
KULLBACK-LEIBLER CONSISTENCY OF p -DIMENSIONAL PÓLYA TREE POSTERiors AND DIFFERENTIAL ENTROPY ESTIMATION

A PREPRINT

Fernando Corrêa

Institute of Mathematics and Statistics
University of São Paulo
São Paulo, SP
fptcorrea@gmail.com

Rafael Bassi Stern

Institute of Mathematics and Statistics
University of São Paulo
São Paulo, SP
rbstern@gmail.com

Julio Michael Stern

Institute of Mathematics and Statistics
University of São Paulo
São Paulo, SP
jstern@ime.usp.br

April 7, 2025

ABSTRACT

We exploit the multiplicative structure of Pólya Tree priors for density and differential entropy estimation in p -dimensions. We establish: (i) a representation theorem of entropy functionals and (ii) conditions on the parameters of Pólya Trees to obtain Kullback-Leibler and Total Variation consistency for vectors with compact support. Those results motivate a novel differential entropy estimator that is consistent in probability for compact supported vectors under mild conditions. In order to enable applications of both results, we also provide a theoretical motivation for the truncation of Univariate Pólya Trees at level $3 \log_2 n$.

Keywords Bayesian nonparametrics · Pólya Trees · Density estimation · Differential Entropy Estimation

1 Introduction

Pólya Trees [Mauldin et al., 1992] are widely studied stochastic processes that draw random probability measures. They are convenient prior distributions in nonparametric Bayesian inference since they are conjugate, mathematically tractable, and allow the modeling of both absolutely continuous and non-continuous distribution functions. Pólya Tree mixtures and generalizations were applied in many different scenarios such as hypothesis testing, survival analysis, and directional statistics [Lavine, 1992, Kraft, 1964, Ferguson, 1974].

One reason for theoretical interest in Pólya Trees is posterior consistency, a major goal in Bayesian nonparametric inference. There are many definitions of consistency, and they materialize the concentration of the posterior around the true data generating process. Usual theorems on the consistency of Pólya Trees explore particular cases of Schwarz's theorem, or the application of the more recent multi-scale approach [Barron et al., 1999, Castillo and Rousseau, 2015].

The usual Bayesian nonparametric setting considers $\mathbf{X}_n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ to be a random p -dimensional i.i.d. sample distributed according to a random density θ , sampled by a measure Π_0 with support on the set of p -dimensional densities. For a measurable, A , the posterior measure $\Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}$ is given by

$$\Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}(A) = \frac{\int_A \prod \theta(x_i) d\Pi_0(\theta)}{\int_{M(\mathbb{R}^p)} \prod \theta(x_i) d\Pi_0(\theta)} \quad (\text{posterior measure})$$

In this setting, let f_0 be the true value of θ . A prior Π_0 is said to be **consistent** with respect to some divergence d if

$$\Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}(\{\theta : d(f_0, \theta) > \epsilon\}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{posterior consistency condition})$$

in f_0 probability or almost surely with respect to an infinite sample of X_i . The posterior $\Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}$ is considered **strongly consistent** if the convergence is almost sure and **weakly consistent**, otherwise.

The theoretical machinery mobilized to obtain consistency results depends on d . Consequently, this choice defines the conditions that Π_0 must satisfy. When d metricizes weak convergence, Schwarz's Theorem requires f_0 to be on the Kullback-Leibler support of Π_0 in order to achieve consistency. For d based on a metric, much stronger requirements are needed. For the Hellinger H or L_1 norm, existing results require the Π_0 to assign small probability to rough densities. Applying the recent multi-scale approach ensures that similar conditions also imply convergence with respect to the supremum norm [Walker, 2004, Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017, Barron et al., 1999].

In this paper, we present a novel technique for obtaining consistency results on Pólya Trees. Let $K(f, \theta)$ be the Kullback-Leibler divergence between a density f and θ sampled by a Pólya Tree. Our first main result is a representation Lemma.

Theorem 1. *If f belongs to the weak Kullback-Leibler support of a Pólya Tree Π_0 that sample densities almost surely bounded away from 0 and ∞ , then $K(f, \theta)$ satisfies*

$$K(f, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P_i$$

Π_0 almost surely where P_i are mutually independent random variables.

Set aside its computational relevance, the conditions of Theorem 1 also guarantee that a Pólya Tree posterior is weakly consistent for several choices of d . One could ask whether the condition on θ is too strong, but this is not the case. In comparison to earlier consistency results, we show throughout the paper that our condition is weaker than others previously considered. For the sake of clarity, we delay the precise statement to the next sections.

Theorem 2. *If f_0 is on the weak Kullback-Leibler support of a Pólya Tree Π_0 and θ is almost surely bounded away from 0 and ∞ , then $\Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}$ is **weakly consistent** with respect to the total variation distance and $\mathbb{E}_{\Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}}[K(f_0, \theta)] \rightarrow 0$ in \mathbf{X}_n probability.*

One could ask whether those conditions also ensure consistency results for functionals of θ . For example, Schwartz's Theorem implies the consistency of functionals of the form $\int g(t)\theta(t)dt$ for bounded functions g . However, this does not include a practically relevant functional known as differential entropy, defined as $H(f_0) = -\int f_0(t) \log f_0(t)dt$. We highlight the fruitfulness of our approach by providing a novel consistent estimator for $H(f_0)$.

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) = -\mathbb{E}_{\theta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\log \theta(X_i)}{n} \middle| \mathbf{X}_n \right] \quad (\text{Pólya Tree estimator of differential entropy})$$

Most differential entropy estimators are frequentist and fall in large classes of estimators. Generally, they are either sample spacing based estimates, re-substitution estimates, plug-in estimates, or cross-validation estimates. Bayesian differential entropy estimation has not received that much attention, with recent installments proposing the first known consistent estimators. Providing a deeper insight on Bayesian differential entropy estimation is a goal of this paper. Specifically, our estimator does not fall into any of the previous known categories of estimators [Al-Labadi et al., 2021] [Castillo and Rousseau, 2015].

Theorem 3. *Under regularity conditions on a Pólya Tree Π_0 and f_0*

$$-\mathbb{E}_{\theta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\log \theta(X_i)}{n} \middle| \mathbf{X}_n \right] \rightarrow H(f_0)$$

in \mathbf{X}_n probability.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present notation and preliminary results that will be referenced throughout the paper. In Section 3 we establish our main results. We begin by presenting Theorem 1 that powers up all of our arguments. Then we proceed to the discussions regarding the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 3.1. Finally, we analyze the properties of the Pólya Tree estimator of differential entropy in Section 3.3. We present summarized proofs throughout the paper and full proofs are available in the appendix.

2 Basic definitions

2.1 Pólya Trees

In this section, we establish the notation and review classic results on Pólya Trees that will be used throughout the paper. We follow the notation of Gosh [2003] and restate results from Ghosal and van der Vaart [2017] employing it. Throughout the paper, we adopt θ as the symbol for a random density sampled by a suitable Pólya Tree. This choice emphasizes that the parameter of interest is the sampled density under the posterior, rather than the random measure itself. Naturally, this focus on the density is feasible only when the random measure considered is almost surely absolutely continuous with respect to some measure λ .

Let:

- $E_j^*, j \in \mathbb{N}$ be the set of all binary sequences of length j . A sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_j) \in E_j^*$ is composed of binary digits $\epsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}, 1 \leq i \leq j$. For example, $(\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3) = (101) \in E_3^*$ is a binary sequence of length 3 in this notation.
- $E_j = \bigcup_{i=1}^j E_i^*$ be the set of binary sequences of length equal to or less than j .
- $E = \{\emptyset\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i^*\right)$ be the set of all finite-length binary sequences including the empty sequence.
- $l(\epsilon)$ be the length of a binary sequence $\epsilon \in E$.
- \mathcal{X} a measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^p .
- $\mathcal{B} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots\}$ be a collection of partitions $P_j = \{B_\epsilon : \epsilon \in E_j^*\}, j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that
 1. P_1 is a partition of \mathcal{X} ;
 2. $\{B_{\epsilon_0}, B_{\epsilon_1}\}$ is a partition of B_ϵ for all $\epsilon \in E$ and
 3. \mathcal{B} generates the Borel σ -algebra.
- a be a set of positive real numbers indexed by E :

$$a = \{\bar{a}_\epsilon, \epsilon \in E\}, \bar{a}_\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

A **Pólya Tree** prior is a probability measure Π on the set of probability measures over \mathcal{X} parametrized by the sets \mathcal{B} and a that satisfies under Π :

1. All random variables in the set $\{P(B_{\epsilon_0}|B_\epsilon) : \epsilon \in E\}$ are independent.
2. For all $\epsilon \in E, P(B_{\epsilon_0}|B_\epsilon) \sim \text{Beta}(a_{\epsilon_0}, a_{\epsilon_1})$.

