

Model selection for the robust efficient signal processing observed with small Lévy noise. ^{*}

Slim Beltaief [†], Oleg Chernoyarov [‡] and Serguei Pergamenchikov [§]

Abstract

We develop a new model selection method for the adaptive robust efficient nonparametric signal estimation observed with impulse noise which is defined by the general non Gaussian Lévy processes. On the basis of the developed method, we construct the estimation procedures which are analyzed in two settings: in non asymptotic and asymptotic ones. For the first time for such models we show non asymptotic sharp oracle inequalities for the quadratic and for the robust risks, i.e. we show that the constructed procedures are optimal in the sharp oracle inequalities sense. Next, by making use of the obtained oracle inequalities, we provide the asymptotic efficiency property for the developed estimation methods in the adaptive setting when the signal/noise ratio goes to infinity. We apply the developed model selection methods for the signals number detection problem in multi-path information transmission.

MSC: primary 62G08, secondary 62G05

Keywords: Model selection; Non-asymptotic estimation; Robust estimation; Oracle inequalities; Efficient estimation; Statistical signal processing techniques and analysis.

^{*}This work was done under financial support of the RSF Grant Number 14-49-00079 (National Research University MPEI 14 Krasnokazarmennaya, 111250 Moscow, Russia) and by the RSF grant 17-11-01049 (National Research Tomsk State University).

[†]Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphaël Salem, UMR 6085 CNRS- Université de Rouen Normandie, France, e-mail: beltaiefslim@hotmail.fr

[‡]Department of Radio Engineering Devices and Antenna Systems, National Research University Moscow Power Engineering Institute and ILSP&QF, National Research Tomsk State University, e-mail: chernoyarovov@mpei.ru

[§]Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphaël Salem, UMR 6085 CNRS- Université de Rouen Normandie, France and ILSP&QF, National Research Tomsk State University, e-mail: Serge.Pergamenchikov@univ-rouen.fr

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the signal estimation problem on the basis of observations defined by the nonparametric regression model in continuous time with pulse noises of small intensity, i.e.,

$$dy_t = S(t)dt + \varepsilon d\xi_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1, \quad (1.1)$$

where $S(\cdot)$ is an unknown deterministic signal (i.e., $[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ nonrandom function), $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is an unobserved noise and $\varepsilon > 0$ is the noise intensity. The problem is to estimate the function S on the observations $(y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Note that if $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is a brownian motion, then we obtain the "signal+white noise" model which is very popular in statistical radio-physics and is well studied by many authors: Ibragimov and Khasminskii in [12], Pinsker in [27], Kutoyants in [20] and [21], etc.. The condition $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ means that the signal/noise ratio goes to infinity. In this paper, we assume that in addition to the intrinsic noise in the radio-electronic system, approximated usually by the gaussian white noise, the useful signal S is distorted by the impulse noise flow defined by Lévy process with jumps introduced in the next section. The cause of the appearance of the pulse stream in the radio-electronic systems can be, for example, either external unintended (atmospheric) noises, intentional impulse noises or errors in the demodulation and channel decoding for the binary information symbols. Note that, the impulse noises for the signal detection problems have been introduced for the first time by Kassam in [14] on the basis of the compound Poisson processes. Later, Konev, Pergamenschikov and Pchelintsev used the compound Poisson processes in [26, 19] for the parametric regression models and in [17, 18] for the nonparametric signal estimation problems. However, the compound Poisson process can describe only the large impulses influence of small frequencies. It should be noted that in the telecommunication systems, the noise impulses are without limitations on frequencies and therefore, the compound Poisson models are too restricted for practical applications. To include all possible impulse noises, we propose to use a general non-gaussian Lévy processes in the observation model (1.1). In this paper, we consider a nonparametric estimation problem in the adaptive setting, i.e., when the regularity of the signal S is unknown. Moreover, we also assume that the distribution Q of the noise process $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is unknown. It is only known that this distribution belongs to the distribution family $\mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon^*$ defined in the next section. By these reasons, we use the robust estimation approach proposed for nonparametric problems by Galtchouk, Konev and Pergamenschikov in [8, 17, 18]. We set the robust risks as

$$\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\hat{S}_\varepsilon, S) = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon^*} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_\varepsilon, S), \quad (1.2)$$

where \hat{S}_ε is an estimator (i.e., any measurable function of $(y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$),

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_\varepsilon, S) := \mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \|\hat{S}_\varepsilon - S\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|S\|^2 = \int_0^1 S^2(t)dt. \quad (1.3)$$

In this paper, we develop a sharp model selection method for estimating the unknown signal S . The interest to such statistical procedures can be explained by the fact that they provide adaptive solutions for the nonparametric estimation through the non-asymptotic oracle inequalities which give the non-asymptotic upper bound for the quadratic risk including the minimal risk over chosen family of estimators with some coefficient close to one. Such inequalities were obtained, for example, by Galtchouk and Pergamenshchikov [9] for non Gaussian regression models in discrete time and by Konev and Pergamenshchikov [15] for general regression semimartingale models in continuous time. It should be noted that for the first time the model selection methods were proposed by Akaike [1] and Mallows [22] for parametric models. Then, by using the oracle inequalities approach, these methods had been developed for the nonparametric estimation by Barron, Birgé, Massart [2], for Gaussian regression models and by Fourdrinier and Pergamenshchikov [6] for non Gaussian models. We know that an oracle inequality yields the upper bound for the risks via minimal risk corresponding to a chosen estimators family. Unfortunately, the oracle inequalities obtained in these papers can not be used for the efficient estimation in the adaptive setting, since the upper bounds in these inequalities have some fixed coefficients in the main terms which are more than one. In order to provide the efficiency property for model selection procedures, one needs to obtain the sharp oracle inequalities, i.e., in which the coefficient at the principal term on the right-hand side of the inequality is close to one. To obtain such inequalities for general non gaussian observations, one needs to use the model selection method based on the weighted least square estimators proposed by Galtchouk and Pergamenshchikov [9, 10] for the heteroscedastic regression models in discrete time and developed then by Konev and Pergamenshchikov in [15, 16, 17, 18] for semimartingale models in continuous time, i.e., when the observation process is given by the following stochastic differential equation

$$dx_t = S(t)dt + d\eta_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq n, \quad (n \rightarrow \infty), \quad (1.4)$$

where S is an unknown 1 - periodic signal and the unobserved noise $(\eta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is square integrated semi-martingale. Note that, for any $0 < t < 1$, setting $\tilde{x}_t = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n (x_{t+j} - x_j)$, we can represent this model as a model with small parameter of form (1.1)

$$d\tilde{x}_t = S(t)dt + \varepsilon d\tilde{\eta}_t, \quad (1.5)$$

where $\varepsilon = n^{-1/2}$ and $\tilde{\eta}_t = n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (\eta_{t+j} - \eta_j)$. If $(\eta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Lévy process, then $\tilde{\eta}_t$ is Lévy process as well. But the main difference between the models (1.1) and (1.5) is that the jumps in the last one are small, i.e.,

$$\Delta \tilde{\eta}_t = \tilde{\eta}_t - \tilde{\eta}_{t-} = O(n^{-1/2}) = O(\varepsilon) \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (1.6)$$

But there is no such property in model (1.1). It should be noted that property (1.6) is crucial in the non asymptotic analysis for observations on large time intervals, i.e. the methods developed for model (1.4) can not be used for the problem (1.1). Moreover, it should be emphasized that the selection

model methods proposed by Konev and Pergameshchikov for the model (1.4) provide the adaptive efficient estimation only for the case when the Lévy measure is finite. This condition considerably reduces their applications in practical problems. So, the main goal of this paper is to develop a new model selection method for the adaptive efficient signal estimation problem in a nonparametric regression (1.1) for the general Lévy noises without limitations on the jumps. First, we construct some model selection procedures and we show the sharp non asymptotic oracle inequalities for the risks (1.2) and (1.3). To do this in Proposition 3.2 we develop a special analytical tool to study the non asymptotic behavior of the jumps in the model (1.1) with the infinite (or finite) Lévy measure. Moreover, to study the efficiency we develop the Van Trees method for general Lévy processes and we obtain in Proposition 6.1 a new lower bound for quadratic risks in the model (1.1). Then, by making use of this lower bound we find the Pinsker constant. As to the upper bound, similarly to Konev and Pergameshchikov [16], we use the obtained sharp oracle inequality for weight least square estimators containing the efficient Pinsker procedure. Therefore, through oracle inequality, we estimate from above the risk for the constructed model selection procedure by the efficient risk up to some coefficient which goes to one. As a result, we provide the robust efficiency property for the constructed procedure in adaptive setting. As an application for the developed model selection method, in this paper, we consider the signals number detection problem for model (1.1). In many areas of science and technology, this problem arises how to select the number of freedom degrees for a statistical model that most adequately describes phenomena under studies (see, for example, Akaike [1]). An important class of such problems is the detection problem of signals number with unknown parameters observed in multi-path information transmission with noises. For example, in the signal multi-path information transmission, there is a detection problem for the number of rays in the multi-path channel. This problem is often reduced to the detection of the number of signals. As a result, the effective detection algorithms can significantly improve the noise immunity in data transmission over a multi-path channel (see, for example, the papers of Flaksman, Manelis, El-BeMac, Trifonov, Kharin, and Chernoyarov [7, 23, 5, 30, 29, 28, 31, 32]). These problems for signals with unknown amplitudes are discussed by Trifonov and Kharin in [30]. The signal amplitude is an energy parameter because it affects the signal energy. At the same time, quite often, such as in radars studied by El-BeMac in [5], it is necessary to detect the number of signals, which besides an unknown amplitude, it contains non-energy parameters such as the time and directions of the signal arrival, its frequency and initial phase. Moreover, Trifonov, Kharin, Chernoyarov and Kalashnikov in [28] considered this problem with unknown initial phases, in [31] with unknown amplitudes and phases and in [32] the detection signal number problem is considered for orthogonal signals with arbitrary non-energy parameters. In all these papers the signals number detection problems are considered only for observation with Gaussian white noise. In this paper we consider this problem for the non Gaussian impulse noise.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give the main

conditions which will be assumed for the model (1.1). In Section 3, we transform the observation model to delete large jumps and we develop an analytical tool for the Lévy regression models in continuous time which provides to study the non asymptotic behavior for the sum of the deviations of the squares of the stochastic integrals of basic functions with respect to the non Gaussian Lévy processes. In Section 4, we construct the sharp model selection procedure. In Section 5 we give the main results on the sharp oracle inequalities and on the asymptotic robust efficiency. In Section 6 we obtain the van Trees inequality for the general Lévy processes. In Sections 7 and 8, we study the lower and upper bounds for the robust risks. In Section 9, we study the signals number detection problem through the developed model selection method. In Section 10 we give simulations results. Section 11 contains the proofs of all main results. In Appendix, we bring all auxiliary results.

