

Robust density estimation over star-shaped density classes

Xiaolong Liu and Matey Neykov

Department of Statistics and Data Science, Northwestern University
xiaolongliu2025@u.northwestern.edu, mneykov@northwestern.edu

Abstract

We establish a novel criterion for comparing the performance of two densities, g_1 and g_2 , within the context of corrupted data. Utilizing this criterion, we propose an algorithm to construct a density estimator within a star-shaped density class, \mathcal{F} , under conditions of data corruption. We proceed to derive the minimax upper and lower bounds for density estimation across this star-shaped density class, characterized by densities that are uniformly bounded above and below (in the sup norm), in the presence of adversarially corrupted data. Specifically, we assume that a fraction $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{3}$ of the N observations are arbitrarily corrupted. We obtain the minimax upper bound $\max\{\tau_j^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2$. Under certain conditions, we obtain the minimax risk, up to proportionality constants, under the squared L_2 loss as

$$\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\},$$

where $\tau^* := \sup\{\tau : N\tau^2 \leq \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)\}$ for a sufficiently large constant c . Here, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)$ denotes the local entropy of the set \mathcal{F} , and d is the L_2 diameter of \mathcal{F} .

1 Introduction

When dealing with minimax rates for density estimation, global metric entropy is often employed. Specifically, the following equation, sometimes informally referred to as the ‘Le Cam equation’, is used to heuristically determine the minimax rate of convergence:

$$\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{glo}}(\tau) \asymp N\tau^2,$$

where N is the sample size, $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{glo}}(\tau)$ is the global metric entropy of the density set \mathcal{F} at a Hellinger distance τ , and τ^2 determines the order of the minimax rate.

Recently, [Shrotriya and Neykov \(2023\)](#) established that local metric entropy consistently determines the minimax rate for star-shaped density classes, where the densities are assumed to be (uniformly) bounded from above and below. Specifically, they revised the Le Cam equation by replacing the global entropy with local entropy (see Definition 2.5) and the Hellinger metric with the L_2 metric. Moreover, they proved that the constraints on the density class could be relaxed to a star-shaped density class that is uniformly bounded above and contains a density that is bounded below. They proposed a ‘multistage sieve’ maximum likelihood estimator that achieves these bounds.

In this paper, we extend this scenario to adversarial data. Specifically, while still seeking an estimator for the true density within this bounded star-shaped density class, we now face corrupted data. We assume that a fraction $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{3}$ of the N observations are arbitrarily corrupted. We modify the ‘multistage sieve’ algorithm from [Shrotriya and Neykov \(2023\)](#) accordingly. Specifically, we establish a new criterion to compare the performance of any two densities g_1 and g_2 based on the corrupted data (see (3)). By using the local entropy of the set \mathcal{F} , we obtain the minimax upper and lower bounds up to proportionality constants under the squared L_2 loss. These two bounds do not always match, but under Condition 1.1, we are able to determine the minimax risk, up to proportionality constants.

We define

$$\xi(\epsilon) := \max_{f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}, \text{TV}(P_1, P_2) \leq \frac{\epsilon'}{1-\epsilon'}} \{\|f_1 - f_2\|_2^2\},$$

where f_1 and f_2 denote the densities of distributions P_1 and P_2 , respectively, TV is the total variation distance, $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the L_2 norm, and $\epsilon' = \epsilon - \frac{1}{N}$.

Condition 1.1 (Condition for optimality). *Assume we have $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon$ when $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$, where $k > 7$ is a constant. For $\epsilon < \frac{k}{N}$, no further assumptions are made.*

Remark 1.2. *As demonstrated in the proof of Lemma 2.8, we established that $\xi(\epsilon) \lesssim \epsilon$. Therefore, under Condition 1.1, it follows that $\xi(\epsilon) \asymp \epsilon$ when $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$. Furthermore, Theorem 2.19 shows that, under this condition, our algorithm achieves optimality.*

Remark 1.3. *The following provides a simple example where Condition 1.1 holds. Consider the case where \mathcal{F} includes the constant function $f(x) := 1$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, and let the function $g(x)$ be defined as:*

$$g(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}, & 0 \leq x < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \\ 1, & \frac{\epsilon}{2} \leq x \leq 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \\ \frac{3}{2}, & 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2} < x \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

where ϵ is a small positive constant. We can verify that the total variation distance satisfies $\text{TV}(f, g) \asymp \epsilon$ and the L_2 norm satisfies $\|f - g\|_2 \asymp \sqrt{\epsilon}$. Therefore, $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon$, where $\xi(\epsilon)$ is defined in Lemma 2.8.

In this case, by Theorem 2.19, the proposed estimator achieves the minimax rate. For instance, the class \mathcal{F} can be taken as the set of monotone densities that includes both f and g .

We adopt the same definition for a general class of bounded densities as in Shrotriya and Neykov (2023), denoted by $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$. We assume that the true density of interest lies within a known star-shaped subset of this ambient density class. Furthermore, we will adhere to the definitions provided in Shrotriya and Neykov (2023), specifically Definitions 2.1, 2.4, and 2.5.

Definition 1.4 (Ambient density class $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$). *Given constants $0 < \alpha < \beta < \infty$, for some fixed dimension $p \in \mathbb{N}$, and a common known (Borel measurable) compact support set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ (with positive measure), we then define the class of density functions, $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$, as follows:*

$$\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]} := \left\{ f : B \rightarrow [\alpha, \beta] \mid \int_B f \, d\mu = 1, f \text{ measurable} \right\}$$

where μ is the dominating finite measure on B . We always take μ to be a (normalized) probability measure on B .

Furthermore, we endow $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$ with the L_2 -metric. That is, for any two densities $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$, we denote the L_2 -metric between them to be

$$\|f - g\|_2 := \left(\int_B (f - g)^2 \, d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Remark 1.5. *When ϵ is sufficiently small, specifically less than $d_1/3$, where d_1 is the diameter of \mathcal{F} in the total variation distance, it becomes feasible to identify two densities whose distance is exactly ϵ , see Lemma 1.3 in Prasad and Neykov (2024). Note that by using Holder's inequality, we have $\int |f_1 - f_2| \, d\mu \leq (\int (f_1 - f_2)^2 \, d\mu)^{1/2}$. Therefore, we have $\text{TV}(f_1, f_2) \lesssim \|f_1 - f_2\|_2$. Consequently, we have $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon^2$. Therefore, for sufficiently small ϵ , the relationship $\epsilon \gtrsim \xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon^2$ holds.*

Remark 1.6. *As mentioned and analyzed in Shrotriya and Neykov (2023), Definition 1.4 implies that $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$ forms a convex set, and that the metric space $(\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}, \|\cdot\|_2)$ is complete, bounded, but may not be totally bounded.*

Core Problem: Suppose we observe n observations $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} := (\tilde{X}_1, \dots, \tilde{X}_n)^\top \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} f$, where $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is a fixed but unknown density function. Here, $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$ is a known star-shaped set. For a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$, independent of n , a fraction ϵ of the observations in $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ are arbitrarily corrupted by some procedure \mathcal{C} . Let $\mathbf{X} = \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$, where the i th coordinate is $X_i = \mathcal{C}(\tilde{X}_i)$ if it is corrupted, otherwise $X_i = \tilde{X}_i$. Our goal is to propose a universal estimator for f based on this corrupted data and to derive the exact (up to constants) squared L_2 -minimax rate of estimation in expectation.

If Condition 1.1 holds, our estimator ν^* achieves the following minimax rate:

$$\inf_{\hat{\nu}} \sup_f \mathbb{E}_f \|\hat{\nu} - f\|_2^2 \asymp \max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}.$$

Here $\tau^* := \sup\{\tau : N\tau^2 \leq \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)\}$, with $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)$ being the L_2 -local metric entropy of \mathcal{F} (see Definition 2.5). The quantity $d := \text{diam}_2(\mathcal{F})$ refers to the L_2 -diameter of \mathcal{F} , which is finite due to the boundedness of $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$ in our setting.

Remark 1.7 (Extending results to $\mathcal{F}_B^{[0, \beta]}$). *If the class \mathcal{F} contains at least one density function that is bounded away from 0, then the boundedness requirement on \mathcal{F} can be relaxed to $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_B^{[0, \beta]}$, where \mathcal{F} is a star-shaped set. This result is proved in Shrotriya and Neykov (2023) and is shown in Proposition 2.21.*

1.1 Related Literature

There is an extensive body of research focused on deriving minimax lower bounds in density estimation. For instance, Boyd and Steele (1978) established a fundamental lower bound for the mean integrated p -th power error, showing that $\mathbb{E}_f \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x) - \hat{f}_n(x)|^p dx \gtrsim n^{-1}$ (with $p \geq 1$) for any arbitrary density estimator. Devroye (1983) further explored lower bounds for the normalized error $\mathbb{E}_f \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |f(x) - \hat{f}_n(x)|^p dx / \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f^p(x) dx$ in density estimation.

Bretagnolle and Huber (1979) assumed that the density function f belongs to a subset \mathcal{F} characterized by a certain level of smoothness. They derived sharp lower bounds for the minimax risk under the L_p norm within this smoothness-constrained class. Since a smoothness assumption for a family of densities generally implies certain dimensional properties, as discussed by Birgé (1986), they assumed specific dimensional properties for the density families and used metric entropy-based methods to derive sharp risk bounds for many smooth density families under the Hellinger metric. Efroimovich and Pinsker (1982) considered the problem where the density is assumed to belong to an ellipsoid in a Hilbert space and is square-integrable. They used an orthonormal basis $\{u_j(x)\}_{j=0,1,\dots}$ to uniquely represent the true density as $f(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \theta_j u_j(x)$, where $\theta_j = \int f(x) u_j(x) d\nu$. This approach transforms the problem into the estimation of the infinite-dimensional parameter θ . The parameter θ is assumed to belong to an ellipsoid defined as $\Theta := \{\theta : \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j \theta_j^2 \leq 1 \text{ and } \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_j = \infty\}$. They then derived both the asymptotic lower bounds for the minimax risk and the corresponding upper bounds. Has (1978) utilized Fano's lemma to derive lower bounds for density estimation in the L_2 metric under specific smoothness conditions. Ibragimov and Khasminskii (1997) applied Fano's lemma to establish minimax lower bounds for estimating a shifted parameter in infinite-dimensional Gaussian white noise.

Ibragimov and Khas' minskii (1978) explored the capacity of communication channels defined by the stochastic differential equation $dX(t) = S(t) dt + \epsilon dw(t)$, where $w(t)$ is a standard Wiener process and ϵ is a small positive parameter. They focused on the problem of estimating an unknown function S , given observations of the process $X(t)$ over the interval $[0, 1]$. The function S was assumed to belong to a predefined subset \mathcal{S} of the unit ball in the $L^2(0, 1)$ space. By leveraging an argument analogous to Fano's inequality, the authors derived a lower bound on the minimax risk for the estimation problem under the L_p norm. In Ibragimov and Khas' minskii (1983), the authors considered the problem of estimating a density function f from a known class of functions \mathcal{F} . They utilized Fano's lemma to derive a minimax lower bound for the estimation error measured in the L_p norm, where $2 \leq p \leq \infty$. The derivation is based on the assumption that within the class \mathcal{F} , there exist $p(\delta)$ distinct densities $f_{i\delta}$ such that the distance between any two distinct

densities satisfies $\|f_{i\delta} - f_{j\delta}\| \geq \delta$, and the loss function L satisfies $L(\delta/2) > 0$. Here, $p(\delta)$ is an integer that depends on δ , which is a positive constant. [Hasminskii and Ibragimov \(1990\)](#) employed Fano’s lemma to derive minimax lower bounds under the scenario where the unknown density f lies within a known set \mathcal{F} . They argued that if $\phi \in \Phi \subset \mathcal{F}$ is used to estimate f , and if \mathcal{F} consists of finite sets with a fixed number N of elements, the results are closely tied to entropy. [Yu \(1997\)](#) presented several lemmas for deriving optimal lower bounds using both Assouad’s and Fano’s lemma arguments for densities on compact supports. [Yang and Barron \(1999\)](#) demonstrated that global metric entropy bounds effectively capture the minimax risk over an entire function class or substantial subsets of it.

The minimax lower bound techniques, particularly in the context of nonparametric density estimation, are well-documented in classical references such as [Devroye \(1987\)](#), [Devroye and Györfi \(1985\)](#), and [Cam \(1986\)](#). More recent works, including [Tsybakov \(2009\)](#) and [Wainwright \(2019\)](#), also offer valuable insights.

