tilde{X}_{j,n} \tilde{X}_{k,n} - \frac{1}{n-1} E_{n,p,h}(x, y),
\end{aligned}$$

where $E_{n,p,h}(x, y)$ is the process defined in (21) and $\tilde{X}_{j,n} = \sqrt{n} \bar{X}_{j,n} = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j}$. By the first statement of ii) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{(x,y)^\top \in D} \frac{1}{n-1} |E_{n,p,h}(x, y)| \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\sqrt{\log(np)}}{n^{3/2} p h} \right). \quad (41)$$

Simple calculations show that $\tilde{X}_{j,n} \sim \text{subG}(\sigma^2)$ and its Orlicz-Norm is given by $\|\tilde{X}_{j,n}\|_{\psi_2} = K$, where $K > 0$ is constant not depending on n . Defining $A := w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \mathbf{1}_{j < k}$ as before, using the estimates (23) and (24) and the Hanson-Wright inequality (Lemma 13) we obtain, analogously to (25),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{(n-1) p h}{\log(np)} \left| \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \frac{\tilde{X}_{j,n} \tilde{X}_{k,n}}{n-1} \right| \geq t \right) &\leq 2 \exp \left(- \tilde{c} \min \left(\frac{t^2 \log^2(np)}{K^4 C_1 C_4}, \frac{t \log(np)}{K^2 C_1 C_3} \right) \right) \\
&\leq 2 \exp(-t \log(np)/C)
\end{aligned}$$

for $t \geq 1$ and $C := K^4 C_1 \max(C_3, C_4)$. The same calculations as in (26) then lead to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x, y \in [0,1]} \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \sum_{i,l=1}^n \epsilon_{i,j} \epsilon_{l,k} \right] = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\log(np)}{n p h} \right). \quad (42)$$

□

Proof of Lemma 12 iii), second bound. Set

$$R_{n,p,h}(x, y) := \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \sum_{i \neq l}^n Z_i(x_j) Z_l(x_k)$$

and consider the envelope $\Phi_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)}$ with entries $\phi_{n,(i,l)}$, $i, l = 1, \dots, n$, with $i \neq l$ given by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n(n-1)}} |Z_i(x)Z_j(y)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n(n-1)}} (M_i + |Z_i(0)|)(M_l + |Z_l(0)|).$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\sqrt{n(n-1)} R_{n,p,h}\|_\infty] &\leq C_4 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x,y \in [0,1]} \left| \sum_{i \neq l}^n \frac{Z_i(x)Z_l(y)}{\sqrt{n(n-1)}} \right| \right] \\ &\leq C_4 \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x,y \in [0,1]} \left| \sum_{i \neq l}^n \frac{Z_i(x)Z_l(y)}{\sqrt{n(n-1)}} \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2C_4 K_2 \Lambda(1)^2 \mathbb{E}[(M_1 + |Z_1(0)|)(M_2 + |Z_2(0)|)^2]^{1/2} \\ &\leq 4C_4 K_2 \Lambda(1)^2 \left(2\mathbb{E}[M_1^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[Z_1(0)^2] \right) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 12 iv), second bound. For $\tilde{S}(x, y) := \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \neq l}^n \frac{Z_i(x_j) \epsilon_{l,k}}{n-1}$ we shall proceed analogously as for the first term. Let

$$\tilde{S}_{|\mathbf{z}}(x, y) := \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq l}^n z_{i,j} \epsilon_{l,k}.$$

Again we can show that $\tilde{S}_{|\mathbf{z}}$ is a sub-Gaussian process with respect to the semi-norm $\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{S}_{|\mathbf{z}}(x, y) - \tilde{S}_{|\mathbf{z}}(x', y'))^2]^{1/2}$. This semi-norm is given by

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\tilde{S}}((x, y)^\top, (x', y')^\top)^2 &= \mathbb{E}[(\tilde{S}_{|\mathbf{z}}(x, y) - \tilde{S}_{|\mathbf{z}}(x', y'))^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{j < k}^p (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) \sum_{i < l}^n \frac{z_{i,j} \epsilon_{l,k}}{n(n-1)} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{n-1} \sum_{k=2}^p \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_{i,j}}{n} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

and further we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[\exp(\tilde{S}_{|\mathbf{z}}(x, y) - \tilde{S}_{|\mathbf{z}}(x', y'))] \\ &= \prod_{k=2}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_{i,j}}{n} \sum_{l=1, l \neq i}^n \frac{\epsilon_{l,k}}{n-1} \right) \right] \\ &\leq \exp \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2(n-1)} \sum_{k=2}^p \left(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_{i,j}}{n} \right)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\tilde{S}_{|\mathbf{z}}$ is a sub-Gaussian process with respect to the semi-norm $d_{\tilde{S}}$. With the same arguments as for the first part we can bound the diameter of the semi-norm by

$$\text{diam}_{\tilde{S}}([0, 1]^2) \leq \frac{C_2^2 C_3^3}{(n-1)ph} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{m_i}{n} \right)^2 \sigma^2 =: \tilde{\Delta} = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{nph} \right).$$

From here the result follows analogously to (30), (31) and (32). □

B Supplement: Proof for the asymptotic normality

Proof of Theorem 9. We make use of the functional central limit theorem Pollard (1990, Theorem 10.6). For the proof let

$$X_{n,i}(x, y) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) Z_{i,j,k}^{\otimes 2}, \quad Z_{i,j,k}^{\otimes 2} := Z_i(x_j)Z_i(x_k) - \Gamma(x_j, x_k),$$

and

$$S_n(x, y) := \sum_{i=1}^n X_{n,i}(x, y), \quad \rho_n(x, y, s, t) := \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[|X_{n,i}(x, y) - X_{n,i}(s, t)|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2}.$$

To apply Pollard (1990, Theorem 10.6) we need to check the following.

i). $X_{n,i}$ is manageable (Pollard, 1990, Definition 7.9) with respect to the envelope $\Phi_n := (\phi_{n,1}, \dots, \phi_{n,n})$ with

$$\phi_{n,i} := \frac{C_4}{\sqrt{n}} (2Z_i^2(0) + 2M_i^2 + L).$$

ii). $R(x, y, s, t) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[S_n(x, y)S_n(s, t)]$, $x, y, s, t \in [0, 1]$.

iii). $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\phi_{n,i}^2] < \infty$.

iv). $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\phi_{n,i}^2 \mathbf{1}_{\phi_{n,i} > \epsilon}] = 0$, $\epsilon > 0$.

v). The limit

$$\rho(x, y, s, t) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n(x, y, s, t), \quad x, y, s, t \in [0, 1],$$

is well-defined and for all deterministic sequences $(x_n, y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (s_n, t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in [0, 1]^2$ with $\rho(x_n, y_n, s_n, t_n) \rightarrow 0$ it also holds $\rho_n(x_n, y_n, s_n, t_n) \rightarrow 0$.

