

Demystifying Fixed k -Nearest Neighbor Information Estimators

Weihao Gao*, Sewoong Oh†, Pramod Viswanath‡

Abstract

Estimating mutual information from i.i.d. samples drawn from an unknown joint density function is a basic statistical problem of broad interest with multitudinous applications. The most popular estimator is one proposed by Kraskov and Stögbauer and Grassberger (KSG) in 2004, and is nonparametric and based on the distances of each sample to its k^{th} nearest neighboring sample, where k is a fixed small integer. Despite its widespread use (part of scientific software packages), theoretical properties of this estimator have been largely unexplored. In this paper we demonstrate that the estimator is consistent and also identify an upper bound on the rate of convergence of the ℓ_2 error as a function of number of samples. We argue that the performance benefits of the KSG estimator stems from a curious “correlation boosting” effect and build on this intuition to modify the KSG estimator in novel ways to construct a superior estimator. As a byproduct of our investigations, we obtain nearly tight rates of convergence of the ℓ_2 error of the well known fixed k nearest neighbor estimator of differential entropy by Kozachenko and Leonenko.

1 Introduction

Information theoretic quantities such as mutual information measure *relations* between random variables. A key property of these measures is that they are invariant to one-to-one transformations of the random variables and obey the data processing inequality [10, 21]. These properties combine to make information theoretic quantities attractive in several data science applications involving clustering [37, 60, 8], classification [46] and more generally as a basic feature that can be used in several downstream applications [15, 3, 65, 54]. A canonical question in all these applications is to estimate the information theoretic quantities from *samples*, typically supposed to be drawn i.i.d. from an unknown distribution. This fundamental question has been of longstanding interest in the theoretical statistics community where it is a canonical question of estimating a functional of the (unknown) density [7] but also in the information theory [64, 43, 66, 63], machine learning [16, 26] and theoretical computer science [55, 4, 1] communities, with significant renewed interest of late, summarized in detail in Section 6. The most fundamental information theoretic quantity of interest is the mutual information between a pair of random variables, which is also the primary focus of this paper, in the context of real valued random variables (in potentially high dimensions).

The basic estimation question takes a different hue depending on whether the underlying distribution is discrete or continuous. In the discrete setting, significant understanding of the minimax rate-optimal estimation of functionals, including entropy and mutual information, of an unknown probability mass function is attained via recent works [43, 42, 55, 22, 66]. The continuous setting is significantly different, bringing to fore the interplay of geometry of the Euclidean space as well as the role of dimensionality of the domain in terms of estimating the information theoretic quantities; this setting is the focus of this paper. Among the various estimation methods, of great theoretical interest and high practical relevance, are the *nearest neighbor* (NN) methods: the quantities of interest are estimated based on distances (in an appropriate norm) of the samples to their k -nearest neighbors (k -NN). Of particular practical interest is the situation when k is a small *fixed* integer – typically in the range of 4~8 – and the estimators based on fixed k -NN statistics typically perform

*Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Coordinated Science Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, email: wgao9@illinois.edu

†Department of Industrial and Enterprise Systems Engineering, Coordinated Science Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, email: swoh@illinois.edu

‡Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Coordinated Science Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, email: pramodv@illinois.edu

significantly better than alternative approaches, discussed in detail in Section 6, both in simulations and when tested in the wild; this is especially true when the random variables are in high dimensions.

The exemplar fixed k -NN estimator is that of differential entropy from i.i.d. samples proposed in 1987 by Kozachenko and Leonenko [27] which involved a novel bias correction term, and we refer to as the KL estimator (of differential entropy). Since the mutual information between two random variables is the sum and difference of three differential entropy terms, any estimator of differential entropy naturally lends itself into an estimator of mutual information, which we christen as the 3KL estimator (of mutual information). In an inspired work in 2004, Kraskov and Stögbauer and Grassberger [29], proposed a different fixed k -NN estimator of the mutual information, which we name the KSG estimator, that involved subtle (sample dependent) alterations to the 3KL estimator. The authors of [29, 25] empirically demonstrated that the KSG estimator consistently improves over the 3KL estimator in a variety of settings. Indeed, the simplicity of the KSG estimator, combined with its superior performance, has made it a very popular estimator of mutual information in practice.

Despite its widespread use, even basic theoretical properties of the KSG estimator are unknown – it is not even clear if the estimator has vanishing bias (i.e., consistent) as the number of samples grows, much less any understanding of the asymptotic behavior of the bias as a function of the number of samples. As observed elsewhere [17], characterizing the theoretical properties of the KSG estimator is of first order importance – this study could shed light on why the sample-dependent modifications lead to improved performance and perhaps this understanding could lead to the design of even better mutual information estimators. Such are the goals of this paper.

Main results. We make the following contributions.

- Our main result is to show that the KSG estimator is consistent. We also show upper bounds to the rate of convergence of the bias as a function of the dimensions of the two random variables involved: in the special case when the dimensions of the two random variables are equal and no more than one, the rate of convergence of the ℓ_2 error is $1/\sqrt{N}$, which is the parametric rate of convergence.
- We argue that the improvement of the KSG estimator over the 3KL estimator comes from a “correlation boosting” effect, which can be further amplified by a suitable modification to the KSG estimator. This leads to a novel mutual information estimator, which we call the bias-improved-KSG estimator (BI-KSG). The asymptotic theoretical guarantees we show of the BI-KSG estimator are the same as the KSG estimator, but the improved performance can be seen empirically – especially for moderate values of N .
- We demonstrate sharp bounds on the ℓ_2 rate of convergence of the KL estimator of (differential) entropy for arbitrary k and arbitrary dimensions d , showing that the parametric rate of convergence of $1/\sqrt{N}$ is achievable when $d \leq 2$.

In the rest of the paper, we mathematically summarize these main results, following up with detailed empirical evidence. A key building block for our results is the asymptotic analysis of the theoretical properties of the KL estimator of differential entropy which we begin with below.

1.1 KL Entropy Estimator and Convergence Rate

Consider a random variable $X \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$. Given N i.i.d. samples X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N from the underlying probability density function $f_X(x)$, we want to estimate the differential entropy $H(X) = -\mathbb{E}[\log f_X(X)]$. As mentioned earlier, a popular approach to estimate the entropy from i.i.d. samples is to use k -NN statistics. Precisely, let $\rho_{k,i,p}$ denote the distance from X_i to the k^{th} nearest neighbor as measured in ℓ_p distance, for some $p \geq 1$. Each k -NN distance $\rho_{k,i,p}$ together with the choice of k , provides a *local* view of the underlying distribution around the i^{th} sample. Informally, considering the ℓ_p -ball of radius $\rho_{k,i,p}$ centered at X_i with sufficiently small radius, one can relate the distribution and the number of samples within the ball via: $\widehat{f}_X(X_i)c_{d,p}(\rho_{k,i,p})^d \simeq \frac{k}{N}$, where $c_{d,p}$ is the volume of the unit ℓ_p ball in d dimensions: $(\Gamma(1 + \frac{1}{p})^d / \Gamma(1 + \frac{d}{p}))2^d$. This simple intuition led Kozachenko and Leonenko to design a powerful and provably consistent *differential*

entropy estimator in [27], which we have called the KL estimator. We begin with the resubstitution estimator $\hat{H}(X) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \hat{f}_X(X_i)$ and combine it with the k -NN estimate of the density to get:

$$\hat{H}_{\text{KL}}(X) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \left(\frac{N c_{d,p}(\rho_{k,i,p})^d}{k} \right) + \log(k) - \psi(k) , \quad (1)$$

where $\psi(x)$ is the digamma function defined as $\psi(x) = \Gamma^{-1}(x)d\Gamma(x)/dx$, and for large x , it is approximately equal to $\log(x)$ up to a correction of $O(1/x)$. Precisely, $\psi(x) = \log x - 1/2x + o(1/x)$. The correction term, introduced in [27], is crucial for debiasing the estimator. Note that if we choose k increasing with N , as commonly done in a significant part of the literature (and summarized in a later section), $\psi(k)$ converges to $\log(k)$ and no correction is necessary for consistency. However, in practice, k is typically a small constant and the correction is crucial. Consistency of the KL estimator has been established for $k = 1$ by the original authors [27] and for general k by [49] and the rate of convergence of the bias and variance has been established (for a certain large class of smooth pdfs with unbounded support, including the Gaussian) only for one-dimensional random variables [53].

Main result. We show the following result on the asymptotic rate of convergence of the KL estimator, over a class of pdfs with *bounded* support which includes the uniform and truncated Gaussian. Below d is the dimension of the random variable whose differential entropy is being estimated and the \tilde{O} -notation denotes the limiting behavior up to polylogarithmic factors in N .

Theorem 1. *The bias of the KL estimator is $\tilde{O}(N^{-\frac{1}{d}})$ and the variance is $\tilde{O}(1/N)$. Thus the ℓ_2 error of the KL estimator is $\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + N^{-\frac{1}{d}})$.*

We note that the parametric rate of convergence is obtained for $d \leq 2$. The result for $d = 1$ is also new since our result holds for pdfs with bounded support, a class that were not included in the conditions for a similar result in [53]. We briefly highlight the key ideas of the proof below and relegate the precise statement of the theorem in Section 2 and its proof to Section 7.

1. We use the average pdf of a ball $B(x, r)$ centered at x with small radius r (usually the k -NN distance of x) to approximate $f(x)$, relying on the smoothness of $f(\cdot)$. The error in this approximation is $O(r^2)$ if the Hessian of f is bounded, and this error dominates the convergence rate of bias. A similar idea was attempted in [39], but the authors mistakenly claimed that the error introduced by the approximation is $O(r^{2d})$, which is much smaller than $O(r^2)$ for $d > 1$ and leads to an incorrect conclusion.
2. If the density $f(x)$ is extremely small, the k -NN distance r of x will be large, which means that the $O(r^2)$ error is large. We truncate the k -NN distance by a_N to solve this problem, but at the cost of additional bias. We need to control the total probability of the tail of f to be small enough so that the additional bias introduced by truncation is not too large; this leads to the necessity of the assumption on the pdfs to be essentially uniformly lower bounded almost everywhere.

1.2 KSG Estimator: Consistency and Convergence Rate

Consider two random variables X in $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ and Y in $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$. Given N i.i.d. samples $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_N, Y_N)$ from the underlying joint probability density function $f_{X,Y}(x, y)$, we want to estimate the mutual information $I(X; Y)$. Mutual information between two random variables X and Y is the sum and difference of differential entropy terms: $I(X; Y) = H(X) + H(Y) - H(X, Y)$. Thus given KL entropy estimator, there is a straightforward and consistent estimation of the mutual information:

$$\hat{I}_{3\text{KL}}(X; Y) = \hat{H}_{\text{KL}}(X) + \hat{H}_{\text{KL}}(Y) - \hat{H}_{\text{KL}}(X, Y). \quad (2)$$

While this estimator performs fairly well in practice, the authors of [29] introduced a simple, but inspired, modification of the 3KL estimator that does even better. Let $n_{x,i,p} \equiv \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{I}\{\|X_j - X_i\|_p \leq \rho_{k,i,p}\}$, which can be interpreted as the number of samples that are within a X -dimensions-only distance of $\rho_{k,i,p}$ with respect to sample i . Since $\rho_{k,i,p}$ is the k -NN distance (in terms of both the dimensions of X and Y) of the

sample i it must be that $n_{x,i,p} \geq k$. Finally, $n_{y,i,p}$ is defined analogously. The KSG estimator measures distances using the ℓ_∞ norm, so $p = \infty$ in the notation above.

The KSG mutual information estimator introduced in [29] is given by:

$$\widehat{I}_{\text{KSG}}(X; Y) \equiv \psi(k) + \log N - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) + \psi(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1)), \quad (3)$$

where $\psi(x) = \Gamma^{-1}(x)d\Gamma(x)/dx$ is the digamma function. Observe that the estimate of the joint differential entropy $H(X, Y)$ is done exactly as in the KL estimator using fixed k -NN distances, but the KL estimates of $H(X)$ and $H(Y)$ are done using $n_{x,\cdot,\infty}$ and $n_{y,\cdot,\infty}$ NN distances, respectively, which are *sample dependent*. The point is that by this choice, the k -NN distance terms are canceled away exactly, although it is not clear why this would be a good idea. In fact, it is not even clear if the estimator is consistent. On the other hand, the authors of [29] showed empirically that the KSG estimator is uniformly superior to the 3KL estimator in many synthetic experiments. A theoretical understanding of the KSG estimator, including a mathematical justification for the improved performance, has been missing in the literature. Our main results fill this gap.

Main result. One of our main results is to show that the KSG estimator is indeed consistent. We prove this result by deriving a vanishingly small upper bound on the bias, subject to regularity conditions on the Radon-Nikodym derivatives of X and Y and standard smoothness conditions on the joint pdf which includes both bounded and unbounded supports. The formal statement of these assumptions is in Section 3 and the proof of the theorem is moved to Sections 11 and 12.

We show the following result on the asymptotic rate of convergence of the KSG estimator.

Theorem 2. *The KSG estimator is consistent. The bias of the KSG estimator is $\widetilde{O}(N^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}})$ and the variance is $\widetilde{O}(1/N)$. Thus the ℓ_2 error of the KL estimator is $\widetilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + N^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}})$.*

Observe that when $d_x = d_y$ and equal to 1, the rate of convergence is $\widetilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}})$, the parametric rate of ℓ_2 error, which cannot be improved upon.

The correlation boosting explanation allows us to propose a new mutual information estimator, that we call the bias-improved KSG (BI-KSG) estimator. The new aspects include using the ℓ_2 norm to measure distances and replacing the digamma function of $n_{x,2,\cdot,2}, n_{y,2,\cdot,2}$ by the logarithm – and although the theoretical properties of the BI-KSG estimator we show are the same as that of the KSG estimator we empirically demonstrate its improved performance which is pronounced when k is small and N is moderate-valued. The formal definition of the BI-KSG estimator is the following.

$$\widehat{I}_{\text{BI-KSG}}(X; Y) \equiv \psi(k) + \log N + \log \left(\frac{c_{d_x,2} c_{d_y,2}}{c_{d_x+d_y,2}} \right) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\log(n_{x,i,2}) + \log(n_{y,i,2})), \quad (4)$$

where $c_{d,2} = \pi^{d/2}/\Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)$ is the volume of d -dimensional unit ℓ_2 ball.

1.3 Outline of this paper

In the next two sections we state our main results formally, also providing brief sketches of, and intuitions behind, the corresponding proofs. Detailed proofs are relegated to the appendix. In Section 4 we discuss the insights behind the KSG estimator: the correlation boosting effect and how this understanding leads to the BI-KSG estimator with improved empirical performance. In Section 5 we discuss generalization of KSG estimator to multivariate mutual information estimators. Section 6 puts our results in context of the vast literature on entropy (and mutual information) estimators. Finally, the proofs of the main results are in Sections 7 through 13.

2 Convergence Rate of KL Entropy Estimator

In this section we carefully analyze the performance of the KL estimator of differential entropy in terms of its ℓ_2 error. We show upper bounds to the rate of convergence of the bias and variance of the KL estimator

separately which combine to provide an upper bound on the ℓ_2 error. A minimax lower bound on the ℓ_2 error provides a baseline to understand how sharp our upper bound characterization is. We start with the upper bound on the convergence rate of ℓ_2 error.

2.1 Upper Bounds

The starting point for our exploration is the pioneering work of [53], which established the $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ -consistency of the one-dimensional KL estimator. In particular, [53] proved that the KL estimator achieves \sqrt{N} -consistency in mean, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{H}(X)] - H(X) = \widetilde{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$, and in variance, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[(\widehat{H}(X) - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{H}(X)])^2] = \widetilde{O}(1/N)$, under the assumption that the X is a one-dimensional random variable and the estimator uses only the nearest neighbor distance with $k = 1$, along with a host of other assumptions on the class of pdfs under consideration (an important one is that the support be unbounded). We prove a generalization of this rate of convergence for general dimensions d and for a general k , but under technical assumptions listed below; some of them mirror the assumptions introduced in [53], but the condition on the support is crucially different.

Assumption 1. *We make the following assumptions: there exist finite constants C_a, C_b, C_c, C_d , and C_0 such that*

- (a) $f(x) \leq C_a < \infty$ almost everywhere;
- (b) There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\int f(x) (\log f(x))^{1+\gamma} dx \leq C_b < \infty$;
- (c) $\int f(x) \exp\{-bf(x)\} dx \leq C_c e^{-C_0 b}$ for all $b > 1$.
- (d) $f(x)$ is twice continuously differentiable and the Hessian matrix H_f satisfy $\|H_f(x)\|_2 < C_d$ almost everywhere.
- (e) The set of points which violates assumption (d) has finite $d - 1$ dimensional Hausdorff measure, i.e. $H^{d-1}(\{x : \|H_f(x)\|_2 \geq C_d\}) < C_e$.

These assumptions are slightly stronger than those in [53], where assumption (a) and (e) are not required (and with some technical finesse can perhaps be eliminated here as well), assumption (b) is mildly weaker requiring only $\int f(x) |\log f(x)| dx < \infty$, and assumption (c) was weaker requiring only $\int f(x) \exp\{-bf(x)\} \leq O(1/b)$. The assumption (c) is satisfied for any distribution with bounded support and pdf bounded away from zero. This assumption provides a sufficient condition to bound the average effect of the truncation. Our analysis can be generalized to relax this assumption on the smoothness, requiring only $\int f(x) \exp\{-bf(x)\} dx \leq C_c b^{-\beta}$ for all $b > 1$, in which case the resulting guarantees will also depend on β . This recovers the result of [53] with $\beta = 1$ which holds for $d = 1$, and we assume stronger conditions here since we seek sharp convergence rates in higher dimensions. The assumption (d) assumes that the pdf is reasonably smooth, and it is essential for NN-based methods. More general families of smoothness conditions have been assumed for other approaches, such as the Hölder condition, and we have made formal comparisons in Section 6.

Note that there exist (families of) distributions, satisfying the assumptions (a)–(d), where the convergence rates of k NN estimators can be made arbitrarily slow. Consider a family of distributions in two dimensional rectangle with uniform measure parametrized by ℓ , such that one side has a length ℓ and the other $1/\ell$. This family of distributions has differential entropy zero. However, for any sample size N , there exists ℓ large enough such that the k -NN distances are arbitrarily large and the estimated entropy is also large. To provide a sharp convergence rate for k NN estimators, we need to restrict the space of distributions by adding appropriate assumptions that captures this phenomenon.

The challenge in the above example has been addressed under the notion of *boundary bias*. k NN distances are larger near the boundaries, which results in underestimating the density at boundaries. This effect is prominent for those distributions that (i) have non-smooth boundaries such as a uniform distribution on a compact support, and (ii) have large surface area at the boundary. There are two solutions; either we strengthen Assumption 1.(d) and require twice continuously differentiability *everywhere* including the boundaries or we can add another assumption on the surface area of the boundaries. In this paper, we take the second route. The reason is that the first option conflicts with the current Assumption 1.(c) where

the only examples we know have lower bounded densities, which implies non-smooth boundaries. It is an interesting future research direction to relax assumption (c) as suggested above, and capture the tradeoff between the lightness of the tail in β and also the smoothness in the boundaries.

Instead, we assume in 1.e that the surface area of the boundaries is finite. Recall that the Hausdorff measure of a set S is defined as

$$H^{d-1}(S) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \inf_{\{U_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\text{diam } U_i)^{d-1} : \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} U_i \supseteq S, \text{diam } U_i < \delta \right\}. \quad (5)$$

It is a measure of the surface area of the set S . Note that this could be unbounded for the boundary of a family of distributions, as is the case for the uniform rectangle example above. Assumption 1.(e) restricts it to be finite, allowing us to limit the boundary bias to $\tilde{O}(N^{-1/d})$ as proved using Lemma 3. Since in the (smooth) interior of the support, the bias is $\tilde{O}(N^{-2/d})$, the boundary bias dominates the error for the proposed k NN method.

We start with a truncated version of the KL estimator, similar in spirit to [53]. Consider $\rho_{k,i,p}$ be the distance to the k^{th} nearest neighbor of X_i with respect to ℓ_p distance. Fix any $\delta > 0$, define the threshold a_N as:

$$a_N = \left(\frac{(\log N)^{1+\delta}}{N} \right)^{1/d}, \quad (6)$$

for some $\delta > 0$. We define a local estimate $\xi_{k,i,p}(X)$ by:

$$\xi_{k,i,p}(X) = \begin{cases} -\psi(k) + \log N + \log c_{d,p} + d \log \rho_{k,i,p} & , \text{ if } \rho_{k,i,p} \leq a_N, \\ 0 & , \text{ if } \rho_{k,i,p} > a_N. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Then the truncated KL estimator is:

$$\hat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{k,i,p}(X). \quad (8)$$

The following theorem upper bounds the bias of the truncated KL entropy estimator. Here $\delta > 0$ is arbitrarily small (and is from the truncation threshold cf. Equation(6)) and d is the dimension of the random variable X and k is any fixed finite integer and for any norm p .

Theorem 3. *Under the Assumption 1 and for finite $k = O(1)$ and $d = O(1)$, the bias of the truncated KL entropy estimator using N i.i.d. samples is bounded by:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\hat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) \right] - H(X) = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{(1+\delta)(1+1/d)}}{N^{1/d}} \right). \quad (9)$$

The following theorem establishes the upper bound for the variance of $\hat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X)$, cf. (8), which we observe is independent of the dimension d of the random variable X . Again $\delta > 0$ is arbitrarily small (and is from the truncation threshold cf. Equation(6)) and k is any fixed integer.

The main step of the proof is the observation that

$$\text{Var} \left[\hat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) \right] \leq \frac{1}{N} \text{Var} [\xi_{k,1,p}] + \text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1,p}, \xi_{k,2,p}]. \quad (10)$$

The first term is bounded by $O((\log \log N)^2)$ due to the truncation of k -NN distances. The second term is actually the covariance of k -NN distances of a pair of samples, which we show to be $O(1/N)$ up to a polylogarithmic factor. Putting these two steps together completes the proof.

Theorem 4. *Under the Assumption 1 and for finite $k = O(1)$ and $d = O(1)$, the variance of the truncated KL entropy estimator using N i.i.d. samples is bounded by:*

$$\text{Var} \left[\hat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log \log N)^2 (\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)}}{N} \right). \quad (11)$$

The Mean Squared Error (MSE) of truncated KL estimator

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) - H(X) \right)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) - H(X) \right]^2 + \text{Var} \left[\widehat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) \right], \quad (12)$$

is the sum of the squared bias and variance. So combining Theorems 3 and 4, we obtain the following upper bound on the MSE of truncated KL estimator. Again $\delta > 0$ is arbitrarily small (and is from the truncation threshold cf. Equation(6)) and k is any fixed integer.

Corollary 1. *Under the Assumption 1 and for finite $k = O(1)$ and $d = O(1)$, the MSE of the truncated KL entropy estimator using N i.i.d. samples is bounded by:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) - H(X) \right)^2 \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{(1+\delta)(2+2/d)}}{N^{2/d}} + \frac{(\log \log N)^2 (\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)}}{N} \right). \quad (13)$$

To see how good this bound on rate of convergence is, we derive a worst case lower bound below.

2.2 Minimax Lower Bound

We follow the standard techniques to lower bound estimator errors of functionals of a density – Le Cam’s method in general and [7] in particular. Consider the class of smooth distributions:

$$\mathcal{F}_d = \{f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ : \int f(x)dx = 1, \|H_f(x)\| \leq C, a.e.\}, \quad (14)$$

where H_f denotes the Hessian matrix of f . We want to estimate the differential entropy of f from n i.i.d. samples $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$, where $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We summarize a minimax lower bound on the ℓ_2 error rate in the following theorems. Here $\Omega(N^{-1})$ is the parametric minimax lower bound and $\Omega(N^{-16/(d+8)})$ follows from the construction in [7].

Theorem 5. *The minimax error rate for estimating entropy from N i.i.d. samples is lower bounded by*

$$\inf_{\widehat{H}_N} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{H}_N(X) - H(X) \right)^2 \right] \geq \Omega(N^{-16/(d+8)} + N^{-1}), \quad (15)$$

where the infimum is taken over all measurable functions over the N samples.

