

OPTIMAL RECOVERY MEETS MINIMAX ESTIMATION

BY RONALD DEVORE^{1,a}, ROBERT D. NOWAK^{2,d}, RAHUL PARHI^{3,e},
GUERGANA PETROVA^{1,b}, AND JONATHAN W. SIEGEL^{1,c}

¹Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, ^ardevore@tamu.edu; ^bgpetrova@tamu.edu; ^cjwsiegel@tamu.edu

²Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Wisconsin–Madison, ^drdnowak@wisc.edu

³Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, San Diego, ^erahul@ucsd.edu

A fundamental problem in statistics and machine learning is to estimate a function f from possibly noisy observations of its point samples. The goal is to design a numerical algorithm to construct an approximation \hat{f} to f in a prescribed norm that asymptotically achieves the best possible error (as a function of the number m of observations and the variance σ^2 of the noise). This problem has received considerable attention in both nonparametric statistics (noisy observations) and optimal recovery (noiseless observations). Quantitative bounds require assumptions on f , known as *model class* assumptions. Classical results assume that f is in the unit ball of a Besov space. In nonparametric statistics, the best possible performance of an algorithm for finding \hat{f} is known as the minimax rate and has been studied in this setting under the assumption that the noise is Gaussian. In optimal recovery, the best possible performance of an algorithm is known as the optimal recovery rate and has also been determined in this setting. While one would expect that the minimax rate recovers the optimal recovery rate when the noise level σ tends to zero, it turns out that the current results on minimax rates do not carefully determine the dependence on σ and the limit cannot be taken. This paper handles this issue and determines the *noise-level-aware* (NLA) minimax rates for Besov classes when error is measured in an L_q -norm with matching upper and lower bounds. The end result is a reconciliation between minimax rates and optimal recovery rates. The NLA minimax rate continuously depends on the noise level and recovers the optimal recovery rate when σ tends to zero.

1. Introduction. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a bounded domain (open, bounded, simply connected set) with a Lipschitz boundary and $\overline{\Omega} := \Omega \cup \partial\Omega$ be the closure of Ω . A fundamental problem in statistics and machine learning is to construct an approximation \hat{f} to a continuous function $f : \overline{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ when given the m noisy observations y_i at the data sites $x_i \in \overline{\Omega}$,

$$(1) \quad y_i = f(x_i) + \eta_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

where η_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$, are i.i.d. Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and variance σ^2 . We will evaluate the quality of the approximant \hat{f} by measuring the error $\|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)}$ in an $L_q(\Omega)$ -norm. Notice that both \hat{f} and the error are random variables depending on the noise.

In order to obtain bounds on $\|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)}$, one needs additional information on the data generating function f . This additional information is the fact that f lies in a *model class* K which is a compact subset of $C(\overline{\Omega})$. In this paper, we consider K to be the unit ball of a Besov space $B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))$. For those unfamiliar with Besov spaces, this space can be intuitively viewed as the space of functions with $s > 0$ derivatives in $L_p(\Omega)$, where $0 < p \leq \infty$, and τ , $0 < \tau \leq \infty$, allows for additional finer control of the regularity of the underlying functions (see §2 for the definition and properties of these spaces). The unit ball of $B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))$

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62G05, 62C20; secondary 41A30, 41A63.

Keywords and phrases: Besov spaces, minimax estimation, nonparametric regression, optimal recovery.

compactly embeds into $C(\overline{\Omega})$ if and only if

$$(2) \quad s > d/p.$$

Therefore, we assume (2) in the remainder of this paper. To simplify the presentation, throughout this paper, we will only consider the case when $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$ is the unit cube in \mathbb{R}^d . We leave the extension of our results to more general domains for future work.

Given a set \mathcal{X} of m data sites

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{X} := \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} \subset \overline{\Omega},$$

we consider an algorithm A (for numerically creating an approximation \hat{f}) to be a mapping

$$(4) \quad A : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow L_q(\Omega),$$

that sends the observations (1) to an approximation $\hat{f} = A(y)$ of f , where $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$. Notice that \hat{f} is an $L_q(\Omega)$ -valued random variable. The performance of the algorithm is usually measured via the worst case $L_q(\Omega)$ -risk

$$(5) \quad E_A(K; \sigma, \mathcal{X})_q := \sup_{f \in K} \mathbb{E} \|f - A(y)\|_{L_q(\Omega)}.$$

Here the expectation \mathbb{E} is over the random noise η_i in our measurements y_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$. Further, we define the *minimax risk* to be the optimal worst-case performance over all possible algorithms and choices of \mathcal{X} with $|\mathcal{X}| = m$, i.e.,

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{R}_m(K; \sigma)_q := \inf_{A, \mathcal{X}} E_A(K; \sigma, \mathcal{X})_q.$$

The special case when $\sigma = 0$, i.e., the case of no noise, is the problem of *optimal recovery* (OR) and has been well studied in the mathematics community.

The most celebrated result for this minimax problem is the one of Donoho and Johnstone [16] who study the case $\Omega = (0, 1)$, $d = 1$, $q = 2$, and m equally spaced data sites $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ from Ω . They prove that a certain algorithm, known as wavelet shrinkage, is asymptotically minimax optimal for the estimation of functions that lie in the unit ball K of the Besov spaces $B_\tau^s(L_p(0, 1))$, $1 \leq \tau, p \leq \infty$, and $s > 1/p$. Moreover, they prove that for fixed $\sigma > 0$, the asymptotic decay of the minimax error in L_2 is

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{R}_m(K; \sigma)_2 \asymp m^{-\frac{s}{2s+1}}, \quad m \geq 1.$$

On the other hand, the OR rate in this case is well known to behave asymptotically as (see [4, 27, 31])

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{R}_m(K; 0)_2 \asymp m^{-s+(1/p-1/2)_+}, \quad m \geq 1.$$

The goal of this paper is to understand the discrepancy between the minimax and OR rates. In particular, we note that the rate decay (7) needs to be interpreted as follows. For each fixed $\sigma > 0$, the constants of equivalency in (7) depend on σ . This precludes letting σ tend to zero to obtain the recovery rate. On the other hand, a special case of the results in this paper gives the rate

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{R}_m(K; \sigma)_2 \asymp m^{-s+(1/p-1/2)_+} + \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+1}}, \quad m \geq 1,$$

where now the constants of equivalency depend on s, p, τ , but do not depend on σ or m . This new asymptotic noise-level-aware result allows one to recover the OR rate by letting $\sigma \rightarrow 0$.

There are two components to the minimax (or OR) theory. The first one is to introduce an algorithm and provide an upper bound for the performance of this algorithm. In the above

setting, the algorithm typically used to prove upper bounds is wavelet shrinkage. That is, one uses the fact that each $f \in K$ has a wavelet decomposition and the membership in the Besov spaces can be exactly described by a suitable weighted ℓ_p -norm on these coefficients. One then uses the data observations to compute empirical noisy wavelet coefficients and thresholds these coefficients to obtain \hat{f} . An issue that needs to be addressed in this approach is that when the smoothness s is greater than one, it is necessary to use smooth wavelets. The wavelet decomposition in this case needs to be altered near the boundary of Ω . This part of the analysis is cumbersome to carry out in detail.

The second part of the theory is to provide for any algorithm and any m data sites lower bounds that match the upper bounds obtained by wavelet thresholding. In the statistics literature, lower bounds are usually proved using information-theoretic methods such as the Le Cam and Fano methods which are based on the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence (see, e.g., [1, 9, 16, 30, 34]). Note that the existing lower bounds do not apply simultaneously for all σ and m and do not consider general data sites. In §6, we prove our lower bounds (see Theorem 1.3) in a self-contained manner that does not require information theory.

The Donoho–Johnstone result set the stage for a multitude of follow-up works (see, e.g., the overview article [24] or the books [20, 22] and the references therein). Several of these works (see, e.g., [5, 9, 14, 16, 18, 19, 22–25]), concentrated on two main issues. The first was to extend the theory to functions of several variables defined on domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The second issue was to allow the recovery error to be measured in a general L_q -norm, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. In particular, we highlight the work of [9], where the authors generalized the result of Donoho and Johnstone to Besov spaces defined on $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$. They provide upper bounds for the performance of wavelet shrinkage for the L_q -estimation, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, of functions that lie in unit ball of $B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))$ with $0 \leq \tau, p \leq \infty$ and $s > d/p$. For example, they show that

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{R}_m(K, \sigma)_2 \leq \mathcal{R}_m(K, \mathcal{X}_m, \sigma)_2 \leq C(\sigma) m^{-\frac{s}{2s+d}}, \quad m \geq 1,$$

when the m sample sites \mathcal{X}_m lie on a tensor product grid of Ω .

The authors of [9] show that the rate in the upper bound (7) is not always $m^{-\frac{s}{2s+d}}$ when $q \neq 2$, but depends on the relationship between s , p , q , and d (see §8). However, it turns out (cf., [9, Theorem 4]) that when these parameters satisfy the inequality

$$(11) \quad q < p + 2\frac{sp}{d},$$

the $L_q(\Omega)$ upper bound rate remains $m^{-\frac{s}{2s+d}}$. Note that since $s > d/p$, this is always the case when $q \leq 2$. We call the case where (11) holds the *primary case*. For simplicity of the presentation in this paper, we restrict ourselves to this primary case when going forward. Later, in the section on concluding remarks, we explain what happens when the parameters are not in the primary case.

We reiterate again that the existing minimax bounds, for example the ones in [9, 16], must be interpreted for a *fixed noise level*. Indeed, suppose that (11) holds. Then the current state of the literature in our setting is that the minimax risk satisfies

$$(12) \quad c(\sigma) m^{-\frac{s}{2s+d}} \leq \mathcal{R}_m(K; \sigma)_q \leq C(\sigma) m^{-\frac{s}{2s+d}}, \quad m \geq 1,$$

for every fixed $\sigma > 0$. This does not capture the effect of the noise level in the estimation error rate and instead, hides the effect of noise in the constants $c(\sigma), C(\sigma) > 0$. In fact, prior to the present paper, the exact dependence of these constants on σ was not well-understood.

Furthermore, one would expect, intuitively, that it should be easier to estimate the function when the noise level is small. It turns out that this intuition is correct and is revealed by the OR rate. In OR, the problem of interest corresponds to the case when $\sigma = 0$ (i.e., no noise). In that case, it is known that the OR rate satisfies the bounds

$$(13) \quad c m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} \leq \mathcal{R}_m(K; \sigma = 0)_q \leq C m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+},$$

where $c, C > 0$ depend only on s, p, q, τ , and d . For a proof of (13) in our specific setting, we refer the reader to [4]. Other relevant references for the OR rate for Besov spaces include [27, 31, 33] who treat various cases of q, Ω , and the positioning of the data sites \mathcal{X} . Comparing (12) and (13), we see that the current minimax bounds do not recover the OR rates as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$.

1.1. *Main Contributions of This Paper.* The motivation for this paper is to remove the gap between the minimax rate (12) and the OR rate (13). Our contributions are four-fold.

1. We propose an algorithm for using the noisy data (1) to approximate functions from Besov spaces based on piecewise polynomials and a certain thresholding procedure. This formulation is attractive in that it avoids the use of wavelets and having to deal with the proper definition and analysis of boundary-adapted wavelets (see, e.g., [7, 8]).
2. We analyze the performance of our proposed algorithm and carefully keep track of the dependence on σ . We provide an $L_q(\Omega)$ -performance bound in probability for $q \geq 1$ when the parameters are in the primary case (see (11)). This bound is novel for three reasons:
 - a) To the best of our knowledge, this is the first bound to characterize the error of estimating a function from a Besov space *in probability*.
 - b) The proof of this result relies on some new results regarding the thresholding of vectors polluted with additive Gaussian noise, which may be of independent interest.
 - c) This is the first bound to characterize the error of estimating a function from a Besov space that recovers the OR rate when $\sigma \rightarrow 0$.
3. We readily derive an $L_q(\Omega)$ -error bound in expectation from our probability bound that carefully keeps track of the dependence on σ . We then derive a matching lower bound for the expected $L_q(\Omega)$ -error that shows the precise dependence on σ .
4. To the best of our knowledge, our results are the first *noise-level-aware* (NLA) minimax rate in the literature. Our NLA minimax rate provides a rigorous justification to the intuitive fact that the estimation problem is easier in a low-noise regime. Furthermore, the NLA minimax rate continuously depends on σ and recovers the OR rate as $\sigma \rightarrow 0$.