Ad i): As in the proof of Lemma 12, iii), the random vector Φ_n is an envelope of $X_n := (X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,n})$ since

$$|X_{n,i}(x, y)| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j < k}^p |w_{j,k}(x, y; h)| (2Z_i^2(0) + 2M_i^2 + L) \leq \frac{C_4}{\sqrt{n}} (2Z_i^2(0) + 2M_i^2 + L),$$

by using (W5), where we may assume $C_4 \geq 1$. We make use of Berger et al. (2024, Lemma 3). We need to show that there exist constants K_1, K_2 and $b \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for all $(x, y), (x', y') \in [0, 1]^2$ it holds

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\infty} \leq K_1 \epsilon^b \Rightarrow |X_{n,i}(x, y) - X_{n,i}(x', y')| \leq K_2 \epsilon \phi_{n,i}, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (43)$$

Since $X_{n,i}(x, y) = X_{n,i}(y, x)$, we can assume that $(x, y), (x', y') \in T^2$.

We distinguish the cases $\epsilon \geq h^\gamma$ and $\epsilon < h^\gamma$. For the first case $\epsilon \geq h^\gamma$ consider

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \sum_{j < k}^p (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) Z_{i;j,k}^{\otimes 2} \right| &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) Z_{i;j,k}^{\otimes 2} - Z_i^{\otimes 2}(x, y) \right| \\ &+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |Z_i^{\otimes 2}(x, y) - Z_i^{\otimes 2}(x', y')| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| Z_i^{\otimes 2}(x', y') - \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x', y'; h) Z_{i;j,k}^{\otimes 2} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

we shall check (43) for $K_1 = 1, K_2 = 3$ and $b = 1/\gamma$. Let $(x, y)^\top, (x', y')^\top \in [0, 1]^2$ such that $\max\{|x - x'|, |y - y'|\} \leq \epsilon^{1/\gamma}$. By Assumption 2 the second term can be estimated by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |Z_i^{\otimes 2}(x, y) - Z_i^{\otimes 2}(x', y')| \leq \frac{(2Z_i^2(0) + 2M_i^2 + L)}{\sqrt{n}} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\infty}^{\gamma} \leq \phi_{n,i} \epsilon.$$

For the first and similarly the third term one gets that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) Z_{i;j,k}^{\otimes 2} - Z_i^{\otimes 2}(x, y) \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j < k}^p |w_{j,k}(x, y; h)| |Z_{i;j,k}^{\otimes 2} - Z_i^{\otimes 2}(x, y)|$$

$$\leq \frac{C_4 ((2Z_i^2(0) + 2M_i^2 + L))}{\sqrt{n}} h^\gamma \leq \phi_{n,i} \epsilon,$$

since the weights vanish for $\max\{|x_j - x|, |x_k - y|\} \geq h$. Adding the three terms concludes (43) for the first case $\epsilon \geq h^\gamma$.

For the second case $\epsilon < h^\gamma$, again take $\max\{|x - x'|, |y - y'|\} \leq \epsilon^{1/\gamma}$. By (W4) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \sum_{j < k}^p (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) Z_{i;j,k}^{\otimes 2} \right| &\leq \sum_{j < k}^p |w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)| \phi_{n,i} \\ &\leq \frac{2C_2 C_3}{h} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix} \right\|_\infty \phi_{n,i} \\ &\leq \frac{2C_2 C_3}{h} \epsilon^{1-1/\gamma} \phi_{n,i}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields (43) in the second case. Berger et al. (2024, Lemma 3) then yields manageability. Ad ii).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_n(x, y)S_n(x', y')] &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,l=1}^n \sum_{j < k}^p \sum_{r < s}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) w_{r,s}(x', y'; h) \mathbb{E}[Z_{i;j,k}^{\otimes 2} Z_{l;r,s}^{\otimes 2}] \\ &= \sum_{j < k}^p \sum_{r < s}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) w_{r,s}(x', y'; h) R(x_j, x_k, x_r, x_s). \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 5, $R \in \mathcal{H}_{D^2}(\zeta, \tilde{L})$ and therefore we get by the same calculations as for the bias in the supplementary appendix A

$$\sup_{x, y, x', y'} \left| \sum_{j < k}^p \sum_{r < s}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) w_{r,s}(x', y'; h) R(x_j, x_k, x_r, x_s) - R(x, y, x', y') \right| = \mathcal{O}(h^\zeta).$$

Ad iii). Follows immediately from Assumption 2 since M has finite fourth moment.

Ad iv). Follows by Assumption 2 and the dominated convergence theorem.

Ad v).

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_n^2(x, y, x', y') &= \sum_{j < k}^p \sum_{r < s}^p (w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)) (w_{r,s}(x, y; h) - w_{r,s}(x', y'; h)) \mathbb{E}[Z_{1;j,k}^{\otimes 2} Z_{1;r,s}^{\otimes 2}] \\ &= \sum_{j < k}^p \sum_{r < s}^p \left(w_{j,k}(x, y; h) w_{r,s}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x, y; h) w_{r,s}(x', y'; h) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h) w_{r,s}(x, y; h) + w_{j,k}(x', y'; h) w_{r,s}(x', y'; h) \right) R(x_j, x_k, x_r, x_s) \\ &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} R(x, y, x, y) - 2R(x, y, x', y') + R(x', y', x', y'), \end{aligned}$$

by the same argument as for ii). Therefore the limit is well defined in \mathbb{R} for all $x, y, x', y' \in [0, 1]$. Given the deterministic sequences (x_n, y_n) and (x'_n, y'_n) such that $\rho(x_n, y_n, x'_n, y'_n) \rightarrow 0, n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \rho_n(x_n, y_n, x'_n, y'_n) &\leq |\rho_n(x_n, y_n, x'_n, y'_n) - \rho(x_n, y_n, x'_n, y'_n)| + |\rho(x_n, y_n, x'_n, y'_n)| \\ &\leq \sup_{x, y, x', y'} |\rho_n(x, y, x', y') - \rho(x, y, x', y')| + |\rho(x_n, y_n, x'_n, y'_n)| \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0, \end{aligned}$$

since the convergence in ii) holds uniformly and hence similarly also the convergence in the first calculation. \square

C Supplement: Auxiliary results for proof of Theorem 7.