2 Main conditions

In this section we assume that the noise process $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is defined as

$$\xi_t = \varrho_1 w_t + \varrho_2 z_t \quad \text{and} \quad z_t = x * (\mu - \tilde{\mu})_t, \quad (2.1)$$

where, ϱ_1 and ϱ_2 are some unknown constants, $(w_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is a standard brownian motion, $*$ denotes the stochastic integral with respect to the compensated jump measure (see, for example in Jacod and Shiryaev [13] or Cont and Tankov [4] for details), $\mu(ds dx)$ is a jump measure with deterministic compensator $\tilde{\mu}(ds dx) = ds \Pi(dx)$, $\Pi(\cdot)$ is the unknown Lévy measure, i.e. some positive measure on $\mathbb{R}_* = \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, such that

$$\Pi(x^2) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi(x^4) < \infty, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\Pi(|x|^m) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_*} |z|^m \Pi(dz)$. Note that the measure $\Pi(\mathbb{R}_*)$ could be equal to $+\infty$. In the sequel we will denote by Q the distribution of the process $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$. We assume that the parameters ϱ_1 and ϱ_2 satisfy the conditions

$$0 < \check{\varrho}_\varepsilon \leq \varrho_1^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \varkappa_Q = \varrho_1^2 + \varrho_2^2 \leq \varsigma_\varepsilon^*, \quad (2.3)$$

where the bounds $\check{\varrho}_\varepsilon$ and ς_ε^* are such that for any $\mathbf{b} > 0$

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-\mathbf{b}} \check{\varrho}_\varepsilon > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{\mathbf{b}} \varsigma_\varepsilon^* = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

We denote by $\mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon^*$ the family of all distributions Q of the process (2.1) in the Skorokhod space $\mathbf{D}[0, 1]$ for which the conditions (2.3) and (2.4) hold.

3 Transformation of the observations

First of all, we need to eliminate the large jumps in the observations (1.1), i.e. we transform this model as

$$\check{y}_t = y_t - \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} \Delta y_s \mathbf{1}_{\{|\Delta y_s| > \bar{a}\}}. \quad (3.1)$$

The parameter $\bar{a} = \bar{a}_\varepsilon > 0$ will be chosen later. So, we obtain that

$$d\check{y}_t = S(t)dt + \varepsilon d\check{\xi}_t - \varepsilon \varrho_2 \Pi(\bar{h}_\varepsilon) dt, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\check{\xi}_t = \varrho_1 w_t + \varrho_2 \check{z}_t$ and $\check{z}_t = h_\varepsilon * (\mu - \tilde{\mu})_t$. The functions $h_\varepsilon(x) = x \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| \leq \check{v}_\varepsilon\}}$ and $\bar{h}_\varepsilon(x) = x \mathbf{1}_{\{|x| > \check{v}_\varepsilon\}}$ with the truncation threshold $\check{v}_\varepsilon = \bar{a}/|\varrho_2|\varepsilon$.

Remark 3.1. *It should be noted that the sum in the transformation (3.1) is finite since the cadlag process has only finite number of jumps more than some positive threshold in absolute value.*

Let $(\phi_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be an orthonormal basis in $\mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$ with $\phi_1 \equiv 1$. We assume that this basis is uniformly bounded, i.e. for some constant $\phi^* > 0$, which may be dependent on $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq j \leq n} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\phi_j(t)| \leq \phi^* < \infty, \quad (3.3)$$

where $n = n_\varepsilon = [1/\varepsilon^2]$ and $[x]$ denotes integer part of x . For example, we can take the trigonometric basis defined as $\text{Tr}_1 \equiv 1$ and for $j \geq 2$

$$\text{Tr}_j(x) = \sqrt{2} \begin{cases} \cos(2\pi[j/2]x) & \text{for even } j; \\ \sin(2\pi[j/2]x) & \text{for odd } j. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, note that for any $[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ function f from $\mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$ and for any $0 \leq t \leq 1$ the integrals

$$I_t(f) = \int_0^t f(s) d\xi_s \quad \text{and} \quad \check{I}_t(f) = \int_0^t f(s) d\check{\xi}_s \quad (3.5)$$

are well defined with $\mathbf{E} I_t(f) = 0$, $\mathbf{E} \check{I}_t(f) = 0$,

$$\mathbf{E} I_t^2(f) = \varkappa_Q \|f\|_t^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{E} \check{I}_t^2(f) = \check{\varkappa}_Q \|f\|_t^2, \quad (3.6)$$

where $\|f\|_t^2 = \int_0^t f^2(s) ds$ and $\check{\varkappa}_Q = \varrho_1^2 + \varrho_2^2 \Pi(h_\varepsilon^2)$. In the sequel we denote by

$$(f, g)_t = \int_0^t f(s)g(s) ds \quad \text{and} \quad (f, g) = \int_0^1 f(s)g(s) ds.$$

To estimate the function S we use the following Fourier series

$$S(t) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \theta_j \phi_j(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_j = (S, \phi_j). \quad (3.7)$$

These coefficients can be estimated by the following way. The first we estimate as

$$\widehat{\theta}_{1,\varepsilon} = \int_0^1 \phi_1(t) d y_t = \theta_1 + \varepsilon \xi_1$$

and for $j \geq 2$

$$\widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} = \int_0^1 \phi_j(t) d \check{y}_t. \quad (3.8)$$

Taking into account here that for $j \geq 2$ the integral $\int_0^1 \phi_j(t) dt = 0$ we obtain from (3.2) that these Fourier coefficients can be represented as

$$\widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} = \theta_j + \varepsilon \bar{\xi}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\xi}_j = \check{I}_1(\phi_j).$$

Setting $\bar{\xi}_1 = \xi_1$ we obtain that for any $j \geq 1$

$$\widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} = \theta_j + \varepsilon \bar{\xi}_j. \quad (3.9)$$

Now, according to the model selection approach developed in [15, 16] we need to study for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the following functions

$$B_{1,\varepsilon}(u) = \sum_{j=1}^n u_j (\mathbf{E}_Q \bar{\xi}_j^2 - \check{\varkappa}_Q) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{2,\varepsilon}(u) = \sum_{j=1}^n u_j \widetilde{\xi}_j, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\widetilde{\xi}_j = \bar{\xi}_j^2 - \mathbf{E}_Q \bar{\xi}_j^2$.

Proposition 3.1. *The following upper bound holds*

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]^n} |B_{1,\varepsilon}(u)| \leq \varkappa_Q. \quad (3.11)$$

Proof. Note that $|\mathbf{E}_Q \bar{\xi}_1^2 - \check{\varkappa}_Q| = |\mathbf{E}_Q \xi_1^2 - \check{\varkappa}_Q| = \varkappa_Q - \check{\varkappa}_Q \leq \varkappa_Q$ and $\mathbf{E}_Q \bar{\xi}_j^2 = \check{\varkappa}_Q$ for $j \geq 2$. So, from this we immediately obtain the upper bound (3.11). \square
Now, for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we set

$$|u|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n u_j^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \#(u) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{u_j \neq 0\}}. \quad (3.12)$$

Proposition 3.2. *For any fixed truncation parameter $\bar{a} > 0$ and for any vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|u| \leq 1$*

$$\mathbf{E}_Q B_{2,\varepsilon}^2(u) \leq U_Q + 6\check{\varkappa}_Q \left(\frac{\bar{a}}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 \#(u) (\phi^*)^4, \quad (3.13)$$

where $U_Q = 24\varkappa_Q^2 + 6\rho_2^4 \Pi(x^4)$.

Remark 3.2. *It should be noted that the last term in the non asymptotic upper bound (3.13) is appeared due to the influence of the jumps in the observations (1.1). Note that we will use the upper bounds (3.11) – (3.13) to obtain the non asymptotic sharp oracle inequalities.*

4 Model selection

We estimate the function $S(x)$ for $x \in [0, 1]$ by the weighted least squares estimator

$$\widehat{S}_\lambda(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} \phi_j(x), \quad (4.1)$$

where $n = [1/\varepsilon^2]$, the weights $\lambda = (\lambda(j))_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ belong to some finite set Λ from $[0, 1]^n$, $\widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon}$ is defined in (3.8) and ϕ_j in (3.4). Now we set

$$\iota = \text{card}(\Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad |\Lambda|_* = \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\lambda_j > 0\}}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\text{card}(\Lambda)$ is the number of the vectors in Λ . In the sequel we assume that ι is a function of $\varepsilon > 0$, i.e. $\iota = \iota(\varepsilon)$, such that for any $\mathbf{b} > 0$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{\mathbf{b}} \iota(\varepsilon) = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Now we chose the truncating parameter \overline{a}_ε as

$$\overline{a}_\varepsilon = \frac{\varepsilon}{|\Lambda|_*}. \quad (4.4)$$

To choose a weight sequence λ in the set Λ we use the empirical quadratic risk, defined as

$$\text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda) = \|\widehat{S}_\lambda - S\|^2,$$

which in our case is equal to

$$\text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda^2(j) \widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon}^2 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} \theta_j + \sum_{j=1}^\infty \theta_j^2. \quad (4.5)$$

Since the Fourier coefficients $(\theta_j)_{j \geq 1}$ are unknown, we replace the terms $\widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} \theta_j$ by

$$\widetilde{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} = \widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon}^2 - \varepsilon^2 \widehat{\varkappa}_\varepsilon, \quad (4.6)$$

where $\widehat{\varkappa}_\varepsilon$ is a some estimate for the variance parameter \varkappa_Q from (3.6). If it is known we set $\widehat{\varkappa}_\varepsilon = \varkappa_Q$ if not this estimator will be prescribed later.

Remark 4.1. *To understand the estimate (4.6) note that the natural way is to replace in the production $\widehat{\theta}_j \theta_j$ the unknown coefficient θ_j with its estimator $\widehat{\theta}_j$, so we obtain $\widehat{\theta}_j^2$. But this is not good estimator for the production since in vue of (3.9) we obtain $\mathbf{E}_Q \widehat{\theta}_j \theta_j = \theta_j^2$, but $\mathbf{E}_Q \widehat{\theta}_j^2 = \theta_j^2 + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{E}_Q \xi_j^2$. Therefore, to obtain unbiased estimator for the production $\widehat{\theta}_j \theta_j$ for $j \geq 2$ one needs to subtract the variance $\varepsilon^2 \varkappa_Q$ if \varkappa_Q is known and its estimate if non. This gives the form (4.6). It should be noted also that we don't take into account the first term, i.e. the case $j = 1$. But only one term has not sufficient influence in the total sum, i.e. it is negligible in the empiric risk (4.5).*

Finally, to choose the weights we will minimize the following cost function

$$J_\varepsilon(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda^2(j) \hat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon}^2 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \tilde{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} + \delta \hat{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda), \quad (4.7)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is some threshold which will be specified later and the penalty term

$$\hat{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda) = \varepsilon^2 \hat{\varkappa}_\varepsilon |\lambda|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\lambda|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^2. \quad (4.8)$$

Note that, if the \varkappa_Q is known then the penalty term is defined as

$$P_\varepsilon(\lambda) = \varepsilon^2 \varkappa_Q |\lambda|^2. \quad (4.9)$$

We define the model selection procedure as

$$\hat{S}_* = \hat{S}_{\hat{\lambda}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\lambda} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J_\varepsilon(\lambda). \quad (4.10)$$

We recall that the set Λ is finite so $\hat{\lambda}$ exists. In the case when $\hat{\lambda}$ is not unique we take one of them.

