

Minmax Trend Filtering: A Locally Adaptive Nonparametric Regression Method via Pointwise Min Max Optimization

Sabyasachi Chatterjee

Department of Statistics, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign

October 7, 2024

Abstract

Trend Filtering is a nonparametric regression method which exhibits local adaptivity, in contrast to a host of classical linear smoothing methods. However, there seems to be no unanimously agreed upon definition of local adaptivity in the literature. A question we seek to answer here is how exactly is Fused Lasso or Total Variation Denoising, which is Trend Filtering of order 0, locally adaptive? To answer this question, we first derive a new pointwise formula for the Fused Lasso estimator in terms of min-max/max-min optimization of penalized local averages. This pointwise representation appears to be new and gives a concrete explanation of the local adaptivity of Fused Lasso. It yields that the estimation error of Fused Lasso at any given point is bounded by the best (local) bias variance tradeoff where bias and variance have a slightly different meaning than usual. We then propose higher order polynomial versions of Fused Lasso which are defined pointwise in terms of min-max/max-min optimization of penalized local polynomial regressions. These appear to be new nonparametric regression methods, different from any existing method in the nonparametric regression toolbox. We call these estimators Minmax Trend Filtering. They continue to enjoy the notion of local adaptivity in the sense that their estimation error at any given point is bounded by the best (local) bias variance tradeoff.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Nonparametric Regression is a classical and fundamental problem in Statistics; see [Györfi et al. \(2002\)](#), [Wasserman \(2006\)](#), [Tsybakov \(2009\)](#) for an introduction to the subject. The standard setup is to assume that data comes from a model

$$y_i = f^*(x_i) + \epsilon_i.$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Here, $f^* : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an unknown function to be estimated on some domain X , referred to as the regression function; $x_i \in X$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are design points, which can either be fixed or modelled as random variables; $\epsilon_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are random errors, usually assumed

to be i.i.d with zero mean; and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are referred to as response points.

In this article, we study specific *locally adaptive* nonparametric regression methods in the univariate setting. Throughout, we will work under the sequence model which corresponds to fixed design regression/signal denoising. This is standard practice in the theoretical study of nonparametric regression. Specifically, we will consider the model

$$y = \theta^* + \epsilon$$

where $y_{n \times 1}$ is the data vector, θ^* is the true signal to be estimated and ϵ is a noise vector consisting of mean 0, i.i.d entries. One can imagine that θ^* corresponds to the evaluations of the regression function f^* on a sorted set of design points.

There are lots of existing methods in the nonparametric regression toolbox. Classical nonparametric regression methods such as Kernel Smoothing, Local Polynomial Regression [Tsybakov \(2009\)](#), Regression Splines, Smoothing Splines [De Boor and De Boor \(1978\)](#), [Green and Silverman \(1993\)](#), [Wahba \(1990\)](#), RKHS methods [Smola and Schölkopf \(1998\)](#) all fall under the class of linear smoothers. Linear smoothers are estimators which are linear functions of the data, produce fitted values $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_n)$ of the form $\hat{\theta} = S^{(\lambda)}y$ for some smoothing matrix $S^{(\lambda)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ depending on the design points and a tuning parameter λ . Linear smoothers also enjoy good estimation properties, for example, these linear smoothers are known to be minimax rate optimal among the classically studied Holder smooth function classes if the tuning parameter is chosen optimally (depending on the smoothness class); see Section 1.6.1 of [Tsybakov \(2009\)](#).

In spite of its apparent conceptual simplicity and good estimation properties, linear smoothers do have their limitations. One major drawback of these linear smoothers is that they are not *locally adaptive*. Intuitively, this means that if the true regression function f^* is smooth in one part and wiggly in another part of the domain, linear smoothers cannot adapt to the different local levels of smoothness exhibited by f^* over the domain. Ideally, a locally adaptive estimator should be able to estimate the regression function at an optimal rate at each location of the domain where the optimal rate depends on some notion of local smoothness of f^* at that point. If the underlying regression function f has heterogenous levels of smoothness over its domain, then linear smoothers will have trouble estimating f optimally throughout, in a mathematically precise sense; see [Donoho and Johnstone \(1998\)](#), [Sadhanala et al. \(2016\)](#), [Sadhanala et al. \(2017\)](#).

Aimed at remedying this lack of local adaptivity of linear smoothers, locally adaptive regression splines (LARS) was proposed; see [Koenker et al. \(1994\)](#), [Mammen and van de Geer \(1997\)](#). The main idea here is to perform penalized least squares by penalizing the ℓ_1 norm of a given order derivative of the fitted function. This is in contrast to classical smoothing splines which penalize the squared ℓ_2 norm of a given order derivative. Infact, the idea of using ℓ_1 penalization for nonparametric estimation goes back to the classic paper of [Rudin et al. \(1992\)](#) which proposed the famous 2D Total Variation Denoising method for image denoising. The papers [Koenker et al. \(1994\)](#), [Mammen and van de Geer \(1997\)](#), [Rudin et al. \(1992\)](#) are notable early examples of the success story of ℓ_1 penalization.

Years later, Trend Filtering (TF), was developed in the optimization community; [Steidl et al. \(2006\)](#), [Kim et al. \(2009\)](#). TF can be seen to be a discrete analog of LARS. TF was then studied thoroughly from a statistical and computational perspective; see [Tibshirani \(2014\)](#). It was argued there that TF can be thought of as a computationally efficient approximation to LARS and yet retains its local adaptivity properties. TF has been studied extensively in recent years from several

angles; e.g. see [Tibshirani \(2020\)](#), [Guntuboyina et al. \(2020\)](#), [Ortelli and van de Geer \(2021\)](#) and references therein.

There seems to be three broad, necessarily nonlinear, approaches to producing locally adaptive nonparametric regression methods. The first is penalized least squares with sparsity promoting penalties such as ℓ_1 or even ℓ_0 type penalties. LARS and TF fall under the ℓ_1 penalization approach. Jump penalized least squares [Boysen et al. \(2009\)](#) or Dyadic CART [Donoho \(1997\)](#), [Chatterjee and Goswami \(2021\)](#) fall under the ℓ_0 penalization approach.

The second approach is to perform Wavelet smoothing [Mallat \(1999\)](#), [Johnstone \(2015\)](#). Wavelet basis functions display spatially localized smoothness at different locations in the input domain. Wavelet smoothing attains local adaptivity by selecting a sparse number of wavelet basis functions, by thresholding the coefficients from a basis regression. However, it appears that Wavelet smoothing does suffer from certain practical shortcomings; e.g it is argued in [Tibshirani \(2014\)](#) that it requires evenly spaced inputs and n to be power of 2, and there are often further assumptions made about the behavior of the fitted function at the boundaries of the input domain.

The third approach is to perform variable bandwidth kernel smoothing. Lepski’s method, which originated in the seminal paper [Lepskii \(1991\)](#), is a procedure for selecting a local bandwidth in kernel smoothing. Since its introduction, many papers have studied and generalized Lepski’s method; see the survey [Lepski \(2022\)](#) and references therein. It appears that it is hard to successfully use these methods in practice since there are effectively many tuning parameters to set.

In this article, we focus on the first approach of ℓ_1 penalization; specifically focussing on Trend Filtering. We revisit and investigate the local adaptivity of Trend Filtering of order 0.

1.2 Existing Notions of Local Adaptivity

Although the meaning of local adaptivity is perhaps intuitively clear, there seems to be no mathematically precise and universally agreed upon definition given in the literature. However, in order to certify local adaptivity of nonlinear methods such as LARS, Trend Filtering and Wavelet Smoothing, the main theoretical characteristic that is typically used seems to be minimax rate optimality over a spatially heterogenous function class. As far as we are aware, two types of function classes are typically used to justify local adaptivity of Trend Filtering; these are

- *Bounded Variation Function Classes*: LARS and TF (of a given order, with proper tuning) are known to be minimax rate optimal over the class of bounded variation (BV) (of a given order) functions; see e.g. [Tibshirani \(2014\)](#), [Guntuboyina et al. \(2020\)](#), [Ortelli and van de Geer \(2021\)](#). BV functions can be extremely spatially heterogenous and allows for differing levels of smoothness in different parts of the domain. It is also known that no linear smoother can be minimax rate optimal over this class and they attain strictly slower rates; see [Tibshirani \(2014\)](#), [Sadhanala et al. \(2021\)](#) and references therein. The fact that nonlinear smoothers such as LARS and TF are provably better than linear smoothers for bounded variation functions is used to justify the local adaptivity enjoyed by these nonlinear smoothers.
- *Piecewise Polynomial Function Classes*: TF (of a given order, with proper tuning) is known to attain near parametric rates $\tilde{O}(\frac{k}{n})$ for piecewise polynomial (discrete splines of the given degree) functions (under mild assumptions) with k pieces; adaptively over all $k \geq 1$. This is a sign of

local adaptivity in the sense that this is a function class exhibiting heterogenous smoothness. There are knots/discontinuities in a given order derivative of the regression function. The rate $\widetilde{O}(\frac{k}{n})$ is minimax rate optimal among the class of k piece polynomial functions and is the same rate (without a log factor) that would have been obtained by an oracle estimator which knows the locations of the change points/knots. Infact, these two notions of local adaptivity are related. A slightly stronger notion (appropriate oracle risk bounds) of this minimax rate optimality property over piecewise polynomial function classes implies minimax rate optimality over BV function classes; see the argument given in the proof of Theorem 5.1 in [Chatterjee and Goswami \(2021\)](#).

1.3 Motivating the Study of Pointwise Estimation Errors

Both the above existing notions of local adaptivity are minimax rate optimality over spatially heterogenous function classes measured in terms of the expected mean squared error (MSE). The MSE is a global notion of error; summing up the squared estimation errors at every location. However, *using global error bounds to justify local adaptivity seems slightly unsatisfying. Ideally, local estimation error bounds which reveal the dependence of the estimation error on some notion of local smoothness of f^* would perhaps be a better way of explaining local adaptivity of a nonparametric regression estimator.* This motivates the following questions.

Questions: Can we understand the estimation error $\widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i^*$ at every point $i \in [n]$ for a locally adaptive nonparametric regression method $\widehat{\theta}$? Can we understand how this estimation error at point i depends on a notion of local smoothness of θ^* at i , thereby revealing/explaining the local adaptivity of $\widehat{\theta}$?

A major focus of this paper is the (univariate) Total Variation Denoising (TVD) estimator, also called the Fused Lasso (FL) estimator. It is perhaps one of the simplest locally adaptive nonparametric regression method and is the simplest instance (0th order) of Trend Filtering. We start by investigating the above posed questions for the TVD estimator. Along the way, we will put forward a new pointwise representation of the TVD estimator, revealing a notion of local adaptivity that is stronger than (implies) both the above notions described in the previous section. We will also propose a new class of nonparametric regression estimators (generalizing Fused Lasso but different from higher order Trend Filtering) which will enjoy similar pointwise representation and local adaptivity.

1.3.1 Pointwise Representations for Locally Adaptive Methods

Unlike linear smoothers, for existing locally adaptive estimators such as Trend Filtering and others it is often hard to give a pointwise representation, that is we cannot write the fitted value at a point explicitly. This is because these estimators are defined as a non linear solution of a convex optimization problem. In contrast, pointwise representation of linear smoothers make them arguably simpler to analyze mathematically. Thus, *the question arises whether we can develop nonparametric regression estimators which are both locally adaptive and also enjoy pointwise representation?* One overarching contribution of this article is to answer the above question in the affirmative.

1.4 Main Contributions of this Article

- We give a pointwise formula for the TVD/Fused Lasso estimator; i.e, we write the Fused Lasso fit at every point explicitly as a minmax/maxmin of penalized local averages. In spite of a long history and substantial literature on analyzing Fused Lasso, this pointwise formula is new and we believe that it gives a new perspective on Fused Lasso.
- We propose higher degree polynomial generalizations of Fused Lasso via the pointwise minmax/maxmin representation developed here. These estimators are in general different from Trend Filtering of order $r \geq 1$. Tentatively, we call these estimators Minmax Trend Filtering. These estimators appear to be new and combine the strengths of linear and nonlinear smoothers by admitting a pointwise representation and by being locally adaptive. In this way, we bring forward pointwise minmax/maxmin optimization as another way to perform locally adaptive nonparametric regression.
- We give pointwise estimation errors for Fused Lasso and Minmax Trend Filtering (of any order $r \geq 1$) which is clearly interpretable as a tradeoff of (local) bias + (local) standard error. The optimal tradeoff of (local) bias + (local) standard error can be regarded as a measure of local smoothness of the underlying regression function. We believe that our pointwise estimation error bound gives a new perspective on the local adaptivity of the TVD/Fused Lasso estimator and its higher degree generalizations proposed here.
- We show that the notion of (local) bias and (local) standard error tradeoff developed here is a stronger notion than the existing minimax rate optimality notions of local adaptivity usually cited for Trend Filtering; discussed in Section 1.2. We show that our pointwise error bounds imply that the Minmax Trend Filtering estimators proposed in this article satisfies these minimax rate optimality properties as well.
- The proof technique is arguably simpler; does not rely on local entropy bounds as in [Guntuboyina et al. \(2020\)](#) or the notion of interpolating vectors as in [Ortelli and van de Geer \(2021\)](#). Moreover, our estimation error bounds have a very clean dependence on the tuning parameter λ . It very clearly reveals what choice of λ should we make.
- Computation of the Minmax Filtering method can be slow, it takes $O(n^5)$ basic computations. We discuss natural ways of making the algorithm faster. We give a near linear time version of the Minmax Filtering method which only searches over dyadic intervals and has computational complexity $O(n(\log n)^4)$ while maintaining a similar pointwise (local) bias plus (local) standard error tradeoff.
- To illustrate the scope of our proof technique and the developed pointwise bound, we give bounds for the estimation error of Minmax Trend Filtering at the boundary. To the best of our knowledge, such boundary error bounds are not available for Trend Filtering. Our bounds show that with a proper choice of the tuning parameter, Minmax Trend Filtering can be rate adaptively consistent at the boundary.

1.5 Notations

We will use $[n]$ to denote the set of positive integers $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $[a : b]$ to denote the set of positive integers $\{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$. We will call I an interval of $[n]$ if $I = [a : b]$ for some positive integers $1 \leq a \leq b \leq n$. We will denote by $|I|$ the cardinality of I . Let us denote by \mathcal{I} the set

of all possible intervals of $[n]$. For any interval I and a n dimensional vector v , $v_I \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|}$ denotes its restriction to I . For any two intervals $J, I \in \mathcal{I}$, we use the notation $I \subset J$ to mean that I is a strict subset in the sense that I does not intersect the two end points of J . Otherwise, if we write $I \subseteq J$, we mean that I is a generic subset of J which may intersect the two end points of J . Throughout the article we will use C_r to denote an absolute constant which only depends on $r \geq 0$; the degree of the polynomial fit in consideration. The exact value of C_r can change from place to place. Also, we will use the term interval partition to denote a partition of $[n]$ into contiguous (discrete) intervals.

1.6 Outline

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe our pointwise representation for Trend Filtering of order 0, write and explain the associated pointwise estimation error bound, interpreting it as a local bias variance tradeoff. In Section 3 we propose Minmax Trend Filtering estimators for any polynomial degree $r \geq 0$; write its pointwise estimation error bound and discuss consequences of this error bound. In Section 4 we propose a computationally efficient dyadic variant of Minmax Trend Filtering and write its associated pointwise estimation error bound. In Section 5 we investigate the performance of Minmax Trend Filtering at the boundary. In Section 6 we discuss some related matters. In Section 7 we present our simulations seeing the practical performance of Minmax Trend Filtering. Sections A, B, C contain proofs of our theorems.

2 Total Variation Denoising/Fused Lasso

The univariate Total Variation Denoising/Fused Lasso estimator is defined as follows for a given data vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\hat{\theta}^{(\lambda)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda TV(\theta) \quad (2.1)$$

where $TV(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i|$.

The literature studying the statistical accuracy of the Univariate Total Variation Denoising/Fused Lasso method is vast; see [Mammen and van de Geer \(1997\)](#), [Harchaoui and Lévy-Leduc \(2010\)](#), [Dalalyan et al. \(2017\)](#), [Lin et al. \(2017\)](#), [Ortelli and van de Geer \(2018\)](#), [Ortelli and van de Geer \(2021\)](#), [Guntuboyina et al. \(2020\)](#), [Madrid Padilla and Chatterjee \(2022\)](#) to name a few. However, all these results investigate the mean squared error which is a global notion of error. Recently, the study of pointwise estimation errors of the TVD estimator was initiated in [Zhang and Chatterjee \(2022\)](#). We build upon, refine and considerably extend the idea in [Zhang and Chatterjee \(2022\)](#). In particular, we start by formulating an expression for the TVD fit at any given point.

2.1 A Pointwise Formula for the TVD Estimator

The TVD estimator, being defined as the nonlinear solution of a convex optimization problem in \mathbb{R}^n ; it is not immediate to see if and how one can derive an useful expression for the fit itself at any given location. Perhaps this is why, inspite of decades of study of this estimator, a pointwise expression for the fit is not available in the literature. *We hereby provide a new pointwise formula for the TVD estimator.*

Recall that \mathcal{I} is the set of all discrete intervals of $[n]$, and for any subset $I \subseteq [n]$, the mean of entries of y in I is denoted by \bar{y}_I .

Theorem 2.1. *[A Pointwise Formula for TVD/Fused Lasso]*

Fix any $i \in [n]$. The following pointwise bound holds for the TVD estimator $\hat{\theta}^{(\lambda)}$ defined in (2.1):

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{y}_I + C_{I,J} \frac{2\lambda}{|I|} \right] \leq \hat{\theta}_i^{(\lambda)} \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{y}_I - C_{I,J} \frac{2\lambda}{|I|} \right] \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$C_{I,J} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } I \subset J \\ -1 & \text{if } I = J \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let us try to understand and interpret some key points/features of the above expression.