2.3 Comparing the Bounds

The minimax ℓ_2 error of the KL estimator (over the class of functions with norm-bounded Hessian matrix) is lower bounded by $\widetilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + N^{-\frac{8}{d+8}})$ (cf. this broadly follows from [7], but a detailed proof is also presented in Section 9 for completeness), we see that the optimality gap of the exponent is characterized by $\min\{1/2, 8/(d+8)\} - \min\{0.5, 1/d\}$, which is always non-negative. This characterizes the $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ rate of convergence for MSE for $d \leq 2$ (this is the parametric rate), while there is some gap in the upper and lower bounds for the rates when $d > 2$. The upper and lower bounds of the MSE error of the KL estimator as a function of the number of samples is depicted in Figure 2 (along with the exponents for other entropy estimators: resubstitution [23] and von Mises expansion estimators [24] with standard KDEs). We see that the upper and lower bounds match for $d \leq 2$ and in this regime the parametric rate of convergence of $\widetilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}})$ is achieved. There is a gap when $d > 2$ and closing this gap is an interesting future direction of research.

To get a feel for whether the upper bound exponent should be improved or the lower bound (or both), it is instructive to plot sample MSE of the KL estimator for a specific pdf. In this synthetic experiment, we choose N i.i.d. samples X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N from uniform distribution over $[0, 1]^d$ and use the KL estimator to estimate entropy. Figure. 1 plots the MSE vs the sample size for different dimensions in log scale; we observe that $\log(\text{MSE})$ is linear in $\log N$. We can use standard linear regression to estimate the slope $\log(\text{MSE})/\log N$ – the experimental results are plotted in Figure. 2 (using green color). We conclude that

the simulation results are fairly close to the theoretical upper bounds on convergence rate – which suggests that the improvements are to be most expected in lower bounds suited to k -NN estimation.

It is interesting that the theoretical rate of convergence is slowest for k -NN methods as compared to KDE (resubstitution or von-Mises expansions), while the empirical performance (for modest sample sizes) is *exactly the reverse* in many diverse settings; Figure 3 illustrates this phenomenon for a specific instance (independent Beta(2,2) in 6 dimensions, with sample sizes varying from 100 to 3000, averaged over 500 trials. The von-Mises estimator is implemented using the default parameters provided by [24]). Clearly the difference in theoretical and empirical performance is to be explained by the constant terms (and not asymptotics in sample size N) – a theoretical understanding of this phenomenon is another interesting direction for future research.




Figure 1: MSE versus sample size in log-log scale.

3 KSG Estimator: Consistency and Convergence Rate

A detailed understanding of the KL estimator sets the stage for the main results of this paper: deriving theoretical properties of the KSG estimator of mutual information. Our main result is that the KSG estimator is consistent, as is our proposed modification, the so-called bias-improved KSG estimator (BI-KSG); these results are under some (fairly standard) assumptions on the joint pdf of (X, Y) .

3.1 Consistency

We make the following assumptions on the joint pdf of (X, Y) . The first assumption is essentially needed to define the joint differential entropy of (X, Y) , the second assumption makes some regularity conditions on the Radon-Nikodym derivatives of X and Y , and the third assumption is regarding standard smoothness conditions on the joint pdf. We note that these conditions are readily met by most popular pdfs, including multivariate Gaussians, and no assumption is made on the boundedness of the support.

Assumption 2. (a) $\int f(x, y) |\log f(x, y)| dx dy < \infty$.

(b) There exists a finite constant C' such that the conditional pdf $f_{Y|X}(y|x) < C'$ and $f_{X|Y}(x|y) < C'$ almost everywhere.

(c) $f(x, y)$ is twice continuously differentiable and the Hessian matrix H_f satisfy $\|H_f(x, y)\|_2 < C$ almost everywhere.




Figure 2: Exponents of the convergence rate of ℓ_2 error for various entropy estimators.




Figure 3: Empirical performance of MSE vs sample size (log-log scale).

Under these assumptions, the KSG and the BI-KSG estimators are both consistent, in probability. This is a formal version of Theorems 2 and 4 of the main text.

Theorem 6. *Under the Assumption 2 and for finite $k > \max\{d_x/d_y, d_y/d_x\}$, $d_x, d_y = O(1)$, and for all $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \hat{I}_{\text{KSG}}(X; Y) - I(X; Y) \right| > \varepsilon \right) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad (16)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \hat{I}_{\text{BI-KSG}}(X; Y) - I(X; Y) \right| > \varepsilon \right) = 0. \quad (17)$$

3.2 Convergence rate

The KSG and BI-KSG mutual information estimators are reintroduced here for ease of reference:

$$\hat{I}_{\text{KSG}}(X; Y) \equiv \psi(k) + \log N - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) + \psi(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1)), \quad (18)$$

$$\hat{I}_{\text{BI-KSG}}(X; Y) \equiv \psi(k) + \log N + \log \left(\frac{c_{d_x,2} c_{d_y,2}}{c_{d_x+d_y,2}} \right) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\log(n_{x,i,2}) + \log(n_{y,i,2})), \quad (19)$$

To understand the rate of convergence of the bias of the KSG and BI-KSG estimators, we first truncate the k -NN distance $\rho_{k,\cdot,\cdot}$, similar to the undertaking in Section 2.1. For any $\delta > 0$, let the truncation threshold be:

$$a_N = \left(\frac{(\log N)^{1+\delta}}{N} \right)^{1/(d_x+d_y)}, \quad (20)$$

where d_x and d_y are the dimensions of the random variables X and Y respectively. We define local information estimates $\iota_{k,i,\infty}$ and $\iota_{k,i,2}$ by:

$$\iota_{k,i,\infty} = \begin{cases} \psi(k) + \log N - \psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) - \psi(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1) & \text{if } \rho_{k,i,\infty} \leq a_N, \\ 0 & \text{if } \rho_{k,i,\infty} > a_N, \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

and

$$\iota_{k,i,2} = \begin{cases} \psi(k) + \log N + \log\left(\frac{c_{d_x,2}c_{d_y,2}}{c_{d_x+d_y,2}}\right) - \log(n_{x,i,2}) - \log(n_{y,i,2}) & \text{if } \rho_{k,i,2} \leq a_N, \\ 0 & \text{if } \rho_{k,i,2} > a_N. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

The modified (via truncation) KSG and BI-KSG estimators (compare with (18) and (19)) are:

$$\widehat{I}_{\text{tKSG}}(X;Y) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \iota_{k,i,\infty}. \quad (23)$$

$$\widehat{I}_{\text{tBI-KSG}}(X;Y) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \iota_{k,i,2}. \quad (24)$$

The following theorem (a formal version of Theorems 2 and 4 of the main text) provides an upper bound on the rate of convergence of the bias and variance, under the conditions in Assumption 3 below, and holds for any k and $\delta > 0$ (parameter in the truncation threshold, cf. (20)).

Assumption 3. *We make the following assumptions: there exist finite constants $C_a, C_b, C_c, C_d, C_e, C_f, C_g, C_h$ and C_0 such that*

- (a) $f(x, y) \leq C_a < \infty$ almost everywhere.
- (b) There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\int f(x, y) (\log f(x, y))^{1+\gamma} dx dy \leq C_b < \infty$.
- (c) $\int f(x, y) \exp\{-bf(x, y)\} dx dy \leq C_c e^{-C_0 b}$ for all $b > 1$.
- (d) $f(x, y)$ is twice continuously differentiable and the Hessian matrix H_f satisfy $\|H_f(x, y)\|_2 < C_d$ almost everywhere.
- (e) The conditional pdf $f_{Y|X}(y|x) < C_e$ and $f_{X|Y}(x|y) < C_e$ almost everywhere.
- (f) The marginal pdf $f_X(x) < C_f$ and $f_Y(y) < C_f$ almost everywhere.
- (g) The set of points violating (d) has finite d_x+d_y-1 -dimensional Hausdorff measure, i.e., $H^{d_x+d_y-1}(\{(x, y) : \|H_f(x, y)\| \geq C_d\}) \leq C_g$.
- (h) The set of points such that $H_{f_X}(x)$ or $H_{f_Y}(y)$ is larger than C_d also has finite $d_x - 1$ (or $d_y - 1$)-dimensional Hausdorff measure, i.e., $H^{d_x-1}(\{x : \|H_{f_X}(x)\| \geq C_d\}) \leq C_h$ and $H^{d_y-1}(\{y : \|H_{f_Y}(y)\| \geq C_d\}) \leq C_h$.

Here Assumption 3.(a) – (d) are the same as in Assumption 1 (which were introduced in the context of characterizing the convergence rate of the KL estimator). Assumption 3.(e) makes sure that the marginal entropy estimator converges at certain rate. Compared to Assumption 2, we need an upper bound for the joint entropy (a). The condition (b) is slightly stronger than Assumption 2 by changing the power from 1 to $1 + \gamma$. The condition (c) is the tail bound which ensures the convergence rate of truncated KL joint entropy estimator. The conditions Assumption 1.(g) and (h) are natural generalizations of Assumption 1.(e). We note that truncated multivariate Gaussians and uniform random variables meet these constraints.

Theorem 7. *Under Assumption 3, and for finite $k > \max\{d_x/d_y, d_y/d_x\}$, $d_x, d_y = O(1)$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{I}_{\text{tKSG}}(X;Y) \right] - I(X;Y) = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{(1+\delta)(1+\frac{1}{d_x+d_y})}}{N^{\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}}} \right). \quad (25)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{I}_{\text{tBI-KSG}}(X;Y) \right] - I(X;Y) = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{(1+\delta)(1+\frac{1}{d_x+d_y})}}{N^{\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}}} \right). \quad (26)$$

The following theorem establishes an upper bound for the variance of truncated KSG and BI-KSG estimators.

Theorem 8. *Under Assumption 3,*

$$\text{Var} \left[\widehat{I}_{\text{tKSG}}(X; Y) \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log \log N)^2 (\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)}}{N} \right). \quad (27)$$

$$\text{Var} \left[\widehat{I}_{\text{tBI-KSG}}(X; Y) \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log \log N)^2 (\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)}}{N} \right). \quad (28)$$

Combining Theorem 7 and Theorem 8, we obtain the following upper bound on the MSE of truncated KSG or BI-KSG estimator.

Corollary 2. *Under the Assumption 3 and for finite $k = O(1)$ and $d = O(1)$, the MSE of the truncated KSG or BI-KSG mutual information estimator using N i.i.d. samples is bounded by:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{I}_{\text{tKSG}}(X; Y) - I(X; Y) \right)^2 \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{2(1+\delta)(1 + \frac{1}{d_x + d_y})}}{N^{\frac{2}{d_x + d_y}}} + \frac{(\log \log N)^2 (\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)}}{N} \right). \quad (29)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{I}_{\text{tBI-KSG}}(X; Y) - I(X; Y) \right)^2 \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{2(1+\delta)(1 + \frac{1}{d_x + d_y})}}{N^{\frac{2}{d_x + d_y}}} + \frac{(\log \log N)^2 (\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)}}{N} \right). \quad (30)$$

It is instructive to compare these upper bounds on mean squared error to that of the 3KL estimator, which can be derived directly from Corollary 1. We see that the rates of convergence of the mean squared error (at least viewed through the upper bounds on their rates of convergence) have the same scaling for 3KL, KSG, and BI-KSG.

Corollary 3. *If $d_x = d_y = 1$, we obtain:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{I}_{\text{tKSG}}(X; Y) - I(X; Y) \right)^2 \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)}}{N} \right). \quad (31)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\widehat{I}_{\text{tBI-KSG}}(X; Y) - I(X; Y) \right)^2 \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)}}{N} \right). \quad (32)$$

This establishes the $1/N$ convergence rate of the MSE of the KSG and BI-KSG and 3KL estimators up to a poly-logarithmic factor; this (parametric) convergence rate cannot be improved upon.

4 Correlation Boosting

Perhaps to build an intuition towards a deeper theoretical understanding of the KSG estimator, we ask for the key features that make it perform better than the 3KL one. This is the focus of the present section, where we see a curious correlation boosting effect which explains the superior performance of the KSG estimator and allows us to derive an even better estimator of mutual information. A related intuitive explanation is provided in [68].

Correlation Boosting Effect. We begin by rewriting the KSG estimator, cf. (18), as:

$$\widehat{I}_{\text{KSG}}(X; Y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \iota_{k,i,\infty} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\xi_{k,i,\infty}(X) + \xi_{k,i,\infty}(Y) - \xi_{k,i,\infty}(X, Y)) \quad (33)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{k,i,\infty}(X, Y) &\equiv -\psi(k) + \log N + \log c_{d_x,\infty} c_{d_y,\infty} + (d_x + d_y) \log \rho_{k,i,\infty} \\ \xi_{k,i,\infty}(X) &\equiv -\psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) + \log N + \log c_{d_x,\infty} + d_x \log \rho_{k,i,\infty} \\ \xi_{k,i,\infty}(Y) &\equiv -\psi(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1) + \log N + \log c_{d_y,\infty} + d_y \log \rho_{k,i,\infty}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Here $\xi_{k,i,\infty}(X, Y)$, $\xi_{k,i,\infty}(X)$ and $\xi_{k,i,\infty}(Y)$ are local estimates of the differential entropies $H(X, Y)$, $H(X)$ and $H(Y)$, respectively, at the i^{th} sample. We will show that the bias of joint entropy estimate $b_{k,i,\infty}(X, Y) = \xi_{k,i,\infty}(X, Y) - H(X, Y)$ is positively correlated to the bias of marginal entropy estimates $b_{k,i,\infty}(X) = \xi_{k,i,\infty}(X) - H(X)$ and $b_{k,i,\infty}(Y) = \xi_{k,i,\infty}(Y) - H(Y)$. Since the bias of the KSG estimator is simply equal to $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N b_{k,i,\infty}(X, Y) - b_{k,i,\infty}(X) - b_{k,i,\infty}(Y)$ the bias is reduced if $b_{k,i,\infty}(X, Y)$ is *positively* correlated with $b_{k,i,\infty}(X)$ and $b_{k,i,\infty}(Y)$. The same effect is true for the 3KL estimator, which is already based on estimating the three differential entropy terms separately. We tabulate the Pearson correlation coefficients of the biases in Table 1 for two exemplar pdfs (independent uniforms and Gaussians). The main empirical observation is that the correlation is positive even for the 3KL estimator but is significantly higher for the KSG estimator (and at times even higher for the BI-KSG estimator which we introduce below).

N	$(X, Y) \sim \text{Unif}([0, 1]^2)$			$(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$		
	1024	2048	4096	1024	2048	4096
3KL	0.1276	0.1259	0.0930	0.4602	0.4471	0.3717
KSG	0.9312	0.9328	0.9085	0.6750	0.7151	0.6687
BI-KSG	0.9253	0.9251	0.8880	0.6823	0.7330	0.6939

Table 1: Pearson Correlation Coefficient $\rho(b(X, Y), b(X))$ for different mutual information estimators.

We hypothesize that this correlation *boosting* effect is the main reason for the KSG estimator having smaller mean-square error than the 3KL one. We simulate 100 i.i.d. samples uniformly from $[0, 1]^2$ and map the scatter-plot of the biases $b(X, Y)$ and $b(X)$ in Figure 4, where the boosted correlation for the KSG estimator is visibly significant.




Figure 4: Scatter plot of the biases $b(X, Y)$ and $b(X)$ to illustrate the correlation boosting effect. Left: 3KL. Right: KSG.

New Estimator of Mutual Information. Given the understanding of the correlation boosting effect, it is natural to ask if this can lead to a new estimator that furthers the improvement in MSE. This goal is achieved below, where we discuss potential areas of improvement of the KSG estimator and conclude with

our proposal: Bias Improved KSG (BI-KSG) estimator of mutual information. One of the key differences comes from using ℓ_2 norm to measure k -NN distances, while KSG uses ℓ_∞ distance. Next, BI-KSG uses $\log(n_{x,i,2})$ and $\log(n_{y,i,2})$ instead of $\psi(n_{x,1,\infty} + 1)$ and $\psi(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1)$, respectively. We briefly discuss the intuitions behind these changes below. We begin by noting that the KSG estimator can be written as:

$$\widehat{I}_{\text{KSG}}(X; Y) = \widehat{H}_{\text{KSG}}(X) + \widehat{H}_{\text{KSG}}(Y) - \widehat{H}_{\text{KL}}(X, Y), \quad (35)$$

where $\widehat{H}_{\text{KL}}(X; Y)$ is the KL entropy estimator (and already known to be consistent). The marginal entropy estimator is

$$\widehat{H}_{\text{KSG}}(X) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (-\psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) + \psi(N) + \log c_{d_x,\infty} + d_x \log \rho_{k,i,\infty}), \quad (36)$$

and we note that this has a form similar to that of the KL entropy estimator, except that k is replaced by $n_{x,i,\infty} + 1$, which is sample dependent. Suppose $(X_i^{(k)}, Y_i^{(k)})$ be the k -NN of (X_i, Y_i) with distance $\rho_{k,i,\infty}$, then the “KSG entropy estimator” in (36) implicitly assumes that $\rho_{k,i,\infty}$ is *both* the $(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1)$ -NN distance of X_i on X -space *and* the $(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1)$ -NN of Y_i on Y -space. But since ℓ_∞ -distance is used, $(X_i^{(k)}, Y_i^{(k)})$ either lies on the X -boundary of the hypercube $S_{(X,Y,\rho_{k,i,\infty})} = \{(x, y) : \max\{\|x - X_i\|_\infty, \|y - Y_i\|_\infty\} \leq \rho_{k,i,\infty}\}$, or on the Y -boundary of $S_{(X,Y,\rho_{k,i,\infty})}$ (the chance of lying on a corner, and thus on both the boundaries, has zero probability). If the k -NN lies on the X -boundary, i.e. $\|X_i^{(k)} - X_i\| = \rho_{k,i,\infty}$ and $\|Y_i^{(k)} - Y_i\| < \rho_{k,i,\infty}$, then $\rho_{k,i,\infty}$ is the $(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1)$ -NN distance of X_i , but *not* the $(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1)$ -NN distance of Y_i . Thus, while the estimate of entropy of X is correct, the entropy of Y is over-estimated. Since $\rho_{k,i,\infty}$ is between the $n_{y,i,\infty}$ -th and $(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1)$ -th NN distance, the “KSG entropy estimator” in (36) introduces a bias of order $1/n_{y,i,\infty}$. Similarly, a $1/n_{x,i,\infty}$ -bias if $(X_i^{(k)}, Y_i^{(k)})$ is introduced if the k -NN sample lies on the Y -boundary.




Figure 5: Illustration of choice of $\rho_{k,i}$ for $k = 3$. Left: use ℓ_∞ -distance. Right: use ℓ_2 -distance

This discussion suggests that we use an ℓ_2 ball, instead of an ℓ_∞ ball to find the k -NN. This would ensure that $\rho_{k,i,2}$ is neither the $(n_{x,i,2} + 1)$ -NN distance of X_i on X -space nor the $(n_{y,i,2} + 1)$ -NN distance of Y_i on Y -space. But then, we are unable to directly use the KL estimator for $H(X)$ and $H(Y)$ with this distance. The following theorem sheds some light on this conundrum, with the proof relegated to the appendix.

Theorem 9. *Given $(X_i, Y_i) = (x, y)$ such that the density f is twice continuously differentiable at (x, y) and $\rho_{k,i,2} = r < r_N$ for some deterministic sequence of r_N such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} r_N = 0$, the number of neighbors $n_{x,i,2} - k$ is distributed as $\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l$, where U_l are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with mean p , and there exists a positive constant C_1 such that for sufficiently large N . $r^{-d_x} |p - f_X(x) c_{d_x,2} r^{d_x}| \leq C_1 (r^2 + r^{d_y})$.*

Intuitively, the theorem says that $E[n_{x,i,2}] \approx N f_X(x) c_{d_x,2} \rho_{k,i,2}^{d_x}$. This suggests that we estimate the log of the density ($\log \widehat{f_X}(x)$) by $\log(n_{x,i,2}) - \log N - \log c_{d_x,2} - d_x \log \rho_{k,i,2}$. The resubstitution estimate of the marginal entropy $H(X)$ is now:

$$\widehat{H}_{\text{BI-KSG}}(X) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (-\log(n_{x,i,2}) + \log N + \log c_{d_x,2} + d_x \log \rho_{k,i,2}) \quad (37)$$

which is different from the KL estimate only via replacing the digamma function by the logarithm. This technique kills the $O(1/n_{x,i,2} + 1/n_{y,i,2})$ bias of the ‘‘KSG entropy estimator’’ and leads to the new estimator of mutual information that we christen *bias-improved KSG estimator*:

$$\widehat{I}_{\text{BI-KSG}}(X; Y) \equiv \psi(k) + \log N + \log \left(\frac{c_{d_x,2} c_{d_y,2}}{c_{d_x+d_y,2}} \right) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log(n_{x,i,2}) + \log(n_{y,i,2}), \quad (38)$$

where $c_{d,2} = \pi^{\frac{d}{2}} / \Gamma(\frac{d}{2} + 1)$ be the volume of d -dimensional unit ℓ_2 ball. We show the following result on the theoretical performance of this new estimator, which mimics our result on the KSG estimator.

Theorem 10. *The BI-KSG estimator is consistent. The bias of the BI-KSG estimator is $\widetilde{O}(N^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}})$ and the variance is $\widetilde{O}(1/N)$. Thus the ℓ_2 error of the BI-KSG estimator is $\widetilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + N^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}})$.*

Indeed, when N gets large, so do $n_{x,i,2}$ and $n_{y,i,2}$, and hence the KSG and BI-KSG estimators asymptotically perform similarly. But when k is small and N is moderate and X and Y are not independent, then $n_{x,i,2}$ and $n_{y,i,2}$ are *expected* to be small. In such cases, BI-KSG should outperform KSG. We demonstrate this empirically in Table 2 where we choose $k = 1$ and X and Y are joint Gaussian with mean 0 and covariance $\Sigma = [1, 0.9; 0.9, 1]$. We can see that all the estimators converge to the ground truth as N goes to infinity, but BI-KSG has the best sample complexity for moderate values of N . Overall, the empirical gains of correlation boosting are most seen in moderate sample sizes.

Our current theoretical understanding leads to the same upper bounds on the asymptotic rates of convergence for the KSG and BI-KSG estimators, and fails to explain the correlation boosting effects. We suspect that the gains of correlation boosting are not in the first order terms in the rates of convergence (of bias and variance) but in the multiplicative constants. A theoretical understanding of these constant terms is an interesting future direction; such an effort has been successfully conducted for entropy estimators based on kernel density estimators [23].

N	100	200	400	800	1600	3200
3KL	0.0590	0.1025	0.0313	0.0053	0.0097	0.0079
KSG	0.0240	0.0100	0.0217	0.0024	0.0087	0.0046
BI-KSG	0.0096	-0.0035	0.0133	-0.0012	0.0071	0.0032

Table 2: Comparison of bias for different mutual information estimators.

5 Multivariate Mutual Information

Generalizations of the standard mutual information that measure the relation *among a sequence* of random variables are routinely used in various applications of machine learning. We discuss two such multivariate versions of mutual information below and show how the correlation boosting ideas from the previous section can be used to construct sample-efficient estimators. The first version is a straightforward generalization and routinely used in unsupervised clustering and correlation extraction, cf. [59, 60, 9, 61] for a few recent applications:

$$I(X_1; X_2; X_3; \dots; X_L) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L H(X_\ell) - H(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_L). \quad (39)$$

One natural way to estimate this multivariate mutual information (MMI) is to use the sum and differences of the basic entropy estimators. In particular, one can use the fixed k -NN based KL entropy estimator to estimate MMI from i.i.d. samples (we can christen such a method as the $L + 1$ -KL estimator, generalizing from the 3KL estimator). Alternatively, one can use the correlation boosting ideas of KSG and BI-KSG to construct superior MMI estimators. Generalizing from Equations (18) and (19) we construct the estimators:

$$I_{\text{KSG}}(X_1; X_2; X_3; \dots; X_L) = \psi(k) + \log N - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^L \psi(n_{x_\ell, i, \infty}), \quad (40)$$

$$I_{\text{BI-KSG}}(X_1; X_2; X_3; \dots; X_L) = \psi(k) + \log N + \log \left(\frac{\prod_{\ell=1}^L c_{d_\ell, 2}}{c_{\sum_{\ell=1}^L d_\ell, 2}} \right) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{\ell=1}^L \log(n_{x_\ell, i, 2}).$$

Here d_ℓ is the dimension of X_ℓ . The key property we used in constructing these estimators is that the definition of MMI is *balanced* with respect to each of the L random variables: for every entropy term with a positive coefficient featuring a random variable X_ℓ there is a corresponding entropy term with a negative coefficient featuring the same random variable X_ℓ . From a theoretical perspective, the balance property ensures that the theoretical properties (including consistency) proved in the (pairwise) mutual information setting in Section 1.2 carry over to this MMI setting as well. From an empirical perspective, we see that the correlation boosting estimators perform significantly better than the simpler $(L + 1)$ -KL estimator defined as $\hat{I}_{(L+1)\text{-KL}} = \sum_{j=1}^L \hat{H}_{\text{KL}}(X_j) - \hat{H}_{\text{KL}}(X_1, \dots, X_L)$ in Figure 6 where $N = 100 \sim 3000$ and $L = 3$ and the random variables are jointly Gaussian with covariance matrix $[1 \ 1/2 \ 1/4; 1/2 \ 1 \ 1/2; 1/4 \ 1/2 \ 1]$.