Now we estimate the variance parameter \varkappa_Q defined in (3.6). To this end for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1/\sqrt{3}$, we set

$$\hat{\varkappa}_\varepsilon = \sum_{j=[1/\varepsilon]+1}^n \hat{\tau}_{j,\varepsilon}^2, \quad n = [1/\varepsilon^2], \quad (4.11)$$

where $\hat{\tau}_{j,\varepsilon}$ are the estimators for the Fourier coefficients τ_j with respect to the trigonometric basis (3.4), i.e.

$$\hat{\tau}_{j,\varepsilon} = \int_0^1 \operatorname{Tr}_j(t) d\tilde{y}_t \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_j = \int_0^1 S(t) \operatorname{Tr}_j(t) dt. \quad (4.12)$$

We study this estimator.

Proposition 4.1. *Assume that in the model (1.1) the unknown function $S(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable. Then, for any $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1/\sqrt{3}$*

$$\mathbf{E}_Q |\hat{\varkappa}_\varepsilon - \varkappa_Q| \leq \varepsilon \Upsilon_Q(S) + \frac{\sqrt{6\varkappa_Q}}{|\Lambda|_*}, \quad (4.13)$$

where $\Upsilon_Q(S) = 4(\|\dot{S}\| + 1)^2 \left(1 + \sqrt{\varkappa_Q} + 2\varkappa_Q + \sqrt{U_Q}\right)$ and \dot{S} is the derivative of the function S .

The proof of this proposition is given in Section 11. It is clear that in the case when $|\Lambda|_* \leq 1/\varepsilon$ we obtain that

$$\mathbf{E}_Q |\hat{\varkappa}_\varepsilon - \varkappa_Q| \leq \frac{\Upsilon_Q(S) + \sqrt{6\varkappa_Q}}{|\Lambda|_*}. \quad (4.14)$$

Remark 4.2. It should be noted that to estimate the parameter \mathfrak{K}_Q we use the equality (3.9) for the Fourier coefficients $(\tau_j)_{j \geq 1}$ with respect to the trigonometric basis (3.4). Moreover, as is shown in Lemma A.6 in [15] for any continuously differentiable function S and for any $m \geq 1$ the sum $\sum_{j \geq m} \tau_j^2$ can be estimated from above in the explicit form. So, taking this into account and the properties (3.13) we the upper bound (4.13).

Now, we specify the weight coefficients $(\lambda(j))_{1 \leq j \leq n}$. Consider a numerical grid of the form

$$\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, k^*\} \times \{r_1, \dots, r_{\mathbf{m}}\}, \quad (4.15)$$

where $r_i = i \varpi$ and $\mathbf{m} = [1/\varpi^2]$. We assume that both the parameters $k^* \geq 1$ and $0 < \varpi < 1$ are functions of ε , i.e. $k^* = k_\varepsilon^*$ and $\varpi = \varpi_\varepsilon$ such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{k_\varepsilon^*} + \frac{k_\varepsilon^*}{|\ln \varepsilon|} \right) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(\varpi_\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon^{\mathbf{b}}}{\varpi_\varepsilon} \right) = 0 \quad (4.16)$$

for any $\mathbf{b} > 0$. One can take, for example, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$

$$\varpi_\varepsilon = |\ln \varepsilon|^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad k_\varepsilon^* = k_0^* + \sqrt{|\ln \varepsilon|}, \quad (4.17)$$

where $k_0^* \geq 0$ is some fixed constant. For each $\alpha = (\beta, r) \in \mathcal{A}$, we introduce the weights $\lambda_\alpha = (\lambda_\alpha(j))_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ from \mathbb{R}^n as

$$\lambda_\alpha(j) = \mathbf{1}_{\{1 \leq j < j_*\}} + (1 - (j/\omega_\alpha)^\beta) \mathbf{1}_{\{j_* \leq j \leq \omega_\alpha\}}, \quad (4.18)$$

where $j_* = j_*(\alpha) = [\omega_\alpha / |\ln \varepsilon|]$, $\omega_\alpha = d_\beta(r v_\varepsilon)^{1/(2\beta+1)}$,

$$d_\beta = \left(\frac{(\beta+1)(2\beta+1)}{\pi^{2\beta}\beta} \right)^{1/(2\beta+1)}, \quad v_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2 \zeta_\varepsilon^*} \quad (4.19)$$

and the threshold ζ_ε^* is introduced in (2.3). Now we define the set Λ as

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda_\alpha, \alpha \in \mathcal{A}\}. \quad (4.20)$$

Note that in this case $\iota = k^* \mathbf{m}$ and the conditions (4.16) imply directly the property (4.3). Moreover, from (4.18) we find that for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_\alpha(j) \leq \omega_\alpha \leq d_* r_{\mathbf{m}}^{1/3} v_\varepsilon^{1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad d_* = \sup_{\beta \geq 1} d_\beta.$$

Therefore, the conditions (4.16) imply that for any $\mathbf{b} > 0$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{2/3+\mathbf{b}} |\Lambda|_* = 0. \quad (4.21)$$

Remark 4.3. The parameters β and r are defined by the regularity of the unknown function S (see for the details Remark 5.3 below). It should be emphasized that the weight coefficients defined by the set (4.20) are used by Konev and Pergamenschikov in [17, 18] for continuous time regression models to show the asymptotic efficiency.

5 Main results

5.1 Oracle inequalities

First we set the following constant which will be used to describe the rest term in the oracle inequalities. We set

$$\Psi_{Q,\varepsilon} = (1 + (\phi^*)^4) \left(1 + \varkappa_Q^2 + \frac{1}{\varkappa_Q} \right) \iota. \quad (5.1)$$

We start with the sharp oracle inequalities.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that for the model (1.1) the condition (2.2) holds. Then there exists a constant $\mathbf{l}_* > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < 1/6$, the estimator of S given in (4.10) with the truncation parameter (4.4) satisfies the following oracle inequality*

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_*, S) \leq \frac{1 + 3\delta}{1 - 3\delta} \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_\lambda, S) + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{l}_* \frac{\Psi_{Q,\varepsilon} + |\Lambda|_* \mathbf{E}_S |\hat{\varkappa}_\varepsilon - \varkappa_Q|}{\delta}. \quad (5.2)$$

If the parameter \varkappa_Q is known, we can simplify this inequality.

Corollary 5.2. *Assume that for the model (1.1) the condition (2.2) holds. If the variance parameter \varkappa_Q is known, then there exists a constant $\mathbf{l}_* > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < 1/6$, the estimator of S given in (4.10) with the truncation parameter (4.4) satisfies the following oracle inequality*

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_*, S) \leq \frac{1 + 3\delta}{1 - 3\delta} \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_\lambda, S) + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{l}_* \frac{\Psi_{Q,\varepsilon}}{\delta}. \quad (5.3)$$

Remark 5.1. *It should be noted that in the classical "signal+white noise" model, i.e. when in the process (2.1) the parameter $\varrho_1 = 1$ and the Levy measure $\Pi = 0$, we obtain $\varkappa_Q = 1$. Therefore, we can use the inequality (5.3).*

Using Proposition 4.1 we can obtain the following inequality.

Theorem 5.3. *Assume that for the model (1.1) the condition (2.2) holds and the unknown signal $S(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable $[0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ function. Then there exists a some constant $\mathbf{l}_* > 0$ such that for any $0 < \delta < 1/6$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, for which $|\Lambda|_* \leq 1/\varepsilon$, the estimator of S given in (4.10) with the truncation parameter (4.4) satisfies the following oracle inequality*

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_*, S) \leq \frac{1 + 3\delta}{1 - 3\delta} \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_\lambda, S) + \varepsilon^2 \mathbf{l}_* \frac{\Psi_{Q,\varepsilon} (\|\dot{S}\| + 1)^2}{\delta}. \quad (5.4)$$

Now we study the robust risks defined in (1.2) for the procedure (4.10).

Moreover, we assume also that the upper bound for the basis functions in (3.3) may be dependent on $\varepsilon > 0$, i.e. $\phi_* = \phi_*(\varepsilon)$, such that for any $\mathbf{b} > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varepsilon^{\mathbf{b}} \phi_*(\varepsilon) = 0. \quad (5.5)$$

Theorem 5.4. Assume that for the model (1.1) the condition (2.2) holds and the unknown function $S(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable. Then for any $0 < \delta < 1/6$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$ for which $|\Lambda|_* \leq 1/\varepsilon$, the robust risks for the procedure (4.10) with the truncation parameter (4.4) satisfies the following oracle inequality

$$\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\widehat{S}_*, S) \leq \frac{1 + 3\delta}{1 - 3\delta} \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\widehat{S}_\lambda, S) + \varepsilon^2 \frac{\mathbf{U}_\varepsilon^*(S)}{\delta}, \quad (5.6)$$

where the term $\mathbf{U}_\varepsilon^*(S) > 0$ is such that under the conditions (4.3) and (5.5) for any $r > 0$ and $\mathbf{b} > 0$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{\mathbf{b}} \sup_{\|\dot{S}\| \leq r} \mathbf{U}_\varepsilon^*(S) = 0. \quad (5.7)$$

Now taking into account the property (4.21) we can deduce the following theorem for the procedure (4.10) with the weight coefficients (4.20).

Theorem 5.5. Assume that for the model (1.1) the condition (2.2) holds. Then the model selection procedure (4.10) constructed on the basis functions satisfying the condition (5.5) and through the weight coefficients (4.20) with the conditions (4.16) satisfies the oracle inequality (5.6) with the property (5.7).

Remark 5.2. Note that the similar sharp oracle inequalities were obtained in the papers [9] and [17] for the model selection procedures based on the trigonometric basis functions (3.4). In this paper we obtain these inequalities for the model selection procedures based on any arbitrary orthogonal basic function in $\mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$. We use the trigonometric functions only to estimate the noise parameter $\check{\kappa}_Q$.

5.2 Adaptive robust efficiency

Now we study the asymptotically efficiency properties for the procedure (4.10), (4.18) with respect to the robust risks (1.2) defined by the distribution family (2.3) – (2.4). To this end we assume that the unknown function (3.7) belongs to the following ellipsoid in l_2

$$W_{\mathbf{r}}^k = \{S \in \mathbf{L}_2[0, 1] : \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \theta_j^2 \leq \mathbf{r}\} \quad (5.8)$$

where $a_j = \sum_{i=0}^k (2\pi[j/2])^{2i}$.

It is easy to see that in the case when the functions $(\phi_j)_{j \geq 1}$ are trigonometric (3.4), then this set coincides with the Sobolev ball

$$W_{\mathbf{r}}^k = \{f \in \mathbf{C}_{per}^k[0, 1] : \sum_{j=0}^k \|f^{(j)}\|^2 \leq \mathbf{r}\}, \quad (5.9)$$

where $\mathbf{r} > 0$ and $k \geq 1$ are some parameters, $\mathbf{C}_{per}^k[0, 1]$ is the set of k times continuously differentiable functions $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f^{(i)}(0) = f^{(i)}(1)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$. Similarly to [17, 18] we will show here that the asymptotic sharp lower bound for the robust risk (1.2) is given by

$$l_*(\mathbf{r}) = ((2k+1)\mathbf{r})^{1/(2k+1)} \left(\frac{k}{(k+1)\pi} \right)^{2k/(2k+1)}. \quad (5.10)$$

Note that this is the well-known Pinsker constant obtained for the nonadaptive filtration problem in “signal + small white noise” model (see, for example, [27]). Let \mathcal{S}_ε be the set of all estimators \hat{S}_ε measurable with respect to the sigma-algebra $\sigma\{y_t, 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ generated by the process (1.1).