1. The bounds in (2.2) hold for all locations i , all input data y and all tuning parameters λ . The bound at location i can be interpreted as min-max/max-min of penalized local averages where the outer min/max is over all intervals $J \subseteq [n]$ containing i and inner max/min is over all sub intervals $I \subseteq J$ containing i .
2. For each such interval J and subinterval $I \subseteq J$, there is a factor $C_{I,J}$ that appear in the bounds. This factor $C_{I,J}$ takes different values for three different cases. When I is strictly in the interior of J , it equals +1, when I exactly contains one boundary point of J , it equals 0 and when $I = J$, it equals -1. The three cases can also be described by the cardinality of the intersection of I with the two boundary points of J . The three cases correspond to this cardinality being 0, 1, 2 respectively.
3. An equivalent way of stating the bound is the following. We just state the upper bound, the lower bound can also be stated similarly. Fix any $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in J$. Then the following holds:

$$\hat{\theta}_i \leq \max_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} \left(\bar{y}_I - 2\lambda \frac{C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right).$$

Note that the right hand side above is only a function of y_J . Therefore, even though the fitted value $\hat{\theta}_i$ is a function of all of y , it can be bounded in terms of only the entries of y within J . Perhaps, when stated this way, the bound seems a bit surprising. We can think of this as a localization property of the fitted value (that is, it depends on a local neighbourhood of i), implied by the ℓ_1 type TV penalty.

4. The main question that now arises is whether the bounds in (2.2) are tight and thus useful? We will argue that indeed these bounds are tight. The primary reason is that these bounds (see the next section) let us prove an estimation error bound with an interpretation of optimal bias variance tradeoff. Moreover, this pointwise estimation error bound implies existing known MSE results for the TVD estimator (possibly, up to a log factor). Therefore, these bounds are *statistically tight* and thus operationally work as a formula for the TVD fit at any given point.
5. Infact, the estimation error bounds we prove hold for any estimator which take value between the min-max and max-min bounds, including the min-max and max-min bounds themselves. Empirically, we see that in many cases, the min-max and the max-min bounds coincide or are extremely close (and thus is almost the same as TVD/Fused Lasso) for most of the interior locations, except at the boundary where the max-min and min-max values typically separate. At the boundary, the bounds in (2.2) can be improved; see Section 5.
6. The proof of Theorem 2.1 relies on the idea of considering boundary constrained TVD solutions and then showing that the boundary constrained solutions can be bounded by a quantity free from the actual constraints or the boundary values. This is done by examining the optimality criterion for the directional (sub)derivative of the TVD objective function for a well chosen (data dependent) direction and by using the fact that gradients of the TV penalty have bounded entries.

2.2 A Pointwise Estimation Error Bound for the TVD Estimator

In this section, we provide a sketch of how we can derive a pointwise estimation error bound from the pointwise formula in (2.2).

For any $i \in [n]$ and any $J \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $i \in J$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\theta}_i^{(\lambda)} &\leq \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{y}_I - \frac{2\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right] = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{\theta}_I^* + \bar{\epsilon}_I - \frac{2\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right] \\ &\leq \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{\theta}_I^* \right] + \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{\epsilon}_I - \frac{2\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can write

$$\tilde{\theta}_i^{(\lambda)} - \theta_i^* \leq \underbrace{\max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{\theta}_I^* - \theta_i^* \right]}_{T_1} + \underbrace{\max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{\epsilon}_I - \frac{2\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right]}_{T_2}. \quad (2.3)$$

The above display is the key bound to the estimation error. We will now interpret the two terms in the bound as bias and (square root) variance.

Fix any location $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in J$. Define the (local) positive and (local) negative bias associated with J as follows:

$$Bias_+(i, J, \theta^*) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{\theta}_I^* - \theta_i^* \right]$$

$$Bias_-(i, J, \theta^*) = \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{\theta}_I^* - \theta_i^* \right]$$

Note that since the singleton set $\{i\}$ always comes into consideration,

$$Bias_+(i, J, \theta^*) \geq 0, Bias_-(i, J, \theta^*) \leq 0.$$

This is different from the usual notion of bias associated with the interval J , which would simply be $\bar{\theta}^*_J - \theta^*_i$. Our notions of bias, the positive and the negative one, sandwich the usual bias.

Equipped with this notation and interpretation, the term T_1 in the bound in (2.3) simply becomes the positive bias $Bias_+(i, J, \theta^*)$.

Now we sketch how we can handle the term T_2 in (2.3). To do this, let us first define the effective noise variable

$$M = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} |\bar{\epsilon}_I \sqrt{|I|}|.$$

Note that for each interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$, the random variable $\bar{\epsilon}_I \sqrt{|I|}$ has variance $O(\sigma^2)$ if the error variables are themselves independent sub gaussian with sub gaussian norm at most σ . Since the number of intervals is at most n^2 ; a standard bound on the maxima of finitely many subgaussians imply the noise variable M is at most $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ with high probability.

We can now write

$$T_2 = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\bar{\epsilon}_I - \frac{2\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right] \leq \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\frac{M}{\sqrt{|I|}} - \frac{2\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right].$$

To bound the R.H.S in the last display; we consider the three different cases where $C_{I,J}$ takes different values.

- **Case($I = J$):** $C_{I,J} = -1$.

$$T_2 \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{2\lambda}{|J|}.$$

- **Case(I shares exactly one boundary point of J):** $C_{I,J} = 0$.

In this case, the maximum will be attained for the smallest possible cardinality of I satisfying this case. This will be attained for the interval whose one end point is i and the other is the end point of J nearer to i . Therefore, we can write

$$T_2 \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt{|Dist(i, \partial J)|}}.$$

where we denote for an interval $J \subseteq [n]$, its boundary (two end points) by ∂J and

$$Dist(i, \partial J) = [j_1 : j_2] = \min\{i - j_1 + 1, j_2 - i + 1\}$$

is the distance of i to the boundary of J .

- **Case($I \subset J$):** $C_{I,J} = 1$.

In this case, we can write

$$T_2 \leq \max_{1 \leq x \leq n} \left(\frac{M}{\sqrt{x}} - \frac{2\lambda}{x} \right) \leq \frac{M^2}{4\lambda}.$$

The last inequality is obtained by reparametrizing $a = \sqrt{\frac{1}{x}}$ above and seeing the optimization problem as a maximization of a concave quadratic; see Lemma A.6.

The three cases (summing up the bounds) together allows us to write

$$T_2 \leq \frac{M}{\sqrt{|Dist(i, \partial J)|}} + \frac{M}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{2\lambda}{|J|} + \frac{M^2}{4\lambda}.$$

We now view the bound above as (local) standard error. In particular, for any fixed location $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in J$, define (local) standard error as

$$SE(i, J, \lambda) = \frac{M}{\sqrt{|Dist(i, \partial J)|}} + \frac{M}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{2\lambda}{|J|} + \frac{M^2}{4\lambda}. \quad (2.4)$$

Let us compare with the standard error of the local average for the maximal interval $I \subseteq J$ containing i and symmetric about i ; its standard error would be $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{|Dist(i, \partial J)|}})$. Thus, our notion of standard error is similar, except that it has additional terms involving λ as well; thereby capturing the dependence on λ . The choice $\lambda = \sqrt{|J|}$ would actually make our notion of standard error exactly similar (up to a log factor implied by the error variable M).

Since this entire argument holds for any interval $J \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $i \in J$, we can now take a minimum over $J \in \mathcal{I}$. A corresponding similar lower bound can be obtained as well. Therefore, this lets us write our pointwise estimation error bound in the following way.

Theorem 2.2 (Informal). *The estimation error of the TVD estimator at any location i is deterministically bounded by a local bias variance tradeoff:*

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} (Bias_-(i, J, \theta^*) - SE(i, J, \lambda)) \leq \hat{\theta}_i^{(\lambda)} - \theta_i^* \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} (Bias_+(i, J, \theta^*) + SE(i, J, \lambda)).$$

The above theorem can be interpreted as saying that the univariate TVD/Fused Lasso estimator and any estimator sandwiched by the min-max/max-min estimator, at a point i , performs local (i dependent) bias variance tradeoff to choose a data dependent penalized local average as the fitted value. The right hand side bounds the positive part of the estimation error and the left hand side bounds the negative part. In our opinion, this sheds new light on why and how is the TVD/Fused Lasso estimator locally adaptive. The local notion of smoothness of θ^ that turns out to be relevant is the bias variance tradeoff defined here. We believe that this result, gives a strong justification of the local adaptivity of Fused Lasso; especially seeing that this notion implies the existing justifications; see Section 3.2.*

Remark 2.1. *We state a formal generalized version of Theorem 2.2 later; see Theorem 3.5.*

3 Minmax Trend Filtering of General Degree

In this section, we develop higher degree polynomial generalizations of the univariate TVD/Fused Lasso estimator via the min-max/max-min formula introduced here in (2.2). These would be different

from Trend Filtering of higher orders. The goal is to examine whether the minmax/maxmin idea continues to be applicable for more general nonparametric regressions. The pointwise representation in Theorem 2.1 readily suggests extending the estimator using local polynomial regression instead of just local averages. In principle, one can use any other basis of functions instead of polynomials; we study the polynomial case here. We now introduce some notations and make formal definitions.

Fix a non negative integer $r \geq 0$. Let us define the the linear subspace of n dimensional *discrete polynomial vectors* of degree r as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_n^{(r)} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n : (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n) = (f(1/n), f(2/n), \dots, f(n/n)) \text{ for some polynomial function } f \text{ of degree } r\}.$$

Given an interval $I = [a : b] \subseteq [n]$ we now define the linear subspace $S^{(I,r)}$ of discrete polynomial vectors of degree r on the interval I as follows:

$$S^{(I,r)} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|} : \theta = v_I \text{ for some vector } v \in \mathcal{P}_n^{(r)}\}.$$

We now denote $P^{(I,r)} \in \mathbb{R}^{|I| \times |I|}$ to be the orthogonal projection matrix on to the subspace $S^{(I,r)}$. It turns out that for any I with the same cardinality, the subspace $S^{(I,r)}$ is the same; we leave this for the reader to verify. Therefore, throughout, we use the notation $P^{(|I|,r)}$. We are now ready to define our estimator.

Definition 3.1. *Given the observation vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for any non negative integer $r \geq 0$ and any tuning parameter $\lambda \geq 0$, define an estimator $\hat{\theta}^{(r,\lambda)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying for any $i \in [n]$,*

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(|I|,r)} y_I)_i + \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right] \leq \hat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)} \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(|I|,r)} y_I)_i - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right] \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$C_{I,J} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } I \subset J \\ -1 & \text{if } I = J \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let us discuss some aspects of the above definition.

1. The estimator $\hat{\theta}^{(r,\lambda)}$ is not uniquely defined as such; since we can take any number between the min-max upper bound and the max- min lower bound. For example, one can take either the min-max or the max-min formula themselves as estimators or take the midpoint of the two bounds.
2. The expression $(P^{(|I|,r)} y_I)_i$ perhaps is a slight abuse of notation. For any $i \in [n]$ and for an interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $i \in I$, this denotes the entry of the vector $(P^{(|I|,r)} y_I) \in \mathbb{R}^{|I|}$ corresponding to the location of i . For instance, when $r = 1$, we perform linear regression on y_I and then $(P^{(|I|,r)} y_I)_i$ is the fitted value of this linear regression at the location i .

3. The formula in (3.1) generalizes the formula in (2.2), in other words the formula in (2.2) is an instance of the formula in (3.1) when $r = 0$ (with 2λ written as λ). Since Trend Filtering, defined for a general degree $r \geq 0$, generalizes Total Variation Denoising, one may wonder if Trend Filtering fitted values satisfy the pointwise bounds in (3.1). The answer is no as soon as $r \geq 1$; see Section 7 for a numerical evidence. To the best of our knowledge, the family of estimators defined in (3.1) appear to be new univariate nonparametric regression/curve fitting methods, different from other existing methods in the nonparametric regression toolbox. We tentatively call these estimators **Minmax Trend Filtering**.
4. Actually, the first question that needs to be answered is why is the above estimator well defined in the sense that why is the left hand side in (3.1) at most the right hand side in (3.1). In the case when $r = 0$, by Theorem 2.1, the Fused Lasso solution has to lie between the min max and the max min bounds and hence the max min cannot be greater than the min max. However, for general $r \geq 1$, one needs to check that this holds; otherwise the definition (3.1) does not make sense. The next lemma asserts that our estimator is always well defined.

Lemma 3.2. *[Well Posedness of Minmax Trend Filtering]*

The estimator $\widehat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)}$ is well defined, i.e, the following inequality is always true for any $i \in [n], r \geq 0, \lambda \geq 0$ and any data vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(|I|,r)} y)_I]_i + \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(|I|,r)} y)_I]_i - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|}. \quad (3.2)$$

Remark 3.1. *The fact that the minmax is always not smaller than the maxmin is perhaps not obvious at a first glance. It appears that all the three cases where $C_{I,J}$ takes different values are crucial in showing the above.*

3.1 Main Result

Our main result is a pointwise estimation error bound in terms of (local) bias variance tradeoff. This is a generalization of the informal theorem 2.2 for general degrees $r \geq 0$. We write our result formally in this section. Let us make a couple of formal definitions.

Fix a sequence $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any integer $r \geq 0$. Fix any location $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in J$. Define the (local) positive and negative r th order bias associated with J as follows:

$$Bias_+^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)} \theta^*)_I]_i - \theta_i^*$$

$$Bias_-^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) = \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)} \theta^*)_I]_i - \theta_i^*$$

As explained before, we always have

$$Bias_+^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) \geq 0, Bias_-^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) \leq 0.$$

We now define the r th order effective noise variable

$$M^{(r)} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} [|(P^{(r,|I|)} \epsilon_I)|_\infty \sqrt{|I|}].$$

Similar to (2.4), we define a notion of r th order local standard error for any location $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $i \in J$.

$$SE^{(r)}(i, J, \lambda) = \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{\text{Dist}(i, \partial J)}} + \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{(M^{(r)})^2}{4\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}.$$

We now state our main deterministic pointwise error bound in the form of the next proposition.

Proposition 3.3 (Deterministic Pointwise Estimation Error as Local Bias Variance Tradeoff). *Fix a non negative integer $r \geq 0$. The estimation error of the r th order Minmax Filtering estimator defined in 3.1, at any location i , is deterministically bounded by a local bias variance tradeoff:*

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_-^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) - SE^{(r)}(i, J, \lambda) \right) \leq \widehat{\theta}_i^{(r, \lambda)} - \theta_i^* \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_+^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) + SE^{(r)}(i, J, \lambda) \right). \quad (3.3)$$

The r th order noise variable $M^{(r)}$ appears in the standard error term. We do not want $M^{(r)}$ to be very large. A natural question is, like in the case when $r = 0$, is it true that $M^{(r)}$ can be bounded by a $O(\sqrt{\log n})$ factor with high probability? Indeed, this turns out to be true and is the content of our next proposition.

Proposition 3.4. *[A Probabilistic Bound on the Effective Noise]*

Recall the effective noise variable

$$M^{(r)} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I} [|(P^{(r, |I|)} \epsilon_I)|_\infty \sqrt{|I|}].$$

Suppose $(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)$ are i.i.d with a Subgaussian(σ) distribution.

With probability not less than $1 - \exp(-cn)$,

$$|M^{(r)}| \leq C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log n}$$

where $C_r > 0$ is an absolute constant which only depends on r and $c > 0$ is another absolute constant.

Remark 3.2. *The above proposition is proved by showing that for any interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ the random variable $|(P^{(r, |I|)} \epsilon_I)|_\infty \sqrt{|I|}$ is subgaussian with subgaussian norm of the order σ and then using the standard maxima bound for subgaussians. Technical facts about projection matrices on the subspace of polynomials are used to show the subgaussianity property.*

Combining the above two propositions, we can write a theorem which is the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.5. *[Main Result]*

For any $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in J$, let us define the r th order local standard deviation

$$SD^{(r)}(i, J, \lambda) = \frac{C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{\text{Dist}(i, \partial J)}} + \frac{C_r \sigma^2 \log n}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}$$

where C_r is related to what arises in Proposition 3.4.

We have the following estimation error bound for the r th order Minmax Filtering estimator which holds simultaneously at every location i , with probability not less than $1 - \exp(-cn)$ (c is the same as what arises in Proposition 3.4),

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_-^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) - SD^{(r)}(i, J, \lambda) \right) \leq \widehat{\theta}_i^{(r, \lambda)} - \theta_i^* \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_+^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) + SD^{(r)}(i, J, \lambda) \right). \quad (3.4)$$

Remark 3.3. Since $\text{Bias}_+^{(r)}, \text{Bias}_-^{(r)}$ is non negative/non positive respectively, the R.H.S in (3.4) bounds the positive part of the estimation error $\widehat{\theta}_i^{(r, \lambda)} - \theta_i^*$; similarly the L.H.S bounds the negative part.

Remark 3.4. The standard deviation term $SD^{(r)}(i, J, \lambda)$ is a λ dependent notion of standard deviation and has three terms. The first term can be thought of as the standard deviation of the local polynomial fit on the best symmetric (about i) interval inside J . The second and third terms reveal the dependence on λ . A nice feature is that the dependence on λ is very clean.

3.2 Mean Squared Error Bounds

The pointwise estimation error bound given in (3.4) can be summed up to yield bounds on a global notion of error such as mean squared error. In the next two sections, we show that (3.4) allows us to recover near minimax rate optimality in MSE over both bounded variation function classes and piecewise polynomial function classes. As mentioned in Section 1.2 such minimax rate optimality are the existing justifications of local adaptivity exhibited by Trend Filtering.

3.2.1 Fast Rate

Let us recall a few notations. We use C_r to denote an absolute constant which only depends on $r \geq 0$; the degree of the polynomial fit in consideration. Also, we use the term interval partition to denote a partition of $[n]$ into contiguous (discrete) intervals.

Theorem 3.6 (Fast Rate for Piecewise Polynomial Signals). *Suppose there exists an interval partition π^* of $[n]$ with intervals I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k such that $\theta_{I_j}^*$ is a (discrete) polynomial of degree $r \geq 0$ for each $j = 1, \dots, k$. In addition, suppose the intervals satisfy the minimum length condition*

$$\min_{j \in [K]} |I_j| \geq c_1 \frac{n}{k}$$

for some absolute constant $c_1 > 0$.