Figure 6: Plot of MSE with sample size. BI-KSG performs marginally better than KSG.




Figure 7: Causal influence on a specific graphical model.

As another application of our ideas, we consider a more general form of multivariate mutual information:

$$\text{MMI}(X_1; X_2; X_3; \dots; X_L) = \sum_{S \subset \{1, \dots, L\}} a_S \cdot H(X_S), \quad (41)$$

for some *balanced* real valued set function a_S , i.e., for every $\ell = 1 \dots L$ we have $\sum_{S \ni \ell \in S} a_S = 0$. Such a metric was posited recently in the context of causal influence measurement on probabilistic graphical models (cf. Equation (9) in [20]) and widely studied in the information theory community due to its invariance to scaling (cf. [35] for a recent example). The definition in Equation (39) is a special case with the set function equal to 1 for singletons and -1 for the whole set and 0, otherwise (and can be viewed as arising out of a graphical model with a single latent variable). Such MMI can be estimated from samples using the correlation boosting ideas presented in this paper: we briefly describe the procedure in the context of an example (which can be viewed as a certain causal strength measurement [20] with respect to the graphical model in Figure 5): $\text{MMI}(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4) = H(X_1 X_3) + H(X_1 X_4) - H(X_1) + H(X_2) - H(X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4)$. For each sample i , we first find the k -NN distance ρ in the joint space (of four random variables) and use it estimate the joint entropy using the KL estimator. Then we use this distance to calculate the number of neighbors in each of

the other subset of random variables (in this case two pairwise ones $((X_1X_3)$ and $(X_1X_4))$, and two marginal ones $(X_1$ and $X_2)$, and use these to estimate the corresponding entropies. The balanced nature of the metric ensures that the actual distance ρ is *precisely canceled out* when all the entropy estimators are put together. In this case, the full estimator (in the spirit of the KSG estimator) is the following, and directly inherits the theoretical and empirical flavor of results from those in Section 1.2:

$$\text{MMI}_{\text{KSG}} = \psi(k) + \log N - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi(n_{x_1x_3,i,\infty}) + \psi(n_{x_1x_4,i,\infty}) - \psi(n_{x_1,i,\infty}) + \psi(n_{x_2,i,\infty}).$$

6 Related Work

The basic estimation question studied in this paper takes a different hue depending on whether the underlying distribution is discrete or continuous. In the discrete setting, significant understanding of the minimax rate-optimal estimation of functionals, including entropy and mutual information, of an unknown probability mass function is attained via recent works [43, 42, 55, 22, 66]. The continuous setting is significantly different, bringing to fore the interplay of geometry of the Euclidean space as well as the role of dimensionality of the domain in terms of estimating the information theoretic quantities; this setting is the focus of this paper. This fundamental question has been of longstanding interest in the theoretical statistics community where it is a canonical question of estimating a functional of the (unknown) density [7] but also in the machine learning [16, 26], information theory [64, 43, 66, 63], and theoretical computer science [55, 4, 1] communities. The popularity of mutual information and other information theoretic quantities comes from their wide use as basic features in several downstream applications [15, 3, 65, 54].

A conceptually straightforward way to estimate the differential entropy and mutual information is to use a kernel density estimator (KDE) [48, 23, 2, 13, 44, 18]: the densities $f_{X,Y}, f_X, f_Y$ are separately estimated from samples and the estimated densities are then used to calculate the entropy and mutual information via the resubstitution estimator. A typical approach to avoid overfitting is to conduct data splitting (DS): split the samples and use one part for KDE and the other for the resubstitution.

In some cases, the parametric rate of convergence of \sqrt{N} of ℓ_2 error is achieved: of particular interest is the result of [23] where the parametric rate is achieved for differential entropy estimation via KDE of density followed by the resubstitution estimator when the dimension is no more than 6. Numerical evidence suggests the hypothesis that the lower bounds derived in Theorem 5 below could perhaps be improved when the dimension is more than 4 and estimators constrained to only use fixed k -NN distances. Under certain very strong conditions on the density class (that are relevant in certain applications on graphical model selection [31]), exponential rate of convergence can be demonstrated [50, 51]. Recent works [30, 24] have studied the performance of the leave-one-out (LOO) approach where all but the sample of resubstitution are used for KDE, involving techniques such as von Mises expansion methods.

Alternative methods involve estimation of the entropies using spacings [58, 56], the Edgeworth expansion [57], and convex optimization [38]. Among the k -NN methods, there are two variants: either k is chosen to grow with the sample size N or k is fixed. There is a large literature on the former, where the classical result is the possibility of consistent estimation of the density from k -NN distances [33, 14], including recent sharper consistency characterizations [5, 28]. Several works have applied this basic insight towards the estimation of the specific case of information theoretic quantities [11, 62] and extensions to generalized NN graphs [41]. For fixed k -NN methods, apart from the works referred to in the main text, detailed experimental comparisons are in [47] and local Gaussian approaches studied in [16, 17, 34] bringing together local likelihood density estimation methods [32, 19] with k -NN driven choices of kernel bandwidth.

In this paper we have considered the smoothness of the class of pdfs studied via bounded Hessians. In nonparametric estimation, a standard feature is to consider whole families of smooth pdfs as defined by how the differences of derivatives relate to the differences of the samples [6]. Of specific interest is the Hölder family: $\Sigma(s, C)$, i.e., for any tuple $r = (r_1, \dots, r_d)$, define $D^r = \frac{\partial^{r_1+\dots+r_d}}{\partial x_1^{r_1} \dots \partial x_d^{r_d}}$. Then for any r such that $\sum_j r_j = \lfloor s \rfloor$, where $\lfloor s \rfloor$ is the largest integer smaller than s , we have:

$$\|D^r f(x) - D^r f(y)\| \leq C \|x - y\|^{s - \sum_j r_j}. \quad (42)$$

for any x, y . The rate of convergence of various nonparametric estimators depends on the parameter s of the Hölder family under consideration, cf. [30, 24] for recent work on convergence rate characterization of information theoretic quantities via KDE and resubstitution estimators as a function of the smoothness parameter s . It is natural to ask if such smoothness considerations could lead to a refined understanding of the rates of convergence of the fixed k -NN KL and KSG estimators studied here.

In the context of the KL estimator, the only place where smoothness plays a critical role is in the statement (and proof) of Lemma 4. For small enough r , defining $P(x, r)(u) = \mathbb{P}\{\|X - x\| < r\}$, we seek to understand how this probability can be approximated by the density at x . With bounded Hessian norms, Lemma 4 asserts the following:

$$|P(x, r) - f(x)c_d r^d| \leq C r^{d+2}, \quad (43)$$

which is crucial in deriving the rate of convergence upper bounds on the KL estimator. A fairly straightforward calculation shows that this condition does not change even if we allow for smoother class of families of pdfs, as defined via the Hölder class – we conclude that refined rates of convergence for fixed k -NN estimators do not materialize by standard approaches such as the Hölder class.

Although our analysis technique is inspired by that of [53], while generalizing it to higher dimensions, several subtle differences emerge and [53] does not imply our result even for $d = 1$: hence, we complement the understanding of KNN methods even for univariate random variables. For example, random variables with strictly positive densities over a bounded support are covered by our analysis, whereas random variables with unbounded support that are smooth everywhere are covered by the results of [53]. The reason is that non-smooth boundaries are not handled in [53] and densities approaching zero are not handled by our analysis. We believe it is possible to extend our analysis to have a theorem that includes both types of random variables, which is an interesting future research direction.

In this paper, k is assumed to be a finite constant, and we do not keep track of how the convergence rate depends on k . Analyses on fixed ρ estimators [52], where instead of fixing k and using the distance ρ_k , one fixes the distance ρ and uses the number of neighbors k_ρ within that distance, we expect the convergence rate of the variance to be independent of k , and the convergence rate of bias to be of order $O((k/N)^{1/d})$. Recently, the idea of using an ensemble of kNN entropy estimators to achieve a faster convergence rate has been introduced in [52, 36]. If the first-order terms in the convergence rate is known, then it is possible to achieve the parametric rate of $O(1/N)$ by taking a (weighted) linear combination of multiple estimators with varying k , whose weight depends on the convergence rate. Applying this idea together with KSG (and KL) estimators have the potential to improve the convergence rate we provide in this paper. The main challenge is in identifying the exact constants in the first-order terms in the convergence rate, and estimating it from samples in the case when the constant depends on the underlying distribution.

7 Proof of Theorem 3

We follow closely the proof from [53] of the \sqrt{N} -consistency of the one-dimensional entropy estimator introduced in [27]. It was proved in [53] that the KL entropy estimator achieves \sqrt{N} -consistency in mean, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[\hat{H}(X)] - H(X) = O(1/\sqrt{N})$, and in variance, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{H}(X) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{H}(X)])^2] = O(1/N)$, under the assumption that the X is a one-dimensional random variable and the estimator uses only the nearest neighbor distance with $k = 1$. In the process of proving our main result, we prove a generalization of this rate of convergence of the KL entropy estimator for general d -dimensional space and for a general k . Also notice that our proof works for any choice of ℓ_p distance for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, so we will drop the subscribe p in the proof of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4.

Firstly, we notice that $\xi_{k,i}(X)$ are identically distributed and $\xi_{k,i} = 0$ if $\rho_{k,i} > a_N$, so we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\hat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) \right] &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,i}(X)] = \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,i} \leq a_N\}]. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

We introduce the following notations. Let $b_N = e^{-\psi(k)} N c_d a_N^d = e^{-\psi(k)} c_d (\log N)^{1+\delta}$ and for every $u > 0$

define

$$r_N(u) = \left(\frac{ue^{\psi(k)}}{c_d N} \right)^{1/d}, \quad (45)$$

such that $r_N(e^{\xi_{k,1}(X)}) = \rho_{k,1}$ for $\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N$ and $r_N(b_N) = a_N$. It is easy to check that $\frac{dr_N(u)}{du} = \frac{r_N(u)}{ud}$. These definitions provides a new representation of the expectation in (44) using a change of variables $u = r_N^{-1}(\rho_{k,1})$:

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}(X) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}] = \mathbb{E}[\log u \cdot \mathbb{I}\{u \leq b_N\}] = \int \left(\int_0^{b_N} \log u dF_{N,x}(u) \right) f(x) dx, \quad (46)$$

where we define the following distribution:

$$F_{N,x}(u) = \mathbb{P}\left(e^{\xi_{k,1}(X)} < u \mid X_1 = x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\rho_{k,1} < r_N(u) \mid X_1 = x\right). \quad (47)$$

Similar change of variables holds for the actual entropy as follows.

Lemma 1.

$$H(X) = \int \left(\int_0^\infty \log u dF_x(u) \right) f(x) dx, \quad (48)$$

where

$$F_x(u) = 1 - \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{(ue^{\psi(k)} f(x))^j}{j!}. \quad (49)$$

This allows us to decompose the bias into three terms, each of which can be bounded separately.

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) \right] - H(X) \right| = \left| \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}] - H(X) \right| \quad (50)$$

$$\leq \int (I_1(x) + I_2(x) + I_3(x)) f(x) dx, \quad (51)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(x) &= \left| \int_{b_N}^\infty \log u dF_x(u) \right|, \\ I_2(x) &= \left| \int_0^1 \log u dF_{N,x}(u) - \int_0^1 \log u dF_x(u) \right|, \\ I_3(x) &= \left| \int_1^{b_N} \log u dF_{N,x}(u) - \int_1^{b_N} \log u dF_x(u) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

We will bound the three terms separately. The main idea is that $I_1(x)$ is small when b_N is sufficiently large, and $I_2(x)$ and $I_3(x)$ are small when $f_x(u)$ and $f_{N,x}(u)$ are close.

$I_1(x)$: We upper bound the tail probability that the k -NN distance is truncated. By plugging in the cdf (49) of $F_x(u)$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(x) &= \left| \int_{b_N}^\infty \log u dF_x(u) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{b_N}^\infty \log u \frac{dF_x(u)}{du} du \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left| \int_{b_N}^\infty (\log u) e^{\psi(k)} f(x) \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} (ue^{\psi(k)} f(x))^{k-1} du \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left| \int_{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)}^\infty (\log t - \psi(k) - \log f(x)) e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where the third equality is from Equation (70) and the last equality comes from changing of variable $t = ue^{\psi(k)} f(x)$. Now we consider two cases:

1. $b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x) < 1$. Then (53) is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left| \int_{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)}^{\infty} (\log t - \psi(k) - \log f(x)) e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left(\left| \int_{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)}^{\infty} \log t e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \right| + |\psi(k) + \log f(x)| \left| \int_{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)}^{\infty} e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \right| \right) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left(\int_0^{\infty} |\log t| e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt + |\psi(k) + \log f(x)| \int_0^{\infty} e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \right) \\
& \leq C_1 (1 + |\psi(k) + \log f(x)|).
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

where $C_1 = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int_0^{\infty} |\log t| e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt, \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \right\}$.

2. $b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x) \geq 1$. Then (53) is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left| \int_{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)}^{\infty} (\log t - \psi(k) - \log f(x)) e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \right| \\
& \leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \left(\left| \int_{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)}^{\infty} \log t e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \right| + |\psi(k) + \log f(x)| \left| \int_{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)}^{\infty} e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \right| \right) \\
& \leq C_2 (1 + |\psi(k) + \log f(x)|) \int_{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)}^{\infty} e^{-t/2} dt \\
& \leq 2C_2 (1 + |\psi(k) + \log f(x)|) \exp\{-b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\},
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

where C_2 is a constant satisfying $\log t \cdot t^{k-1}/(k-1)! < C_2 e^{t/2}$ and $t^{k-1}/(k-1)! < C_2 e^{t/2}$ for all $t > 1$.

Now combining the two cases, $I_1(x)$ is bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1(x) & \leq (1 + |\psi(k) + \log f(x)|) \left(C_1 \mathbb{I}\{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x) < 1\} + 2C_2 \exp\{-b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} \right) \\
& \leq C_3 (1 + |\log f(x)|) \exp\{-b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\},
\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where we use the fact that $\mathbb{I}\{b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x) < 1\} \leq \exp\{1 - b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\}$. Here $C_3 = (C_1 e + 2C_2)(1 + |\psi(k)|)$.

$I_2(x)$: $I_2(x)$ can be bounded by:

$$I_2(x) = \left| \int_0^1 \log u dF_{N,x}(u) - \int_0^1 \log u dF_x(u) \right| \leq \int_0^1 |\log u| |f_{N,x}(u) - f_x(u)| du \tag{57}$$

where $f_{N,x}(u)$ and $f_x(u)$ are the corresponding pdfs of $F_{N,x}(u)$ and $F_x(u)$, respectively. Here we partition the support into two parts. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 & = \{x : \|H_f(y)\|_2 < C_d, \forall y \in B(x, a_N)\} \\
S_2 & = \{x : \|H_f(y)\|_2 \geq C_d \text{ for some } y \in B(x, a_N)\} = S_1^C
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

From Assumption 1, $(d-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure of the set that $\|H_f(x)\| \geq C_d$ is finite, so the Lebesgue measure of S_2 is bounded by $2a_N C_e$ for sufficiently large N . For points in S_1 and S_2 , In the following lemma we give an upper bound for the difference of $f_{N,x}(u)$ and $f_x(u)$ for x in S_1 and S_2 separately.

Lemma 2. *Under the Assumption 1, for any $x \in S_1$,*

$$|f_{N,x}(u) - f_x(u)| \leq C_4 \left(N^{-2/d} + N^{-1} \right), \tag{59}$$

for $u \leq 1$. For $x \in S_2$, we have

$$|f_{N,x}(u) - f_x(u)| \leq C_4, \tag{60}$$

for $u \leq 1$.

Using Lemma 2 and the fact that $\int_0^1 |\log u| du = 1$, $I_2(x)$ is upper bounded by:

$$I_2(x) \leq C_4(N^{-2/d} + N^{-1}) \int_0^1 |\log u| du \leq C_4(N^{-2/d} + N^{-1}). \quad (61)$$

for $x \in S_1$ and

$$I_2(x) \leq C_4 \int_0^1 |\log u| du \leq C_4. \quad (62)$$

for $x \in S_2$.

$I_3(x)$: $I_3(x)$ can be bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(x) &= \left| \int_1^{b_N} \log u dF_{N,x}(u) - \int_1^{b_N} \log u dF_x(u) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_1^{b_N} \frac{1}{u} (1 - F_{N,x}(u)) du - \int_1^{b_N} \frac{1}{u} (1 - F_x(u)) du \right| \\ &\leq \int_1^{b_N} \frac{1}{u} |F_{N,x}(u) - F_x(u)| du. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

In the following lemma we give an upper bound for the difference of $F_{N,x}(u)$ and $F_x(u)$ for x in S_1 and S_2 separately.

Lemma 3. *Under the Assumption 1,*

$$|F_{N,x}(u) - F_x(u)| \leq C_5 \left(u^{1+2/d} N^{-2/d} + u^2/N \right), \quad (64)$$

for $x \in S_1$ and

$$|F_{N,x}(u) - F_x(u)| \leq C_5 (u + u^2/N), \quad (65)$$

for $x \in S_2$.

Using Lemma 3, $I_3(x)$ is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(x) &\leq C_5 \int_1^{b_N} \left((u/N)^{2/d} + u/N \right) du \\ &\leq C_5 \left(b_N^{1+2/d} N^{-2/d} + b_N^2 N^{-1} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

for $x \in S_1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(x) &\leq C_5 \int_1^{b_N} (1 + u/N) du \\ &\leq C_5 (b_N + b_N^2 N^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

for $x \in S_2$

Combining the upper bounds of $I_1(x)$, $I_2(x)$ and $I_3(x)$ and defining $C_6 = \max\{C_3, C_4, C_5\}$, the bias is

bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\widehat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) \right] - H(X) \\
& \leq \int (I_1(x) + I_2(x) + I_3(x)) f(x) dx \\
& \leq \int I_1(x) f(x) dx + \int_{S_1} (I_2(x) + I_3(x)) f(x) dx + \int_{S_2} (I_2(x) + I_3(x)) f(x) dx \\
& \leq C_6 \int \left(|1 + \log f(x)| \exp\{-b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} \right) f(x) dx \\
& \quad + \int_{S_1} \left(N^{-2/d} + N^{-1} + b_N^{1+2/d} N^{-2/d} + b_N^2 N^{-1} \right) f(x) dx + \int_{S_2} (1 + b_N + b_N^2 N^{-1}) f(x) dx \\
& \leq C_6 \left(\int f(x) \exp\{-b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} + \int f(x) |\log f(x)| \exp\{-b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + b_N^{1+2/d} N^{-2/d} + b_N^2 N^{-1} + b_N \left(\int_{S_2} f(x) dx \right) \right), \tag{68}
\end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 1.(c), the first term is bounded by: $\int f(x) \exp\{-b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} \leq C_d e^{-b_N C_0}$. The second term is bounded by Hölder inequality as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int f(x) |\log f(x)| \exp\{-b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} \\
& \leq \left(\int f(x) (\log f(x))^{1+\gamma} dx \right)^{1/(1+\gamma)} \left(\int f(x) \exp\left\{-\frac{1+\gamma}{\gamma} b_N e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\right\} dx \right)^{\gamma/(1+\gamma)} \\
& \leq C_b^{1/(1+\gamma)} \left(C_d e^{-\frac{1+\gamma}{\gamma} C_0 b_N} \right)^{\gamma/(1+\gamma)}. \tag{69}
\end{aligned}$$

By choosing $b_N = e^{-\psi(k)} c_d (\log N)^{1+\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$, we know that $e^{-C_0 b_N}$ decays faster than $N^{-\alpha}$ for any α .

The last term is bounded by $b_N (\int_{S_2} f(x) dx) \leq b_N C_a m(S_2) \leq 2b_N a_N C_a C_e$, where $m(S_2)$ is the Lebesgue measure of S_2 . Recall that we choose $a_N = ((\log N)^{1+\delta}/N)^{1/d}$, so the proof is complete.