Theorem 5.6. *For the distribution family (2.3) – (2.4). the robust risk admits the following lower bound*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} v_\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+1)} \inf_{\hat{S}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon} \sup_{S \in W_r^k} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\hat{S}_\varepsilon, S) \geq l_*(\mathbf{r}), \quad (5.11)$$

where the rate v_ε is given in (4.19), i.e. $v_\varepsilon = (\varepsilon^2 \varsigma_\varepsilon^*)^{-1}$.

We set the parameter δ in (4.7) as function of ε , i.e. $\delta = \delta_\varepsilon$ is such that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_\varepsilon = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-\mathbf{b}} \delta_\varepsilon = +\infty \quad (5.12)$$

for any $\mathbf{b} > 0$. For example, we can take $\delta_\varepsilon = (6 + |\ln \varepsilon|)^{-1}$.

Theorem 5.7. *Assume that for the model (1.1) the condition (2.2) holds. Then the model selection procedure (4.10) constructed on the basis functions satisfying the condition (5.5) and through the weight coefficients (4.20) with the conditions (4.16) admits the following asymptotic upper bound*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} v_\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+1)} \sup_{S \in W_r^k} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\hat{S}_*, S) \leq l_*(\mathbf{r}). \quad (5.13)$$

Theorem 5.6 and Theorem 5.7 imply the following result

Corollary 5.8. *Under the conditions Theorem 5.7*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} v_\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+1)} \inf_{\hat{S}_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon} \sup_{S \in W_r^k} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\hat{S}_\varepsilon, S) = l_*(\mathbf{r}). \quad (5.14)$$

Remark 5.3. *It should be noted (see, for example, Pinsker [27]). that if the parameters k and r of the Sobolev ball (5.8) are known, then to obtain the efficient estimation it suffice to chose the weight least square estimator (4.1) with the weights (4.18) and $\alpha = (k, r)$. In the adaptive estimation case, i.e. when these parameters are unknown we propose to use the selection model procedure for the family $(\hat{S}_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ which contains the efficient estimator. Then, the efficiency property is provided through the sharp oracle inequalities. Moreover, note*

also that the optimal (minimax) risk convergence rate for the Sobolev ball W_r^k is $\varepsilon^{-4k/(2k+1)}$. We see here that the efficient robust rate is $v_\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+1)}$, i.e. if the distribution upper bound $\zeta_\varepsilon^* \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain the more rapid rate with respect to $\varepsilon^{-4k/(2k+1)}$, and if $\zeta_\varepsilon^* \rightarrow \infty$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we obtain the more slow rate. In the case when ζ_ε^* is constant the robuste rate is the same as the classical non robuste convergence rate.

6 The van Trees inequality for Lévy processes.

In this section we consider the following continuous time parametric regression model

$$dy_t = S(t, \theta)dt + d\xi_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1, \quad (6.1)$$

where $S(t, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i \phi_i(t)$ with the unknown parameters $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)'$ and the process $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is defined in (2.1). Note now that according to Proposition A.2 the distribution \mathbf{P}_θ of the process (6.1) is absolutely continuous with respect to the \mathbf{P}_ξ on $\mathbf{D}[0, 1]$ and the corresponding Radon-Nikodym derivative is

$$f(x, \theta) = \frac{d\mathbf{P}_\theta}{d\mathbf{P}_\xi}(x) = \exp \left\{ \int_0^1 \frac{S(t, \theta)}{\varrho_1^2} dx_t^c - \int_0^1 \frac{S^2(t, \theta)}{2\varrho_1^2} dt \right\}, \quad (6.2)$$

where $(x_t^c)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is the continuous part of the process $(x_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ in $\mathbf{D}[0, T]$, i.e.

$$x_t^c = x_t - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}} v (\mu_x(ds, dv) - \Pi(dv)ds)$$

and for any $t > 0$ and any measurable Γ from $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$

$$\mu_x([0, t], \Gamma) = \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta x_s \in \varrho_2 \Gamma\}}.$$

Let Φ be a prior density on \mathbb{R}^d having the following form:

$$\Phi(\theta) = \Phi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d) = \prod_{j=1}^d \varphi_j(\theta_j),$$

where φ_j is some continuously differentiable density in \mathbb{R} . Moreover, let $g(\theta)$ be a continuously differentiable $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ function such that, for each $1 \leq j \leq d$,

$$\lim_{|\theta_j| \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta) \varphi_j(\theta_j) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g'_j(\theta)| \Phi(\theta) d\theta < \infty, \quad (6.3)$$

where

$$g'_j(\theta) = \frac{\partial g(\theta)}{\partial \theta_j}.$$

For any $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable integrable function $H = H(x, \theta)$ we denote

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf{E}} H &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathcal{X}} H(x, \theta) d\mathbf{P}_\theta \Phi(\theta) d\theta \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathcal{X}} H(x, \theta) f(x, \theta) \Phi(\theta) d\mathbf{P}_\xi(x) d\theta,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{D}[0, 1]$.

Proposition 6.1. *For any $\mathcal{F}^y = \sigma\{y_t : 0 \leq t \leq 1\}$ -measurable square integrable function \hat{g} and for any $1 \leq j \leq d$, the following inequality holds*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}(\hat{g} - g(\theta))^2 \geq \frac{\Lambda_j^2}{\|\phi_j\|^2 \varrho_1^{-2} + I_j}, \quad (6.4)$$

where

$$\lambda_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g'_j(\theta) \Phi(\theta) d\theta \quad \text{and} \quad I_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\dot{\varphi}_j^2(z)}{\varphi_j(z)} dz.$$

Proof. First of all note that, the density (6.2) on the process ξ is bounded with respect to $\theta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any $1 \leq j \leq d$

$$\limsup_{|\theta_j| \rightarrow \infty} f(\xi, \theta) = 0. \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Now, we set

$$\tilde{\Phi}_j = \tilde{\Phi}_j(x, \theta) = \frac{\partial(f(x, \theta)\Phi(\theta))/\partial\theta_j}{f(x, \theta)\Phi(\theta)}.$$

Taking into account the condition (6.3) and integrating by parts yield

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\left((\hat{g} - g(\theta))\tilde{\Phi}_j\right) &= \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^d} ((\hat{g}(x) - g(\theta)) \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_j} (f(x, \theta)\Phi(\theta)) d\theta \mathbf{P}_\xi(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^{d-1}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} g'_j(\theta) f(x, \theta) \Phi(\theta) d\theta_j \right) \left(\prod_{i \neq j} d\theta_i \right) \mathbf{P}_\xi(dx) = \lambda_j.\end{aligned}$$

Now by the Bouniakovskii-Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we obtain the following lower bound for the quadratic risk

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}((\hat{g} - g(\theta))^2) \geq \frac{\Lambda_j^2}{\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\tilde{\Phi}_j^2}.$$

To study the denominator in the left hand of this inequality note that in view of the representation (6.2)

$$\frac{1}{f(y, \theta)} \frac{\partial f(y, \theta)}{\partial\theta_j} = \frac{1}{\varrho_1} \int_0^1 \phi_j(t) dw_t.$$

Therefore, for each $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathbf{E}_\theta \frac{1}{f(y, \theta)} \frac{\partial f(y, \theta)}{\partial \theta_j} = 0$$

and

$$\mathbf{E}_\theta \left(\frac{1}{f(y, \theta)} \frac{\partial f(y, \theta)}{\partial \theta_j} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{\varrho_1^2} \int_0^1 \phi_j^2(t) dt = \frac{1}{\varrho_1^2} \|\phi_j\|^2.$$

Taking into account that

$$\tilde{\Phi}_j = \frac{1}{f(x, \theta)} \frac{\partial f(x, \theta)}{\partial \theta_j} + \frac{1}{\Phi(\theta)} \frac{\partial \Phi(\theta)}{\partial \theta_j},$$

we get

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}} \tilde{\Phi}_j^2 = \frac{1}{\varrho_1^2} \|\phi_j\|^2 + I_j.$$

Hence Proposition 6.1. \square

Remark 6.1. *Note that, the lower bound (6.4) is an extension for the van Trees inequality used for the "signal+white noise" model (see, for example, the inequality (A.5) in [16]).*

7 Lower bound

Firstly, note, that for any fixed $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon^*$

$$\sup_{S \in W_\tau^k} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\hat{S}_\varepsilon, S) \geq \sup_{S \in W_\tau^k} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_\varepsilon, S). \quad (7.1)$$

Now for any fixed $0 < \tilde{\gamma} < 1$ we set

$$d = d_\varepsilon = \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{k} v_\varepsilon^{1/(2k+1)} l_*(r_0) \right\rceil \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{r}_0 = (1 - \tilde{\gamma}) \mathbf{r}. \quad (7.2)$$

Using this definition we introduce the parametric family $(S_z)_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ as

$$S_z(x) = \sum_{j=1}^d z_j \phi_j(x). \quad (7.3)$$

To define the bayesian risk we choose a prior distribution on \mathbb{R}^d as

$$\kappa = (\kappa_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_j = s_j \eta_j, \quad (7.4)$$

where η_j are i.i.d. gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ random variables and the coefficients

$$s_j = \sqrt{\frac{s_j^*}{v_\varepsilon}} \quad \text{and} \quad s_j^* = \left(\frac{d}{j} \right)^k - 1.$$

Denoting by μ_κ the distribution of the random variables $(\kappa_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d}$ on \mathbb{R}^d we introduce the Bayes risk as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_Q(\hat{S}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}, S_z) \mu_\kappa(dz). \quad (7.5)$$

Furthermore, for any function $f \in \mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$, we denote by $\mathbf{p}(f)$ its projection in $\mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$ onto $W_{k,r}$, i.e.

$$\|f - \mathbf{p}(f)\| = \inf_{h \in W_r^k} \|f - h\|.$$

Since W_r^k is a convex and closed set in $\mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$, this projector exists and is unique for any function $f \in \mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$ and, moreover,

$$\|f - h\|^2 \geq \|\mathbf{p}(f) - h\|^2 \quad \text{for any } h \in W_r^k.$$

So, setting $\hat{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{p}(\hat{S})$, we obtain that

$$\sup_{S \in W_r^k} \mathcal{R}(\hat{S}, S) \geq \int_{\{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : S_z \in W_r^k\}} \mathbf{E}_{S_z} \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - S_z\|^2 \mu_\kappa(dz).$$

Taking into account now that $\|\hat{\mathbf{p}}\|^2 \leq \mathbf{r}$ we obtain

$$\sup_{S \in W_r^k} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}, S) \geq \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_Q(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) - 2\Delta_\varepsilon \quad (7.6)$$

and

$$\Delta_\varepsilon = \int_{\{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : S_z \notin W_{k,r}\}} (\mathbf{r} + \|S_z\|^2) \mu_\kappa(dz).$$

Therefore, in view of (7.1),

$$\sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\hat{S}_\varepsilon, S) \geq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon^*} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_Q(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) - 2\Delta_\varepsilon. \quad (7.7)$$