We next summarize the main results of this paper. We first state our results for the case $0 < p \leq q$ and $q \geq 1$, and later mention how one trivially derives the corresponding results for $p > q$ from these.

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$ and $1 \leq q < \infty$, $0 < \tau \leq \infty$, $0 < p \leq q$ and $s > 0$ be parameters satisfying (2) and (11). Assume that we observe noisy function values according to (1) as follows:*

1. *The observation points lie on the tensor-product grid*

$$(14) \quad G_n := \{0, 2^{-n}, \dots, 1 - 2^{-n}\}^d, \quad n \geq 1,$$

with total number of observations $m = 2^{nd}$.

2. *The noise $\eta_i, i = 1, \dots, m$, are i.i.d. Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and variance σ^2 for some $\sigma \geq 0$.*

Then, for any

$$(15) \quad 0 < \alpha < 2 - \frac{d(q-p)_+}{sp},$$

there exists an algorithm A (that depends on s, p, q, d, m, α , and σ) such that for any $f \in U(B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega)))$ and $t \geq 0$, we have the bound

$$(16) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\|f - A(y)\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq C \left[m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} + t \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}} \right] \right) \leq C e^{-ct^\alpha}.$$

Here the constants C and c depend only upon s, p, q, d and α , but not on m or σ .

REMARK 1.2. Note that there always exists α satisfying condition (15) since we are in the primary regime. We also remark that the assumption on the noise being i.i.d. Gaussian can be relaxed. Indeed, Theorem 1.1 holds more generally for independent sub-Gaussian noise with variance bounded by σ^2 for each measurement.

The probability bound in Theorem 1.1 readily implies an upper bound on the expectation of the error (see Theorem 1.4 below). It turns out that the upper bound is also sharp. Indeed, in §6 we prove the following lower bound.

THEOREM 1.3. Consider the model class $K = U(B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega)))$, where $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$ and $0 < p, \tau \leq \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and $s > 0$, are parameters satisfying (2) and (11). Then, we have

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{R}_m(K; \sigma)_q \geq C \left(m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} + \min \left\{ 1, \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}} \right\} \right),$$

where the constants C depends only on s, p, q, τ , and d .

When transforming our probabilistic results to results in expectation, we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 1.4. Let $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$, and $q \geq 1$, $0 < \tau, p \leq \infty$, and $s > 0$, where the parameters s, p , and q satisfy (2) and (11). For the model class $K = U(B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega)))$, there exist constants depending on s, p, τ , and q , but not on σ or m , such that

$$(18) \quad R_m(K, \sigma)_q \asymp \left(m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} + \min \left\{ 1, \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}} \right\} \right), \quad \sigma \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad m \geq 1.$$

The main takeaway from Theorems 1.1 and 1.4 is that the NLA minimax rate scales as

$$(19) \quad m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} + \min \left\{ 1, \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}} \right\},$$

and that the dependence on both σ and m is sharp. This provides rigorous justification for the intuitive fact that the difficulty of the estimation problem depends on the noise level. Furthermore, we see that the two terms in (19) are balanced when

$$(20) \quad \sigma^2 \asymp m^{-\frac{2s}{d} + \frac{2s+d}{s}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+}.$$

This value of σ is the transition value between the *low-noise* and *high-noise* regimes. In particular, this critical noise level depends on the number of data m as well as the norm used to measure the error and the parameters of the model class. For an analogous setting, we refer the reader to the recent work [21] on minimax estimation of sparse vectors that takes the noise level into account.

Note that our proposed algorithm uses piecewise polynomials and a thresholding procedure. Although the use of piecewise polynomials for nonparametric function estimation is not new (see, e.g., [2, 3, 6, 26]), our specific algorithm, to the best of our knowledge, has not been studied before.

Finally, we want to mention that there has been recent work aimed at generalizing classical statistical tools for deriving minimax lower bounds in expectation to the setting of high-probability minimax lower bounds [29].

1.2. *Organization of the Paper.* An outline of this paper is as follows. In §2, we recall the definition of Besov classes and some of their properties. In §3, we introduce our numerical algorithm. In §4, we revisit the classical problem of recovery of a finite dimensional vector from noisy coordinate measurements. In §5, we prove Theorem 1.1, in §6, we prove Theorem 1.3, and in §7 we prove Theorem 1.4. Finally, in §8, we give our concluding remarks.

2. Besov Spaces. In this section, we recall the definition of Besov spaces and their properties that we will need going forward. We begin by assuming that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is any bounded Lipschitz domain, i.e. Ω is an open simply connected bounded set with a boundary $\partial\Omega$ that can be locally described as the graph of Lipschitz functions (see [13]). Later, we specialize to the case $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$.

If $s > 0$, and $0 < p, \tau \leq \infty$, then the Besov space $B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))$ is a space of functions with smoothness of order s in $L_p(\Omega)$. Here τ is a secondary index that gives a finer gradation of these spaces. Frequently, the case $0 < p < 1$ is avoided in the literature for technical reasons. However, we want to include this case in what follows since it is an important model class for nonlinear methods of approximation. The material in this section is taken for the most part from the papers [4, 11–13]. The presentation and notation used in this paper is most closely connected to that in [4]. We give a condensed version of this material on Besov spaces and the reader will have to refer to those papers for some of the definitions and proofs. The univariate case is covered in the book [10].

If r is a positive integer and $0 < p \leq \infty$, we define the modulus of smoothness by

$$(21) \quad \omega_r(f, t)_p := \sup_{|h| \leq t} \|\Delta_h^r(f, \cdot)\|_{L_p(\Omega_{rh})}, \quad t > 0,$$

where

$$(22) \quad \Delta_h^r(f, \cdot) := (-1)^r \sum_{k=0}^r (-1)^k \binom{r}{k} f(\cdot + kh),$$

is the r -th difference of f for $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and

$$(23) \quad \Omega_h := \{x \in \Omega : [x, x + h] \subset \Omega\}.$$

If $s > 0$, $0 < \tau < \infty$, and $0 < p \leq \infty$, then $B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))$ is defined as the set of all functions in $L_p(\Omega)$ for which

$$(24) \quad \|f\|_{B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))} := \left[\int_0^1 [t^{-s} \omega_r(f, t)_p]^\tau \frac{dt}{t} \right]^{1/\tau} < \infty,$$

where r is the smallest integer strictly bigger than s . When $\tau = \infty$, we replace the integral by a supremum in the definition. This is a (quasi-)semi-norm and we obtain the (quasi-)norm for $B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))$ by adding $\|f\|_{L_p(\Omega)}$ to this (quasi-)semi-norm. An equivalent (quasi-)semi-norm is given by

$$(25) \quad \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} [2^{ks} \omega_r(f, 2^{-k})_p]^\tau \right]^{1/\tau}.$$

This equivalence is proved by discretizing the integral in (24) and using the monotonicity of ω_r as a function of t .

Let us remark on the role of τ in this definition. If $\tau_1 > \tau_2$, then we have that the spaces $B_{\tau_2}^s(L_p(\Omega)) \subset B_{\tau_1}^s(L_p(\Omega))$. In other words, these spaces get smaller as τ gets smaller, and thus all of these spaces are contained in $B_\infty^s(L_p(\Omega))$ once s and p are fixed. The effect of τ in the definition of the Besov spaces is subtle. In this paper, the space $B_\infty^s(L_p(\Omega))$ will be the

most important case when proving upper estimates for optimal recovery or minimax because these estimates do not depend on τ . Accordingly, we use the abbreviated notation

$$(26) \quad B_p^s := B_\infty^s(L_p(\Omega))$$

in going forward.

There are many equivalent descriptions of Besov classes. Most notably, when B_p^s embeds into $L_1(\Omega)$, one can characterize the elements $f \in B_p^s$ as having a wavelet basis decomposition whose wavelet coefficients belong to a certain sequence space [7]. We want to avoid the complexity of defining wavelets on domains and therefore will, instead, use a description of Besov spaces via piecewise polynomial approximation. From the definition of Besov spaces, it follows that a function f is in B_p^s if and only if

$$(27) \quad \omega_r(f, t)_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq M t^s, \quad t > 0,$$

and the smallest M for which (27) is valid is the (quasi-)semi-norm $|f|_{B_p^s}$. We obtain the (quasi-)norm for B_p^s by adding the $L_p(\Omega)$ (quasi-)norm to this semi-norm. When s is not an integer, this space is commonly referred to as the (generalized) Lipschitz smoothness space of order s in L_p . It is important to note that when s is an integer, we take $r = s + 1$ in its definition, and therefore the Besov space B_p^s is not a Lipschitz space in this case. In view of (25), we have that a function f is in B_p^s if and only if

$$(28) \quad \omega_r(f, 2^{-k})_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq M' 2^{-ks}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots,$$

and the smallest M' for which this is true is an equivalent (quasi-)semi-norm. We proceed now to show how B_p^s is characterised by local polynomial approximation.

2.1. Local Approximation by Polynomials. Let \mathcal{P}_r denote the space of algebraic polynomials of order r (total degree $r - 1$) in d variables, namely, \mathcal{P}_r is the span of the monomials $x^k = x_1^{k_1} \cdots x_d^{k_d}$ with the k_j 's being non negative integers which satisfy $\sum_{j=1}^d k_j < r$. Note that $\omega_r(P, t)_{L_p(\Omega)} = 0$, $t \geq 0$, for all $P \in \mathcal{P}_r$. We use the notation

$$(29) \quad \rho := \rho(r) := \dim(\mathcal{P}_r) = \binom{d+r-1}{d}.$$

If I is any cube contained in Ω and $g \in L_p(I)$, $0 < p \leq \infty$, we let

$$(30) \quad E_r(g, I)_p := \inf_{P \in \mathcal{P}_r} \|g - P\|_{L_p(I)},$$

denote the error of the L_p -approximation of g on I by the elements of \mathcal{P}_r . A well known result in approximation theory, commonly referred to as Whitney's theorem [32], says that for any $g \in L_p(I)$ with I a cube with sidelength ℓ_I , we have

$$(31) \quad cE_r(g, I)_p \leq \omega_r(g, \ell_I)_{L_p(I)} \leq CE_r(g, I)_p,$$

with the constants $c, C > 0$ depending only on r, d and p_0 when $p_0 \leq p \leq \infty$. Whitney's theorem usually only refers to the lower inequality in (31). However, the upper inequality follows trivially since

$$(32) \quad \omega_r(g, \ell_I)_{L_p(I)} = \omega_r(g - P, \ell_I)_{L_p(I)} \leq C \|g - P\|_{L_p(I)},$$

holds for any polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_r$.

If $I \subset \Omega$ is a cube, we say that $Q \in \mathcal{P}_r$ is a near best $L_p(I)$ -approximation to g with constant $c_0 \geq 1$ if

$$(33) \quad \|g - Q\|_{L_p(I)} \leq c_0 E_r(g, I)_p.$$

It is shown in Lemma 3.2 of [11] that if $Q \in \mathcal{P}_r$ is a near best approximation in $L_p(I)$, then it is also a near best approximation in $L_{\bar{p}}(I)$ whenever $\bar{p} \geq p$. Another important remark is that any near best approximation Q in $L_p(I)$ is near best on any larger cube J which contains I in the sense that

$$(34) \quad \|g - Q\|_{L_p(J)} \leq C c_0 E_r(g, J)_p,$$

where now C depends additionally on $|J|/|I|$, where $|I|$ denotes the measure of I . In other words, a near best $L_p(I)$ approximation is also near best on larger cubes J containing I and larger values $\bar{p} \geq p$. We shall use these facts throughout this paper.