7.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Since $F_x(u)$ is a continuous CDF, the corresponding pdf is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
f_x(u) = \frac{dF_x(u)}{du} &= -\exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{(ue^{\psi(k)} f(x))^{j-1}}{(j-1)!} e^{\psi(k)} f(x) \\
&+ e^{\psi(k)} f(x) \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{(ue^{\psi(k)} f(x))^j}{j!} \\
&= \frac{1}{(k-1)!} e^{\psi(k)} f(x) \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} (ue^{\psi(k)} f(x))^{k-1}. \tag{70}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^\infty \log u dF_x(u) &= \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int_0^\infty \log u e^{\psi(k)} f(x) \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)} f(x)\} (ue^{\psi(k)} f(x))^{k-1} du \\
&= \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int_0^\infty (\log t - \psi(k) - \log f(x)) e^{-t} t^{k-1} dt \\
&= \psi(k) - \psi(k) - \log f(x) \\
&= -\log f(x), \tag{71}
\end{aligned}$$

where the third to last equation comes from change of variable $t = ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)$. The penultimate equation comes from the fact that $\psi(k) = \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int_0^\infty (\log t) t^{k-1} e^{-t} dt$ and $1 = \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int_0^\infty t^{k-1} e^{-t} dt$. Therefore,

$$\int \left(\int_0^\infty \log udF_x(u) \right) f(x) dx = \int (-\log f(x)) f(x) dx = H(X). \quad (72)$$

7.2 Proof of Lemma 2

Recall that

$$f_x(u) = \frac{1}{(k-1)!} e^{\psi(k)} f(x) \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)\} (ue^{\psi(k)}f(x))^{k-1}. \quad (73)$$

Notice that $r_N(u)$ is the k^{th} order statistic of $\{\|X_1 - x\|, \|X_2 - x\|, \dots, \|X_{N-1} - x\|\}$. Therefore the density $f_{N,x}(u)$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{N,x}(u) &= f_{r_N(u)} \frac{dr_N(u)}{du} \\ &= \frac{(N-1)!}{(k-1)!(N-k-1)!} (P(x, r_N(u)))^{k-1} (1 - P(x, r_N(u)))^{N-k-1} \frac{dP(x, r_N(u))}{dr_N(u)} \frac{dr_N(u)}{du} \\ &= \frac{(N-1)!}{(k-1)!(N-k-1)!} (P(x, r_N(u)))^{k-1} (1 - P(x, r_N(u)))^{N-k-1} \frac{dP(x, r_N(u))}{du}. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Here $P(x, r)(u) = \mathbb{P}\{\|X - x\| < r\} = \int_{t \in B(x, r)} f(t) dt$. Since f is twice differentiable and $r_N(u)$ goes to 0 as N goes to infinity, we can use $f(z) \text{Vol}(B(z, r_N(u)))$ to estimate $P(z, r_N(u))$. The following lemma bounds the error of this estimation for $x \in S_1$ and $x \in S_2$ separately:

Lemma 4. *Under Assumption 1, there exists a constant C such that for sufficiently small r , we have*

$$|P(x, r) - f(x)c_d r^d| \leq C r^{d+2}, \quad (75)$$

and

$$\left| \frac{dP(x, r)}{dr} - f(x)dc_d r^{d-1} \right| \leq C r^{d+1}, \quad (76)$$

for $x \in S_1$. For $x \in S_2$, we have

$$|P(x, r) - f(x)c_d r^d| \leq C r^d, \quad (77)$$

and

$$\left| \frac{dP(x, r)}{dr} - f(x)dc_d r^{d-1} \right| \leq C r^{d-1}, \quad (78)$$

Using Lemma 4 and substituting $r = r_N(u) = (ue^{\psi(k)}/(c_d N))^{1/d}$, we have:

$$\left| P(x, r_N(u)) - \frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right| = |P(x, r_N(u)) - f(x)c_d(r_N(u))^d| \leq C_1(r_N(u))^{d+2}. \quad (79)$$

for $x \in S_1$. Similarly, $\left| \frac{d}{du} P(x, r_N(u)) - \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right|$ can be bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \frac{d}{du} P(x, r_N(u)) - \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right| \\ &= \frac{dr_N(u)}{du} \left| \frac{d}{dr_N(u)} P(x, r_N(u)) - \left(\frac{dr_N(u)}{du} \right)^{-1} \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right| \\ &= \frac{r_N(u)}{u d} \left| \frac{d}{dr_N(u)} P(x, r_N(u)) - f(x)dc_d(r_N(u))^{d-1} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{C_1(r_N(u))^{d+2}}{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

for $x \in S_1$. Analogously we have $\left|P(x, r_N(u)) - \frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N}\right| \leq C_1(r_N(u))^d$ and $\left|\frac{d}{du}P(x, r_N(u)) - \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N}\right| \leq C_1(r_N(u))^d/u$ for $x \in S_2$. Now we can write the difference of $f_{N,x}(u)$ and $f_x(u)$ via two terms:

$$|f_{N,x}(u) - f_x(u)| \leq |f_{N,x}(u) - f_{N,x}^{(1)}(u)| + |f_{N,x}^{(1)}(u) - f_x(u)|, \quad (81)$$

where $f_{N,x}^{(1)}(u)$ defined as:

$$f_{N,x}^{(1)}(u) = \frac{(N-1)!}{(k-1)!(N-k-1)!} \left(\frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N}\right)^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N}\right)^{N-k-1} \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N}. \quad (82)$$

Consider the function $g(p) = \frac{(N-1)!}{(k-1)!(N-k-1)!} p^{k-1} (1-p)^{N-k-1}$ for $p \in (0, 1)$. By basic calculus, we can see that $g(p) \leq C_2 N$ and $|g'(p)| \leq C_3 N^2$ for $p \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, the first term in (81) can be bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} & |f_{N,x}(u) - f_{N,x}^{(1)}(u)| \\ &= \left| g(P(x, r_N(u))) \frac{dP(x, r_N(u))}{du} - g\left(\frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N}\right) \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right| \\ &\leq g(P(x, r_N(u))) \left| \frac{dP(x, r_N(u))}{du} - \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right| + \left| g(P(x, r_N(u))) - g\left(\frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N}\right) \right| \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \\ &\leq g(P(x, r_N(u))) \left| \frac{dP(x, r_N(u))}{du} - \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right| + \max_{p \in (0,1)} |g'(p)| \left| P(x, r_N(u)) - \frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right| \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \\ &\leq C_1 C_2 N (r_N(u))^{d+2}/u + C_1 C_3 N^2 (r_N(u))^{d+2} \frac{e^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \\ &\leq C_4 \frac{u^{1+2/d}}{N^{2/d}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{u}\right) \\ &\leq C_4 N^{-2/d}, \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

for $u \leq 1$ and $x \in S_1$. Here $C_4 = \max\{C_1 C_2 (e^{\psi(k)} C_a)^{1+2/d}, C_1 C_3 (e^{\psi(k)} C_a)^{2+2/d}\}$, where $C_a = \sup_x f(x)$ by Assumption 1.(a). Similarly, we have $|f_{N,x}(u) - f_{N,x}^{(1)}(u)| \leq C_4$ for $u \leq 1$ and $x \in S_2$. For the second term, we denote $q = ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)$ for short. Then the second term in (81) can be bounded as:

$$\begin{aligned} & |f_{N,x}^{(1)}(u) - f_x(u)| \\ &= \frac{1}{u} \left| \frac{(N-1)!}{(k-1)!(N-k-1)!} \left(\frac{q}{N}\right)^k \left(1 - \frac{q}{N}\right)^{N-k-1} - \frac{1}{(k-1)!} q^k e^{-q} \right| \\ &= \frac{k}{u} \left| \binom{N-1}{k} \left(\frac{q}{N}\right)^k \left(1 - \frac{q}{N}\right)^{N-k-1} - \frac{q^k e^{-q}}{k!} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Notice that the difference inside the absolute value is just the difference of $P(X = k)$ under $\text{Bino}(N-1, q/N)$ and $\text{Poisson}(q)$. The difference is bounded by:

Lemma 5. For $q < C\sqrt{N}$, we have:

$$\left| \binom{N-1}{k} \left(\frac{q}{N}\right)^k \left(1 - \frac{q}{N}\right)^{N-k-1} - \frac{q^k e^{-q}}{k!} \right| \leq C_5 q^{k+2} e^{-q} N^{-1}, \quad (85)$$

for some $C_5 > 0$.

Therefore, by lemma 5, we have:

$$|f_{N,x}^{(1)}(u) - f_x(u)| \leq C_5 \frac{kq^{k+2} e^{-q}}{uN} \leq C_5 \frac{k(e^{\psi(k)}f(x))^{k+2} u^{k+1}}{N} \leq C_6 N^{-1}, \quad (86)$$

for $u \leq 1$, here $C_6 = C_5 k (e^{\psi(k)} C_a)^{k+1}$. Therefore, combining (83) and (86), we have the desired statement.

7.3 Proof of Lemma 3

Recall that

$$F_x(u) = 1 - \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)\} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)^j}{j!}. \quad (87)$$

The cdf $F_{N,x}(u) = \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,i} < r_N(u) | X_i = x)$ is just the probability that at least k samples are inside the ball $B(x, r_N(u))$ and hence

$$F_{N,x}(u) = 1 - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{(N-1)!}{j!(N-j-1)!} (P(x, r_N(u)))^j (1 - P(x, r_N(u)))^{N-j-1}. \quad (88)$$

So we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & |F_{N,x}(u) - F_x(u)| \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{(N-1)!}{j!(N-j-1)!} (P(x, r_N(u)))^j (1 - P(x, r_N(u)))^{N-j-1} - \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)\} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)^j}{j!} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{j!} \left| \frac{(N-1)!}{(N-j-1)!} (P(x, r_N(u)))^j (1 - P(x, r_N(u)))^{N-j-1} - \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)\} (ue^{\psi(k)}f(x))^j \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

Let

$$h_{N,x,j}(u) = \frac{(N-1)!}{j!(N-j-1)!} (P(x, r_N(u)))^j (1 - P(x, r_N(u)))^{N-j-1}, \quad (90)$$

and

$$h_{x,j}(u) = \frac{1}{j!} \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)\} (ue^{\psi(k)}f(x))^j. \quad (91)$$

Consider

$$h_{N,x,j}^{(1)}(u) = \frac{(N-1)!}{j!(N-j-1)!} \left(\frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right)^j \left(1 - \frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right)^{N-j-1}. \quad (92)$$

We will bound $|h_{N,x,j}(u) - h_{x,j}(u)|$ by $|h_{N,x,j}(u) - h_{N,x,j}^{(1)}(u)| + |h_{N,x,j}^{(1)}(u) - h_{x,j}(u)|$. For the first term, consider function $g_j(p) = \frac{(N-1)!}{j!(N-j-1)!} p^j (1-p)^{N-j-1}$. It is easy to see that $|g_j'(p)| \leq C_1 N$ for any $p \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, by Lemma 4, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |h_{N,x,j}(u) - h_{N,x,j}^{(1)}(u)| &= \left| g(P(x, r_N(u))) - g\left(\frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N}\right) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{p \in (0,1)} |g'(p)| \left| P(x, r_N(u)) - \frac{ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)}{N} \right| \\ &\leq C_1 N (r_N(u))^{d+2} \\ &\leq C_2 u^{1+2/d} N^{-2/d}, \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

for $x \in S_1$ and $|h_{N,x,j}(u) - h_{N,x,j}^{(1)}(u)| \leq C_2 u$ for $x \in S_2$, where $C_2 = \max\{C_1(e^{\psi(k)}C_a)^{1+2/d}, C_1 e^{\psi(k)}C_a\}$. For the second term, let $q = ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)$, and using a similar analysis as (86), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} |h_{N,x,j}^{(1)}(u) - h_{x,j}(u)| &= \left| \binom{N-1}{j} \left(\frac{q}{N}\right)^j \left(1 - \frac{q}{N}\right)^{N-j-1} - \frac{q^j e^{-q}}{j!} \right| \\ &\leq C_3 \frac{q^{j+2} e^{-q}}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Combine (93) and (94), and we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
|F_{N,x}(u) - F_x(u)| &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} |h_{N,x,j}(u) - h_{x,j}(u)| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left(|h_{N,x,j}(u) - h_{N,x,j}^{(1)}(u)| + |h_{N,x,j}^{(1)}(u) - h_{x,j}(u)| \right) \\
&\leq kC_2u^{1+2/d}N^{-2/d} + C_3 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{q^{j+2}e^{-q}}{N} \\
&\leq kC_2u^{1+2/d}(N)^{-2/d} + (k-1)!C_3q^2/N \\
&\leq kC_2u^{1+2/d}(N)^{-2/d} + (k-1)!C_3(e^{\psi(k)}C_a)^2u^2/N, \tag{95}
\end{aligned}$$

for $x \in S_1$. Here we used the fact that $\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} q^j e^{-q} \leq (k-1)! \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{q^j e^{-q}}{(k-1)!} \leq (k-1)!$. Analogously, we have $|F_{N,x}(u) - F_x(u)| \leq kC_2u + (k-1)!C_3(e^{\psi(k)}C_a)^2u^2/N$ for $x \in S_2$. Therefore, we have the desired statement by $C_5 = \max\{kC_2, (k-1)!C_3(e^{\psi(k)}C_a)^2\}$.

7.4 Proof of Lemma 4

We will prove the lemma for $x \in S_1$ and $x \in S_2$ separately. For $x \in S_1$, we have $\|H_f(x)\| \leq C_d$ for every $y \in B(x, r)$ as long as $r \leq a_N$. Hence, there exists a $y = at + (1-a)x$ for some $a \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
|P(x, r) - f(x)c_d r^d| &= \left| \int_{t \in B(x, r)} (f(t) - f(x)) dt \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{t \in B(x, r)} \left(f(x) + (\nabla f(x))^T (t-x) + (t-x)^T H_f(y)(t-x) - f(x) \right) dt \right| \\
&= \left| \int_{t \in B(x, r)} ((t-x)^T H_f(y)(t-x)) dt \right| \\
&\leq C_d \int_{t \in B(x, r)} \|t-x\|^2 dt \\
&\leq C_d \text{Vol}(B(x, r)) \cdot d \cdot r^2 \leq C_1 r^{d+2}, \tag{96}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Vol}(B(x, r))$ is the volume of $B(x, r)$. $\|t-x\|^2 \leq d \cdot r^2$ for all $t \in B(x, r)$ (here $B(x, r)$ can be any p -norm ball with $1 \leq p \leq \infty$). For the second part, Let $S(B(x, r))$ be the surface of $B(x, r)$. Consider m^{d-1} be the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^{d-1} , so $m^{d-1}(S(B(x, r))) = dc_d r^{d-1}$. Similarly we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{dP(x, r)}{dr} - f(x)dc_d r^{d-1} \right| &= \left| \int_{t \in S(B(x, r))} (f(t) - f(x)) dm^{d-1}(t) \right| \\
&\leq C_d \int_{t \in S(B(x, r))} \|t-x\|^2 dm^{d-1}(t) \\
&\leq C_2 r^{d+1}. \tag{97}
\end{aligned}$$

For $x \in S_2$, we simply bound the difference by:

$$|P(x, r) - f(x)c_d r^d| \leq f(x)c_d r^d \leq C_a c_d r^d \tag{98}$$

and

$$\left| \frac{dP(x, r)}{dr} - f(x)dc_d r^{d-1} \right| \leq f(x)dc_d r^{d-1} \leq C_a dc_d r^{d-1} \tag{99}$$

since $f(x) \leq C_a$ by Assumption 1.(a).

7.5 Proof of Lemma 5

We will prove that:

$$\left| \log \left(\binom{N}{k} \left(\frac{q}{N} \right)^k \left(1 - \frac{q}{N} \right)^{N-k} \right) - \log \left(\frac{q^k e^{-q}}{k!} \right) \right| \leq Cq^2/N. \quad (100)$$

Then for sufficiently small q such that $\exp\{Cq^2/N\} \leq 2Cq^2/N$, we obtain our desired statement by the fact that $|x - y| \leq |\log x - \log y| \cdot \frac{y}{2}$ for small enough $|\log x - \log y|$. Using Stirling's formula: $\log(N!) = N \log N - N + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi N) + O(1/N)$, the difference (100) is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \log \left(\binom{N}{k} \left(\frac{q}{N} \right)^k \left(1 - \frac{q}{N} \right)^{N-k} \right) - \log \left(\frac{q^k e^{-q}}{k!} \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \log N! - \log(N-k)! - \log k! + k \log q + (N-k) \log(N-q) - N \log N - k \log q + q + \log(k!) \right| \\ &= \left| \log N! - \log(N-k)! + (N-k) \log(N-q) - N \log N + q \right| \\ &\leq \left| N \log N - N + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi N) - (N-k) \log(N-k) + (N-k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi(N-k)) + (N-k) \log(N-q) - N \log N + q \right| + C/N \\ &= \left| -k + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{N}{N-k} + (N-k) \log \frac{N-q}{N-k} + q \right| + C/N \\ &= \left| -k + q + (N-k) \left(\frac{k-q}{N-k} - \frac{(k-q)^2}{2(N-k)^2} + O\left(\frac{(k-q)^3}{(N-k)^3}\right) \right) \right| + C/N \\ &\leq \frac{(k-q)^2}{2(N-k)} + Cq^3/N^2 + C/N \\ &\leq Cq^2/N, \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

where we used the assumption that $q < C\sqrt{N}$ for sufficiently small constant $C > 0$.

8 Proof of Theorem 4

Recall that $\widehat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{k,i}(X)$ and $\xi_{k,i}(X)$ are identically distributed, therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[\widehat{H}_{\text{tKL}}(X) \right] &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Var} [\xi_{k,i}(X)] + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq i}^N \text{Cov} [\xi_{k,i}(X), \xi_{k,j}(X)] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] + \frac{N(N-1)}{N^2} \text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X)] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] + \text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X)]. \end{aligned} \quad (102)$$

We claim the following two lemmas:

Lemma 6. *Under the Assumption 1,*

$$\text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] = O \left((\log \log N)^2 \right), \quad (103)$$

Lemma 7. *Under the Assumption 1,*

$$\text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X)] = O \left((\log \log N)^2 (\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)} N^{-1} \right). \quad (104)$$

Combining the two lemmas, we obtain the desired statement.

8.1 Proof of Lemma 6

Recall that in the proof of Theorem 3, we have defined the following distributions:

$$F_{N,x}(u) = \mathbb{P}\left(e^{\xi_{k,1}(X)} < u \mid X_1 = x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\rho_{k,1} < r_N(u) \mid X_1 = x\right); \quad (105)$$

$$F_x(u) = 1 - \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)\} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{(ue^{\psi(k)}f(x))^j}{j!}, \quad (106)$$

and their corresponding pdfs $f_{N,x}(u)$ and $f_x(u)$. The variance of $\xi_{k,i}(X)$ is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\xi_{k,1}(X)] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[(\xi_{k,1}(X))^2\right] = \mathbb{E}_X\left[\mathbb{E}\left[(\xi_{k,1}(X))^2 \mid X_1 = x\right]\right] \\ &= \int \left(\int_0^{b_N} (\log u)^2 f_{N,x}(u) du \right) f(x) dx \\ &= \int \left(\int_0^1 (\log u)^2 f_{N,x}(u) du + \int_1^{b_N} (\log u)^2 f_{N,x}(u) du \right) f(x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

For $u < 1$, Lemma 2 told us that there exists some $C_1 > 0$ such that

$$|f_{N,x}(u) - f_x(u)| \leq C_1, \quad (108)$$

holds for $x \in S_1$ or S_2 . The closed form of $f_x(u)$ is given by:

$$f_x(u) = \frac{1}{(k-1)!} e^{\psi(k)} f(x) \exp\{-ue^{\psi(k)}f(x)\} (ue^{\psi(k)}f(x))^{k-1}. \quad (109)$$

Since $\frac{1}{(k-1)!} t^{k-1} e^{-t} < 1$ for all $t > 0$, we know that $f_x(u) < e^{\psi(k)} f(x)$. Therefore, $f_{N,x}(u) \leq C_1 + e^{\psi(k)} f(x)$ by triangle inequality. Therefore,

$$\int_0^1 \log^2(u) f_{N,x}(u) du \leq \left(C_1 + e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\right) \int_0^1 (\log u)^2 du = 2 \left(C_1 + e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\right). \quad (110)$$

For $1 \leq u \leq b_N$, we have $(\log u)^2 \leq (\log b_N)^2 = \log^2((\log N)^{1+\delta}) = (1+\delta)^2 (\log \log N)^2$ for sufficiently large N . Therefore,

$$\int_1^{b_N} (\log u)^2 f_{N,x}(u) du \leq (1+\delta)^2 (\log \log N)^2 \int_1^{b_N} f_{N,x}(u) du \leq (1+\delta)^2 (\log \log N)^2. \quad (111)$$

Combine these two results into (107), and we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\xi_{k,1}(X)] &\leq \int \left(\int_0^1 (\log u)^2 f_{N,x}(u) du + \int_1^{b_N} (\log u)^2 f_{N,x}(u) du \right) f(x) dx \\ &\leq \int \left(2 \left(C_1 + e^{\psi(k)} f(x)\right) + (1+\delta)^2 (\log \log N)^2 \right) f(x) dx \\ &\leq 2C_1 + 2e^{\psi(k)} C_a + (1+\delta)^2 (\log \log N)^2 \\ &= O\left((\log \log N)^2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

where we used the assumption that $f(x) \leq C_a$.

8.2 Proof of Lemma 7

The covariance can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X)] \\
&= \mathbb{E} [(\xi_{k,1}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X)]) (\xi_{k,2}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X)])] \\
&= \int_{x,y} \mathbb{E} [(\xi_{k,1}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X)]) (\xi_{k,2}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X)]) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y] f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
&= \int_{\|x-y\| \leq 2a_N} \mathbb{E} [(\xi_{k,1}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X)]) (\xi_{k,2}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X)]) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y] f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
&+ \int_{\|x-y\| > 2a_N} \mathbb{E} [(\xi_{k,1}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X)]) (\xi_{k,2}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X)]) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y] f(x)f(y) dx dy. \tag{113}
\end{aligned}$$

We split the covariance into two separate cases: If $\|x - y\| \leq 2a_N$, the first term of (113) can be bounded by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\|x-y\| \leq 2a_N} \mathbb{E} [(\xi_{k,1}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X)]) (\xi_{k,2}(X) - \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X)]) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y] f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
&\leq \int_{\|x-y\| \leq 2a_N} \text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y]^{1/2} \text{Var} [\xi_{k,2}(X) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y]^{1/2} f(x)f(y) dx dy. \tag{114}
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the following CDF:

$$F_{N,x}(u) = \mathbb{P} \left(e^{\xi_{k,1}(X)} < u | X_1 = x, X_2 = y \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(\rho_{k,1} < r_N(u) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y \right); \tag{115}$$

and the corresponding pdf $f_{N,x,y}(u)$, which is given by order statistic [40]:

$$f_{N,x,y}(u) = \begin{cases} \frac{(N-2)!}{(k-2)!(N-k-1)!} p^{k-2} (1-p)^{N-k-1} \frac{dp}{du} & , \|x - y\| \leq u, \\ \frac{(N-2)!}{(k-1)!(N-k-2)!} p^{k-1} (1-p)^{N-k-2} \frac{dp}{du} & , \|x - y\| > u \end{cases}$$

where $p = P(x, r_N(u)) = \int_{t \in B(x, r_N(u))} f(t) dt$. Since $f(x) \leq C_a$ almost everywhere, we have:

$$p \leq \text{Vol}(B(x, r_N(u))) \left(\sup_{t \in B(x, r_N(u))} f(t) \right) = c_d r_N(u)^d \cdot C_a \leq \frac{2u C_a e^{\psi(k)}}{N}. \tag{116}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dp}{du} &= \frac{dp}{dr_N(u)} \frac{dr_N(u)}{du} \leq S(B(x, r_N(u))) \left(\sup_{t \in B(x, r_N(u))} f(t) \right) \frac{r_N(u)}{ud} \\
&\leq d c_d r_N(u)^{d-1} \cdot C_a \cdot \frac{r_N(u)}{ud} = \frac{c_d r_N(u)^d C_a}{u} \leq \frac{2C_a e^{\psi(k)}}{N}. \tag{117}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for any $u \leq 1$, we have:

$$f_{N,x,y}(u) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{(k-1)!} N^{k-1} p^{k-2} \frac{dp}{du} \leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} (2u C_a e^{\psi(k)})^{k-2} (2C_a e^{\psi(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} (2C_a e^{\psi(k)})^{k-1} & , \|x - y\| \leq u \\ \frac{1}{(k-1)!} N^k p^{k-1} \frac{dp}{du} \leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} (2u C_a e^{\psi(k)})^{k-1} (2C_a e^{\psi(k)}) \leq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} (2C_a e^{\psi(k)})^k & , \|x - y\| > u \end{cases}$$

So there exists some C_2 not depend on N such that $f_{N,x,y}(u) \leq C_2$ for all $u \leq 1$. Therefore, we can bound $\text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y]$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y] &\leq \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}^2(X) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y] \\
&= \int_0^{b_N} (\log u)^2 f_{N,x,y}(u) du \\
&= \int_0^1 (\log u)^2 f_{N,x,y}(u) du + \int_1^{b_N} (\log u)^2 f_{N,x,y}(u) du \\
&= C_2 \int_0^2 (\log u)^2 du + (\log b_N)^2 \\
&= C_2 + (1 + \delta)(\log \log N)^2 \leq C'_2(\log \log N)^2 \tag{118}
\end{aligned}$$

for some $C'_2 > 0$. Similarly, we know that $\text{Var} [\xi_{k,2}(X) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y] \leq C'_2(\log \log N)^2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\|x-y\| \leq 2a_N} \text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y]^{1/2} \text{Var} [\xi_{k,2}(X) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y]^{1/2} f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
&\leq C'_2(\log \log N)^2 \int_{\|x-y\| \leq 2a_N} f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
&\leq C'_2(\log \log N)^2 \mathbb{P}[\|x-y\| \leq 2a_N] \\
&= C'_2(\log \log N)^2 \int \left(\int_{y \in B(x, 2a_N)} f(y) dy \right) f(x) dx. \tag{119}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that by Lemma 4, we know that

$$\left| \int_{y \in B(x, 2a_N)} f(y) dy - f(x)c_d(2a_N)^d \right| \leq C_3 a_N^{d+2} \leq C_3 a_N^d, \tag{120}$$

for some constant $C_3 > 0$. So we have $\int_{y \in B(x, 2a_N)} f(y) dy \leq f(x)c_d(2a_N)^d + C_3 a_N^d$. Therefore, by plugging in $a_N = (\log(N)^{1+\delta}/N)^{1/d}$, we obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \left(\int_{y \in B(x, 2a_N)} f(y) dy \right) f(x) dx &\leq \int (f(x)c_d(2a_N)^d + C_3 a_N^d) f(x) dx \\
&\leq (C_a c_d 2^d + C_3) \frac{(\log N)^{1+\delta}}{N}. \tag{121}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we know that the first term of (113) is upper bounded by $C_4(\log \log N)^2(\log N)^{1+\delta}/N$ for some C_4 .