Lemma 14. *In the situation of the proof of Theorem 7 the symmetric square root $\Sigma_l^{1/2} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is given by*

$$\Sigma_l^{1/2} = \mathbf{I}_p + \frac{\sqrt{1 + \|v\|_2^2} - 1}{\|v\|_2^2} v v^\top,$$

Proof. The matrix $\Sigma_l^{1/2}$ is symmetric. Further we have

$$\Sigma_l^{1/2} \Sigma_l^{1/2} = \mathbf{I}_p + 2 \frac{\sqrt{1 + \|v\|_2^2} - 1}{\|v\|_2^2} v v^\top + \frac{1 + \|v\|_2^2 - 2\sqrt{1 + \|v\|_2^2} + 1}{\|v\|_2^2} v v^\top \mathbf{I}_p + v v^\top = \Sigma_l. \quad \square$$

Lemma 15. *Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $x, y \neq 0$, and define the matrix $M = x x^\top - y y^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Then the eigenvalues of M are given by 0 and*

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{\|y\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2}{2} \pm \left(\left(\frac{\|y\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2}{2} \right)^2 + \|x\|_2^2 \|y\|_2^2 - \langle x, y \rangle^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad (44)$$

and in consequence it holds that

$$\det(\mathbf{I}_p + M) = (1 + \lambda_1)(1 + \lambda_2) = 1 + \|y\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2 + \|x\|_2^2 \|y\|_2^2 - \langle x, y \rangle^2.$$

Proof. Eigenvectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ of M need to be of the form $r x + s y = v$, $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ and fulfil

$$\begin{aligned} M v &= (x x^\top - y y^\top)(r x + s y) = r \|x\|_2^2 x - r \langle x, y \rangle y + s \langle x, y \rangle x - s \|y\|_2^2 y \\ &= (r \|x\|_2^2 + s \langle x, y \rangle) x - (r \langle x, y \rangle + s \|y\|_2^2) y \stackrel{!}{=} \lambda (r x + s y) \end{aligned}$$

for an eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0$. We have $v \neq 0$ for all λ such that the previous system of linear equations has non trivial solutions, speaking

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \|x\|_2^2 - \lambda & \langle x, y \rangle \\ -\langle x, y \rangle & -\|y\|_2^2 - \lambda \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{!}{=} 0.$$

The solution of $\lambda^2 + \lambda(\|y\|_2^2 - \|x\|_2^2) - (\|x\|_2^2 \|y\|_2^2 - \langle x, y \rangle^2) = 0$ is given by $\lambda_{1,2}$ in (44). \square

Lemma 16. *In the situation of the proof of Theorem 7 the eigenvalues of the matrix*

$$A = v v^\top - \Sigma^{1/2} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{p \times p}}{p+1} \Sigma^{1/2}$$

are given by

$$\lambda_{1,2}(A) = -\frac{p \|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2 + \|v\|_2^2 - p}{2(p+1)} \pm \left(\left(\frac{p \|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2 + \|v\|_2^2 - p}{2(p+1)} \right)^2 + \frac{p \|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2}{p+1} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Proof. Calculate A by

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= v v^\top - \Sigma^{1/2} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{p \times p}}{p+1} \Sigma^{1/2} \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{(\sqrt{1 + v^\top v} - 1)^2}{\|v\|_2^4 (1+p)} \|v\|_1^2 \right) v v^\top - \frac{\|v\|_1 (\sqrt{1 + \|v\|_2^2} - 1)}{\|v\|_2^2 (1+p)} \left(\begin{pmatrix} v, \dots, v \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} v^\top \\ \vdots \\ v^\top \end{pmatrix} \right) - \frac{\mathbf{1}_{p \times p}}{p+1} \end{aligned}$$

$$= v v^\top - \left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_p}{\sqrt{p+1}} + \frac{\|v\|_1(\sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}-1)}{\|v\|_2^2\sqrt{1+p}} v \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_p^\top}{\sqrt{p+1}} + \frac{\|v\|_1(\sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}-1)}{\|v\|_2^2\sqrt{1+p}} v^\top \right).$$

The entries of A are given by

$$a_{ij} = v_i v_j - \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p+1}} + \frac{\|v\|_1(\sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}-1)}{\|v\|_2^2\sqrt{1+p}} v_i \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p+1}} + \frac{\|v\|_1(\sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}-1)}{\|v\|_2^2\sqrt{1+p}} v_j \right).$$

Let

$$w := \frac{\mathbf{1}_p}{\sqrt{p+1}} + \frac{\|v\|_1(\sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}-1)}{\|v\|_2^2\sqrt{1+p}} v,$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_2^2 &= \frac{p}{p+1} + 2 \frac{\|v\|_1^2(\sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}-1)}{\|v\|_2^2(p+1)} + \frac{\|v\|_1^2(\sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}-1)^2}{\|v\|_2^2(p+1)} \\ &= \frac{p}{p+1} + \frac{\|v\|_1^2(\sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}-1)}{\|v\|_2^2(p+1)} (2 + \sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}-1) \\ &= \frac{p + \|v\|_1^2}{p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 15 we get the eigenvalues of A by

$$\lambda_{1,2}(A) = \frac{\|w\|_2^2 - \|v\|_2^2}{2} \pm \left(\left(\frac{\|w\|_2^2 - \|v\|_2^2}{2} \right)^2 + \|w\|_2^2 \|v\|_2^2 - \langle w, v \rangle^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Computing the parts

$$\|w\|_2^2 - \|v\|_2^2 = -\frac{p\|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2 + \|v\|_2^2 - p}{p+1},$$

and

$$\langle w, v \rangle^2 = \frac{\|v\|_1}{p+1} \left(1 - (1 - \sqrt{1+\|v\|_2^2}) \right)^2 = \frac{p\|v\|_2^2 + \|v\|_1^2 \|v\|_2^2}{p+1},$$

and

$$\|v\|_2^2 \|w\|_2^2 = \frac{\|v\|_2^2}{p+1} (p + \|v\|_1^2) = \frac{p\|v\|_2^2 + \|v\|_1^2 \|v\|_2^2}{p+1},$$

concludes to

$$\|v\|_2^2 \|w\|_2^2 - \langle v, w \rangle^2 = \frac{p\|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2}{p+1} = p \sum_{k=1}^p (1 + g(x_k))^2 - \left(\sum_{k=1}^p (1 + g(x_k)) \right)^2.$$

□

Lemma 17. *In the situation of the proof of Theorem 7 it holds*

$$\sum_{k=1}^p g^2(x_k) \simeq p h^{2\gamma+1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^p g(x_k) \simeq p h^{\gamma+1}.$$

In particular it holds

$$\sum_{k=1}^p g^2(x_k) \leq C^L \frac{\log(np)}{n},$$

where $C^L > 0$ is a constant that depends monotonically increasing on L .