In addition to the extensive research on minimax lower bounds, there has also been significant work on deriving minimax upper bounds in density estimation. For example, [Barron and Cover \(1991\)](#) employs the minimum distance principle to derive density estimators defined by $\hat{f} := \operatorname{argmin}_{q \in \Gamma} \left(L(q) + \log \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^n q(X_i)} \right)$, where Γ is a set of candidate densities and $L(q)$ is a nonnegative function that satisfies Kraft’s inequality $\sum_q 2^{-L(q)} \leq 1$. They use relative entropy (Kullback-Leibler divergence) to upper bound the error under the Hellinger distance. Similarly, [Yatracos \(1985\)](#) explores minimum distance estimators, providing uniformly consistent robust estimators and using entropy to derive upper bounds under the L_1 metric. [Birgé \(1983\)](#) investigates the speed of estimation under the Hellinger metric. Specifically, they consider the minimax risk defined as

$$R_n(q) := \inf_{T_n} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_\theta [d^q(\theta, T_n)],$$

where T_n is any estimator of the parameter θ . The speed of estimation is described by a function $r(n)$ such that there exist constants C_1 and C_2 satisfying

$$C_1 r^q(n) \leq R_n(q) \leq C_2 r^q(n).$$

As mentioned earlier, [Birgé \(1986\)](#) leverages the dimensional properties of density families and uses metric entropy to derive sharp risk bounds under the Hellinger metric. [Van de Geer \(1993\)](#) examines the maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ of the true parameter θ , based on the empirical distribution P_n . The estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ is defined as the maximizer of the log-likelihood function, given by

$$\int \log(f_{\hat{\theta}_n}) dP_n = \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \int \log(f_\theta) dP_n.$$

The study investigates the convergence of $\hat{f} := f_{\hat{\theta}_n}$ to the true density f under the Hellinger metric. [Wong and Shen \(1995\)](#) investigates upper bounds for density estimation using the ‘sieve’ MLE technique, utilizing a metric constructed from a family of discrepancy indices, which includes the squared Hellinger distance, Kullback-Leibler divergence, and Pearson’s χ^2 statistic as special cases. A ‘sieve’ estimator, as noted in ([Grenander, 1981](#), Chapter 8), effectively estimates the parameter of interest through an optimization procedure (e.g., maximum likelihood) over a constrained subset of the parameter space. [Birgé and Massart \(1993\)](#) examines minimum contrast estimators (M.C.E.) in a nonparametric setting, deriving upper bounds for their performance, with the main theorem linking the rate of convergence of these estimators to the entropy structure of the parameter space. Furthermore, [Birgé and Massart \(1998\)](#) extends this work by focusing on minimum contrast estimators on sieves, computing sharp rates of convergence. More recently, [Shrotriya and Neykov \(2023\)](#) introduced local metric entropy to determine the minimax rate for star-shaped density classes where densities are uniformly bounded above and below. They revised the Le Cam equation using local entropy and the L_2 metric, relaxed constraints on the density class, and proposed a ‘multistage sieve’ MLE that achieves these bounds.

[Hampel \(1968\)](#), [Huber \(1992\)](#), and [Tukey \(1960\)](#) are seminal works in robust statistics that have been systematically studied. Huber’s contamination model [Huber \(1965, 1992\)](#) is a well-known framework for studying robustness in various modern settings. In this model, observations are assumed to be i.i.d. from

the distribution $P_{\epsilon, f, G} := (1 - \epsilon)P_f + \epsilon G$, where P_f is a distribution on \mathbb{R}^d with the density of interest f , G is an arbitrary contamination distribution, and ϵ represents the contamination proportion. [Chen et al. \(2016\)](#) investigates the robust minimax risk, $\inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_Q \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon, \theta, Q} L(\hat{\theta}, \theta)$, for a given parameter space Θ and a loss function L under Huber’s contamination model: $(1 - \epsilon)P_\theta + \epsilon Q$. They demonstrated that this robust minimax risk is upper bounded by a universal constant times $\min_{\delta > 0} \left\{ \frac{\log \mathcal{M}(\delta, \Theta, \text{TV})}{n} + \delta^2 \right\} \vee \epsilon^2$, where $\mathcal{M}(\delta, \Theta, \text{TV})$ denotes the δ -covering number of Θ with respect to the total variation distance. In our opinion, this is probably the closest paper to ours on the topic since it provides entropic upper bounds and uses a testing lemma to achieve the rate. We would therefore like to underscore the key differences between our work and [Chen et al. \(2016\)](#):

1. They work with the Huber model while we work with an adversarial model;
2. They use a TV-based loss function while we use the squared L_2 loss;
3. We provide bounds on the expected squared L_2 loss while they give high-probability bounds;
4. In our opinion there is no corresponding general lower bound to their upper bound. Even though [Chen et al. \(2016\)](#) cite [Yang and Barron \(1999\)](#) and claim there is a matching lower bound we are unaware how one can derive a matching bound of the sort $\min_{\delta > 0} \left\{ \frac{\log \mathcal{M}(\delta, \Theta, \text{TV})}{n} + \delta^2 \right\}$;
5. We provide upper and lower bounds for general density estimation problems. If Condition [1.1](#) holds, then these bounds are matching. The dependence on the amount of data corruption ϵ is different from the one exhibited in [Chen et al. \(2016\)](#) as they have ϵ^2 (on the squared TV loss function), while our rate is ϵ on the squared L_2 loss function;
6. Our testing lemma is completely different from the one used by [Chen et al. \(2016\)](#). We use a likelihood ratio based test while [Chen et al. \(2016\)](#) use a test function called ‘Scheffe’s estimate’, which is inspired by [Yatracos \(1985\)](#)’s famous estimator, in order to achieve their entropic upper bound.

In [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#), a general minimax lower bound on the probability for the ϵ -contamination in Huber’s model is provided. Specifically, it is proven that under certain assumptions, for any $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$, the inequality $\inf_{\hat{\theta}} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_Q \mathbb{P}_{\epsilon, \theta, Q} \{L(\hat{\theta}, \theta) > \mathcal{M}(\epsilon)\} > c$ holds, where $\mathcal{M}(\epsilon) \asymp \mathcal{M}(0) \vee \omega(\epsilon, \Theta)$, and $\omega(\epsilon, \Theta) = \sup \{L(\theta_1, \theta_2) : \text{TV}(P_{\theta_1}, P_{\theta_2}) \leq \epsilon / (1 - \epsilon); \theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta\}$. This result provides inspiration for deriving a lower bound for the minimax rate within our specific problem setting. [Liu and Gao \(2018\)](#) investigates density estimation under pointwise loss in Huber’s contamination model and derives the minimax rate for the estimator of $f(x_0)$ at a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, assuming Hölder smoothness for both the true density and the contamination density. [Gao \(2020\)](#) studies robust regression in the settings of Huber’s contamination models. [Zhang and Ren \(2023\)](#) adopt a general L_p ($1 \leq p < \infty$) loss and assume that the function f belongs to an anisotropic Nikol’skii class, which serves as a natural extension of the Hölder class under the L_p norm on \mathbb{R}^d . They address the problem of adaptive minimax density estimation on \mathbb{R}^d with L_p loss functions under Huber’s contamination model.

In our problem setting, there is a key difference compared to Huber’s contamination model: For a given sample of size N , we have a known fraction ϵ of the observations coming from a contamination density, with no randomness in the number of contaminated observations. In contrast, under Huber’s contamination model, the number of contaminated observations in a sample of size n includes some randomness.

1.2 Organization

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In [Section 2](#), we establish risk bounds for our setting, starting with the demonstration of the key topological equivalence between the L_2 -metric and the Kullback-Leibler divergence in $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$. Next, in [Section 2.1](#), we derive minimax lower bounds for our setting, introducing additional mathematical background as needed, such as local metric entropy. In [Section 2.2](#), we define our likelihood-based estimator and provide the intuition behind its construction. We then present our algorithm

for constructing the estimator using a tree structure, followed by a derivation of its minimax risk upper bound. In Section 2.3, we derive the minimax rate for our algorithm. Finally, in Section 3, we summarize our findings and discuss potential directions for future research.

1.3 Notation

We outline some commonly used notation here. We use $a \vee b$ and $a \wedge b$ to denote the maximum and minimum of two numbers $\{a, b\}$, respectively. Throughout the paper, $\|\cdot\|_2$ denotes the L_2 -metric in \mathcal{F} . For integers n and m with $n \leq m$, $[n, m]$ denotes the set $\{n, n+1, \dots, m\}$. If $n = 1$, we will simply write $[m]$. We use $B_2(\theta, r)$ to denote a closed L_2 -ball centered at the point θ with a positive radius r . The symbols \lesssim and \gtrsim are used to indicate \leq and \geq up to absolute (positive) constant factors, respectively. For two sequences a_n and b_n , we write $a_n \asymp b_n$ if both $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $a_n \gtrsim b_n$ hold. Throughout the paper, \log refers to the natural logarithm. Our use of $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ exclusively refers to the constants in Definition 1.4, defining $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$ (and thus \mathcal{F}).

2 Main Results

First, we have the result that there exists a ‘topological equivalence’ between the L_2 -metric and the KL-divergence on the density class $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$. This result was stated without proof in Klemelä (2009) and later proved in Shrotريا and Neykov (2023).

Definition 2.1 (KL-divergence). *For any two densities $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$, the KL-divergence between them is defined to be*

$$d_{KL}(f \| g) := \int_B f \log \left(\frac{f}{g} \right) d\mu = \mathbb{E}_f \log \left(\frac{f(X)}{g(X)} \right),$$

where $X \sim f$.

The following is Lemma 2 in Shrotريا and Neykov (2023).

Lemma 2.2 (KL- L_2 equivalence on $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$). *For each pair of densities $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$, the following relationship holds:*

$$c(\alpha, \beta) \|f - g\|_2^2 \leq d_{KL}(f \| g) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \|f - g\|_2^2, \quad (1)$$

where we denote $c(\alpha, \beta) := \frac{h(\beta/\alpha)}{\beta} > 0$. Here $h : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined to be

$$h(\gamma) := \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma-1-\log \gamma}{(\gamma-1)^2} & \text{if } \gamma \in (0, \infty) \setminus \{1\} \\ \frac{1}{2} = \lim_{x \rightarrow 1} \frac{x-1-\log x}{(x-1)^2} & \text{if } \gamma = 1, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

and is positive over its entire support. It is also easily seen that on $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$, d_{KL} (and hence the L_2 -metric) is also equivalent to the Hellinger metric. Furthermore, these properties are also inherited by $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$, which is our density class of interest.

2.1 Lower Bounds

We first establish lower bounds for the density estimator. For completeness, we will introduce Fano’s inequality for the star-shaped density class \mathcal{F} [see Tsybakov (2009), Lemma 2.10].

Lemma 2.3 (Fano’s inequality for \mathcal{F}). *Let $\{f^1, \dots, f^m\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a collection of τ -separated densities (i.e., $\|f^i - f^j\|_2 > \tau$ for $i \neq j$), in the L_2 -metric. Suppose J is uniformly distributed over the index set $[1, m]$, and $(X_i | J = j) \sim f^j$ for each $i \in [1, N]$. Then*

$$\inf_{\hat{\nu}} \sup_f \mathbb{E}_f \|\hat{\nu}(\mathbf{X}) - f\|_2^2 \geq \frac{\tau^2}{4} \left(1 - \frac{I(\mathbf{X}; J) + \log 2}{\log m} \right),$$

where $I(\mathbf{X}; J) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N I(X_i; J)$ is the mutual information between \mathbf{X} and J .

Here $I(X_1; J) := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m d_{KL}(f^j || \bar{f})$ with $\bar{f} := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m f^j$. [See Section 15.3 in [Wainwright \(2019\)](#)].

Next, we provide the classical definition of packing sets and packing numbers.

Definition 2.4 (Packing sets and packing numbers of \mathcal{F} in the L_2 -metric). *Given any $\tau > 0$, an τ -packing set of \mathcal{F} in the L_2 -metric, is a set $\{f^1, \dots, f^m\} \subset \mathcal{F}$ of τ -separated densities (i.e., $\|f^i - f^j\|_2 > \tau$ for $i \neq j$) in the L_2 -metric. The corresponding τ -packing number, denoted by $\mathcal{M}(\tau, \mathcal{F})$, is the cardinality of the maximal τ -packing of \mathcal{F} . We refer to $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{gl}}(\tau) := \log \mathcal{M}(\tau, \mathcal{F})$ as the global metric entropy of \mathcal{F} .*

Now, we define the notion of local metric entropy, which plays a key role in the development of our risk bound.

Definition 2.5 (Local metric entropy of \mathcal{F}). *Let $c > 0$ be fixed, and $f \in \mathcal{F}$ be an arbitrary point. Consider the set $\mathcal{F} \cap B_2(f, \tau)$. Let $\mathcal{M}(\tau/c, \mathcal{F} \cap B_2(f, \tau))$ denote the τ/c -packing number of $\mathcal{F} \cap B_2(f, \tau)$ in the L_2 -metric. Let*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c) := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{M}(\tau/c, \mathcal{F} \cap B_2(f, \tau)) =: \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F} \cap B_2(f, \tau)}^{\text{gl}}(\tau/c).$$

We refer to $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)$ as the local metric entropy of \mathcal{F} .

The following is Lemma 6 of [Shrotriya and Neykov \(2023\)](#). By applying Fano's inequality directly, we obtain a minimax lower bound for our star-shaped density estimation setting over \mathcal{F} . Notably, this lower bound does not depend on the corruption rate ϵ . Immediately afterward, we establish a lower bound that accounts for the corruption level ϵ .

Lemma 2.6 (Minimax lower bound in general case). *Let $c > 0$ be fixed, and independent of the data samples \mathbf{X} . Then the minimax rate satisfies*

$$\inf_{\hat{v}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_f \|\hat{v}(\mathbf{X}) - f\|_2^2 \geq \frac{\tau^2}{8c^2},$$

if τ satisfies $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c) > 2N\tau^2/\alpha + 2 \log 2$.

Remark 2.7. *In the proof of ([Shrotriya and Neykov, 2023](#), Lemma 6), there is a small typo. We will fix it in the appendix.*

Next, we establish a new minimax lower bound, drawing inspiration from the work of [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#). This lower bound is specifically designed to handle corruption schemes. Furthermore, in the following lemma, we demonstrate that this lower bound is tight up to constant factors.

Lemma 2.8 (Lower bound in corruption schemes). *Consider the corruption mechanism \mathcal{C} in the core problem setting: for a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$, a fraction ϵ of the observations in $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ are arbitrarily corrupted by some procedure \mathcal{C} . Let $\mathbf{X} = \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$, where the i th coordinate is $X_i = \mathcal{C}(\tilde{X}_i)$ if it is corrupted; otherwise, $X_i = \tilde{X}_i$. Suppose $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$ with a constant $k > 7$, then the following lower bound holds:*

$$\inf_f \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_c \mathbb{E}_f \left\| \hat{f}(\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})) - f \right\|_2^2 \gtrsim \xi(\epsilon) \wedge d^2,$$

where $\xi(\epsilon) := \max_{f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}, \text{TV}(P_1, P_2) \leq \frac{\epsilon'}{1-\epsilon'}} \{\|f_1 - f_2\|_2^2\}$, with $\epsilon' = \epsilon - \frac{1}{N}$, f_1 and f_2 denoting the densities of distributions P_1 and P_2 , respectively. Furthermore, $\xi(\epsilon) \lesssim \epsilon$. And $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon^2$ when $\epsilon \lesssim \max\{d_{\text{TV}}, d_{L_2}^2\}$, where d_{TV} denotes the diameter of \mathcal{F} with respect to the total variation (TV) distance and d_{L_2} denotes the diameter of \mathcal{F} with respect to the L_2 -norm.