Now consider the case that $\|x-y\| > 2a_N$. Then the two balls $B(x, \rho_{k,1})$ and $B(y, \rho_{k,2})$ are disjoint since $\rho_{k,i} \leq a_N$. Therefore, consider the following joint distribution:

$$F_{N,x,y}(u, v) = \mathbb{P} \left(e^{\xi_{k,1}(X)} < u, e^{\xi_{k,2}(X)} < v | X_1 = x, X_2 = y \right) = \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r_N(u), \rho_{k,2} < r_N(v) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y) \tag{122}$$

Therefore, the covariance can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\|x-y\| > 2a_N} \mathbb{E} [(\xi_{k,1}(X) - \mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}(X)])(\xi_{k,2}(X) - \mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,2}(X)]) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y] f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
&= \int_{\|x-y\| > 2a_N} \left(\int_0^{b_N} \int_0^{b_N} \log u \log v f_{N,x,y}(u, v) dudv - \left(\int_0^{b_N} \log u f_{N,x}(u) du \right) \left(\int_0^{b_N} \log v f_{N,y}(v) dv \right) \right) f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
&= \int_{\|x-y\| > 2a_N} \left(\int_0^{b_N} \int_0^{b_N} \log u \log v (f_{N,x,y}(u, v) - f_{N,x}(u)f_{N,y}(v)) dudv \right) f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
&\leq \int_{\|x-y\| > 2a_N} \left(\int_0^{b_N} \int_0^{b_N} |\log u \log v| |f_{N,x,y}(u, v) - f_{N,x}(u)f_{N,y}(v)| dudv \right) f(x)f(y) dx dy. \tag{123}
\end{aligned}$$

Here by the pdf of order statistic [40], the pdf of $f_{N,x,y}(u, v)$ and $f_{N,x}(u)$ and $f_{N,y}(v)$ is given by:

$$f_{N,x,y}(u, v) = \frac{(N-2)!}{(N-2k-2)!((k-1)!)^2} p^{k-1} q^{k-1} (1-p-q)^{N-2k-2} \frac{dp}{du} \frac{dq}{dv}, \quad (124)$$

$$f_{N,x}(u) = \frac{(N-2)!}{(N-k-2)!(k-1)!} p^{k-1} (1-p)^{N-k-1} \frac{dp}{du}, \quad (125)$$

$$f_{N,y}(v) = \frac{(N-2)!}{(N-k-2)!(k-1)!} q^{k-1} (1-q)^{N-k-1} \frac{dq}{dv}, \quad (126)$$

where $p = P(x, r_N(u)) = \int_{t \in B(x, r_N(u))} f(t) dt$ and $q = P(y, r_N(v))$ for short. Since $f(x) \leq C_a$ almost everywhere, we have

$$p \leq \text{Vol}(B(x, r_N(u))) \left(\sup_{t \in B(x, r_N(u))} f(t) \right) = c_d r_N(u)^d \cdot C_a \leq \frac{2u C_a e^{\psi(k)}}{N}. \quad (127)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dp}{du} &= \frac{dp}{dr_N(u)} \frac{dr_N(u)}{du} \leq S(B(x, r_N(u))) \left(\sup_{t \in B(x, r_N(u))} f(t) \right) \frac{r_N(u)}{ud} \\ &\leq d c_d r_N(u)^{d-1} \cdot C_a \cdot \frac{r_N(u)}{ud} = \frac{c_d r_N(u)^d C_a}{u} \leq \frac{2C_a e^{\psi(k)}}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

Denote $C_5 = 2C_a e^{\psi(k)}$ for short, then $p \leq C_5 u/N$ and $\frac{dp}{du} \leq C_5/N$. Similarly, $q \leq C_5 v/N$ and $\frac{dq}{dv} \leq C_5/N$. Then we can upper bound the difference of $|f_{N,x,y}(u, v) - f_{N,x}(u)f_{N,y}(v)|$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} &|f_{N,x,y}(u, v) - f_{N,x}(u)f_{N,y}(v)| \\ &= \frac{1}{((k-1)!)^2} p^{k-1} q^{k-1} \left| \frac{(N-2)!}{(N-2k-2)!} (1-p-q)^{N-2k-2} - \left(\frac{(N-2)!}{(N-k-2)!} \right)^2 (1-p)^{N-k-1} (1-q)^{N-k-1} \right| \frac{dp}{du} \frac{dq}{dv} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{((k-1)!)^2} \left(\frac{C_5 u}{N} \right)^{k-1} \left(\frac{C_5 v}{N} \right)^{k-1} \left(\frac{C_5}{N} \right)^2 \left| \frac{(N-2)!}{(N-2k-2)!} (1-p-q)^{N-2k-2} - \left(\frac{(N-2)!}{(N-k-2)!} \right)^2 (1-p)^{N-k-1} (1-q)^{N-k-1} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{((k-1)!)^2} \frac{C_5^{2k} u^{k-1} v^{k-1}}{N^{2k}} (Q_1 + Q_2 + Q_3), \end{aligned} \quad (129)$$

where

$$Q_1 = \frac{(N-2)!}{(N-2k-2)!} \left((1-p-q)^{N-2k-2} - (1-p-q)^{N-k-1} \right), \quad (130)$$

$$Q_2 = \left| \left(\frac{(N-2)!}{(N-k-2)!} \right)^2 - \frac{(N-2)!}{(N-2k-2)!} \right| (1-p-q)^{N-k-1}, \quad (131)$$

$$Q_3 = \left(\frac{(N-2)!}{(N-k-2)!} \right)^2 \left((1-p)^{N-k-1} (1-q)^{N-k-1} - (1-p-q)^{N-k-1} \right). \quad (132)$$

We will bound the three terms separately. For Q_1 , notice that $(N-2)!/(N-2k-2)! \leq N^{2k}$ and

$$(1-p-q)^{N-k-1} - (1-p-q)^{N-2k-2} \leq 1 - (1-p-q)^{k+1} \leq (k+1)(p+q) \leq \frac{(k+1)C_5(u+v)}{N}. \quad (133)$$

So $Q_1 \leq (k+1)C_5(u+v)N^{2k-1}$. For Q_2 , notice that both $(N-2)!/(N-2k-2)!$ and $\left(\frac{(N-2)!}{(N-k-2)!} \right)^2$ are polynomial of N with $2k$ order, moreover, the coefficient of N^{2k} are both 1. So they differs at most $C_6 N^{2k-1}$, where C_6 is some constant relevant to k . $(1-p-q)^{N-k-1}$ is simply upper bounded by 1. For Q_3 , notice that $\left(\frac{(N-2)!}{(N-k-2)!} \right)^2 \leq N^{2k}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &(1-p)^{N-k-1} (1-q)^{N-k-1} - (1-p-q)^{N-k-1} \\ &= (1-p-q+pq)^{N-k-1} - (1-p-q)^{N-k-1} \\ &\leq (N-k-1)pq(1-p-q+pq)^{N-k-2} \leq Npq \leq \frac{C_5^2 uv}{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

Therefore, $Q_3 \leq C_5^2 uv N^{2k-1}$. Combine the upper bounds of Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 into (129), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |f_{N,x,y}(u,v) - f_{N,x}(u)f_{N,y}(v)| \\
\leq & \frac{1}{((k-1)!)^2} \frac{C_5^{2k} u^{k-1} v^{k-1}}{N^{2k}} \left((k+1)C_5(u+v)N^{2k-1} + C_6 N^{2k-1} + C_5^2 uv N^{2k-1} \right) \\
\leq & \frac{C_7}{N} u^{k-1} v^{k-1} (1+u+v+uv), \tag{135}
\end{aligned}$$

for some $C_7 > 0$. Plug this in (123), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\|x-y\|>2a_N} \mathbb{E} [(\xi_{k,1}(X) - \mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}(X)]) (\xi_{k,2}(X) - \mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,2}(X)]) | X_1 = x, X_2 = y] f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
\leq & \int_{\|x-y\|>2a_N} \left(\int_0^{b_N} \int_0^{b_N} |\log u \log v| |f_{N,x,y}(u,v) - f_{N,x}(u)f_{N,y}(v)| dudv \right) f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
\leq & \int_{\|x-y\|>2a_N} \left(\frac{C_7}{N} \int_0^{b_N} \int_0^{b_N} |\log u \log v| \cdot u^{k-1} v^{k-1} (1+u+v+uv) dudv \right) f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
\leq & \int_{\|x-y\|>2a_N} \left(\frac{C_7}{N} (\log b_N)^2 b_N^{2k+2} \right) f(x)f(y) dx dy \\
\leq & \frac{C_7}{N} (\log b_N)^2 b_N^{2k+2}. \tag{136}
\end{aligned}$$

By substituting $b_N = (\log N)^{1+\delta}$, we obtain the desired claim.

9 Proof of Theorem 5 on the minimax lower bound

The proof is based on the standard Le Cam's method [67]. First we will prove the $\Omega(1/N)$ lower bound. Consider two Gaussian distributions $P = \mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$ and $Q = \mathcal{N}(0, (1+\delta)I_d)$. The norm of Hessian matrix of P and Q are both bounded, so $P, Q \in \mathcal{F}_d$. Then we claim that: $H(P) = d \log(2\pi e)/2$ and $H(Q) = d \log(2\pi e)/2 + d \log(1+\delta)/2$. Applying Le Cam's method, the minimax lower bound is bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\hat{H}_n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{H}_n(X) - H(X) \right)^2 \right] & \geq \frac{1}{2} |H(P) - H(Q)|^2 (1 - \|P^N - Q^N\|_{TV}) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} (d \log(1+\delta)/2)^2 \left(1 - \sqrt{2 - 2(1 - d_h(P, Q)^2)^N} \right), \tag{137}
\end{aligned}$$

where $d_h(P, Q) = \int (\sqrt{p(x)} - \sqrt{q(x)})^2 dx = 2 - 2 \int \sqrt{p(x)q(x)} dx$ is the Hellinger distance of P and Q , and $\|P - Q\|_{TV}$ is the total variation between P and Q . We claim that $d_h(P, Q)^2$ is bounded as:

$$d_h^2(P, Q) = O(d\delta^2). \tag{138}$$

Therefore, by choose $\delta = \Theta(\sqrt{1/dN})$ such that $\left(1 - \sqrt{2 - 2(1 - d_h(P, Q)^2)} \right) > 1/2$ the minimax lower bound is given by:

$$\inf_{\hat{H}_n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{H}_n(X) - H(X) \right)^2 \right] \geq \frac{1}{4} \left(d \log(1 + \sqrt{1/dN})/2 \right)^2 = \Omega(d/N). \tag{139}$$

We are now left to prove (138):

$$\begin{aligned}
d_h(P, Q)^2 &= 2 - 2 \int \sqrt{p(x)q(x)} dx \\
&= 2 - 2 \int \sqrt{\frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{2}\right\} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}(1+\delta)^{d/2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{2(1+\delta)}\right\}} dx \\
&= 2 - 2 \int \sqrt{\frac{1}{(2\pi)^d(1+\delta)^{d/2}} \exp\left\{-\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2(1+\delta)}\right)x^2\right\}} dx \\
&= 2 - 2 \int \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}(1+\delta)^{d/4}} \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{2\left(\frac{2+2\delta}{2+\delta}\right)}\right\} dx \\
&= 2 - 2 \left(\frac{(2\pi)^{d/2} \left(\frac{2+2\delta}{2+\delta}\right)^{d/2}}{(2\pi)^{d/2}(1+\delta)^{d/4}} \right) \\
&= 2 - 2 \left(\frac{1+\delta}{(1+\delta/2)^2} \right)^{d/4} \\
&\leq 2 - 2 \left(1 - \frac{d}{4} \cdot \frac{\delta^2/4}{(1+\delta/2)^2} \right) \leq \frac{d\delta^2}{8}, \tag{140}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the fact that $(1-x)^N \leq 1-Nx$ for $x \leq 1$ to obtain the inequality.

The proof of the $\Omega(N^{-16/(d+8)})$ lower bound follows closely the proof of lower bound in [30]. We will use the following lemma, which is an extension of Le Cam's method:

Lemma 8. *Let H be a functional defined on some class of functions \mathcal{F} . We have $u \in \mathcal{F}$ and $v_\lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ for any λ in some finite index set Λ . Define $\bar{v}^N = \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} v_\lambda^N$. If we have:*

1. For any v_λ , we have $H(u) - H(v_\lambda) > \alpha$.
2. $\|u^N - \bar{v}^N\|_{TV} \leq \beta$.

Then the minimax lower bound is given by:

$$\inf_{\hat{H}_n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{H}_n(X) - H(X) \right)^2 \right] \geq K \cdot \alpha^2(1-\beta) \tag{141}$$

for some constant $K > 0$.

Now let u be the uniform distribution over $[0, 1]^d$. To construct the v_λ functions, we partition the space $[0, 1]^d$ to m^d hypercubes denoted by R_1, \dots, R_{m^d} . Let $t_j : R_j \rightarrow [0, 1]^d$ maps the small hypercube R_j to $[0, 1]^d$. We pick a function g supported on $[0, 1]^d$ such that:

1. $\int_{[0,1]^d} g(x) dx = 0$
2. $\int_{[0,1]^d} g^2(x) dx = 1$
3. g belongs to the smoothness class \mathcal{F}_d .

We define $u(x)$ to be the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]^d$ and v_λ by adding an appropriately chosen perturbation:

$$v_\lambda(x) = u(x) + m^{-\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \lambda_j \mathbb{I}\{x \in R_j\} g(t_j(x)) \tag{142}$$

for any $\lambda \in \Lambda = \{\pm 1\}^{m^d}$. Here we need $\gamma \geq 2$ to make sure that $v_\lambda \in \mathcal{F}_d$. We claim the following:

Lemma 9.

$$H(u) - H(v_\lambda) \geq \frac{1}{3}m^{-2\gamma}, \forall \lambda \in \{\pm 1\}^{m^d}. \quad (143)$$

Lemma 10.

$$\|u^N - \frac{1}{|\Lambda|}v_{\lambda^N}\|_{TV}^2 \leq O(N^2m^{-d-4\gamma}). \quad (144)$$

Therefore, let $m = \Theta(N^{2/(d+4\gamma)})$ such that $\|u^N - \frac{1}{|\Lambda|}v_{\lambda^N}\|_{TV} \leq 1/2$, and by applying Lemma 8, we know that:

$$\inf_{\hat{H}_N} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_d} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{H}_N(X) - H(X) \right)^2 \right] \geq \Omega(N^{-8\gamma/(d+4\gamma)}). \quad (145)$$

We obtain the minimax lower bound of $N^{-16/(d+8)}$ by plugging in $\gamma = 2$.

9.1 Proof of Lemma 9

It is obvious that the entropy of uniform distribution is highest. So $H(u) > H(v_\lambda)$. Their difference is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} H(u) - H(v_\lambda) &= - \int_{[0,1]^d} u(x) \log u(x) dx + \int_{[0,1]^d} v_\lambda(x) \log v_\lambda(x) dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \int_{R_j} v_\lambda(x) \log v_\lambda(x) dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \int_{R_j} (u(x) + m^{-\gamma} \lambda_j g(t_j(x))) \log (u(x) + m^{-\gamma} \lambda_j g(t_j(x))) dx \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \int_{R_j} \left(m^{-\gamma} \lambda_j g(t_j(x)) + \frac{1}{3} (m^{-\gamma} \lambda_j g(t_j(x)))^2 dx \right) \\ &= m^{-\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \lambda_j \int_{R_j} g(t_j(x)) dx + \frac{1}{3} m^{-2\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \lambda_j^2 \int_{R_j} g^2(t_j(x)) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{3} m^{-2\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} m^{-d} = \frac{1}{3} m^{-2\gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

Here the inequality comes from the fact that $x \log x \geq (x-1) + \frac{1}{3}(x-1)^2$ for $x \in (0.5, 1.5)$.

9.2 Proof of Lemma 10

The proof uses the fact that $\|p(x) - q(x)\|_{TV}^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_P[(\frac{q(x)}{p(x)})^2] - 1$, which comes immediately from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. So

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{u^N} \left[\left(\frac{\bar{v}^N(x)}{u(x)} \right)^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{u^N} \left[\frac{1}{|\Lambda|^2} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda} \frac{v_\lambda^N(x) v_\mu^N(x)}{(u^N(x))^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^2} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda} \mathbb{E}_{u^N} \left[\frac{v_\lambda^N(x) v_\mu^N(x)}{(u^N(x))^2} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^2} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda} \left(\mathbb{E}_u \left[\frac{v_\lambda(x) v_\mu(x)}{(u(x))^2} \right] \right)^N \\
&= \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^2} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \int_{R_j} (1 + m^{-\gamma} \lambda_j g(t_j(x))) (1 + m^{-\gamma} \mu_j g(t_j(x))) dx \right)^N \\
&= \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^2} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \int_{R_j} (1 + m^{-\gamma} (\lambda_j + \mu_j) g(t_j(x)) + m^{-2\gamma} \lambda_j \mu_j g^2(t_j(x))) dx \right)^N \\
&= \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^2} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda} \left(1 + m^{-\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} (\lambda_j + \mu_j) \int_{R_j} g(t_j(x)) dx + m^{-2\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \lambda_j \mu_j \int_{R_j} g^2(t_j(x)) dx \right)^N \\
&= \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^2} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda} \left(1 + m^{-d-2\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \lambda_j \mu_j \right)^N \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^2} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda} \exp \left\{ N m^{-d-2\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \lambda_j \mu_j \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^2} \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda} \left(1 + N m^{-d-2\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \lambda_j \mu_j + n^2 m^{-2d-4\gamma} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \lambda_j \mu_j \right)^2 \right) \\
&= 1 + N m^{-d-2\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \sum_{\lambda_j, \mu_j \in \{\pm 1\}} \lambda_j \mu_j + N^2 m^{-2d-4\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \sum_{k=1}^{m^d} \sum_{\lambda_j, \lambda_k, \mu_j, \mu_k \in \{\pm 1\}} \lambda_j \mu_j \lambda_k \mu_k \\
&= 1 + N^2 m^{-2d-4\gamma} \sum_{j=1}^{m^d} \sum_{\lambda_j, \mu_j \in \{\pm 1\}} \lambda_j^2 \mu_j^2 \\
&= 1 + 4N^2 m^{-d-4\gamma} \tag{147}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from the fact that $1 + x \leq e^x$ and the second comes from $e^x \leq 1 + x + x^2$ for $x \leq 2$. Therefore, we have $\|u^n - \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} v_{\lambda^n}\|_{TV}^2 \leq O(N^2 m^{-d-4\gamma})$.

10 Proof of Theorem 6 on the consistency of KSG estimator

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{I}_{KSG}(X; Y) &= \widehat{H}_{KSG}(X) + \widehat{H}_{KSG}(Y) - \widehat{H}_{KL, \infty}(X, Y), \\
\widehat{I}_{BI-KSG}(X; Y) &= \widehat{H}_{BI-KSG}(X) + \widehat{H}_{BI-KSG}(Y) - \widehat{H}_{KL, 2}(X, Y),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{H}_{KL,\infty}(X, Y) \equiv -\psi(k) + \log N + \log c_{d_x,\infty} c_{d_y,\infty} + (d_x + d_y) \log \rho_{k,i,\infty}, \quad (148)$$

$$\widehat{H}_{KSG}(X) \equiv -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) + \log N + \log c_{d_x,\infty} + d_x \log \rho_{k,i,\infty}, \quad (149)$$

$$\widehat{H}_{KSG}(Y) \equiv -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \psi(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1) + \log N + \log c_{d_y,\infty} + d_y \log \rho_{k,i,\infty}, \quad (150)$$

and

$$\widehat{H}_{KL,2}(X, Y) \equiv -\psi(k) + \log N + \log c_{d_x+d_y,2} + (d_x + d_y) \log \rho_{k,i,2}, \quad (151)$$

$$\widehat{H}_{BI-KSG}(X) \equiv -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log n_{x,i,2} + \log N + \log c_{d_x,2} + d_x \log \rho_{k,i,2}, \quad (152)$$

$$\widehat{H}_{BI-KSG}(Y) \equiv -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log n_{y,i,2} + \log N + \log c_{d_y,2} + d_y \log \rho_{k,i,2}. \quad (153)$$

We prove the following technical lemma that shows the convergence of the marginal entropy estimate (149) and (152). The convergence of (150) and (153) is immediate by interchanging X and Y . The convergence in probability of the joint entropy estimate (148) and (151) are known from [29]. This proves the desired claim.

Lemma 11. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 6, the estimated marginal entropy converges to the true entropy, i.e. for all $\varepsilon > 0$*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \widehat{H}_{KSG}(X) - H(X) \right| > \varepsilon \right) = 0, \quad (154)$$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \widehat{H}_{BI-KSG}(X) - H(X) \right| > \varepsilon \right) = 0. \quad (155)$$

10.1 Proof of Lemma 11

Define

$$\widehat{f}_X^{KSG}(X_i) \equiv \frac{\exp\{\psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1)\}}{N c_{d_x,\infty} \rho_{k,i,\infty}^{d_x}}, \quad (156)$$

and

$$\widehat{f}_X^{BI-KSG}(X_i) \equiv \frac{n_{x,i,2}}{N c_{d_x,2} \rho_{k,i,2}^{d_x}}, \quad (157)$$

such that $\widehat{H}_{KSG}(X) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \widehat{f}_X^{KSG}(X_i)$ and $\widehat{H}_{BI-KSG}(X) = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \widehat{f}_X^{BI-KSG}(X_i)$. From now on we will skip the subscript KSG or BI-KSG and the subscript 2 or ∞ if the formula holds for both. We will specify it whenever necessary. Now we write $|\widehat{H}(X) - H(X)|$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \widehat{H}(X) - H(X) \right| \\ &= \left| -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \widehat{f}_X(X_i) - \left(-\int f_X(x) \log f_X(x) dx \right) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log f_X(X_i) - \int f_X(x) \log f_X(x) dx \right| + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \log \widehat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (158)$$

The first term is the error from the empirical mean. Notice that $\log f_X(X_i)$ are i.i.d. random variables, satisfying

$$\mathbb{E} |\log f_X(X_i)| = \int f_X(x) |\log f_X(x)| dx < +\infty \quad (159)$$

where the mean is given by:

$$\mathbb{E} (\log f_X(X_i)) = \int f_X(x) \log f_X(x) dx. \quad (160)$$

Therefore, by weak law of large numbers, we have:

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log f_X(X_i) - \int f_X(x) \log f_X(x) dx \right| > \varepsilon \right) = 0 \quad (161)$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

The second term comes from density estimation. We denote $Z = (X, Y)$ and $f(z) = f(x, y)$ for short, then for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \log \hat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \left\{ \left| \log \hat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \right\} \right) \\ & \leq N \cdot \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \log \hat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \right) \\ & = N \int \underbrace{\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \log \hat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \mid Z_i = z \right)}_{=I_1(z)+I_2(z)+I_3(z)} f(z) dz \end{aligned} \quad (162)$$

where

$$I_1(z) = \mathbb{P} \left(\rho_{k,i} > \log N (N f(z) c_{d_x+d_y})^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}} \mid Z_i = z \right) \quad (163)$$

$$I_2(z) = \mathbb{P} \left(\rho_{k,i} < (\log N)^2 (N f_X(x) c_{d_x})^{-\frac{1}{d_x}} \mid Z_i = z = (x, y) \right) \quad (164)$$

$$I_3(z) = \int_{r=(\log N)^2 (N f_X(x) c_{d_x})^{-\frac{1}{d_x}}}^{\log N (N f(z) c_{d_x+d_y})^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}}} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \log \hat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i} = r, Z_i = z \right) f_{\rho_{k,i}}(r) dr \quad (165)$$

where $f_{\rho_{k,i}}(r)$ is the pdf of $\rho_{k,i}$ given $Z_i = z$. We will consider the three terms separately, and show that each is bounded by $o(N^{-1})$.