2.2. Polynomial Norms. All norms on the finite dimensional space \mathcal{P}_r are equivalent. In what follows, we need good bounds on the constants that appear when comparing norms. We introduce the normalized L_p (quasi-)norms

$$(35) \quad \|g\|_{L_p(I)}^* := |I|^{-1/p} \|g\|_{L_p(I)},$$

for any cube $I \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and any $g \in L_p(I)$, $0 < p \leq \infty$. We recall the equivalences given in (3.2) of [13] and conclude that for any polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_r$ and any p, q , we have

$$(36) \quad \|P\|_{L_q(I)}^* \leq C \|P\|_{L_p(I)}^*,$$

with absolute constants, provided r is fixed, and $q_0 \leq q, p$ with q_0 fixed.

2.3. Besov Spaces and Piecewise-Polynomial Approximation. We recall how membership in $B_p^s(\Omega) = B_p^s(\bar{\Omega})$, $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$, is characterized by piecewise polynomial approximation. For each $k \geq 0$, we define \mathcal{D}_k to be the set of all dyadic cubes $I \subset \Omega$ of side length 2^{-k} . For specificity, we take these cubes to be half open, i.e., each I has the form $I = [a_1, b_1) \times \cdots \times [a_d, b_d)$. These cubes give a partition of $[0, 1]^d$. We then define $\mathcal{S}_k = \mathcal{S}_k(r)$ to be the space of all piecewise polynomials of order r that are subordinate to the partition \mathcal{D}_k . More precisely, a function S is in $\mathcal{S}_k(r)$ if and only if for each $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$, we have $S = Q_I$ with $Q_I \in \mathcal{P}_r$. Each S has a natural extension to $[0, 1]^d$.

Let $0 < p \leq \infty$ and $s > 0$ and $r > s$. A function $f \in B_p^s(\Omega)$, if and only if (see [4, Lemma 12.1])

$$(37) \quad \text{dist}(f, \mathcal{S}_k(r))_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq M 2^{-ks}, \quad k \geq 0.$$

The smallest M for which (37) holds can be taken as a (quasi-)semi-norm for $B_p^s(\Omega)$.

2.4. Least-Squares Approximation. In this section, we construct and analyze a projection onto the space \mathcal{S}_k which is based upon performing a least squares fit to the function values on each cube $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$. Let $k \leq n - r$ be fixed and $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$. Observe that I is a dyadic cube with side length 2^{-k} and so the intersection $I \cap G_n$ of I with the observation grid (see (14)) consists of a regular grid with $N_k = 2^{n-k}$ points in each direction. We remark that since $k \leq n - r$, we have $N_k^d > \rho$.

Since the least squares procedure is invariant to scaling, we begin with the case $I = [0, 1]^d$ and the set of points $\{z_i, i = 1, \dots, N^d\}$, from the grid $\Lambda = \{0, 1/N, \dots, 1 - 1/N\}^d$, with some $N^d > \rho$. This is the set of these data sites for performing a least squares fitting to a given function f by polynomials from \mathcal{P}_r . We introduce the measure

$$(38) \quad \mu := \frac{1}{N^d} \sum_{i=1}^{N^d} \delta_{z_i} = \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \sum_{z_i \in \Lambda} \delta_{z_i},$$

where the δ_{z_i} are Dirac measures at z_i . We then have the Hilbert space $L_2(\mu)$, which is identified with functions defined on the data sites Λ , with the inner product

$$(39) \quad \langle f, g \rangle := \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \sum_{z_i \in \Lambda} f(z_i)g(z_i).$$

Recall that $\rho = \dim(\mathcal{P}_r)$ and let Q_1, \dots, Q_ρ , be an orthonormal system for \mathcal{P}_r viewed as a subspace of $L_2(\mu)$. Since $N^d = |\Lambda| > \rho$, for any function f defined on the data sites Λ , the polynomial

$$(40) \quad Pf := \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \langle f, Q_j \rangle Q_j,$$

is the least squares approximation to f from \mathcal{P}_r . We will need the following technical lemma about the orthonormal basis Q_1, \dots, Q_ρ , which is proved in Appendix A.1.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let I be a bounded cube in \mathbb{R}^d and let $\rho := \dim(\mathcal{P}_r)$. Let $\Lambda_I := \{z_j, j = 1, \dots, N^d\}$ be a tensor product grid of N^d points from I with spacing $1/N$, and let the $Q_{I,j}$, $j = 1, \dots, \rho$, be an orthonormal basis for \mathcal{P}_r on I , considered as a subspace of the Hilbert space $L_2(\mu_I)$. If $N^d > \rho$ and $q_0 \leq q \leq \infty$, then the following (quasi-)norms of a polynomial $Q = \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \beta_j Q_{I,j}$ are equivalent with constants of equivalency depending only on r, d and $q_0 > 0$ but not depending on N or q :*

- (i) $\|Q\|_{L_q(I)}^*$;
- (ii) $\|(Q(z_j))\|_{\ell_q(\Lambda_I)}^* := N^{-d/q} \|(Q(z_j))_{z_j \in \Lambda_I}\|_{\ell_q(\Lambda_I)}$;
- (iii) $\|(\beta_j)_{j=1}^{\rho}\|_{\ell_q}$.

In particular, it follows that

$$(41) \quad \|Q_{I,j}\|_{L_\infty(I)} \leq C, \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho,$$

where C depends only on r, d .

It follows from the bound (41) that for a function $f \in C(I) \subset L_2(\mu)$ the linear mapping $f \mapsto Pf$ is a projection onto \mathcal{P}_r and satisfies

$$(42) \quad \|Pf\|_{C(I)} \leq C \|f\|_{C(I)}$$

for a constant C depending only upon r and d , and thus we have

$$(43) \quad \|f - Pf\|_{C(I)} \leq (1 + C) \text{dist}(f, \mathcal{P}_r)_{C(I)}, \quad f \in C(I).$$

Let us now consider any cube $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$. We rescale the above construction to I and denote by $P_I f$ the resulting least squares polynomial fit from \mathcal{P}_r to this data on I , i.e., (40) rescaled to I . We then define

$$(44) \quad S_k f := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} (P_I f) \chi_I.$$

LEMMA 2.2. *Let $0 < p \leq \infty$ and $s > d/p$. If $f \in B_p^s = B_p^s(\Omega)$, then for each $0 < q \leq \infty$, the piecewise polynomial $S_k f$ in (44) satisfies*

$$(45) \quad \|f - S_k f\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{B_p^s(\Omega)} 2^{-k(s-(d/p-d/q)_+)}, \quad k \leq n - r,$$

where C depends only on p, q, s, d, r .

PROOF. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [4], which applies to interpolating polynomials instead of the least squares polynomial fit, and we do not repeat it in detail here. Indeed, the only property of the interpolating operator which was used in [4] was boundedness in $C(I)$, which the operator S_k also has, see (42). \square

2.5. Multiscale Decompositions. Let $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$ and let us fix $f \in B_p^s(\Omega)$ with $s > d/p$. Recall that each such function is uniformly continuous and hence has a natural extension to $\overline{\Omega}$. We assume that the data sites are the tensor product grid G_n (14), $n \geq 1$, and therefore $m = |G_n| = 2^{nd}$. Note that the number of data sites in any dyadic cube $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$ is $2^{(n-k)d}$ for $0 \leq k \leq n$. We recall that $\rho := \dim(\mathcal{P}_r)$. We need to ensure that each $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$ contains more than ρ data points for every level k . This can be done by restricting k to be a constant less than n . For simplicity, we will restrict $k \leq n - r$, which one can easily verify that is enough. It follows that the least squares operator P_I from the previous subsection is well defined and is represented by (40). We let

$$(46) \quad S_k := S_k f := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} (P_I f) \chi_I \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{S}_k := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} (P_I y) \chi_I, \quad k \leq n - r,$$

where y is the vector of noisy data observations $(y_i)_{x_i \in \Lambda_I}$ from (1) (which can be viewed as an element of $L_2(\mu)$).

If we define the piecewise polynomials

$$(47) \quad T_0 := S_0, \quad \tilde{T}_0 := \tilde{S}_0, \quad T_k := S_k - S_{k-1}, \quad \tilde{T}_k := \tilde{S}_k - \tilde{S}_{k-1}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n - r,$$

then we have the following multiscale representations

$$(48) \quad S_k = \sum_{j=0}^k T_j \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{S}_k = \sum_{j=0}^k \tilde{T}_j, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n - r,$$

which we shall exploit in our recovery algorithms. The following lemma holds.

LEMMA 2.3. *For every $0 \leq k \leq n - r$ we have the representation*

$$(49) \quad T_k := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{\rho} c_{I,j} Q_{I,j} \right] \chi_I,$$

where the vector ν_k of coefficients defined by

$$(50) \quad \nu_k := (c_{I,j}), \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho,$$

has length $L_k := \rho 2^{kd}$, and its ℓ_p norm satisfies

$$(51) \quad \|\nu_k\|_{\ell_p} \leq C 2^{-k(s-d/p)}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n - r,$$

with C depending only upon s, p, r and d .

PROOF. We have

$$(52) \quad T_k = S_k - S_{k-1} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} R_I \chi_I, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n - r, \quad \text{with} \quad R_I := P_I - P_{I'}, \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_k,$$

where for each $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$, we denote by $I' \in \mathcal{D}_{k-1}$ the parent of I , i.e., the cube in \mathcal{D}_{k-1} that contains I . Note that T_k clearly lies in the space \mathcal{S}_k of piecewise polynomials on the grid \mathcal{D}_k . It follows from Lemma 2.2 with $q = p$ that

$$(53) \quad \|T_k\|_{L_p(\Omega)} \leq C \|f\|_{B_p^s(\Omega)} 2^{-ks}.$$

Now we use Lemma 2.1 to see that

$$(54) \quad \|\nu_k\|_{\ell_p}^p = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} |c_{I,j}|^p \leq C \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} (\|T_k\|_{L_p(I)}^*)^p = C 2^{kd} \|T_k\|_{L_p(\Omega)}^p,$$

from which (51) follows. \square

Similarly, one can show the following lemma for \tilde{S}_{n-r} .

LEMMA 2.4. *We have the representation*

$$(55) \quad \tilde{T}_k := \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{\rho} c_{I,j}^* Q_{I,j} \right] \chi_I,$$

where

$$(56) \quad c_{I,j}^* := c_{I,j} + \eta_{I,j}, \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-r, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho,$$

are the noisy observation of the true $c_{I,j}$'s, polluted by the additive Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{I,j}^2)$ noise $\eta_{I,j}$ with variance

$$(57) \quad 0 \leq \sigma_{I,j}^2 \leq C_{\rho} 2^{-(n-k)d} \sigma^2, \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho.$$

PROOF. Using the same notation and analysis as in Lemma 2.3 we have

$$(58) \quad \tilde{T}_k = \tilde{S}_k - \tilde{S}_{k-1} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} \tilde{R}_I \chi_I, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-r, \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{R}_I := \tilde{P}_I - \tilde{P}_{I'}, \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_k,$$

where for each $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$,

$$(59) \quad \tilde{P}_I = \frac{1}{\#(\Lambda_I)} \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \left[\sum_{x_i \in \Lambda_I} (f(x_i) + \eta_i) Q_{I,j}(x_i) \right] Q_{I,j} = P_I + \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \tilde{\eta}_{I,j} Q_{I,j}.$$

Here

$$(60) \quad \tilde{\eta}_{I,j} := \frac{1}{\#(\Lambda_I)} \sum_{x_i \in \Lambda_I} Q_{I,j}(x_i) \eta_i, \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho,$$

are random variables. This gives

$$(61) \quad \tilde{R}_I = \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} c_{I,j} Q_{I,j} + \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \eta_{I,j} Q_{I,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} c_{I,j}^* Q_{I,j},$$

where

$$(62) \quad \eta_{I,j} := \tilde{\eta}_{I,j} - \sum_{i=1}^{\rho} \tilde{\eta}_{I',i} \langle Q_{I',i}, Q_{I,j} \rangle_I.$$

Therefore (55) follows from (61) and (58).