Proof. For the upper bound we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{g}^2(\tilde{x}_{j,l}) \leq L^2 p h_n (h_n/2)^{2\gamma} 2 f_{\max} \exp(-2) \leq C^L \frac{\log(np)}{n},$$

for $C^L := L^2 2^{1-2\gamma} f_{\max} \exp(-2)$, by making use of the structure of x_k and Assumption 1. For the lower bound we consider the equidistant design with $x_j = j/p$, $j = 1, \dots, p$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/8]$. Then

$$\exp\left(-\frac{1}{1-x^2}\right) \mathbf{1}_{|x|<1} \geq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{1-x^2}\right) \mathbf{1}_{|x|<1-2\alpha}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$\exp\left(-\frac{1}{1-x^2}\right) \geq c_\alpha > 0, \quad \text{for all } |x| < 1 - 2\alpha.$$

Further

$$|\tilde{x}_{j,l}| < 1 - 2\alpha \Leftrightarrow x_j \in \left[\frac{l-(1-\alpha)}{N_{n,p}}, \frac{l-\alpha}{N_{n,p}}\right] \Leftrightarrow i \in \left[p \frac{l-(1-\alpha)}{N_{n,p}}, p \frac{l-\alpha}{N_{n,p}}\right],$$

and

$$p \frac{l-\alpha}{N_{n,p}} - p \frac{l-(1-\alpha)}{N_{n,p}} = \frac{p(1-2\alpha)}{N_{n,p}}.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{1}_{N_{n,p} x_j \in [l-1, l]} = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{1}_{N_{n,p} x_j \in [l-(1-\alpha), l-\alpha]} \geq \left\lfloor \frac{p(1-2\alpha)}{N_{n,p}} \right\rfloor.$$

In consequence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{g}^2(\tilde{x}_{j,l}) &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{p(1-2\alpha)}{N_{n,p}} \right\rfloor c_\alpha^2 L^2 \left(\frac{h_n}{2}\right)^{2\gamma} \\ &\geq \frac{p(1-2\alpha)}{4c_0(np/\log(np))^{1/2\gamma}} c_\alpha^4 L^4 \left(\frac{1}{4c_0} \left(\frac{\log(np)}{np}\right)^{1/(2\gamma+1)}\right)^{2\gamma} \\ &= C \frac{\log(np)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

for the constant $C := \tilde{C}_{c_0, \gamma, \alpha, L} := (1-2\alpha)c_\alpha^4 L^4 / (4c_0)^{2\gamma+1}$. The second claim follows analogously. \square

Lemma 18. *In the situation of the proof of Theorem 7 it holds*

$$\tau_{n,p} \geq (np)^{-C^L}, \quad t \simeq \log(np), \quad \|A\|_F^2 \simeq \frac{\log(np)}{n}, \quad \|A\|_{\text{op}} \simeq \left(\frac{\log(np)}{n}\right)^{1/2},$$

where $C^L > 0$ is an adaptive constant is large for a large L .

Proof. We estimate with Lemma 17 that

$$\tau_{n,p} = \exp\left(-\frac{np}{p+1} \sum_{j=1}^p g^2(x_k)\right) \geq \exp(-C^L \log(np)) = (np)^{C^L}. \quad (45)$$

In the following we need that by Lemma 17 it holds

$$\frac{p\|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2}{p+1} = \frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{k=1}^p g^2(x_k) - \frac{1}{p+1} \left(\sum_{k=1}^p g(x_k)\right)^2$$

$$\simeq p h^{2\gamma+1} - \frac{(p h^{\gamma+1})^2}{p+1} \simeq p h^{2\gamma+1} \simeq \frac{\log(np)}{n} \quad (46)$$

and

$$\frac{\|v\|_2^2 - p}{p+1} = \frac{1}{p+1} \sum_{k=1}^p g^2(x_k) - \frac{2}{p+1} \sum_{k=1}^p g(x_k) \simeq -h^{\gamma+1}, \quad (47)$$

since $h = N_{n,p}^{-1} \rightarrow 0$.

For $t = 2 \log(\tau_{n,p}^{-1}) + n (\log(\det \Sigma_l / \det \Sigma_0) - \text{tr}(A))$ we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(A) &= \|v\|_2^2 - \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+p}} - \frac{\|v\|_1 (1 - \sqrt{1 + \|v\|_2^2})}{\|v\|_2^2 \sqrt{1+p}} v_k \right)^2 \\ &= \|v\|_2^2 - \frac{p}{p+1} + 2 \frac{\|v\|_1^2 (1 - \sqrt{1 + \|v\|_2^2})}{\|v\|_2^2 (p+1)} - \frac{\|v\|_1^2 (1 - \sqrt{1 + \|v\|_2^2})^2}{\|v\|_2^2 (p+1)} \\ &= \|v\|_2^2 - \frac{p}{p+1} - \frac{\|v\|_1^2}{p+1} = \frac{p\|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2}{p+1} + \frac{\|v\|_2^2 - p}{p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

With $\log(x) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{l+1} (x-1)^l / l$, $x \geq 1$ we get

$$\log \left(\frac{\det \Sigma_l}{\det \Sigma_0} \right) = \log \left(\frac{1 + \|v\|_2^2}{1+p} \right) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{l+1}}{l} \left(\frac{\|v\|_2^2 - p}{p+1} \right)^l.$$

Together with (46) and (47) this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\frac{\det \Sigma_l}{\det \Sigma_0} \right) - \text{tr}(A) &= \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{l+1}}{l} \left(\frac{\|v\|_2^2 - p}{p+1} \right)^l - \frac{p\|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2}{p+1} \\ &\geq -\frac{p\|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2}{p+1} \stackrel{(46)}{\simeq} \frac{\log(np)}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Together with (45) this yields $t \simeq \log(np)$.

To calculate the order of the norms we need that by Lemma 16 the eigenvalues of A are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{1,2}(A) &= -\frac{p\|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2 + \|v\|_2^2 - p}{2(p+1)} \pm \left(\left(\frac{p\|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2 + \|v\|_2^2 - p}{2(p+1)} \right)^2 + \frac{p\|v\|_2^2 - \|v\|_1^2}{p+1} \right)^{1/2} \\ &=: -a_p \pm (a_p^2 + b_p)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (46) and (47) we have $a_p \simeq p h^{2\gamma+1} - h^{\gamma+1}$ and $b_p \simeq p h^{2\gamma+1}$. Then the Frobenius-Norm is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \|A\|_F^2 &= \lambda_1^2(A) + \lambda_2^2(A) = (-a_p - (a_p^2 + b_p)^{1/2})^2 + (-a_p + (a_p^2 + b_p)^{1/2})^2 \\ &= 4a_p^2 + 2b_p \geq 2b_p \simeq p h^{2\gamma+1} \simeq \frac{\log(np)}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for n large enough it also holds $\|A\|_F \lesssim \log(np)/n$. For the operator norm we write

$$\|A\|_{\text{op}} = \max_{j=1, \dots, p} \lambda(A^\top A) = \max\{|\lambda_1(A)|, |\lambda_2(A)|\} \geq \frac{|\lambda_1(A)| + |\lambda_2(A)|}{2} \simeq \frac{\log(np)}{n}.$$