I_1 : Let $B_Z(z, r) = \{Z : \|Z - z\| < r\}$ be the $(d_x + d_y)$ -dimensional ball centered at z with radius r . Since the Hessian matrix of $H(f)$ exists and $\|H(f)\|_2 < C$ almost everywhere, then for sufficiently small r , there exists z' such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} (u \in B_Z(z, r)) = \int_{\|u-z\| \leq r} f(u) du \\ & = \int_{\|u-z\| \leq r} f(z) + (u-z)^T \nabla f(z) + (u-z)^T H_f(z')(u-z) du \\ & \in \left[f(z) c_{d_x+d_y} r^{d_x+d_y} (1 - Cr^2), f(z) c_{d_x+d_y} r^{d_x+d_y} (1 + Cr^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (166)$$

Then for sufficiently large N ,

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1 &= \mathbb{P} \left(u \in B_Z(z, \log N(Nf(z)c_{d_x+d_y})^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}}) \right) \\
&\geq f(z)c_{d_x+d_y} \left(\log N(Nf(z)c_{d_x+d_y})^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}} \right)^{d_x+d_y} \left(1 - C(\log N(Nf(z)c_{d_x+d_y})^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}})^2 \right) \\
&\geq \frac{(\log N)^{d_x+d_y}}{2N}
\end{aligned} \tag{167}$$

Therefore, $I_1(z)$ is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1(z) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\rho_{k,i} > \log N(Nf(z)c_{d_x+d_y})^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}} \mid Z_i = z \right) \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \binom{N}{m} p_1^m (1-p_1)^{N-1-m} \\
&\leq \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} N^m (1-p_1)^{N-1-m} \\
&\leq kN^{k-1} \left(1 - \frac{(\log N)^{d_x+d_y}}{2N} \right)^{N-k-1} \\
&\leq kN^{k-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(\log N)^{d_x+d_y} (N-k-1)}{2N} \right\} \\
&\leq kN^{k-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(\log N)^{d_x+d_y}}{4} \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{168}$$

for any $d_x, d_y \geq 1$.

I_2 : For sufficiently large N , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
p_2 &= \mathbb{P} \left(u \in B_Z(z, (\log N)^2(Nf_X(x)c_{d_x})^{-\frac{1}{d_x}}) \right) \\
&\leq f(z)c_{d_x+d_y} \left((\log N)^2(Nf_X(x)c_{d_x})^{-\frac{1}{d_x}} \right)^{d_x+d_y} \left(1 + C(\log N(Nf_X(x)c_{d_x})^{-\frac{1}{d_x}})^2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{2f(z)c_{d_x+d_y}}{(f(x)c_{d_x})^{\frac{d_x+d_y}{d_x}}} (\log N)^{2(d_x+d_y)} N^{-\frac{d_x+d_y}{d_x}} \\
&\leq 2f_{Y|X}(y|x) \frac{C_{d_x+d_y}}{C_{d_x}} (\log N)^{2(d_x+d_y)} N^{-\frac{d_x+d_y}{d_x}} \\
&\leq 2C_e \frac{C_{d_x+d_y}}{C_{d_x}} (\log N)^{2(d_x+d_y)} N^{-\frac{d_x+d_y}{d_x}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{169}$$

I_2 is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2(z) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\rho_{k,i} < \log N(Nf_X(x)c_{d_x})^{-\frac{1}{d_x}} \mid Z_i = z \right) \\
&= \sum_{m=k}^{N-1} \binom{N-1}{m} p_2^m (1-p_2)^{N-1-m} \\
&\leq \sum_{m=k}^{N-1} N^m p_2^m \\
&\leq \sum_{m=k}^{N-1} \left(2C_e \frac{C_{d_x+d_y}}{C_{d_x}} (\log N)^{2(d_x+d_y)} N^{-\frac{d_x+d_y}{d_x}} \right)^m \\
&\leq \left(4C_e \frac{C_{d_x+d_y}}{C_{d_x}} \right)^k (\log N)^{2K(d_x+d_y)} N^{-\frac{k d_y}{d_x}},
\end{aligned} \tag{170}$$

for any $d_x, d_y \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$.

I_3 : Now we will consider KSG and BI-KSG separately. Also we need to specify whether we are considering ℓ_2 or ℓ_∞ norm. For KSG, given that $Z_i = z = (x, y)$ and $\rho_{k,i,\infty} = r$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \log \widehat{f}_X^{KSG}(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,\infty} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) - \log N - \log c_{d_x,\infty} - d_x \log \rho_{k,i,\infty} - \log f_X(x) \right| > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,\infty} = r, Z_i = z \right). \end{aligned} \quad (171)$$

Notice that for any integer $x \geq 2$, we have $\log(x-1) < \psi(x) < \log(x)$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) - \log N - \log c_{d_x,\infty} - d_x \log \rho_{k,i,\infty} - \log f_X(x) < -\varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,\infty} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\log n_{x,i,\infty} - \log N - \log c_{d_x,\infty} - d_x \log \rho_{k,i,\infty} - \log f_X(x) < -\varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,\infty} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(n_{x,i,\infty} < N c_{d_x,\infty} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^{-\varepsilon} \mid \rho_{k,i,\infty} = r, Z_i = z \right). \end{aligned} \quad (172)$$

In the other direction,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) - \log N - \log c_{d_x,\infty} - d_x \log \rho_{k,i,\infty} - \log f_X(x) > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,\infty} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\log(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) - \log N - \log c_{d_x,\infty} - d_x \log \rho_{k,i,\infty} - \log f_X(x) > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,\infty} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(n_{x,i,\infty} > N c_{d_x,\infty} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^\varepsilon - 1 \mid \rho_{k,i,\infty} = r, Z_i = z \right). \end{aligned} \quad (173)$$

For BI-KSG, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \log \widehat{f}_X^{BI-KSG}(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,2} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \log n_{x,i,2} - \log N - \log c_{d_x,2} - d_x \log \rho_{k,i,2} - \log f_X(x) \right| > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,2} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \log n_{x,i,2} - \log N c_{d_x,2} r^{d_x} f_X(x) \right| > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,2} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(n_{x,i,2} > N c_{d_x,2} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^\varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i,2} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &+ \mathbb{P} \left(n_{x,i,2} < N c_{d_x,2} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^{-\varepsilon} \mid \rho_{k,i,2} = r, Z_i = z \right). \end{aligned} \quad (174)$$

Combine them together, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \log \widehat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(n_{x,i} < N c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^{-\varepsilon} \mid \rho_{k,i} = r, Z_i = z \right) \end{aligned} \quad (175)$$

$$+ \mathbb{P} \left(n_{x,i} > N c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^\varepsilon - 1 \mid \rho_{k,i} = r, Z_i = z \right). \quad (176)$$

holds for both KSG and BI-KSG estimates. Recall that in Theorem 9, given that $\rho_{k,i} = r$ and $Z_i = z$, $n_{x,i} - k$ is distributed as $\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l$, where U_l are i.i.d Bernoulli random variables with mean p satisfying

$$r^{-d_x} \left| p - f_X(x) c_{d_x} r^{d_x} \right| \leq C_1 (r^2 + r^{d_y}). \quad (177)$$

For small enough r such that $C_1 (r^2 + r^{d_y}) \leq \varepsilon/2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(n_{x,i} > (N-1) c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^\varepsilon - 1 \mid \rho_{k,i} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l > (N-1) c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^\varepsilon - k - 1 \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l - (N-k-1) \mathbb{E}[U_l] > (N-1) c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^\varepsilon - k - 1 - (N-k-1) \mathbb{E}[U_l] \right), \end{aligned} \quad (178)$$

and the right-hand side in the probability is lower bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& Nc_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^\varepsilon - k - 1 - (N - k - 1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] \\
& \geq Nc_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^\varepsilon - k - 1 - (N - k - 1)f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}(1 + \varepsilon/2) \\
& \geq (N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)(e^\varepsilon - 1 - \varepsilon/2) - k - 1 \\
& \geq (N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)\varepsilon/4
\end{aligned} \tag{179}$$

for sufficiently large N such that $(N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)(e^\varepsilon - 1 - \varepsilon/4) > k + 1$. Since U_l is Bernoulli, we have $\mathbb{E}[U_l^2] = \mathbb{E}[U_l]$. Now applying Bernstein's inequality, (178) is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l - (N - k - 1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] > (N - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^\varepsilon - k - (N - k - 1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l - (N - k - 1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] > (N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)\varepsilon/4 \right) \\
& \leq \exp \left\{ - \frac{((N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)\varepsilon/4)^2}{2 \left((N - k - 1)\mathbb{E}[U_l^2] + \frac{1}{3}((N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)\varepsilon/4) \right)} \right\} \\
& \leq \exp \left\{ - \frac{((N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)\varepsilon/4)^2}{2 \left((N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)(1 + \varepsilon/2) + \frac{1}{3}((N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)\varepsilon/4) \right)} \right\} \\
& = \exp \left\{ - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32(1 + 7\varepsilon/12)}(N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{180}$$

Similarly, the tail bound on the other way is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(n_{x,i} < Nc_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^{-\varepsilon} \mid \rho_{k,i} = r, Z_i = z \right) \\
& = \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l < Nc_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^{-\varepsilon} - k \right) \\
& = \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l - (N - k - 1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] < Nc_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^{-\varepsilon} - k - (N - k - 1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{181}$$

and the right hand side in the probability is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& Nc_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^{-\varepsilon} - k - (N - k - 1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] \\
& \leq Nc_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^{-\varepsilon} - k - (N - k - 1)f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}(1 - \varepsilon/2) \\
& \leq (N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^{-\varepsilon} - (N - k - 1)f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}(1 - \varepsilon/2) \\
& = (N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x) \left(e^{-\varepsilon} - 1 + \varepsilon/2 \right) \\
& \leq -(N - k - 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)\varepsilon/4
\end{aligned} \tag{182}$$

for sufficiently small r such that $(k + 1)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}f_X(x)e^{-\varepsilon} < k$ and sufficiently small ε such that $e^{-\varepsilon} - 1 + \varepsilon/2 \leq$

$-\varepsilon/4$. Similarly, by applying Bernstein's inequality, (181) is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l - (N-k-1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] < Nc_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) e^{-\varepsilon} - k - (N-k-1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l - (N-k-1)\mathbb{E}[U_l] > -(N-k-1)c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) \varepsilon/4 \right) \\
& \leq \exp \left\{ - \frac{((N-k-1)c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) \varepsilon/4)^2}{2 \left((N-k-1)\mathbb{E}[U_l^2] + \frac{1}{3}((N-k-1)c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) \varepsilon/4) \right)} \right\} \\
& \leq \exp \left\{ - \frac{((N-k-1)c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) \varepsilon/4)^2}{2 \left((N-k-1)c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) (1 + \varepsilon/2) + \frac{1}{3}((N-k-1)c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) \varepsilon/4) \right)} \right\} \\
& = \exp \left\{ - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32(1 + 7\varepsilon/12)} (N-k-1)c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) \right\}. \tag{183}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $I_3(z)$ is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_3(z) &= \int_{r=(\log N)^2(Nf_X(x)c_{d_x})^{-\frac{1}{d_x}}}^{\log N(Nf(z)c_{d_x+d_y})^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}}} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \log \widehat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \mid \rho_{k,i} = r, Z_i = z \right) f_{\rho_{k,i}}(r) dr \\
&\leq \int_{r=(\log N)^2(Nf_X(x)c_{d_x})^{-\frac{1}{d_x}}}^{\log N(Nf(z)c_{d_x+d_y})^{-\frac{1}{d_x+d_y}}} 2 \exp \left\{ - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{32(1 + 7\varepsilon/12)} (N-k-1)c_{d_x} r^{d_x} f_X(x) \right\} f_{\rho_{k,i}}(r) dr \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left\{ - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{64} Nc_{d_x} f_X(x) ((\log N)^2(Nf_X(x)c_{d_x})^{-\frac{1}{d_x}})^{d_x} \right\} \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left\{ - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{64} (\log N)^{2d_x} \right\} \tag{184}
\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large N such that $(N-k-1)/(1 + \frac{7}{12}\varepsilon) > N/2$ and any $d_x \geq 1$. The upper bounds of $I_1(z)$, $I_2(z)$ and $I_3(z)$ are all independent of z . Therefore, combine the upper bounds of $I_1(z)$, $I_2(z)$ and $I_3(z)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \log \widehat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \right) \\
& \leq N \int (I_1(z) + I_2(z) + I_3(z)) f(z) dz \\
& = kN^k \exp \left\{ - \frac{(\log N)^{d_x+d_y}}{4} \right\} + \left(4C' \frac{c_{d_x+d_y}}{c_{d_x}} \right)^k (\log N)^{2k(d_x+d_y)} N^{1-\frac{k d_y}{d_x}} + 2N \exp \left\{ - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{64} (\log N)^{2d_x} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $k > d_y/d_x$ as per our assumption, each of the three terms goes to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Therefore

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \log \widehat{f}_X(X_i) - \log f_X(X_i) \right| > \varepsilon \right) = 0 \tag{185}$$

Therefore, by combining the convergence of error from sampling and error from density estimation, we obtain that $\widehat{H}(X)$ converges to $H(X)$ in probability.

11 Proof of Theorem 7 on the bias of KSG estimator

We will introduce some notations first. Let $Z = (X, Y)$, $f(x) = f(x, y)$ and $d = d_x + d_y$ for short. Let $B(z, r)$ denote the d -dimensional ball centered at z with radius r , $B_X(x, r)$ denote the d_x -dimensional ball (on X space) centered at x with radius r . $P(z, r)$ denotes the probability mass inside $B(z, r)$, i.e.,

$P(z, r) = \int_{B(z, r)} f(t) dt$. Similarly, $P_X(x, r) = \int_{B_X(x, r)} f_X(t) dt$ denotes the probability mass inside $B_X(z, r)$. Now note that if $\rho_{k,i,\cdot} \leq a_N$, we can write $\iota_{k,i,2}$ and $\iota_{k,i,\infty}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}\iota_{k,i,\infty} &= \xi_{k,i,\infty}(X) + \xi_{k,i,\infty}(Y) - \xi_{k,i,\infty}(Z) \\ \iota_{k,i,2} &= \xi_{k,i,2}(X) + \xi_{k,i,2}(Y) - \xi_{k,i,2}(Z),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\xi_{k,i,\infty}(Z) \equiv -\psi(k) + \log N + \log c_{d_x, \infty} c_{d_y, \infty} + d \log \rho_{k,i,\infty}, \quad (186)$$

$$\xi_{k,i,\infty}(X) \equiv -\psi(n_{x,i,\infty} + 1) + \log N + \log c_{d_x, \infty} + d_x \log \rho_{k,i,\infty}, \quad (187)$$

$$\xi_{k,i,\infty}(Y) \equiv -\psi(n_{y,i,\infty} + 1) + \log N + \log c_{d_y, \infty} + d_y \log \rho_{k,i,\infty}. \quad (188)$$

and

$$\xi_{k,i,2}(Z) \equiv -\psi(k) + \log N + \log c_{d,2} + d \log \rho_{k,i,2}, \quad (189)$$

$$\xi_{k,i,2}(X) \equiv -\log(n_{x,i,2}) + \log N + \log c_{d_x,2} + d_x \log \rho_{k,i,2}, \quad (190)$$

$$\xi_{k,i,2}(Y) \equiv -\log(n_{y,i,2}) + \log N + \log c_{d_y,2} + d_y \log \rho_{k,i,2}. \quad (191)$$

If $\rho_{k,i,\cdot} > a_N$, just define $\xi_{k,i,\cdot}(X) = \xi_{k,i,\cdot}(Y) = \xi_{k,i,\cdot}(Z) = 0$. Similar as the proof of Theorem 6, we drop the superscript KSG or BI-KSG and subscript 2 and ∞ for statements that holds for both. Since $\iota_{k,i}$'s are identically distributed, we have $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{I}(X; Y)] = \mathbb{E}[\iota_{k,1}]$. By triangular inequality, the bias of $\widehat{I}(X; Y)$ can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{E}[\widehat{I}(X; Y)] - I(X; Y) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\iota_{k,1}] - I(X; Y) \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}(X)] - H(X)| + |\mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}] - H(Y)| + |\mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}(Z)] - H(Z)| \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}]| + |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} > a_N\}]| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(Y) - H(Y)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}]| + |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(Y) - H(Y)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} > a_N\}]| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}(Z) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\} - H(Z)]| + |\mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}(Z) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} > a_N\}]| \\ &= |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}]| + |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(Y) - H(Y)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}]| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}(Z) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\} - H(Z)]| + (|H(X)| + |H(Y)|) \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,i} > a_N).\end{aligned} \quad (192)$$

The probability that $\rho_{k,i} > a_N$ is bounded by the following lemma:

Lemma 12. *Under the Assumption 3.(c) and (d), we have:*

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,i} > a_N) \leq C \left(N^{k-1} \exp\{-C(\log N)^{1+\delta}\} + \left(\frac{(\log N)^{1+\delta}}{N} \right)^{1/d} \right). \quad (193)$$

Note $N^{k-1} \exp\{-C(\log N)^{1+\delta}\}$ decays faster than $1/N^c$ for any constant c .

Now we consider the bias of $\xi_{k,i}(Z)$, $\xi_{k,i}(X)$ and $\xi_{k,i}(Y)$ when $\rho_{k,i} \leq a_N$. $\xi_{k,1}(Z)$ is local d -dimensional Kozachenko-Leonenko entropy estimator [27]. Therefore, by Theorem 3, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}[\xi_{k,1}(Z) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\} - H(Z)] \leq O\left(\frac{(\log N)^{(1+\delta)(1+1/d)}}{N^{1/d}}\right), \quad (194)$$

The following lemma establishes the convergence rate for marginal entropy estimator $\xi_{k,1}(X)$.

Lemma 13. *Under the Assumption 3.(c) – (e), the bias of marginal entropy estimator $\xi_{k,1}(X)$ is given by:*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}] = O\left(\frac{(\log N)^{(1+\delta)(1+1/d)}}{N^{1/d}}\right). \quad (195)$$

for $k \geq d_x/d_y$.

Convergence rate of $\xi_{k,1}(Y)$ is immediate by exchanging X and Y and $k \geq d_x/d_y$. Combining Theorem 3, Lemma 13 and Lemma 12, we obtain the desired statement.

11.1 Proof of Lemma 12

For $Z_1 = z$, the k NN distance is larger than a_N , i.e. $\rho_{k,1} > a_N$ when at most $k-1$ samples are in $B(z, a_N)$, which gives

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} > a_N \mid Z_1 = z) = \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \binom{N-1}{m} P(z, a_N)^m (1 - P(z, a_N))^{N-1-m}. \quad (196)$$

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3, we divide the support into two parts as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \{z : \|H_f(z')\| < C_d, \forall z' \in B(z, a_N)\} \\ S_2 &= \{z : \|H_f(z')\| \geq C_d, \text{ for some } z' \in B(z, a_N)\} = S_1^C \end{aligned} \quad (197)$$

We have shown that $\int_{S_2} f(z) dz \leq 2C_a a_N C_g$ from the proof of Theorem 3. For $z \in S_1$, since f is twice continuously differentiable in $B(z, a_N)$ and a_N vanishes as N grows, $f(z) \text{Vol}(B(z, a_N))$ approaches $P(z, a_N)$. Precisely, by Lemma 4, for sufficiently large N , we have $P(z, a_N) \geq f(z) c_d a_N^d - C_d a_N^{d+2}$. This provide the following upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} > a_N \mid Z_1 = z \in S_1) &= \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} \binom{N-1}{m} P(z, a_N)^m (1 - P(z, a_N))^{N-1-m} \\ &\leq \sum_{m=0}^{k-1} N^m (1 - P(z, a_N))^{N-1-m} \\ &\leq k N^{k-1} (1 - P(z, a_N))^{N-k-1} \\ &\leq k N^{k-1} \exp\{-(N-k-1)P(z, a_N)\} \\ &\leq k N^{k-1} \exp\{-(N-k-1)f(z) c_d a_N^d + (N-k-1)C_d a_N^{d+2}\} \\ &\leq k N^{k-1} \exp\{-Cf(z)(\log(N))^{1+\delta}\} \exp\{\log(N)^{(1+\delta)(1+2/d)}/N^{2/d}\} \\ &\leq k e N^{k-1} \exp\{-Cf(z)(\log(N))^{1+\delta}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (198)$$

The last inequality comes from the fact that $\log(N)^{(1+\delta)(1+2/d)}/N^{2/d} < 1$ for sufficiently large N and $s \geq 1$. For $z \in S_2$, we just use the trivial bound $\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} > a_N \mid Z_1 = z \in S_2) \leq 1$. Taking the expectation over Z_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} > a_N) &= \int_{S_1} f(z) \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} > a_N \mid Z_1 = z) dz + \int_{S_2} f(z) \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} > a_N \mid Z_1 = z) dz \\ &\leq k e N^{k-1} \int_{S_1} f(z) \exp\{-Cf(z)(\log(N))^{1+\delta}\} dz + \int_{S_2} f(z) dz \\ &\leq k e C_c N^{k-1} \exp\{-CC_0(\log(N))^{1+\delta}\} + 2C_a a_N C_g, \end{aligned} \quad (199)$$

where the last inequality comes from Assumption 3.(c). We complete the proof by plugging in $a_N = ((\log N)^{1+\delta}/N)^{1/d}$.

11.2 Proof of Lemma 13

Define $r_N = (\log N)^2 N^{-1/d_x}$, we can split the bias of $\xi_{k,i}(X)$ into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}]| \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} < r_N\}]| + |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{r_N \leq \rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}]|, \end{aligned} \quad (200)$$

If $\rho_{k,1} < r_N$, recall that $\xi_{k,1}(X) = -h(n_{x,1}) + \log c_{d_x} + \log N + d_x \log \rho_{k,1}$, where $h(x) = \log(x)$ or $\psi(x+1)$. Notice that $k < n_{x,1} < N$, so $0 \leq h(n_{x,1}) \leq 2 \log N$. Therefore, we can bound the first term of (200) by:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} < r_N\}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[(\log N + \log c_{d_x} + d_x \log \rho_{k,1} - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} < r_N\}] \\ &\leq (\log N + \log c_{d_x} - H(X)) \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r_N) + d_x \int_0^{r_N} \log r f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) dr, \end{aligned} \quad (201)$$

where $f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r)$ is the pdf of $\rho_{k,1}$. Similarly, it can be lower bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} < r_N\}] \\
& \geq \mathbb{E}[(-\log N + \log c_{d_x} + d_x \log \rho_{k,1} - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} < r_N\}] \\
& \geq (-\log N + \log c_{d_x} - H(X)) \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r_N) + d_x \int_0^{r_N} \log r f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) dr, \tag{202}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} < r_N\}]| \\
& \leq (\log N + |\log c_{d_x} - H(X)|) \mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r_N) + d_x \int_0^{r_N} |\log r| f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) dr, \tag{203}
\end{aligned}$$

Now we will give an upper bound on the probability $\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r)$ for any $r \leq r_N$. Given that $Z_1 = z$, Let p_r be the probability inside the ℓ_p ball centered at $Z_1 = z = (x, y)$ with radius r . For sufficiently large N , we have

$$p_r = \mathbb{P}(u \in B_Z(z, r)) \leq \left(\sup_{t \in B_Z(z, r)} f(t) \right) c_d r^d \leq C_a c_d r^d \tag{204}$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r | Z_1 = z)$ is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r | Z_1 = z) &= \sum_{m=k}^{N-1} \binom{N-1}{m} p_r^m (1-p_r)^{N-1-m} \leq \sum_{m=k}^{N-1} N^m p_r^m \\
&\leq \sum_{m=k}^{N-1} (NC_a c_d r^d)^m \leq 2(NC_a c_d r^d)^k, \tag{205}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $r \leq r_N = (\log N)^{2N^{-1/d_x}}$, so for sufficiently large N , we have $NC_a c_d r^d \leq 1/2$, which gives us the last inequality. Notice that this probability is independent of z , therefore, we have $\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r) \leq 2(NC_a c_d r^d)^k$. Plugging in $r_N = (\log N)^{2N^{-1/d_x}}$, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r_N) \leq 2(NC_a c_d (\log N)^{2d} N^{-d/(d_x)})^k = 2C_a^k c_d^k (\log N)^{2kd} N^{-kd_y/d_x} \tag{206}$$

Let $F_{\rho_{k,1}}(r)$ be the CDF of $\rho_{k,1}$ and $F_0(r) = 2(NC_a c_d r^d)^k$ be the upper bound for $F_{\rho_{k,1}}(r)$. Then using integration by parts, the integral $\int_0^{r_N} |\log r| f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) dr$ can be bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{r_N} |\log r| f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) dr &= \int_0^{r_N} (-\log r) dF_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) \\
&= -\log(r_N) F_{\rho_{k,1}}(r_N) + \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} (\log(r) F_{\rho_{k,1}}(r)) - \int_0^{r_N} \left(-\frac{F_{\rho_{k,1}}(r)}{r} \right) dr \\
&\leq -\log(r_N) F_0(r_N) + \int_0^{r_N} \frac{F_0(r)}{r} dr \\
&= -2\log(r_N) (NC_a c_d r_N^d)^k + \int_0^{r_N} \frac{2(NC_a c_d r^d)^k}{r} dr \\
&= -2\log(r_N) (NC_a c_d r_N^d)^k + \frac{2}{kd} (NC_a c_d r_N^d)^k \\
&= \frac{2}{kd} (NC_a c_d)^k r_N^{kd} (1 - kd \log(r_N)) \\
&= \frac{2}{kd} (NC_a c_d)^k (\log N)^{2kd} N^{-\frac{kd}{d_x}} (1 - kd(-\frac{1}{d_x} \log N + 2 \log \log N)) \\
&= \frac{2(C_a c_d)^k}{kd} (\log N)^{2kd} (1 + \frac{kd}{d_x} \log N) N^{-\frac{kd_y}{d_x}} \tag{207}
\end{aligned}$$

If $k \geq d_x/d_y$, then there exists some constant C such that $\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r_N) \leq C(\log N)^{2kd}/N$ and $\int_0^{r_N} |\log r| f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) dr \leq C(\log N)^{2kd+1}/N$. Therefore, plug it in (203), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{\rho_{k,1} \leq r_N\}]| \\ & \leq (\log N + |\log c_{d_x} - H(X)|) C \frac{(\log N)^{2kd}}{N} + d_x C \frac{(\log N)^{2kd+1}}{N} \\ & \leq C(1 + d_x) \frac{(\log N)^{2kd+1}}{N} + C |\log c_{d_x} - H(X)| \frac{(\log N)^{2kd}}{N} \leq N^{-d_y/d} \end{aligned} \quad (208)$$

for sufficiently large N .