Then, if we set

$$\lambda = C_r \left(\frac{n \sigma^2 \log n}{k} \right)^{1/2},$$

then with probability atleast $1 - \exp(-cn)$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \|\widehat{\theta}^{(r, \lambda)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq C_r \sigma^2 \frac{k}{n} \log n \log \frac{n}{k}.$$

Incidentally, if we consider the ℓ_1 loss then we do not need the minimum length condition, i.e., even without it, with the same choice of λ as above and under the same event as above which has probability atleast $1 - \exp(-cn)$, we have the bound

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\widehat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)} - \theta_i^*| \leq C_r \sigma \sqrt{\frac{k \log n}{n}}.$$

Remark 3.5. *The above result is reminiscent of the fast rates attained by (ideally tuned) Trend Filtering for piecewise polynomial functions (discrete splines) under a minimum length condition; see [Ortelli and van de Geer \(2021\)](#), [Guntuboyina et al. \(2020\)](#). However, our result here seems to be more general in some aspects as mentioned below.*

Remark 3.6. *The fact that the minimum length condition is not needed for the ℓ_1 loss bound may be true for Trend Filtering as well; however this is unknown as of now to the best of our knowledge. Moreover, our proof technique allows proving such fast rates for Minmax Trend Filtering of all orders $r \geq 0$; such fast rates for penalized Trend Filtering has only been established for $r \leq 4$; see [Ortelli and van de Geer \(2021\)](#).*

Remark 3.7. *Trend Filtering is known to be able to only fit discrete splines which are piecewise polynomials with regularity at the knots. However, [Theorem 3.6](#) holds without any such regularity assumption. This makes Minmax Trend Filtering consistent for piecewise polynomial functions which are not discrete splines as well. For example, if the underlying function is discontinuous and piecewise polynomial, Trend Filtering is not expected to be consistent; however the above result ensures that Minmax Trend Filtering continues to attain the fast rate. This is a potential advantage of Minmax Trend Filtering over Trend Filtering. See [Section 7](#) for a numerical evidence.*

Remark 3.8. *We believe the $\log n/k$ factor in the MSE bound and the $\sqrt{\log n}$ factor in the ℓ_1 bound maybe superfluous and are possibly artifacts of our proof. However, this appears to be a delicate issue and since this is not the main point of this article, we leave investigation of this matter for future research.*

3.2.2 Slow Rate

We first need to define the notion of total variation of all orders. For a vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let us define $D^{(0)}(\theta) = \theta$, $D^{(1)}(\theta) = (\theta_2 - \theta_1, \dots, \theta_n - \theta_{n-1})$ and $D^{(r)}(\theta)$, for $r \geq 2$, is recursively defined as $D^{(r)}(\theta) = D^{(1)}(D^{(r-1)}(\theta))$. Note that $D^{(r)}(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-r}$. For simplicity, we denote the operator $D^{(1)}$ by D . For any positive integer r , let us also define the r th order total variation of a vector θ as follows:

$$\text{TV}^{(r)}(\theta) = n^{r-1} |D^{(r)}(\theta)|_1 \tag{3.5}$$

where $|\cdot|_1$ denotes the usual ℓ_1 norm of a vector. Note that $\text{TV}^{(1)}(\theta)$ is the usual total variation of a vector used in the penalty term for Fused Lasso.

Remark 3.9. *The n^{r-1} term in the above definition is a normalizing factor and is written following the convention adopted in [Guntuboyina et al. \(2020\)](#). If we think of θ as evaluations of a r times differentiable function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the grid $(1/n, 2/n, \dots, n/n)$ then the Riemann approximation to the integral $\int_{[0,1]} f^{(r)}(t) dt$ is precisely equal to $\text{TV}^{(r)}(\theta)$. Here $f^{(r)}$ denotes the r th derivative of f . Thus, for natural instances of θ , the reader can imagine that $\text{TV}^{(r)}(\theta) = O(1)$.*

Theorem 3.7 (Slow Rate for Bounded Variation Signals). *Fix a positive integer r . Let us denote $V = \text{TV}^{(r)}(\theta^*)$. If we set*

$$\lambda = C_r n^{r/(2r+1)} V^{-1/(2r+1)} \sigma^{1+1/(2r+1)} (\log n)^{1/2+1/(2r+1)}$$

then with probability atleast $1 - \exp(-cn)$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \|\widehat{\theta}^{(r-1, \lambda)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq C_r \frac{1}{n^{2r/(2r+1)}} V^{2/(2r+1)} (\sigma^2 (\log n)^2)^{2r/(2r+1)}.$$

Remark 3.10. *The above bound shows that Minmax Trend Filtering of order $r - 1$ is near minimax rate optimal for r th order bounded variation sequences. The bound has the right minimax dependence on V and n (up to log factors); reminiscent of similar bounds known for Trend Filtering. The proof relies on an appropriately informative approximation result of bounded variation sequences by piecewise polynomial sequences; see Proposition A.10.*

Remark 3.11. *The upshot of the above two theorems is that Minmax Trend Filtering (like Trend Filtering) satisfies near minimax rate optimality among bounded variation sequences and piecewise polynomial sequences. These two results follow as a consequence of the pointwise bound in Theorem 3.5.*

4 Dyadic Minmax Trend Filtering

Computing the Minmax Trend Filtering Estimator for a general order $r \geq 0$ as defined in (3.1) takes $O(n^5)$ basic computations. It is not clear to us whether this can be improved. To reduce the computational burden, it is natural to reduce the search space of intervals over which we perform minimax optimization to a given subclass of the set of intervals of $[n]$. Towards this end, it turns out that we can consider a *dyadic* class of intervals for which the overall computation comes down to $O(n(\log n)^4)$ basic computations. It is important to define a dyadic version of Minmax Trend Filtering because this makes it practically computable. We have implemented this version of Minmax Trend Filtering while doing our simulations when the sample size is of the order of several thousands. This section is devoted to explaining the resulting estimator which we call Dyadic Minmax Trend Filtering and discussing its properties. As we will see, the dyadic version of Minmax Trend Filtering also attains similar estimation error bounds as the non dyadic version and performs reasonably well in our simulations.

4.1 Defining the Search Space of Dyadified Intervals

For each $i \in [n]$ we will define a set of indices $\mathcal{L}_i \subseteq [1 : i]$ and $\mathcal{R}_i \subseteq [i : n]$. To do this, let us first define what we mean by the set of dyadic intervals of $[n]$. For simplicity of exposition, let n be a power of 2. The full set $[1 : n]$ is a dyadic interval. One can split it into two intervals of equal sizes $[1 : n/2]$ and $[n/2 + 1 : n]$. These are also dyadic intervals. Any two intervals resulting from splitting a dyadic interval at the mid point into two equal parts are also dyadic intervals. This defines the set of all dyadic intervals of $[n]$. If n is not a power of 2; we just need a convention for deciding the midpoint to split. Throughout, we will use the fact that dyadic intervals can naturally be put in one to one correspondence with the nodes of a binary tree. The leaves correspond to the singletons and the root corresponds to the full interval $[1 : n]$.

Fix any $i \in [n]$. We will now define the set $\mathcal{R}_i = \{r_0, r_1, \dots\} \subseteq [i : n]$ inductively. To do this, define $r_0 = i$. Note that r_0 can be trivially seen to be the right end point of the dyadic interval which is the leaf of the binary tree corresponding to i . Let us also set up the convention that the last level

of the binary tree is level 0 and the level above is level -1 and so on. The root therefore is at level $-H$ where $H = O(\log n)$.

Now suppose we have defined r_j which is a right end point of a dyadic interval at level $-j$. If $r_j = n$ we stop otherwise we follow the three steps below. The base case $j = 0$ is already done.

1. If the node containing r_j at level $-j$ is a left child, then define r_{j+1} to be the right end point of the parent of this node.
2. If the node containing r_j is a right child, then define r_{j+1} to be the right end point of the right neighbor of the parent of this node.
3. If $r_j = n$ then stop enlarging \mathcal{R}_i .

Similarly, we can construct the set $\mathcal{L}_i = \{l_0, l_1, \dots\} \subseteq [1 : i]$ inductively. To do this, define $l_0 = i$. Note that l_0 can be trivially seen to be the left end point of the dyadic interval which is the leaf of the binary tree corresponding to i .

Now suppose we have defined l_j which is a left end point of a dyadic interval at level $-j$. If $l_j = 1$ we stop otherwise we follow the three steps below. The base case $j = 0$ is already done.

1. If the node containing l_j at level $-j$ is a right child, then define l_{j+1} to be the left end point of the parent of this node.
2. If the node containing l_j is a left child, then define l_{j+1} to be the left end point of the left neighbor of the parent of this node.
3. If $l_j = 1$ then stop enlarging \mathcal{L}_i .

For the index $i \in [n]$, define the set of *dyadified intervals*

$$\mathcal{D}_i = \{[l, r] \in \mathcal{I} : l \in \mathcal{L}_i, r \in \mathcal{R}_i\}.$$

Remark 4.1. *This construction of \mathcal{D}_i has been done keeping in mind the overall computational complexity as well as the statistical risk; see Remark B.1 in the appendix.*

4.2 Defining the Dyadic Minmax Filtering Estimator of General Degree

For each index $i \in [n]$, recall the set of dyadified intervals \mathcal{D}_i defined in the last section.

Definition 4.1. *For any non negative integer $r \geq 0$ and a tuning parameter $\lambda \geq 0$, define an estimator $\hat{\theta}^{(dyad, r, \lambda)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, satisfying for any $i \in [n]$,*

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{D}_i} \min_{I \in \mathcal{D}_i : I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(|I|, r)} y_I)_i + \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|} \right] \leq \hat{\theta}_i^{(dyad, r, \lambda)} \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{D}_i} \max_{I \in \mathcal{D}_i : I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(|I|, r)} y_I)_i - \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|} \right] \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$C_{I,J} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } I \subset J \\ -1 & \text{if } I = J \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 4.2. $\widehat{\theta}^{(dyad,r,\lambda)}$ is well defined for similar reasons as before.

The Dyadic version has significantly less computational complexity than the non dyadic version. This is stated formally next.

Lemma 4.2 (Computation). *The estimator $\widehat{\theta}^{(dyad,r,\lambda)}$ in (4.1) can be computed with $O(r^3 n (\log n)^4)$ basic computations.*

4.3 Pointwise Estimation Error Bound

We can show an analogous pointwise estimation error bound for the Dyadic version of Minmax Trend Filtering. Fix a sequence $\theta^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and any integer $r \geq 0$. Fix any location $i \in [n]$ and any dyadified interval $J \in \mathcal{D}_i$ such that $i \in J$. Define the (local) positive and negative r th order (dyadified) bias associated with J as follows:

$$Bias_+^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \theta^*) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{D}_i: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta_I^*)_i - \theta_i^*]$$

$$Bias_-^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \theta^*) = \min_{I \in \mathcal{D}_i: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta_I^*)_i - \theta_i^*]$$

As before, $Bias_+^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \theta^*) \geq 0$, $Bias_-^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \theta^*) \leq 0$ because the singleton set $\{i\} \in \mathcal{D}_i$.

Also, define the (dyadified) r th order local standard deviation

$$SD^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \lambda) = \frac{C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log \log n}}{\sqrt{Dist(i, \partial J)}} + \frac{C_r \sigma^2 \log \log n}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}$$

where C_r is an appropriate absolute constant only depending on $r \geq 0$.

Theorem 4.3. *We have the following estimation error bound for the r th order Dyadic Minmax Filtering estimator which holds simultaneously at every location i , with probability not less than $1 - \exp(-cn)$ for an absolute constant $c > 0$,*

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{D}_i: i \in J} (Bias_-^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \theta^*) - SD^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \lambda)) \leq \widehat{e}_i \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{D}_i: i \in J} (Bias_+^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \theta^*) + SD^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \lambda)) \quad (4.2)$$

where $\widehat{e}_i = \widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i^*$.

4.3.1 Comparison of Theorem 4.3 with Theorem 3.5

It is not clear whether the bound for the Dyadic version of Minmax Filtering in (4.2) is uniformly comparable with the bound for the non dyadic version in (3.4). This is because of the following two reasons.

1. Firstly, the bias term $Bias_+^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \theta^*)$ for a given dyadified interval $J \in \mathcal{D}_i$ is a max over only dyadified subintervals of J and hence cannot be larger than the non dyadic version $Bias_+^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*)$. On the other hand, in the upper bound here we are only minimizing over the smaller set of dyadified intervals $J \in \mathcal{D}_i$.
2. Secondly, the $SD^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \lambda)$ term as compared to the non dyadic version $SD^{(r)}(i, J, \lambda)$ has $\log \log n$ instead of $\log n$ in its first two terms. The constant C_r in both the terms may be different though.

4.4 Mean Squared Error Bounds

The pointwise error bound for Dyadic Minmax Filtering furnishes bounds on global notions of error such as MSE which scale similarly to the corresponding bounds for the non dyadic version.

Theorem 4.4 (Fast Rate for Piecewise Polynomial Signals). *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 3.6, if we set*

$$\lambda = C_r \left(\frac{n\sigma^2 \log \log n}{k} \right)^{1/2},$$

then with probability atleast $1 - \exp(-cn)$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \|\widehat{\theta}^{(dyad,r,\lambda)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq C_r \sigma^2 \frac{k}{n} \log \frac{n}{k} \log \log n.$$

Also, without the minimum length condition and under the same event as above which has probability atleast $1 - \exp(-cn)$, we have the ℓ_1 bound

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\widehat{\theta}_i^{(dyad,r,\lambda)} - \theta_i^*| \leq C_r \sigma \sqrt{\frac{k \log \log n}{n}}.$$

Theorem 4.5 (Slow Rate for Bounded Variation Signals). *Under the same conditions as in Theorem 3.7, if we set*

$$\lambda = C_r n^{r/(2r+1)} V^{-1/(2r+1)} \sigma^{1+1/(2r+1)} (\log \log n)^{1/2 + 1/(2r+1)}$$

then with probability atleast $1 - \exp(-cn)$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \|\widehat{\theta}^{(dyad,r-1,\lambda)} - \theta^*\|^2 \leq C_r \frac{1}{n^{2r/(2r+1)}} V^{2/(2r+1)} (\sigma^2 (\log n \log \log n))^{2r/(2r+1)}.$$

Remark 4.3. *We can see that we seem to have better log factors (at the expense of perhaps a larger constant) in the upper bounds in the above results as compared to the analogous results for the non dyadic version. It is not clear to us whether this is an artifact of our proof or is this an actual fact.*

5 Estimation at the Boundary

In this section, we illustrate how the proof techniques and insights developed so far let us examine the estimation error at the boundary. Investigating consistency at the boundary for nonparametric regression methods has been of classical interest. We first raise the following question.

Question: Is univariate Total Variation Denoising/Fused Lasso consistent at the Boundary?

To the best of our knowledge, this question has not been investigated so far in the literature and the answer is hitherto unknown. It is clear that we need an estimation error bound at the boundary point for Fused Lasso. It is here that the bounds developed in this article can help. We can recall the pointwise bound (which holds with high probability) in Theorem 2.2 applied to the last point;

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: n \in J} (\text{Bias}_-(J, \theta^*, n) - SD(J, \lambda, n)) \leq \widehat{\theta}_n^{(0, \lambda)} - \theta_n^* \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: n \in J} (\text{Bias}_+(J, \theta^*, n) + SD(J, \lambda, n)).$$

where

$$SD(J, \lambda, n) = \frac{C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{\text{Dist}(n, \partial J)}} + \frac{C_r \sigma^2 \log n}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}.$$

Note that we are considering $J \in \mathcal{I}$, which are intervals of $[n]$, containing the last point $\{n\}$. Therefore, $\text{Dist}(n, \partial J) = 1$ and thus $SD(J, \lambda, n)$ cannot be smaller than $\widetilde{O}(1)$. Therefore, our estimation error bound at the boundary does not suggest that Fused Lasso is consistent at the last point. However, it turns out that this is due to the fact that although the estimation error bound given in Theorem 3.5 is good for most points $i \in [n]$, it can be slightly loose very near the boundary. Indeed, for the boundary point, we can improve our bound by modifying our proof appropriately. This improved bound lets us answer the question posed above in the affirmative.

Answer: Yes! Univariate Total Variation Denoising/Fused Lasso is consistent at the boundary with the usual choices of the tuning parameter.

The minmax/maxmin bounds for Fused Lasso, given in Theorem 2.1, needs to be modified if we want to use it specifically for the last point.

Theorem 5.1. *[Improved Bounds for the Fused Lasso Solution at the Boundary] The following pointwise bound holds for the last point of Fused Lasso:*

$$\max_{j \leq n} \min_{i \geq j} \left[\bar{y}_{[i:n]} + \frac{C_{i,j} \lambda}{n - i + 1} \right] \leq \widehat{\theta}_n^{(\lambda)} \leq \min_{j \leq n} \max_{i \geq j} \left[\bar{y}_{[i:n]} - \frac{C_{i,j} \lambda}{n - i + 1} \right] \quad (5.1)$$

where

$$C_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i > j \\ -1 & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

Remark 5.1. *The bounds given here are tighter than what would be implied by Theorem 2.1. For any fixed $j \in [n]$ and $i > j$, for the interval $[i, n]$; the penalty parameter $C_{i,j} = +1$ whereas it would be 0 if we used Theorem 2.1. Therefore, the min max upper bound here is smaller. Similarly, the max min lower bound is greater as well. This improvement comes about with tweaking the proof of*

Theorem 2.1. There, we considered Fused Lasso with the solution at both boundary points constrained to be some given numbers a, b and then optimizing over both a, b . Here, because we are only interested in the rightmost boundary point, we do not need to constrain both ends of the solution; rather just constraining the left boundary of the solution to a number a and then optimizing over a produces this improved bound.

We can now generalize (5.1) to define higher degree polynomial counterparts.

Definition 5.2. [Defining the r th order Estimator at the Boundary Point]

For any non negative integer $r \geq 0$ and a tuning parameter $\lambda \geq 0$, we define the following:

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: n \in J} \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: n \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(|I|, r)} y_I)_n + \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|} \right] \leq \widehat{\theta}_n^{(r, \lambda)} \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: n \in J} \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: n \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(|I|, r)} y_I)_n - \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|} \right] \quad (5.2)$$

where

$$C_{I, J} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } I \neq J \\ -1 & \text{if } I = J. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, recalling the set of dyadified intervals \mathcal{D}_n , the dyadic version of this estimator can be defined as follows:

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{D}_n} \min_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n: I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(|I|, r)} y_I)_n + \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|} \right] \leq \widehat{\theta}_n^{(dyad, r, \lambda)} \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{D}_n} \max_{I \in \mathcal{D}_n: I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(|I|, r)} y_I)_n - \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|} \right] \quad (5.3)$$

Remark 5.2. The above definition generalizes the Fused Lasso bound in (5.1) to higher orders, i.e., when $r = 0$, Fused Lasso at the boundary satisfies (5.2).