Using (60) and Lemma 2.1, we find that

$$(63) \quad \eta_{I,j} = \sum_{i: x_i \in \Lambda_{I'}} \beta_{i,j} \eta_i, \quad \text{where} \quad |\beta_{i,j}| \leq C_{\rho} \#(\Lambda_I)^{-1}, \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho.$$

It follows that each of the $\eta_{I,j}$ is a Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{I,j}^2)$ with variance

$$(64) \quad 0 \leq \sigma_{I,j}^2 \leq C_{\rho} 2^{-(n-k)d} \sigma^2, \quad I \in \mathcal{D}_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, \rho,$$

because $\#(\Lambda_I) = 2^{(n-k)d}$. □

3. A Numerical Recovery Algorithm. In this section, we fix m, σ, s, p, q , and d and describe our algorithm A for approximating $f \in B_p^s(\Omega)$ from the noisy data y , see (1). We do this under the assumption that the data sites $\mathcal{X} = G_n$, that is, they lie on the tensor product grid described in (14) consisting of $m = 2^{nd}$ points. Our algorithm creates a function $\hat{f} := A(y)$ that approximates f in the $L_q(\Omega)$ norm with $q \in [1, \infty)$.

Step 0: If $\sigma^2 \geq m$, we define $A(y) := 0$ for all y . If $\sigma^2 < m$, we proceed to the following two steps.

Step 1: From the noisy observations $\{y_i\}$, we construct the polynomials \tilde{P}_I , $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$, $k \leq n - r$, using least squares approximation from \mathcal{P}_r . This enables us to compute the polynomials \tilde{R}_I , see (61), for $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$, $0 \leq k \leq n - r$,

$$(65) \quad \tilde{R}_I = \tilde{P}_I - \tilde{P}_{I'} = \sum_{j=1}^{\rho} c_{I,j}^* Q_{I,j}, \quad \text{where} \quad c_{I,j}^* := c_{I,j} + \eta_{I,j},$$

and calculate the coefficients $\{c_{I,j}^*\}$. Recall that, see Lemma 2.4,

$$(66) \quad \tilde{T}_k = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} \tilde{R}_I \chi_I = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{\rho} c_{I,j}^* Q_{I,j} \right] \chi_I.$$

Step 2: For each dyadic level k and each index pair (I, j) with $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$, we shall use the, calculated in Step 1 coefficients, $\{c_{I,j}^*\}$ to derive new coefficients $\hat{c}_{I,j}$, $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$, $j = 1, \dots, \rho$, which approximate the true coefficients $c_{I,j}$ at this dyadic level. The method for calculating the $\hat{c}_{I,j}$'s from the noisy observations $c_{I,j}^*$ (which will be hard-thresholding) will be described and analyzed in §4. This part of the algorithm requires the a priori knowledge of the noise level σ . Notice that the $\hat{c}_{I,j}$'s will be random variables. We then define the piecewise polynomial function

$$(67) \quad \hat{T}_k = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{\rho} \hat{c}_{I,j} Q_{I,j} \right] \chi_I,$$

and consider

$$(68) \quad \hat{f} := A(y) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} \hat{T}_k,$$

to be our approximation to f .

3.1. Preliminary Analysis. To analyze the approximation error in L_q of our algorithm, we use Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 to obtain the estimate.

$$(69) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} &\leq \|f - S_{n-r}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} \|T_k - \hat{T}_k\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C 2^{-(n-r)(s-(d/p-d/q)_+)} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} \|T_k - \hat{T}_k\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \\ &\leq C m^{-(s/d-(1/p-1/q)_+)} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} \|T_k - \hat{T}_k\|_{L_q(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

In order to bound $\|T_k - \hat{T}_k\|_{L_q(\Omega)}$, we will use the inequality

$$(70) \quad \|T_k - \hat{T}_k\|_{L_q(\Omega)}^q \leq C \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{\rho} |c_{I,j} - \hat{c}_{I,j}|^q \right] |I| = C 2^{-kd} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{D}_k} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{\rho} |c_{I,j} - \hat{c}_{I,j}|^q \right].$$

Next, we organize our notation as follows. Recall that ν_k was defined in (50) as the vector of coefficients $c_{I,j}$, $I \in \mathcal{D}_k$, $j = 1, \dots, \rho$, in the representation of T_k at level k . In going forward, we use the notation

$$(71) \quad \nu_k^* := (c_{I,j}^*), \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_k^* := (\eta_{I,j}),$$

so that

$$(72) \quad \nu_k^* = \nu_k + \eta_k^*.$$

The vector $\hat{\nu}_k$ is our approximation (which we have not yet defined) to ν_k obtained from the noisy observation ν_k^* . For a finite vector, say $v = (v_1, \dots, v_L) \in \mathbb{R}^L$, we introduce the weighted ℓ_q -norm, given by

$$(73) \quad \|v\|_q^* := \left(\frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L |v_i|^q \right)^{1/q}.$$

Utilizing that ν_k and $\hat{\nu}_k$ are vectors of length $L_k = \rho 2^{kd}$, we rewrite the bound (70) as

$$(74) \quad \|T_k - \hat{T}_k\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \leq C \|\nu_k - \hat{\nu}_k\|_q^*.$$

We want to define $\hat{\nu}_k$ to make (74) small. Putting (74) together with (69) results in

$$(75) \quad \|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \leq C \left(m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} \|\nu_k - \hat{\nu}_k\|_q^* \right).$$

In the next sections, we explain how we obtain $\hat{\nu}_k$ by hard-thresholding the entries in ν_k^* and bound the resulting error $\|\nu_k - \hat{\nu}_k\|_q^*$ in probability.

4. Finite-Dimensional Estimates. Here, we study the problem of recovering a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^L$ from noisy observations $v^* = v + \xi$ with error measured in the norm $\|\cdot\|_q^*$ with $1 \leq q < \infty$. We assume that each entry ξ_i of the noise vector ξ is a mean zero Gaussian with variance σ_i^2 bounded by $\tilde{\sigma}^2 \geq 0$. In this analysis, we allow the noise in the different components to potentially be correlated. We will later use the results in this section to bound the error terms $\|\nu_k - \hat{\nu}_k\|_q^*$ in (75).

The problem of recovering v has been studied before in the literature (see for instance [15, 17]). One popular method for estimating v is hard-thresholding, defined by

$$(76) \quad \hat{v}_i = \text{thresh}_\lambda(v_i^*) := \begin{cases} v_i^*, & |v_i^*| > \lambda, \\ 0, & |v_i^*| \leq \lambda, \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is a parameter to be chosen. The key property of hard-thresholding that we are going to use is stated in the next simple Lemma (see Lemma 2 in [9]). As remarked in [9, 14, 15, 17], any coordinatewise estimation rule satisfying the bound of the Lemma, including the popular soft-thresholding rule, can be used to obtain similar guarantees.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $x, \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for any $\lambda \geq 0$, we have the estimate*

$$(77) \quad |\text{thresh}_\lambda(x + \epsilon) - x| \leq 3(\min\{|x|, \lambda\} + |\text{thresh}_{\lambda/2}(\epsilon)|).$$

PROOF. Indeed, if $|x| \leq \lambda/2$ and $|\epsilon| < \lambda/2$, then

$$(78) \quad \text{thresh}_\lambda(x + \epsilon) = 0 \Rightarrow |\text{thresh}_\lambda(x + \epsilon) - x| = |x| \leq \min\{|x|, \lambda\}.$$

Otherwise, we use that for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $|\text{thresh}_\lambda(z) - (z)| \leq \lambda$, which implies that

$$(79) \quad |\text{thresh}_\lambda(x + \epsilon) - x| \leq \lambda + |\epsilon|.$$

Now, if $|\epsilon| \geq \lambda/2$, it follows that $\lambda \leq 2|\epsilon|$ so that

$$(80) \quad |\text{thresh}_\lambda(x + \epsilon) - x| \leq 3|\epsilon| = 3 \cdot |\text{thresh}_{\lambda/2}(\epsilon)|.$$

On the other hand, if $|\epsilon| < \lambda/2$ and $|x| > \lambda/2$, then $\lambda/2 < \min\{|x|, \lambda\}$, and we have

$$(81) \quad |\text{thresh}_\lambda(x + \epsilon) - x| \leq \lambda + |\epsilon| \leq (3/2)\lambda \leq 3 \min\{|x|, \lambda\}.$$

So, in all cases, we have the estimate (77). \square

We use this Lemma to show that the error $\|v - \hat{v}\|_q^*$ can be bounded by a deterministic and stochastic component. We first define a new random variable ξ_λ , whose components are obtained from the components of a Gaussian random variable ξ via hard thresholding,

$$(82) \quad (\xi_\lambda)_i := \text{thresh}_{\lambda/2}(\xi_i) = \begin{cases} \xi_i, & |\xi_i| \geq \lambda/2, \\ 0, & |\xi_i| < \lambda/2, \end{cases}$$

and prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.2. *Let v be a vector from \mathbb{R}^L for which we have the noisy observations $v^* = v + \xi$. For $\lambda \geq 0$, we define \hat{v} by (76). Then, for any $1 \leq q < \infty$, and $0 < p \leq q$, we have*

$$(83) \quad \|v - \hat{v}\|_q^* \leq 3 [\|\min\{|v|, \lambda\}\|_q^* + \|\xi_\lambda\|_q^*] \leq 3 \left[(\|v\|_p^*)^{p/q} \lambda^{1-p/q} + \|\xi_\lambda\|_q^* \right],$$

where $\min\{|v|, \lambda\}$ is defined componentwise.

PROOF. We apply Lemma 4.1 to each component of v to obtain

$$(84) \quad |v_i - \hat{v}_i| \leq 3(\min\{|v_i|, \lambda\} + |(\xi_\lambda)_i|).$$

We now apply the $\|\cdot\|_q^*$ to derive the first inequality in (83). Next, for each component v_i of v , we have

$$(85) \quad \min\{|v_i|, \lambda\} \leq |v_i|^{p/q} \lambda^{1-p/q}.$$

Applying $\|\cdot\|_q^*$ we arrive at the last inequality in (83). \square

Notice that the first term on the right side of (83) is deterministic since it does not depend on the noise draw. We next want to give a bound for the second term which is stochastic. To derive our bound, we introduce the notation.

$$(86) \quad F := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L f_i, \quad \text{where} \quad f_i := |\xi_\lambda|_i^q = \begin{cases} |\xi_i|^q, & |\xi_i| \geq \lambda/2, \\ 0, & |\xi_i| < \lambda/2. \end{cases}$$

Then, $\|\xi_\lambda\|_q^* = F^{1/q}$.

THEOREM 4.3. *For any increasing, convex function ϕ on $\mathbb{R}_+ := [0, \infty)$ with $\phi(0) = 0$ and any $1 \leq q < \infty$, we have*

$$(87) \quad \mathbb{P}(\|\xi_\lambda\|_q^* \geq T) \leq \tilde{\sigma}^{-1} \int_{\lambda/2}^{\infty} \frac{\phi(x^q)}{\phi(T^q)} e^{-x^2/2\tilde{\sigma}^2} dx, \quad T > 0.$$

PROOF. First note that from the convexity of ϕ and Jensen's inequality, we have

$$(88) \quad \phi(F) \leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L \phi(f_j),$$

and

$$(89) \quad \mathbb{E}(\phi(F)) \leq \frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L \mathbb{E}(\phi(f_j)) \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq L} \mathbb{E}(\phi(f_j)).$$

We can therefore estimate

$$(90) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\xi_\lambda\|_q^* \geq T) &= \mathbb{P}(F \geq T^q) \leq \mathbb{P}(\phi(F) \geq \phi(T^q)) \leq (\phi(T^q))^{-1} \mathbb{E}(\phi(F)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\phi(T^q)} \max_{1 \leq j \leq L} \mathbb{E}(\phi(f_j)), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Markov's inequality, (89), and the monotonicity of ϕ . Recall that σ_j^2 , the variance of ξ_j , is such that $\sigma_j \leq \tilde{\sigma}$. We then have

$$(91) \quad [\phi(T^q)]^{-1} \mathbb{E}(\phi(f_j)) \leq \sigma_j^{-1} \int_{\lambda/2}^{\infty} \frac{\phi(x^q)}{\phi(T^q)} e^{-x^2/2\sigma_j^2} dx,$$

where we change variables by setting $x = (\sigma_j/\tilde{\sigma})z$, $dx = (\sigma_j/\tilde{\sigma})dz$, to get

$$(92) \quad [\phi(T^q)]^{-1} \mathbb{E}(\phi(f_j)) \leq \tilde{\sigma}^{-1} \int_{(\lambda/2)(\tilde{\sigma}/\sigma_j)}^{\infty} \frac{\phi((\sigma_j/\tilde{\sigma})z^q)}{\phi(T^q)} e^{-z^2/2\tilde{\sigma}^2} dz.$$

Finally, we use that $\sigma_j \leq \tilde{\sigma}$ and that ϕ is increasing and non-negative to obtain

$$(93) \quad [\phi(T^q)]^{-1} \mathbb{E}(\phi(f_j)) \leq \tilde{\sigma}^{-1} \int_{\lambda/2}^{\infty} \frac{\phi(z^q)}{\phi(T^q)} e^{-z^2/2\tilde{\sigma}^2} dz,$$

which completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Given the above theorem, we will obtain the best (smallest) probability bound for the stochastic term in (83), by minimizing over the choice of ϕ . To help decide which ϕ to employ, we will use the following elementary result, proved in Appendix A.2.