Now we consider the second term of (200). Recall that

$$\xi_{k,1,2}(X) \equiv \log \left(\frac{c_{d_x,2} N \rho_{k,1,2}^{d_x}}{n_{x,1,2}} \right) \quad (209)$$

$$\xi_{k,1,\infty}(X) \equiv \log \left(\frac{c_{d_x,\infty} N \rho_{k,1,\infty}^{d_x}}{\exp\{\psi(n_{x,1,\infty} + 1)\}} \right), \quad (210)$$

Given that $r_N \leq \rho_{k,1,2} \leq a_N$, the bias of $\xi_{k,1,2}(X)$ is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1,2}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{r_N \leq \rho_{k,1,2} \leq a_N\}]| \\ & = \left| \mathbb{E}_{Z,\rho_{k,1,2}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n_{x,1,2}} \left[\left(\xi_{k,1,2}(X) + \int f_X(x) \log f_X(x) dx \right) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{r_N \leq \rho_{k,1,2} \leq a_N\} \mid Z, \rho_{k,1,2} \right] \right] \right| \\ & \leq \int \left(\int_{r_N}^{a_N} |\log(f_X(x) c_{d_x,2} N r^{d_x}) - \mathbb{E}[\log(n_{x,1,2}) | \rho_{k,1,2} = r, Z_1 = z]| f_{\rho_{k,1,2}}(r) dr \right) f(z) dz, \end{aligned} \quad (211)$$

where we applied the Jensen's inequality. By noticing that $\log(x) < \psi(x+1) < \log(x+1)$ for any integer $x \geq 2$, we have $|\psi(x+1) - y| \leq \max_{\theta \in \{0,1\}} |\log(x+\theta) - y|$. So the bias of $\xi_{k,1,\infty}$ is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1,\infty}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{r_N \leq \rho_{k,1,\infty} \leq a_N\}] \\ & = \left| \mathbb{E}_{Z,\rho_{k,1,\infty}} \left[\mathbb{E}_{n_{x,1,\infty}} \left[\left(\xi_{k,1,\infty}(X) + \int f_X(x) \log f_X(x) dx \right) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{r_N \leq \rho_{k,1,\infty} \leq a_N\} \mid Z, \rho_{k,1,\infty} \right] \right] \right| \\ & \leq \int \left(\int_{r_N}^{a_N} |\mathbb{E}[\psi(n_{x,1,\infty} + 1) | \rho_{k,1,\infty} = r, Z_1 = z] - \log(f_X(x) c_{d_x,\infty} N r^{d_x})| f_{\rho_{k,1,\infty}}(r) dr \right) f(z) dz \\ & \leq \int \left(\int_{r_N}^{a_N} \left| \max_{\theta \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}[\log(n_{x,1,\infty} + \theta) | \rho_{k,1,\infty} = r, Z_1 = z] - \log(f_X(x) c_{d_x,\infty} N r^{d_x}) \right| f_{\rho_{k,1,\infty}}(r) dr \right) f(z) dz \end{aligned} \quad (212)$$

Combine the arguments for KSG and BI-KSG, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{r_N \leq \rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}] \\ & \leq \int \left(\int_{r_N}^{a_N} \left| \max_{\theta \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}(\log(n_{x,1} + \theta) | \rho_{k,1} = r, Z_1 = z) - \log(f_X(x) c_{d_x} N r^{d_x}) \right| f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) dr \right) f(z) dz \end{aligned} \quad (213)$$

From now on we drop the subscript 2 or ∞ . Now similar as the proof of 3, we divide the support of X into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1^{(X)} & = \{x : \|H_{f_x}(x)\| < C_d, \forall x' \in B_X(x, a_N)\} \\ S_2^{(X)} & = \{x : \|H_f(x)\| \geq C_d, \text{ for some } x' \in B_X(x, a_N)\} = S_1^C \end{aligned} \quad (214)$$

where the Lebesgue measure of $S_2^{(X)}$ is upper bounded by $2C_h a_N$ for sufficiently small a_N . Therefore, we rewrite (213) as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{r_N \leq \rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}] \\ & \leq \int_{S_1} \left(\int_{r_N}^{a_N} \left| \max_{\theta \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}(\log(n_{x,1} + \theta) | \rho_{k,1} = r, Z_1 = z) - \log(f_X(x) c_{d_x} N r^{d_x}) \right| f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) dr \right) f(z) dz \\ & \quad + \int_{S_2} \left(\int_{r_N}^{a_N} \left| \max_{\theta \in \{0,1\}} \mathbb{E}(\log(n_{x,1} + \theta) | \rho_{k,1} = r, Z_1 = z) - \log(f_X(x) c_{d_x} N r^{d_x}) \right| f_{\rho_{k,1}}(r) dr \right) f(z) dz \end{aligned} \quad (215)$$

Recall that in Theorem 9, given that $\rho_{k,i} = r$ and $Z_i = z$, $n_{x,i} - k$ is distributed as $\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l$, where U_l are i.i.d Bernoulli random variables with mean p satisfying

$$r^{-d_x} |p - f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}| \leq C_1(r^2 + r^{d_y}). \quad (216)$$

if $x \in S_1^{(X)}$. For $x \in S_2^{(X)}$, the Bernoulli property still holds, but the mean p is simply bounded by

$$r^{-d_x} |p - f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}| \leq r^{-d_x} f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x} \leq C_a c_{d_x} \quad (217)$$

From now on, we will focus on $x \in S_1^{(X)}$. For $x \in S_2^{(X)}$, the analyses also hold if we replace $C_1(r^2 + r^{d_y})$ by $C_a c_{d_x}$ everywhere. We will skip that for simplicity. For $r > r_N = (\log N)^2 N^{-1/d_x}$, we know that $p \geq f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}/2 = f_X(x)c_{d_x}(\log N)^{2d_x}/(2N)$ for sufficiently large N . Therefore, for any $\theta \in \{0, 1\}$, using the Taylor expansion of a logarithm, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}[\log(n_{x,1} + \theta) | \rho_{k,1} = r, X_1 = x] = \log(p(N - k - 1) + k + \theta) - \frac{1-p}{2p(N - k - 1)} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2(N - k - 1)^2}\right) \quad (218)$$

For sufficiently large N , this gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E}(\log(n_{x,1} + \theta) | \rho_{k,1} = r, X_1 = x) - \log(f_X(x)c_{d_x}Nr^{d_x}) \right| \\ & \leq \left| \log(p(N - k - 1) + k + \theta) - \log(f_X(x)c_{d_x}Nr^{d_x}) \right| + \frac{1-p}{2p(N - k - 1)} + \frac{C_2}{p^2(N - k - 1)^2} \\ & \leq \left| \log(pN) - \log(f_X(x)c_{d_x}Nr^{d_x}) \right| + \left| \log(pN) - \log(pN + k(1-p) + \theta - p) \right| \\ & \quad + \frac{1-p}{2p(N - k - 1)} + \frac{C_2}{p^2(N - k - 1)^2} \\ & \leq \left| \log(pN) - \log(f_X(x)c_{d_x}Nr^{d_x}) \right| + \frac{C_3}{pN}, \end{aligned} \quad (219)$$

For sufficiently large N we have sufficiently small r such that, from Theorem 9, we get $p > f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}/2$. Therefore the first term in (219) is bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \log(pN) - \log(f_X(x)c_{d_x}Nr^{d_x}) \right| & \leq |p - f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}| \left(\frac{1}{2p} + \frac{1}{2f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}} \right) \\ & \leq C_1 (r^{d_x+2} + r^{d_x+d_y}) \frac{3}{2f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}} \\ & \leq \frac{3C_1(r^2 + r^{d_y})}{2c_{d_x}f_X(x)}, \end{aligned} \quad (220)$$

where we used the fact that $\log x - \log y \leq |x - y|(1/(2x) + 1/(2y))$ for any positive x and y and the upper bound on $|p - f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}|$ from (216). The second term in (219) is bounded by $2C_3/(f_X(x)r^{d_x}N)$, which gives, for $C_4 = \max\{3C_1/2c_{d_x}, 2C_3\}$,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}(\log(n_{x,1} + \theta) | \rho_{k,1} = r, X_1 = x) - \log(f_X(x)c_{d_x}Nr^{d_x}) \right| \leq \frac{C_4}{f_X(x)} \left(\frac{1}{r^{d_x}N} + r^2 + r^{d_y} \right). \quad (221)$$

To integrate with respect to $\rho_{k,1} = r$, note that $\rho_{k,1}$ is simply the k^{th} order statistic of $N - 1$ i.i.d. random variables $\{\|Z_2 - z\|, \|Z_3 - z\|, \dots, \|Z_N - z\|\}$. The corresponding pdf satisfies [12]:

$$f_{\rho_{k,1}^{(N-1)}}(r) = \frac{N-1}{k-1} f_{\rho_{k-1,1}^{(N-2)}}(r) P(z, r). \quad (222)$$

For any $\theta \in \{0, 1\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^{a_N} \left| \mathbb{E}(\log(n_{x,i} + \theta) | \rho_{k,i} = r, Z_i = z) - \log(f_X(x) c_{d_x} N r^{d_x}) \right| f_{\rho_{k,i}^{(N-1)}}(r) dr \\
& \leq C_4 \int_0^{a_N} \frac{1}{f_X(x)} \left(\frac{1}{r^{d_x} N} + r^2 + r^{d_y} \right) f_{\rho_{k,i}^{(N-1)}}(r) dr \\
& = C_4 \int_0^{a_N} \frac{(N-1)P(z,r)}{(k-1)f_X(x)} \left(\frac{1}{r^{d_x} N} + r^2 + r^{d_y} \right) f_{\rho_{k-1,1}^{(N-2)}}(r) dr \\
& \leq C_4 \max_{r \leq a_N} \frac{NP(z,r)}{(k-1)f_X(x)} \left(\frac{1}{r^{d_x} N} + r^2 + r^{d_y} \right). \tag{223}
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4, $|P(z,r) - f(z)c_d r^d| \leq C r^{d+2}$. Therefore, for sufficiently small a_N , we have $P(z,r) < 2f(z)c_d r^d$ for all $r \leq a_N$. Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{r \leq a_N} \frac{NP(z,r)}{(k-1)f_X(x)} \left(\frac{1}{r^{d_x} N} + r^2 + r^{d_y} \right) & \leq \max_{r \leq a_N} \frac{2f(z)c_d r^d N}{(k-1)f_X(x)} \left(\frac{1}{r^{d_x} N} + r^2 + r^{d_y} \right) \\
& = \max_{r \leq a_N} \frac{2c_d f_{Y|X}(y|x)}{k-1} (r^{d_y} + N r^{d+2} + N r^{d+d_y}) \\
& \leq C_5 \left(a_N^{d_y} + N a_N^{d+2} + N a_N^{d+d_y} \right). \tag{224}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $f_{Y|X}(y|x)$ is upper bounded by C_e , here C_5 is given by $C_5 = 2c_d C_e / (k-1)$. The above upper bound holds for $x \in S_1^{(X)}$, while for $x \in S_2^{(X)}$, we have an upper bound of $C_6(a_N^{d_y} + N a_N^d)$ for some $C_6 > 0$. Now averaging over z , we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[(\xi_{k,1}(X) - H(X)) \cdot \mathbb{I}\{r_N \leq \rho_{k,1} \leq a_N\}] \\
& \leq C_4 C_5 \int_{S_1} f(z) \left(a_N^{d_y} + N a_N^{d+2} + N a_N^{d+d_y} \right) dz + C_4 C_6 \int_{S_2} f(z) \left(a_N^{d_y} + N a_N^d \right) \\
& \leq C_4 C_5 \left(a_N^{d_y} + N a_N^{d+2} + N a_N^{d+d_y} \right) + C_a C_4 C_6 m(S_2) \left(a_N^{d_y} + N a_N^d \right). \tag{225}
\end{aligned}$$

here the Lebesgue measure of S_2 is upper bounded by $2C_g a_N$ by Assumption 3.(h). Together with Equation (208) and by the choice of a_N in Equation (20), the proof is completed.

12 Proof of Theorem 8 on the variance of KSG estimator

Similar as the proof of Theorem 7, we can write $\iota_{k,i,2}$ and $\iota_{k,i,\infty}$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\iota_{k,i,\infty} & = \xi_{k,i,\infty}(X) + \xi_{k,i,\infty}(Y) - \xi_{k,i,\infty}(Z), \\
\iota_{k,i,2} & = \xi_{k,i,2}(X) + \xi_{k,i,2}(Y) - \xi_{k,i,2}(Z),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_{k,i,\infty}$ and $\xi_{k,i,2}$ are defined through (186) - (191). Similar as the proof of Theorem 6 and 7, we drop the superscript KSG or BI-KSG and subscript 2 and ∞ for statements that holds for both. Consider

$$\widehat{H}(X) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{k,i}(X), \quad \widehat{H}(Y) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{k,i}(Y). \tag{226}$$

Then $\widehat{I}(X; Y)$ can be rewritten as $\widehat{I}(X; Y) = \widehat{H}(X) + \widehat{H}(Y) - \widehat{H}_{t_{KL}}(Z)$, where $\widehat{H}_{t_{KL}}(Z) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{k,i}(Z)$ is the truncated KL entropy estimator. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain:

$$\text{Var} \left[\widehat{I}(X; Y) \right] \leq 3 \left(\text{Var} \left[\widehat{H}_{t_{KL}}(Z) \right] + \text{Var} \left[\widehat{H}(X) \right] + \text{Var} \left[\widehat{H}(Y) \right] \right). \tag{227}$$

From Theorem 4, we know that

$$\text{Var} \left[\widehat{H}_{t_{KL}}(Z) \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log \log N)^2 (\log N)^{(2k+2)(1+\delta)}}{N} \right), \tag{228}$$

so we only need to give an upper bound for $\text{Var}[\widehat{H}(X)]$ and $\text{Var}[\widehat{H}(Y)]$, which use the adaptive choice of $n_{x,i}$ and $n_{y,i}$. The following lemma gives an upper bound for $\text{Var}[\widehat{H}(X)]$,

Lemma 14. *Under the Assumption 3 we have:*

$$\text{Var} \left[\widehat{H}(X) \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{3+\delta}}{N} \right). \quad (229)$$

Similarly, we have $\text{Var} \left[\widehat{H}(Y) \right] = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{3+\delta}}{N} \right)$. Together with Theorem 4, we obtain the desired statement.

12.1 Proof of Lemma 14

Recall that $\widehat{H}(X) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{k,i}(X)$, where $\xi_{k,i}(X)$ are identically distributed, we can rewrite the variance of $\widehat{H}(X)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[\widehat{H}(X) \right] &= \text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \xi_{k,i}(X) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \text{Var} [\xi_{k,i}(X)] + \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j \neq i}^N \text{Cov} [\xi_{k,i}(X), \xi_{k,j}(X)] \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] + \text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X)]. \end{aligned} \quad (230)$$

We will consider the variance term and covariance term separately. The following lemma gives an upper bound for $\text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)]$.

Lemma 15. *Under the Assumption 3 we have:*

$$\text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] = O \left((\log N)^2 \right). \quad (231)$$

The covariance term is upper bounded by the following lemma.

Lemma 16. *Under the Assumption 3 we have:*

$$\left| \text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X)] \right| = O \left(\frac{(\log N)^{3+\delta}}{N} \right). \quad (232)$$

Combine Lemma 15 and Lemma 16, we complete the proof.

12.2 Proof of Lemma 15

Recall that $\xi_{k,1}(X) = -h(n_{x,1}) + \log \left(N c_{d_x} \rho_{k,1}^{d_x} \right)$, where $h(x) = \log(x)$ or $\psi(x+1)$. Therefore, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have:

$$\text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] \leq 2 \left(\text{Var} [h(n_{x,1})] + \text{Var} \left[\log \left(N c_{d_x} \rho_{k,1}^{d_x} \right) \right] \right). \quad (233)$$

Notice that $k < n_{x,1} < N$, so $0 \leq h(n_{x,1}) \leq 2 \log N$. Therefore, $\text{Var} [h(n_{x,1})] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[(h(n_{x,i}))^2 \right] \leq 4(\log N)^2$.

For $\text{Var} \left[\log \left(N c_{d_x} \rho_{k,1}^{d_x} \right) \right]$, recall that in (205) we have shown that $\mathbb{P}(\rho_{k,1} < r) \leq 2(N C_a c_{d_x} r^{d_x})^k$, therefore, the CDF of $N c_{d_x} \rho_{k,1}^{d_x}$ is upper bounded by $F_{N c_{d_x} \rho_{k,1}^{d_x}}(t) \leq 2(C_a t)^k$. Moreover, since we truncated $\rho_{k,1}$ by a_N ,

so $Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x} \leq Nc_{d_x}a_N^{d_x}$. So the variance is upper bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var} \left[\log \left(Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x} \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\log \left(Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x} \right) \right)^2 \right] \\
&= \int_0^{Nc_{d_x}a_N^{d_x}} (\log t)^2 f_{Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x}}(t) dt \\
&= \int_0^1 (\log t)^2 f_{Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x}}(t) dt + \int_1^{Nc_{d_x}a_N^{d_x}} (\log t)^2 f_{Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x}}(t) dt \\
&= - \int_0^1 \frac{2 \log t F_{Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x}}(t)}{t} dt + \int_1^{Nc_{d_x}a_N^{d_x}} (\log t)^2 f_{Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x}}(t) dt \\
&\leq - \int_0^1 \frac{4 \log t (C_a t)^k}{t} dt + \left(\log \left(Nc_{d_x}a_N^{d_x} \right) \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{4C_a^k}{k^2} + \left(\log \left(Nc_{d_x}a_N^{d_x} \right) \right)^2. \tag{234}
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging in $a_N = \left((\log N)^{1+\delta} / N \right)^{1/(d_x+d_y)}$, we obtain that $\text{Var} \left[\log \left(Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x} \right) \right] \leq C_1 (\log N)^2$ for some $C_1 > 0$. Therefore, we have $\text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] = O \left((\log N)^2 \right)$.

12.3 Proof of Lemma 16

First, we decompose the covariance using law of total covariance as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X)] \\
&= \text{Cov} [\mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}], \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \tag{235}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}_{Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}} [\text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] , \tag{236}$$

For (235), we consider two cases.

(1) $\|Z_1 - Z_2\| > 2a_N$, then the two balls $B(Z_1, \rho_{k,1})$ and $B(Z_2, \rho_{k,2})$ are disjoint. Recall that in Theorem 9, we have shown that given $Z_1 = z$ and $\rho_{k,1} = r$, $n_{x,i} - k$ is distributed as $\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l$, where U_l are i.i.d. Bernoulli random variable with mean p which only depends on Z_1 and $\rho_{k,1}$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}] = \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X) | Z_1, \rho_{k,1}]$ only depends on Z_1 and $\rho_{k,1}$ i.e., only depends on Z_1 and its k -nearest neighbors. Analogously, $\mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X) | Z_2, \rho_{k,2}]$ only depends on Z_2 and its k -nearest neighbors. Since $B(Z_1, \rho_{k,1})$ and $B(Z_2, \rho_{k,2})$ are disjoint, so the two conditional expectations are independent, therefore, have a zero covariance.

(2) $\|Z_1 - Z_2\| \leq 2a_N$. In this case, the covariance is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \text{Cov} [\mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}], \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \right| \\
&\leq \sqrt{\text{Var} [\mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \text{Var} [\mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]]} \\
&\leq \sqrt{\text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] \text{Var} [\xi_{k,2}(X)]}, \tag{237}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use Cauchy-Schwarz for the first inequality and the fact that conditioning reduces variance for the second inequality. Recall that in Lemma 15 we have proved that $\text{Var} [\xi_{k,1}(X)] = O \left((\log N)^2 \right)$ and $\xi_{k,2}$ is identically distributed as $\xi_{k,1}(X)$, so the covariance is $O \left((\log N)^2 \right)$ in this case. This case happens with probability

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P} [\|Z_1 - Z_2\| \leq 2a_N] &= \int_x \left(\int_{y \in B(x, 2a_N)} f(y) \right) f(x) dx \\
&\leq \int_x (C_a c_d (2a_N)^d) f(x) dx \\
&= C_a c_d (2a_N)^d = 2C_a c_d \frac{(\log N)^{1+\delta}}{N}. \tag{238}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combine the two cases, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \text{Cov} [\mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X) \mid Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}], \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X) \mid Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \right| \\
& \leq \left| \text{Cov} \left[\mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,1}(X) \mid Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}], \mathbb{E} [\xi_{k,2}(X) \mid Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}] \mid \|Z_1 - Z_2\| \leq 2a_N \right] \right| \\
& \quad \times \mathbb{P} [\|Z_1 - Z_2\| \leq 2a_N] \\
& \leq C_1 (\log N)^2 \mathbb{P} [\|Z_1 - Z_2\| \leq 2a_N] \\
& \leq 2C_1 C_a c_d (\log N)^{3+\delta} / N,
\end{aligned} \tag{239}$$

for some constant C_1 .

For (236), recall that $\xi_{k,i}(X) = -h(n_{x,i}) + \log N + \log c_d + d_x \log \rho_{k,i}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, here $h(x) = \log(x)$ or $\psi(x+1)$. So given Z_1, Z_2 and $\rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}$, $\text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X)] = \text{Cov} [h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2})]$ (we will drop the conditioning on Z_1, Z_2 and $\rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}$ for simplicity). The next step is to identify the joint distribution of $n_{x,1}$ and $n_{x,2}$. Here we consider three cases.