We shall refer to one such measure as $\Pi \sim PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$. A random measure \mathcal{P} drawn according to the measure Π shall be denoted $\mathcal{P} \sim \Pi$. In this case, as Π is induced by \mathcal{P} , we shall also write $\mathcal{P} \sim PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$ for simplicity. Furthermore, we will represent the beta-distributed random variables that constitute a random \mathcal{P} by:

$$Y_\epsilon = Y_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k} = P(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k} | B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{k-1}}).$$

Throughout this paper, we shall consider only specific choices of parameters for Pólya Trees. This ensures both the existence of Π and the smoothness of random measures $\mathcal{P} \sim \Pi$. Our results concern Pólya Trees $PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$ that satisfy

1. $\bar{a}_\epsilon = a_{l(\epsilon)}, \forall \epsilon \in E$ and

$$\sum \frac{1}{a_l} < \infty \quad (\text{sufficient condition for absolute continuity of } \mathcal{P})$$

2. For a continuous probability measure λ over \mathcal{X} we have $\lambda(B_\epsilon) = 2^{-l(\epsilon)}$.

Under this circumstance \mathcal{P} is absolutely continuous with respect to λ . If \mathcal{B} satisfies $\lambda(B_\epsilon) = 2^{-l(\epsilon)}$ we shall call this partition **canonical** with respect to λ [Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017]. If $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}$ the canonical partition is uniquely determined by

$$B_\epsilon = \lambda^{-1} \left(\left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\epsilon_i}{2^i}, \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\epsilon_i}{2^i} + \frac{1}{2^{l(\epsilon)}} \right] \right)$$

On general sets \mathcal{X} such as $[0, 1]^p, p \geq 2$ or a p -dimensional sphere, the canonical partition is not uniquely determined by λ . On convex \mathcal{X} we shall apply our results to specific \mathcal{B} canonical with respect to the Lebesgue Measure. If \mathcal{X} is \mathbb{R}^p , one may take λ to be an arbitrary absolutely continuous measure with density f_λ . Our results are stated for general canonical partitions with respect to the Lebesgue Measure when $\lambda(\mathcal{X}) < \infty$. We shall present a specific canonical partition for $[0, 1]^p$ in Section 3.

Finally, we quote the posterior conjugacy result for Pólya Trees. Let $\mathbf{X}_n | \mathcal{P}$ be an i.i.d. sample of observations distributed accordingly to \mathcal{P} . Let \mathbf{x}_n be an observation from \mathbf{X}_n . If $\mathcal{P} \sim PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$ then the posterior $\mathcal{P} | \mathbf{X}_n$ is also sampled by a Pólya tree $PT(\mathcal{B}, a_{\mathbf{x}_n})$ where

$$a_{\mathbf{x}_n} = \{a_\epsilon + n_\epsilon : \epsilon \in E\} \text{ and } n_\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^n I_{B_\epsilon}(X_i).$$

We shall refer to the density of \mathcal{P} with respect to the suitable Lebesgue Measure being considered as $\theta | \mathbf{X}_n$ and to the measure induced by $\mathcal{P} | \mathbf{X}_n$ as $\Pi_{\theta | \mathbf{X}_n}$. Expectations with regard to $\Pi_{\theta | \mathbf{X}_n}$ shall be denoted $\mathbb{E}_\theta[\cdot | \mathbf{X}_n]$ and expectations with regard to \mathbf{X}_n shall be denoted $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n}[\cdot]$. We shall switch notations between the random variable $N_\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^n I_{B_\epsilon}(X_i)$ and the realization n_ϵ , when analyzing the behavior of $\Pi_{\theta | \mathbf{X}_n}$ as a random variable or a fixed realization, respectively. Realizations of $\Pi_{\theta | \mathbf{X}_n}$ are important as they're probability measures over the set of densities with support on \mathcal{X} that capture the updating of Π_0 as a belief measure under the observation of \mathbf{X}_n .

2.2 Regularity conditions on f_0

In this section we define the classes of functions f_0 under which our consistency result holds. Our first condition asks for f_0 to have finite differential entropy.

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{X}} f_0(t) \log f_0(t) dt \right| < \infty \quad (\text{Assumption I})$$

This condition is standard in Bayesian Nonparametrics, as it is deeply connected with the notion of Kullback-Leibler support. The KS-support of a measure Π_0 over the set of densities is defined as the set

$$f_0 \text{ such that exists } \epsilon > 0 \text{ that satisfies } \Pi_0(\theta : K(f_0, \theta) \leq \epsilon) > 0 \quad (\text{KS support})$$

Traditional consistency theorems for Bayesian Nonparametric Posteriors hold for members of the Kullback-Leibler support. For Pólya Trees that satisfy the sufficient condition for absolute continuity of \mathcal{P} , any f_0 satisfying Assumption I is also a member of the Kullback-Leibler support [Gosh, 2003, Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017]. As we are also interested in estimating $H(f_0)$ we are forced to consider this condition in our differential entropy estimation results.

Assumption II is a complementary regularity condition which we require for the consistency of our differential entropy estimator.

$$\text{There is } m \in [0, 1] \text{ such that } y_{\epsilon_0}(f_0) = \frac{\int_{B_{\epsilon_0}} f_0(t) dt}{\int_{B_\epsilon} f_0(t) dt} > m \text{ for } \epsilon \in E \quad (\text{Assumption II})$$

This condition ensures that the expectation of certain functionals of $\theta | \mathbf{X}_n$ are bounded with respect to $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n}$. Assumption II is motivated by the similarity between the convergence $\theta | \mathbf{X}_n$ towards f_0 and the convergence $\{Y_\epsilon : \epsilon \in E\} | \mathbf{X}_n$ towards a sequence $\{y_\epsilon(f_0) : \epsilon \in E\}$. In other words, Assumption II asks for $\{y_\epsilon(f_0)\}$ to be bounded away from 0. This ensures that the sample \mathbf{X}_n eventually provides data for posterior inference on all Y_ϵ . This is enough for establishing the consistency of an estimator of $H(f_0)$ based on $Y_\epsilon : \epsilon \in E | \mathbf{X}_n$.

A traditional sufficient condition for consistency in density estimation is sufficient for Assumptions I and II. If f_0 is bounded away from zero and infinity, it also has finite differential entropy and $y_\epsilon(f_0)$ is bounded away from 0. Thus, in general, all of our results hold for f_0 satisfying Assumption III.

$$\text{There are } M_1, M_2 \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } M_1 > f_0(t) > M_2 > 0 \text{ for all } t \in \mathcal{X} \quad (\text{Assumption III})$$

3 Main results

In this section we state and discuss our main consistency results alongside an intermediate computational result. Theorem 2 states that Pólya Tree priors satisfying mild regularity conditions are weakly consistent with respect to Total Variation and Kullback-Leibler neighborhoods if f_0 satisfy Assumption I. Theorem 3 states that under Assumptions II and III a Pólya Tree-based differential entropy estimator is consistent in probability. Theorem 1 is an intermediate result that stabilizes both results.

Theorem 2. *Let $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$ parametrized by a canonical partition with respect to the Lebesgue Measure. If f_0 is in the Kullback-Leibler support of Π_0 and*

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{l}{a_l} < \infty \quad (\text{regularity condition on the prior})$$

then for all $\epsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [\mathbb{E}_{\theta} [K(f_0, \theta) | \mathbf{X}_n]] \rightarrow 0$$

$$\Pi_{\theta | \mathbf{X}_n} (TV(f_0, \theta) > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\Pi_{\theta | \mathbf{X}_n} (K(f_0, \theta) > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$$

in \mathbf{X}_n probability.

As much of the literature is concerned with such results, before continuing we make a brief survey of related works. Schwartz [1965] establishes general conditions for consistency in the weak topology, which were applied to Pólya Trees by Lavine [1992]. Strong consistency with respect to the Hellinger and Total Variation metric was obtained by Barron et al. [1999] and further refined by Walker [2004]. Later works considered convergence rates of $\Pi_{\theta | \mathbf{X}_n}(N_{\epsilon}^c)$ on situations under which consistency was demonstrated. Consistency of Pólya Trees with respect to the supremum norm was demonstrated more recently by Castillo [2017].

In comparison to the previous works, we work with less restrictive assumptions on the prior because Theorem 2 establishes convergence in probability, not almost surely. The slower growth rate admitted for consistency with respect to TV is $a_l = l^{3+\delta}$, $\delta > 0$. The regularity condition on the prior on the other hand, holds for slower growth rates such as $a_l = l^{2+\delta}$. Our assumptions on f_0 are also less restrictive or exactly equal to other conditions previously considered. f_0 being a member of the Kullback-Leibler support of Π_0 is also required by Barron et al. [1999] and Schwartz [1965]. Earlier results on the convergence in the supremum norm also required f_0 to be Hölder continuous [Castillo and Rousseau, 2015].