Additionally it also holds $\|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq |\lambda_1(A)| + |\lambda_2(A)| \simeq \log(np)/n$. \square

D Supplement: Proofs related to restricted local polynomial estimation

From Example 1 recall the notation

$$U_m(u_1, u_2) := (1, P_1(u_1, u_2), \dots, P_m(u_1, u_2))^\top, \quad u_1, u_2 \in [0, 1],$$

where for $l = 1, \dots, m$ we set

$$P_l(u_1, u_2) := \left(\frac{u_1^l}{l!}, \frac{u_1^{l-1}u_2}{(l-1)!}, \frac{u_1^{l-2}u_2^2}{(l-2)!2!}, \dots, \frac{u_2^l}{l!} \right), \quad u_1, u_2 \in [0, 1].$$

Moreover for a non-negative kernel function $K: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and a bandwidth $h > 0$ we set $K_h(x_1, x_2) := K(x_1/h, x_2/h)$ and $U_{m,h}(u_1, u_2) := U_m(u_1/h, u_2/h)$.

Given an order $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and observations $((x_j, x_k), z_{j,k}), 1 \leq j < k \leq p$, we consider

$$\widehat{\text{LP}}(x, y) := \underset{\boldsymbol{\vartheta} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m}}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{j < k}^p \left(z_{j,k} - \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} \right)^2 K_h \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq y \leq 1, \quad (49)$$

and define the local polynomial estimator of the target function with order m at (x, y) as

$$\widehat{\text{LP}}_1(x, y) := \begin{cases} (\widehat{\text{LP}}(x, y))^\top U_m(0, 0), & x \leq y, \\ (\widehat{\text{LP}}(y, x))^\top U_m(0, 0), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } (x, y)^\top \in [0, 1]^2, \quad (50)$$

since $U_m(0, 0)$ is the first unit vector in N_m dimensions.

Lemma 19. *Let the kernel function $K: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ have compact support in $[-1, 1]^2$ and satisfy*

$$K_{\min} \mathbb{1}_{\{-\Delta \leq u_1, u_2 \leq \Delta\}} \leq K(u_1, u_2) \leq K_{\max} \quad \text{for all } u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (51)$$

for a constants $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $K_{\min}, K_{\max} > 0$. Then under Assumption 4 there exist a sufficiently large $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sufficiently small $h_0 > 0$ such that for all $p \geq p_0$ and $h \in (c/p, h_0]$, where $c > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant, the local polynomial estimator in (50) with any order $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is unique. Moreover, the corresponding weights in (53) satisfy Assumption 3 with $\gamma = m$.

Let us proceed to preparations of the proof of Lemma 19.

For $x \leq y$, $x, y \in [0, 1]$ set

$$B_{p,h}(x, y) := \frac{1}{(ph)^2} \sum_{j < k}^p U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} U_h^\top \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} K_h \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m \times N_m} \quad (52)$$

and

$$\mathbf{a}_{p,h}(x, y) := \frac{1}{(ph)^2} \sum_{j < k}^p U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} K_h \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} z_{j,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m},$$

then (49) is the solution to the weighted least squares problem

$$\widehat{\text{LP}}(x, y) = \underset{\boldsymbol{\vartheta} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m}}{\text{argmin}} (-2\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top \mathbf{a}_{p,h}(x, y) + \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top B_{p,h}(x, y)\boldsymbol{\vartheta}).$$

The solution is determined by the normal equations

$$\mathbf{a}_{p,h}(x, y) = B_{p,h}(x, y)\boldsymbol{\vartheta}.$$

In particular, if $B_{p,h}(x, y)$ is positive definite, the solution in (49) is uniquely determined and we obtain

$$\widehat{\text{LP}}_1(x, y) = \sum_{j < k}^p w_{j,k}(x, y; h) z_{j,k}$$

with (now stating both cases)

$$w_{j,k}(x, y; h) := \frac{1}{(ph)^2} U^\top \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{cases} B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y) U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} K_h \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix}, & \text{for } x \leq y, \\ B_{p,h}^{-1}(y, x) U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x_j - y \\ x_k - x \end{pmatrix} K_h \begin{pmatrix} x_j - y \\ x_k - x \end{pmatrix}, & \text{for } x > y, \end{cases} \quad (53)$$

so that the local polynomial estimator is a linear estimator.

The more challenging part is to prove (LP1) now for a sufficiently large number p of design points and an uniformly choice of the bandwidth h .

Lemma 20. *Suppose that the kernel K suffices (51) in Lemma 19 and Assumption 4 is satisfied. Then there exist a sufficiently large $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sufficiently small $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $p \geq p_0$ and $h \in (c/p, h_0]$, where $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a sufficiently large constant, the smallest eigenvalues $\lambda_{\min}(B_{p,h}(x, y))$ of the matrices $B_{p,h}(x, y)$, which are given in (52), are bounded below by a universal positive constant $\lambda_0 > 0$ for any $x, y \in [0, 1]$ with $x < y$.*

An immediate consequence of Lemma 20 is the invertibility of $B_{p,h}(x, y)$ for all $p \geq p_0$, $h \in (c/p, h_0]$ and $x < y, x, y \in [0, 1]$, and hence also the uniqueness of the local polynomial estimator for these p and h . In Tsybakov (2004, Lemma 1.5) the lower bound for the smallest eigenvalues has only be shown for a fixed sequence h_p (for $d = 1$) of bandwidths which satisfies $h_p \rightarrow 0$ and $ph_p \rightarrow \infty$. In contrast, we allow an uniformly choice of h which results, in particular, in the findings of Section 3.