(1) $\|X_1 - X_2\| > 2a_N$, namely the two strips $S_1 = \{x : \|X_1 - x\| \leq a_N\}$ and $S_2 = \{x : \|X_2 - x\| \leq a_N\}$ are disjoint. In this case, similarly to Theorem 9, we can show that $n_{x,1} - k$ and $n_{x,2} - k$ are jointly distributed as multinomial distribution with $N - k - 2$ trials and probabilities of p_1 and p_2 , respectively. Here p_1 and p_2 are determined by Z_1, Z_2 and $\rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}$. In order to obtain the covariance of $h(n_{x,1})$ and $h(n_{x,2})$, we use Multivariate Delta Method [45] stated as follows:

Lemma 17. *If $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of random vectors satisfies $\sqrt{n}(X_i - \mu) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. For a given function g with continuous first partial derivatives, then we have*

$$\sqrt{n}(g(X_i) - g(\mu)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \nabla g(\mu)^T \Sigma \nabla g(\mu)). \tag{240}$$

Since $n_{x,1}$ and $n_{x,2}$ are jointly distributed as multinomial distribution, so we have:

$$\sqrt{N - k - 2} \left(\left(\frac{n_{x,1} - k}{N - k - 2}, \frac{n_{x,2} - k}{N - k - 2} \right) - \mu \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma), \tag{241}$$

where $\mu = (p_1, p_2)$ and $\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} p_1(1-p_1) & -p_1 p_2 \\ -p_1 p_2 & p_2(1-p_2) \end{pmatrix}$. Since k is fixed, we can replace $n_{x,i} - k$ by simply $n_{x,i}$. Now plugging in $g(x_1, x_2) = (\log(x_1), \log(x_2))$ and $\nabla g(x_1, x_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 1/x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/x_2 \end{pmatrix}$, we have:

$$\sqrt{N - k - 2} \left(\left(\log\left(\frac{n_{x,1}}{N - k - 2}\right), \log\left(\frac{n_{x,2}}{N - k - 2}\right) \right) - \log(\mu) \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \nabla g(\mu)^T \Sigma \nabla g(\mu)), \tag{242}$$

here $\nabla g(\mu)^T \Sigma \nabla g(\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} (1-p_1)/p_1 & -1 \\ -1 & (1-p_2)/p_2 \end{pmatrix}$. For a large enough N ,

$$\text{Cov} [\log(n_{x,1}), \log(n_{x,2})] = \text{Cov} \left[\log\left(\frac{n_{x,1}}{N - k - 2}\right), \log\left(\frac{n_{x,2}}{N - k - 2}\right) \right] = -\frac{1}{N - k - 2} \tag{243}$$

(If $h(x) = \psi(x+1)$, similarly, we can prove that $|\text{Cov} [\psi(n_{x,1} + 1), \psi(n_{x,2} + 1)]| \leq \frac{2}{N - k - 2}$). Therefore, in this case, $|\text{Cov} [h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2})]| \leq 3/N$ for sufficiently large N .

(2) $\|X_1 - X_2\| \leq 2a_N$ but $\|Z_1 - Z_2\| > 2a_N$, namely the two balls $B_1 = \{z : \|Z_1 - z\| \leq a_N\}$ and $B_2 = \{z : \|Z_2 - z\| \leq a_N\}$ are disjoint, but the two strips S_1 and S_2 are not. In this case, we can write $n_{x,1} = k + m_1 + m_2$ and $n_{x,2} = k + m_2 + m_3$, here

- m_1 is the number of samples in $R_1 = S_1 \setminus (S_2 \cup B_1)$.




Figure 8: Regions R_1 , R_2 and R_3 .

- m_2 is the number of samples in $R_2 = (S_1 \setminus B_1) \cap (S_2 \setminus B_2)$.
- m_3 is the number of samples in $R_3 = S_2 \setminus (S_1 \cup B_2)$.

Figure. reffig:regions illustrates the positions of regions R_1 , R_2 and R_3 . Similarly to Theorem 9, we can show that m_1 , m_2 and m_3 are jointly distributed as multinomial distribution with $N - k - 2$ trials and probabilities of p_1 , p_2 and p_3 , respectively. The probabilities are determined by Z_1 , Z_2 and $\rho_{k,1}$, $\rho_{k,2}$. Analogously as case 1, here we have:

$$\sqrt{N - k - 2} \left(\left(\frac{n_{x,1} - k}{N - k - 2}, \frac{n_{x,2} - k}{N - k - 2} \right) - \mu \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma), \quad (244)$$

here $\mu = (p_1 + p_2, p_2 + p_3)$ and $\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} (p_1 + p_2)(1 - p_1 - p_2) & p_2 - (p_1 + p_2)(p_2 + p_3) \\ p_2 - (p_1 + p_2)(p_2 + p_3) & (p_2 + p_3)(1 - p_2 - p_3) \end{pmatrix}$. Follow the same analysis as case 1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}[h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2})] &= \frac{p_2 - (p_1 + p_2)(p_2 + p_3)}{(N - k - 2)(p_1 + p_2)(p_2 + p_3)} \\ &= \frac{p_2}{(N - k - 2)(p_1 + p_2)(p_2 + p_3)} - \frac{1}{N - k - 2}, \end{aligned} \quad (245)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \left| \text{Cov}[h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2})] \right| &\leq \frac{1}{(N - k - 2)(p_1 + p_2)} + \frac{1}{N - k - 2} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{(N - k - 2)(p_1 + p_2)} \leq \frac{4}{N(p_1 + p_2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (246)$$

for sufficiently large N . Notice that $p_1 + p_2$ is the probability in $S_1 \setminus B_1$. In Theorem 9, we have shown that $p_1 + p_2 \geq f_X(X_1)c_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x}/2$. Therefore, $\left| \text{Cov}[h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2})] \right| \leq 8/(f_X(X_1)Nc_{d_x}\rho_{k,1}^{d_x})$.

(3) $\|Z_1 - Z_2\| \leq 2a_N$, namely the two balls $B_1 = \{z : \|Z_1 - z\| \leq a_N\}$ and $B_2 = \{z : \|Z_2 - z\| \leq a_N\}$ are intersected. In this case, it is hard to identify the joint distribution of $n_{x,1}$ and $n_{x,2}$. But using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and law of total covariance, we can upper bound the covariance by:

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \text{Cov}[h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2}) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}] \right| \\ &\leq \sqrt{\text{Var}[h(n_{x,1}) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}] \text{Var}[h(n_{x,2}) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\text{Var}[h(n_{x,1})] \text{Var}[h(n_{x,2})]} \leq C_3(\log N)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (247)$$

for some constant C_3 .

Now combine the three cases. By E_1 , E_2 and E_3 we denote the event that case (1), (2) or (3) happens.

So

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E}_{Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}} [\text{Cov} [\xi_{k,1}(X), \xi_{k,2}(X) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E}_{Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}} [\text{Cov} [h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2}) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \right| \\
&\leq \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}} [\text{Cov} [h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2}) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \mid E_1 \right] \right| \times \mathbb{P}[E_1] \tag{248}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}} [\text{Cov} [h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2}) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \mid E_2 \right] \right| \times \mathbb{P}[E_2] \tag{249}$$

$$+ \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_{\rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}} [\text{Cov} [h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2}) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \mid E_3 \right] \right| \times \mathbb{P}[E_3] \tag{250}$$

We will deal with the three terms separately as follows.

1. For (248), we use the upper bound $\text{Cov} [h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2}) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}] \leq 3/N$ and $\mathbb{P}[E_1] \leq 1$. So (248) is upper bounded by $3/N$.
2. For (249), the inner expectation is upper bounded by:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}} [\text{Cov} [h(n_{x,1}), h(n_{x,2}) | Z_1, Z_2, \rho_{k,1}, \rho_{k,2}]] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{8}{f_X(X_1) N c_{d_x} \rho_{k,1}^{d_x}} \right], \tag{251}$$

Recall that the pdf of $\rho_{k,1}$ is given in (222). Following the same analysis as (223) and (224), we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{8}{f_X(X_1) N c_{d_x} \rho_{k,1}^{d_x}} \right] \leq C_4 a_N^{d_y}, \tag{252}$$

for some constant $C_4 > 0$. Moreover, the probability of E_2 is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[E_2] &\leq \mathbb{P}[\|X_1 - X_2\| \leq 2a_N] \\
&= \int_x f_X(x) \left(\int_{y \in B_X(x, 2a_N)} f_X(y) dy \right) dx \\
&\leq \int_x f_X(x) C_f c_{d_x} (2a_N)^{d_x} dx \leq C_f c_{d_x} (2a_N)^{d_x} \tag{253}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (249) is upper bounded by $C_5 a_N^{d_x + d_y}$ for some constant $C_5 > 0$. By plugging in the choice $a_N = ((\log N)^{1+\delta}/N)^{1/(d_x + d_y)}$, (249) is upper bounded by $C_5 (\log N)^{1+\delta}/N$.

3. For (250), the expected covariance is upper bounded by $O((\log N)^2)$. The probability of E_3 is upper bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}[E_3] &= \mathbb{P}[\|Z_1 - Z_2\| \leq 2a_N] \\
&= \int_z f(z) \left(\int_{t \in B(z, 2a_N)} f(t) dt \right) dz \\
&\leq \int_z f(z) C_a c_{d_x + d_y} (2a_N)^{d_x + d_y} dz \leq C_a c_{d_x + d_y} (2a_N)^{d_x + d_y} \tag{254}
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging in a_N , $\mathbb{P}[E_3] \leq C_6 (\log N)^{1+\delta}/N$ for some constant $C_6 > 0$. Therefore, (250) is upper bounded by $C_6 (\log N)^{3+\delta}/N$.

Combine the three cases and analysis of (235), we obtain the desired statement.

13 Proof of Theorem 9

Given that $Z_1 = z = (x, y)$ and $\rho_{k,1} = r$, let $\{2, 3, \dots, N\} = S \cup \{j\} \cup T$ be a partition of the indices with $|S| = k - 1$ and $|T| = N - k - 1$. Define an event $\mathcal{A}_{S,j,T}$ associated to the partition as:

$$\mathcal{A}_{S,j,T} = \{ \|Z_s - z\| < \|Z_j - z\|, \forall s \in S, \text{ and } \|Z_t - z\| > \|Z_j - z\|, \forall t \in T \}. \quad (255)$$

Since $Z_j - z$ are i.i.d. random variables each of the events $\mathcal{A}_{S,j,T}$ has identical probability. The number of all partitions is $\frac{(N-1)!}{(N-k-1)!(k-1)!}$ and thus $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{S,j,T}) = \frac{(N-k-1)!(k-1)!}{(N-1)!}$. So the cdf of $n_{x,i}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(n_{x,1} \leq k + m | \rho_{k,1} = r, Z_1 = z) &= \sum_{S,j,T} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A}_{S,j,T}) \mathbb{P}(n_{x,1} \leq k + m | \mathcal{A}_{S,j,T}, \rho_{k,1} = r, Z_1 = z) \\ &= \frac{(N-k-1)!(k-1)!}{(N-1)!} \sum_{S,j,T} \mathbb{P}(n_{x,i} \leq k + m | \mathcal{A}_{S,j,T}, \rho_{k,1} = r, Z_1 = z) \end{aligned} \quad (256)$$

Now condition on event $\mathcal{A}_{S,j,T}$ and $\rho_{k,1} = r$, namely Z_j is the k -nearest neighbor with distance r , S is the set of samples with distance smaller than r and T is the set of samples with distance greater than r . Recall that $n_{x,1}$ is the number of samples with $\|X_j - x\| < r$. For any index $s \in S \cup \{j\}$, $\|X_s - x\| < r$ is satisfied. Therefore, $n_{x,1} \leq k + m$ means that there are no more than m samples in T with X -distance smaller than r . Let $U_l = \mathbb{I}\{\|X_l - x\| < r | \|Z_l - z\| > r\}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(n_{x,1} \leq k + m | \mathcal{A}_{S,j,T}, \rho_{k,1} = r, Z_1 = z) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{t \in T} \mathbb{I}\{\|X_t - x\| < r\} \leq m \mid \|Z_s - z\| < r, \forall s \in S, \|Z_j - z\| = r, \|Z_t - z\| > r, \forall t \in T, Z_i = z\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{t \in T} \mathbb{I}\{\|X_t - x\| < r\} \leq m \mid \|Z_t - z\| > r, \forall t \in T\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l \leq m\right). \end{aligned} \quad (257)$$

We can drop the conditioning of Z_s 's for $s \notin T$ since Z_s and X_t are independent. Therefore, given that $\|Z_t - z\| > r$ for all $t \in T$, the variables $\mathbb{I}\{\|X_t - x\| < r\}$ are i.i.d. and have the same distribution as U_l . We conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(n_{x,1} \leq k + m | \rho_{k,1} = r, Z_1 = z) &= \frac{(N-k-1)!(k-1)!}{(N-1)!} \sum_{S,j,T} \mathbb{P}(n_{x,i} \leq k + m | \mathcal{A}_{S,j,T}, \rho_{k,i} = r, Z_i = z) \\ &= \frac{(N-k-1)!(k-1)!}{(N-1)!} \sum_{S,j,T} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l=k+1}^N U_l \leq m\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l \leq m\right) \end{aligned} \quad (258)$$

Thus we have shown that $n_{x,i} - k$ has the same distribution as $\sum_{l=k+1}^{N-1} U_l$ given $Z_i = z$ and $\rho_{k,i} = r$, in other words is a Binomial random variable.

Now we bound the mean of U_l :

$$p = \mathbb{E}[U_l] = \mathbb{P}(\|X_l - x\| < r \mid \|Z_l - z\| > r) = \frac{P_X(x, r) - P(z, r)}{1 - P(z, r)}. \quad (259)$$

By Lemma 4, we have:

$$|P_X(x, r) - f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}| \leq Cr^{d_x+2}. \quad (260)$$

and

$$|P(z, r) - f(z)c_d r^d| \leq r^{d+2}. \quad (261)$$

Therefore, the difference of p and $f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}$ is bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
|p - f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}| &\leq \left| \frac{P_X(x, r) - P(z, r)}{1 - P(z, r)} - P_X(x, r) \right| + |P_X(x, r) - f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}| \\
&\leq \frac{P(z, r)(1 - P_X(x, r))}{1 - P(z, r)} + |P_X(x, r) - f_X(x)c_{d_x}r^{d_x}| \\
&\leq P(z, r) + Cr^{d_x+2} \leq C(r^{d_x+2} + r^{d_x+d_y}).
\end{aligned} \tag{262}$$

14 Acknowledgement

The authors thank Sreeram Kannan for introducing the KSG estimator to them, Yihong Wu for many helpful discussions, and anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback.

References

- [1] J. Acharya, A. Orlitsky, A. T. Suresh, and H. Tyagi. Estimating renyi entropy of discrete distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.1000*, 2014.
- [2] I. A. Ahmad and P. Lin. A nonparametric estimation of the entropy for absolutely continuous distributions (corresp.). *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 22(3):372–375, 1976.
- [3] R. Battiti. Using mutual information for selecting features in supervised neural net learning. *Neural Networks, IEEE Transactions on*, 5(4):537–550, 1994.
- [4] T. Batu, L. Fortnow, R. Rubinfeld, W. D. Smith, and P. White. Testing that distributions are close. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2000. Proceedings. 41st Annual Symposium on*, pages 259–269. IEEE, 2000.
- [5] G. Biau, F. Chazal, D. Cohen-Steiner, L. Devroye, and C. Rodriguez. A weighted k-nearest neighbor density estimate for geometric inference. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 5:204–237, 2011.
- [6] P Bickel, P Diggle, S Fienberg, U Gather, I Olkin, and S Zeger. Springer series in statistics. 2009.
- [7] L. Birgé and P. Massart. Estimation of integral functionals of a density. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 11–29, 1995.
- [8] C. Chan, A. Al-Bashabsheh, J. B. Ebrahimi, T. Kaced, and T. Liu. Multivariate mutual information inspired by secret-key agreement. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 103(10):1883–1913, 2015.
- [9] C Chan, A Al-Bashabsheh, T Kaced, Q Zhou, and T Liu. Clustering of random variables by multivariate mutual information. *submitted to IEEE Transactions on Information Theory.[Online]. Available: <http://bit.ly/1CawCYo>*.
- [10] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. Information theory and statistics. *Elements of Information Theory*, pages 279–335, 1991.
- [11] S. Dasgupta and S. Kpotufe. Optimal rates for k-nn density and mode estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2555–2563, 2014.
- [12] H. A. David and H. N. Nagaraja. *Order statistics*. Wiley Online Library, 1970.
- [13] P. PB. Eggermont and V. N. LaRiccia. Best asymptotic normality of the kernel density entropy estimator for smooth densities. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 45(4):1321–1326, 1999.
- [14] E. Fix and J. L. Hodges Jr. Discriminatory analysis-nonparametric discrimination: consistency properties. Technical report, DTIC Document, 1951.
- [15] F. Fleuret. Fast binary feature selection with conditional mutual information. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5:1531–1555, 2004.
- [16] S. Gao, G. Ver Steeg, and A. Galstyan. Efficient estimation of mutual information for strongly dependent variables. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.2003*, 2014.
- [17] S. Gao, G Ver Steeg, and A. Galstyan. Estimating mutual information by local gaussian approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.00536*, 2015.
- [18] P. Hall and S. C. Morton. On the estimation of entropy. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 45(1):69–88, 1993.

- [19] N. L. Hjort and M. C. Jones. Locally parametric nonparametric density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1619–1647, 1996.
- [20] D. Janzing, D. Balduzzi, M. Grosse-Wentrup, and B. Schölkopf. Quantifying causal influences. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(5):2324–2358, 2013.
- [21] J. Jiao, T. A. Courtade, K. Venkat, and T. Weissman. Justification of logarithmic loss via the benefit of side information. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 61(10):5357–5365, 2015.
- [22] J. Jiao, K. Venkat, Y. Han, and T. Weissman. Minimax estimation of functionals of discrete distributions. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 61(5):2835–2885, 2015.
- [23] H. Joe. Estimation of entropy and other functionals of a multivariate density. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 41(4):683–697, 1989.
- [24] K. Kandasamy, A. Krishnamurthy, B. Poczos, and L. Wasserman. Nonparametric von mises estimators for entropies, divergences and mutual informations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 397–405, 2015.
- [25] S. Khan, S. Bandyopadhyay, A. R. Ganguly, S. Saigal, D. J. Erickson III, V. Protopopescu, and G. Ostrouchov. Relative performance of mutual information estimation methods for quantifying the dependence among short and noisy data. *Physical Review E*, 76(2):026209, 2007.
- [26] J. B. Kinney and G. S. Atwal. Equitability, mutual information, and the maximal information coefficient. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(9):3354–3359, 2014.
- [27] LF Kozachenko and Nikolai N Leonenko. Sample estimate of the entropy of a random vector. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 23(2):9–16, 1987.
- [28] S. Kpotufe and U. von Luxburg. Pruning nearest neighbor cluster trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1105.0540*, 2011.
- [29] A. Kraskov, H. Stögbauer, and P. Grassberger. Estimating mutual information. *Physical review E*, 69(6):066138, 2004.
- [30] A. Krishnamurthy, K. Kandasamy, B. Poczos, and L. Wasserman. Nonparametric estimation of renyi divergence and friends. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.2966*, 2014.
- [31] H. Liu, L. Wasserman, and J. D. Lafferty. Exponential concentration for mutual information estimation with application to forests. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2537–2545, 2012.
- [32] C. R. Loader. Local likelihood density estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 24(4):1602–1618, 1996.
- [33] D. O. Loftsgaarden and C. P. Quesenberry. A nonparametric estimate of a multivariate density function. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 36(3):1049–1051, 1965.
- [34] D. Lombardi and S. Pant. Nonparametric k-nearest-neighbor entropy estimator. *Physical Review E*, 93(1):013310, 2016.
- [35] A. V. Makuva and Y. Wu. On additive-combinatorial affine inequalities for shannon entropy and differential entropy. *CoRR*, abs/1601.07498, 2016.
- [36] K. R. Moon and A. O. Hero. Ensemble estimation of multivariate f-divergence. In *Information Theory (ISIT), 2014 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 356–360. IEEE, 2014.
- [37] A. C. Müller, S. Nowozin, and C. H. Lampert. *Information theoretic clustering using minimum spanning trees*. Springer, 2012.
- [38] X. Nguyen, M. J. Wainwright, and M. I. Jordan. Estimating divergence functionals and the likelihood ratio by convex risk minimization. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 56(11):5847–5861, 2010.
- [39] M. Nilsson and W. B. Kleijn. On the estimation of differential entropy from data located on embedded manifolds. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 53(7):2330–2341, 2007.
- [40] A. B. Owen. *Monte Carlo theory, methods and examples*. 2013.
- [41] D. Pál, B. Póczos, and C. Szepesvári. Estimation of rényi entropy and mutual information based on generalized nearest-neighbor graphs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1849–1857, 2010.
- [42] L. Paninski. Estimation of entropy and mutual information. *Neural computation*, 15(6):1191–1253, 2003.
- [43] L. Paninski. Estimating entropy on m bins given fewer than m samples. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 50(9):2200–2203, 2004.
- [44] L. Paninski and M. Yajima. Undersmoothed kernel entropy estimators. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 54(9):4384–4388, 2008.

- [45] Alex Papanicolaou. Taylor approximation and the delta method, 2009.
- [46] H. Peng, F. Long, and C. Ding. Feature selection based on mutual information criteria of max-dependency, max-relevance, and min-redundancy. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, IEEE Transactions on*, 27(8):1226–1238, 2005.
- [47] F. Pérez-Cruz. Estimation of information theoretic measures for continuous random variables. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1257–1264, 2009.
- [48] B. W. Silverman. *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis*, volume 26. CRC press, 1986.
- [49] H. Singh, N. Misra, V. Hnizdo, A. Fedorowicz, and E. Demchuk. Nearest neighbor estimates of entropy. *American journal of mathematical and management sciences*, 23(3-4):301–321, 2003.
- [50] S. Singh and B. Póczos. Exponential concentration of a density functional estimator. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3032–3040, 2014.
- [51] S. Singh and B. Póczos. Generalized exponential concentration inequality for rényi divergence estimation. 2014.
- [52] K. Sricharan, D. Wei, and A. O. Hero. Ensemble estimators for multivariate entropy estimation. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 59(7):4374–4388, 2013.
- [53] A. B. Tsybakov and E. C. Van der Meulen. Root-n consistent estimators of entropy for densities with unbounded support. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, pages 75–83, 1996.
- [54] P. D. Turney. Thumbs up or thumbs down?: semantic orientation applied to unsupervised classification of reviews. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting on association for computational linguistics*, pages 417–424. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2002.
- [55] G. Valiant and P. Valiant. Estimating the unseen: an $n/\log(n)$ -sample estimator for entropy and support size, shown optimal via new clts. In *Proceedings of the forty-third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 685–694. ACM, 2011.
- [56] B. Van Es. Estimating functionals related to a density by a class of statistics based on spacings. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, pages 61–72, 1992.
- [57] M. M. Van Hulle. Edgeworth approximation of multivariate differential entropy. *Neural computation*, 17(9):1903–1910, 2005.
- [58] O. Vasicek. A test for normality based on sample entropy. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 54–59, 1976.
- [59] G. Ver Steeg and A. Galstyan. Discovering structure in high-dimensional data through correlation explanation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 577–585, 2014.
- [60] G. Ver Steeg and A. Galstyan. Maximally informative hierarchical representations of high-dimensional data. *stat*, 1050:27, 2014.
- [61] G. Ver Steeg and A. Galstyan. The information sieve. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.02284*, 2015.
- [62] Pascal Vincent, Yoshua Bengio, et al. Locally weighted full covariance gaussian density estimation. Technical report, Technical report 1240, 2003.
- [63] Q. Wang, S. R. Kulkarni, and S. Verdú. Divergence estimation of continuous distributions based on data-dependent partitions. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 51(9):3064–3074, 2005.
- [64] Q. Wang, S. R. Kulkarni, and S. Verdú. Divergence estimation for multidimensional densities via-nearest-neighbor distances. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 55(5):2392–2405, 2009.
- [65] W. M. Wells, P. Viola, H. Atsumi, S. Nakajima, and R. Kikinis. Multi-modal volume registration by maximization of mutual information. *Medical image analysis*, 1(1):35–51, 1996.
- [66] Y. Wu and P. Yang. Minimax rates of entropy estimation on large alphabets via best polynomial approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.0381*, 2014.
- [67] B. Yu. Assouad, fano, and le cam. In *Festschrift for Lucien Le Cam*, pages 423–435. Springer, 1997.
- [68] Jie Zhu, Jean-Jacques Bellanger, Huazhong Shu, Chunfeng Yang, and Régine Le Bouquin Jeannès. Bias reduction in the estimation of mutual information. *Physical Review E*, 90(5):052714, 2014.