LEMMA 4.4. *For any $a, q > 0$, we have*

$$(94) \quad \int_a^{\infty} x^q e^{-x^2/2} dx \leq C(q) e^{-a^2/4}.$$

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

THEOREM 4.5. *If $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^L$ has components each of which is a mean zero Gaussian with variance at most $\tilde{\sigma}^2$, then for any threshold $\lambda \geq 0$ and any $T > 0$, we have*

$$(95) \quad \mathbb{P}(\|\xi_\lambda\|_q^* \geq T) \lesssim T^{-q} \tilde{\sigma}^q e^{-(\tilde{\sigma}^{-1}b)^2/4}, \quad \text{where } b := \max\{2^{-1}\lambda, 2^{-1/q}T\},$$

and the constant in \lesssim depends only on q .

PROOF. We define $\phi(x) := (x - T^q/2)_+$, for $x \geq 0$. It follows from Theorem 4.3 that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\xi_\lambda\|_q^* \geq T) \leq \tilde{\sigma}^{-1} \int_{\lambda/2}^{\infty} \frac{\phi(x^q)}{\phi(T^q)} e^{-x^2/2\tilde{\sigma}^2} dx = \tilde{\sigma}^{-1} \int_b^{\infty} \frac{\phi(x^q)}{\phi(T^q)} e^{-x^2/2\tilde{\sigma}^2} dx$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= [\phi(T^q)]^{-1} \int_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-1}b}^{\infty} \phi(\tilde{\sigma}^q u^q) e^{-u^2/2} du \leq 2T^{-q} \tilde{\sigma}^q \int_{\tilde{\sigma}^{-1}b}^{\infty} u^q e^{-u^2/2} du \\
(96) \quad &\lesssim T^{-q} \tilde{\sigma}^q e^{-(\tilde{\sigma}^{-1}b)^2/4},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\phi(x) \leq x$ on $[0, \infty)$ and had applied Lemma 4.4. \square

5. Proofs of Upper Bounds. In this section, we show that our numerical algorithm from §3 will satisfy the upper bound of the theorems formulated in §1, provided we properly choose the thresholds λ_k at each dyadic level k . Throughout this section, we fix s, p, q , so that $s > d/p$, and we assume that we are in the primary case, i.e., (11) holds.

5.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let us begin by making two remarks that will allow us to restrict the range of the parameters in what follows.

REMARK 5.1. We can assume that $p \leq q$.

Indeed, when $p \geq q$ we have $U(B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))) \subset U(B_\tau^s(L_q(\Omega)))$ and the right side of (15) is always equal to 2. Therefore this claim follows from the case $p = q$. We assume that $p \leq q$ in going forward in this section.

REMARK 5.2. We can assume that $\sigma^2 < m$.

Indeed, recall that when $\sigma^2 \geq m$, we define $A(y) := 0$ for all y . Since $f \in U(B_\tau^s(L_p)) \subset U(B_\infty^s(L_p))$ and $\|f\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \leq C_0 \|f\|_{B_\infty^s(L_p(\Omega))} \leq C_0$, the probability in (16) will always be zero if the constant C in (16) is chosen such that $C \geq C_0$. Hence, (16) will automatically be satisfied for all $t > 0$ whenever $\sigma^2 \geq m$. We assume $\sigma^2 < m$ in going forward in this section.

REMARK 5.3. In order to prove (16) for any fixed q , it is enough to consider $t \geq 1$.

Indeed, once (16) is proven for a given C, c and $t \geq 1$, then it holds for all $t < 1$ by simply adjusting the constant C in (16).

In order to bound $\|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)}$, we will use (75). So our task is to prove a bound for

$$(97) \quad E^* := \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} \|\nu_k - \hat{\nu}_k\|_q^*,$$

where ν_k are defined in (50) and $\hat{\nu}_k = \text{thresh}_{\lambda_k}(\nu_k^*)$ are obtained by thresholding the observed coefficients, i.e., the entries in the vector $\nu_k^* = \nu_k + \eta_k^*$. Here, the $\text{thresh}_{\lambda_k}$ is performed coordinatewise, with parameters λ_k specified later in (105). Notice that E^* is a random variable depending on our noise draw.

For the remainder of this section, let $f \in B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))$. Since our performance theorems do not depend on τ , it is enough to consider $\tau = \infty$ which gives the largest model class. We introduce the quantity

$$(98) \quad \varepsilon := \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}},$$

which occurs prominently in the bounds we want to prove. Note that $\varepsilon < 1$ since $\sigma^2 < m$. We know that, see Lemma 2.3,

$$(99) \quad \|\nu_k\|_p^* \leq C 2^{-ks}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-r,$$

since the true coefficient vector ν_k has length $L_k = C2^{kd}$ and satisfies (51). Each component of the noise η_k^* is a Gaussian random variable, see Lemma 2.4, with variance bounded by (see (57))

$$(100) \quad \sigma_k^2 := C2^{-(n-k)d}\sigma^2 = C \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right] 2^{kd}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-r.$$

It follows from Theorem 4.2 applied with $\lambda = \lambda_k$, $v = \nu_k$, and $\xi = \eta_k^*$, that

$$(101) \quad \|\nu_k - \hat{\nu}_k\|_q^* \leq C \left[2^{-ksp/q} \lambda_k^{1-p/q} + \|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* \right], \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-r,$$

where we used the notation $\eta_{\lambda_k} := \text{thresh}_{\lambda_k/2}(\eta_k^*)$. Therefore, from (75) and (97), we obtain

$$(102) \quad \|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \leq C \left[m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} + E^* \right] \leq C \left[m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} + \Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 \right],$$

with

$$(103) \quad \Sigma_1 := \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} 2^{-ksp/q} \lambda_k^{1-p/q}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_2 := \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} \|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^*.$$

In order to give our choice for the thresholds λ_k , $0 \leq k \leq n-r$, we define k^* as the integer which satisfies

$$(104) \quad 2^{k^*-1} \leq \varepsilon^{-1/s} < 2^{k^*}.$$

Note that $k^* > 0$ since $\varepsilon < 1$. We now define the thresholds

$$(105) \quad \lambda_k := 2^{-k^*s} \begin{cases} 0, & k \leq k^*, \\ 2^{\beta(k-k^*)}, & k > k^*, \end{cases}$$

where β is any parameter from the interval $\beta \in \left(\frac{d}{2}, \frac{sp}{q-p} \right)$. This interval is non-empty due to assumption (11). The (implied) constants in what follows may depend upon the choice of β , but β will be specified later in the proof and will depend only upon α .

Note that it follows from (100) and (104) that

$$(106) \quad \epsilon \asymp \sigma_{k^*}, \quad \sigma_k \asymp 2^{\frac{d}{2}(k-k^*)} \varepsilon, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-r,$$

and

$$(107) \quad \lambda_k \asymp 2^{\beta(k-k^*)} \varepsilon, \quad \text{when } k > k^*.$$

In the following subsections, we will bound the deterministic term Σ_1 and the stochastic term Σ_2 for the above choice of thresholds and thereby prove Theorem 1.1.

5.2. *Bounding the Deterministic Term Σ_1 .* Using the above choice of λ_k , we have

$$(108) \quad \Sigma_1 = \sum_{k=k^*+1}^{n-r} 2^{-ksp/q} \lambda_k^{1-p/q} \lesssim 2^{-k^*s} \sum_{k>k^*} 2^{(\beta(1-\frac{p}{q})-s\frac{p}{q})(k-k^*)} \lesssim 2^{-k^*s} \lesssim \varepsilon.$$

Note that the middle sum is a convergent geometric series because $\beta < \frac{sp}{q-p}$. In the last \lesssim we have used the definition (104) of k^* .

5.3. *Bounding the Stochastic Term Σ_2 .* We turn now to bounding the stochastic term Σ_2 . Our goal is to show that for $f \in K := U(B_\infty^s(L_p(\Omega)))$, we have

$$(109) \quad \mathbb{P}(\Sigma_2 > t\varepsilon) \leq Ce^{-ct^\alpha}, \quad t \geq 1,$$

for any $0 < \alpha < 2 - \frac{d(q-p)}{sp}$ which will in turn prove the theorem. Since we are in the primary case, we have $2 - \frac{d(q-p)}{sp} > 0$. The constants $c, C > 0$ depend only on s, p, q, d , and the choice of α . In this section, we will frequently make use of the following lemma, whose proof is in Appendix A.3.

LEMMA 5.4. *For any $0 \leq a \leq a_0; b \geq b_0 > 0; c > 0$, and $\tau \geq 1$, we have*

$$(110) \quad \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{ak} e^{-c2^{bk}\tau} \leq C(a_0, b_0, c)e^{-c\tau}, \quad \tau \geq 1.$$

We fix any $q \geq 1$ and $t \geq 1$. Recall that according to Remark 5.3 we only have to prove (109) for such t . We introduce numbers $t_k \geq 0$, to be specified below, which satisfy $\sum_{k=0}^{n-r} t_k \leq t$. A standard union bound argument implies that it suffices to show that

$$(111) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{n-r} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) \leq Ce^{-ct^\alpha}, \quad t \geq 1,$$

where we choose

$$(112) \quad t_k := \bar{c}t \begin{cases} 2^{\delta(k-k^*)}, & 0 \leq k \leq k^*, \\ 2^{\delta(k^*-k)}, & k^* < k \leq n-r, \end{cases}$$

with $0 < \delta < d/2$, and define \bar{c} so that that $\sum_{k=0}^{n-r} t_k = t$. Note that $\bar{c} \geq c(\delta) > 0$, where $c(\delta)$ is a constant depending only δ . The subsequent constants in what follows may depend upon δ , but δ will be specified later in the proof and will depend only upon α .

The remainder of the proof is divided into the following two cases.

Case 1: A bound for $\sum_{k=0}^{k^*} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon)$.

Let $0 \leq k \leq k^*$. In this case, all thresholds are zero, i.e., no thresholding takes place. We return to Theorem 4.5 and take $T = T_k := t_k \varepsilon = \bar{c}2^{\delta(k-k^*)}t\varepsilon \geq c(\delta)2^{\delta(k-k^*)}t\varepsilon$. Since the thresholds are zero, we have $b = b_k = 2^{-1/q}T_k$ and $\sigma_k \asymp 2^{\frac{d}{2}(k-k^*)}\varepsilon$. We compute

$$(113) \quad T_k^2/\sigma_k^2 \gtrsim t^2\varepsilon^2 2^{2(k-k^*)\delta} 2^{d(k^*-k)}\varepsilon^{-2} \asymp t^2\mu^{k^*-k}, \quad \mu := 2^{d-2\delta} > 1.$$

Thus, if $t \geq 1$, then

$$(114) \quad T_k > C\sigma_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq k^*.$$

Theorem 4.5 now gives

$$(115) \quad \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) \leq CT_k^{-q}\sigma_k^q e^{-c(\sigma_k^{-1}T_k)^2} \leq Ce^{-c\mu^{(k^*-k)}t^2}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq k^*.$$

Hence, using Lemma 5.4 with $\tau = t^2 \geq 1$, we obtain the bound

$$(116) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{k^*} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) \leq C \sum_{k=0}^{k^*} e^{-c\mu^{(k^*-k)}t^2} \leq Ce^{-ct^2}.$$

Here, we have changed c, C from line to line, but ultimately, we will end up with fixed c, C , once δ and β are specified, depending on the choice of α .