Corollary 2.9. *Suppose $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$ with a constant $k > 7$. If $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon$, i.e., Condition 1.1 holds, then the following lower bound holds:*

$$\inf_f \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_c \mathbb{E}_f \left\| \hat{f}(\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})) - f \right\|_2^2 \gtrsim \epsilon \wedge d^2.$$

2.2 Upper Bound

Now, we turn to the upper bound. Let $X_1, \dots, X_N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} f \in \mathcal{F}$ represent the N observed (corrupted) samples and define $\mathbf{X} := (X_1, \dots, X_N)^\top$. Define $k := 1/(3\epsilon)$, where $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{3}$ is the corruption rate. We divide the data into $N/k = 3\epsilon N$ groups (assuming, for simplicity, that N/k is an integer) and denote the sets of indices for the data in each group by $G_1, \dots, G_{N/k}$. We establish a criterion to compare two densities $g, g' \in \mathcal{F}$:

$$\psi(g, g', \mathbf{X}) := \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N/k} \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in G_j} \log \frac{g(X_i)}{g'(X_i)} > 0 \right) \geq \frac{N}{2k} \right). \quad (3)$$

If $\psi(g, g', \mathbf{X}) = 1$, then we say $g' \prec g$. At a high level, this means that we partition the data into N/k groups. We consider g to be ‘better’ than g' if, in more than half of the groups, the difference in log-likelihoods between g and g' is greater than 0, indicating that g performs better than g' in a majority of the groups. Note that there are at most ϵN groups having corrupted data.

Remark 2.10. *If we let $k = \frac{1}{(2+\gamma)\epsilon}$, where $\gamma > 0$ and k is an integer, then it is possible to tolerate more than $1/3$ of the observations being corrupted.*

In fact, our universal estimator over \mathcal{F} is constructed as a likelihood-based estimator for f . In particular:

Remark 2.11. *The log-likelihood difference $\psi(g, g', \mathbf{X})$ in (3) is well-defined. This is because, for each $i \in [1, N]$, the individual random variables $\log \frac{g(X_i)}{g'(X_i)}$ are well-defined (as $\alpha > 0$) and bounded. Specifically,*

$$-\infty < \log \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \leq \log \frac{g(X_i)}{g'(X_i)} \leq \log \frac{\beta}{\alpha} < \infty,$$

for each $i \in [1, N]$.

Lemma 2.12 (Group log-likelihood-form difference concentration in \mathcal{F}). *Let $\delta > 0$ be arbitrary but assumed to be bigger than $\sqrt{\epsilon}$ up to absolute constant factors, and let $X_1, \dots, X_N \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} f \in \mathcal{F}$ represent the N observed (corrupted) samples and define $\mathbf{X} := (X_1, \dots, X_N)^\top$. For any two densities $g, g' \in \mathcal{F}$, let*

$$\psi(g, g', \mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N/k} \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in G_j} \log \frac{g(X_i)}{g'(X_i)} > 0 \right) \geq \frac{N}{2k} \right).$$

We then have

$$\sup_{\substack{g, g' \in \mathcal{F}: \|g - g'\|_2 \geq C\delta, \\ \|g' - f\|_2 \leq \delta}} \mathbb{P}(\psi(g, g', \mathbf{X}) = 1) \leq \exp(-NC_{10}\delta^2), \quad (4)$$

where

$$C_{10} = \frac{L(\alpha, \beta, C)}{4} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3} \right), \quad (5)$$

$$C > 1 + \sqrt{1/(\alpha c(\alpha, \beta))}, \quad (6)$$

$$L(\alpha, \beta, C) := \frac{\left\{ \sqrt{c(\alpha, \beta)}(C - 1) - \sqrt{1/\alpha} \right\}^2}{2(2K(\alpha, \beta) + \frac{2}{3} \log \beta/\alpha)}, \quad (7)$$

with $K(\alpha, \beta) := \beta/(\alpha^2 c(\alpha, \beta))$, and $c(\alpha, \beta)$ is as defined in Lemma 2.2. In the above \mathbb{P} is taken with respect to the true density function f , i.e., $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_f$.

From Lemma 2.12, we derive a key concentration result concerning a packing set in \mathcal{F} , as summarized in Lemma 2.13. Our estimator will be constructed using packing sets of \mathcal{F} , making Lemma 2.13 an important tool for obtaining an upper bound for our minimax rate.

Lemma 2.13 (Maximum likelihood concentration in \mathcal{F}). *Let ν_1, \dots, ν_M be a maximal δ -packing (covering) set of $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}'$ and $\delta \geq C_1 \sqrt{\epsilon}$. Let $i^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_i T_i$, where*

$$T_i = \begin{cases} \max_{j \in E_i} \|\nu_i - \nu_j\|_2, & \text{if } E_i := \{j \in [M] : \nu_i \prec \nu_j, \|\nu_i - \nu_j\|_2 \geq C\delta\} \text{ is not empty,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Here, we denote $\nu_i \prec \nu_j$ as $\psi(\nu_j, \nu_i, \mathbf{X}) = 1$.

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\nu_{i^*} - f\|_2 \geq (C+1)\delta) \leq M \exp\left(-C_{10}N\delta^2\right).$$

We refer to ν_{i^*} as the ‘best’ density among ν_1, \dots, ν_M .

Combining our criterion with the techniques from [Prasadan and Neykov \(2024\)](#) and [Shrotriya and Neykov \(2023\)](#), we now introduce the details of our algorithm to construct an estimator for $f \in \mathcal{F}$, as presented in [Algorithm 1](#).

We will use the notation from [Prasadan and Neykov \(2024\)](#). Given a node (i.e., element) $u \in G$ for some set G , we define the parent set $\mathcal{P}(u)$ as the set of nodes u' with a directed edge from u' to u ($u' \rightarrow u$). We refer to a node u as an offspring of a parent node v if $v \in \mathcal{P}(u)$. For a node v , let $\mathcal{O}(v)$ denote the set of all offspring of v , i.e., $\mathcal{O}(v) = \{u : v \in \mathcal{P}(u)\}$. We will call any $q \in \mathcal{F}$ a point.

For our algorithm, we will first construct a pruned tree for the class \mathcal{F} based on packing sets before observing any data. Then, we will traverse this tree from top to bottom.

Specifically, we first arbitrarily select a point $\nu_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ as our root node. We also have some sufficiently large $c > 0$, which is independent of the data, and define $C := \frac{c}{2} - 1$. The definition of \bar{J} is given in [Theorem 2.16](#). We fix some $\tilde{J} \geq \bar{J}$. If $\tilde{J} = 1$, then this tree will consist of a single node. If $\tilde{J} = 2$, we treat ν_1 as the first level of the tree, and then construct a maximal $\frac{d}{c}$ -packing set of $B_2(\nu_1, d) \cap \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}$. A directed edge is drawn from ν_1 to each of these points to form level 2. Denote $\mathcal{L}(2)$ as the set of nodes forming the graph at level 2. Otherwise, we continue the following steps until we have constructed the \tilde{J} th level of the tree:

For level $j \geq 3$, assuming we already have $\mathcal{L}(j-1)$, where $\mathcal{L}(j)$ denotes the set of nodes forming the pruned graph at level j for $j > 2$, we iterate through each point q in $\mathcal{L}(j-1)$. For each q , we construct a maximal $\frac{d}{2^{j-1}c}$ -packing set of $B_2(q, \frac{d}{2^{j-2}}) \cap \mathcal{F}$ and draw directed edges from q to its associated packing set points. These newly generated points are denoted as candidate points in level j . Then, we apply a pruning step. Lexicographically order these candidate points at level j , i.e., $q_1^j, \dots, q_{M_j}^j$, where M_j is the total number of these candidate points. Construct an ordered set $\mathcal{Q}_j = [q_1^j, \dots, q_{M_j}^j]$. While \mathcal{Q}_j is not empty, pick the first element in \mathcal{Q}_j , say q_l^j . Construct a set $\mathcal{T}_j(q_l^j) := \{q_k^j \in \mathcal{Q}_j : \|q_l^j - q_k^j\|_2 \leq \frac{d}{2^{j-1}c}, l \neq k\}$. For each $q_k^j \in \mathcal{T}_j(q_l^j)$, remove the directed edge from $\mathcal{P}(q_k^j)$ to q_k^j and add a directed edge from $\mathcal{P}(q_k^j)$ to q_l^j . Then, remove q_k^j from the tree. Once finished iterating through the elements in $\mathcal{T}_j(q_l^j)$, remove $\{q_l^j\} \cup \mathcal{T}_j(q_l^j)$ from \mathcal{Q}_j . Once \mathcal{Q}_j is empty, the resulting offspring nodes of points from level $j-1$ form level j , denoted as $\mathcal{L}(j)$.

We continue this process until we have constructed the \tilde{J} th level of the tree.

Take the procedure of constructing $\mathcal{L}(3)$ as an example: for each point q in $\mathcal{L}(2)$, we construct a maximal $\frac{d}{4c}$ -packing set of $B_2(q, \frac{d}{2}) \cap \mathcal{F}$ and draw directed edges from q to its corresponding maximal packing set points. After iterating through all the points in $\mathcal{L}(2)$, lexicographically order these candidate points, i.e., $q_1^3, \dots, q_{M_3}^3$. Construct an ordered set $\mathcal{Q}_3 = [q_1^3, \dots, q_{M_3}^3]$. Assuming \mathcal{Q}_3 is not empty, consider the first element $q_1^3 \in \mathcal{Q}_3$. Construct a set $\mathcal{T}_3(q_1^3) := \{q_k^3 \in \mathcal{Q}_3 : \|q_1^3 - q_k^3\|_2 \leq \frac{d}{4c}, k \neq 1\}$, which may be empty. If $q_k^3 \in \mathcal{T}_3(q_1^3)$ for some k , then it cannot share the same parent as q_1^3 because the offspring of $\mathcal{P}(q_1^3)$ form a $\frac{d}{4c}$ -packing set. For each $q_k^3 \in \mathcal{T}_3(q_1^3)$, remove the directed edge from $\mathcal{P}(q_k^3)$ to q_k^3 and add a directed edge from $\mathcal{P}(q_k^3)$ to q_1^3 . Now these q_k^3 's are points with no edges connected to them (meaning they are longer points in the tree graph). Remove $\{q_1^3\} \cup \mathcal{T}_3(q_1^3)$ from \mathcal{Q}_3 . Keep performing these pruning steps until \mathcal{Q}_3 is empty. Level 3 nodes are then the set of offspring of nodes from level 2, denoted as $\mathcal{L}(3)$.

Next, we traverse this tree structure from the top layer to the bottom. We already have ν_1 . For the j th layer, we select the ‘best’ density according to the criterion in [Lemma 2.13](#) from the offspring of ν_j , based

on the corrupted data \mathbf{X} (note that this is the first time the algorithm encounters the data), and designate this density as ν_{j+1} .

Finally, we set $\nu^* := \nu_{\bar{J}}$ as the output of our algorithm.

Prasad and Neykov (2024) provides the proofs for the following two lemmas, which establish two important properties of the tree we constructed above.

Lemma 2.14 (Upper bound for the cardinality of the offspring). *Let G be the pruned graph from above and assume $c > 2$. Then for any $j \geq 3$, $\mathcal{L}(j)$ forms a $d/(2^{j-2}c)$ -covering of \mathcal{F} and a $d/(2^{j-1}c)$ -packing of \mathcal{F} . In addition, for each parent node Υ_{j-1} at level $j-1$, its offspring $\mathcal{O}(\Upsilon_{j-1})$ form a $d/(2^{j-2}c)$ -covering of the set $B_2(\Upsilon_{j-1}, d/2^{j-2}) \cap \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, the cardinality of $\mathcal{O}(\Upsilon_{j-1})$ is upper bounded by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(d/2^{j-2}, 2c)$ for $j \geq 2$.*

Lemma 2.15 (Upper bound for the cardinality of $\mathcal{L}(j-1) \cap B_2(f, d/2^{j-2})$). *Pick any $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Then for $J \geq 2$, $\mathcal{L}(j-1) \cap B_2(f, d/2^{j-2})$ has cardinality upper bounded by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(d/2^{j-2}, c) \leq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(d/2^{j-2}, 2c)$.*

By Proposition 10 in Shrotriya and Neykov (2023), we know that $\nu^*(\mathbf{X})$ is a measurable function of the data with respect to the Borel σ -field on \mathcal{F} in the L_2 -metric topology. We can now derive a main theorem to establish the performance of $\nu^*(\mathbf{X})$, as shown in Theorem 2.16.

Theorem 2.16 (Upper bound rate for $\nu^*(X)$). *Let ν^* be the output of the multistage sieve MLE which is run for j steps where $j \geq \bar{J}$. Here \bar{J} is defined as the maximal integer $J \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\tau_J := \frac{\sqrt{C_{10}d}}{2^{(J-1)(C+1)}}$ satisfies*

$$N\tau_J^2 > 2 \log \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}} \left(\tau_J \frac{c}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c \right) \right]^2 \vee \log 2, \quad (9)$$

or $\bar{J} = 1$ if no such J exists.