As to the last term in this inequality, in Appendix we show that for any $\mathbf{b} > 0$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon^{-\mathbf{b}} \Delta_\varepsilon = 0. \quad (7.8)$$

Now it is easy to see that

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - S_z\|^2 \geq \sum_{j=1}^d (\hat{z}_j - z_j)^2,$$

where $\hat{z}_j = \int_0^1 \hat{\mathbf{p}}(t) \phi_j(t) dt$. So, in view of Proposition 6.1 and reminding that $v_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-2}/\zeta_\varepsilon^*$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon^*} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_Q(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) &\geq \sup_{0 < \varrho_1^2 \leq \zeta_\varepsilon^*} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{-2} \varrho_1^{-2} + v_\varepsilon (s_j^*)^{-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{v_\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{s_j^*}{s_j^* + 1} = \frac{1}{v_\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d \left(1 - \frac{j^k}{d_\varepsilon^k}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using now the definition (7.2), the inequality (7.7) and the limit (7.8), we obtain that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\hat{S} \in \Pi_\varepsilon} v_\varepsilon^{\frac{2k}{2k+1}} \sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\hat{S}_\varepsilon, S) \geq (1 - \check{\gamma})^{\frac{1}{2k+1}} l_*(\mathbf{r}).$$

Taking here limit as $\check{\gamma} \rightarrow 0$ implies Theorem 5.6 . \square

8 Upper bound

First of all we recall the Novikov inequalities, [25], also referred to as the Bichteler–Jacod inequalities, see [3, 24], providing bounds of the moments of the supremum of purely discontinuous local martingales for $p \geq 2$

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{t \leq 1} |g * (\mu - \tilde{\mu})_t|^p \leq C_p^* \left(\mathbf{E} (|g|^2 * \tilde{\mu}_1)^{p/2} + \mathbf{E} (|g|^p * \tilde{\mu}_1) \right), \quad (8.1)$$

where C_p^* is some positive constant.

8.1 Known smoothness

First we suppose that the parameters $k \geq 1$, $\mathbf{r} > 0$ in (5.9) and ς_ε^* in (2.3) are known. Let the family of admissible weighted least squares estimates $(\hat{S}_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ given by (4.20). Consider the pair

$$\check{\alpha} = (k, \check{r}) \quad \text{and} \quad \check{r} = \varpi \lfloor \mathbf{r}/\varpi \rfloor.$$

Denote the corresponding estimate as

$$\check{S} = \hat{S}_{\check{\lambda}} \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\lambda} = \lambda_{\check{\alpha}}. \quad (8.2)$$

Note that for sufficiently small ε the pair $\check{\alpha}$ belongs to the set (4.15).

Theorem 8.1. *The estimator \check{S} admits the following asymptotic upper bound*

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} v_\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+1)} \sup_{S \in W_{\mathbf{r}}^k} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\check{S}, S) \leq l_*(\mathbf{r}). \quad (8.3)$$

Proof. Substituting (3.9) and taking into account the definition (8.2) one gets

$$\|\check{S} - S\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - \check{\lambda}(j))^2 \theta_j^2 - 2\check{M}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \check{\lambda}^2(j) \check{\xi}_j^2,$$

where $\check{M}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (1 - \check{\lambda}(j)) \check{\lambda}(j) \theta_j \bar{\xi}_j$. Note now that for any $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon^*$ the expectation $\mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \check{M}_\varepsilon = 0$ and, in view of the upper bound (2.3),

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_\varepsilon^*} \mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \check{\lambda}^2(j) \check{\xi}_j^2 \leq \varsigma_\varepsilon^* \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \check{\lambda}^2(j).$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\check{S}, S) \leq \sum_{j=\check{j}_*}^{\infty} (1 - \check{\lambda}(j))^2 \theta_j^2 + \frac{1}{v_\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \check{\lambda}^2(j), \quad (8.4)$$

where $\check{j}_* = j_*(\check{\alpha})$. Setting

$$\mathbf{u}_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+1)} \sup_{j \geq \check{j}_*} (1 - \check{\lambda}(j))^2 / a_j,$$

we obtain that for each $S \in W_r^k$

$$\Upsilon_{1,\varepsilon}(S) = v_\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+1)} \sum_{j=\check{i}}^{\infty} (1 - \check{\lambda}(j))^2 \theta_j^2 \leq \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon \sum_{j=\check{i}}^{\infty} a_j \theta_j^2 \leq \mathbf{u}_\varepsilon r.$$

Taking into account that $\check{r} \rightarrow r$, we obtain that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sup_{S \in W_r^k} \Upsilon_{1,\varepsilon}(S) \leq \frac{r^{1/(2k+1)}}{\pi^{2k} (\mathbf{d}_k)^{2k/(2k+1)}} := \Upsilon_1^*.$$

To estimate the last term in the right hand of (8.4), we set

$$\Upsilon_{2,\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{v_\varepsilon^{1/(2k+1)}} \sum_{j=1}^n \check{\lambda}^2(j).$$

It is easy to check that

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \Upsilon_{2,\varepsilon} \leq \frac{2(\mathbf{rd}_k)^{1/(2k+1)} k^2}{(k+1)(2k+1)} := \Upsilon_2^*.$$

Therefore, taking into account that by the definition of the Pinsker constant in (5.10) $\Upsilon_1^* + \Upsilon_2^* = l_*(\mathbf{r})$, we arrive at the inequality

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} v_\varepsilon^{2k/(2k+1)} \sup_{S \in W_r^k} \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\check{S}, S) \leq l_*(\mathbf{r}).$$

Hence Theorem 8.1. \square

8.2 Unknown smoothness

Combining Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 8.1 yields Theorem 5.7. \square

9 Signals number detection

In this section we consider the estimation problem for the signals number in the multi-path connection channel. In the framework of the statistical radio-physics models we study the telecommunication system in which we observe the

summarized signal in the multi-path channel with noise on the time interval $[0, 1]$:

$$y_t = \sum_{j=1}^q \theta_j \phi_j(t) + \nu_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1,$$

where $(\nu_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the gaussian white noise. The energetic parameters $(\theta_j)_{j \geq 1}$, and the number of signals q are unknown and the signals $(\phi_j)_{j \geq 1}$ are known orthonormal functions, i.e.

$$\int_0^1 \phi_i(t) \phi_j(t) dt = \mathbf{1}_{\{i=j\}}.$$

The problem is to estimate q when signal/noise ratio goes to infinity. To describe this problem in a mathematical framework one has to use the following stochastic differential equation

$$dy_t = \left(\sum_{j=1}^q \theta_j \phi_j(t) \right) dt + \varepsilon dw_t, \quad (9.1)$$

where $(w_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is the standard brownian motion and the parameter $\varepsilon > 0$ is the noise intensity. We study this model when the signal/noise ration goes to infinity, i.e. $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The logarithm of the likelihood ratio for model (9.1) can be represented as

$$\ln L_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{j=1}^q \theta_j \int_0^1 \phi_j(t) dy_t - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} \sum_{j=1}^q \theta_j^2.$$

If we try to construct the maximum likelihood estimators for $(\theta_j)_{1 \leq j \leq q}$ and q , then we obtain that

$$\max_{1 \leq q \leq q_*} \max_{\theta_j} \ln L_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2\varepsilon^2} \sum_{j=1}^{q_*} \left(\int_0^1 \phi_j(t) dy_t \right)^2.$$

Therefore, the maximum likelihood estimation for $\hat{q} = q^*$. So, if $q^* = \infty$ we obtain that $\hat{q} = \infty$. Thus, this estimator gives nothing, i.e. it does not work. By these reasons we propose to study the estimation problem for q for the process (9.1) in a nonparametric setting and to apply the model selection procedure (4.10). To this end we consider the model (1.1) with the unknown function S defined as

$$S(t) = \sum_{j=1}^q \theta_j \phi_j(t). \quad (9.2)$$

For this problem we use the LSE family $(\hat{S}_d)_{1 \leq d \leq m}$ defined as

$$\hat{S}_d(x) = \sum_{j=1}^d \hat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} \phi_j(x). \quad (9.3)$$

This estimate can be obtained from (3.2) with the weights $\lambda_d(j) = \chi\{j \leq d\}$. The number of estimators ι satisfies the condition (4.3). As a risk for the signals number we use

$$\mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(d, q) = \mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\hat{S}_d, S), \quad (9.4)$$

where the risk $\mathcal{R}_\varepsilon^*(\hat{S}, S)$ is defined in (1.2) and d is an integer number (maybe random) from the set $\{1, \dots, \iota\}$. In this case the cost function (4.7) has the following form.

$$J_\varepsilon(d) = \sum_{j=1}^d \hat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon}^2 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^d \tilde{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} + \delta \hat{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda). \quad (9.5)$$

So, for this problem the LSE model selection procedure is defined as

$$\hat{q}_\varepsilon = \operatorname{argmin}_{1 \leq d \leq \iota} J_\varepsilon(d). \quad (9.6)$$

Note that Theorem 5.4 implies that the robust risks of the procedure (4.10) with $|\Lambda|_* \leq 1/\varepsilon$, for any $0 < \delta < 1/6$, satisfy the following oracle inequality

$$\mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(\hat{q}_\varepsilon, q) \leq \frac{1 + 3\delta}{1 - 3\delta} \min_{1 \leq d \leq \iota} \mathbf{D}_\varepsilon(d, q) + \varepsilon^2 \frac{\mathbf{U}_\varepsilon^*(S)}{\delta}, \quad (9.7)$$

where the last term satisfies the property (5.7).

10 Simulations

In this section we report the results of a Monte Carlo experiment to assess the performance of the proposed model selection procedure (4.10). In (1.1) we chose

$$S(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{10} \frac{j}{j+1} \phi_j(t), \quad (10.1)$$

with $\phi_j(t) = \sqrt{2} \sin(2\pi l_j t)$, $l_j = [\sqrt{j}]j$. We simulate the model

$$dy_t = S(t)dt + \varepsilon dw_t.$$

The frequency of observations per period equals $p = 100000$. We use the weight sequence as proposed in [9] for a discrete time model: $k^* = 100 + \sqrt{|\ln \varepsilon|}$ and $m = \lceil |\ln \varepsilon|^2 \rceil$. We calculated the empirical quadratic risk defined as

$$\bar{\mathbf{R}} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{\mathbf{E}} \left(\tilde{S}_\varepsilon(u_j) - S(u_j) \right)^2, \quad u_j = j/p,$$

and the relative quadratic risk

$$\bar{\mathbf{R}}_* = \bar{\mathbf{R}} / \|S\|_p^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|S\|_p^2 = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p S^2(u_j).$$

The expectations was taken as an average over $N = 10000$ replications, i.e.

$$\hat{\mathbf{E}} \left(\tilde{S}_\varepsilon(\cdot) - S(\cdot) \right)^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \left(\tilde{S}_\varepsilon^l(\cdot) - S(\cdot) \right)^2 .$$

We used the cost function with $\delta = (3 + |\ln \varepsilon|)^{-2}$.

Table : Empirical risks

ε	$\overline{\mathbf{R}}$	$\overline{\mathbf{R}}_*$
$1/\sqrt{20}$	0.0158	0.307
$1/\sqrt{100}$	0.0113	0.059
$1/\sqrt{200}$	0.0076	0.04
$1/\sqrt{1000}$	0.0035	0.0185

In the following graphics the dashed line is the model selection procedure (4.10), the continuous line is the function (10.1) and the bold line is the corresponding observations (1.1).