Case 2: A bound for $\sum_{k > k^*} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon)$.

We next consider the case when $k > k^*$. In this case, the thresholds are given in (105) and thereby satisfy $\lambda_k \asymp \varepsilon 2^{\beta(k-k^*)}$, where we recall that $\beta \in \left(\frac{d}{2}, \frac{sp}{q-p}\right)$. We fix k and proceed to bound each of the probabilities $\mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon)$. We use Theorem 4.5 with $T = T_k := t_k \varepsilon = \bar{c} 2^{-\delta(k-k^*)} t \varepsilon \geq c(\delta) 2^{-\delta(k-k^*)} t \varepsilon$, and thus

$$(117) \quad b = b_k = \max\{2^{-1}\lambda_k, 2^{-1/q}T_k\} \gtrsim \varepsilon \max\{2^{\beta(k-k^*)}, t 2^{-\delta(k-k^*)}\}.$$

Since $\sigma_k \asymp 2^{\frac{d}{2}(k-k^*)}\varepsilon$, we have that

$$(118) \quad \sigma_k^{-1}b_k \gtrsim 2^{-(k-k^*)d/2} \max\{2^{\beta(k-k^*)}, t 2^{-\delta(k-k^*)}\}.$$

Applying Theorem 4.5, we obtain the bound

$$(119) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) &\lesssim T_k^{-q} \sigma_k^q \exp(-c(\sigma_k^{-1}b_k)^2/4) \\ &\lesssim (t\varepsilon)^{-q} 2^{(k-k^*)\delta q} \varepsilon^q 2^{(k-k^*)qd/2} \exp(-c(\sigma_k^{-1}b_k)^2/4) \\ &\lesssim \left[t^{-1} 2^{(k-k^*)(d/2+\delta)}\right]^q \exp(-c(\sigma_k^{-1}b_k)^2/4). \end{aligned}$$

The maximum on the right hand side in (118) will be given by the second term for $k^* < k \leq k'$ and by the first term for $k > k'$, where the value of $k' = k'(t)$ satisfies

$$(120) \quad t^{\frac{1}{\beta+\delta}} \lesssim 2^{(k'-k^*)} \leq t^{\frac{1}{\beta+\delta}}.$$

Plugging this into (119) gives

$$(121) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) &\lesssim 2^{(k-k')q(d/2+\delta)} 2^{(k^*-k')q(\beta-d/2)} \exp(-c(\sigma_k^{-1}b_k)^2/4) \\ &\lesssim 2^{(k-k')q(d/2+\delta)} \exp(-c(\sigma_k^{-1}b_k)^2/4), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $\beta > d/2$. Now we write

$$(122) \quad \sum_{k>k^*} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) = \sum_{k^* < k \leq k'} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) + \sum_{k>k'} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) =: \Sigma' + \Sigma'',$$

and bound each of these sums.

Case 2.1: A bound for Σ' .

It follows from (118) that in the case $k^* < k \leq k'$,

$$(123) \quad \sigma_k^{-1}b_k \gtrsim 2^{-(k-k^*)d/2} \max\{2^{\beta(k-k^*)}, t 2^{-\delta(k-k^*)}\} = 2^{-(k-k^*)(d/2+\delta)} t.$$

Plugging this into (121) gives

$$(124) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) &\lesssim 2^{(k-k')q(d/2+\delta)} \exp(-c 2^{-(k-k^*)(d+2\delta)} t^2) \\ &\lesssim \exp(-c 2^{-(k-k^*)(d+2\delta)} t^2) \end{aligned}$$

since $k \leq k'$. Therefore, we see that

$$(125) \quad \begin{aligned} \Sigma' &= \sum_{k^* < k \leq k'} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) \lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{k'-k^*} \exp(-c 2^{-k(d+2\delta)} t^2) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \exp(-c 2^{k(d+2\delta)} [2^{-(k'-k^*)(d+2\delta)} t^2]) \lesssim e^{-c\tau} \leq e^{-ct^{\frac{2\beta-d}{\beta+\delta}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 5.4 with $\tau = 2^{-(k'-k^*)(d+2\delta)} t^2$. Note that by (120) it follows that $\tau \geq t^{\frac{2\beta-d}{\beta+\delta}} \geq 1$.

Case 2.2: A bound for Σ'' .

We obtain from (118) in the case $k > k'$ that

$$(126) \quad \sigma_k^{-1} b_k \gtrsim 2^{-(k-k^*)d/2} \max\{2^{\beta(k-k^*)}, t2^{-\delta(k-k^*)}\} = 2^{(k-k^*)(\beta-d/2)}.$$

Using (121), we derive

$$(127) \quad \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) \lesssim 2^{(k-k')q(d/2+\delta)} \exp(-c2^{(k-k^*)(2\beta-d)}),$$

which gives the estimate

$$(128) \quad \begin{aligned} \Sigma'' &= \sum_{k>k'} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) \lesssim \sum_{k>k'} 2^{(k-k')q(d/2+\delta)} \exp(-c2^{(k-k^*)(2\beta-d)}) \\ &= \sum_{j>0} 2^{jq(d/2+\delta)} \exp(-c2^{j(2\beta-d)} [2^{(k'-k^*)(2\beta-d)}]) \\ &\lesssim \exp(-c2^{(k'-k^*)(2\beta-d)}) \lesssim \exp(-ct^{\frac{2\beta-d}{\beta+\delta}}). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we again apply Lemma 5.4 with $\tau = 2^{(k'-k^*)(2\beta-d)} \geq 1$.

Combining the bounds for Σ' and Σ'' , we obtain that

$$(129) \quad \sum_{k>k^*} \mathbb{P}(\|\eta_{\lambda_k}\|_q^* > t_k \varepsilon) \lesssim \exp(-ct^{\frac{2\beta-d}{\beta+\delta}}), \quad t \geq 1.$$

Recall that β and δ can be chosen as any numbers satisfying $\beta \in (\frac{d}{2}, \frac{sp}{q-p})$ and $\delta \in (0, d/2)$, respectively. Therefore, given any α satisfying $0 < \alpha < 2 - \frac{d(q-p)}{sp}$, we can choose β and δ so that

$$(130) \quad \alpha = \frac{2\beta-d}{\beta+\delta} \quad \text{since} \quad \lim_{\substack{\beta \rightarrow sp/(q-p) \\ \delta \rightarrow 0}} \frac{2\beta-d}{\beta+\delta} = 2 - \frac{d(q-p)}{sp}.$$

This, together with (116) proves (109), and therefore we have completed the proof of the theorem.

6. Proof of Theorem 1.3 . The proof we present here uses well-known ideas from both optimal recovery [4, 27, 31, 33] and minimax estimation [1, 16, 34]. We give a complete and self-contained argument which unifies both regimes. We restrict our presentation to the case where the parameters p, q, s are in the primary case (see (11)). We fix these parameters for the remainder of this section. We also fix $m \geq 1$ and the variance σ^2 assumed on the noise vectors. We let the data sites $\mathcal{X} = \{x_i \in \bar{\Omega}, i = 1, \dots, m\}$ be arbitrary but fixed.

Let $K = U(B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega)))$, where $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$, $0 < \tau \leq \infty$, and the other parameters are in the primary region. Our goal in this section is to prove the lower bound

$$(131) \quad R_m(K, \sigma, \mathcal{X})_q \geq c \left\{ m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (1/p-1/q)_+} + \min \left\{ 1, \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}} \right\} \right\}.$$

We will use without further mention the fact that the left side of (131) is increasing as σ increases and decreasing as m increases. This fact shows in particular that it is enough to prove (131) for $\sigma \leq \sqrt{m}$ which is an assumption we impose for the remainder of this section. Therefore,

$$(132) \quad \min \left\{ 1, \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}} \right\} = \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}} =: \varepsilon.$$

Throughout this section constants like c, C depend only on p, q, s and τ , but not on σ or m , and may change from line to line.

In going further in this section, we denote by y any vector in \mathbb{R}^m , by $y(f)$ the true data vector of f and by $\tilde{y}(f)$ the noisy observation vector

$$(133) \quad y(f) := (f(x_1), \dots, f(x_m)), \quad \tilde{y}(f) := y(f) + \eta,$$

where the entries in the noise vector η are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$, and hence $\tilde{y}(f)$ is a random variable.

Let A be any mapping from \mathbb{R}^m into $L_q(\Omega)$. For any such mapping A , we will show that there is a function $f := f_A \in K$ for which

$$(134) \quad \mathbb{E} \|f - A(\tilde{y}(f))\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq c \{m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (1/p-1/q)_+} + \varepsilon\},$$

which will then complete the proof of the lower bound.

As already noted in this paper, see [4], it is known from optimal recovery that there exist two functions $f, g \in K$ such that $y(f) = y(g)$ and

$$(135) \quad cm^{-\frac{s}{d} + (1/p-1/q)_+} \leq \|f - g\|_{L_q(\Omega)}.$$

Since $A(\tilde{y}(f)) = A(\tilde{y}(g))$, it follows that

$$(136) \quad cm^{-\frac{s}{d} + (1/p-1/q)_+} \leq \|f - A(\tilde{y}(f))\|_{L_q(\Omega)} + \|g - A(\tilde{y}(g))\|_{L_q(\Omega)}.$$

If we now take an expectation with respect to the noise draw, we have

$$(137) \quad \max\{\mathbb{E} \|f - A(\tilde{y}(f))\|_{L_q(\Omega)}, \mathbb{E} \|g - A(\tilde{y}(g))\|_{L_q(\Omega)}\} \geq cm^{-\frac{s}{d} + (1/p-1/q)_+}.$$

We have satisfied (134) whenever $\varepsilon \leq m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (1/p-1/q)_+}$. Therefore, in going further, we can assume that σ, m satisfy

$$(138) \quad \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}} = \varepsilon \geq m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (1/p-1/q)_+}.$$

We fix such a pair σ, m for the remainder of this section and proceed to show the existence of a function $f = f_A \in K$ such that

$$(139) \quad \mathbb{E} \|f - A(\tilde{y}(f))\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq c\varepsilon,$$

which will complete the proof of the lower bound.

To produce such a function $f \in K$ satisfying (139), we proceed in a way, similar to the proof of lower bounds for the entropy of K . We want to produce a family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_N\} \subset K$ of functions with N large such that $\|f_i - f_j\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq \varepsilon$. We recall that the entropy numbers $\varepsilon_\ell(K)_{L_q(\Omega)}$, $\ell \geq 1$, of K are known to satisfy $\varepsilon_\ell(K)_{L_q(\Omega)} \asymp \ell^{-\frac{s}{d}}$, $\ell \geq 1$, see [4]. This means that for each integer $\ell \geq 1$, there is a set of 2^ℓ functions g_1, \dots, g_{2^ℓ} all from K such that

$$(140) \quad \|g_i - g_j\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq c\ell^{-\frac{s}{d}}, \quad i \neq j = 1, \dots, 2^\ell.$$

We now define n as the smallest integer such that

$$(141) \quad n^{-s} \leq \varepsilon,$$

and describe the construction of $\mathcal{F} := \{f_1, \dots, f_N\}$. We refer the reader to §12 of [4], where a similar construction is given in detail. Let $\phi \in C_c^\infty([0, 1]^d)$ be a fixed smooth and compactly supported function on the unit cube $[0, 1]^d$ with $\|\phi\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} = 1$ and $M := \|\phi\|_{B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega))}$ finite. It follows that $\phi \geq c$ on a set of positive measure, and therefore

$$(142) \quad \|\phi\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq c.$$

Consider a uniform (tensor product) subdivision of Ω into n^d cubes Q_1, \dots, Q_P , $P := n^d$ of side length $1/n$, where n is given by (141). We define the functions

$$(143) \quad \phi_i(x) = \gamma n^{-s} \phi(n(x - z_i)), \quad i = 1, \dots, P,$$

where z_i is the bottom left corner of the cube Q_i and the normalizing constant γ defined momentarily. Thus, each ϕ_i is a rescaling of ϕ to the cube Q_i and each ϕ_i has $L_\infty(\Omega)$ norm equal to γn^{-s} .