Remark 5.3. Note that the definition of $C_{I, J}$ above is different from the earlier definition in Definition 3.1. Now there are only two cases to consider instead of three. This is because we are only considering intervals J which contain the last point $\{n\}$. Thus, any subinterval of J also containing $\{n\}$ cannot completely be in the interior of J .

Lemma 5.3. The estimators defined above are well defined; i.e., the left hand side in (5.2) is not greater than the right hand side in (5.2). The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.2.

We can prove a deterministic estimation error bound at the boundary point for the above estimators. This is the content of the next result.

Theorem 5.4. Let us define, for a given interval $J \subseteq [n]$ containing $[n]$, its associated r th order standard deviation term,

$$SD^{(r)}(J, \lambda) = \frac{C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{C_r \sigma^2 \log n}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}$$

for an appropriate constant C_r . Similarly, for a dyadified interval $J \in \mathcal{D}_n$, define

$$SD^{(r, dy)}(J, \lambda) = \frac{C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log \log n}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{C_r \sigma^2 \log \log n}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}$$

for possibly a different constant C_r . Then the following deterministic inequalities are true with probability not less than $1 - \exp(-cn)$ for an absolute constant $c > 0$,

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: n \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_-^{(r)}(n, J, \theta^*) - SD^{(r)}(J, \lambda) \right) \leq \widehat{\theta}_n^{(r, \lambda)} - \theta_n^* \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: n \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_+^{(r)}(n, J, \theta^*) + SD^{(r)}(J, \lambda) \right). \quad (5.4)$$

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{D}_n} \left(\text{Bias}_-^{(r, dy)}(n, J, \theta^*) - SD^{(r, dy)}(J, \lambda) \right) \leq \widehat{e}_n \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{D}_n} \left(\text{Bias}_+^{(r, dy)}(n, J, \theta^*) + SD^{(r, dy)}(J, \lambda) \right). \quad (5.5)$$

where $\widehat{e}_n = \widehat{\theta}_n^{(dyad, r, \lambda)} - \theta_n^*$.

Remark 5.4. The above theorem again shows that the estimation error at the boundary of the estimators defined here are bounded by a best bias variance tradeoff. This shows the local adaptivity of the estimators even at the boundary. The main difference of the above theorem with Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 4.3 is that the standard deviation term is different. In its first term in the denominator; the term $\sqrt{\text{Dist}(n, \partial J)}$ is replaced by $\sqrt{|J|}$ which is clearly better because $\sqrt{\text{Dist}(n, \partial J)}$ always equals 1 for any interval J containing $[n]$. This improvement is enough to let us show consistency at the boundary for any signal which satisfies some sort of smoothness at the boundary. For example, if we assume that the function (at the boundary) is locally constant at the boundary then the above bound shows that by choosing λ properly one can get the parametric rate $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ up to log factors. More generally, if the function is locally α Holder for some $0 < \alpha < 1$ at the boundary; then the usual rate for α Holder functions (up to log factors) can be attained by the above estimators at the boundary by choosing λ properly. We leave this for the reader to verify.

6 Discussions

In this section we discuss various aspects of the work in this article and some naturally related follow up research directions which could potentially be of interest.

- Theorem 2.2 gives a concrete local bias variance tradeoff interpretation for the estimation error of Univariate Total Variation Denoising/Fused Lasso which is Trend Filtering of order 0. Theorem 3.5 extends this for the Minmax Trend Filtering estimator of all orders $r \geq 0$. However, deriving pointwise bounds for Trend Filtering (of higher orders) itself remains an open problem. We believe and hope that the insights produced in this work will help in solving this problem.
- We defined the Minmax Trend Filtering estimator as minmax/maxmin of penalized local polynomial regressions. In principle, one can use any set of basis functions (instead of polynomial functions) and still define minmax/maxmin of penalized local projections. It could be interesting to study versions of Minmax Trend Filtering for other basis functions.
- The above point suggests that given any base estimator such as mean or polynomial regression; one can define a suitably penalized minmax/maxmin version which should be locally adaptive in a certain sense. This is why we feel that this work puts forward minmax/maxmin optimization as an alternative principled way to produce locally adaptive estimators.

- Our proof techniques are arguably simpler than existing proof techniques for Trend Filtering say. For example, we believe that the proof techniques can easily be extended to handle other loss functions such as logistic regression/quantile regression with TV type penalty etc as well as handle dependent errors or heavier tailed errors. We also believe that our proof reveals the right choice of the tuning parameter λ more transparently than existing proofs and manifests itself by revealing an estimation error bound with a very clean dependence on λ .
- We believe it might be interesting to look at higher dimensional/graph versions of Total Variation Denoising/Trend Filtering and investigate if the proof techniques developed here can be extended to these settings to obtain pointwise estimation error bounds. We leave this for future work.
- The fits produced by Minmax Trend Filtering are non smooth and look jagged; see Section 7. It should be possible to define appropriately kernelized versions of Minmax Trend Filtering which would produce smoother fits and retain similar estimation guarantees. We leave this for future work.
- Our work has connections with Isotonic Regression. In shape constrained nonparametric regression, univariate Isotonic Regression (IR) admits a pointwise representation with minmax optimization [Robertson and Wright \(1975\)](#); [Robertson et al. \(1988\)](#). Such a pointwise representation then allows derivation of pointwise estimation error bounds; see [Zhang \(2002\)](#), [Chatterjee et al. \(2015\)](#). IR with pointwise minmax/maxmin representations have now been extended to multi dimensions; see [Fokianos et al. \(2020\)](#), [Deng and Zhang \(2020\)](#). In a sense, the effort here has been to develop pointwise representations for locally adaptive nonparametric regression beyond shape constraints. The minmax optimization in IR is over so called upper and lower sets while the fundamental difference here, due to the lack of shape constraint, is that the min max optimization is over intervals (outer min/max) and their sub intervals (inner max/min) containing a fixed point. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time a non shape constrained nonparametric regression method has been defined using the the minmax principle.
- Probabilistically, the only thing needed here has been a basic square root log cardinality bound on the maxima of subgaussians. This is what keeps our proof relatively simple but perhaps result in extra log factors. We believe it might be possible to improve these log factors in our bounds. However, this would require more sophisticated handling of maxima of the projections of errors which form a dependent stochastic process. We leave this for future work.
- One can naturally extend the definition of the Minmax Trend Filtering estimators to arbitrary design points $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_n$. We believe that similar theoretical properties will hold as long as the design is reasonably uniform over a bounded interval.
- Our simulations in Section 7 indicate that for nice functions, Minmax Trend Filtering is perhaps not a viable competitor to Trend Filtering. However, for functions which have highly variable smoothness or have discontinuities (either in the function or their derivatives), Minmax Trend Filtering appears to be very competitive and sometimes even better than Trend Filtering. It might be interesting to obtain some characterization of functions for which Minmax Trend Filtering can be better than Trend Filtering.
- Trend Filtering can leverage very efficient convex optimization solvers enabling fast computation. On the other hand, Minmax Trend Filtering can be slow to compute. The non dyadic version presently can only be run (within 15 minutes on a standard laptop) up to sample sizes of the order of a couple of hundreds. The dyadic version can be run on problems of sample size

of the order tens of thousands. Hence, it might be interesting to examine if the computation can be made faster. There seems to be a lot of repeated computations for nearby points but it is not clear to us how to efficiently get around this problem.

- We feel that one of our main contributions in this work has been in giving an explanation and interpretation of exactly how TVD/Fused Lasso and Minmax Trend Filtering estimators of general degrees are locally adaptive. The explanation is that the estimation error at any point is bounded by a (local) bias variance tradeoff where the meaning of bias and variance are related but different from their usual meanings. What if we insist on retaining their usual meanings? Does there exist a nonparametric regression method with a single tuning parameter which attains this stronger notion of local adaptivity? We feel this is an interesting question which deserves attention.

7 Numerical Experiments

In this section we report our observations from some preliminary simulations that we performed. Our simulations are fully reproducible and our code is available on request.

7.1 Visualizations

In figure 1, we show a plot of Minmax Trend Filtering (both upper and lower) estimators as well as Fused Lasso. As predicted by Theorem 2.1, the Fused Lasso fit is sandwiched by the upper and lower Minmax Trend Filtering estimators of order 0. We took the underlying function to be a smooth trigonometric function

$$f_{smooth}(x) = \text{Sin}(5 \pi x) + 0.5 \text{Cos}(4 \pi x) + 2.$$

In all of the simulations described in this section, we took the errors $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ to be i.i.d $N(0, \sigma^2)$ where $\sigma = 0.3$. Throughout, we considered the average of the minmax and the maxmin estimators.

For the purpose of visualization, in figure 2, we show a plot of the (Dyadic) Minmax Trend Filtering fits of orders 0, 1. We show the cross validated (2 fold) fits on a grid of λ ranging from 0 to 100 in increments of 5. We note that our fits are non smooth and look jagged. This is because no explicit global smoothness is enforced and the definition of our estimators is pointwise. This is similar to k nearest neighbor local averaging fits which would also look jagged. The usual way to smoothen the k nearest neighbor fit is to do kernel smoothing; that is to use a continuous kernel like the gaussian kernel for example. Our estimators are minmax/maxmin of penalized local averages. In principle, we can define kernelized versions of our estimators which would be defined as minmax/maxmin of penalized kernelized local averages. We expect these to be much smoother fits that what is shown. We leave exploring this direction for future research.




Figure 1: $n = 100$ data points (in black) were generated as $y_i = f_{smooth}(i/n) + \epsilon_i$. The f_{smooth} function is plotted in green. The Minmax Trend Filtering upper and lower fits with $\lambda = 2$ are plotted in red and blue respectively. The Trend Filtering fit of order 0 or Fused Lasso with $\lambda = 1$ is plotted in brown. We see that the Fused Lasso fit lies in between the upper and lower Minmax Trend Filtering fits. Infact, in this instance the three fits are identical in the interior of the domain. Near the boundary, the upper and lower fits separate and the Fused Lasso fit lies in between them.




Figure 2: $n = 1024$ data points (in grey) were generated as $y_i = f_{smooth}(i/n) + \epsilon_i$. The Dyadic Minmax Trend Filtering fits (with upper and lower fits averaged), with 2 fold cross validation, of orders 0, 1 (left,right) respectively are shown in red.

7.2 Empirical Comparisons with Trend Filtering

Since our Minmax Trend Filtering (MTF) estimators are clearly inspired by Trend Filtering (TF), it is natural to compare their performances to get some context as to how well our estimators perform practically. We take the order $r = 3$; that is we report comparisons of cubic Minmax Trend Filtering and cubic Trend Filtering. This is simply because there is a long standing tradition of using cubic smoothing splines in nonparametric regression.

We considered three underlying functions. For each function f , we generated $n = 1024$ samples as $y_i = f(i/n) + \epsilon_i$. We then did 2 fold cross validation for a well chosen grid of λ to produce our Dyadic Minmax Trend Filtering (DMTF) fits. For each fit, we calculated its mean squared error (MSE) (as compared to the true signal). We repeated this experiment 100 times. Similarly, for each iteration, we also produced Trend Filtering fits (with 2 fold cross validation) and calculated its mean squared errors. We used the *cv.trendfilter* function in *R* to compute the trend filtering fits. We then compared the 100 mean squared errors we obtained for both the fits. We now report our observations.

We consider the dyadic version of MTF here because the non dyadic version is too slow to compute when $n = 1024$. We have observed in our simulations that in the case when n is small; say $n = 128$, the non dyadic version tends to perform better than the dyadic version by a constant factor such as 2 or 3. Therefore, it is expected that if we had been able to compare with the non dyadic version of MTF then the results would have been better for MTF.

Our general observation is that, if we consider overall predictive accuracy such as measuring MSE, Trend Filtering generally performs better for smooth or simple functions; however for functions which are very hard to estimate in the sense of having highly inhomogenous smoothness, it is possible that Minmax Trend Filtering performs better. One clear advantage of Minmax Trend Filtering is that it is consistent for non (discrete) spline functions as well. It is known that Trend Filtering cannot be consistent for such functions.

This section is not meant to portray any practical advantages of MTF over TF. As of now, TF has several clear advantages such as having efficient packages for computation and producing smooth fits. The aim here is to report that Minmax Trend Filtering is perhaps not inadmissible when compared to Trend Filtering and does have some of its own merits.

7.2.1 Smooth Function

The first function we took is the f_{smooth} function defined in the last section. In figure 3, we show a boxplot of the 100 MSE's we obtained. We see that Trend Filtering (TF) outperforms DMTF in this instance. The monte carlo estimates we get for the expected MSE of DMTF and TF are 0.006 and 0.001 respectively. In figure 4, we show the fits (DMTF in red, TF in blue) of one typical realization from the 100 iterations we performed. We observe that the TF fit is really smooth which may be one of the main reasons why it performs better than DMTF in this instance.




Figure 3: The boxplot of 100 simulated MSE for cubic DMTF (in red) and cubic TF (in blue) is shown when the underlying function is the f_{smooth} function.




Figure 4: A realization of the DMTF fit (in red below) and TF fit (in blue above) are shown when the underlying function is the f_{smooth} function (plotted in green).

7.2.2 Doppler Function

The second function we took is the $f_{doppler}$ function defined as follows.

$$f_{doppler}(x) = \text{Sin}\left(\frac{4}{x}\right) + 1.5.$$

There is a long history of evaluating the performance of locally adaptive nonparametric regression methods on this Doppler function; see Tibshirani (2014), ?, Mammen and van de Geer (1997). This function is very difficult to estimate and provides a good test case for nonparametric regression methods. The function is spatially inhomogeneous which means that its smoothness (say the second derivative) varies a lot over the domain $x \in [0, 1]$. Its total variation is infinite.

In figure 5, we show a boxplot of the 100 MSE's we obtained. In this instance however, somewhat surprisingly for us, we see that DMTF outperforms TF. The monte carlo estimates we get for the expected MSE of DMTF and TF are 0.035 and 0.08 respectively. In figure 6, we show the 2 fold cross validated fits (DMTF in red, TF in blue) of one typical realization from the 100 iterations we performed. We observe that the TF fit, when cross validated on the entire data, is able to only estimate well up to 3 cycles of the Doppler function; on the other hand the corresponding DMTF fit is able to capture roughly 5 cycles of the Doppler function. Our simulation shows that for the Doppler function, DMTF seems to be more *locally adaptive* than TF and thus the overall predictive accuracy of the DMTF fit is better than TF.




Figure 5: The boxplot of 100 simulated MSE for cubic DMTF (in red) and cubic TF (in blue) is shown when the underlying function is the $f_{doppler}$ function.




Figure 6: A realization of the DMTF fit (in red) and TF fit (in blue) are shown when the underlying function is the $f_{doppler}$ function. We observe that the TF fit is only able to capture 3 cycles of the Doppler function; on the other hand the corresponding DMTF fit is able to capture roughly 5 cycles of the Doppler function.

7.2.3 Discontinuous Function

The third function we consider here is a discontinuous function

$$f_{\text{discont}}(x) = 100 x^3 1(x \leq 0.5) + 100 (x - 0.5)^3 1(x > 0.5).$$

Trend Filtering of order r is known to be constrained to fit discrete splines of degree r ; see [Guntuboyina et al. \(2020\)](#). Discrete Splines form a subspace of piecewise polynomial signals which satisfy regularity at the knots in the sense that the left and right discrete derivatives (of all orders from 0 to $r - 1$) match. Cubic Trend Filtering therefore can only fit cubic (discrete) splines. The function f_{discont} is a piecewise cubic polynomial but is not a discrete spline since it is discontinuous at $x = 0.5$. Hence, Trend Filtering cannot be expected to be even consistent for such a function. It is a natural question whether Minmax Trend Filtering shares this limitation of Trend Filtering. [Theorem 3.5](#) actually answers this question in the negative; that is MTF would actually be consistent for this function. Infact, [Theorem 3.5](#) says that the MSE would converge at a $O(1/n)$ rate up to log factors for this function. Our simulation verifies that DMTF convincingly outperforms TF in this instance. In [figure 7](#) we see from the boxplots that the minimum MSE (among the 100 iterations) for TF is much larger than the maximum MSE for DMTF. The monte carlo estimates we get for the expected MSE of DMTF and TF are 0.008 and 0.6 respectively. In [figure 8](#) we show the 2 fold cross validated fits (DMTF in red, TF in blue) of one typical realization from the 100 iterations we performed. TF performs badly precise because it is constrained to fit a (discrete) spline; it cannot estimate the function around the point of discontinuity. However, DMTF performs very well even around the point of discontinuity and thus performs way better in terms of overall predictive accuracy.




Figure 7: The boxplot of 100 simulated MSE for cubic DMTF (in red) and cubic TF (in blue) is shown when the underlying function is the f_{smooth} function. Note that the scale in the y axis is completely different in the two plots. The estimated expected MSE is about 0.008 for the DMTF fit and is about 0.6 for the TF fit which indicates that TF is not even consistent when the underlying function is the $f_{discont}$ function.




Figure 8: A realization of the DMTF fit (in red) and TF fit (in blue) are shown when the underlying function is the $f_{discont}$ function. We see that TF completely fails to fit the discontinuity and hence does a rather poor job of estimating near the point of discontinuity. On the other hand, DMTF performs very well in terms of predictive accuracy even near the boundary.

A Proofs for Minmax Trend Filtering

A.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

The proof relies on realization of the fact that $\hat{\theta}_i$ can be upper bounded only in terms of y_J for any interval J containing i . One can then take minimum of these upper bounds over all such intervals J which still remains an upper bound for $\hat{\theta}_i$. Thus, it suffices to prove the following proposition.

Proposition A.1. *Fix any $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in J$. Then the following holds:*

$$\hat{\theta}_i \leq \max_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} (\bar{y}_I - 2\lambda \frac{C_{I,J}}{|I|}).$$

Here we recall the definition of $C_{I,J}$ for any interval $J \subseteq [n]$ and any subinterval $I \subseteq J$.

$$C_{I,J} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } I \subset J \\ -1 & \text{if } I = J \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof of Proposition A.1. Recall the n dimensional Fused Lasso objective function

$$L(\theta) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda TV(\theta)$$

and the Fused Lasso solution is

$$\hat{\theta} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n} L(\theta).$$

For any interval $J = [j_1, j_2] \subseteq [n]$ and any two given real numbers a, b , let us define Fused Lasso ($|J| = m$ dimensional with $1 \leq m \leq n$) objective function with **boundary constraints**. This corresponds to the case when the *two end points of the Fused Lasso solution within J are tied to the numbers a, b* .

$$L^{J,a,b}(\theta_J) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=j_1}^{j_2} (y_j - \theta_j)^2 + \lambda(TV(\theta_J) + |\theta_{j_1} - a| + |\theta_{j_2} - b|). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Let us also denote

$$\hat{\theta}^{J,a,b} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|}} L^{J,a,b}(\theta).$$

Just to be clear, $\hat{\theta}^{J,a,b}$ is a $|J|$ dimensional vector. However, with a slight abuse of notation, for any $i \in [n]$ such that J contains i , we will use $\hat{\theta}_i^{J,a,b}$ to denote the entry of $\hat{\theta}^{J,a,b}$ at location i , which is technically the $(i - j_1 + 1)$ th entry of $\hat{\theta}^{J,a,b}$.