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_f \|\nu^* - f\|_2^2 \lesssim \max\{\tau_{\bar{J}}^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2.$$

We remind the reader that $c := 2(C+1)$ is the constant from the definition of local metric entropy, which is assumed to be sufficiently large. Here C is assumed to satisfy (9), and $L(\alpha, \beta, C)$ is defined as per (10) in Shrotriya and Neykov (2023).

Remark 2.17. *In Definition 2.5, which defines local metric entropy, we specify a constant, denoted by \tilde{c} , so that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, \tilde{c})$ is computed using τ/\tilde{c} packings of balls in K . In the lower bound result of Lemma 2.6, we could have used $\tilde{c} = 2c$ instead of c , and the resulting bound would remain unchanged except for an absolute constant. Therefore, the local metric entropy parameter in the lower bound can be chosen to match the $2c$ appearing in (9) of Theorem 2.16. Consequently, without loss of generality, we can assume that the same sufficiently large constant c appears in both the lower and upper bounds, and replace (9) with the following: Let \bar{J} be the maximal integer such that*

$$\frac{N\tau_J^2}{\sigma^2} > 2 \log \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}} \left(\tau_J \frac{c}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, c \right) \right]^2 \vee \log 2, \quad (10)$$

with $\bar{J} = 1$ if this condition never occurs.

2.3 Minimax Rate

Now we define

$$\tau^* := \sup \{ \tau : N\tau^2 \leq \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c) \}.$$

We will use this and ϵ to achieve the optimal minimax rate. However, we first require the following lemma to handle the case when ϵ is small.

Algorithm 1: Pruned tree structure construction of the multistage sieve estimator, $\nu^*(X)$, of $f \in \mathcal{F}$

```

1 Input: A corrupted data  $\mathbf{X} := (X_1, \dots, X_N)^T$  with corruption rate  $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$ . Some sufficiently
   large  $c > 0$  which is independent from the data and define  $C := \frac{c}{2} - 1$ . An integer number  $\tilde{J}$  as
   defined in Theorem 2.16. A root node  $\nu_1$  randomly picked in  $\mathcal{F}$ . The diameter of  $\mathcal{F}$ ,  $d := \text{diam}(\mathcal{F})$ ;
2 Fixed some  $\tilde{J} \geq \bar{J}$ ;
3  $j \leftarrow 2$ ;
4  $\mathcal{L}(1) \leftarrow \{\nu_1\}$ ;
5 if  $\tilde{J} = 1$  then
6   We have a tree with only a single root node  $\nu_1$ ;
7   return  $\nu^*(\mathbf{X}) := \nu_1(\mathbf{X})$ ;
8 else
9   while  $j \leq \tilde{J}$  do
10    Ordered set  $\mathcal{Q}_j \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
11    for each point  $q_i$  in  $\mathcal{L}(j-1)$  do
12     if  $j = 2$  then
13      Construct a maximal  $\frac{d}{c}$ -packing set  $\mathcal{U}_{q_i}$  of  $B_2(q_i, d) \cap \mathcal{F}$ ;
14     else
15      Construct a maximal  $\frac{d}{2^{j-1}c}$ -packing set  $\mathcal{U}_{q_i}$  of  $B_2(q_i, \frac{d}{2^{j-2}}) \cap \mathcal{F}$ ;
16     Add all the points in  $\mathcal{U}_{q_i}$  into the set  $\mathcal{O}(q_i)$  and  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ ;
17     For each  $p_k \in \mathcal{U}_{q_i}$ , set  $\mathcal{P}(p_k) = q_i$ ;
18    if  $j \geq 3$  then
19     while  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  not empty do
20      Pick first element  $q_l^j \in \mathcal{Q}_j$  and construct a set
21       $\mathcal{T}_j(q_l^j) := \{q_k^j \in \mathcal{Q}_j : \|q_l^j - q_k^j\|_2 \leq \frac{d}{2^{j-1}c}, l \neq k\}$ ;
22      for  $q_k^j \in \mathcal{T}_j(q_l^j)$  do
23       Add  $\{q_l^j\}$  to  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{P}(q_k^j))$ ;
24       Remove  $q_k^j$  from  $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{P}(q_k^j))$ ;
25      Remove  $\{q_l^j\} \cup \mathcal{T}_j(q_l^j)$  from  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ ;
26    for  $q_i$  in  $\mathcal{L}(j-1)$  do
27     Add  $\mathcal{O}(q_i)$  into the set  $\mathcal{L}(j)$ ;
28    $j \leftarrow j + 1$ ;
29  $j_0 \leftarrow 2$ ;
30 while  $j_0 \leq \tilde{J}$  do
31   Pick  $\nu_{j_0}$  from the set  $\mathcal{O}(\nu_{j_0-1})$  such that  $\nu_{j_0} := q_{i^*}$  with  $i^*$  as defined in Lemma 2.13;
32    $j_0 \leftarrow j_0 + 1$ ;
33 return  $\nu^*(\mathbf{X}) := \nu_{j_0}(\mathbf{X})$ ;

```

Lemma 2.18 (Lower bound for optimal minimax rate). Define $\tau^* := \sup\{\tau : N\tau^2 \leq \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)\}$, where c in the definition of local metric entropy is a sufficiently large absolute constant. When $\epsilon < \frac{k}{N}$ with a constant $k > 7$, we have

$$\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\} = \tau^{*2} \wedge d^2$$

up to a constant.

Using the results from Lemma 2.6, Corollary 2.9, Theorem 2.16 and Lemma 2.18, we can formally demonstrate that the estimator obtained from our algorithm achieves the minimax rate if Condition 1.1 holds, as shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.19 (Minimax rate). Define $\tau^* := \sup\{\tau : N\tau^2 \leq \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)\}$, where c in the definition of local metric entropy is a sufficiently large absolute constant. If Condition 1.1 holds, the minimax rate is given by

$$\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\} \text{ up to absolute constant factors.}$$

Remark 2.20. We can extend our results to loss functions in KL-divergence and the Hellinger metric, as stated in *Shrotriya and Neykov (2023)*, because we have the ‘topological equivalence’ of the KL-divergence and squared Hellinger metric with the squared L_2 -metric on \mathcal{F} in Lemma 2.2.

The following proposition relaxes the requirement of boundedness on \mathcal{F} , extending it from $\mathcal{F}_B^{[\alpha, \beta]}$ to $\mathcal{F}_B^{[0, \beta]}$, provided that there exists at least one $f_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ that is α -lower bounded, where $\alpha > 0$.

Proposition 2.21 (Extending results to $\mathcal{F}_B^{[0, \beta]}$). Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_B^{[0, \beta]}$ be a star-shaped class of densities, with at least one $f_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ that is α -lower bounded, with $\alpha > 0$. If Condition 1.1 holds, then the minimax rate in the squared L_2 -metric is $\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}$, where $\tau^* := \sup\{\tau : N\tau^2 \leq \log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)\}$.

Remark 2.22. The proof of Proposition 2.21 in the case without corrupted data, as established in Proposition 13 of *Shrotriya and Neykov (2023)*, remains valid even in our case with corrupted data. We therefore omit the proof.

3 Discussion

In this paper, we establish a new criterion for comparing the performance of two densities, g_1 and g_2 , based on corrupted data. Using this criterion, we modify an algorithm to construct a density estimator within a star-shaped density class under corrupted data. We then leverage local metric entropy to derive the minimax lower and upper bounds for density estimation over a star-shaped density class consisting of densities that are uniformly bounded above and below (in the sup norm) in the presence of adversarially corrupted data. If Condition 1.1 holds, these bounds are shown to match.

For future work, it is noteworthy that our estimator’s performance relies on satisfying Condition 1.1, i.e. $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon$ when ϵ is ‘big’, which is challenging to circumvent at present. We are keen to investigate whether it is possible to achieve the optimal minimax rate without this stringent condition. Moreover, this paper’s analysis depends heavily on the equivalence between the KL divergence and the L_2 loss to establish the lower bound. We are interested in examining whether similar results could be obtained using alternative loss functions. Another promising avenue for research is the development of an estimator for nonparametric regression within an adversarially corrupted data framework.

References

- A.R. Barron and T.M. Cover. Minimum complexity density estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 37(4):1034–1054, 1991. doi: 10.1109/18.86996.
- Lucien Birgé. Approximation dans les espaces métriques et théorie de l’estimation. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 65:181–237, 1983.

- Lucien Birgé. On estimating a density using hellinger distance and some other strange facts. *Probability theory and related fields*, 71(2):271–291, 1986.
- Lucien Birgé and Pascal Massart. Rates of convergence for minimum contrast estimators. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 97:113–150, 1993.
- Lucien Birgé and Pascal Massart. Minimum contrast estimators on sieves: Exponential bounds and rates of convergence. *Bernoulli*, 4(3):329–375, 1998. doi: 10.2307/3318720. URL <https://doi.org/10.2307/3318720>.
- David W Boyd and J Michael Steele. Lower bounds for nonparametric density estimation rates. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 932–934, 1978.
- Jean Bretagnolle and Catherine Huber. Estimation des densités: risque minimax. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 47:119–137, 1979.
- Lucien Le Cam. *Asymptotic Methods in Statistical Decision Theory*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer New York, NY, 1 edition, 1986. ISBN 978-0-387-96307-5, 978-1-4612-9369-9, 978-1-4612-4946-7. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4612-4946-7.
- Mengjie Chen, Chao Gao, and Zhao Ren. A general decision theory for huber’s ϵ -contamination model. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(2016):3752–3774, 2016. doi: 10.1214/16-EJS1216.
- Mengjie Chen, Chao Gao, and Zhao Ren. Robust covariance and scatter matrix estimation under huber’s contamination model, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.00691>.
- Luc Devroye. On arbitrarily slow rates of global convergence in density estimation. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 62(4):475–483, 1983.
- Luc Devroye. *A Course in Density Estimation*, volume 14 of *Progress in Probability*. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, 1987. ISBN 0817633650, 9780817633653.
- Luc Devroye and László Györfi. *Nonparametric Density Estimation: The L1 View*. Wiley Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics. Wiley, 1985. ISBN 0471816469, 9780471816461.
- Devdatt P. Dubhashi and Alessandro Panconesi. *Concentration of Measure for the Analysis of Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.
- S Yu Efronovich and Mark Semenovich Pinsker. Estimation of square-integrable probability density of a random variable. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 18(3):19–38, 1982.
- Chao Gao. Robust regression via multivariate regression depth. *Bernoulli*, 26(2):1139–1170, 2020. doi: 10.3150/19-BEJ1144.
- U. Grenander. *Abstract Inference*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1981. ISBN 0-471-08267-8.
- Frank Rudolf Hampel. *Contributions to the theory of robust estimation*. University of California, Berkeley, 1968.
- RZ Has. minskii. a lower bound for risks of nonparametric density estimates in the uniform metric. *Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen.*, 23(4):824–828, 1978.
- Rafael Hasminskii and Ildar Ibragimov. On density estimation in the view of kolmogorov’s ideas in approximation theory. *The Annals of Statistics*, 18(3):999–1010, 1990. doi: 10.1214/aos/1176347736. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176347736>.

- Peter J Huber. A robust version of the probability ratio test. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 1753–1758, 1965.
- Peter J Huber. Robust estimation of a location parameter. In *Breakthroughs in statistics: Methodology and distribution*, pages 492–518. Springer, 1992.
- I. Ibragimov and R. Khasminskii. *Some Estimation Problems in Infinite Dimensional Gaussian White Noise*, pages 259–274. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1997. ISBN 978-1-4612-1880-7. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4612-1880-7_16. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1880-7_16.
- I. A. Ibragimov and R. Z. Khas'minskii. Estimation of distribution density. *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, 21(1):40–57, 1983. ISSN 1573-8795. doi: 10.1007/BF01091455. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01091455>.
- Ildar Abdullovič Ibragimov and Rafail Zalmanovič Khas'minskii. On the capacity in communication by smooth signals. In *Doklady Akademii Nauk*, volume 242, pages 32–35. Russian Academy of Sciences, 1978.
- Jussi Sakari Klemelä. *Smoothing of multivariate data: density estimation and visualization*. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- A. Klenke and L. Mattner. Stochastic ordering of classical discrete distributions. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 42(2):392–410, 2010. doi: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25683826>.
- Haoyang Liu and Chao Gao. Density estimation with contaminated data: Minimax rates and theory of adaptation, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.07801>.
- Akshay Prasad and Matey Neykov. Information theoretic limits of robust sub-gaussian mean estimation under star-shaped constraints, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.03832>.
- Shamindra Shrotriya and Matey Neykov. Revisiting le cam’s equation: Exact minimax rates over convex density classes, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.11436>.
- Alexandre B. Tsybakov. *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer New York, NY, 1 edition, 2009. ISBN 978-0-387-79051-0, 978-1-4419-2709-5, 978-0-387-79052-7. doi: 10.1007/b13794.
- John Wilder Tukey. A survey of sampling from contaminated distributions. *Contributions to probability and statistics*, pages 448–485, 1960.
- Sara Van de Geer. Hellinger-consistency of certain nonparametric maximum likelihood estimators. *The Annals of Statistics*, 21(1):14–44, 1993.
- Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Wing Hung Wong and Xiaotong Shen. Probability inequalities for likelihood ratios and convergence rates of sieve mles. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 339–362, 1995.
- Yuhong Yang and Andrew Barron. Information-theoretic determination of minimax rates of convergence. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1564–1599, 1999.
- Yannis G. Yatracos. Rates of convergence of minimum distance estimators and kolmogorov’s entropy. *The Annals of Statistics*, 13(2):768–774, 1985. doi: 10.1214/aos/1176349553. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176349553>.
- B. Yu. Assouad, fano, and le cam. In D. Pollard, E. Torgersen, and G. Yang, editors, *Festschrift for Lucien Le Cam*, pages 423–435. Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- Peiliang Zhang and Zhao Ren. Adaptive minimax density estimation on \mathbb{R}^d for huber’s contamination model. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 12(4):3042–3066, 2023.