To construct our collection of functions \mathcal{F} , we need a well known combinatorial lemma (see for instance Lemma 2.2 in Chapter 15 in [28]) stating that there is a subset $S \subset \{\pm 1\}^P$ such that:

1. $|S| \geq 2^{cP}$
2. $\|\kappa - \nu\|_{\ell^1} \geq cP$ for any $\kappa \neq \nu$ with $\kappa, \nu \in S$.

We then consider

$$(144) \quad \mathcal{F} = \left\{ f = \sum_{i=1}^P \kappa_i \phi_i : \kappa = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_P) \in S \right\},$$

and define

$$(145) \quad N := \#(\mathcal{F}) \geq 2^{cP} = 2^{cn^d}.$$

Note that if the normalizing constant γ is small enough (depending only on p, q, s and τ), we can guarantee that $\mathcal{F} \subset K$. This now fixes γ .

There are N functions f_1, \dots, f_N in \mathcal{F} and each has $L_\infty(\Omega)$ norm at most $c_0 \gamma \varepsilon$ for a fixed constant c_0 . Additionally, if $i \neq j$ then the vectors κ giving the sign pattern for f_i and ν giving the sign pattern for f_j will differ in at least cP coordinates, that is, $|\kappa_\ell - \nu_\ell| = 2$ for at least cP coordinates. This gives (see (142)) that

$$(146) \quad \|f_i - f_j\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq c_0 \gamma \varepsilon, \quad i \neq j.$$

We also need a bound on the values of the f_i at the m data sites. Since $\|f_i\|_{L_\infty(\Omega)} \leq \gamma n^{-s}$ and from (141), we have that $y(f_i) = (f(x_1), \dots, f(x_m))$ satisfies

$$(147) \quad \|y(f_i)\| \leq C_0 \gamma \sqrt{m} \varepsilon, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^m . Notice that

$$(148) \quad \sigma^{-2} m \varepsilon^2 = \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{2s}{2s+d}-1} = \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{-d}{2s+d}} = \varepsilon^{-d/s} \asymp n^d \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sqrt{m} \varepsilon \asymp \sigma n^{d/2},$$

and therefore the bound (147) can be equivalently written as

$$(149) \quad \|y(f_i)\| \leq C_1 \gamma \sigma n^{d/2} = C_1 \sigma \gamma \sqrt{\ln N}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where the constant C_1 depends only on p, q, s and τ , which are of course fixed.

Combining all of this, by choosing γ appropriately small (but fixed depending only upon p, q, s and τ), we can guarantee that $\mathcal{F} \subset K$, $\|f_i - f_j\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq \tilde{c}_0 \varepsilon$ for $i \neq j$, and

$$(150) \quad \|y(f_i)\| < \sigma \sqrt{\ln(N/5)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

We proceed now to show that given any algorithm $A : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow L_q(\Omega)$, there is a function $f \in K$ that satisfies (139). For this purpose, we consider the sets

$$(151) \quad B_i = A^{-1} \left(\left\{ g \in L_q(\Omega) : \|f_i - g\|_{L_q(\Omega)} < \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{2} \varepsilon \right\} \right) \subset \mathbb{R}^m, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Obviously, the sets B_i are disjoint due to the fact that the f_i are separated by at least $\tilde{c}_0\epsilon$. For $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\sigma > 0$, and $B \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, we introduce the notation

$$(152) \quad \mu_{y,\sigma}(B) := \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{m/2}} \int_B e^{-\|z-y\|^2/2\sigma^2} dz$$

for the measure of the set B under a Gaussian centered at y with variance σ^2 .

Since the sets B_i are disjoint, it follows that for some i we must have

$$(153) \quad \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{m/2}} \int_{B_i} e^{-\|z\|^2/2\sigma^2} dz = \mu_{0,\sigma}(B_i) \leq \frac{1}{N}.$$

We fix such a value of i . We can now show that the function f_i satisfies (139). The proof of this fact is typically completed in the statistics literature via a proper comparison between a Gaussian centered at 0 and a Gaussian centered at $y(f_i)$. Such a comparison is provided by using the KL-divergence. For the reader's convenience, in case they are not familiar with these concepts, we state and explicitly prove the following lemma.

LEMMA 6.1. *Suppose that $\sigma > 0$, $0 < \bar{\alpha} < 1/5$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\|y\|^2 < -\sigma^2 \ln(5\bar{\alpha})$. If $B \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is a measurable set satisfying*

$$(154) \quad \mu_{0,\sigma}(B) = \bar{\alpha},$$

then

$$(155) \quad \mu_{y,\sigma}(B) < \frac{1}{2}.$$

We give a measure-theoretic proof of this lemma in Appendix A.4. Using this lemma, we complete the proof of (139) as follows. We take for B the set B_i which satisfies $\mu_{0,\sigma}(B_i) \leq 1/N$. We know that the vector $y(f_i)$ satisfies

$$(156) \quad \|y(f_i)\|^2 < \sigma^2 \ln(N/5).$$

Applying the lemma with $\bar{\alpha} = 1/N$, we find that

$$(157) \quad \mu_{y(f_i),\sigma}(B_i) < 1/2.$$

This means that

$$(158) \quad \mu_{y(f_i),\sigma}(B_i^c) > 1/2.$$

For any $y \in B_i^c$, we have $\|f_i - A(y)\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{2}\epsilon$. It follows that

$$(159) \quad \mathbb{E}\|f_i - A(\tilde{y}(f_i))\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq \mu_{y(f_i),\sigma}(B_i^c) \cdot \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{2}\epsilon > \frac{\tilde{c}_0}{4}\epsilon.$$

This completes the proof of (139) and thereby proves Theorem 1.3. \square

7. Proof of Theorem 1.4. The lower bound in Theorem 1.4 follows from Theorem 1.3. To prove the upper bound, we fix the parameters s, p, q from the primary region. Let

$$(160) \quad M := C m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} \quad \text{and} \quad M^* := C \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}},$$

with C the constant in Theorem 1.1. We then have for every $f \in K$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq t) dt \leq M + \int_M^\infty \mathbb{P}(\|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq t) dt \\
&= M + M^* \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(\|f - \hat{f}\|_{L_q(\Omega)} \geq M + M^*t) dt \\
(161) \quad &\leq M + CM^* \int_0^\infty e^{-ct^\alpha} dt \leq C \left(m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} + \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right]^{\frac{s}{2s+d}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Theorem 1.1. This completes the proof in the case when $\sigma^2 \leq m$. If $\sigma^2 > m$, one can just take the algorithm to be $Ay = 0$ for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$. In this case, the error is always bounded by a constant since K embeds into $L_\infty(\Omega)$. \square

8. Concluding Remarks. The goal of this paper was to merge the optimal recovery and minimax theories for error measured in $L_q(\Omega)$, $\Omega = (0, 1)^d$, $1 \leq q < \infty$, for model classes K that are the unit ball of Besov spaces. We accomplished this goal by proving upper and lower bounds in Theorem 1.4 for $R_m(K, \sigma)_q$ in which the constants do not depend on either σ or m . As part of meeting this goal, we have given performance results in probability which are stronger than those in expectation. Our algorithm for accomplishing these results is also interesting in that it uses only piecewise polynomial approximation and not wavelets. This should be useful in extending our results to more general domains Ω .

The above analysis of upper bounds on performance of learning algorithms in probability or expectations was carried out for Besov classes when the parameters are in the primary region (see (11)). We restricted our analysis to this case in order to keep the presentation as simple as possible. A similar analysis can be carried out when the parameters are outside the primary region. We do not give the details in this case but mention the form of the results.

REMARK 8.1. Let $K = U(B_\tau^s(L_p(\Omega)))$ with $s > d/p$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. Outside of the primary regime (see (11)), one can use the techniques of this paper to prove that if $\sigma^2 \leq m/2$, then

$$(162) \quad R(K, \sigma)_q \asymp \left\{ m^{-\frac{s}{d} + (\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q})_+} + \left(\log(m/\sigma^2) \left[\frac{\sigma^2}{m} \right] \right)^{\frac{(s/d + 1/q - 1/p)}{(1 + 2(s/d - 1/p))}} \right\},$$

see, for comparison, [9, 30].

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Peter Binev, Albert Cohen, Wolfgang Dahmen, and Ryan Tibshirani for valuable conversations about the material in this paper.

Funding. This research was supported in part by the NSF grants DMS-2134077 and DMS-2134140 of the NSF MoDL program (RD, RN, and GP), NSF grant DMS-2424305 (JS), and the ONR MURI grant N00014-20-1-2787 (RD, RN, GP, and JS).

REFERENCES

- [1] BARRON, A., BIRGÉ, L. and MASSART, P. (1999). Risk bounds for model selection via penalization. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **113** 301–413.
- [2] BINEV, P., COHEN, A., DAHMEN, W., DEVORE, R., TEMLYAKOV, V. and BARTLETT, P. (2005). Universal algorithms for learning theory. Part I: Piecewise constant functions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **6**.
- [3] BINEV, P., COHEN, A., DAHMEN, W. and DEVORE, R. (2007). Universal algorithms for learning theory. Part II: Piecewise polynomial functions. *Constructive Approximation* **26** 127–152.