Weak consistency in a strong metric such as TV is interesting for applications and for theoretical reasons. Weak consistency is easier to extend to the setting where \mathbf{X}_n does not consist of i.i.d. samples, as pointed out by [Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017]. Examples of such cases are the practically relevant applications in survival analysis and time series modeling. From a theoretical point of view, our results bridge a gap between Schwartz's Theorem, which states convergence in the weak topology, and strong convergence on strong metrics. Theorem 2 shows that almost all Pólya Trees that satisfy Schwartz's Theorem are also weakly consistent in a stronger topology. Theorem 2 is also useful for obtaining consistency for specific statistics. Corollary 1 for example states that the predictive density is consistent in probability.

Corollary 1. *Consider a prior $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{D}, a_l)$. Set*

$$\hat{\theta}(t) = \mathbb{E}_{\theta} [\theta(t) | \mathbf{X}_n] \quad (\text{predictive density})$$

If Π_0 satisfies the regularity condition on the prior and f_0 a density in the Kullback-Leibler support of Π_0 then

$$TV(\hat{\theta}, f_0) \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{predictive consistency with respect to TV})$$

in \mathbf{X}_n probability.

Different from previous results, Theorem 2 is also stated for a generic sample space. Usually, consistency results for Pólya Trees are obtained as particular cases of results that apply to general priors. Setting $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]$ is a pivotal step in order to verify the conditions of general consistency theorems. Theorem 2 holds e.g. for $[0, 1]^p$ if a canonical partition is provided. We build such partitions for many interesting samples spaces in Section 3.3.

Theorem 3 deepens the analysis of the consistency of a Pólya Tree posterior $\Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}$ for differential entropy estimation. Consistency of bounded functionals of $\hat{\theta}$ may be established by Schwartz's Theorem, but Theorem 3 states the consistency of the entropy functional $H(f) = -\int f(t) \log f(t) dt$, which is unbounded.

Theorem 3. *Consider $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$ parametrized by a canonical partition with respect to the Lebesgue Measure, satisfying the sufficient condition for absolute continuity of \mathcal{P} and \mathbf{X}_n an i.i.d. sample of some absolutely continuous X . Consider also the quantity*

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) = -\sum_{\epsilon \in E} \frac{N_\epsilon}{n} \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n] = \sum_{\epsilon \in E} \frac{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k}}{n} (\log 2 + \psi(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k} + a_{l(\epsilon)}) - \psi(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{k-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}))$$

(estimator of differential entropy)

If f_0 satisfies Assumptions I and II and $a_l = 2^{\beta l}$ for $\beta > 2$ then $|\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) - H(f_0)| \rightarrow 0$ in \mathbf{X}_n probability.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first explicit estimator of differential entropy based on a full Bayesian Non-parametric posterior. Earlier Bayesian differential entropy methods considered finite alphabets or truncated priors [Nemenman, 2011]. Theorem 3 holds for both finite and infinite alphabets, and also in arbitrary dimensions and sample spaces.

The conditions of Theorem 3 are also weaker than usual. We divide differential entropy estimation methods into whether they are based on nearest neighborhoods, plug-in estimators, or sample-spacings. Nearest neighborhood methods usually require mild tail conditions. Plug-in estimators usually require Assumption III, which is much stronger than Assumption II. Sample-spacings methods require fewer conditions but work on less general sample spaces.

In the following subsections, we discuss the results in detail and provide outlines for the proofs. Full proofs are provided in the appendix.

3.1 Representation Lemma

In this section we state and prove Theorem 1. This result enables the explicit computation of moments of the cross entropy and Kullback-Leibler divergence functionals calculated with respect to a random $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{D}, a_l)$. In the next sections we shall explore two important applications, but both Theorem 1 and its Lemmas are of general interest; therefore, we now briefly discuss them and present a proof at the end of the section.

Theorem 1 Consider $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{D}, a_l)$ and Π_0 the corresponding measure. If f belongs to the weak Kullback-Leibler support of Π_0 and

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{l}{a_l} < \infty$$

(regularity condition on the prior)

then $K(f, \theta)$ satisfies

$$K(f, \theta) = \int f(t) \log f(t) dt - \sum_{\epsilon \in E} (F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \log 2Y_{\epsilon_0} + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \log 2(1 - Y_{\epsilon_0}))$$

(series representation of KL divergence)

Π_0 almost surely. It also holds

$$H(\theta) = -\int \theta(t) \log \theta(t) dt = -\sum_{\epsilon \in E} (\mathcal{P}(B_{\epsilon_0}) \log 2Y_{\epsilon_0} + \mathcal{P}(B_{\epsilon_1}) \log 2(1 - Y_{\epsilon_0}))$$

(series representation of random differential entropy)

Theorem 1 may be interpreted intuitively as a result on truncated Pólya Trees. Let \mathcal{P}^j be a Pólya Tree truncated at j , an arbitrary level of truncation of the partition tree. For $l(\epsilon) \leq j$ by definition $\mathcal{P}^j(B_\epsilon) = \prod_{k=1}^{l(\epsilon)} Y_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_k}$ and $\theta^j(t) = 2^{l(\epsilon)} \prod_{\epsilon': t \in B_{\epsilon'}} Y_{\epsilon'}$. Theorem 1 states that the following approximation holds a.s. when $j \rightarrow \infty$.

$$\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt = \int f_0(t) \log \left(\frac{d\mathcal{P}}{d\lambda}(t) \right) dt \approx \int f_0(t) \log \left(\frac{d\mathcal{P}^j}{d\lambda}(t) \right) dt = \sum_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} F_0(B_\epsilon) \log (\mathcal{P}^j(B_\epsilon)) = \sum_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} F_0(B_\epsilon) \log \left(2^{l(\epsilon)} \prod_{\epsilon': t \in B_{\epsilon'}} Y_{\epsilon'} \right) = \sum_{\epsilon' \in E: l(\epsilon') \leq j} F_0(B_{\epsilon'}) \log(2Y_{\epsilon'})$$

This is an "expectation and limit commutes" kind of theorem, and as usual, e.g. for Dominated Convergence Theorem, we must ask for a regularity condition on the integrand $f_0(t) \log \theta(t)$. One could wonder whether the regularity condition on the prior is too strong. This is not the case, because the sufficient condition for absolute continuity of \mathcal{P} , which we must require, is just mildly weaker than regularity condition on the prior. For example, $a_l = l^2$ satisfies only the first condition, while $a_l = l^3$ satisfies both of them. In fact, for any $\alpha > 0$, the regularity condition on the prior is satisfied by $a_l = l^{2+\alpha}$. Thus, this condition is satisfied for a_l that grows as fast as many polynomials, and consequently is weaker than the exponential growth rates such $a_l = 8^l$ required for stronger forms of consistency [Barron et al., 1999].

We are motivated to prove this result because a similar formula holds for any f_0 with finite differential entropy. Let $f_j(t)$ be a uniform discretization of f alongside a partition $\{P_j = B_\epsilon : \epsilon \in E_j^*\}$. Lemma B.10 of Ghosal and van der Vaart [2017] states that:

$$\int f(t) \log f(t) dt = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f(t) \log f_j(t) dt$$

Also, J. Watson and Holmes [2017] applied a similar result when computing Kullback-Leibler divergences with regard to random densities sampled by truncated Pólya trees. Theorem 1 may be interpreted as a limit of integrals of truncated Pólya Trees.

The condition on f_0 is also mild and standard in the Bayesian Nonparametric literature. It is guaranteed by the traditional result on the Kullback-Leibler support of absolutely continuous Pólya Trees. In the following, we restate it for completeness, as they're both Lemmas for Theorem 1.

Proposition 1 (Kullback-Leibler property of Pólya Trees). [Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017]

Let $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{D}, a_l)$, Π the corresponding measure and f_0 a density. If

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_l} < \infty \quad (\text{sufficient condition for absolute continuity of } \mathcal{P})$$

then

$$|H(f_0)| < \infty \implies \Pi(K(f_0, \theta) > \epsilon) > 0 \quad (\text{Kullback-Leibler property})$$

Proposition 1 tells us that an absolutely continuous Pólya Tree assigns mass to the neighborhood of any finite differential entropy density, but we require a stronger result. Theorem 1 is the result of being able to exchange the expectation and the product of the following identity, so we look for an application of the Dominated Convergence Theorem.

Let $X \sim f_0$ and consider its binary digits $0.\epsilon_1(X)\epsilon_2(X)\dots$; for a fixed realization of $\{Y_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in E}$, we have

$$\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f_0} [\log \theta(X)] = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f_0} \left[\log \left(\prod_{l=1}^{\infty} 2Y_{\epsilon_1(X) \dots \epsilon_l(X)} \right) \right]$$

thus if $|\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt| \leq \sup |\log \theta(t)| < \infty$ the Dominated Convergence Theorem applies and we are able to exchange $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim f_0}$ and the infinite product.