Proof of Lemma 20. In the following let $v \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m}$. We show that there exist a sufficiently large $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a component wise sufficiently small $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that the estimate

$$\inf_{p \geq p_0} \inf_{h \in (c/p, h_0]} \inf_{\substack{x, y \in [0, 1] \\ x < y}} \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} v^\top B_{p,h}(x, y) v \geq \lambda_0 \quad (54)$$

is satisfied. Then we obtain for these choices of p and h , and any $x, y \in [0, 1]$ also

$$\lambda_{\min}(B_{p,h}(x, y)) = e_{\min}^\top(B_{p,h}(x, y)) B_{p,h}(x, y) e_{\min}(B_{p,h}(x, y)) \geq \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} v^\top B_{p,h}(x, y) v \geq \lambda_0,$$

where $e_{\min}(B_{p,h}(x, y)) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ is a normalised eigenvector of $\lambda_{\min}(B_{p,h}(x, y))$. Let $E^1 := \{(x, y)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x, y \in [0, \Delta], x \leq y\}$, $E^2 := \{(x, y)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x \in (-\Delta, 0], y \in [0, \Delta]\}$ and $E^3 := \{(x, y)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid x, y \in (-\Delta, 0], x \leq y\}$, where $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is given in (51). We set

$$\lambda_i(v) := f_{\min}^2 K_{\min} \int_{E^i} (v^\top U_m(\mathbf{z}))^2 d\mathbf{z}, \quad \lambda_i := \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} \lambda_i(v)$$

for all $i = 1, 2, 3$. Applying Tsybakov (2004, Lemma 1) with $K(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{1}_{E^i}(\mathbf{z}), \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, leads to $\lambda_i(v) \geq \lambda_i > 0$. Therefore we find a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that $\min(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) > \lambda_0 > 0$, e.g. $\lambda_0 := \min(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)/2$. Now we want to specify a partition $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3 = \{(x, y)^\top \mid 0 \leq x \leq y \leq 1\}$ and functions $A_{p,h}^{(1)}(x, y; v), A_{p,h}^{(2)}(x, y; v)$ and $A_{p,h}^{(3)}(x, y; v)$ such that

$$v^\top B_{p,h}(x, y) v \geq A_{p,h}^{(i)}(x, y; v), \quad (x, y)^\top \in S_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (55)$$

and

$$\sup_{(x, y)^\top \in S_i} \sup_{\|v\|_2=1} |A_{p,h}^{(i)}(x, y; v) - \lambda_i(v)| \leq \frac{c_1}{ph}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad (56)$$

hold true for a positive constant $c_1 > 0$. Consider $h \in (c/p, h_0]$ with $c := c_1/(\min(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) - \lambda_0)$ yields $c_1/(ph) < c_1/c \leq \lambda_i - \lambda_0$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3$. Hence, it follows by (55) and (56) that

$$\inf_{(x, y)^\top \in S_i} \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} v^\top B_{p,h}(x, y) v = \inf_{(x, y)^\top \in S_i} \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} (\lambda_i(v) + v^\top B_{p,h}(x, y) v - \lambda_i(v))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \lambda_i + \inf_{(x,y)^\top \in S_i} \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} (A_{p,h}^{(i)}(x,y;v) - \lambda_i(v)) \\
&= \lambda_i - \sup_{(x,y)^\top \in S_i} \sup_{\|v\|_2=1} (\lambda_i(v) - A_{p,h}^{(i)}(x,y;v)) \\
&\geq \lambda_i - \sup_{(x,y)^\top \in S_i} \sup_{\|v\|_2=1} |A_{p,h}^{(i)}(x,y;v) - \lambda_i(v)| \\
&\geq \lambda_i - \frac{c_1}{ph} \geq \lambda_0,
\end{aligned}$$

which leads to (54) because of

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{p \geq p_0} \inf_{h \in (c/p, h_0]} \inf_{0 \leq x \leq y \leq 1} \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} v^\top B_{p,h}(x,y)v \\
&= \inf_{p \geq p_0} \inf_{h \in (c/p, h_0]} \min_{i=1,2,3} \left(\inf_{(x,y)^\top \in S_i} \inf_{\|v\|_2=1} v^\top B_{p,h}(x,y)v \right) \geq \lambda_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we show (55) and (56). Let $I_0 := [0, 1 - \Delta h - 1/(2f_{\min} p)]$ and $I_1 := [1 - \Delta h - 1/(2f_{\min} p), 1]$. We define $S_1 := \{(x,y)^\top \in I_0^2 \mid x \leq y\}$, $S_2 := \{(x,y)^\top \in I_0 \times I_1\}$ and $S_3 := \{(x,y)^\top \in I_1^2 \mid x \leq y\}$. It is clear that $\bigcup_{i=1}^3 S_i = \{(x,y)^\top \mid 0 \leq x \leq y \leq 1\}$. Define $\tilde{x}_j := (x_j - x)/h$, $x \in [0, 1]$ and $\tilde{y}_j := (x_j - y)/h$ for all $1 \leq j \leq p$, where x_1, \dots, x_p are the design points.

We have to differentiate two different cases. At first let $x \in I_0$. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{x}_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2f_{\min} p h} - \frac{x}{h} \leq \frac{1}{2f_{\min} p h}, \\
\tilde{x}_p &\geq \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2f_{\min} p} - x}{h} \geq \frac{1 - (1 - \Delta h - (2f_{\min} p)^{-1})}{h} - \frac{1}{2f_{\min} p h} = \Delta
\end{aligned}$$

by (60) in Lemma 21. For appropriate p and $h \in (c/p, h_0]$ the quantity $(2f_{\min} p h)^{-1}$ gets small if c is chosen large enough. Consequently, the points $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p$ form a grid which covers an interval containing at least $[1/(2f_{\min} p h), \Delta]$. Hence, there exist $1 \leq j_* := j_*(x) < j^* := j^*(x) \leq p$ such that $\tilde{x}_{j_*} \geq 0 \wedge (j_* = 1 \vee \tilde{x}_{j_*-1} < 0)$ and $\tilde{x}_{j^*} \leq \Delta \wedge \tilde{x}_{j^*+1} > \Delta$ are satisfied. Here \wedge denotes the logical and, and \vee the logical or. For the second case let $x \in I_1$. Then we obtain the estimates

$$\tilde{x}_1 \leq \frac{1}{2f_{\min} p h} - \frac{x}{h} \leq \Delta - \frac{1}{h} \leq -\Delta, \quad \tilde{x}_p \geq -\frac{1}{2f_{\min} p h},$$

since h has to be sufficiently small and p sufficiently large. Consequently, the points $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_p$ form a grid which covers an interval containing $[-\Delta, -1/(2f_{\min} p h)]$. Define \tilde{j}_* and \tilde{j}^* in the same manner. Of course this also holds for $\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_p$.