- [4] BONITO, A., DEVORE, R., PETROVA, G. and SIEGEL, J. W. (2024). Convergence and error control of consistent PINNs for elliptic PDEs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09217*.
- [5] CHAMBOLLE, A., DEVORE, R. A., LEE, N.-Y. and LUCIER, B. J. (1998). Nonlinear wavelet image processing: Variational problems, compression, and noise removal through wavelet shrinkage. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* **7** 319–335.
- [6] CHAUDHURI, P., HUANG, M.-C., LOH, W.-Y. and YAO, R. (1994). Piecewise-polynomial regression trees. *Statistica Sinica* 143–167.
- [7] COHEN, A., DAHMEN, W. and DEVORE, R. (2000). Multiscale decompositions on bounded domains. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **352** 3651–3685.
- [8] COHEN, A., DAUBECHIES, I. and VIAL, P. (1993). Wavelets and fast wavelet transforms on the interval. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* **1** 54–81.
- [9] DELYON, B. and JUDITSKY, A. (1996). On minimax wavelet estimators. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis* **3** 215–228.
- [10] DEVORE, R. and LORENTZ, G. (1993). *Constructive Approximation. Grundlehren, Springer Verlag (Berlin), Vol. 303*. Springer, Berlin.
- [11] DEVORE, R. A. and POPOV, V. A. (1988). Interpolation of Besov spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **305** 397–414.
- [12] DEVORE, R. and SHARPLEY, R. (1984). Maximal Functions Measuring Smoothness. *Memoirs of the AMS* **293**.
- [13] DEVORE, R. A. and SHARPLEY, R. C. (1993). Besov spaces on domains in \mathbb{R}^d . *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **335** 843–864.
- [14] DONOHO, D. L. and JOHNSTONE, I. M. (1994a). Ideal spatial adaptation by wavelet shrinkage. *Biometrika* **81** 425–455.
- [15] DONOHO, D. L. and JOHNSTONE, I. M. (1994b). Minimax risk over l_p -balls for l_q -error. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **99** 277–303.
- [16] DONOHO, D. L. and JOHNSTONE, I. M. (1998). Minimax estimation via wavelet shrinkage. *Annals of Statistics* **26** 879–921.
- [17] DONOHO, D. L., LIU, R. C. and MACGIBBON, B. (1990). Minimax risk over hyperrectangles, and implications. *Annals of Statistics* 1416–1437.
- [18] DONOHO, D. L., JOHNSTONE, I. M., KERKYACHARIAN, G. and PICARD, D. (1995). Wavelet shrinkage: asymptopia? *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* **57** 301–337.
- [19] DONOHO, D. L., JOHNSTONE, I. M., KERKYACHARIAN, G. and PICARD, D. (1996). Density estimation by wavelet thresholding. *Annals of Statistics* 508–539.
- [20] GINÉ, E. and NICKL, R. (2016). *Mathematical Foundations of Infinite-Dimensional Statistical Models. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press.
- [21] GUO, Y., WENG, H. and MALEKI, A. (2024). Signal-to-Noise Ratio Aware Minimaxity and Higher-Order Asymptotics. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **70** 3538–3566.
- [22] HÄRDLE, W., KERKYACHARIAN, G., PICARD, D. and TSYBAKOV, A. (2012). *Wavelets, approximation, and statistical applications* **129**. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [23] JOHNSTONE, I. M. (1999). Wavelets and the theory of non-parametric function estimation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **357** 2475–2493.
- [24] KERKYACHARIAN, G. and PICARD, D. (2000). Thresholding algorithms, maxisets and well-concentrated bases. *Test* **9** 283–344. With comments, and a rejoinder by the authors.
- [25] KERKYACHARIAN, G. and PICARD, D. (2002). Minimax or maxisets? *Bernoulli* **8** 219 – 253.
- [26] KOLACZYK, E. D. and NOWAK, R. D. (2005). Multiscale generalised linear models for nonparametric function estimation. *Biometrika* **92** 119–133.
- [27] KRIEG, D., NOVAK, E. and SONNLEITNER, M. (2022). Recovery of Sobolev functions restricted to iid sampling. *Mathematics of Computation* **91** 2715–2738.
- [28] LORENTZ, G. G., GOLITSCHER, M. and MAKOVZOV, Y. (1996). *Constructive Approximation: Advanced Problems. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [29] MA, T., VERCHAND, K. A. and SAMWORTH, R. J. (2024). High-probability minimax lower bounds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13447*.
- [30] NEMIROVSKI, A. (2000). Topics in Non-Parametric Statistics. *Ecole d’Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour*.
- [31] NOVAK, E. and TRIEBEL, H. (2006). Function spaces in Lipschitz domains and optimal rates of convergence for sampling. *Constructive approximation* **23** 325–350.
- [32] STOROZHENKO, E. A. and OSWALD, P. (1978). Jackson’s theorem in the spaces $L_p(R^k)$, $0 < p < 1$. *Siberian Mathematical Journal* **19** 630–656.
- [33] VYBIRAL, J. (2007). Sampling numbers and function spaces. *Journal of Complexity* **23** 773–792.
- [34] YANG, Y. and BARRON, A. (1999). Information-theoretic determination of minimax rates of convergence. *Annals of Statistics* 1564–1599.

APPENDIX

A.1. Proof of Lemma 2.1. All of the (quasi-)norms appearing in the statement of the lemma are equivalent because they are (quasi-)norms on \mathcal{P}_r . Indeed, if $\|\cdot\|$ is any of these (quasi-)norms, we have $\|Q\| = 0$ for $Q \in \mathcal{P}_r$ if and only if Q is the zero polynomial. Thus, the only issue to be addressed is to prove that the constants appearing in these equivalences can be chosen to depend only on the dimension of the space \mathcal{P}_r and q_0 and not on q, I or N , once $N^d > \rho$. The fact that the constants do not depend on I is a simple matter of rescaling which we do not discuss further. So in proving the lemma, we can assume that $I = \Omega = (0, 1)^d$.

It is well known, see for instance (3.1) in [13], that the (quasi-)norms in (i) (which do not depend on N) are all uniformly equivalent for different values of $q \geq q_0$. Similarly, the (quasi-)norms in (iii) are all uniformly equivalent for different values of $q \geq q_0$ (since these (quasi-)norms are simply on \mathbb{R}^ρ and ρ is fixed), and hence equivalent to the $q = 2$ norm. From the orthogonality, it follows that the norms in (ii) and (iii) are equal when $q = 2$.

We will complete the proof by showing that (i) and (ii) are equivalent (uniformly in $q \geq q_0$ and $N^d > \rho$). We denote the cubes in the grid Λ_I by J and their collection by \mathcal{J}_N . For each $J \in \mathcal{J}_N$, we denote by x_J the lower left corner of J . If $Q \in \mathcal{P}_r$, we define

$$S_N(Q) := \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}_N} Q(x_J) \chi_J,$$

where χ_J is the characteristic function of J . Then, S is a piecewise constant function. From Markov's inequality for polynomials, if $Q \in \mathcal{P}_r$, we have

$$|Q(x) - Q(x_J)| \leq C(r)N^{-1}\|Q\|_{L_\infty(I)} \leq C(r)N^{-1}\|Q\|_{L_q(I)}, \quad x \in J.$$

Here we note that the constant $C(r)$ can be chosen uniformly in $q_0 \leq q \leq \infty$. Therefore, we have

$$\|Q - Q(x_J)\|_{L_q(J)} \leq C(r)\|Q\|_{L_q(I)}N^{-1}|J|^{1/q}, \quad J \in \mathcal{J}_N,$$

and hence

$$\|Q - S_N(Q)\|_{L_q(I)} \leq C(r)\|Q\|_{L_q(I)}N^{-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\left| \|Q\|_{L_q(I)} - \|S_N(Q)\|_{L_q(I)} \right| \leq C(r)\|Q\|_{L_q(I)}N^{-1}.$$

We now choose N_0 so that $C(r)N_0^{-1} \leq 1/2$. Then, for $N \geq N_0$, we obtain the equivalency of $\|S_N(Q)\|_{L_q(I)}$ with $\|Q\|_{L_q(I)}$ with fixed equivalency constants. This gives the equivalency of $\|(Q(x_j))\|_{\ell_q}^*$ and $\|Q\|_{L_q(I)}^*$ since

$$\|S_N(Q)\|_{L_q(I)} = \|(Q(x_j))\|_{\ell_q}^* \text{ and } \|Q\|_{L_q(I)} = \|Q\|_{L_q(I)}^*.$$

On the other hand, we have the equivalency of the (quasi-)norms with $N \leq N_0$ with fixed equivalency constants because there are only a finite number of them. The uniformity in $q_0 \leq q \leq \infty$ is obtained because the constants of equivalence are continuous functions of $1/q$ for fixed N , and hence these constants achieve a finite maximum on the compact interval $[0, 1/q_0]$. In summary, we obtain that all the (quasi-)norms in (i) and (ii) are equivalent on \mathcal{P}_r with equivalency constants only depending on r .

Finally, let us use the norm in (i) with $q = \infty$ and the norm in (iii) with $q = 2$, for $Q = Q_{I,j}$, $j = 1, \dots, \rho$ (recall the $Q_{I,j}$'s form an orthonormal basis for \mathcal{P}_r in the Hilbert space $L_2(\mu_I)$). We have shown that these two norms are equivalent, from which we obtain that

$$1 \asymp \|Q_{I,j}\|_{L_\infty(I)},$$

which proves (41). □

A.2. Proof of Lemma 4.4. Note that if $a < 1$, there is nothing to prove. For $a \geq 1$, the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^\infty t^q e^{-t^2/2} dt &= \int_a^\infty (t^{q-1} e^{-t^2/4})(te^{-t^2/4}) dt \\ &\leq \left(\max_{t \geq 1} t^{q-1} e^{-t^2/4} \right) \int_a^\infty te^{-t^2/4} dt \leq C_q e^{-a^2/4}. \end{aligned}$$

□

A.3. Proof of Lemma 5.4. First, let us observe that

$$(163) \quad \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{ak} e^{-c2^{bk}\tau} \leq \sum_{k \geq 0} 2^{a_0 k} e^{-c2^{b_0 k}\tau}, \quad \tau \geq 1.$$

Note that there is a $\bar{k} = \bar{k}(a_0, b_0, c)$ such that

$$(164) \quad a_0 k \leq \frac{c}{2}(2^{b_0 k} - 1), \quad k \geq \bar{k}.$$

Hence, we have

$$(165) \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\bar{k}} 2^{a_0 k} e^{-c2^{b_0 k}\tau} \leq e^{-c\tau} \sum_{k=0}^{\bar{k}} 2^{a_0 k} \leq C(a_0, b_0, c) e^{-c\tau},$$

and

$$(166) \quad \sum_{k > \bar{k}} 2^{a_0 k} e^{-c2^{b_0 k}\tau} \leq e^{-c\tau} \sum_{k > \bar{k}} 2^{a_0 k} e^{-c(2^{b_0 k} - 1)\tau} \leq e^{-c\tau} \sum_{k > \bar{k}} e^{-\frac{c}{2}(2^{b_0 k} - 1)} \leq C(a_0, b_0, c) e^{-c\tau},$$

where we have used the definition of \bar{k} and the fact that $\tau \geq 1$. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

A.4. Proof of Lemma 6.1. We denote by

$$(167) \quad \bar{\beta} := \mu_{y, \sigma}(B) := \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{m/2}} \int_B e^{-\|x-y\|^2/2\sigma^2} dx,$$

and will show that $\bar{\beta} < \frac{1}{2}$. Observe that

$$(168) \quad 1 - \bar{\alpha} = \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{m/2}} \int_{B^c} e^{-\|x\|^2/2\sigma^2} dx, \quad 1 - \bar{\beta} = \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{RR2}} \int_{B^c} e^{-\|x-y\|^2/2\sigma^2} dx.$$

Since

$$(169) \quad \|y\|^2 = \|x\|^2 - \|x-y\|^2 - 2\langle x-y, y \rangle,$$

and $\langle z, y \rangle$ is an odd function of z , we have

$$(170) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\|y\|^2}{2\sigma^2} &= \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{m/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (\|x\|^2 - \|x-y\|^2) e^{-\|x-y\|^2/2\sigma^2} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{m/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} -\ln \left(\frac{\exp(-\|x\|^2/2\sigma^2)}{\exp(-\|x-y\|^2/2\sigma^2)} \right) e^{-\|x-y\|^2/2\sigma^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

We divide the last integral into integrals over the sets B and B^c and use Jensen's inequality and the convexity of $(-\ln x)$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|y\|^2}{2\sigma^2} &= \bar{\beta} \int_B -\ln \left(\frac{\exp(-\|x\|^2/2\sigma^2)}{\exp(-\|x-y\|^2/2\sigma^2)} \right) \frac{e^{-\|x-y\|^2/2\sigma^2}}{(2\pi\sigma)^{m/2}\bar{\beta}} dx \\
&\quad + (1-\bar{\beta}) \int_{B^c} -\ln \left(\frac{\exp(-\|x\|^2/2\sigma^2)}{\exp(-\|x-y\|^2/2\sigma^2)} \right) \frac{e^{-\|x-y\|^2/2\sigma^2}}{(2\pi\sigma)^{m/2}(1-\bar{\beta})} dx \\
(171) \quad &\geq -\bar{\beta} \ln \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\beta}} \right) - (1-\bar{\beta}) \ln \left(\frac{1-\bar{\alpha}}{1-\bar{\beta}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now, if $\bar{\beta} \geq 1/2$, we will show that $\|y\|^2 \geq -\sigma^2 \ln(5\bar{\alpha})$ which would contradict the assumptions of the lemma.

Note that the first term above is lower bounded by

$$(172) \quad -\bar{\beta} \ln \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\bar{\beta}} \right) \geq -\frac{1}{2} \ln(2\bar{\alpha}).$$

On the other hand, the second term is lower bounded by

$$(173) \quad -(1-\bar{\beta}) \ln \left(\frac{1-\bar{\alpha}}{1-\bar{\beta}} \right) \geq (1-\bar{\beta}) \ln(1-\bar{\beta}) \geq \min_{0 < t < 1} \{t \ln(t)\} = -e^{-1}.$$

We use these bounds in (171) to obtain that

$$(174) \quad \|y\|^2 \geq -\sigma^2 [\ln(2\bar{\alpha}) + 2e^{-1}] = -\sigma^2 \ln(2e^{2/e}\bar{\alpha}) \geq -\sigma^2 \log(5\bar{\alpha}),$$

and this completes the proof of the lemma. \square