The condition $\sup |\log \theta(t)|$ is equivalent to $\theta(t)$ being almost surely bounded and also never becoming too close to 0. In the density estimation literature, this condition is known as bounded away from 0 and ∞ . The regularity condition on the prior is sufficient for verifying this property.

Lemma 1 (Pólya Trees bounded away from 0 and ∞). *Let $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{D}, a_l)$ and Π the corresponding measure. If*

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{l}{a_l} < \infty \quad (\text{regularity condition on the prior})$$

then $\theta(t)$ is almost surely bounded away from 0 and ∞

This result is of general interest even without further consistency consequences. A subjective Bayesian could consider whether or not the boundedness of $\log(\theta(t))$ is coherent with her subjective knowledge about $\theta(t)$. In the negative case, it could be the case of considering another prior for θ . Also, this result also ensures the existence of other integrals such as $\int g(\theta(t))dt$ for g unbounded as $\theta(t)$ approaches 0. Here we apply it in the particular case $g = \log$.

Lemma 1 and Proposition 1 are sufficient to prove Theorem 1, proof which we now present. The proof of Lemma 1 is provided in the appendix.

Proof of Theorem 1. First we observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim f_0} [\log (2Y_{\epsilon_1(X) \dots \epsilon_l(X)})] = \sum_{\epsilon \in E_l^*} F_0(B_\epsilon) \log (2Y_\epsilon). \quad (1)$$

As Lemma 1 implies that $|\log \theta(t)|$ is almost surely bounded on t , the conditions of the Dominated Convergence Theorem are almost surely satisfied and therefore:

$$\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f_0} \left[\log \left(\prod_{l=1}^{\infty} 2Y_{\epsilon_1(X) \dots \epsilon_l(X)} \right) \right] = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f_0} [\log (2Y_{\epsilon_1(X) \dots \epsilon_l(X)})]. \quad (2)$$

It follows that

$$\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim f_0} [\log (2Y_{\epsilon_1(X) \dots \epsilon_l(X)})] = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{\epsilon \in E_l^*} F_0(B_\epsilon) \log (2Y_\epsilon) \right) = \sum_{\epsilon \in E} F_0(B_\epsilon) \log (2Y_\epsilon).$$

We conclude the proof noting that each Y_ϵ for $l(\epsilon) > 1$ is either $Y_{\epsilon'0}$ or $Y_{\epsilon'1} = 1 - Y_{\epsilon'0}$ for a $\epsilon' \in E$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\epsilon \in E} F_0(B_\epsilon) \log (2Y_\epsilon) = \\ & F_0(B_0) \log(2Y_0) + F_0(B_1) \log(2Y_1) + \sum_{\epsilon \in E} (F_0(B_{\epsilon 0}) \log (2Y_{\epsilon 0}) + F_0(B_{\epsilon 1}) \log (2(1 - Y_{\epsilon 0}))) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

which is a sum of mutually independent random variables. □

3.2 Weak consistency of Pólya Trees

In this section, we apply Theorem 1 as a Lemma to demonstrate Theorem 2, our main consistency result. It consists of showing that under the same mild conditions of Theorem 1 the posterior consistency condition holds with respect to the total variation distance. As already mentioned, this is a desirable property per se, and is also sufficient for another result with practical relevance. It ensures the consistency of the predictive density $\hat{\theta}$.

Next we discuss an overview of the proof. The general strategy for obtaining consistency results is upper bounding $\Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}(N_\epsilon)$ by the posterior expectation of $K(f_0, \theta)$. This bound is possible because

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}(TV(f_0, \theta) > \epsilon) &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[TV(f_0, \theta)^2|\mathbf{X}_n]}{\epsilon^2} \leq \text{By Markov's Inequality} \\ &\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[K(f_0, \theta)|\mathbf{X}_n]}{2\epsilon^2} \quad \text{by Pinskers's Inequality} \end{aligned}$$

We obtain weak consistency results showing that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n}[\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[K(f_0, \theta)|\mathbf{X}_n]]$ vanishes. Theorem 1 enables explicit computations:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n}[\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[K(f_0, \theta)|\mathbf{X}_n]] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n}\left[-\sum_{\epsilon \in E} F_0(B_{\epsilon})\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\log(2Y_{\epsilon})|\mathbf{X}_n] - H(f_0)\right] = \\ &-\sum_{\epsilon \in E} F_0(B_{\epsilon})\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n}[\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\log(2Y_{\epsilon})|\mathbf{X}_n]] - H(f_0) = \\ &-\sum_{\epsilon \in E} F_0(B_{\epsilon})\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n}[\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\log(2Y_{\epsilon})|\mathbf{X}_n]] + \sum_{\epsilon \in E} F_0(B_{\epsilon})\log\left(2\frac{F_0(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l(\epsilon)-1})}}{F_0(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l(\epsilon)})}\right) = \\ &\sum_{\epsilon \in E} F_0(B_{\epsilon})\left(\log\left(2\frac{F_0(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l(\epsilon)-1})}}{F_0(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l(\epsilon)})}\right) - \mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\log(2Y_{\epsilon})|\mathbf{X}_n]\right) \end{aligned}$$

$\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[K(f_0, \theta)|\mathbf{X}_n]$ is a weighted average of the biases of $\mathbb{E}_{\theta}[\log(2Y_{\epsilon})|\mathbf{X}_n]$ as an estimator of $\log\left(2\frac{F_0(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l(\epsilon)-1})}}{F_0(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l(\epsilon)})}\right)$. They are bounded in ϵ and vanish with n . The proof revolves around bounding the summands' bias.

The biases are summable for $\epsilon \in E$ because

3.3 Differential entropy estimation

Theorem 2 states that $-\mathbb{E}_{\theta}\left[\int f_0(t)\log\theta(t)dt\right]$ concentrates around $H(f_0)$. A natural following strategy is if plugging in some estimate \hat{f}_0 into $\int \hat{f}_0(t)\log\theta(t)dt$ would also work as an estimator of $H(f_0)$. The answer is positive and is the conclusion of Theorem 3, which we shall prove in this section.

A natural question is whether the posterior sampling variance of the estimator coincides asymptotically. As $-\sum_{\epsilon \in E} \frac{n_{\epsilon}}{n} \log(2Y_{\epsilon})$ is a random series of independent random variables under $\Pi_{\theta|\mathbf{X}_n}$, their variance and computation are straightforward. The following result ties them both.

Proposition 2. *For any $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{D}, a_l)$ satisfying the sufficient condition for absolute continuity of \mathcal{P} it holds*

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\epsilon \in E} (N_{\epsilon} \log(2) + N_{\epsilon_0} \psi(N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)}) + N_{\epsilon_1} \psi(N_{\epsilon_1} + a_{l(\epsilon)}) - N_{\epsilon} \psi(N_{\epsilon} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)})) \quad (4a)$$

$$\mathbb{V}_{\theta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta(X_i)}{n} \middle| \mathbf{X}_n \right] = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{\epsilon \in E} (N_{\epsilon_0}^2 \psi_1(N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)}) + N_{\epsilon_1}^2 \psi_1(N_{\epsilon_1} + a_{l(\epsilon)}) - N_{\epsilon}^2 \psi_1(N_{\epsilon} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)})) \quad (4b)$$

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\theta} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\log \theta(X_i)}{n} \right)^2 \middle| \mathbf{X}_n \right] \right] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)]^2 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\mathbb{V}_{\theta} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\log \theta(X_i)}{n} \middle| \mathbf{X}_n \right] \right] \quad (4c)$$

Proposition 2 implies that, in general, both variances may not be equal, so the credible regions around $\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)$ might not be confidence regions. It does, however, suggest an estimator for the variance of $\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)$.

Before further discussions we note that in practical applications $\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)$ must be truncated at some finite level. We expect that if the truncation level is large enough, then Theorem 3 will hold as if we were able to compute $\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)$ fully. This truncation might be deterministic or a quantity that depends on \mathbf{X}_n . In order to explore the impact of a truncation on $\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)$ we introduce the statistic

$$L(\mathbf{X}_n) = \min\{j : \max_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} N_\epsilon = 1\} + 1 \quad (\text{maximum impact level})$$

$L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ is **maximum impact level** of sample \mathbf{X}_n on a Pólya Tree prior Π_0 . It consists of the first level along the partition tree such that all N_ϵ are either 1 or 0. $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ is almost surely finite if X is absolutely continuous, as the probability of ties is 0. After $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$, all $Y_\epsilon|\mathbf{X}_n$ that constitute $\mathcal{P}|\mathbf{X}_n$ are either $Beta(a_\epsilon + 1, a_\epsilon)$ or $Beta(a_\epsilon, a_\epsilon)$ distributed. In this sense, the distributions of Y_ϵ (prior) and $Y_\epsilon|\mathbf{X}_n$ (posterior) are exactly equal or the difference is minimal. Therefore, on those levels, the impact of the prior is large and the impact of the data is minimized.