A Minimax Lower Bounds

Lemma A.1 (Lemma 6 in [Shrotriya and Neykov \(2023\)](#)). *Let $c > 0$ be fixed, and independent of the data samples \mathbf{X} . Then the minimax rate satisfies*

$$\inf_{\hat{\nu}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_f \|\hat{\nu}(\mathbf{X}) - f\|_2^2 \geq \frac{\tau^2}{8c^2},$$

if τ satisfies $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c) > 2N\tau^2/\alpha + 2 \log 2$.

Proof. According to equation (15.52) in [Wainwright \(2019\)](#) and Lemma 2.2, for an arbitrary density $\theta \in \mathcal{F}$, consider the maximal packing set $\{f^1, \dots, f^m\} \subset \mathcal{F} \cap B(\theta, \tau)$ at a L_2 -distance τ/c . We have

$$I(X_1; J) \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m d_{KL}(f^j \|\theta) \leq \max_{j \in [m]} d_{KL}(f^j \|\theta) \leq \max_{j \in [m]} \frac{1}{\alpha} \|f^j - \theta\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\tau^2}{\alpha}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 2.3 (Fano's inequality), we have

$$\inf_{\hat{\nu}} \sup_f \mathbb{E}_f \|\hat{\nu}(\mathbf{X}) - f\|_2^2 \geq \frac{\tau^2}{4c^2} \left(1 - \frac{I(\mathbf{X}; J) + \log 2}{\log m} \right) \geq \frac{\tau^2}{4c^2} \left(1 - \frac{N\tau^2/\alpha + \log 2}{\log m} \right).$$

Note that by the definition of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)$, we have $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c) := \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{M}(\tau/c, \mathcal{F} \cap B(f, \tau))$. When $\log m > \frac{2N\tau^2}{\alpha} + 2 \log 2$, by taking the supremum over θ for $\log m$, we have $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c) > \frac{2N\tau^2}{\alpha} + 2 \log 2$. Given that $\theta \in \mathcal{F}$ was chosen arbitrarily, this completes the proof. \square

Lemma A.2. *Consider the corruption mechanism \mathcal{C} in the core problem setting: for a fixed $\epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]$, a fraction ϵ of the observations in $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ are arbitrarily corrupted by some procedure \mathcal{C} . Let $\mathbf{X} = \mathcal{C}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})$, where the i th coordinate is $X_i = \mathcal{C}(\tilde{X}_i)$ if it is corrupted; otherwise, $X_i = \tilde{X}_i$. Suppose $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$ with a constant $k > 7$, then the following lower bound holds:*

$$\inf_f \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbb{E}_f \left\| \hat{f}(\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}})) - f \right\|_2^2 \gtrsim \xi(\epsilon) \wedge d^2,$$

where $\xi(\epsilon) := \max_{f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}, \text{TV}(P_1, P_2) \leq \frac{\epsilon'}{1-\epsilon'}} \{\|f_1 - f_2\|_2^2\}$, with $\epsilon' = \epsilon - \frac{1}{N}$, f_1 and f_2 denoting the densities of distributions P_1 and P_2 , respectively. Furthermore, $\xi(\epsilon) \lesssim \epsilon$. And $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon^2$ when $\epsilon \lesssim \max\{d_{\text{TV}}, d_{L_2}^2\}$, where d_{TV} denotes the diameter of \mathcal{F} with respect to the total variation (TV) distance and d_{L_2} denotes the diameter of \mathcal{F} with respect to the L_2 -norm.

Proof. Given that a portion of the data is corrupted, these data points originate from some arbitrary corrupting process q . We define \mathcal{P} as the set of all possible joint distributions $\mathbb{P}_{f, q, \epsilon}$ based on data $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ with a corruption rate ϵ , where the uncorrupted data follows some density $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and the corrupted data follows q . Specifically, $\mathcal{P} := \{\mathbb{P}_{f, q, \epsilon} : f \in \mathcal{F}, q \text{ is any arbitrary corrupting process}, \epsilon \in [0, \frac{1}{3}]\}$. We will find two distributions $\mathbb{P}_{f_0, q_0, \bar{\epsilon}}, \mathbb{P}_{f_1, q_1, \bar{\epsilon}} \in \mathcal{P}$ and use Le Cam's two-point lemma to establish that, for $\|f_0 - f_1\|_2^2 = \omega(\epsilon)$, $\inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_f \|\hat{f} - f\|_2^2 \geq \frac{\omega(\epsilon)}{2} (1 - \|\mathbb{P}_{f_0, q_0, \bar{\epsilon}} - \mathbb{P}_{f_1, q_1, \bar{\epsilon}}\|_{\text{TV}})$.

Inspired by the proof in [Prasadan and Neykov \(2024\)](#) and similar to the approach in the proof of Theorem 5.1 in [Chen et al. \(2017\)](#), consider two probability measures P_1 and P_2 such that $\text{TV}(P_1, P_2) \leq \frac{\epsilon'}{1-\epsilon'}$, where $\epsilon' = \epsilon - \frac{1}{N} \leq \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{N}$. Recall that by assumption, $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{3}$. Note that $\epsilon' < \frac{\epsilon'}{1-\epsilon'} < \frac{3}{2}\epsilon'$. And since $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$, where $k > 7$, we have $\frac{1}{\epsilon N} \leq \frac{1}{k}$ and $\epsilon > \epsilon' = \epsilon(1 - \frac{1}{\epsilon N}) \geq \frac{(k-1)\epsilon}{k}$. Thus, $\frac{\epsilon'}{1-\epsilon'} \asymp \epsilon$.

Since $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}^{[\alpha, \beta]}$, this implies that $|f_1 - f_2| \leq M$ for some constant M . Then we have $|\int (f_1 - f_2)^2 d\mu| \leq M \int |f_1 - f_2| d\mu$. Therefore, we have $\|f_1 - f_2\|_2^2 \lesssim \text{TV}(f_1, f_2)$, where f_1 and f_2 are the densities of P_1 and P_2 , respectively.

Denote

$$\xi(\epsilon) := \max_{f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}, \text{TV}(P_1, P_2) \leq \frac{\epsilon'}{1-\epsilon'}} \{\|f_1 - f_2\|_2^2\}.$$

Thus we have $\xi(\epsilon) \lesssim \epsilon$.

Another way to show that is by Pinsker's inequality and Lemma 2.2, we have

$$[\text{TV}(P_1, P_2)]^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} d_{KL}(f_1 \| f_2) \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha} \|f_1 - f_2\|_2^2,$$

We also have

$$\|f_1 - f_2\|_2^2 \asymp H^2(f_1, f_2) \lesssim \text{TV}(f_1, f_2) \lesssim H(f_1, f_2) \asymp \|f_1 - f_2\|_2, \quad (11)$$

where $H(f_1, f_2)$ is the Hellinger distance between f_1 and f_2 .

Note that if $\epsilon \lesssim d_{\text{TV}}$, where d_{TV} denotes the diameter of \mathcal{F} with respect to the total variation (TV) distance, we can construct two densities f_1 and f_2 such that $\text{TV}(f_1, f_2) = \epsilon$. Consequently, $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon^2$ since $\|f_1 - f_2\|_2 \gtrsim \text{TV}(f_1, f_2)$ by (11).

On the other hand, if $\epsilon \lesssim d_{L_2}^2$, where d_{L_2} denotes the diameter of \mathcal{F} with respect to the L_2 -norm, we have $d_{L_2}^2 \lesssim d_{\text{TV}}$. Therefore, $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon^2$ by (11).

Suppose for some $\epsilon'' \leq \epsilon'$, $\text{TV}(P_1, P_2) = \frac{\epsilon''}{1-\epsilon''}$. We define the densities q_1 and q_2 by

$$q_1 = \frac{(f_2 - f_1)\mathbb{1}(f_2 \geq f_1)}{\text{TV}(P_1, P_2)}, \quad q_2 = \frac{(f_1 - f_2)\mathbb{1}(f_1 \geq f_2)}{\text{TV}(P_1, P_2)}.$$

By the proof of Theorem 5.1 in Chen et al. (2017), we know that q_1 and q_2 are probability densities.

Now, define the measures Q_1 and Q_2 with densities q_1 and q_2 , respectively, i.e.,

$$\frac{dQ_1}{d(P_1 + P_2)} = q_1, \quad \frac{dQ_2}{d(P_1 + P_2)} = q_2.$$

Consider two mixture measures $(1 - \epsilon'')P_1 + \epsilon''Q_1$ and $(1 - \epsilon'')P_2 + \epsilon''Q_2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d((1 - \epsilon'')P_1 + \epsilon''Q_1) &= (1 - \epsilon'')f_1 + (1 - \epsilon'')(f_2 - f_1)\mathbb{1}(f_2 \geq f_1) \\ &= (1 - \epsilon'')f_1\mathbb{1}(f_1 \geq f_2) + (1 - \epsilon'')f_2\mathbb{1}(f_2 \geq f_1) \\ &= (1 - \epsilon'')(f_1 - f_2)\mathbb{1}(f_1 \geq f_2) + (1 - \epsilon'')f_2 \\ &= d((1 - \epsilon'')P_2 + \epsilon''Q_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\text{TV}(((1 - \epsilon'')P_1 + \epsilon''Q_1)^{\otimes N}, ((1 - \epsilon'')P_2 + \epsilon''Q_2)^{\otimes N}) = 0.$$

Now, let's expand the total variation (TV) distance. Define the set family

$$\binom{[N]}{s} = \{\{i_1, \dots, i_s\} : i_1, \dots, i_s \in [N], i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_s\}.$$

Introduce the shorthand notation:

$$u(\mathbf{X}) := \prod_{i \in [N] \setminus I} f_1(x_i) \prod_{i \in I} q_1(x_i) - \prod_{i \in [N] \setminus I} f_2(x_i) \prod_{i \in I} q_2(x_i).$$

We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \text{TV} \left(((1 - \epsilon'')P_1 + \epsilon''Q_1)^{\otimes N}, ((1 - \epsilon'')P_2 + \epsilon''Q_2)^{\otimes N} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \prod_{i \in [N]} [(1 - \epsilon'')f_1(x_i) + \epsilon''q_1(x_i)] - \prod_{i \in [N]} [(1 - \epsilon'')f_2(x_i) + \epsilon''q_2(x_i)] \right| \prod dx_i \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \sum_{s=0}^N \sum_{I \in \binom{[N]}{s}} (1 - \epsilon'')^{N-s} (\epsilon'')^s u(\mathbf{X}) \right| \prod dx_i \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \sum_{s=0}^{2\epsilon''N} \sum_{I \in \binom{[N]}{s}} (1 - \epsilon'')^{N-s} (\epsilon'')^s u(\mathbf{X}) \right| \prod dx_i \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \sum_{s=2\epsilon''N+1}^N \sum_{I \in \binom{[N]}{s}} (1 - \epsilon'')^{N-s} (\epsilon'')^s u(\mathbf{X}) \right| \prod dx_i \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \sum_{s=0}^{2\epsilon''N} \sum_{I \in \binom{[N]}{s}} (1 - \epsilon'')^{N-s} (\epsilon'')^s u(\mathbf{X}) \right| \prod dx_i - \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(N, \epsilon'') > 2\epsilon''N) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \int \left| \sum_{s=0}^{2\epsilon''N} \sum_{I \in \binom{[N]}{s}} (1 - \epsilon'')^{N-s} (\epsilon'')^s u(\mathbf{X}) \right| \prod dx_i - \exp(-ND(2\epsilon'' \|\epsilon''\|)).
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds by a binomial Chernoff bound from Section 1.3 in [Dubhashi and Panconesi \(2009\)](#). Recalling that $D(q\|p) = q \log \frac{q}{p} + (1-q) \log \frac{1-q}{1-p}$, we have $D(2\epsilon'' \|\epsilon''\|) = 2\epsilon'' \log 2 + (1 - 2\epsilon'') \log(1 - \frac{\epsilon''}{1-\epsilon''})$.

By Taylor's expansion, we have

$$\log(1-x) = -x - \frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{x^3}{3(1-u)^3},$$

where $u \in (0, x)$ and $|x| < 1$. When $0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain

$$1 + \frac{2x}{3(1-u)^3} < 1 + \frac{2x}{3(1-x)^3} \leq \frac{11}{3} =: c_0.$$

This implies that

$$\frac{x^3}{3(1-u)^3} \leq \frac{x^2}{2}(c_0 - 1),$$

i.e.,

$$-\frac{x^2}{2} - \frac{x^3}{3(1-u)^3} \geq -\frac{x^2}{2}c_0.$$

Note that since $\epsilon'' < \frac{1}{3}$, we have $0 \leq \frac{\epsilon''}{1-\epsilon''} < \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore,

$$\log \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon''}{1-\epsilon''} \right) \geq -\frac{\epsilon''}{1-\epsilon''} - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\epsilon''}{1-\epsilon''} \right)^2 c_0.$$

Denote

$$\kappa(\epsilon'') = 2\epsilon'' \log 2 - (1 - 2\epsilon'') \frac{\epsilon''}{1-\epsilon''} - (1 - 2\epsilon'')/2 \left(\frac{\epsilon''}{1-\epsilon''} \right)^2 \cdot c_0.$$

Now we minimize the function $\frac{\kappa(x)}{x}$ given $x \in [0, 1/3]$. The derivative of this function is

$$-\frac{27x-5}{6(x-1)^3} > 0.$$

Thus, the minimizer of $\frac{\kappa(x)}{x}$ occurs at $x^* = \frac{1}{3}$, and we have

$$\frac{\kappa(x^*)}{x^*} = 2 \log 2 - \frac{23}{24} > 0.3.$$

This implies that

$$D(2\epsilon'' \parallel \epsilon'') > 0.3\epsilon''$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(N, \epsilon'') > 2\epsilon''N) \leq \exp(-0.3N\epsilon'').$$

Thus, if we choose $\epsilon'' > \frac{3}{N}$, we will have

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(N, \epsilon'') > 2\epsilon''N) \leq \exp(-0.9).$$

Furthermore, we require $2\epsilon'' < \epsilon$ so that our construction below is within \mathcal{P} . Note that we can always find some ϵ'' such that $\epsilon/2 > \epsilon'' > \frac{3}{N}$ since the only constraint is $\epsilon'' \leq \epsilon' = \epsilon - \frac{1}{N}$ and $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$ with $k > 7$.