We now write an intermediate lemma stating that the entries of $\hat{\theta}^{J,a,b}$ can be bounded by the right hand side in the statement of Proposition A.1, a quantity only depending on y_J but not on a or b .

Lemma A.2. *[Pointwise Bound for Boundary Constrained Fused Lasso]*

Fix any $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J = [j_1, j_2] \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in J$. Then the following holds:

$$\sup_{a, b \in \mathbb{R}} \widehat{\theta}_i^{J, a, b} \leq \max_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} (\bar{y}_I - 2\lambda \frac{C_{I, J}}{|I|}).$$

Remark A.1. *What is perhaps surprising in the above lemma is that the bound for the boundary constrained Fused Lasso fitted value does not depend on the boundary constraints a, b . In other words, the bound holds for any a, b .*

Proof. Fix $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$. Within this proof we will delete the superscripts J, a, b and write $\widehat{\theta}^{J, a, b}$ as simply $\widehat{\theta}$ to reduce notational clutter.

Take $\widetilde{J} = [s, t]$ to be the largest sub interval of J containing i such that

$$\widehat{\theta}_v \geq \widehat{\theta}_i \quad \forall v \in \widetilde{J}.$$

Note that we always have $i \in \widetilde{J}$ and hence \widetilde{J} is non empty.

Define $\widetilde{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\widetilde{J}|}$, which is an $\epsilon > 0$ perturbation of $\widehat{\theta}$, in the following way:

$$\widetilde{\theta}_v = \widehat{\theta}_v - \epsilon 1(v \in \widetilde{J}) \quad \forall v \in J.$$

Now by optimality of $\widehat{\theta}$, we must have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (L^{J, a, b}(\widetilde{\theta}) - L^{J, a, b}(\widehat{\theta})) \geq 0.$$

We now note

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in J} (y_j - \widetilde{\theta}_j)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in J} (y_j - \widehat{\theta}_j)^2 \right) = \sum_{j \in \widetilde{J}} (y_j - \widehat{\theta}_j)$$

Moreover, it can be checked that

$$(TV(\widetilde{\theta}) + |\widetilde{\theta}_{j_1} - a| + |\widetilde{\theta}_{j_2} - b|) - (TV(\widehat{\theta}) + |\widehat{\theta}_{j_1} - a| + |\widehat{\theta}_{j_2} - b|) = \begin{cases} -2\epsilon & \text{if } s \neq j_1 \text{ and } t \neq j_2 \\ -2\epsilon + 2\epsilon 1(\widehat{\theta}_{j_1} \leq a) & \text{if } s = j_1, t \neq j_2 \\ -2\epsilon + 2\epsilon 1(\widehat{\theta}_{j_2} \leq b) & \text{if } s \neq j_1, t = j_2 \\ -2\epsilon + 2\epsilon 1(\widehat{\theta}_{j_2} \leq b) + 2\epsilon 1(\widehat{\theta}_{j_1} \leq a) & \text{if } s = j_1 \text{ and } t = j_2. \end{cases}$$

In the above, the fact that \widetilde{J} is the maximal interval containing i where $\widehat{\theta}$ takes values not less than $\widehat{\theta}_i$ has been used crucially.

Therefore, by replacing the indicators in the above display by 1 we can succinctly write

$$(TV(\tilde{\theta}) + |\tilde{\theta}_{j_1} - a| + |\tilde{\theta}_{j_2} - b|) - (TV(\hat{\theta}) + |\hat{\theta}_{j_1} - a| + |\hat{\theta}_{j_2} - b|) \leq -2C_{\tilde{J},J}\epsilon.$$

Therefore, the last three displays let us conclude that

$$0 \leq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (L^{J,a,b}(\tilde{\theta}) - L^{J,a,b}(\hat{\theta})) \leq \sum_{j \in \tilde{J}} (y_j - \hat{\theta}_j) - 2\lambda C_{\tilde{J},J}.$$

Rewriting the above in terms of averages, we get

$$\hat{\theta}_i \leq \tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{J}} \leq \bar{y}_{\tilde{J}} - 2\lambda \frac{C_{\tilde{J},J}}{|\tilde{J}|} \leq \max_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} (\bar{y}_I - 2\lambda \frac{C_{I,J}}{|I|}).$$

where in the first inequality above we used the precise definition of the interval \tilde{J} , and in the last inequality above we replaced the interval \tilde{J} with a maximum over all possible sub intervals I of J containing i .

□

We now state a simple but important observation in the form of the next intermediate lemma.

Lemma A.3. *Fix any $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J = [j_1 : j_2] \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in J$. Then the following is true:*

$$\hat{\theta}_i = \hat{\theta}_i^{J, \hat{\theta}_{j_1-1}, \hat{\theta}_{j_2+1}}$$

where we set for the sake of convention, $\hat{\theta}_0 = \hat{\theta}_1$ and $\hat{\theta}_{n+1} = \hat{\theta}_n$.

Proof. First, consider the case when $1 < j_1 < j_2 < n$. Consider computing $\hat{\theta}$ by minimizing $L(\theta)$ with the extra information when $\hat{\theta}_{j_1-1}, \hat{\theta}_{j_2+1}$ are known.

By definition of the TV functional, the objective function $L(\theta)$ viewed as a function of $\theta_{[n]-\{j_1-1, j_2+1\}}$ separates into a sum of two objective functions, one of which is precisely $L^{J, \hat{\theta}_{j_1-1}, \hat{\theta}_{j_2+1}}$ as a function of θ_J and the other a function of $\theta_{[n]-[j_1-1: j_2+1]}$. Therefore, to compute $\hat{\theta}_J$ it will suffice to minimize the function $L^{J, \hat{\theta}_{j_1-1}, \hat{\theta}_{j_2+1}}$. This completes the proof in this case.

Now consider the case when $J = [n]$ so that $j_1 = 1$ and $j_2 = n$. In this case, it is easy to check that by definition of $L^{J,a,b}$, $\hat{\theta}$ is still the minimizer of $L^{J, \hat{\theta}_{j_1-1}, \hat{\theta}_{j_2+1}}$.

The other cases when $j_1 = 1$ or $j_2 = n$ but not both, can be argued similarly.

□

We are now ready to prove Proposition A.1. Fixing any $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \subset [n]$ such that $i \in J$,

$$\widehat{\theta}_i = \widehat{\theta}_i^{J, \widehat{\theta}_{j_1-1}, \widehat{\theta}_{j_2+1}} \leq \sup_{a, b \in \mathbb{R}} \widehat{\theta}_i^{J, a, b} \leq \max_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} (\bar{y}_I - 2\lambda \frac{C_{I, J}}{|I|})$$

where in the first equality we used Lemma A.3 and in the second inequality we used Lemma A.2. □

We can now finish the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Since Proposition A.1 holds for any interval J containing i , we can now take a minimum over such intervals to conclude Theorem 2.1,

$$\widehat{\theta}_i \leq \min_{J \subseteq [n]: i \in J} \max_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} (\bar{y}_I - 2\lambda \frac{C_{I, J}}{|I|}). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The above shows the upper bound in (2.2). To show the lower bound, we can simply apply the whole argument to the negative data vector $-y$. It is clear that $-\widehat{\theta}$ is the solution of the Fused Lasso objective $L(\theta)$ when the input data vector is $-y$.

Therefore, (A.2) implies that

$$-\widehat{\theta}_i \leq \min_{J \subseteq [n]: i \in J} \max_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} (-\bar{y}_I - 2\lambda \frac{C_{I, J}}{|I|}).$$

We can rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_i &\geq - \min_{J \subseteq [n]: i \in J} \max_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} (-\bar{y}_I - 2\lambda \frac{C_{I, J}}{|I|}) = \max_{J \subseteq [n]: i \in J} (- \max_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} (-\bar{y}_I - 2\lambda \frac{C_{I, J}}{|I|})) \\ &= \max_{J \subseteq [n]: i \in J} \min_{I \subseteq J: i \in I} (\bar{y}_I + 2\lambda \frac{C_{I, J}}{|I|}). \end{aligned}$$

The above display along with (A.2) finishes the proof. □

A.2 Proof of Lemma 3.2

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Fix any $i \in [n]$. For any $J \in \mathcal{I}$ which contains the point i , let's define the two quantities

$$LH(J) = \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(|I|, r)} y_I)_i + \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|}].$$

$$RH(J) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(|I|, r)} y_I)_i - \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|}].$$

To show that (3.2) holds, it is enough to show that

$$LH(J_1) \leq \overline{RH(J_2)} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for any two intervals $J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $i \in J_1 \cap J_2$.

We will now show that (A.3) holds by considering three exhaustive cases.

Case 1: When $J_2 \subseteq J_1$.

We can write

$$LH(J_1) \leq \left[(P^{(|J_2|,r)} y_{J_2})_i + \frac{\lambda C_{J_2, J_1}}{|J_2|} \right] \leq \left[(P^{(|J_2|,r)} y_{J_2})_i + \frac{\lambda}{|J_2|} \right] = \left[(P^{(|J_2|,r)} y_{J_2})_i - \frac{\lambda C_{J_2, J_2}}{|J_2|} \right] \leq RH(J_2). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the first inequality follows from the definition of $LH(J_1)$, second inequality follows from the facts $C_{J_2, J_1} \leq 1, \lambda \geq 0$, the equality follows because $C_{J_2, J_2} = -1$ and the final inequality follows from the definition of $RH(J_2)$.

Case 2: When $J_1 \subseteq J_2$.

One can argue similarly as in the previous case and conclude

$$LH(J_1) \leq \left[(P^{(|J_1|,r)} y_{J_1})_i + \frac{\lambda C_{J_1, J_1}}{|J_1|} \right] = \left[(P^{(|J_1|,r)} y_{J_1})_i - \frac{\lambda}{|J_1|} \right] \leq \left[(P^{(|J_1|,r)} y_{J_1})_i - \frac{\lambda C_{J_1, J_2}}{|J_1|} \right] \leq RH(J_2). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Case 3: When $J_1 \cap J_2 \neq J_1$ and $J_1 \cap J_2 \neq J_2$.

In this case, we consider the interval $J_1 \cap J_2$. We observe that $J_1 \cap J_2$ is neither contained strictly in the interior of J_1 or J_2 nor can it be equal to J_1 or J_2 . In fact, one of the end points of $J_1 \cap J_2$ must be an end point of J_1 and the other end point of $J_1 \cap J_2$ must be an end point of J_2 .

Therefore, we have $C_{J_1 \cap J_2, J_1} = C_{J_1 \cap J_2, J_2} = 0$.

Now we can write

$$\begin{aligned} LH(J_1) &\leq \left[(P^{(|J_1 \cap J_2|,r)} y_{J_1 \cap J_2})_i + \frac{\lambda C_{J_1 \cap J_2, J_1}}{|J_1 \cap J_2|} \right] = (P^{(|J_1 \cap J_2|,r)} y_{J_1 \cap J_2})_i \\ &= \left[(P^{(|J_1 \cap J_2|,r)} y_{J_1 \cap J_2})_i - \frac{\lambda C_{J_1 \cap J_2, J_2}}{|J_1 \cap J_2|} \right] \leq RH(J_2). \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3.5

To prove Theorem 3.5, it suffices to prove Proposition 3.3 and Proposition 3.4. This is what we do next.

A.3.1 Proof of Proposition 3.3

Proof of Proposition 3.3. This proof relies on a few intermediate lemmas. The first lemma is the following.

Lemma A.4. *Fix a non negative integer $r \geq 0$. Fix any location $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in J$. Recall the (r th order) positive and negative bias terms*

$$Bias_+^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta^*)_i - \theta_i^*]$$

$$Bias_-^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) = \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta^*)_i - \theta_i^*]$$

Also recall the r th order effective noise term

$$M^{(r)} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)|_\infty \sqrt{|I|}].$$

Now define the following intermediate standard error quantity

$$\widetilde{SE}(i, J, \lambda) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|I|}} - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right].$$

Then the following deterministic inequality is true:

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(Bias_-(J) - \widetilde{SE}(i, J, \lambda) \right) \leq \widehat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)} - \theta_i^* \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(Bias_+(J) + \widetilde{SE}(i, J, \lambda) \right).$$

Proof of Lemma A.4. For any $i \in [n]$ and any $J \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $i \in J$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)} &\leq \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(r,|I|)}y_I)_i - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right] = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta^*)_i + (P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right] \leq \\ &\max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} (P^{(r,|I|)}\theta^*)_i + \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)} - \theta_i^* &\leq \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta_I^*)_i - \theta_i^*] + \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|}] \\ &\leq \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta_I^*)_i - \theta_i^*] + \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|I|}} - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right].\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)} &\geq \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}y_I)_i + \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|}] = \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta_I^*)_i + (P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i + \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|}] \geq \\ &\min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} (P^{(r,|I|)}\theta_I^*)_i + \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i + \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|}]\end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)} - \theta_i^* &\geq \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta_I^*)_i - \theta_i^*] + \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i + \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|}] \geq \\ &\min_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} [(P^{(r,|I|)}\theta_I^*)_i - \theta_i^*] - \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|I|}} - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right].\end{aligned}$$

□

Given Lemma A.4, to prove Proposition 3.3 it now suffices to show that for any interval J containing i , we have $\widehat{SE}(i, J, \lambda) \leq SE(i, J, \lambda)$. This is the content of the next lemma.

Lemma A.5. *Fix any $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \in \mathcal{I}$ containing i . Then we have for all $\lambda \geq 0$,*

$$\underbrace{\max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J} \left[\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|I|}} - \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|} \right]}_{\widehat{SE}(i, J, \lambda)} \leq \underbrace{\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{\text{Dist}(i, \partial J)}} + \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{(M^{(r)})^2}{4\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}}_{SE(i, J, \lambda)}.$$

Proof of Lemma A.5. It will be helpful to first solve the optimization problem suggested by the left hand side above. We do this in the following lemma.

Lemma A.6. *(An Optimization Problem) For a positive integer $N \geq 1$, and $M > 0, \lambda \geq 0$, consider the optimization problem*

$$OPT(M, \lambda, N) = \max_{1 \leq x \leq N} \left(\frac{M}{\sqrt{x}} - \frac{\lambda}{x} \right).$$

Then, we have

$$OPT(M, \lambda, N) = \begin{cases} M - \lambda & \text{if } 0 \leq \lambda < \frac{M}{2} \\ \frac{M^2}{4\lambda} & \text{if } \frac{M}{2} \leq \lambda < \frac{M}{2} \sqrt{N} \\ \frac{M}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\lambda}{N} \leq \frac{M}{2\sqrt{N}} & \text{if } \frac{M}{2} \sqrt{N} \leq \lambda. \end{cases}$$

Also, for any fixed M, λ, N we have

$$OPT(M, \lambda, N) \leq \frac{M^2}{4\lambda}.$$

Proof of Lemma A.6. We can write

$$OPT(M, \lambda, N) = \max_{1 \leq x \leq N} \left(\frac{M}{\sqrt{x}} - \frac{\lambda}{x} \right) = \max_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \leq a \leq 1} (Ma - \lambda a^2).$$

So we are simply maximizing a concave quadratic in an interval. The roots of the quadratic are 0 and $\frac{M}{\lambda}$ and the global maximizer of the quadratic is at $\frac{M}{2\lambda}$. This means there are three cases to consider.

1. $\frac{M}{2\lambda} > 1$: This is the case when the global max is larger than 1. In this case the maximizer is at 1 and the value is $M - \lambda$.
2. $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \leq \frac{M}{2\lambda} \leq 1$: This is the case when the global max is inside the feasible interval. The maximizer is the global max and the value is $\frac{M^2}{4\lambda}$.
3. $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} > \frac{M}{2\lambda}$: This is the case when the global max is smaller than the smallest feasible value. In this case, the maximizer is at the smallest feasible value which is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ and the value is $\frac{M}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\lambda}{N}$.

The second display simply follows from the fact that

$$OPT(M, \lambda, N) \leq \max_{0 \leq a} (Ma - \lambda a^2).$$

The proof is finished. □

We are now ready to finish the proof of Lemma A.5. We can consider three separate cases for which the values of $C_{I,J}$ are different and write

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{SE}(i, J, \lambda) &\leq \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J, I \cap \partial J \neq \{\emptyset\}} \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|I|}} + \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: i \in I, I \subseteq J, I \cap \partial J = \{\emptyset\}} \left[\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|I|}} - \frac{\lambda}{|I|} \right] + \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|} \leq \\ &\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{Dist(i, \partial J)}} + OPT(M^{(r)}, \lambda, |J|) + \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|} \leq \\ &\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{Dist(i, \partial J)}} + \frac{(M^{(r)})^2}{4\lambda} + \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}. \end{aligned}$$

□

This finishes the proof of Proposition 3.3. □

A.3.2 Proof of Proposition 3.4

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Fix any interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Note that for any fixed $i \in I$, we can write $(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i = \sum_{j \in |I|} P_{ij}^{(r,|I|)} \epsilon_j$ as a linear combination of $\{\epsilon_j; j \in I\}$, therefore it will be subgaussian. The subgaussian norm squared will be at most the sum of squares of the coefficients $\sum_{j \in |I|} (P_{ij}^{(r,|I|)})^2$. Now note that

$$\sum_{j \in |I|} (P_{ij}^{(r,|I|)})^2 = \sum_{j \in |I|} P_{ij}^{(r,|I|)} P_{ji}^{(r,|I|)} = (P^{(r,|I|)})_{ii}^2 = P_{ii}^{(r,|I|)}.$$

In the first equality we used the symmetry of the orthogonal projection matrix $P^{(r,|I|)}$ and in the last equality we used the fact that $P^{(r,|I|)}$ is idempotent.