Figure 1: $\varepsilon = 1/\sqrt{20}$




Figure 2: $\varepsilon = 1/\sqrt{100}$




Figure 3: $\varepsilon = 1/\sqrt{200}$




Figure 4: $\varepsilon = 1/\sqrt{1000}$

To estimate the signals number q we use two procedures. The first \hat{q}_1 is (9.7) with $\iota = \lfloor \ln \varepsilon^{-2} \rfloor$. The second \hat{q}_2 is defined through the shrinkage approach for the model selection procedure (10.1).

$$\hat{q}_2 = \inf\{j \geq 1 : |\hat{\theta}_j| \leq \mathbf{c}_\varepsilon^*\}, \quad \mathbf{c}_\varepsilon^* = \varepsilon \sqrt{|\log \varepsilon|}.$$

Table : Estimation of the number signals

ε	\hat{q}_1	\hat{q}_2
$1/\sqrt{20}$	6	5
$1/\sqrt{100}$	8	7
$1/\sqrt{200}$	9	7
$1/\sqrt{1000}$	10	9

Remark 10.1. *From the simulation we can conclude that the LSE procedure (9.7) is more appropriate than shrinkage method for such number detection problem.*

11 Proofs

11.1 Proof of Proposition 3.2

First note that

$$B_{2,\varepsilon}^2(u) \leq 2\tilde{\xi}_1^2 + 2B_{2,\varepsilon}^2(u'), \quad (11.1)$$

where $u' = (0, u_2, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It should be noted that

$$\mathbf{E} \tilde{\xi}_1^2 \leq \mathbf{E} \xi_1^4 \leq 8 (\varrho_1^4 \mathbf{E} w_1^4 + \varrho_1^4 \mathbf{E} z_1^4) = 8 (3\varrho_1^4 + \varrho_1^4 \mathbf{E} z_1^4).$$

To study the last term in the right hand side of the inequality (11.1) we set for any function f from $\mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$

$$\check{I}_t(f) = \int_0^t f(s) d\check{\xi}_s \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{I}_t(f) = \check{I}_t^2(f) - \mathbf{E} \check{I}_t^2(f).$$

Note that for $j \geq 2$ we define the random variables $\tilde{\xi}_j = \tilde{I}_1(\phi_j)$. So,

$$B_{2,\varepsilon}^2(u') = \sum_{j=2}^n u_j \tilde{I}_1(\phi_j) =: D_1(u).$$

By the Itô formula we can write that for any function f from $\mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$

$$d\tilde{I}_t(f) = 2\check{I}_{t-}(f)f(t)d\check{I}_t(f) + \varrho_2^2 f^2(t) d\check{m}_t,$$

where $\check{m}_t = h_\varepsilon^2 * (\mu - \tilde{\mu})_t$. So, taking into account that

$$d\check{I}_t(f) = \varrho_1 f(t)dw_t + \varrho_2 f(t)d\check{z}_t,$$

we obtain that

$$d\tilde{I}_t(f) = 2\varrho_1 \check{I}_t(f)f(t)dw_t + 2\varrho_2 \check{I}_{t-}(f)f(t)d\check{z}_t + \varrho_2^2 f^2(t) d\check{m}_t.$$

So, setting

$$V_t = \sum_{j=2}^n u_j \check{I}_t(\phi_j)\phi_j(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_t = \sum_{j=2}^n u_j \phi_j^2(t),$$

we obtain that

$$dD_t = 2\varrho_1 V_t dw_t + 2\varrho_2 V_{t-} d\check{z}_t + \varrho_2^2 \Psi_t d\check{m}_t.$$

So, we obtain that

$$D_1^2 \leq 12\varrho_1^2 \left(\int_0^1 V_t dw_t \right)^2 + 12\varrho_2^2 M_1^2 + 3\varrho_2^4 \left(\int_0^1 \Psi_{t-} d\check{m}_t \right)^2, \quad (11.2)$$

where $M_t = \int_0^t V_{s-}(u) d\check{z}_s$. Moreover, taking into account that for any f, g from $\mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$

$$\mathbf{E} \check{I}_t(f) \check{I}_t(g) = \check{\kappa}_Q \int_0^t f(s)g(s) ds,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_0^1 \mathbf{E} V_t^2 dt &= 2 \sum_{i,j=2}^n u_i u_j \int_0^1 \phi_i(t)\phi_j(t) \mathbf{E} \check{I}_t(\phi_i) \check{I}_t(\phi_j) dt \\ &= \check{\kappa}_Q \sum_{i,j=2}^n u_i u_j \left(\int_0^1 \phi_i(t)\phi_j(t) dt \right)^2 = \check{\kappa}_Q. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$2\mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^1 V_t dw_t \right)^2 = \check{\kappa}_Q.$$

Now, to estimate the second term in the inequality (11.2) note that in view of the inequality (8.1) for any bounded function f and any $0 \leq t \leq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \check{I}_t^4(f) &\leq 8\varrho_1^4 \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^t f(s)dw_s \right)^4 + 8\varrho_2^4 \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^t f(s)d\check{z}_s \right)^4 \\ &\leq 24\varrho_1^4 \int_0^1 f^2(t)dt + C_4^* \left(\left(\Pi(h_\varepsilon^2) \int_0^1 f^2(t)dt \right)^2 + \Pi(h_\varepsilon^4) \int_0^1 f^4(t)dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E} \check{I}_t^4(f) < \infty.$$

Now it is easy to see that through the Hölder inequality the term V_t can be estimated as

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E} V_t^4 < \infty.$$

From here and the inequality (8.1) it follows that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \mathbf{E} M_t^4 \leq C_4^* \left((\Pi(h_\varepsilon^2))^2 + \Pi(h_\varepsilon^4) \right) \int_0^1 \mathbf{E} V_t^4 dt < \infty$$

and, therefore,

$$\int_0^1 \mathbf{E} M_t^2 V_t^2 dt \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} (\mathbf{E} M_t^4)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^1 \mathbf{E} V_t^4 dt \right)^{1/2} < \infty.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbf{E} \int_0^1 M_{t-} dM_t = 0.$$

Thus, the Itô formula implies

$$2\mathbf{E} M_1^2 = \mathbf{E} \sum_{0 \leq t \leq 1} (\Delta M_t)^2 = 2\Pi(h_\varepsilon^2) \int_0^1 \mathbf{E} V_t^2 dt = \Pi(h_\varepsilon^2) \check{\kappa}_Q.$$

In the same way we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho_2^2 \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^1 \Psi_{t-} d\check{m}_t \right)^2 &= \varrho_2^2 \mathbf{E} \sum_{0 \leq t \leq 1} (\Delta \check{m}_t)^2 \Psi_{t-}^2 \\ &= \varrho_2^2 \Pi(h_\varepsilon^4) \int_0^1 \Psi_t^2 dt \leq \Pi(x^2) (a/\varepsilon)^2 (\phi^*)^4 \#(u). \end{aligned}$$

So, taking into account that $\Pi(x^2) = 1$, we obtain that

$$\mathbf{E} D_1^2 \leq 6\varrho_1^2 \check{\kappa}_Q + 3\varrho_2^2 (2\check{\kappa}_Q + (\phi^*)^4) \leq 6\kappa_Q^2 + 3\varrho_2^2 (\phi^*)^4.$$

Similarly we obtain that

$$\mathbf{E} \tilde{\xi}_1^2 \leq 6\kappa_Q^2 + 3\varrho_2^4 \Pi(x^4).$$

This implies the upper bound (3.13). \square

11.2 Proof of Theorem 5.1

First note, that we can rewrite the empirical squared error in (4.5) as follows

$$\text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda) = J_\varepsilon(\lambda) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \check{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} + \|S\|^2 - \delta \widehat{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda), \quad (11.3)$$

where $\check{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} = \widetilde{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} - \theta_j \widehat{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon}$. Now using the definition of $\widetilde{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon}$ in (4.6) we obtain that

$$\check{\theta}_{j,\varepsilon} = \varepsilon \theta_j \bar{\xi}_j + \varepsilon^2 \bar{\xi}_j^2 + \varepsilon^2 (\mathbf{E}_Q \bar{\xi}_{j,\varepsilon}^2 - \check{\kappa}_Q) + \varepsilon^2 (\check{\kappa}_Q - \widehat{\kappa}_\varepsilon).$$

Where $\bar{\xi}_j = \bar{\xi}_j^2 - \mathbf{E}_Q \bar{\xi}_j^2$ and $\bar{\xi}_j = \check{I}_1(\phi_j)$. Setting

$$M_\varepsilon(\lambda) = \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \theta_j \bar{\xi}_j \quad \text{and} \quad L(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j), \quad (11.4)$$

we can rewrite (11.3) as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda) &= J_\varepsilon(\lambda) + 2\varepsilon^2 (\check{\kappa}_Q - \widehat{\kappa}_\varepsilon) L(\lambda) + 2M_\varepsilon(\lambda) + 2\varepsilon^2 B_{1,\varepsilon}(\lambda) \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon \sqrt{P_\varepsilon(\lambda)} \frac{B_{2,\varepsilon}(u_\lambda)}{\sqrt{\check{\kappa}_Q}} + \|S\|^2 - \delta \widehat{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (11.5)$$

where $u_\lambda = \lambda/|\lambda|$, the exact penalization is defined in (4.9) and the functions $B_{1,\varepsilon}(\cdot)$ and $B_{2,\varepsilon}(\cdot)$ are defined in (3.10). It should be noted that for the truncation parameter (4.4) the bound (3.13) implies

$$\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbf{E}_Q \left| B_{2,\varepsilon}^2(u_\lambda) \right| \leq U_Q + 6\check{\kappa}_Q \left(\frac{\bar{a}}{\varepsilon} \right)^2 |\Lambda|_* (\phi^*)^4 = U_{1,Q}, \quad (11.6)$$

where $U_{1,Q} = U_Q + 6\check{\kappa}_Q (\phi^*)^4$.