$L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ is useful because it simplifies computations on deep levels of a Pólya Tree. For example, the Pólya Tree estimator of differential entropy satisfies

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) = - \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\epsilon \in E; l(\epsilon) \leq L(\mathbf{X}_n)} (\log 2) + N_{\epsilon 0} \psi(N_{\epsilon 0} + a_{l(\epsilon)}) + N_{\epsilon 1} \psi(N_{\epsilon 1} + a_{l(\epsilon)}) - N_\epsilon \psi(N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}) \right) - \sum_{l=L(\mathbf{X}_n)}^{\infty} (\log 2 + \psi(a_l + 1) - \psi(2a_l + 1)). \quad (5)$$

As $\log 2 + \psi(a_l + 1) - \psi(2a_l + 1) = O(a_l^{-1})$, it follows that the error committed by truncating the sum of $\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)$ at level $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ is $O(a_{L(\mathbf{X}_n)}^{-1})$. We may also get the error to become as low as needed if an arbitrary deterministic truncation L_n level is larger than $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$. As computing $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ is possibly computationally expensive, it would be convenient to have a deterministic formula that dominates $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$. For a large class of f_0 we are able to find a deterministic upper bound for $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ with high probability, so it is possible to define a deterministic truncation that gets the truncation error to vanish.

Proposition 3 for $p = 1$ states that $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ is at most $2 \log_2 n$ for any square integrable f_0 .

Proposition 3. *Let M_n be a sequence of positive numbers such that $M_n \rightarrow \infty$. If $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and f_0 is square integrable then*

$$L(\mathbf{X}_n) < 2 \log_2(n) + M_n \quad (6)$$

in \mathbf{X}_n probability.

This result is of general interest because it defines that any truncation level L_n such that $L_n - 2 \log_2 n \rightarrow \infty$, e.g. $3 \log_2 n$, is enough to surpass the maximum impact level. This is the case because any truncation level asymptotically larger than $\log_2 n$ dominates $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ with high probability. On the other hand, the Proposition also points out that truncation levels below $\log_2 n$ might be discarding levels with a significant impact on the data distribution of Y_ϵ .

Theorem 3 is stated in terms of the complete version of the estimator. The behavior of the complete estimator informs us on the behavior of the truncated estimator with large L_n or the estimator truncated at $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$. As Proposition 3 gives an estimate for $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$, we have two approaches for truncation of the Pólya Tree estimator of differential entropy.

We prove Theorem 3 noting that $\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)$ follows closely the "oracle" estimator $\mathbb{E}_\theta[\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt | \mathbf{X}_n]$ obtained in Theorem 2. This occurs because $\hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)$ estimates $f_0(t)$ by $d\hat{F}_n(t)$, where \hat{F}_n is the empirical distribution function. Under this circumstance, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt | \mathbf{X}_n \right] \right| = \\ & \left| \sum_{\epsilon \in E} \frac{N_\epsilon}{n} \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n] - \sum_{\epsilon \in E} F(B_\epsilon) \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n] \right| = \\ & \left| \sum \left(\frac{N_\epsilon}{n} - F(B_\epsilon) \right) \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n] \right| \leq \sum_{\epsilon \in E} \left| \frac{N_\epsilon}{n} - F(B_\epsilon) \right| |\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]| \leq \end{aligned}$$

$$\left(\sup_{\epsilon \in E} \left| \frac{N_\epsilon}{n} - F(B_\epsilon) \right| \right) \left(\sum_{\epsilon \in E} |\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]| \right)$$

\mathcal{B} is a Glivenko-Cantelli class, therefore we have that the supremum norm between the differences of \hat{F}_n and F on \mathcal{B} is $O(1/\sqrt{n})$. Then our proof strategy consists of estimating the second term of the upper bound. Proposition 4 provides a sufficient condition for this.

Proposition 4. *If $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$ is a canonical partition with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathcal{X} such that*

$$a_l = 2^{(2+\delta)l}, \delta > 0$$

and f_0 satisfies Assumption II then

$$\frac{(\sum_{\epsilon \in E} |\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]|)}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow 0$$

in \mathbf{X}_n probability.

3.4 Canonical partitions for the multidimensional cube

In this section we present a canonical partition for the sample space $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^p$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure. This construction is due to Hanson [2006]. The same idea applies to other compact sets. This construction is relevant for applications of Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 on arbitrary p -dimensional spaces.

When $p = 1$ the canonical partition with respect to the Lebesgue Measure is the set of dyadic intervals. For $p > 1$ there are many possible constructions of partitions that satisfy $\lambda(B_\epsilon) = 1/2^{l(\epsilon)}$. In this section, we provide a construction that is sufficiently straightforward for applications.

Our construction may be represented by the following algorithm

1. Start from the whole $\mathcal{X} = [0, 1]^p$.
2. Split it in half with respect to the first dimension, say x_1 . Therefore $B_0 = \{(x_1, \dots, x_p) \in \mathcal{X}, x_1 \leq 1/2\}$ and $B_1 = \{(x_1, \dots, x_p) \in \mathcal{X}, x_1 > 1/2\}$.
3. Split both B_0 and B_1 in half with respect to the second dimension x_2 .
4. Repeat until all p dimensions have been used, then start it over splitting with respect to x_1, x_2 and so on.

This construction is equivalent to assigning a periodic pattern to one unique binary sequence $\epsilon \in E$. Consider an element $(x_1, \dots, x_p) \in \mathcal{X}$. In this pattern, ϵ_1 represents the first binary digit of x_1 , ϵ_2 the first binary digit of x_2 and ϵ_p the first binary digit of x_p . The next terms of ϵ encodes the next digits of every x_i . In this way ϵ_{p+1} shall represent the second binary digit of x_1 , ϵ_{p+2} shall represent the second binary digit of x_2 and so on.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we establish the theory for two applications of Pólya Trees. On one hand, we provide a consistency theorem that holds for a generic \mathcal{X} , provided we adopt canonical partitions. This powers up inference such as multivariate density estimation, for example. This result also enables the study of the convergence rate of the posterior with respect to the distribution of $D_{KL}(f_0 || \theta)$, which is a sum of independent random variables.

On the other hand, we also demonstrate the usefulness of Pólya Trees in the differential entropy estimation problem. We propose a novel differential entropy estimator as the expectation of a functional of θ . In this paper, we prove the consistency in probability of this estimator. However, the efficiency in terms of the optimality of the mean squared error, for example, remains to be further studied.

Aside from our main results, we also highlight two of our intermediate results. For the truncation of Pólya Trees, we obtained a theoretical result on the "safe" truncation of a Pólya Tree. For square-integrable data generating densities, we showed that truncating a Pólya Tree at level $3 \log_2 n$ captures the relevant influence of X_n on the prior with high probability as n increases.

Lastly, we also obtained a computational formula for entropy functionals of Pólya Trees. Our application is one example of the usefulness of the result, as it enables the study of consistency properties. However, entropy functionals between Pólya Trees and fixed densities are also considered in other contexts such as hypothesis tests and prior elicitation.

References

- R. Daniel Mauldin, William D. Sudderth, and S. C. Williams. Pólya Trees and Random Distributions. *The Annals of Probability*, 20(3):1203–1221, 1992.
- Michael Lavine. Some Aspects of Polya Tree Distributions for Statistical Modelling. *The Annals of Statistics*, 20(3):1222–1235, September 1992. ISSN 0090-5364, 2168-8966. doi:10.1214/aos/1176348767. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Charles H. Kraft. A Class of Distribution Function Processes Which Have Derivatives. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 1(2):385–388, 1964. ISSN 0021-9002. doi:10.2307/3211867. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3211867>. Publisher: Applied Probability Trust.
- Thomas S. Ferguson. Prior Distributions on Spaces of Probability Measures. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2(4):615–629, July 1974. ISSN 0090-5364, 2168-8966. doi:10.1214/aos/1176342752. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Andrew Barron, Mark J. Schervish, and Larry Wasserman. The consistency of posterior distributions in non-parametric problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 27(2):536–561, April 1999. ISSN 0090-5364, 2168-8966. doi:10.1214/aos/1018031206. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Ismaël Castillo and Judith Rousseau. A Bernstein–von Mises theorem for smooth functionals in semiparametric models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(6):2353–2383, December 2015. ISSN 0090-5364, 2168-8966. doi:10.1214/15-AOS1336. Publisher: Institute of Mathematical Statistics.
- Stephen Walker. New approaches to Bayesian consistency. *The Annals of Statistics*, 32(5):2028 – 2043, 2004. doi:10.1214/009053604000000409. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/009053604000000409>.
- Subhashis Ghosal and Aad van der Vaart. *Consistency: Examples*, page 165–191. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Luai Al-Labadi, Vishakh Patel, Kasra Vakiloroayaei, and Clement Wan. A Bayesian nonparametric estimation to entropy. *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics*, 35(2):421 – 434, 2021. doi:10.1214/20-BJPS483. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-BJPS483>.
- J. K. Gosh. *Bayesian Nonparametrics*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003. ISBN 978-0-387-95537-7. doi:10.1007/b97842. URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/b97842>.
- Lorraine Schwartz. On Bayes procedures. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete*, 4(1):10–26, March 1965. ISSN 1432-2064. doi:10.1007/BF00535479. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00535479>.
- Ismaël Castillo. Pólya tree posterior distributions on densities. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 53(4):2074 – 2102, 2017. doi:10.1214/16-AIHP784. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/16-AIHP784>.
- Ilya Nemenman. Coincidences and estimation of entropies of random variables with large cardinalities. *Entropy*, 13(12):2013–2023, 2011. ISSN 1099-4300. doi:10.3390/e13122013. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/1099-4300/13/12/2013>.
- L. Nieto-Barajas J. Watson and C. Holmes. Characterizing variation of nonparametric random probability measures using the kullback–leibler divergence. *Statistics*, 51(3):558–571, 2017. doi:10.1080/02331888.2016.1258072. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/02331888.2016.1258072>.
- Timothy E. Hanson. Inference for mixtures of finite polya tree models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(476):1548–1565, 2006. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27639772>.
- Olivier Marchal and Julyan Arbel. On the sub-Gaussianity of the Beta and Dirichlet distributions. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 22(none):1 – 14, 2017. doi:10.1214/17-ECP92. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/17-ECP92>.
- Izrail Solomonovich Gradshteyn and Iosif Moiseevich Ryzhik. *Table of integrals, series, and products*. Academic press, 2014.