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\text{TV}} &:= \frac{\frac{1}{2} \int \left| \sum_{s=0}^{2\epsilon''N} \sum_{I \in \binom{[N]}{s}} (1-\epsilon'')^s (\epsilon'')^{N-s} u(\mathbf{X}) \right| \prod dx_i}{\mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(N, \epsilon'') \leq 2\epsilon''N)} \\ &\leq \frac{\exp(-0.9)}{1 - \exp(-0.9)} < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here, μ_{TV} is the total variation between the mixture measures corrupting less than or equal to $2\epsilon'' < \epsilon$ of the observations at random, i.e. $\mathbb{P}_{f_1, q_1, 2\epsilon''} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{f_2, q_2, 2\epsilon''} \in \mathcal{P}$ (with densities h_0 and h_1 , respectively). The following two densities are valid probability densities:

$$\begin{aligned} h_0(x_1, \dots, x_N) &= \frac{\sum_{s=0}^{2\epsilon''N} \sum_{I \in \binom{[N]}{s}} (1-\epsilon'')^s (\epsilon'')^{N-s} \prod_{i \in I} f_1(x_i) \prod_{i \in [N] \setminus I} q_1(x_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(N, \epsilon'') \leq 2\epsilon''N)} \\ h_1(x_1, \dots, x_N) &= \frac{\sum_{s=0}^{2\epsilon''N} \sum_{I \in \binom{[N]}{s}} (1-\epsilon'')^s (\epsilon'')^{N-s} \prod_{i \in I} f_2(x_i) \prod_{i \in [N] \setminus I} q_2(x_i)}{\mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(N, \epsilon'') \leq 2\epsilon''N)} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, according to Le Cam's two-point lemma in Chapter 15 of [Wainwright \(2019\)](#), and since $\mu_{\text{TV}} \leq \frac{\exp(-0.9)}{1 - \exp(-0.9)} < 1$, we have

$$\inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_f \|\hat{f} - f\|_2^2 \geq (\xi(\epsilon) \wedge d^2) \frac{1}{2} (1 - \mu_{\text{TV}}) \gtrsim \xi(\epsilon) \wedge d^2.$$

Thus, we have

$$\inf_{\hat{f}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{\mathcal{C}} \mathbb{E}_f \left\| \hat{f} \left(\mathcal{C}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \right) - f \right\|_2^2 \gtrsim \xi(\epsilon) \wedge d^2.$$

□

B Minimax Upper Bound

Lemma B.1. *Let $\delta > 0$ be arbitrary but assumed to be bigger than $\sqrt{\epsilon}$ up to absolute constant factors, and let $X_1, \dots, X_N \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} f \in \mathcal{F}$ represent the N observed (corrupted) samples and define $\mathbf{X} := (X_1, \dots, X_N)^\top$. For any two densities $g, g' \in \mathcal{F}$, let*

$$\psi(g, g', \mathbf{X}) = \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N/k} \mathbb{1} \left(\sum_{i \in G_j} \log \frac{g(X_i)}{g'(X_i)} > 0 \right) \geq \frac{N}{2k} \right).$$

We then have

$$\sup_{\substack{g, g' \in \mathcal{F}: \|g - g'\|_2 \geq C\delta, \\ \|g' - f\|_2 \leq \delta}} \mathbb{P}(\psi(g, g', \mathbf{X}) = 1) \leq \exp(-NC_{10}\delta^2), \quad (12)$$

where

$$C_{10} = \frac{L(\alpha, \beta, C)}{4} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3} \right), \quad (13)$$

$$C > 1 + \sqrt{1/(\alpha c(\alpha, \beta))}, \quad (14)$$

$$L(\alpha, \beta, C) := \frac{\left\{ \sqrt{c(\alpha, \beta)}(C - 1) - \sqrt{1/\alpha} \right\}^2}{2(2K(\alpha, \beta) + \frac{2}{3} \log \beta/\alpha)}, \quad (15)$$

with $K(\alpha, \beta) := \beta/(\alpha^2 c(\alpha, \beta))$, and $c(\alpha, \beta)$ is as defined in Lemma 2.2. In the above \mathbb{P} is taken with respect to the true density function f , i.e., $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_f$.

Proof. By Lemma 7 of Shrotriya and Neykov (2023), we know that for all $j \in [N/k]$:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i \in G_j} \log \frac{g(\tilde{X}_i)}{g'(\tilde{X}_i)} > 0 \right) \leq \exp(-kL(\alpha, \beta, C)\delta^2).$$

Given that $\delta \gtrsim \sqrt{\epsilon}$ for a sufficiently large constant, and recalling that $k = \frac{1}{3\epsilon}$, the above probability can be made smaller than $\varrho := \frac{1}{4} \exp\left(-k \frac{L(\alpha, \beta, C)}{2} \delta^2\right)$. Let $\phi \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$ be a constant.

Define A_j as the event $\sum_{i \in G_j} \log \frac{g(\tilde{X}_i)}{g'(\tilde{X}_i)} > 0$ and B_j as the event $\sum_{i \in G_j} \log \frac{g(X_i)}{g'(X_i)} > 0$. Let $\tilde{\psi} = 1$ denote the event that at least $\frac{3}{2}\epsilon N - \epsilon N\phi(1 - \varrho)$ of the A_j events occur, and let $\psi = 1$ denote the event that at least $\frac{3}{2}\epsilon N$ of the B_j events occur. We assume that $\phi(1 - \varrho) > 1$.

We aim to prove $\mathbb{P}(\psi = 1) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} = 1)$. If $\tilde{\psi} = 0$, then no more than $\frac{3}{2}\epsilon N - \epsilon N\phi(1 - \varrho)$ of the A_j events occur. Then, no more than

$$\left(\frac{3}{2}\epsilon N - \epsilon N\phi(1 - \varrho) + \epsilon N \right) = \frac{3}{2}\epsilon N + \epsilon N(1 - \phi(1 - \varrho)) \leq \frac{3}{2}\epsilon N$$

of the B_j events occur, i.e., $\tilde{\psi} = 0$ implies $\psi = 0$. Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(\psi = 0) \geq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} = 0)$, proving our claim that $\mathbb{P}(\psi = 1) \leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} = 1)$.

Observe that $\tilde{\psi} = 1$ implies that no more than $\frac{3}{2}\epsilon N + \epsilon N\phi(1 - \varrho)$ of the A_j^c events occur. Recall that $\mathbb{P}(A_j^c) \geq 1 - \varrho$. Set $p = 1 - \varrho$ and $\chi = \frac{1}{2} - \varrho - \frac{\phi(1 - \varrho)}{3}$, so that $p - \chi = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi(1 - \varrho)}{3}$ and $p \leq \mathbb{P}(A_j^c)$.

Following earlier arguments, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} = 1) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\text{Bin}(3\epsilon N, \mathbb{P}(A_j^c)) \leq \frac{3}{2}\epsilon N + \epsilon N\phi(1 - \varrho) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\text{Bin}(3\epsilon N, \mathbb{P}(A_j^c)) \leq 3\epsilon N(p - \chi) \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\text{Bin}(3\epsilon N, p) \leq 3\epsilon N(p - \chi) \right) \\ &\leq \exp(-3\epsilon ND(p - \chi\|p)), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Theorem 1(a) in [Klenke and Mattner \(2010\)](#) for the stochastic dominance property of binomials and then applied a binomial Chernoff bound from Section 1.3 in [Dubhashi and Panconesi \(2009\)](#).

Recalling that $D(q\|p) = q \log \frac{q}{p} + (1-q) \log \frac{1-q}{1-p}$, we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} D(p - \chi\|p) &= D\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3} \parallel 1 - \varrho\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3}\right) \log \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3}}{1-\varrho} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3}\right) \log \frac{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3}}{\varrho} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \log \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3}}{1-\varrho} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \log \frac{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3}}{\varrho} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi}{3}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \log \frac{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}}{\varrho} \\ &= g(\phi) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \log \frac{1}{\varrho}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $g(\phi) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi}{3}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right)$ and $g(\phi) < 0$.

To justify inequality (16), note that $6\varrho^2 - 7\varrho + 3 > 0$ always holds, which is equivalent to $\frac{3-3\varrho}{4-6\varrho} > \varrho$. Recall that $\phi \in (0, \frac{3}{2})$, $\varrho \in [0, \frac{1}{4})$, and $\phi(1-\varrho) > 1$. Thus, we have $\frac{3-2\phi}{6-2\phi} \in \left(\frac{3-3\varrho}{4-6\varrho}, 1\right)$. Then $\varrho < \frac{3-2\phi}{6-2\phi}$, which implies $\frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3}}{1-\varrho} < 1 < \frac{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3}}{\varrho}$. Hence, the first logarithm term is negative while the second logarithm term is positive, leading to our inequality when setting $\varrho = 0$ in the constants in front of each respective logarithm term. For (17), we use the fact that $\frac{d}{d\varrho} \frac{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\phi(1-\varrho)}{3}}{1-\varrho} = \frac{1}{2(1-\varrho)^2} > 0$, so the first logarithm term increases with ϱ . Our bound follows from setting $\varrho = 0$ inside the first logarithm term and also setting ϱ in the numerator of the second logarithm term to 0.

Since we have $\phi(1-\varrho) > 1$, this is equivalent to $\log(\varrho) < \log\left(1 - \frac{1}{\phi}\right)$. Recall that $\delta \gtrsim \sqrt{\epsilon}$ for a sufficiently large constant, so ϱ can be made smaller than any fixed positive constant. Therefore, we have

$$\log(\varrho) \leq \min \left\{ \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{\phi}\right), \frac{2g(\phi)}{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}} \right\}.$$

Thus, the inequality

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\varrho}\right) \geq -2g(\phi) > 0$$

holds, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(p - \chi\|p) &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \log \left(\frac{1}{\varrho}\right) \\ &= \frac{L(\alpha, \beta, C)}{4} k\delta^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right) + \frac{\log 4}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{L(\alpha, \beta, C)}{4} k\delta^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, noting that $3\epsilon \cdot k = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\psi} = 1) &\leq \exp(-3\epsilon N \cdot D(p - \chi\|p)) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-3\epsilon N \cdot \frac{L(\alpha, \beta, C)}{4} k\delta^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right)\right) \\ &= \exp(-NC_{10}\delta^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{10} = \frac{L(\alpha, \beta, C)}{4} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\phi}{3}\right)$. □

Lemma B.2. Let ν_1, \dots, ν_M be a maximal δ -packing (covering) set of $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}'$ and $\delta \geq C_1\sqrt{\epsilon}$. Let $i^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_i T_i$, where

$$T_i = \begin{cases} \max_{j \in E_i} \|\nu_i - \nu_j\|_2, & \text{if } E_i := \{j \in [M] : \nu_i \prec \nu_j, \|\nu_i - \nu_j\|_2 \geq C\delta\} \text{ is not empty,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Here, we denote $\nu_i \prec \nu_j$ as $\psi(\nu_j, \nu_i, \mathbf{X}) = 1$.

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\nu_{i^*} - f\|_2 \geq (C+1)\delta) \leq M \exp\left(-C_{10}N\delta^2\right).$$

We refer to ν_{i^*} as the ‘best’ density among ν_1, \dots, ν_M .