Let $\lambda_0 = (\lambda_0(j))_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ be a fixed sequence in Λ and $\widehat{\lambda}$ be as in (4.10). Substituting λ_0 and $\widehat{\lambda}$ in the equation (11.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\widehat{\lambda}) - \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda_0) &= J(\widehat{\lambda}) - J(\lambda_0) + 2\varepsilon^2 (\check{\kappa}_Q - \widehat{\kappa}_\varepsilon) L(\varpi) \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon^2 B_{1,\varepsilon}(\varpi) + 2M_\varepsilon(\varpi) \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon \sqrt{P_\varepsilon(\widehat{\lambda})} \frac{B_{2,\varepsilon}(\widehat{u})}{\sqrt{\check{\kappa}_Q}} - 2\varepsilon \sqrt{P_\varepsilon(\lambda_0)} \frac{B_{2,\varepsilon}(u_0)}{\sqrt{\check{\kappa}_Q}} \\ &\quad - \delta \widehat{P}_\varepsilon(\widehat{\lambda}) + \delta \widehat{P}_\varepsilon(\lambda_0) \end{aligned} \quad (11.7)$$

where $\varpi = \widehat{\lambda} - \lambda_0$, $\widehat{u} = u_{\widehat{\lambda}}$ and $u_0 = u_{\lambda_0}$. Note that by (4.2)

$$|L(\varpi)| \leq L(\widehat{\lambda}) + L(\lambda_0) \leq 2|\Lambda|_*.$$

The inequality

$$2|ab| \leq \delta a^2 + \delta^{-1} b^2 \quad (11.8)$$

implies that for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$

$$2\varepsilon \sqrt{P_\varepsilon(\lambda)} \frac{|B_{2,\varepsilon}(u_\lambda)|}{\sqrt{\check{\kappa}_Q}} \leq \delta P_\varepsilon(\lambda) + \varepsilon^2 \frac{B_{2,\varepsilon}^2(u_\lambda)}{\delta \check{\kappa}_Q}.$$

From the bound (3.11) it follows that for $0 < \delta < 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\hat{\lambda}) &\leq \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda_0) + 2M_\varepsilon(\varpi) + 2\varepsilon^2 \frac{B_{2,\varepsilon}^*}{\delta \check{\kappa}_Q} + 2\varepsilon^2 \check{\kappa}_Q \\ &\quad + \varepsilon^2 |\hat{\kappa} - \check{\kappa}_Q| (|\hat{\lambda}|^2 + |\lambda_0|^2 + 4|\Lambda|_*) + 2\delta P_\varepsilon(\lambda_0), \end{aligned}$$

where $B_{2,\varepsilon}^* = \sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} B_{2,\varepsilon}^2(u_\lambda)$. It should be noted that through (11.6) we can estimate this term as

$$\mathbf{E}_Q B_{2,\varepsilon}^* \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbf{E}_Q B_{2,\varepsilon}^2(u_\lambda) \leq \iota U_{1,Q}. \quad (11.9)$$

Taking into account that $\sup_{\lambda \in \Lambda} |\lambda|^2 \leq |\Lambda|_*$, we can rewrite the previous bound as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\hat{\lambda}) &\leq \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda_0) + 2M_\varepsilon(\varpi) + 2\varepsilon^2 \frac{B_{2,\varepsilon}^*}{\delta \check{\kappa}_Q} + 2\varepsilon^2 \check{\kappa}_Q \\ &\quad + \frac{6\varepsilon^2 |\Lambda|_*}{n} |\hat{\kappa} - \check{\kappa}_Q| + 2\delta P_\varepsilon(\lambda_0). \end{aligned} \quad (11.10)$$

To estimate the second term in the right hand side of this inequality we introduce

$$S_v = \sum_{j=1}^n v(j) \theta_j \phi_j, \quad v = (v(j))_{1 \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Moreover, note that

$$M_\varepsilon^2(v) \leq 2\varepsilon^2 (v^2(1) \xi_1^2 + \check{I}_1(\Phi)),$$

where $\Phi(t) = \sum_{j=2}^n v(j) \theta_j \phi_j(t)$. Therefore, thanks to (3.6) we obtain that for any nonrandom $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\mathbf{E} M_\varepsilon^2(v) \leq 2\check{\kappa}_Q \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^n v^2(j) \theta_j^2 = 2\check{\kappa}_Q \varepsilon^2 \|S_v\|^2. \quad (11.11)$$

To estimate this function for a random vector we set

$$M_\varepsilon^* = \sup_{v \in \Lambda_1} \frac{M^2(v)}{\varepsilon^2 \|S_v\|^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_1 = \Lambda - \lambda_0.$$

So, through the inequality (11.8)

$$2|M_\varepsilon(v)| \leq \delta \|S_v\|^2 + \varepsilon^2 \frac{M_\varepsilon^*}{\delta}. \quad (11.12)$$

It is clear that the last term here can be estimated as

$$\mathbf{E} M_\varepsilon^* \leq \sum_{v \in \Lambda_1} \frac{\mathbf{E} M_\varepsilon^2(v)}{\varepsilon^2 \|S_v\|^2} \leq 2 \sum_{v \in \Lambda_1} \mathfrak{K}_Q = 2\mathfrak{K}_Q \iota, \quad (11.13)$$

where $\iota = \#(\Lambda)$. Moreover, note that, for any $v \in \Lambda_1$,

$$\|S_v\|^2 - \|\widehat{S}_v\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n v^2(j)(\theta_j^2 - \widehat{\theta}_j^2) \leq 2|M_\varepsilon(v^2)|,$$

where $v^2 = (v^2(j))_{1 \leq j \leq n}$. Taking into account now, that for any $x \in \Lambda_1$ the components $|v(j)| \leq 1$, we can estimate the last term as in (11.11), i.e.

$$\mathbf{E} M_\varepsilon^2(v^2) \leq 2\varepsilon^2 \mathfrak{K}_Q \|S_v\|^2.$$

Similarly, setting

$$M_{1,\varepsilon}^* = \sup_{v \in \Lambda_1} \frac{M_\varepsilon^2(v^2)}{\varepsilon^2 \|S_v\|^2}$$

we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_Q M_{1,\varepsilon}^* \leq 2\mathfrak{K}_Q \iota. \quad (11.14)$$

By the same way we find that

$$2|M_\varepsilon(v^2)| \leq \delta \|S_v\|^2 + \frac{M_{1,\varepsilon}^*}{n\delta}$$

and, for any $0 < \delta < 1$,

$$\|S_v\|^2 \leq \frac{\|\widehat{S}_v\|^2}{1-\delta} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 M_{1,\varepsilon}^*}{\delta(1-\delta)}.$$

So, from (11.12) we get

$$2M(v) \leq \frac{\delta \|\widehat{S}_v\|^2}{1-\delta} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 (M_\varepsilon^* + M_{1,\varepsilon}^*)}{\delta(1-\delta)}.$$

Therefore, taking into account that $\|\widehat{S}_\varpi\|^2 \leq 2(\text{Err}_\varepsilon(\widehat{\lambda}) + \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda_0))$, the term $M_\varepsilon(\varpi)$ can be estimated as

$$2M_\varepsilon(\varpi) \leq \frac{2\delta(\text{Err}_\varepsilon(\widehat{\lambda}) + \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda_0))}{1-\delta} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 (M_\varepsilon^* + M_{1,\varepsilon}^*)}{\delta(1-\delta)}.$$

Using this bound in (11.10) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\widehat{\lambda}) &\leq \frac{1+\delta}{1-3\delta} \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda_0) + \frac{\varepsilon^2(M_\varepsilon^* + M_{1,\varepsilon}^*)}{\delta(1-3\delta)} + \frac{2\varepsilon^2 B_{2,\varepsilon}^*}{\delta(1-3\delta)\check{\kappa}_Q} \\ &\quad + \frac{2\varepsilon^2 \check{\kappa}_Q}{1-3\delta} + \frac{6\varepsilon^2 |\Lambda|_*}{(1-3\delta)} |\widehat{\kappa} - \check{\kappa}_Q| + \frac{2\delta}{(1-3\delta)} P_\varepsilon(\lambda_0). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $0 < \delta < 1/6$ we can rewrite this inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\widehat{\lambda}) &\leq \frac{1+\delta}{1-3\delta} \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda_0) + \frac{2\varepsilon^2(M_\varepsilon^* + M_{1,\varepsilon}^*)}{\delta} + \frac{4\varepsilon^2 B_{2,\varepsilon}^*}{\delta \check{\kappa}_Q} \\ &\quad + 4\varepsilon^2 \check{\kappa}_Q + 12\varepsilon^2 |\Lambda|_* |\widehat{\kappa} - \check{\kappa}_Q| + 4\delta P_\varepsilon(\lambda_0). \end{aligned}$$

Using here the bounds (11.9), (11.13), (11.14) and taking into account that $\check{\kappa}_Q \leq \kappa_Q$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{S}_*, S) &\leq \frac{1+\delta}{1-3\delta} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{S}_{\lambda_0}, S) + \frac{4\varepsilon^2 \kappa_Q(2\iota + \delta)}{\delta} + \frac{4\varepsilon^2 U_{1,Q} \iota}{\delta \check{\kappa}_Q} \\ &\quad + 12\varepsilon^2 |\Lambda|_* \mathbf{E}_Q |\widehat{\kappa} - \check{\kappa}_Q| + \frac{2\delta}{1-3\delta} P_\varepsilon(\lambda_0). \end{aligned}$$

Now, from Lemma A.1 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{S}_*, S) &\leq \frac{1+3\delta}{1-3\delta} \mathcal{R}(\widehat{S}_{\lambda_0}, S) + \frac{4\varepsilon^2 \kappa_Q(2\iota + \delta)}{\delta} + \frac{4\varepsilon^2 U_{1,Q} \iota}{\delta \check{\kappa}_Q} \\ &\quad + 12\varepsilon^2 |\Lambda|_* \mathbf{E}_Q |\widehat{\kappa} - \check{\kappa}_Q| + \varepsilon^2 \frac{2\delta}{1-3\delta} \kappa_Q. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account here that $2\delta/(1-3\delta) \leq 1$ for $0 < \delta < 1/6$ and using the function (5.1) we obtain the inequality (5.2) for some constant $\mathbf{l}_* > 0$ which depends on $\Pi(x^4)$. Hence Theorem 5.1. \square

11.3 Proof of Proposition 4.1

We use here the same method as in [15]. First, note that from the definitions (3.9) and (4.12) we obtain

$$\widehat{\tau}_{j,\varepsilon} = \tau_j + \varepsilon \eta_j, \quad (11.15)$$

where

$$\tau_j = \int_0^1 S(t) \text{Tr}_j(t) dt \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_j = \int_0^1 \text{Tr}_j(t) d\check{\xi}_t.$$

So, we have

$$\widehat{\kappa}_\varepsilon = \sum_{j=[1/\varepsilon]+1}^n \tau_j^2 + 2\check{M}_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=[1/\varepsilon]+1}^n \eta_j^2, \quad (11.16)$$

where $\check{M}_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \sum_{j=[1/\varepsilon]+1}^n \tau_j \eta_j$. Note that for the continuously differentiable functions (see, for example, Lemma A.6 in [15]) the Fourier coefficients (τ_j) for any $n \geq 1$ satisfy the following inequality

$$\sum_{j=[1/\varepsilon]+1}^{\infty} \tau_j^2 \leq 4\varepsilon \left(\int_0^1 |\dot{S}(t)| dt \right)^2 \leq 4\varepsilon \|\dot{S}\|^2. \quad (11.17)$$

We recall, that \dot{S} is the derivative of S . The term \check{M}_ε can be estimated by the same way as in (11.11), i.e.

$$\mathbf{E}_Q \check{M}_\varepsilon^2 \leq \check{\kappa}_Q \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=[1/\varepsilon]+1}^n \tau_j^2 \leq 4\varepsilon^3 \check{\kappa}_Q \|\dot{S}\|^2.$$

Moreover, taking into account that for $j \geq 2$ the expectation $\mathbf{E} \eta_j^2 = \check{\kappa}_Q$ we can represent the last term in (11.16) as

$$\varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=[1/\varepsilon]+1}^n \eta_j^2 = \check{\kappa}_Q (\varepsilon^2 n - \varepsilon^2 [1/\varepsilon]) + \varepsilon B_{2,\varepsilon}(x'),$$

where the function $B_{2,\varepsilon}(x')$ is defined in (3.10) and $x'_j = \varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{\{1/\varepsilon < j \leq 1/\varepsilon^2\}}$. We remind that $n = [1/\varepsilon^2]$. Therefore, in view of Proposition (3.2) we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_Q \left| \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=[\sqrt{1/\varepsilon}]+1}^n \eta_j^2 - \check{\kappa}_Q \right| \leq 2\varepsilon \check{\kappa}_Q + \varepsilon \sqrt{U_Q} + \frac{\sqrt{6\check{\kappa}_Q}}{|\Lambda|_*}.$$

So, we obtain the bound (4.13). Hence Proposition 4.1. \square

Acknowledgements.