Now, we claim that there exists a constant $c_r > 0$ only depending on r such that

$$P_{ii}^{(r,|I|)} \leq \frac{c_r}{|I|}.$$

This claim is a property about the subspace of discrete polynomials and is stated and proved in a stand alone Proposition A.7.

The above claim implies that for any I containing i , the random variable $\sqrt{|I|}(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i$ is Subgaussian with subgaussian norm bounded by a constant c_r only depending on r . Using a standard result about maxima of finitely many subgaussians finishes the proof of this proposition as there are at most $O(n^2)$ intervals I containing i and we can further take a union bound over i as well. \square

A.4 A Fact about Discrete Polynomials

Proposition A.7. Fix an integer $r \geq 0$. For any positive integer m , define $I = [m]$. Define the (Vandermonde) matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (r+1)}$ obtained by stacking together columns

$$B = (b_0 : b_1 : \dots : b_r)$$

where for each $j \in [0 : r]$ we define

$$b_j = (1^j, 2^j, \dots, m^j)^T.$$

We call b_j as the (discrete) polynomial vector of degree j on I . Define $P^{(r)}$ to be the orthogonal projection matrix on to the subspace $S^{(r)}$ of r th degree polynomials or more precisely,

$$S^{(r)} = \text{Span}(b_0, \dots, b_r).$$

Then there exists a constant $C_r > 0$ only depending on r such that

$$\| \text{Diag}(P^{(r)}) \|_{\infty} \leq \frac{C_r}{m}. \tag{A.6}$$

Proof. Let the vectors $\tilde{b}_0, \dots, \tilde{b}_r$ be an orthogonal basis of $S^{(r)}$ obtained by performing Gram Schmidt orthogonalization on the ordered set $\{b_0, \dots, b_r\}$. We can think of $\tilde{b}_0, \dots, \tilde{b}_r$ as a set of (discrete)

orthogonal polynomials, infact these can be thought of as (discrete) Legendre polynomials. We can now write the orthogonal projection matrix $P^{(r)}$ as follows:

$$P^{(r)} = \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{\tilde{b}_j \tilde{b}_j^T}{\|\tilde{b}_j\|^2}.$$

Fix an $i \in [m]$ and we can write the i th diagonal element of $P^{(r)}$ as

$$P_{ii}^{(r)} = e_i^T P^{(r)} e_i = \sum_{j=0}^r \frac{(e_i^T \tilde{b}_j)^2}{\|\tilde{b}_j\|^2}.$$

In the above, e_i is the i th canonical basis vector in \mathbb{R}^m .

The following two lemmas will now finish the proof.

Lemma A.8. *Fix non negative integers r and $m > r$. There exists a positive constant c_r only depending on r such that*

$$\min_{0 \leq j \leq r} \|\tilde{b}_j\|^2 \geq c_r m^{2j+1}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Lemma A.9. *Fix non negative integers r and m . For each $j \in [0 : r]$ there exists a positive constant c_r only depending on r such that*

$$\|\tilde{b}_j\|_\infty \leq c_r m^j. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

□

Now we give proofs of both these lemmas. Within these proofs c_r will denote a generic positive constant only depending on r and whose exact value might change from line to line.

Proof of Lemma A.8. If $j = 0$, then $\tilde{b}_j = b_j$ and there is nothing to prove since $\|\tilde{b}_0\|^2 = m$. So fix any $j \in [r]$. Note that since we are performing Gram Schmidt orthogonalization, we can write \tilde{b}_j as a linear combination of b_0, b_1, \dots, b_j where the coefficient of b_j is 1, i.e,

$$\tilde{b}_j = a_0 b_0 + a_1 b_1 + \dots + a_{j-1} b_{j-1} + a_j b_j$$

where $a_j = 1$. Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{b}_j\|^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^m (a_0 + a_1 i + a_2 i^2 + \dots + a_j i^j)^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{u=0}^j \sum_{v=0}^j a_u i^u a_v i^v = \\ &= \sum_{u=0}^j \sum_{v=0}^j \underbrace{a_u m^{u+1/2}}_{x_u} \underbrace{a_v m^{v+1/2}}_{x_v} \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{i}{m} \right)^{u+v} \right)}_{Q_{uv}} = \\ &= x^T Q x. \end{aligned}$$

In the above step, we wrote $\|\tilde{b}_j\|^2$ as a quadratic form in a vector $x = (x_0, \dots, x_j) \in \mathbb{R}^{j+1}$.

It will help to think of Q in the block matrix form as follows.

$$Q = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} Q_{11} & Q_{12} \\ \hline Q_{21} & Q_{22} \end{array} \right]$$

where $Q_{11} = Q_{[0:(j-1),0:(j-1)]} \in \mathbb{R}^{j \times j}$ and $Q_{22} = Q_{jj} \in \mathbb{R}$. We can now write

$$x^T Q x = y^T Q_{11} y + 2y^T Q_{12} x_j + x_j^2 Q_{jj}$$

where $y = x[0 : (j - 1)]$.

We now claim that Q is strictly positive definite, we will prove this at the end. This will imply that its leading principal minor Q_{11} is also strictly positive definite. Thus, viewing $x^T Q x$ as a function of y as above (keeping x_j fixed), we see that it is a strongly convex function of y (since Q_{11} is positive definite) and hence has a unique minima. By differentiating and solving for y , it can be checked that $y^* = -Q_{11}^{-1} Q_{12} x_j$ is the minima and the minimum value is $x_j^2 (Q_{jj} - Q_{21} Q_{11}^{-1} Q_{12})$. This gives us the lower bound

$$x^T Q x \geq x_j^2 (Q_{jj} - Q_{21} Q_{11}^{-1} Q_{12}).$$

Note that $x_j^2 = a_j^2 m^{2j+1} = m^{2j+1}$ since $a_j = 1$. Therefore, to show (A.7) it suffices to show that

$$(Q_{jj} - Q_{21} Q_{11}^{-1} Q_{12}) \geq c_r > 0. \tag{A.9}$$

Now, using linear algebra terminology, $(Q_{jj} - Q_{21} Q_{11}^{-1} Q_{12})$ is the Schur complement of Q_{11} and using the well known block matrix inversion formula we obtain

$$(Q^{-1})_{jj} = \frac{1}{Q_{jj} - Q_{21} Q_{11}^{-1} Q_{12}}$$

Moreover, we also have

$$(Q^{-1})_{jj} \leq \lambda_{\max}(Q^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}.$$

where $\lambda_{\max}, \lambda_{\min}$ denote the maximum and minimum eigenvalue respectively. Therefore, to show (A.9), it suffices to show that for all $m \geq 1$,

$$\lambda_{\min}(Q) \geq c_r > 0. \tag{A.10}$$

Let U_m be a discrete random variable uniform on the set $\{\frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m}{m}\}$ and U denote a $U(0, 1)$ random variable. Then, we have U_m converging to U weakly; i.e.,

$$U_m \xrightarrow[m \rightarrow \infty]{\text{law}} U.$$

Note that Q is product moment matrix of the random vector $U_m^{(vec)} = (U_m^1, \dots, U_m^j)$. That is,

$$Q_{uv} = \mathbb{E} U_m^u U_m^v.$$

Define Q^{pop} to be the population version of Q ; more precisely, define

$$Q_{uv}^{POP} = \mathbb{E} U^u U^v.$$

By the continuous mapping theorem, we can conclude that

$$Q \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} Q^{pop}.$$

Since λ_{min} is a continuous function on the space of positive definite matrices, we further can write

$$\lambda_{min}(Q) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{min}(Q^{pop}).$$

Now we claim that Q^{pop} is positive definite and hence there exists a constant $c_r > 0$ such that $\lambda_{min}(Q^{pop}) > c_r$. Therefore, there exists a positive integer $M \geq 1$ such that $\lambda_{min}(Q) \geq \frac{c_r}{2}$ for all $m \geq M$. Combined with the fact that $\lambda_{min}(Q) > 0$ for all $m \geq 1$, this proves (A.10) and in turn proves (A.9) which in turn proves (A.7).

All that remains is to show that Q^{pop} is positive definite and so is Q for all $m \geq 1$.

Take any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{j+1}$ and consider the quadratic form $v^T Q^{pop} v$. Suppose

$$v^T Q^{pop} v = E \sum_{u=0}^j \sum_{v=0}^j v_u v_j U^{u+j} = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{u=0}^j v_u U^u \right)^2 = 0$$

This implies that the random variable $\sum_{u=0}^j c_u U^u = 0$ almost surely. If any of the v_u 's are non zero then the above is a polynomial of degree at most j and hence cannot be 0 almost surely in U . Therefore, it has to be the case that the vector v is zero. This shows that Q^{pop} is positive definite.

Similarly, suppose

$$v^T Q v = \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{u=0}^j v_u U_m^u \right)^2 = 0$$

The above means that the polynomial $p(x) = \sum_{u=0}^j v_u x^u$ has at least m roots $\{\frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m}{m}\}$. However, $p(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $j \leq r$. Therefore, if $m > r$ then this is a contradiction unless v is the zero vector. This shows that if $m > r$, then Q is also positive definite.

□

Proof of Lemma A.9. If $j = 0$, then $\tilde{b}_j = b_j$ and there is nothing to prove since $\|\tilde{b}_0\|^2 = m$. So fix any $j \in [r]$. Note that because we are doing Gram Schmidt orthogonalization, we can write $\tilde{b}_j = b_j - P^{(j-1)}b_j$. Therefore, by the triangle inequality

$$\|\tilde{b}_j\|_\infty = \|b_j - P^{(j-1)}b_j\|_\infty \leq \|b_j\|_\infty + \|P^{(j-1)}b_j\|_\infty.$$

Now, it can be easily checked that $\|b_j\|_\infty = m^j$. So to show (A.8) it suffices to show that there exists a constant $c_r > 0$ such that

$$\|P^{(j-1)}b_j\|_\infty \leq c_r m^j.$$

For this, we first note that $\|b_j\|_2^2 \leq c_r m^{2j+1}$ and therefore $\|P^{(j-1)}b_j\|_2 \leq c_r m^{j+1/2}$. Let us denote

$$v = \frac{P^{(j-1)}b_j}{\|P^{(j-1)}b_j\|_2}.$$

It now suffices to show that

$$\|v\|_\infty \leq \frac{c_r}{m^{1/2}}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Let (L_0, \dots, L_r) be the set of (normalized) Legendre polynomials of degree r defined on the domain $[-1, 1]$. These are orthogonal polynomials and satisfy for $u, v \in [0 : r]$,

$$\int_0^1 L_u L_v = 1(u \neq v).$$

Another fact about these Legendre Polynomials is that they are bounded and their derivatives are bounded, that is

$$\max\{\|L_u\|_\infty, \|L'_u\|_\infty : u = 0, \dots, r\} \leq c_r < \infty.$$

We now note that $P^{(j-1)}$ is the orthogonal projection matrix on to the span of the set of monomials $\{x^u : u \in [0 : r]\}$ evaluated on the points $\{\frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{m}{m}\}$. It can be readily seen that this linear subspace is same as the linear span $\text{Span}(L(x_1), \dots, L(x_m))$ where

$$x_i = -1 + \frac{2i}{m}.$$

Therefore, we can write for each $i \in [m]$,

$$v_i = \sum_{u=0}^{j-1} a_u L_u(x_i).$$

Note that

$$\|v\|_\infty \leq \left(\max_{0 \leq u \leq (j-1)} |a_u| \right) \sum_{u=0}^{j-1} \|L_u\|_\infty$$

and hence

$$\|v\|_\infty \leq c_r \left(\max_{0 \leq u \leq (j-1)} |a_u| \right) \leq c_r \sqrt{\sum_{u=0}^{j-1} a_u^2}.$$

Therefore, to show (A.11) it suffices to show

$$\sum_{u=0}^{j-1} a_u^2 \leq \frac{c_r}{m}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Denote the population or function version of v as f defined by

$$f = \sum_{u=0}^{j-1} a_u L_u.$$

Now we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{u=0}^{j-1} a_u^2 - \frac{2}{m} \right| &= \left| \int_{-1}^1 f^2(x) - \frac{2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f^2(x_i) \right| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} (f^2(x) - f^2(x_i)) dx \right| \leq \\ &\sum_{i=1}^m \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} |f^2(x) - f^2(x_i)| dx \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} \|(f^2)'\|_\infty |x - x_i| dx \leq \|(f^2)'\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{2}{m}\right)^2 \leq \frac{4}{m} \|(f^2)'\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, $x_0 = -1$ and in the second inequality we used the mean value theorem.

Moreover,

$$\|(f^2)'\|_\infty \leq \left\| \sum_{u=0}^{j-1} \sum_{v=0}^{j-1} a_u a_v (L_u L_v)' \right\|_\infty \leq c_r \left(\max_{0 \leq u \leq (j-1)} |a_u| \right)^2 \leq c_r \sum_{u=0}^{j-1} a_u^2.$$

Therefore, the last two displays lets us obtain

$$\left| \sum_{u=0}^{j-1} a_u^2 - \frac{2}{m} \right| \leq \frac{c_r}{m} \sum_{u=0}^{j-1} a_u^2.$$

Therefore, there exists a positive integer M (only depending on r) such that for $m > M$, the inequality (A.12) holds. This finishes the proof. \square

A.5 An Approximation Result for Bounded Variation Sequences

We prove the following proposition about approximation of a bounded variation vector by a piecewise polynomial vector.

Proposition A.10. Fix a integer $r \geq 1$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $\text{TV}^{(r)}(\theta) := V$. For any $\delta > 0$, there exists an interval partition π of $[n]$ such that

- a) $\text{TV}^{(r)}(\theta_I) \leq V\delta \quad \forall I \in \pi$,
- b) For any $i \in [n]$, we have

$$\max\{|Bias_+^{(r-1)}(i, J_i, \theta)|, |Bias_-^{(r-1)}(i, J_i, \theta)|\} \leq C_r V \delta$$

where J_i is the interval within the partition π which contains i ,

- c) $|\pi| \leq C_r \delta^{-1/r}$.

- d) There exists absolute constants $0 < c_1 \leq c_2$ such that for any integer $l \geq 0$,

$$|I \in \pi : c_1 \frac{n}{2^l} \leq |I| \leq c_2 \frac{n}{2^l}| \leq C_r \min\left\{\frac{2^{-\ell(r-1)}}{\delta}, 2^\ell\right\}.$$

Remark A.2. The proof uses a recursive partitioning scheme proposed in [Chatterjee and Goswami \(2021\)](#); see Proposition 8.9 therein, which further can be thought of as a discrete version of a classical analogous result for functions defined on the continuum in [Birman and Solomjak \(1967\)](#).

Proof of Proposition A.10. We first need a lemma quantifying the error when approximating an arbitrary vector θ by its polynomial projection.

Lemma A.11. Fix any integer $r \geq 0$. For any $n \geq 1$ and for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we have

$$|\theta - P^{(n,r)}\theta|_\infty \leq C_r \text{TV}^{(r+1)}(\theta). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Proof. Let us denote $P^{(n,r)}$ by $P^{(r)}$ within this proof and let us denote the subspace of discrete r th order polynomials on $[n]$ by $S^{(r)}$.

Write the projection matrix onto the orthogonal complement of $S^{(r)}$ (denote by $S^{(r,\perp)}$) by P^\perp . We want to bound $|\theta - P^{(r)}\theta|_\infty = |P^\perp\theta|_\infty$.

Note that $S^{(r)}$ is precisely the null space of the matrix $D^{(r+1)}$. Therefore, $S^{(r,\perp)}$ becomes the row space of the matrix $D^{(r+1)}$. In case, $D^{(r+1)}$ was full row rank (which it is not), then by standard least squares theory we could have written

$$P^\perp\theta = (D^{(r+1)})^t (D^{(r+1)}(D^{(r+1)})^t)^{-1} D^{(r+1)}\theta.$$

Since $D^{(r+1)}$ is not of full row rank we have to modify the above slightly. Using the concept of generalized inverse, the above display still holds with the inverse replaced by a generalized inverse. The main point in all of this is that entries of $P^\perp\theta$ can be written as linear combinations of the entries of $D^{(r+1)}\theta$. Infact, the above display can be simplified as

$$P^\perp\theta = (D^{(r+1)})^+ D^{(r+1)}\theta$$

where $(D^{(r+1)})^+$ is the appropriate matrix from above; also known as the Moore Penrose Inverse of $D^{(r+1)}$.

We now claim that $|(D^{(r+1)})^+|_\infty \leq C_r n^r$. This will finish the proof by using

$$|P^\perp\theta|_\infty \leq |(D^{(r+1)})^+|_\infty |D^{(r+1)}\theta|_1 \leq C_r \text{TV}^{(r+1)}(\theta).$$

It remains to prove the claim. We will use certain existing representations of $(D^{(r+1)})^+$ for this.

By Lemma 13 in Wang et al. (2016), we have that $(D^{(r+1)})^+ = \frac{n^r}{r!} P^\perp H$ where H consists of the last $n - r - 1$ columns of the so called r th order falling factorial basis matrix. Further, expressions for the falling factorial basis are given in Wang et al. (2014). We have that for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n - r - 1\}$,

$$H_{i,j} = h_j(i/n),$$

where

$$h_j(x) = \prod_{l=1}^{r-1} \left(x - \frac{j+l}{n} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{x \geq \frac{j+r-1}{n}\}}.$$

Take e_i , the i th element of the canonical basis in R^{n-r-1} . Using the expression for $(D^{(r+1)})^+$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n^r} \|e_i^\top (D^{(r+1)})^+\|_\infty &\leq \|P^\perp e_i\|_1 \|H_2\|_\infty / r! \\ &\leq (\|e_i\|_1 + \|P^{(r)} e_i\|_1) \|H_2\|_\infty / (r-1)! \\ &\leq [1 + \|P^{(r)} e_i\|_1] / (r-1)! \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Hölder's inequality, the second from the triangle inequality and the last by the definition of H_2 .

Next let v_1, \dots, v_{r+1} be an orthonormal basis of $S^{(r)}$. Then

$$\|P^{(r)} e_i\|_1 = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{r+1} (e_i^\top v_j) v_j \right\|_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r+1} |(e_i^\top v_j)| \|v_j\|_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r+1} \|v_j\|_\infty \|v_j\|_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{r+1} \|v_j\|_\infty n^{1/2}.$$

Now, Lemmas A.8, A.9 tell us that $\|v_j\|_\infty \leq \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{n}}$ for all $j \in [r+1]$.