David A. Wooff. Bounds on reciprocal moments with applications and developments in stein estimation and post-stratification. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 47(2):362–371, 12 1975. ISSN 0035-9246. doi:10.1111/j.2517-6161.1985.tb01365.x. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1985.tb01365.x>.

Necdet Batir. Inequalities for the gamma function. *Arch. Math.*, 91(6):554–563, December 2008. ISSN 1420-8938. doi:10.1007/s00013-008-2856-9. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00013-008-2856-9>.

S. Kanagawa, Y. Mochizuki, and H. Tanaka. Limit theorems for the minimum interpoint distance between any pair of i.i.d. random points in Rd. *Ann Inst Stat Math*, 44(1):121–131, March 1992. ISSN 1572-9052. doi:10.1007/BF00048674. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00048674>.

A Proof of Lemma 1

We prove Lemma 1 by applying the following auxiliary results

Proposition 5. [Marchal and Arbel, 2017]

Let $X \sim \text{Beta}(a, a)$ for $a \geq 1$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(Y - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2j} \right] = \frac{(2j)!(a)_j}{2^{2j} j! (2a)_{2j}}.$$

where $(a)_j = \Gamma(a + j)/\Gamma(a)$

Lemma 2. Consider $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$ and Y_ϵ

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\left(Y_\epsilon - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2j} \right] \leq \frac{2^{j+1} e^{-j}}{(2a_{l(\epsilon)} + 1)^j} \quad (7)$$

Proof. From proposition 5

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\left(Y_\epsilon - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2j} \right] = \frac{(2j)!(a_{l(\epsilon)})_j}{2^{2j} j! (2a_{l(\epsilon)})_{2j}}.$$

We upper bound this number in two steps. First by the definition

$$\frac{(a_{l(\epsilon)})_j}{(2a_{l(\epsilon)})_{2j}} \leq \frac{1}{2^j \prod_{k=1}^j (2a_{l(\epsilon)} + 2k - 1)} \leq \frac{1}{2^j (2a_{l(\epsilon)} + 1)^j}.$$

Second by standard Stirling's inequalities:

$$\frac{(2j)!}{2^{2j} j!} \leq \frac{e(2j)^{2j+1/2} e^{-2j}}{\sqrt{2}(j)^{j+1/2} e^{-j}} \leq \frac{2^{2j+1} j^{2j+1} e^{-2j}}{j^j e^{-j}} = 2^{j+1} j^{j+1} e^{-j}.$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\left(Y_\epsilon - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2j} \right] \leq \frac{2^{j+1} j^{j+1} e^{-j}}{2^j (2a_{l(\epsilon)} + 1)^j} = \frac{2^{j+1} e^{-j}}{(2a_{l(\epsilon)} + 1)^j}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 1. For all t we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \min_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} 2Y_\epsilon \leq \theta(t) \leq \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \max_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} 2Y_\epsilon$$

therefore

$$\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \min_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} 2Y_\epsilon \leq \inf \theta(t) < \sup \theta(t) \leq \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} 2 \max_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} Y_\epsilon.$$

Our argument consists of exploiting the fact that both bounds are products of independent random variables. For the maximum, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} 2Y_\epsilon &= \max_{\epsilon' \in E_{j-1}^*} \{\max\{2Y_{\epsilon'0}, 2Y_{\epsilon'1}\}\} = \\ \max_{\epsilon' \in E_{j-1}^*} \{\max\{2Y_{\epsilon'0}, 2(1 - Y_{\epsilon'0})\}\} &= \max_{\epsilon' \in E_{j-1}^*} \left(1 + 2 \left|\frac{1}{2} - Y_{\epsilon'0}\right|\right) = 1 + 2 \max_{\epsilon' \in E_{j-1}^*} \left(\left|\frac{1}{2} - Y_{\epsilon'0}\right|\right), \end{aligned}$$

and analogously for the minimum:

$$\min_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} 2Y_\epsilon = 1 - 2 \max_{\epsilon' \in E_{j-1}^*} \left(\left|\frac{1}{2} - Y_{\epsilon'0}\right|\right).$$

We conclude the proof noting that by Kakutni's Theorem for convergence of product martingales, for both bounds to be almost surely finite and non-zero, it suffices to have

$$1 < \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \max_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} 2Y_\epsilon \right] < \infty$$

This is the case because by Jensen's Inequality for any $p \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\max_{\epsilon' \in E_{j-1}^*} \left(\left|\frac{1}{2} - Y_{\epsilon'0}\right|\right) \right] \leq \left(2^{j-1} \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\left(\left|\frac{1}{2} - Y_{\epsilon'0}\right|\right)^p \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

and applying Lemma 2

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\max_{\epsilon' \in E_{j-1}^*} \left(\left|\frac{1}{2} - Y_{\epsilon'0}\right|\right) \right] \leq \left(2^{j-1} \frac{2p^{p+1}e^{-p}}{(2a_j + 1)^p}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Choosing p to be the first even integer above j , we have the following for some constant C that does not depend on j

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\max_{\epsilon' \in E_{j-1}^*} \left(\left|\frac{1}{2} - Y_{\epsilon'0}\right|\right) \right] \leq C \frac{j}{a_j}.$$

Thus

$$1 < \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \max_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} Y_\epsilon \right] \leq \prod \left(1 + C \frac{j}{a_j}\right) < \infty$$

where the last inequality follows from the hypothesis. □

B Proof of Theorem 2

We present a proof that employs three auxiliary results alongside Theorem 1. Proposition 6 provides estimates for the negative moment of a binomial random variable and Proposition 7 provides bounds for evaluations of the digamma function [see e.g. [Gradshteyn and Ryzhik, 2014] for details]. Finally, Proposition 8 applies Proposition 6 obtaining an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n}[\log(\hat{Y}_\epsilon)]$.

Proposition 6 ([Wooff, 1975]). *Let $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$ be a binomial random variable. It holds*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{a + X} \right] \leq \frac{1}{(np + a - 1 + p)} \quad (8)$$

Proposition 7 ([Batir, 2008]). *The digamma function ψ satisfy for all $x > 0$:*

$$\log(x) - \frac{1}{x} < \psi(x) < \log(x) - \frac{1}{2x} \quad (9)$$

Proposition 8. *Let \mathbf{X}_n be an i.i.d. sample of r.v.s with support on \mathcal{X} and $\{N_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon \in E}$ counts alongside a partition tree of \mathcal{X} . It holds*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] \leq \log \left(\frac{nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + y_\epsilon(f_0) - 2)} \right) \quad (10a)$$

$$F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \log \left(\frac{F(B_\epsilon)}{2F(B_{\epsilon_0})} \right) + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \log \left(\frac{F(B_\epsilon)}{2F(B_{\epsilon_1})} \right) - \frac{F(B_\epsilon)}{a_{l(\epsilon)}} \leq \quad (10b)$$

$$F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] \quad (10c)$$

$$F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] \leq \frac{2F(B_\epsilon)}{2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 4} \quad (10d)$$

We present our proof of Proposition 8 after proving Theorem 1 as it is a slight distraction from the main argument.