We set $g_v(x,y) := (v^\top U(x,y))^2$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m}$. For $0 \leq x \leq y \leq 1$ we can further estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
v^\top B_{p,h}(x,y)v &= \frac{1}{(ph)^2} v^\top \left(\sum_{j < k}^p U_m \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_j \\ \tilde{y}_k \end{pmatrix} U_m^\top \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_j \\ \tilde{y}_k \end{pmatrix} K \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_j \\ \tilde{y}_k \end{pmatrix} \right) v \\
&\geq \frac{f_{\min}^2 K_{\min}}{f_{\min}^2 (ph)^2} \sum_{j < k}^p \left(v^\top U_m \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_j \\ \tilde{y}_k \end{pmatrix} \right)^2 \mathbb{1}_{[-\Delta, \Delta]^2}(\tilde{x}_j, \tilde{y}_k) \\
&\geq f_{\min}^2 K_{\min} \sum_{j < k}^{p-1} g_v \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_j \\ \tilde{y}_k \end{pmatrix} (\tilde{x}_{j+1} - \tilde{x}_j)(\tilde{y}_{k+1} - \tilde{y}_k) \mathbb{1}_{[0, \Delta]^2}(\tilde{x}_j, \tilde{y}_k) \\
&\geq f_{\min}^2 K_{\min} \sum_{j=j_*}^{j^*} \sum_{\substack{k=k_* \\ j < k}}^{k^*} g_v \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_j \\ \tilde{y}_k \end{pmatrix} (\tilde{x}_{j+1} - \tilde{x}_j)(\tilde{y}_{k+1} - \tilde{y}_k) \\
&=: A_{p,h}^{(i)}(x,y;v), \quad i = 1, 2, 3,
\end{aligned}$$

for $(x,y)^\top \in S_1$ by Assumption 4, inequality (61) in Lemma 21 for the \tilde{x}_j, \tilde{y}_k and the presentation of $B_{p,h}(x,y)$ in (52). We start with the case $(x,y)^\top \in S_1 = I_0 \times I_0$. By inserting this function




Figure 12: Illustration to the approximation in (57). On the left the first and on the right the third case.

in (56), dropping the scalar $f_{\min}^2 K_{\min}$ and oppressing the sups the object of interest is given by

$$\left| \sum_{j=j_*}^{j^*} \sum_{\substack{k=k_* \\ j < k}}^{k^*} g_v \left(\begin{array}{c} \tilde{x}_j \\ \tilde{y}_k \end{array} \right) (\tilde{x}_{j+1} - \tilde{x}_j) (\tilde{y}_{k+1} - \tilde{y}_k) - \int_{E_1} g_v(z) dz \right| \quad (57)$$

In order to bound these terms of the sum separately we note that $g_v(z) = (v^\top U_m(z))^2$ is a bivariate polynomial function and therefore Lipschitz-continuous on E_1, E_2 and E_3 respectively. By Lemma 21 it holds $|\tilde{x}_{j+1} - \tilde{x}_j| \leq (f_{\min} p h)^{-1}$. Therefore the difference of every point of $z = (z_1, z_2)^\top \in E_1$ to a design point $(\tilde{x}_j, \tilde{y}_k)$ is of order $(p h)^{-1}$. Figure 12 illustrates this step. The amount of points $(\tilde{x}_j, \tilde{y}_k)^\top, j_* \leq j \leq j^*, k_* \leq k \leq k^*, j < k$, is bounded by Lemma 22

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^p \mathbf{1}_{E_1}(\tilde{x}_j, \tilde{y}_k) \leq \left(2f_{\max} \max(\Delta p h, 1) \right)^2 = \mathcal{O}((p h)^2).$$

Therefore the sum approximates the integral in form of a Riemann-sum of a Riemann-integrable, since it is Lipschitz-continuous, function with the error rate getting small with order $(p h)^{-1}$. This concludes the proof via the previous steps. \square

Now we can prove Lemma 19.

Proof of Lemma 19. By Lemma 20 there exist a sufficiently large $p_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sufficiently small $h_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for all $p \geq p_0$ and $h \in (c/p, h_0]$, where $c > 0$ is a sufficiently large constant such that the local polynomial estimator in (50) with any order $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is unique and a linear estimator with weights given in (53). We make use of Lemma 20 by

$$\|B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y)\|_{M,2} \leq \lambda_0^{-1} \quad (58)$$

for all $p \geq p_0, h \in (c/p, h_0]$ and $x \leq y \in [0, 1]$, where $\|M\|_{M,2}$ is the spectral norm of a symmetric matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m \times N_m}$.

(W1): Let Q be a bivariate polynomial of degree $\zeta \geq 1$ with $r_1 + r_2 = \zeta, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. By the bivariate Taylor expansion we have

$$Q(x_j, x_k) = Q(x, y) + \sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \sum_{l=1}^{r_2} \frac{(x_j - x)^i (x_k - y)^l}{i! l!} \cdot \frac{\partial^{i+l}}{\partial^i x \partial^l y} Q(x_j, x_k) = q(x, y)^\top U_h \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix},$$

where $q(x, y) := (q_0(x, y), \dots, q_\zeta(x, y))^\top$, with

$$q_l(x, y) := \left(\frac{\partial^l q(x, y)}{\partial^l x}, \frac{\partial^l q(x, y)}{\partial^{l-1} x \partial y}, \dots, \frac{\partial^l q(x, y)}{\partial^l y} \right).$$

Setting $z_{j,k} = Q(x_j, x_k)$, we get for $x \leq y$

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{LP}}(x, y) &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\zeta}} \sum_{j < k}^p \left(Q(x_j, x_k) - \vartheta^\top U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} \right)^2 K_h \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\zeta}} \sum_{j < k}^p \left((q(x, y) - \vartheta)^\top U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} \right)^2 K_h \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\zeta}} (q(x, y) - \vartheta)^\top B_{p,h}(x, y) (q(x, y) - \vartheta) = q(x, y), \end{aligned}$$

since $B_{p,h}(x, y)$ is positive definite.

(W2): This follows directly by the support of the kernel function K and the display (53).

(W3): If design points are dispersed according to Assumption 4, then by Lemma 22 and the fact $\|U_h(0, 0)\|_2 = 1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} |w_{j,k}(x, y; h)| &\leq \frac{1}{(ph)^2} \|U_h(0, 0)\|_2 \|B_{p,h}^{-1}\|_{M,2} \left\| U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} K_h \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{K_{\max}}{(ph)^2 \lambda_0} \left\| U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x_j - x \\ x_k - y \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \mathbf{1}_{\max\{|x_j - x|, |x_k - y|\} \leq h} \\ &\leq \frac{4 K_{\max}}{(ph)^2 \lambda_0}. \end{aligned}$$

(W4): We divide the proof in three cases with respect to the fact whether the weights vanish or not. In the following let $1 \leq j \leq p$ and $x, y \in [0, 1]$.

Let $\min(\max(|x - x_j|, |y - x_k|), \max(|y' - x_k|, |y' - x_k|)) > h$, then by (W2) both weights $w_{j,k}(x, y; h)$ and $w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)$ vanish, and hence (W4) is clear.