All in all, the above arguments finally imply our claim

$$\|(D^{(r+1)})^+\|_\infty \leq C_r n^r. \tag{A.14}$$

□

We are now ready to proceed with the proof of Proposition A.10. For the sake of clean exposition, we assume n is a power of 2. The reader can check that the proof holds for arbitrary n as well (by adopting a convention for splitting an interval by half). For an interval $I \subseteq [n]$, let us define

$$\mathcal{M}(I) = \text{TV}^{(r)}(\theta_I) = |I|^{r-1} |D^{(r)} \theta_I|_1$$

where $|I|$ is the cardinality of I and θ_I is the vector θ restricted to the indices in I . Let us now perform recursive dyadic partitioning of $[n]$ according to the following rule. Starting with the root vertex $I = [n]$ we check whether $\mathcal{M}(I) \leq V\delta$. If so, we stop and the root becomes a leaf. If not, divide the root I into two equal nodes or intervals $I_1 = [n/2]$ and $I_2 = [n/2 + 1 : n]$. For $i = 1, 2$ we now check whether $\mathcal{M}(I_j) \leq V\delta$ for $j = 1, 2$. If so, then this node becomes a leaf otherwise we keep partitioning. When this scheme halts, we would be left with a Recursive Dyadic Partition π of $[n]$ which are constituted by disjoint intervals. Let's say there are k of these intervals denoted by B_1, \dots, B_k . By construction, we have $\mathcal{M}(B_i) \leq V\delta$ which proves part (a).

One of the B_1, \dots, B_k would contain i . We denote this interval by J_i . Let I be any subset of J_i containing i . Since $\text{TV}^{(r)}(\theta_{J_i}) \leq V\delta$ we must have

$$\text{TV}^r(\theta_I) \leq V\delta.$$

We can now apply Lemma A.11 to θ_I to obtain

$$|\theta_I - P^{(|I|, r-1)}\theta_I|_\infty \leq C_r \text{TV}^{(r)}(\theta_I) \leq C_r V\delta.$$

Since this bound holds uniformly for all such I , we prove part (b).

Let us rewrite $\mathcal{M}(I) = (\frac{|I|}{n})^{r-1} n^{r-1} |D^{(r)}\theta_I|_1$. Note that for arbitrary disjoint intervals B_1, B_2, \dots, B_k we have by sub-additivity of the $\text{TV}^{(r)}$ functional,

$$\sum_{j \in [k]} n^{r-1} |D^{(r)}\theta_{B_j}|_1 \leq \text{TV}^r(\theta) = V. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

The entire process of obtaining our recursive partition of $[n]$ actually happened in several rounds. In the first round, we possibly partitioned the interval $I = [n]$ which has size proportion $|I|/n = 1 = 2^{-0}$. In the second round, we possibly partitioned intervals having size proportion 2^{-1} . In general, in the ℓ th round, we possibly partitioned intervals having size proportion $2^{-\ell}$. Let n_ℓ be the number of intervals with size proportion $2^{-\ell}$ that we divided in round ℓ . Let us count and give an upper bound on n_ℓ . If we indeed partitioned I with size proportion $2^{-\ell}$ then by construction this means

$$n^{r-1} |D^{(r)}\theta_I|_1 > \frac{V\delta}{2^{-\ell(r-1)}}. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Therefore, by sub-additivity as in (A.15) we can conclude that the number of such divisions is at most $\frac{2^{-\ell(r-1)}}{\delta}$. On the other hand, note that clearly the number of such divisions is bounded above by 2^ℓ . Thus we conclude

$$n_\ell \leq \min\left\{\frac{2^{-\ell(r-1)}}{\delta}, 2^\ell\right\}.$$

This proves part (d).

Therefore, we can assert that

$$k = 1 + \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} n_\ell \leq \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \min\left\{\frac{2^{-\ell(r-1)}}{\delta}, 2^\ell\right\} \leq C_r \delta^{-1/r}. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

In the above, we set $n_\ell = 0$ for ℓ exceeding the maximum number of rounds of division possible. The last summation can be easily performed as there exists a nonnegative integer $\ell^* = O(\delta^{-1/r})$ such that

$$\min\left\{\frac{2^{-\ell(r-1)}}{\delta}, 2^\ell\right\} = \begin{cases} 2^\ell, & \text{for } \ell < \ell^* \\ \frac{2^{-\ell(r-1)}}{\delta} & \text{for } \ell \geq \ell^* \end{cases}$$

This proves part (c) and finishes the proof. \square

A.6 Proof of Theorem 3.7

Proof. For a $\delta > 0$ to be chosen later, we invoke Proposition A.10 to obtain an interval partition $\pi_\delta := \pi$ such that

- a) $TV^{(r)}(\theta_I^*) \leq V\delta \quad \forall I \in \pi$,
b) For any $i \in [n]$, we have

$$\max\{|Bias_+^{(r-1)}(i, J_i, \theta)|, |Bias_-^{(r-1)}(i, J_i, \theta)|\} \leq C_r V\delta$$

- where J_i is the interval within the partition π which contains i ,
c) $|\pi| \leq C_r \delta^{-1/r}$
d) For any integer $u \geq 0$,

$$|I \in \pi : c_1 \frac{n}{2^u} \leq |I| \leq c_2 \frac{n}{2^u}| \leq C_r \min\left\{\frac{2^{-u(r-1)}}{\delta}, 2^u\right\}$$

where c_1, c_2 are absolute constants.

Now, let us bound the positive part of $\widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i^*$. The negative part can be bounded similarly. The bound as given by Theorem 3.5 is that with probability (exponentially) near 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_i^{(r-1, \lambda)} - \theta_i^* &\leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(Bias_+^{(r-1)}(i, J, \theta^*) + SD^{(r-1)}(i, J, \lambda) \right) \leq Bias_+^{(r-1)}(i, J_i, \theta^*) + SD^{(r-1)}(i, J_i, \lambda) \\ &\leq C_r V\delta + \frac{C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{Dist(i, \partial J_i)}} + \frac{C_r \sigma^2 \log n}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J_i|}. \end{aligned}$$

Squaring and adding over all indices in i , we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{\theta}_i^{(r-1, \lambda)} - \theta_i^*)^2 \lesssim nV^2\delta^2 + \sigma^2 \log n \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{Dist(i, \partial J_i)}}_{T_1} + \frac{n\sigma^4 \log^2 n}{\lambda^2} + \lambda^2 \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|J_i|^2}}_{T_2} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

where \lesssim notation means up to a constant factor C_r which only depends on r . We will use this notation throughout this proof.

We will now bound T_1 and T_2 separately. Let π consist of intervals (B_1, \dots, B_k) where $k = |\pi| \lesssim \delta^{-1/r}$. Let us also denote the cardinalities of these intervals by n_1, \dots, n_k .

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{Dist(i, \partial J_i)} = \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{i \in B_l} \frac{1}{Dist(i, \partial B_l)} = \sum_{l=1}^k 2\left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{n_l/2}\right) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{l=1}^k \log n_l = k \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k \log n_l \right) \leq k \log \frac{n}{k} \leq k \log n \lesssim \delta^{-1/r} \log n \end{aligned}$$

where in the third last inequality we used Jensen's inequality.

We can also write

$$T_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|J_i|^2} = \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{i \in B_l} \frac{1}{|B_l|^2} = \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{1}{n_l}.$$

At this point, for the sake of simpler exposition, we assume n is a power of 2 although the argument works for any n . Then, by the nature of our recursive dyadic partitioning scheme, the cardinalities n_l are of the form $\frac{n}{2^u}$ for some integer $u \geq 0$. Continuing from the last display, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{1}{n_l} &= \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n_l} 1(n_l = \frac{n}{2^u}) = \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^u}{n} \sum_{l=1}^k 1(n_l = \frac{n}{2^u}) \lesssim \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^u}{n} \min\{\frac{2^{-u(r-1)}}{\delta}, 2^u\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \min\{\frac{2^{-u(r-2)}}{\delta}, 2^{2u}\} \lesssim \frac{\delta^{-2/r}}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

The last step above follows from the fact that there exists a nonnegative integer $u^* = O(\delta^{-1/r})$ such that

$$\min\{\frac{2^{-u(r-2)}}{\delta}, 2^{2u}\} = \begin{cases} 2^{2u}, & \text{for } u < u^* \\ \frac{2^{-u(r-2)}}{\delta} & \text{for } u \geq u^*. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$T_2 \lesssim \frac{\delta^{-2/r}}{n}.$$

The two bounds on T_1 and T_2 respectively, along with (A.18) lets us obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{\theta}_i^{(r-1, \lambda)} - \theta_i^*)^2 \lesssim nV^2\delta^2 + \sigma^2\delta^{-1/r}(\log n)^2 + \frac{n\sigma^4 \log^2 n}{\lambda^2} + \frac{\lambda^2\delta^{-2/r}}{n}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Now the above bound holds for any $\delta > 0$, hence we can optimize the bound over δ . Note that the first two terms do not involve λ . Let us minimize the sum of the first two terms; we can do this by setting

$$\delta := \delta^* = C_r \left(\frac{\sigma^2 (\log n)^2}{nV^2} \right)^{r/(2r+1)}.$$

Then the sum of the first two terms scale like

$$(nV^2)^{1/(2r+1)} (\sigma^2 (\log n)^2)^{2r/(2r+1)} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

We will now handle the sum of the last two terms in the bound in (A.19), these are the terms which involve λ and will inform us of a good choice of λ . We will show that with an optimal choice of λ , this sum of the last two terms is essentially of the same order as the expression in (A.20).

We will plug in the optimized choice δ^* here. Let us denote the effective number of pieces

$$k^* = (\delta^*)^{-1/r}.$$

Then the sum of the last two terms in (A.19) can be written as

$$\frac{n\sigma^4 \log^2 n}{\lambda^2} + \frac{\lambda^2 (k^*)^2}{n}.$$

The above suggests that we minimize the sum of the above two terms by equating them. This will mean that we need to choose

$$\lambda = C_r \left(\frac{n^2}{(k^*)^2} \sigma^4 (\log n)^2 \right)^{1/4} = C_r n^{r/(2r+1)} V^{-1/(2r+1)} \sigma^{1+1/(2r+1)} (\log n)^{1/2+1/(2r+1)}.$$

By setting this choice of λ , the sum of the two terms involving λ scale like

$$k^* \sigma^2 \log n = (\delta^*)^{-1/r} \sigma^2 \log n.$$

This is dominated by the sum of the first two terms as can be seen from the second term in (A.19). This finishes the proof. \square

A.7 Proof of Theorem 3.6

Proof. We are given that there exists an interval partition π^* of $[n]$ with intervals I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k such that $\theta_{I_j}^*$ is a polynomial of degree $r \geq 0$ for each $j = 1, \dots, k$. Since I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k forms a partition of $[n]$, for any index $i \in [n]$, one of these intervals contain i . Let us denote this interval by J_i .

Let us bound the positive part of $\widehat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)} - \theta_i^*$. The negative part can be bounded similarly. The bound as given by Theorem 3.5 is that with probability (exponentially) near 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\theta}_i^{(r,\lambda)} - \theta_i^* &\leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_+^{(r)}(i, J, \theta^*) + SD^{(r)}(i, J, \lambda) \right) \leq \text{Bias}_+^{(r)}(i, J_i, \theta^*) + SD^{(r)}(i, J_i, \lambda) \\ &\leq \frac{C_r \sigma \sqrt{\log n}}{\sqrt{\text{Dist}(i, \partial J_i)}} + \frac{C_r \sigma^2 \log n}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J_i|}. \end{aligned}$$

because by definition, $\text{Bias}_+^{(r)}(i, J_i, \theta^*) = 0$.

Squaring and adding over all indices in i , we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i^*)_+^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 \log n \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\text{Dist}(i, \partial J_i)}}_{T_1} + \frac{n \sigma^4 \log^2 n}{\lambda^2} + \lambda^2 \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|J_i|^2}}_{T_2} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

As in the proof of Theorem 3.7, we have

$$T_1 \lesssim k \log \frac{n}{k}.$$

As for T_2 , we have to use the minimum length condition that each of the $|J_i|$ have length atleast $c \frac{n}{k}$. Therefore,

$$T_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|J_i|^2} = \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{i \in I_l} \frac{1}{|I_l|^2} = \sum_{l=1}^k \frac{1}{|I_l|} \lesssim \frac{k^2}{n}.$$

Therefore, we get the bound

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i^*)_+^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 k \log n \log \frac{n}{k} + \frac{n\sigma^4 \log^2 n}{\lambda^2} + \lambda^2 \frac{k^2}{n}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

We can now choose

$$\lambda = C_r \left(\frac{n^2 \sigma^4 (\log n)^2}{k^2} \right)^{1/4}$$

to obtain the final bound

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i^*)_+^2 \lesssim \sigma^2 k \log n \log \frac{n}{k} + \sigma^2 k \log n.$$

To obtain the ℓ_1 loss bound we again start from

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i^*)_+ &\lesssim \sigma \sqrt{\log n} \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{\text{Dist}(i, \partial J_i)}}}_{T_1} + \frac{n\sigma^2 \log n}{\lambda} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|J_i|} \\ &\lesssim \sigma \sqrt{\log n} \sum_{l=1}^k \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1}} + \dots + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|I_l|}} \right) + \frac{n\sigma^2 \log n}{\lambda} + \lambda \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{i \in I_l} \frac{1}{|J_i|} \\ &\lesssim \sigma \sqrt{\log n} \sum_{l=1}^k \sqrt{|I_l|} + \frac{n\sigma^2 \log n}{\lambda} + \lambda k \\ &\leq \sigma \sqrt{nk \log n} + \frac{n\sigma^2 \log n}{\lambda} + \lambda k \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used Jensen's inequality. Setting

$$\lambda = \left(\frac{n\sigma^2 \log n}{k} \right)^{1/2}$$

we get the final bound

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\widehat{\theta}_i - \theta_i^*)_+ \lesssim \sigma \sqrt{nk \log n}.$$

□

B Proofs for Dyadic Minmax Filtering

B.1 A Basic Fact about our Dyadification Scheme

Lemma B.1. *Fix any $i \in [n]$. We now collect some properties of the set \mathcal{R}_i . Let us denote its cardinality by N_i . Then $\mathcal{R}_i = \{r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{N_i}\}$.*

- $N_i \leq O(\log n)$.

-

$$r_0 < r_1 < r_2 \cdots < r_{N_i}.$$

- For any $j \in [N_i]$, $[r_{j-1} + 1, r_j]$ is a dyadic interval.
- r_j is the right end point of some dyadic interval at level $-j$.

-

$$2^j \leq r_{j+1} - r_j \leq 2^{j+1}.$$

- Given any $b \in [n]$ such that $b \geq i$, then there exists a $j \in [0 : N_i]$ such that

$$r_j - i \geq \frac{b - i}{5}.$$

Proof. We leave the proof of the first four parts to the reader. Let us show the last part. We know

$$(2^0 + 2^1 + \dots + 2^{j-1}) \leq (r_j - i) \leq 2(2^0 + 2^1 + \dots + 2^{j-1}).$$

Let j^* be the maximum index such that $r^{j^*} \leq b$. We have $r^{j^*} - i \geq 2^{j^*-1}$. Now

$$b - i < r^{j^*+1} - r^{j^*} + (r^{j^*} - i) \leq 2^{j^*+1} + (r^{j^*} - i) = 4 \cdot 2^{j^*-1} + (r^{j^*} - i) \leq 5(r^{j^*} - i).$$

□

B.2 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Proof. We identify each dyadic interval with the nodes of a complete binary tree. We first precompute some terms needed for computing projections.

1. Let $B^{(r,I)}$ denote the basis matrix of size $|I| \times (r+1)$ for an interval I . We will first compute $(B^{(r,I)})^T B^{(r,I)}$ and its inverse for every dyadic interval I . We will traverse the tree bottom up. For each level, we make the convention of travelling the tree from left to right. Computing $(B^{(r,I)})^T B^{(r,I)}$ can be done by merging the two children nodes of I . This involves summing two $(r+1) \times (r+1)$ matrices and thus involves $O(r^2)$ work per node. Then inverting takes $O(r^3)$ work per node. So in all $O(r^3 n)$ work is needed in this step.
2. Next, we compute $(B^{(r,I)})^T y_I$ for every dyadic interval I . This can again be done similarly as above by adding two $(r+1)$ dimensional vectors. This is $O(r)$ work per node and hence in all $O(rn)$ work.

Now we run over indices i from 1 to n . For each $i \in [n]$, we compute in these next three steps.

1. Compute $(B^{(r,I)})^T B^{(r,I)}$ and its inverse and $(B^{(r,I)})^T y_I$ for each interval $I \in \mathcal{D}_i$. To do this, we can first run over intervals of the form $[i, r_j]$ for $r_j \in R_i$ in increasing order of r_j from $j = 0$ to N_i . Here, we crucially use the property that for any $j \in [N_i]$, $[r_{j-1} + 1, r_j]$ is a dyadic interval. This lets us merge seamlessly. Now for each fixed $j \in [N_i]$ we can run over the intervals $[l_k, r_j]$ in decreasing order of l_k . Then do this for all j . Total work is $O((\log n)^2 r^3)$.

2. Now compute for each interval $I \in \mathcal{D}_i$ the regressions

$$(P^{(|I|,r)}y_I)_i = \left(1, \frac{i}{n}, \dots, \left(\frac{i}{n}\right)^r\right)^T \left((B^{(r,I)})^T B^{(r,I)}\right)^{-1} (B^{(r,I)})^T y_I$$

This involves multiplying $O(r)$ dimensional vectors and matrices and will take $O(r^2)$ work per node and hence $O((\log n)^2 r^2)$ work in total.

3. Now we can create a at most $|\mathcal{L}_i||\mathcal{R}_i| \times |\mathcal{L}_i||\mathcal{R}_i|$ matrix consisting of the values $[(P^{(|I|,r)}y_I)_i \pm \frac{\lambda C_{I,J}}{|I|}]$ and then computing its min max will take at most $O(\log n)^4$ work.

So, all in all the computational complexity comes out to be $O(r^3 n (\log n)^4)$.

□

B.3 Proof of Theorem 4.3

The proof of Theorem 4.3 goes along very similar lines as the proof of Theorem 3.5. In particular, showing the following two propositions will suffice.