Proof. Without loss of generality, let ν_1 be the closest point to f . Since \mathcal{F}' is δ -packed, we have $\|\nu_1 - f\|_2 \leq \delta$ (a maximal δ -packing set of \mathcal{F}' is also a δ -covering set of \mathcal{F}'). By definition, $\max(T_i, T_j) \geq \|\nu_i - \nu_j\|_2$ whenever $\|\nu_i - \nu_j\|_2 \geq C\delta$. Consequently,

$$\mathbb{1}_{\|\nu_{i^*} - \nu_1\|_2 \geq C\delta} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\max(T_{i^*}, T_1) \geq C\delta} = \mathbb{1}_{T_1 \geq C\delta}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\nu_{i^*} - \nu_1\|_2 \geq C\delta) \leq \mathbb{P}(T_1 \geq C\delta) \leq M \exp(-NC_{10}\delta^2),$$

where the last inequality follows from the union bound and Theorem 2.12 (with M being the cardinality of the packing set), assuming that $\delta > C_1\sqrt{\epsilon}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(T_1 \geq C\delta) &= \mathbb{P}(E_1 := \{\nu_1 \prec \nu_j, \|\nu_1 - \nu_j\|_2 \geq C\delta, j \in [1, M]\} \text{ is not empty}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\nu_1 \prec \nu_j, \|\nu_1 - \nu_j\|_2 \geq C\delta \text{ for some } j \in [M]) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{P}(\nu_1 \prec \nu_j, \|\nu_1 - \nu_j\|_2 \geq C\delta) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^M \mathbb{P}\left(\nu_1 \prec \nu_j \mid \|\nu_1 - f\|_2 \leq \delta, \|\nu_1 - \nu_j\|_2 \geq C\delta\right) \\ &\leq M \exp(-NC_{10}\delta^2). \end{aligned}$$

By the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\nu_{i^*} - f\|_2 \geq (C+1)\delta) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\nu_{i^*} - \nu_1\|_2 + \|\nu_1 - f\|_2 \geq (C+1)\delta) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|\nu_{i^*} - \nu_1\|_2 \geq C\delta) \\ &\leq M \exp(-NC_{10}\delta^2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma B.3. Let τ_j be defined as in Theorem 2.16. Suppose \tilde{J} satisfies (9) and $\delta_{\tilde{J}}^2 := \frac{d^2}{2^{2(\tilde{J}-1)}(C+1)^2} \geq C_1^2\epsilon$, where C_1 is a sufficiently large constant. Then for each such $1 \leq j \leq \tilde{J}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A_j) := \mathbb{P}\left(\|f - \gamma_j\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}}\right) \leq 2 \exp(-N\tau_j^2/2) \mathbb{1}(j > 1).$$

Proof. This proof is inspired by the proof in Prasad and Neykov (2024). Since we have \tilde{J} satisfying (9) and $\delta_{\tilde{J}}^2 := \frac{d^2}{2^{2(\tilde{J}-1)}(C+1)^2} \geq C_1^2\epsilon$, where C_1 is a sufficiently large constant, it is clear that for any $1 \leq j \leq \tilde{J}$,

these two conditions are satisfied. For $3 \leq j \leq \tilde{J}$, if $\|\gamma_{j-1} - f\|_2 \leq \frac{d}{2^{j-2}}$, then $\gamma_{j-1} = q$ for some $q \in \mathcal{L}(j-1) \cap B_2(f, \frac{d}{2^{j-2}})$. Recall the definition of $T_i := T(\delta, \nu_i, \mathcal{F}')$ in Lemma 2.13. Let $\delta_j = \frac{d}{2^{j-1}(C+1)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\|\gamma_j - f\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}}, \|\gamma_{j-1} - f\|_2 \leq \frac{d}{2^{j-2}}\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{q \in \mathcal{L}(j-1) \cap B(f, \frac{d}{2^{j-2}})} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\gamma_j - f\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}}, \gamma_{j-1} = q\right) \\ & = \sum_{q \in \mathcal{L}(j-1) \cap B(f, \frac{d}{2^{j-2}})} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{O}(q)} T(\delta_j, \nu, \mathcal{O}(q)) - f\|_2 > (C+1)\delta_j, \gamma_{j-1} = q\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{q \in \mathcal{L}(j-1) \cap B(f, \frac{d}{2^{j-2}})} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\operatorname{argmin}_{\nu \in \mathcal{O}(q)} T(\delta_j, \nu, \mathcal{O}(q)) - f\|_2 > (C+1)\delta_j\right) \end{aligned}$$

By using Lemma 2.15, we have that $\mathcal{L}(j-1) \cap B_2(f, \frac{d}{2^{j-2}})$ has cardinality upper bounded by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\frac{d}{2^{j-2}}, 2c)$. Set $\mathcal{F}' = B_2(q, \frac{d}{2^{j-2}}) \cap \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and using the result in Lemma 2.14 that $\mathcal{O}(q)$ forms a $\frac{d}{2^{j-2}c} = \delta_j$ -covering of \mathcal{F}' with cardinality bounded by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}'}^{\text{loc}}(\frac{d}{2^{j-2}}, 2c)$. Applying Lemma 2.13, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\|\gamma_j - f\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}}, \|\gamma_{j-1} - f\|_2 \leq \frac{d}{2^{j-2}}\right) \\ & \leq \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}\left(\frac{d}{2^{j-2}}, 2c\right)\right]^2 \exp(-C_{10}N\delta_j^2) \\ & = \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}\left(\frac{c\tau_j}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c\right)\right]^2 \exp(-N\tau_j^2). \end{aligned}$$

Here we use the definition that $\tau_j := \frac{\sqrt{C_{10}d}}{2^{j-1}(C+1)} = \frac{\sqrt{C_{10}d}}{2^{j-2}c} = \sqrt{C_{10}}\delta_j$. Denote the event $A_j := \{\|\gamma_j - f\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}}\}$. Then by using Lemma 3.8 in Prasad and Neykov (2024), we have for any $1 \leq j \leq \tilde{J}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_j) \leq \mathbb{P}(A_1) + \mathbb{P}(A_2 \cap A_1^c) + \sum_{j=3}^j \mathbb{P}(A_j \cap A_{j-1}^c).$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}(A_1) = 0$ and we have already bounded $\mathbb{P}(A_j \cap A_{j-1}^c)$ for $3 \leq j \leq \tilde{J}$. Recall that in the algorithm for the second level, we construct a maximal $\frac{d}{c}$ -packing of $B(\nu_1, d) \cap \mathcal{F}$, which is also a $\frac{d}{c}$ -covering. Thus by using Lemma 2.13, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(A_2 \cap A_1^c) & = \mathbb{P}(A_2) \leq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(d, c) \exp(-C_{10}N\delta_2^2) \\ & \leq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(d, c) \exp(-C_{10}N\delta_2^2) \\ & \leq \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}\left(\frac{c\tau_2}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c\right)\right]^2 \exp(-C_{10}N\delta_2^2) \end{aligned}$$

Since τ_j decreases with respect to j and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}$ is non-increasing with respect to τ_j by Lemma 1.4 in Prasad and Neykov (2024), we can bound $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\frac{c\tau_j}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c)$ with $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\frac{c\tau_j}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c)$ for any $j \leq J$. Thus, for $1 \leq j \leq \tilde{J}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\|\gamma_j - f\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}}\right) & \leq \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}\left(\frac{c\tau_j}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c\right)\right]^2 \sum_{j=2}^j \exp(-N\tau_j^2) \\ & \leq \mathbb{1}(j > 1) \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}\left(\frac{c\tau_j}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c\right)\right]^2 \frac{a_j}{1 - a_j}, \end{aligned}$$

where $a_j = \exp(-N\tau_j^2)$. Note that since $\phi < \frac{3}{2}$, we have $a_j < 1$.

Now suppose $N\tau_j^2 > 2 \log \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}} \left(\tau_j \frac{c}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c \right) \right]^2 \vee \log 2$, i.e., (9) holds. And note that $N\tau_j^2 > \log 2$ implies $a_j < \frac{1}{2}$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\|\gamma_j - f\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}} \right) &\leq \mathbb{1}(j > 1) \exp \left(-\frac{N\tau_j^2}{2} \right) \frac{a_j}{1 - a_j} \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{N\tau_j^2}{2} \right) \mathbb{1}(j > 1) \\ &= 2 \exp \left(-\frac{N\tau_j^2}{2} \right) \mathbb{1}(j > 1). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma B.4. *Let τ_j be defined as in Theorem 2.16. Suppose \tilde{J} satisfies (9) and also $\frac{d}{2^{\tilde{J}-1}(C+1)} \geq C_1\sqrt{\epsilon}$ for some sufficient large constant C_1 . Then if ν^* denotes the output after at least \tilde{J} iterations, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_f \|\nu^* - f\|_2^2 \leq \frac{(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \tau_{\tilde{J}}^2 + \frac{4(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \mathbb{1}(\tilde{J} > 1) \frac{1}{N} \exp(-N\tau_{\tilde{J}}^2/2).$$

Proof. This proof is inspired by the proof in Prasad and Neykov (2024).

By Lemma B.3, we have for $1 \leq j \leq \tilde{J}$ that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_j) = \mathbb{P} \left(\|f - \gamma_j\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}} \right) \leq 2 \exp(-N\tau_j^2/2) \mathbb{1}(j > 1),$$

where event $A_j := \{\|\gamma_j - f\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}}\}$.

Let $\nu_j^* := \gamma_{\tilde{J}}$, which is the output of $\tilde{J} - 1$ steps. Define B_j to be the event that $\|f - \nu_j^*\|_2 > \eta\tau_j$, where $\eta := \frac{1+3c}{2\sqrt{C_{10}}}$. Since (9) holds for \tilde{J} , by Lemma 3.3 in Prasad and Neykov (2024), we have for any $1 \leq j \leq \tilde{J} \leq \tilde{J}$

$$\|\gamma_j - \nu_j^*\|_2 \leq \frac{d(2+4c)}{c2^j},$$

where $\tilde{J} \leq \tilde{J}$ always holds by definition. Note that A_j^c implies B_j^c , because by triangle inequality we have, if $\|\gamma_j - f\|_2 \leq \frac{d}{2^{j-1}}$:

$$\|f - \nu_j^*\|_2 \leq \|f - \gamma_j\|_2 + \|\nu_j^* - \gamma_j\|_2 \leq \frac{d}{2^{j-1}} + \frac{d(2+4c)}{c2^j} = \frac{d}{2^{j-1}} \left(3 + \frac{1}{c} \right) = \eta\tau_j.$$

Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}(B_j) = \mathbb{P}(\|f - \nu_j^*\|_2 > \eta\tau_j) \leq \mathbb{P}(A_j) \leq 2 \exp(-N\tau_j^2/2) \mathbb{1}(j > 1).$$

The above inequality also holds for $j \leq 1$ since $\frac{d}{2^{j-1}}$ will be greater than d and both sides will be equals to 0. Also we have $\mathbb{1}(j > 1) \leq \mathbb{1}(\tilde{J} > 1)$.

Now for $x \in [\tau_j, \tau_{j-1})$, where $j \leq \tilde{J}$, which is equivalent to $x \geq \tau_j$. And note that $\tau_{j-1} = 2\tau_j$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|f - \nu_j^*\|_2 > 2\eta x) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|f - \nu_j^*\|_2 > \eta\tau_{j-1}) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-N\tau_{j-1}^2/2) \mathbb{1}(\tilde{J} > 1) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-Nx^2/2) \mathbb{1}(\tilde{J} > 1) \end{aligned}$$

Let ν^* be the output for j th step where $j \geq \bar{J}$. Then by Lemma 3.3 in [Prasadan and Neykov \(2024\)](#) we have for $x \geq \tau_{\bar{J}}$:

$$\|\nu^* - \nu_{\bar{J}}^*\|_2 = \|\gamma_{j+1} - \gamma_{\bar{J}-1}\|_2 \leq \frac{d(2+4c)}{c2^{\bar{J}-1}} = \frac{4c+2}{3c+1}\eta\tau_{\bar{J}} \leq \frac{4c+2}{3c+1}\eta\tau_{\bar{J}} \leq \frac{4c+2}{3c+1}\eta x.$$

Then by triangle inequality we have

$$\|f - \nu^*\|_2 \leq \|f - \nu_{\bar{J}}^*\|_2 + \|\nu_{\bar{J}}^* - \nu^*\|_2 \leq \|f - \nu_{\bar{J}}^*\|_2 + \frac{4c+2}{3c+1}\eta x.$$

Then for $x \geq \tau_{\bar{J}}$, let $\omega = \left(2 + \frac{4c+2}{3c+1}\right)\eta = \frac{5c+2}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|f - \nu^*\|_2 > \omega x) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\|f - \nu_{\bar{J}}^*\|_2 \geq 2\eta x) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-Nx^2/2) \mathbb{1}(\bar{J} > 1) \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|f - \nu^*\|_2^2 &= \int_0^\infty 2x\mathbb{P}(\|f - \nu^*\|_2 > x)dx \\ &= 2\omega^2 \int_0^\infty x\mathbb{P}(\|f - \nu^*\|_2 > \omega x)dx \\ &\leq 2\omega^2 \int_0^{\tau_{\bar{J}}} xdx + 2\omega^2 \int_{\tau_{\bar{J}}}^\infty x\mathbb{P}(\|f - \nu^*\|_2 > \omega x)dx \\ &\leq \omega^2\tau_{\bar{J}}^2 + 4\omega^2\mathbb{1}(\bar{J} > 1) \int_{\tau_{\bar{J}}}^\infty x \exp(-Nx^2/2)dx \\ &= \omega^2\tau_{\bar{J}}^2 + 4\omega^2\mathbb{1}(\bar{J} > 1)\frac{1}{N} \exp(-N\tau_{\bar{J}}^2/2) \\ &= \frac{(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}}\tau_{\bar{J}}^2 + \frac{4(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}}\mathbb{1}(\bar{J} > 1)\frac{1}{N} \exp(-N\tau_{\bar{J}}^2/2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem B.5. *Let ν^* be the output of the multistage sieve MLE which is run for j steps where $j \geq \bar{J}$. Here \bar{J} is defined as the maximal integer $J \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\tau_J := \frac{\sqrt{C_{10}d}}{2^{(J-1)}(C+1)}$ satisfies*

$$N\tau_J^2 > 2 \log \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}} \left(\tau_J \frac{c}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c \right) \right]^2 \vee \log 2,$$

or $\bar{J} = 1$ if no such J exists.

Then

$$\mathbb{E}_f \|\nu^* - f\|_2^2 \lesssim \max\{\tau_{\bar{J}}^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2.$$

We remind the reader that $c := 2(C+1)$ is the constant from the definition of local metric entropy, which is assumed to be sufficiently large. Here C is assumed to satisfy (9), and $L(\alpha, \beta, C)$ is defined as per (10) in [Shrotriya and Neykov \(2023\)](#).

Proof. This proof is inspired by the proof in [Prasadan and Neykov \(2024\)](#) and [Shrotriya and Neykov \(2023\)](#). If $\bar{J} = 1$, then $\tau_{\bar{J}} \asymp d$. Then obviously we have $\mathbb{E}_f \|\nu^* - f\|_2^2 \leq d^2 \asymp \max\{d^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2 \asymp \max\{\tau_{\bar{J}}^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2$. Thus we assume $\bar{J} > 1$.

Let $\nu_{\bar{J}}^* = \gamma_{\bar{J}}$ be the output of the multistage sieve MLE which is run for $\bar{J} - 1$ steps.

We assume the initial input is γ_1 and denote γ_{k+1} the output of k iterations of the algorithm. Since $N\tau_j^2$ decreasing with respect to j and $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}} \left(\tau_j \frac{c}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c \right)$ non-decreasing with respect to j according to the

Lemma 9 in [Shrotriya and Neykov \(2023\)](#), we conclude that $\bar{J} < \infty$. Denote $A_j := \{\|f - \gamma_j\|_2 > \frac{d}{2^{j-1}}\}$, for each integer $j \geq 1$.