Proof of Theorem 1. First we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [\mathbb{E}_\theta [D_{KL}(f_0|\theta)]] &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log f_0(t) dt - \int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt \right] \right] = \\ &= -H(f_0) + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\mathbb{E}_\theta \left[- \int f_0(t) \log(\theta(t)) dt | \mathbf{X}_n \right] \right] > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore our proof strategy consists in bounding the expectation of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [\mathbb{E}_\theta [- \int f_0(t) \log(\theta(t)) dt | \mathbf{X}_n]]$ and comparing it to $H(f_0)$. We outline the steps of proof as:

1. Apply Theorem 1 to decompose $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \mathbb{E}_\theta [- \int f_0(t) \log(\theta(t)) dt | \mathbf{X}_n]$ as a converging series.
2. Estimate the size of the terms to obtain an upper bound of the form

$$H(f_0) < \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\mathbb{E}_\theta \left[- \int f_0(t) \log(\theta(t)) dt | \mathbf{X}_n \right] \right] < \sum_{\epsilon \in E} b_{\epsilon, n}$$

for some absolutely summable series with $|b_{\epsilon, n}| < u_\epsilon$.

3. Apply the Bounded Convergence Theorem to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\epsilon \in E} b_{\epsilon, n} = \sum_{\epsilon \in E} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{\epsilon, n} = - \sum_{\epsilon \in E} F_0(B_\epsilon) \log(2y_\epsilon(f_0)) = H(f_0)$$

The last equation implies the required result directly.

Step 1 goes as

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log(\theta(t)) dt | X_n \right] = \\
& \text{Theorem 1 and BCT } E_\theta \left[\sum F(B_\epsilon) \log(2Y_\epsilon) | X_n \right] = \sum F(B_\epsilon) E_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | X_n] = \\
& \text{Property of beta distribution } \sum F(B_\epsilon) (\log(2) + \psi(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l} + a_{l(\epsilon)}) - \psi(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)})) \geq \\
& \text{Proposition 7 } \sum F(B_\epsilon) \log \left(\frac{2(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l} + a_{l(\epsilon)})}{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) - \sum F(B_\epsilon) \left(\frac{2}{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l} + a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

By Propositions 8 and 6, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
-E_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log(\theta(t)) dt | X_n \right] &\leq \sum_{\epsilon \in E} F_0(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) \log \left(\frac{nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + y_\epsilon(f_0) - 2))} \right) + \\
&\sum_{\epsilon \in E} \frac{F_0(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}})}{nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - 1 + F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l})}
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 8 also states that the absolute value of the terms of the first sum are uniformly bounded in n . The second term may also be uniformly bounded in n taking $n = 0$.

As the infinite sums on $\epsilon \in E$ of both upper bounds are smaller than $-H(f_0) + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_l}$, it follows from the Dominated Convergence Theorem that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[-\mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log(\theta(t)) dt | X_n \right] \right] \leq \\
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\epsilon} F(B_\epsilon) \log \left(\frac{nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + 1 - F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}))} \right) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum \frac{F(B_\epsilon)}{nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + 1 - F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l})} = \\
& \sum_{\epsilon} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(B_\epsilon) \log \left(\frac{nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + 1 - F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}))} \right) + \sum \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(B_\epsilon)}{nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + 1 - F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l})} = \\
& \sum_{\epsilon} F(B_\epsilon) \log \left(\frac{F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}})}{2F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l})} \right) + 0 = \\
& \qquad \qquad \qquad H(f_0)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 8. First we note that $N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l} | N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} \sim \text{Bin}(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}, y_\epsilon(f_0))$ and therefore expectations of ratio of $N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}$ and $N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}$ might be computed applying the Law of Total expectation. The first part of the proof consists applications of the law of iterated expectation and alternated applications of Jensen's Inequality, Proposition 6.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] = \\
& \mathbb{E}_{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \middle| N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} \right] \right] \leq \quad \text{LTE} \\
& \mathbb{E}_{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}} \left[\log \left(\mathbb{E}_{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}} \left[\frac{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \middle| N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} \right] \right) \right] \leq \quad \text{Jensen's} \\
& \mathbb{E}_{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} y_\epsilon(f_0) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + y_\epsilon(f_0) - 1)} \right) \right] = \quad \text{Proposition 6} \\
& \mathbb{E}_{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}} \left[\log(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}} \left[\log \left(\frac{1}{2(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} y_\epsilon(f_0) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + y_\epsilon(f_0) - 1)} \right) \right] \leq \\
& \mathbb{E}_{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}} \left[\log(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}) \right] + \log \left(\mathbb{E}_{N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}} \left[\frac{1}{2(N_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}} y_\epsilon(f_0) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + y_\epsilon(f_0) - 1)} \right] \right) \leq \quad \text{Jensen's} \\
& \log(nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}) + \log \left(\frac{1}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) y_\epsilon(f_0) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + y_\epsilon(f_0) - 2)} \right) = \quad \text{Proposition 6} \\
& \log \left(\frac{nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_l}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} + F(B_{\epsilon_1 \dots \epsilon_{l-1}}) + y_\epsilon(f_0) - 2)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

For the second equation we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] \leq \\
& F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \log \left(\frac{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - 2)} \right) + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \log \left(\frac{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - 2)} \right) \leq \\
& F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \left(\frac{n(F(B_\epsilon) - 2F(B_{\epsilon_0})) + 4}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - 2)} \right) + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \left(\frac{n(F(B_\epsilon) - 2F(B_{\epsilon_1})) + 4}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - 2)} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

without loss of generality lets write $F(B_{\epsilon_0}) = F(B_\epsilon)/2 + \delta$ and $F(B_{\epsilon_1}) = F(B_\epsilon)/2 - \delta$ for $0 \leq \delta < F(B_\epsilon)/2$. Then $(F(B_\epsilon) - 2F(B_{\epsilon_0})) = -2\delta$ and $(F(B_\epsilon) - 2F(B_{\epsilon_1})) = 2\delta$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
& F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \left(\frac{n(F(B_\epsilon) - 2F(B_{\epsilon_0})) + 4}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - 2)} \right) + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \left(\frac{n(F(B_\epsilon) - 2F(B_{\epsilon_1})) + 4}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - 2)} \right) = \\
& (F(B_\epsilon)/2 + \delta) \left(\frac{-2n\delta + 4}{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2n\delta + 2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 4} \right) + (F(B_\epsilon)/2 - \delta) \left(\frac{2n\delta + 4}{nF(B_\epsilon) - 2n\delta + 2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 4} \right) = \\
& \frac{F(B_\epsilon)}{2} \left(\frac{-2n\delta + 4}{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2n\delta + 2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 4} + \frac{2n\delta + 4}{nF(B_\epsilon) - 2n\delta + 2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 4} \right) + \\
& \delta \left(\frac{-2n\delta + 4}{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2n\delta + 2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 4} - \frac{2n\delta + 4}{nF(B_\epsilon) - 2n\delta + 2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 4} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

This sum is maximized for $\delta = 0$. Thus

$$F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] \leq \frac{2F(B_\epsilon)}{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 4} \leq \frac{2F(B_\epsilon)}{2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 4}$$

as stated.

For the last equation we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& F(B_{\epsilon_0})\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] + F(B_{\epsilon_1})\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\log \left(\frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(N_{\epsilon_1} + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) \right] \geq \\
& F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \log \left(\frac{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \log \left(\frac{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1}) + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) + F(B_\epsilon) \left(1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}]}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right] \right) \geq \\
& F(B_{\epsilon_0}) \log \left(\frac{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) + F(B_{\epsilon_1}) \log \left(\frac{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2(nF(B_{\epsilon_1}) + a_{l(\epsilon)})} \right) - \frac{F(B_\epsilon)(1 - F(B_\epsilon))}{nF(B_\epsilon) + 2a_{l(\epsilon)} - 1 + F(B_\epsilon)}
\end{aligned}$$

and that the lower bound is decreasing towards their limits in n , proving the third equation. \square

C Proof of Theorem 3

Our proof employs two auxiliary results. We present their proofs after the proof of Theorem 3.

Lemma 3. *Let $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$ and $\theta|\mathbf{X}_n$ its posterior. If*

$$a_l = 2^{l(2+\delta)}, \delta > 0$$

then

$$\frac{(\sum_{\epsilon \in E} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [|\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]|])}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (11)$$

in \mathbf{X}_n probability.

Proposition 9. *Let $\theta \sim PT(\mathcal{B}, a)$ and $\theta|\mathbf{X}_n$ be its posterior. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [|\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]|] \leq \frac{nP(B_\epsilon) + 2}{2(nP(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - y_\epsilon(f_0))} \quad (12)$$

Proof of Theorem 3. It holds

$$\begin{aligned}
|H(f_0) - \hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n)| & \leq \left| \hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt | \mathbf{X}_n \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt | \mathbf{X}_n \right] - H(f_0) \right| = \\
& \left| \hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt | \mathbf{X}_n \right] \right| + \mathbb{E}_\theta [K(f_0; \theta) | \mathbf{X}_n]
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2 states that the second term converges to 0 in probability. We prove the theorem showing that $\left| \hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt | \mathbf{X}_n \right] \right| \rightarrow 0$ in probability.

It holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \hat{H}(\mathbf{X}_n) - \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[\int f_0(t) \log \theta(t) dt | \mathbf{X}_n \right] \right| = \\
& \left| \sum \frac{N_\epsilon}{n} \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n] - \sum F(B_\epsilon) \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n] \right| = \\
& \left| \sum \left(\frac{N_\epsilon}{n} - F(B_\epsilon) \right) \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n] \right| \leq \sum_{\epsilon \in E} \left| \frac{N_\epsilon}{n} - F(B_\epsilon) \right| |\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]| \leq
\end{aligned}$$

$$\left(\sup_{\epsilon \in E} \left| \frac{N_\epsilon}{n} - F(B_\epsilon) \right| \right) \left(\sum_{\epsilon \in E} |\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]| \right)$$

\mathcal{B} has VC-dimension 2, therefore by Glivenko-Cantelli, the first term is bounded in probability by $O(1/\sqrt{n})$. By

Lemma 3 $\frac{\left(\sum_{\epsilon \in E} |\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]| \right)}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow 0$ in probability. It follows that the product converges to 0 and the theorem is proved. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. By Assumption I, the upper bound of proposition X is uniformly bounded by some finite value M . Consider $L_n = \log_2 n / \delta$ a fixed truncation level of the partition tree for some $\delta > 2$. It holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{\epsilon \in E} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [|\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]|] \right) &\leq \sum_{\epsilon: l(\epsilon) \leq L_n} M + \sum_{\epsilon: l(\epsilon) > L_n} \left(\frac{nP(B_\epsilon) + 2}{2(nP(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - y_\epsilon)} \right) = \\ &2M(2^{L_n} - 1) + \sum_{\epsilon: l(\epsilon) > L_n} \left(\frac{nP(B_\epsilon) + 2}{2(nP(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - y_\epsilon)} \right) = \\ &2M(n^{\frac{1}{\delta}} - 1) + \sum_{\epsilon: l(\epsilon) > L_n} \left(\frac{nP(B_\epsilon) + 2}{2(nP(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - y_\epsilon)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

If $l(\epsilon) > L_n \implies a_{l(\epsilon)} > n2^{l(\epsilon)\beta}$ for some $\beta > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\epsilon: l(\epsilon) > L_n} \left(\frac{nP(B_\epsilon) + 2}{2(nP(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - y_\epsilon)} \right) &\leq \left(\sum_{\epsilon: l(\epsilon) > L_n} \frac{nP(B_\epsilon)}{2(nP(B_{\epsilon_0}) + n2^{l(\epsilon)\beta} - y_\epsilon)} \right) + \left(\sum_{\epsilon: l(\epsilon) > L_n} \frac{2}{2(nP(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - y_\epsilon)} \right) \leq \\ &\sum_{\epsilon: l(\epsilon) > L_n} \frac{nP(B_\epsilon)}{n2^{l(\epsilon)\beta}} + \sum_{\epsilon: l(\epsilon) > L_n} \frac{2}{a_{l(\epsilon)}/2} = \left(\sum_{l > L_n} \frac{1}{2^{l\beta}} \right) + \left(\sum_{l > L_n} \frac{2^l}{a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) < \infty \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption II both inequalities hold; therefore

$$\frac{\sum_{\epsilon \in E} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [|\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]|]}{\sqrt{n}} \leq n^{\frac{2-\delta}{2\delta}} + \frac{M_2}{\sqrt{n}} \rightarrow 0$$

and the convergence in probability follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 9. First we note that

$$\log \left(\frac{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) - \frac{1}{N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)}} + \frac{1}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \leq \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n] \leq \log \left(\frac{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) - \frac{1}{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} + \frac{1}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}$$

and thus

$$\log \left(\frac{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) - \frac{1}{N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)}} \leq \mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n] \leq \log \left(\frac{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) + \frac{1}{N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)}}.$$

Therefore

$$|\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]| \leq \left| \log \left(\frac{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) \right| + \frac{1}{N_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)}}.$$

Also

$$1 - \frac{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \leq \log \left(\frac{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) \leq \frac{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} - 1$$

and thus

$$\frac{N_{\epsilon_0} - N_{\epsilon_1}}{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \leq \log \left(\frac{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) \leq \frac{N_{\epsilon_0} - N_{\epsilon_1}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}.$$

Consequently

$$\left| \log \left(\frac{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}{N_\epsilon + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right) \right| \leq \frac{|N_{\epsilon_0} - N_{\epsilon_1}|}{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \leq \frac{N_\epsilon}{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}}.$$

As

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\frac{N_\epsilon}{2N_{\epsilon_0} + 2a_{l(\epsilon)}} \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} \left[\frac{N_\epsilon}{2(N_\epsilon y_{\epsilon_0} + a_{l(\epsilon)} - y_{\epsilon_0} + 1)} \right] \leq \frac{nP(B_\epsilon)}{2(nP(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - y_{\epsilon_0} + 1)}$$

we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{X}_n} [|\mathbb{E}_\theta [\log(2Y_\epsilon) | \mathbf{X}_n]|] \leq \frac{nP(B_\epsilon) + 2}{2(nP(B_{\epsilon_0}) + a_{l(\epsilon)} - y_{\epsilon_0})}$$

□

A Proof of Proposition 3

We begin with an auxiliary result.

Proposition 10 (Adapted from Theorem 2.1 of Kanagawa et al. [1992]). *Let \mathbf{X}_n be an i.i.d. sample of r.v. with density $f : \mathbb{R}^p \in L^2$. Then:*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(n^2 \min_{i,j} |x_i - x_j| > u \right) = e^{-\frac{\|f\|_2^2 u}{2}}. \quad (13)$$

$n^2 \min_{i,j} |x_i - x_j|$ converges in law to a random variable with an exponential distribution with parameter $\|f\|_2^2/2$.

We are able to control the size of $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ because it is deeply related to sample spacings.

Proposition 11. *Let $d(\mathbf{x}_n) = \min_{i,j \leq n} |x_i - x_j|$ be the smallest distance between two points in a one-dimensional \mathbf{x}_n . Then:*

$$\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil + 1 \leq L(\mathbf{X}_n) \leq \lceil -\log_2 d(\mathbf{x}_n) \rceil + 1 \quad (14)$$

Proof. For the lower bound, note that for all j , the number of elements in E_j^* is 2^j and that $\sum_{\epsilon \in E_j^*} n_\epsilon = n$. Thus, if $2^j < n$, by the pigeonhole principle, any distribution of the sample points \mathbf{x}_n in the partition $\{B_\epsilon, \epsilon \in E_j^*\}$ assigns at least two observations to some B_ϵ , resulting in $n_\epsilon > 1$. For the first j^* such that $2^{j^*} \geq n$, it becomes possible to observe an allocation in which all n_ϵ are 1. By definition, $j^* = \lceil \log_2(n) \rceil$, and thus the result is demonstrated.

For the upper bound, note that for all $k \geq -\log_2 d(\mathbf{x}_n)$, we have:

$$k \geq -\log_2 d(\mathbf{x}_n) \implies -k \leq \log_2 d(\mathbf{x}_n) \implies \frac{1}{2^k} \leq \min_{i,j \leq n} |x_i - x_j|.$$

It follows that there are no two x_i, x_j in the same B_ϵ with $\epsilon \in E_k^*$. We demonstrate this fact by contradiction because if there were $x_i, x_j \in B_\epsilon$, the distance between them should be less than the width of B_ϵ , which is $1/2^k$, contradicting the above implications.

Thus, $L(\mathbf{X}_n) < k + 1$. We can refine the inequality by taking the smallest k that satisfies $k \geq -\log_2 d(\mathbf{x}_n)$. By definition, this number is $\lceil -\log_2 d(\mathbf{x}_n) \rceil$, as we wanted to demonstrate. □

As a corollary, we obtain precise estimates for the growth of $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$:

Proposition 12. *Under the conditions of Proposition 10, for all $M_n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$L(\mathbf{X}_n) < 2 \log_2(n) + M_n \text{ in } \mathbf{X}_n \text{ probability} \tag{15}$$

Proof. First, we note that as $n^2 \min |X_i - X_j|$ converges in law to a absolutely continuous limit X , the convergence is uniform. Therefore the approximation error $E_n = \sup_t |F_{n^2 \min |X_i - X_j|}(t) - F_X(t)|$ does not depend on t . By the previous propositions, taking $u = 2^{-M_n}$, we have:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(n^2 \min_{i,j} |x_i - x_j| > u \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(-\log_2 \min_{i,j} |x_i - x_j| < 2 \log_2 n - \log_2 u \right) \leq e^{-\frac{\|f\|_2^2}{2M_n+1}} + E_n \rightarrow 0$$

Therefore, $-\log_2 \min_{i,j} |x_i - x_j|$ is bounded in probability. By Proposition 11, so is $L(\mathbf{X}_n)$ as stated. □