Let $\max(\max(|x - x_j|, |y - x_k|), \max(|y' - x_k|, |y' - x_k|)) > h$. We assume $\max(x - x_j, y - x_j) > h$ and $\max(y - x_k, y - x_j) \leq h$ without loss of generality. Once again (W2) leads to $w_{j,k}(x, y; h) = 0$, and hence the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\|U(0, 0)\|_2 = 1$ and (58) imply

$$\begin{aligned} |w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)| &= \frac{1}{ph} \left| U^\top(0, 0) B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y) U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} \right| \left| K_h \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p^1 h^1} \|U(0, 0)\|_2 \left\| B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y) U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \left| K_h \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{ph} \|B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y)\|_{M,2} \left\| U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \left| K_h \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_0 ph} \left| K_h \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} \right| \left(\sum_{\substack{|r|=0, \\ r=(r_1, r_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2}}^m \left(\frac{(x_j - x)^{r_1} (x_k - y)^{r_2}}{h^r r_1! r_2!} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{c_1}{\lambda_0 ph} \left| K_h \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} \right| \end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant $c_1 > 0$. In the last step we used the fact that the sum can not get arbitrarily large, also for component wise small h , because the kernel K has compact support in $[-1, 1]$. If $\max(x - y, x' - y') > h$, we use the upper bound of the kernel function in (51) and obtain

$$|w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h)| \leq \frac{c_1 K_{\max}}{\lambda_0 ph}.$$

Conversely, if $\max(x - y, x' - y') \leq h$, we add $K_h(x_j - x', x_k - y') = 0$ and estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \left| w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h) \right| &\leq \frac{c_1}{\lambda_0 p^1 h^1} \left| K_h \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} - K_h \begin{pmatrix} x' - x_j \\ y' - x_k \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{c_1 L_K}{\lambda_0 p^1 h^1} \frac{\max(|x - y|, |x' - y'|)}{h}, \end{aligned}$$

because of the Lipschitz continuity of the kernel. In total we get

$$\left| w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h) \right| \leq \frac{c_1 \max(K_{\max}, L_K)}{\lambda_0 p h} \left(\frac{\max(|x - y|, |x' - y'|)}{h} \wedge 1 \right). \quad (59)$$

Let $\max(\max(|x - x_j|, |y - x_k|), \max(|y' - x_k|, |y' - x_j|)) \leq h$, then both weights doesn't vanish and we have to show a proper Lipschitz property for

$$w_{j,k}(x, y; h) = \frac{1}{p h} U^\top(0, 0) B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y) U_{m,h} \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix} K_h \begin{pmatrix} x - x_j \\ y - x_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

The kernel K and polynomials on compact intervals are Lipschitz continuous, hence it suffices to show that $B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y)$ has this property as well. Then the weights are products of bounded Lipschitz continuous functions and, thus, also Lipschitz continuous. The entries of the matrix $B_{p,h}(x, y)$, which is defined in (52), considered as functions from $[0, 1]$ to \mathbb{R} are Lipschitz continuous. Indeed they are of order one by using Assumption 1 and Lemma 22. Hence, the row sum norm $\|B_{p,h}(x, y) - B_{p,h}(x', y')\|_{M,\infty}$ is a sum of these Lipschitz continuous functions and, in consequence, there exists a positive constants $L_\infty > 0$ such that

$$\|B_{p,h}(x, y) - B_{p,h}(x', y')\|_{M,\infty} \leq (N_m + 1) L_\infty \frac{\max(|x - y|, |x' - y'|)}{h}$$

is satisfied. Since the matrices are symmetric the column sum norm is equal to the row sum norm and we obtain

$$\|B_{p,h}(x, y) - B_{p,h}(x', y')\|_{M,2} \leq \|B_{p,h}(x, y) - B_{p,h}(x', y')\|_{M,\infty} \leq (N_m + 1) L_\infty \frac{\max(|x - y|, |x' - y'|)}{h}.$$

This leads together with (58) and the submultiplicativity of the spectral norm to

$$\begin{aligned} \|B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y) - B_{p,h}^{-1}(x', y')\|_{M,2} &= \|B_{p,h}^{-1}(x', y') (B_{p,h}(x', y') - B_{p,h}(x, y)) B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y)\|_{M,2} \\ &\leq \|B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y)\|_{M,2} \|B_{p,h}(x', y') - B_{p,h}(x, y)\|_{M,2} \|B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y)\|_{M,2} \\ &\leq \frac{(N_m + 1) L_\infty}{\lambda_0^2} \frac{\max(|x - y|, |x' - y'|)}{h}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the Lipschitz continuity of $B_{p,h}^{-1}(x, y)$ with respect to the spectral norm. So finally there exists a positive constant $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\left| w_{j,k}(x, y; h) - w_{j,k}(x', y'; h) \right| \leq \frac{c_2}{2 p h} \frac{\max(|x - y|, |x' - y'|)}{h} \leq \frac{c_2}{p h}$$

is satisfied. Here we used in the last step that $\max(\max(|x - x_j|, |y - x_j|), \max(|y - x_k|, |y - x_j|)) \leq h$ implies $\max(|x - y|, |x' - y'|) \leq 2h$.

In the end we choose $C_3 \geq \max(c_1 \max(K_{\max}, L_K)/\lambda_0, c_2)$ and obtain Assumption (W4). \square

Here we state two auxiliary Lemmas which result as a consequence of Assumption 4 and which were used in the proof of Lemma 19. For their proofs see (Berger et al., 2024, Proofs of Lemma 6 and 7).

Lemma 21. *Let Assumption 4 be satisfied. Then for all $j = 1, \dots, p$ it follows that*

$$\frac{j-0.5}{f_{\max} p} \leq x_j \leq \frac{j-0.5}{f_{\min} p} \quad \text{and} \quad 1 - \frac{p-j+0.5}{f_{\min} p} \leq x_j \leq 1 - \frac{p-j+0.5}{f_{\max} p}, \quad (60)$$

and for all $1 \leq j < l \leq p$ that

$$\frac{l-j}{f_{\max} p} \leq x_l - x_j \leq \frac{l-j}{f_{\min} p}. \quad (61)$$

Lemma 22. *Suppose that Assumption 4 is satisfied. Then we obtain for all $p \geq 1$ and any set $S = [a_1, b_1] \times [a_2, b_2] \subseteq [0, 1]^2$ the estimate*

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^p \mathbb{1}_{\{(x_k, x_j)^\top \in S\}} \leq 4 f_{\max}^2 \max(p(b_1 - a_1), 1) \max(p(b_2 - a_2), 1).$$

In particular Assumption 1 is satisfied.

E Supplement: Additional numerical results




Figure 13: Supremum error of the estimation of the covariance kernel of an Ornstein Uhlenbeck process with $\theta = 3$ and $\sigma = 2$. The additional Gaussian noise has standard deviation $\sigma_\epsilon = 0.75$. The graphics show the supremum error for $n = 50, 100, 200, 400$ curves for different p . The points on the x -axis indicate which bandwidth led to the minimal empirical supremum error.




Figure 14: Results from $N = 1000$ times using the 5-fold cross validation for $n = 100$ and various p . The procedure does not perform as well as for $n = 400$ in Figure 5, which is explainable by Figure 13.