(1) Suppose $\delta_j^2 = \frac{d^2}{2^{2(j-1)}(C+1)^2} \geq C_1^2 \epsilon$, where C_1 is a sufficiently large constant, for all $J \leq \bar{J}$.

If one sets $\tau_J := \frac{\sqrt{C_{10}d}}{2^{(J-1)}(C+1)}$, we have that

$$N\tau_J^2 > 2 \log \left[\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}} \left(\tau_J \frac{c}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, 2c \right) \right]^2 \vee \log 2 \quad (19)$$

Then by Lemma B.4 with $\tilde{J} = \bar{J}$ and $N\tau_{\bar{J}} \geq \log 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_f \|\nu^* - f\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \tau_J^2 + \frac{4(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \mathbb{1}(\bar{J} > 1) \frac{1}{N} \exp(-n\tau_J^2/2) \\ &\leq \frac{(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \tau_J^2 + \frac{4(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \mathbb{1}(\bar{J} > 1) \frac{1}{N} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \log 2) \\ &\leq \frac{(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \tau_J^2 + \frac{4(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \mathbb{1}(\bar{J} > 1) \frac{\tau_J^2}{\log 2} \exp(-\frac{1}{2} \log 2) \end{aligned}$$

Since d^2 is always the bound of $\mathbb{E}_f \|f - \nu^*\|_2^2$, we have that $\mathbb{E}_f \|f - \nu^*\|_2^2 \lesssim \tau_J^2 \wedge d^2 \leq \max\{\tau_J^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2$.

(2) Suppose $\delta_{j_0}^2 = \frac{d^2}{2^{2(j_0-1)}(C+1)^2} < C_1^2 \epsilon$, where C_1 is a sufficiently large constant, for some $j_0 \in [1, \bar{J}]$.

Here \bar{J} is defined the same as the previous part. And suppose j_0 is the smallest one satisfies this constraint.

If $j_0 = 1$ or 2 , then $d \lesssim \sqrt{\epsilon}$. Then $d^2 \lesssim \max\{\tau_{j_0}^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2$. And obviously, we have $\mathbb{E}_f \|f - \nu_{j_0}^*\|_2^2 \lesssim d^2$.

Suppose $j_0 > 2$, then for all $j \in [1, j_0 - 1]$, we have $\delta_j^2 = \frac{d^2}{2^{2(j-1)}(C+1)^2} \geq C_1^2 \epsilon$.

Now by using Lemma B.4 with $\tilde{J} = j_0 - 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_f \|\nu^* - f\|_2^2 \leq \frac{(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \tau_{j_0-1}^2 + \frac{4(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \mathbb{1}(\bar{J} > 1) \frac{1}{N} \exp(-N\tau_{j_0-1}^2/2).$$

Now, suppose $\sqrt{\epsilon} < \frac{\sqrt{\log 2}}{C_1 \sqrt{N C_{10}}} =: \frac{C_5}{\sqrt{N}}$, we have

$$N\tau_{j_0}^2 = n \left(\frac{d\sqrt{C_{10}}}{2^{j_0-1}(C+1)} \right)^2 < N C_1^2 C_{10} \epsilon < \log 2.$$

Since $N\tau_j^2$ decreasing w.r.t. j and $j_0 \leq \bar{J}$, this means that $N\tau_j^2 < \log 2$. So this means $\bar{J} = 1 = j_0$. As we talked about at the beginning, if $j_0 = 1$, then $d \lesssim \sqrt{\epsilon}$. Then $d \lesssim \max\{\tau_{j_0}^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2$. And obviously, we have $\mathbb{E} \|f - \nu_{j_0}^*\|_2^2 \lesssim d^2$.

Suppose $\sqrt{\epsilon} \geq \frac{C_5}{\sqrt{N}}$, we have $\frac{1}{N} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{C_5^2}$. And $\tau_{j_0-1}^2 = 4\tau_{j_0}^2 < 4C_1^2 \epsilon$. Also according to the definition of j_0 we have $N\tau_{j_0-1}^2 = \frac{N C_{10} d^2}{2^{2(j_0-2)}(C+1)^2} \geq N C_{10} C_1^2 \epsilon \geq \log 2$.

So

$$\mathbb{E}_f \|f - \nu^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} 4C_1^2 \epsilon + \frac{4(5c+2)^2}{C_{10}} \mathbb{1}(\bar{J} > 1) \frac{\epsilon}{C_5^2} \exp(-\frac{\log 2}{2}) \lesssim \epsilon < \max\{\tau_{j_0}^2, \epsilon\}.$$

So we have $\mathbb{E}_f \|f - \nu^*\|_2^2 \lesssim \max\{\tau_{j_0}^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2$. \square

C Minimax Rate

Lemma C.1. Define $\tau^* := \sup\{\tau : N\tau^2 \leq \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)\}$, where c in the definition of local metric entropy is a sufficiently large absolute constant. When $\epsilon < \frac{k}{N}$ with a constant $k > 7$, we have

$$\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\} = \tau^{*2} \wedge d^2$$

up to a constant.

Proof. Let $\tau = 2\sqrt{\frac{k}{N}}$ with a constant $k > 7$. Note that $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau/2, c) \geq \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\sqrt{k}, c)$, since the map $\tau \mapsto \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)$ is non-increasing by Lemma 1.4 in Prasad and Neykov (2024). For a sufficiently large constant c , we can ensure that $\sqrt{k}/c < d$. Note that when choosing c , it only needs to be independent of the data (i.e., c is selected prior to observing the data).

Suppose $d > \tau$. We can put points in the diameter of the ball with radius $\tau/2 < d/2$ and make $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\sqrt{k}, c) > k$ as long as c big enough. Therefore, we have $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau/2, c) \geq \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\sqrt{k}, c) > k = N(\tau/2)^2$. By the definition of the supremum, we have $\tau^{*2} \geq (\tau/2)^2 = \frac{k}{N}$.

Suppose $d \leq \tau$. We can put points in the diameter of the ball with radius $d/3$ and make $\log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(d/3, c) > k$ as long as c big enough. And note that $N(d/3)^2 < N(\tau/2)^2 = k$. Therefore, by the definition of the supremum, we have $\tau^{*2} \geq (d/3)^2$.

Then, we have $\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2 \gtrsim \frac{k}{N} \wedge d^2$. Therefore, when $\epsilon < \frac{k}{N}$, we have $\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\} = \tau^{*2} \wedge d^2$ up to a constant. \square

Theorem C.2. Define $\tau^* := \sup\{\tau : N\tau^2 \leq \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)\}$, where c in the definition of local metric entropy is a sufficiently large absolute constant. If Condition 1.1 holds, the minimax rate is given by

$$\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\} \text{ up to absolute constant factors.}$$

Proof. When $\tau^* = 0$, by the definition of supremum we have $N\tau^2 > \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)$ for any $\tau > 0$. This implies $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c) = 1$ for sufficient small τ , i.e. $\log 2 > N\tau^2 > \log \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)$. Then we can conclude that \mathcal{F} only contains one single point, i.e. $d = 0$. Our algorithm will trivially output that point achieving the minimax rate of 0. Thus it suffices to consider $\tau^* > 0$. Note that $\tau^* > 0$ implies $d > 0$ and this implies given a fixed constant u , we can make $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(u, c)$ greater than any fixed constant as long as c is sufficient large.

Denote a constant $k > 7$.

Case 1: $N\tau^{*2} > 4 \log 2$ and $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$.

Define $\delta^* := \frac{\tau^*}{\sqrt{4(\frac{1}{\alpha} + 1)}}$. In this case, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \log M^{\text{loc}}(\delta^*, c) &\geq \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau^* - \lambda, c) \\ &\geq N\tau^{*2} \\ &\geq \frac{N\tau^{*2}}{2} + 2 \log 2 \\ &\geq \frac{2N\delta^{*2}}{\alpha} + 2 \log 2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the sufficient condition for the lower bound in Lemma 2.6. Therefore, the minimax rate is lower bounded by δ^{*2} up to a constant, and thus lower bounded by τ^{*2} up to a constant. Since $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$ with a constant $k > 7$ by assumption and $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon$ by Condition 1.1, by Corollary 2.9 the minimax rate is also lower bounded by $\epsilon \wedge d^2$. Hence, the minimax rate is lower bounded by $\max\{\tau^{*2}, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}$. Moreover, as $\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\} \leq \max\{\tau^{*2}, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}$, we conclude that $\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}$ is a lower bound for the minimax rate in this case.

According to Theorem 2.16, $\max\{\tau_j^2, \epsilon\} \wedge d^2 = \max\{\tau_j^2 \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}$ is the upper bound for the minimax rate. We now aim to find a $\tilde{\tau} \asymp \tau^*$ such that $\tilde{\tau}^2 \geq \tau_j^2$, which implies

$$\max\{\tau_j^2 \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\} \leq \max\{\tilde{\tau}^2 \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}.$$

Thus, we can conclude that $\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}$ is an upper bound of the minimax rate.

First, we construct $\tilde{\tau} > 0$ that satisfies (9). Set $\eta = \min\{1, \sqrt{8(C+1)^2/C_{10}}\}$ and choose a constant D such that $D\eta > 1$. Then, let $\tilde{\tau} = D\sqrt{2}\tau^*$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} N\tilde{\tau}^2 &= \eta^{-2}2N(D\eta\tau^*)^2 \geq 2N(D\eta\tau^*)^2 > 2 \log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(D\eta\tau^*, c) \\ &\geq 2 \log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}\left(\frac{D\sqrt{8(C+1)^2}\tau^*}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, c\right) = 2 \log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}\left(\frac{2(C+1)\tilde{\tau}}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, c\right). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds due to the definition of τ^* . By the assumption in this case, we have

$$N\tilde{\tau}^2 = 2ND^2\tau^{*2} > 8D^2 \log 2 > \log 2.$$

Thus, $\tilde{\tau}$ satisfies (9).

Now, we know that the map $\tau \mapsto \log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tau, c)$ is non-increasing by Lemma 1.4 in Prasad and Neykov (2024). Based on this, we define a non-decreasing map $\phi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\phi(x) = Nx^2 - 2 \log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}\left(\frac{2(C+1)x}{\sqrt{C_{10}}}, c\right) \vee \log 2.$$

We have $\phi(\tilde{\tau}) > 0$.

Suppose some τ_J for $J \geq 1$ satisfies (9). Then, by the definition of \bar{J} in Theorem 2.16, we know that $\tau_{\bar{J}+1} = \tau_{\bar{J}}/2$ and $\phi(\tau_{\bar{J}+1}) < 0 < \phi(\tilde{\tau})$. Thus, we have $\tilde{\tau} \geq \tau_{\bar{J}}/2$. If no τ_J satisfies (9), then by the definition of \bar{J} in Theorem 2.16, we know that $\bar{J} = 1$. Then we have $\phi(\tau_{\bar{J}}) < 0 < \phi(\tilde{\tau})$, so $\tilde{\tau} \geq \tau_{\bar{J}}/2$. We have thus found a $\tilde{\tau} \asymp \tau^*$ such that $\tilde{\tau}^2 \geq \tau_{\bar{J}}^2$.

Case 2: $N\tau^{*2} \leq 4 \log 2$ and $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$.

Since τ^* is the supremum, we have $\log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(2\tau^*, c) < 4N(\tau^*)^2 \leq 16 \log 2$. We now want to prove that d , the diameter of the set \mathcal{F} , cannot be greater than $4\tau^*$. Suppose $d > 4\tau^*$. Denote B as a ball with diameter $4\tau^*$. Consider a diameter l in this ball. If we choose c large enough, we can place more than $\exp(16 \log 2)$ packing points on this line. So, if d is greater than $4\tau^*$, we could find such a ball B such that $\mathcal{F} \cap B$ contains at least one line segment greater than $4\tau^*$. By the definition of $\log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}$, this implies that $\log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(2\tau^*, c) > 16 \log 2$, which contradicts $\log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(2\tau^*, c) < 16 \log 2$. Thus, $d \leq 4\tau^* \leq 8\sqrt{\frac{\log 2}{N}}$.

Let $\tilde{\tau} = d$. First, we have $2N\tilde{\tau}^2/\alpha + 2 \log 2 < \frac{128 \log 2}{\alpha} + 2 \log 2$. Now, with a large enough c , we have $\log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tilde{\tau}, c) > \frac{128 \log 2}{\alpha} + 2 \log 2$. Thus, $\log M_{\mathcal{F}}^{\text{loc}}(\tilde{\tau}, c) > 2N\tilde{\tau}^2/\alpha + 2 \log 2$, which satisfies the sufficient condition of Lemma 2.6. So the minimax rate is lower bounded by d^2 up to a constant, and thus lower bounded by $\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2$ up to a constant.

Since $\epsilon \geq \frac{k}{N}$ with a constant $k > 7$ by assumption and $\xi(\epsilon) \gtrsim \epsilon$ by Condition 1.1, using Corollary 2.9, we conclude that $\epsilon \wedge d^2$ up to a constant is a lower bound of the minimax rate. Thus, $\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}$ up to a constant is a lower bound of the minimax rate.

Clearly, d^2 is an upper bound of the minimax rate. Since $d^2 \leq 16\tau^{*2}$, $\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2$ is an upper bound up to a constant of the minimax rate. Thus, $\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\}$ up to a constant is an upper bound of the minimax rate.

Case 3: $\epsilon < \frac{k}{N}$.

By Lemma 2.18, we have $\max\{\tau^{*2} \wedge d^2, \epsilon \wedge d^2\} = \tau^{*2} \wedge d^2$ up to a constant. Therefore, the result still holds. \square