Proposition B.2. Fix a non negative integer $r \geq 0$. Define the effective noise vector $M^{(r)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$M_i^{(r)} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{D}_i: i \in I} [|(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i| \sqrt{|I|}].$$

Now define a random quantity, which plays the role of standard error associated with the interval J , as follows

$$SE^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \lambda) = \frac{M_i^{(r)}}{\sqrt{\text{Dist}(i, \partial J)}} + \frac{M_i^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{(M_i^{(r)})^2}{4\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}.$$

The estimation error of the r th order Dyadic Minmax Filtering estimator defined in 3.1, at any location i , is deterministically bounded by a local bias variance tradeoff:

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{D}_i: i \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_-^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \theta^*) - SE^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \lambda) \right) \leq \widehat{e}_i \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{D}_i: i \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_+^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \theta^*) + SE^{(r,dy)}(i, J, \lambda) \right).$$

where $\widehat{e}_i = \widehat{\theta}_i^{(dyad,r,\lambda)} - \theta_i^*$.

Proposition B.3. [A Probabilistic Bound on the Effective Noise] Recall the effective noise vector $M^{(r)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$M_i^{(r)} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{D}_i: i \in I} [|(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)_i| \sqrt{|I|}].$$

Suppose $(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)$ are i.i.d with a Subgaussian(σ) distribution.

Then for any $i \in [n]$, with high probability,

$$M_i \leq C_r \sqrt{\log \log n}$$

where $C_r > 0$ is a constant which only depends on r .

Proposition B.2 can be proved following exactly the same reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 3.3. Proposition B.3 also follows from showing that for any interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ the random variable $|(P^{(r,|I|)}\epsilon_I)|_\infty \sqrt{|I|}$ is subgaussian with subgaussian norm of the order σ and then using the standard maxima bound for subgaussians. This is already shown in the proof of Proposition 3.4. Here, the $\log \log n$ term arises because the total number of intervals in \mathcal{D}_i is at most $O(\log n)$ as can be seen from Lemma B.1. These two propositions finish the proof.

B.4 Proofs of Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5

The proofs can be shown by following exactly the same reasoning given in the proofs of Theorem 3.6 and Theorem 3.7. In these proofs, we crucially use Proposition A.10 to obtain a partition of $[n]$. The interval J_i within this partition which contains i plays a crucial role.

In these proofs we have to use the fact that we can find a dyadified interval $\tilde{J}_i \in \mathcal{D}_i$ such that

1. $\tilde{J}_i \subseteq J_i$
2. $\text{Dist}(i, \partial \tilde{J}_i) \geq c \text{Dist}(i, \partial J_i)$
3. $|\tilde{J}_i| \geq c |J_i|$

for an absolute constant $c > 0$.

These facts follow from Lemma B.1. The other change in these proofs are that now in the standard deviation term, there is $\log \log n$ instead of $\log n$.

We leave working out the explicit calculation to the reader in order to reduce the length of this paper.

Remark B.1. *We now discuss about why we constructed the dyadified intervals \mathcal{D}_i the way we did here. For our statistical risk results to hold; such as Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.5, we needed something like Lemma B.1 to hold for the set of dyadified intervals \mathcal{D}_i . Such a lemma would also hold if we had defined $\mathcal{R}_i = \{i, i+1, i+2, i+4, \dots, i+2^l, \dots\}$ and \mathcal{L}_i similarly. However, for the resulting set of dyadified intervals, it is not clear to us whether we can compute the associated projections for all these projections in near linear time. On the other hand, we could have considered the set \mathcal{R}_i to be the right end points of the dyadic intervals (of all possible lengths) containing i . For the resulting set of intervals, one can check that Lemma B.1 may not hold for certain indices i .*

C Proofs for Boundary Estimation Error

C.1 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1 with one main difference. Since we are interested in only the last point, we do not consider tying the fused lasso solution to the right but only tie it to a number somewhere to the left.

As before, it suffices to prove the following proposition.

Proposition C.1. *Fix any $j \leq n$. Then the following holds:*

$$\hat{\theta}_n \leq \max_{i \geq j} \left[\bar{y}_{[i:n]} - \frac{C_{i,j} \lambda}{n - i + 1} \right]$$

where

$$C_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i > j \\ -1 & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

Proof of Proposition C.1. For any $j \leq n$ and any given real numbers a , let us define the modified Fused Lasso ($n - j + 1$ dimensional) objective function which corresponds to the case when the left end point of the Fused Lasso solution within $J = [j : n]$ is tied to the number a .

$$L^{J,a}(\theta_J) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=j}^n (y_l - \theta_l)^2 + \lambda(TV(\theta_J) + |\theta_j - a|). \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Let us also denote

$$\hat{\theta}^{J,a} = \underset{\theta_J \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|}}{\operatorname{argmin}} L^{J,a}(\theta_J).$$

We now write an intermediate lemma stating that the entries of $\hat{\theta}^{J,a}$ can be bounded by the right hand side in the statement of Proposition C.1, a quantity only depending on y_J but not on a .

Lemma C.2. *Fix any $j \in [n]$. We use the notation J to denote the interval $[j : n]$. Then the following holds:*

$$\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \hat{\theta}_n^{J,a} \leq \max_{i \geq j} \left[\bar{y}_{[i:n]} - \frac{C_{i,j} \lambda}{n - i + 1} \right].$$

Proof. Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Within this proof we will delete the superscripts J, a and write $\hat{\theta}^{J,a}$ as simply $\hat{\theta}$ to reduce notational clutter.

Define \tilde{j} to be the smallest integer in $[n]$ such that

$$\hat{\theta}_v \geq \hat{\theta}_n \quad \forall v \in [\tilde{j}, n].$$

Define $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{|J|}$, which is an $\epsilon > 0$ perturbation of $\hat{\theta}$, in the following way:

$$\tilde{\theta}_v = \hat{\theta}_v - \epsilon \mathbf{1}(v \in [\tilde{j}, n]) \quad \forall v \in J.$$

Now by optimality of $\hat{\theta}$, we must have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (L^{J,a}(\tilde{\theta}) - L^{J,a}(\hat{\theta})) \geq 0. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Recall

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{l \in J} (y_l - \tilde{\theta}_l)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l \in J} (y_l - \hat{\theta}_l)^2 \right) = \sum_{l \in [\tilde{j}:n]} (y_l - \theta_l) \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Moreover, it can be checked that

$$(TV(\tilde{\theta}) + |\tilde{\theta}_{j_1} - a|) - (TV(\hat{\theta}) + |\hat{\theta}_{j_1} - a|) = \begin{cases} -\epsilon & \text{if } \tilde{j} > j \\ -\epsilon \mathbf{1}(\hat{\theta}_j > a) + \epsilon \mathbf{1}(\hat{\theta}_j \leq a) & \text{if } \tilde{j} = j \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Therefore, we can succinctly write

$$(TV(\tilde{\theta}) + |\tilde{\theta}_{j_1} - a|) - (TV(\hat{\theta}) + |\hat{\theta}_{j_1} - a|) \leq -C_{\tilde{j},j} \epsilon. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Therefore, the last three displays let us conclude that

$$0 \leq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (L^{J,a}(\tilde{\theta}) - L^{J,a}(\hat{\theta})) \leq \sum_{l \in [\tilde{j}:n]} (y_l - \hat{\theta}_l) - \lambda C_{\tilde{j},j}.$$

Rewriting the above in terms of averages, we get

$$\hat{\theta}_n \leq \bar{\theta}_{[\tilde{j}:n]} \leq \bar{y}_{[\tilde{j}:n]} - \lambda \frac{C_{\tilde{j},j}}{n - \tilde{j} + 1} \leq \max_{i \in [n]: i \geq \tilde{j}} \left(\bar{y}_I - \lambda \frac{C_{i,j}}{n - i + 1} \right).$$

□

We now state a simple but important observation in the form of the next intermediate lemma.

Lemma C.3. *Fix any $i, j \in [n]$ such that $j \leq i$. We denote $J = [j : n]$. Then the following is true:*

$$\hat{\theta}_i = \hat{\theta}_i^{J, \hat{\theta}_{j-1}}$$

where we set for the sake of convention, $\hat{\theta}_0 = \hat{\theta}_1$.

Proof. The proof is exactly similar to the proof of Lemma A.3. We leave this to the reader to check. □

We now return to the proof of Proposition C.1. Fixing any $i, j \in [n]$ such that $j \leq i$ with $J = [j : n]$,

$$\widehat{\theta}_i = \widehat{\theta}_i^{J, \widehat{\theta}_{j-1}} \leq \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}} \widehat{\theta}_i^{J, a} \leq \max_{i \geq j} \left[\bar{y}_{[i:n]} - \frac{C_{i,j} \lambda}{n - i + 1} \right]$$

where in the first equality we used Lemma C.3 and in the second inequality we used Lemma C.2. \square

We can now finish the proof of Theorem 5.1 by first taking minimum of the right hand side in the last display over all $j \in [n]$ (which gives us the min max upper bound) and then repeating the argument to $-y$ to get the max min lower bound. \square

C.2 Proof of Theorem 5.4

We will give the proof for the nondyadic version; the dyadic version can be done similarly. As before, it suffices to prove the following deterministic error bound.

Proposition C.4 (A Deterministic Bias Variance like Decomposition). *Fix a non negative integer $r \geq 0$. Fix any location $i \in [n]$ and any interval $J \in \mathcal{I}[i]$ such that $i \in J$.*

Define the effective noise $M^{(r)}$ such that

$$M^{(r)} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: n \in I} \left[|(P^{(r, |I|)} \epsilon_I)_n| \sqrt{|I|} \right].$$

Now define a random quantity, which plays the role of standard error associated with the interval J , as follows

$$SE^{(r)}(J, \lambda) = \frac{M_i^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{(M_i^{(r)})^2}{4\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}.$$

Then the following deterministic inequality is true:

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_-^{(r)}(n, J, \theta^*) - SE^{(r)}(J, \lambda) \right) \leq \widehat{\theta}_n^{(r, \lambda)} - \theta_n^* \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: i \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_+^{(r)}(n, J, \theta^*) + SE^{(r)}(J, \lambda) \right). \quad (\text{C.6})$$

The rest of the proof relies on standard bounds for M by seeing it as a maxima of $O(1)$ subgaussians as before. We now provide a proof of Proposition C.4.

C.2.1 Proof of Proposition C.4

Proof. We can first show that

$$\max_{J \in \mathcal{I}: n \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_-^{(r)}(n, J, \theta^*) - \widetilde{SE}^{(r)}(J, \lambda) \right) \leq \widehat{\theta}_n^{(r, \lambda)} - \theta_n^* \leq \min_{J \in \mathcal{I}: n \in J} \left(\text{Bias}_+^{(r)}(n, J, \theta^*) + \widetilde{SE}^{(r)}(J, \lambda) \right) \quad (\text{C.7})$$

where for an interval J containing n ,

$$\widetilde{SE}^{(r)}(J, \lambda) = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: I \subseteq J, n \in I} \left[\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|I|}} - \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|} \right]$$

with

$$M^{(r)} = \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: n \in I} \left[|(P^{(r, |I|)} \epsilon_I)_n| \sqrt{|I|} \right].$$

The proof of (C.7) can be done exactly similarly as the proof of Lemma A.4. Next we write a lemma analogous to Lemma A.5.

Lemma C.5. *Fix any interval $J \in \mathcal{I}$ containing n . Then we have*

$$\underbrace{\max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: I \subseteq J, n \in I} \left[\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|I|}} - \frac{\lambda C_{I, J}}{|I|} \right]}_{\widetilde{SE}^{(r)}(J, \lambda)} \leq \underbrace{\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{(M^{(r)})^2}{4\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|}}_{SE^{(r)}(J, \lambda)}.$$

Proof. If $I \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $I \subseteq J, n \in I$ then there are only two possible cases. Either $I \neq J$ in which case $C_{I, J} = +1$ or $I = J$ in which case $C_{I, J} = -1$. We consider these two exclusive and exhaustive cases and write

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{SE}^{(r)}(J, \lambda) &\leq \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}: n \in I, I \subseteq J, I \neq J} \left[\frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|I|}} - \frac{\lambda}{|I|} \right] + \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|} \leq \\ &OPT(M^{(r)}, \lambda, |J|) + \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|} \leq \frac{(M^{(r)})^2}{4\lambda} + \frac{M^{(r)}}{\sqrt{|J|}} + \frac{\lambda}{|J|} \end{aligned}$$

where we recall the optimization problem and its associated bound in Lemma A.6. The above lemma C.5 along with (C.7) finishes the proof. \square

\square

References

- Birman, M. S. and M. Z. Solomjak (1967). Piecewise-polynomial approximation of functions of the classes w_p . *Mathematics of the USSR Sbornik* 73, 295–317.
- Boysen, L., A. Kempe, V. Liebscher, A. Munk, and O. Wittich (2009). Consistencies and rates of convergence of jump-penalized least squares estimators. *The Annals of Statistics* 37(1), 157–183.
- Chatterjee, S. and S. Goswami (2021). Adaptive estimation of multivariate piecewise polynomials and bounded variation functions by optimal decision trees. *The Annals of Statistics* 49(5), 2531–2551.
- Chatterjee, S., A. Guntuboyina, and B. Sen (2015). On risk bounds in isotonic and other shape restricted regression problems. *The Annals of Statistics* 43(4), 1774–1800.
- Dalalyan, A., M. Hebiri, and J. Lederer (2017). On the prediction performance of the lasso. *Bernoulli* 23(1), 552–581.
- De Boor, C. and C. De Boor (1978). *A practical guide to splines*, Volume 27. springer-verlag New York.
- Deng, H. and C.-H. Zhang (2020). Isotonic regression in multi-dimensional spaces and graphs. *Annals of Statistics* 48(6), 3672–3698.
- Donoho, D. L. (1997). CART and best-ortho-basis: a connection. *The Annals of Statistics* 25(5), 1870–1911.
- Donoho, D. L. and I. M. Johnstone (1998). Minimax estimation via wavelet shrinkage. *The Annals of Statistics* 26(3), 879–921.
- Fokianos, K., A. Leucht, and M. H. Neumann (2020). On integrated l_1 convergence rate of an isotonic regression estimator for multivariate observations. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 66(10), 6389–6402.
- Green, P. J. and B. W. Silverman (1993). *Nonparametric regression and generalized linear models: a roughness penalty approach*. Crc Press.
- Guntuboyina, A., D. Lieu, S. Chatterjee, and B. Sen (2020). Adaptive risk bounds in univariate total variation denoising and trend filtering. *The Annals of Statistics* 48(1), 205–229.
- Györfi, L., M. Kohler, A. Krzyżak, and H. Walk (2002). *A Distribution-Free Theory of Nonparametric Regression*. New York: Springer.
- Harchaoui, Z. and C. Lévy-Leduc (2010). Multiple change-point estimation with a total variation penalty. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 105(492), 1480–1493.
- Johnstone, I. M. (2015). *Gaussian estimation: Sequence and wavelet models*. Available at <http://statweb.stanford.edu/~imj/GE09-08-15.pdf>.
- Kim, S.-J., K. Koh, S. Boyd, and D. Gorinevsky (2009). ℓ_1 trend filtering. *SIAM Rev.* 51(2), 339–360.
- Koenker, R., P. Ng, and S. Portnoy (1994). Quantile smoothing splines. *Biometrika* 81(4), 673–680.
- Lepski, O. (2022). Theory of adaptive estimation. In *Proc. Int. Cong. Math*, Volume 7, pp. 5478–5498.

- Lepskii, O. (1991). On a problem of adaptive estimation in gaussian white noise. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* 35(3), 454–466.
- Lin, K., J. L. Sharpnack, A. Rinaldo, and R. J. Tibshirani (2017). A sharp error analysis for the fused lasso, with application to approximate changepoint screening. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30.
- Madrid Padilla, O. H. and S. Chatterjee (2022). Risk bounds for quantile trend filtering. *Biometrika* 109(3), 751–768.
- Mallat, S. (1999). *A wavelet tour of signal processing*. Elsevier.
- Mammen, E. and S. van de Geer (1997). Locally adaptive regression splines. *The Annals of Statistics* 25(1), 387–413.
- Ortelli, F. and S. van de Geer (2018). On the total variation regularized estimator over a class of tree graphs. *Electron. J. Statist.* 12(2), 4517–4570.
- Ortelli, F. and S. van de Geer (2021). Prediction bounds for higher order total variation regularized least squares. *The Annals of Statistics* 49(5), 2755–2773.
- Robertson, T. and F. T. Wright (1975). Consistency in generalized isotonic regression. *Ann. Statist.* 3, 350–362.
- Robertson, T., F. T. Wright, and R. L. Dykstra (1988). *Order restricted statistical inference*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Rudin, L. I., S. Osher, and E. Fatemi (1992). Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 60(1), 259–268.
- Sadhanala, V., Y.-X. Wang, A. J. Hu, and R. J. Tibshirani (2021). Multivariate trend filtering for lattice data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.14758*.
- Sadhanala, V., Y.-X. Wang, J. L. Sharpnack, and R. J. Tibshirani (2017). Higher-order total variation classes on grids: Minimax theory and trend filtering methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30.
- Sadhanala, V., Y.-X. Wang, and R. J. Tibshirani (2016). Total variation classes beyond 1d: Minimax rates, and the limitations of linear smoothers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 3513–3521.
- Smola, A. J. and B. Schölkopf (1998). *Learning with kernels*, Volume 4. Citeseer.
- Steidl, G., S. Didas, and J. Neumann (2006). Splines in higher order tv regularization. *International journal of computer vision* 70(3), 241–255.
- Tibshirani, R. J. (2014). Adaptive piecewise polynomial estimation via trend filtering. *The Annals of Statistics* 42(1), 285–323.
- Tibshirani, R. J. (2020). Divided differences, falling factorials, and discrete splines: Another look at trend filtering and related problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.03886*.
- Tsybakov, A. (2009). *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer-Verlag.
- Wahba, G. (1990). *Spline models for observational data*. SIAM.

- Wang, Y.-X., J. Sharpnack, A. Smola, and R. J. Tibshirani (2016). Trend filtering on graphs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 17(105), 1–41.
- Wang, Y.-X., A. J. Smola, and R. J. Tibshirani (2014). The falling factorial basis and its statistical applications. In *ICML*, pp. 730–738.
- Wasserman, L. (2006). *All of Nonparametric Statistics*. Springer-Verlag.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2002). Risk bounds in isotonic regression. *Ann. Statist.* 30(2), 528–555.
- Zhang, T. and S. Chatterjee (2022). Element-wise estimation error of generalized fused lasso. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.04369*.