The construction of the model selection procedures, the construction of the signals detection procedures and numerical simulations were done under financial support of the RSF Grant Number 14-49-00079 (National Research University MPEI 14 Krasnokazarmennaya, 111250 Moscow, Russia). The oracles inequalities were obtained under financial support of the RSF grant 17-11-01049 (National Research Tomsk State University). The analyse efficiency: the upper and lower bounds for the robust risk, the van Trees inequalities for the impulse noises, the calculation of the Pinsker constant were done under financial support of the RFBR Grant no. 16-01-00121, the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation in the framework of the research project no. 2.3208.2017/4.6 and the Russian Federal Professor program (project no. 1.472.2016/1.4, Ministry of Education and Science).

12 Appendix

A.1 Property of the penalty term

Lemma A.1. *Assume that Proposition 3.1 holds. Then for any $n \geq 1$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda$,*

$$P_\varepsilon(\lambda) \leq \mathcal{R}(\widehat{S}_\lambda, S) + \varepsilon^2 \varkappa_Q.$$

where the coefficient $P_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ is defined in (4.9).

Proof. In view of the definition of $\text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ and the equation (3.9) one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left((\lambda(j) - 1)\theta_j + \varepsilon\lambda(j)\bar{\xi}_j \right)^2 + \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} \theta_j^2 \\ &\geq 2\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^n (\lambda(j) - 1)\theta_j \lambda(j)\bar{\xi}_j + \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda^2(j)\bar{\xi}_j^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using here the definition (3.10) we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_Q \text{Err}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \geq \varepsilon^2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda^2(j) \mathbf{E}_Q \bar{\xi}_j^2 = P_\varepsilon(\lambda) - \varepsilon^2 B_{1,\varepsilon}(\lambda^2),$$

where $\lambda^2 = (\lambda^2(j))_{1 \leq j \leq n}$. Now, Proposition 3.1 implies Lemma A.1. \square

A.2 Proof of the limit equality (7.8)

First, setting $\zeta_\varepsilon = \sum_{j=1}^d \kappa_j^2 a_j$, we obtain that

$$\{S_\kappa \notin W_{k,\mathbf{r}}\} = \{\zeta_\varepsilon > \mathbf{r}\}.$$

Moreover, note that one can check directly that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{E} \zeta_\varepsilon = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{v_\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^d s_j^* a_j = \check{\mathbf{r}} = (1 - \check{\gamma})\mathbf{r}.$$

So, for sufficiently small ε we obtain that

$$\{S_\kappa \notin W_{k,r}\} \subset \{\tilde{\zeta}_\varepsilon > \mathbf{r}_1\},$$

where $\mathbf{r}_1 = \mathbf{r}\check{\gamma}/2$, $\tilde{\zeta}_\varepsilon = \zeta_\varepsilon - \mathbf{E} \zeta_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d s_j^* a_j \tilde{\eta}_j$ and $\tilde{\eta}_j = \eta_j^2 - 1$. Through the correlation inequality (see, Proposition A.1 in [11]) we can get that for any $p \geq 2$

$$\mathbf{E} \tilde{\zeta}_\varepsilon^p \leq (2p)^{p/2} \mathbf{E} |\tilde{\eta}_1|^p v_\varepsilon^{-p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d (s_j^*)^2 a_j^2 \right)^{p/2} = O(v_\varepsilon^{-\frac{p}{4k+2}}),$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, for any $\iota > 0$ using the Chebychev inequality for $p > (4k+2)\iota$ we obtain that

$$v_\varepsilon^\iota \mathbf{P}(\tilde{\zeta}_\varepsilon > \mathbf{r}_1) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence the equality (7.8). \square

A.3 The absolute continuity of distributions for the Lévy processes.

In this section we study the absolute continuity for the the Lévy processes defined as

$$dy_t = S(t)dt + d\xi_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $S(\cdot)$ is any arbitrary nonrandom square integrated function, i.e. from $\mathbf{L}_2[0, T]$ and $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is the Lévy process of the form (2.1) with nonzero constants ϱ_1 and ϱ_2 . We denote by \mathbf{P}_y and \mathbf{P}_ξ the distributions of the processes $(y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ and $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ on the Skorokhod space $\mathbf{D}[0, T]$. Now for any $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $(x_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ from $\mathbf{D}[0, T]$ we set

$$\Upsilon_t(x) = \exp \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{S(u)}{\varrho_1^2} dx_u^c - \int_0^t \frac{S^2(u)}{2\varrho_1^2} du \right\}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where x^c is the continuous part of the process x defined in (6.2). Now we study the measures \mathbf{P}_y and \mathbf{P}_ξ in $\mathbf{D}[0, T]$.

Proposition A.2. *For any $T > 0$ the measure $\mathbf{P}_y \ll \mathbf{P}_\xi$ in $\mathbf{D}[0, T]$ and the Radon-Nikodym derivative is*

$$\frac{d\mathbf{P}_y}{d\mathbf{P}_\xi}(\xi) = \Upsilon_T(\xi).$$

Proof. Note that to show this proposition it suffices to check that for any $0 = t_0 < \dots < t_n = T$ any $b_j \in \mathbb{R}$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$

$$\mathbf{E} \exp \left\{ i \sum_{l=1}^n b_j (y_{t_j} - y_{t_{j-1}}) \right\} = \mathbf{E} \exp \left\{ i \sum_{l=1}^n b_j (\xi_{t_j} - \xi_{t_{j-1}}) \right\} \Upsilon_T(\xi).$$

taking into account that the processes $(y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ have the independent homogeneous increments, to this end one needs to check only that for any $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \leq s < t \leq T$

$$\mathbf{E} \exp \{ i b (y_t - y_s) \} = \mathbf{E} \exp \{ i b (\xi_t - \xi_s) \} \frac{\Upsilon_t(\xi)}{\Upsilon_s(\xi)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

To check this equality note that the process

$$\Upsilon_t(\xi) = \exp \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{S(u)}{\varrho_1} dw_u - \int_0^t \frac{S^2(u)}{2\varrho_1^2} du \right\}$$

is the gaussian martingale. From here we directly obtain the squation (A.3). Hence Proposition A.2. \square

References

- [1] Akaike, H. A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control* **19** (1974) 716–723.
- [2] Barron, A. , Birgé, L. and Massart, P. (1999) Risk bounds for model selection via penalization. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **113**, 301–415.
- [3] Bichteler K., Jacod J. *Calcul de Malliavin pour les diffusions avec sauts: existence d'une densité dans le cas unidimensionnel*. Séminaire de probabilité, XVII, Lecture Notes in Math., **986**, Springer, Berlin, 1983, 132–157.
- [4] Cont R., Tankov P. *Financial Modelling with Jump Processes*. Chapman & Hall, 2004.
- [5] El-Behery I.N. and Macphie R.H. (1978) Maximum Likelihood Estimation of the Number, Directions and Strengths of Point Radio Sources from Variable Baseline Interferometer Data. *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation*, **26** (2), 294 – 301.
- [6] Fourdrinier, D. and Pergamenshchikov, S. (2007) Improved selection model method for the regression with dependent noise. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **59**(3), 435–464.
- [7] Flaksman, A.G. (2002) Adaptive signal processing in antenna arrays with allowance for the rank of the impule-response matrix of a multipath channel *Izvestiya Vysshikh Uchebnykh Zavedenij. Radiofizika*, **45** (12), 1064 – 1077.
- [8] Galtchouk, L.I. and Pergamenshchikov, S.M. (2006) Asymptotically efficient estimates for non parametric regression models. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **76** (8), 852–860.
- [9] Galtchouk, L.I. and Pergamenshchikov, S. M. (2009) Sharp non-asymptotic oracle inequalities for nonparametric heteroscedastic regression models. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* **21** (1), 1 - 16.

- [10] Galtchouk, L. and Pergamenshchikov, S. (2009) Adaptive asymptotically efficient estimation in heteroscedastic nonparametric regression. *Journal of Korean Statistical Society*, **38**(4), 305–322.
- [11] Galtchouk, L. and Pergamenshchikov, S. (2013) Uniform concentration inequality for ergodic diffusion processes observed at discrete times. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, **123**, 91109
- [12] Ibragimov I. A. and Khasminskii R. Z. *Statistical Estimation: Asymptotic Theory*. Springer, New York, 1981.
- [13] Jacod J., Shiryaev A.N. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*. 2nd edition, Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [14] Kassam, S.A. Signal detection in non-Gaussian noise. New York: Springer-Verlag Inc., IX, 1988.
- [15] Konev V. V. and Pergamenshchikov S. M. Nonparametric estimation in a semimartingale regression model. Part 1. Oracle Inequalities. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics of Tomsk State University* **3** (2009) 23–41.
- [16] Konev V. V. and Pergamenshchikov S. M. Nonparametric estimation in a semimartingale regression model. Part 2. Robust asymptotic efficiency. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics of Tomsk State University* **4** (2009) 31–45.
- [17] Konev V. V. and Pergamenshchikov S. M. Efficient robust nonparametric estimation in a semimartingale regression model. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, **48** (4), 2012, 1217–1244.
- [18] Konev V. V. and Pergamenshchikov S. M. Robust model selection for a semimartingale continuous time regression from discrete data. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, **125**, 2015, 294 – 326.
- [19] Konev V., Pergamenshchikov, S. and Pchelintsev, E. (2014) Estimation of a regression with the pulse type noise from discrete data. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **58** (3), 442–457.
- [20] Kutoyants, Yu. A. *Parameter Estimation for Stochastic Processes*. Heldeman-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [21] Kutoyants, Yu. A. *Identification of dynamical systems with small noise*. Mathematics and its Applications, 300. Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1994.
- [22] Mallows, C. Some comments on C_p . *Technometrics* **15** (1973) 661–675.
- [23] Manelis, B.V. (2007) Algorithms for tracking and demodulation of the mobile communication signal in the conditions of the Indiscriminating multipath propagation, *Radiotekhnika*, 4, 16–21 (in Russian).

- [24] Marinelli C., Röckner M. (2014) On maximal inequalities for purely discontinuous martingales in infinite dimensions. *Séminaire de Probabilités*, Lect. Notes Math., **XLVI** , 293–315.
- [25] Novikov A.A. (1975) On discontinuous martingales. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **20**, 1, 11–26.
- [26] Pchelintsev, E. (2013) Improved estimation in a non-Gaussian parametric regression. *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.*, **16** (1), 15 – 28.
- [27] Pinsker, M.S. (1981) Optimal filtration of square integrable signals in gaussian white noise. *Problems of Transimission information* **17**, 120–133.
- [28] Trifonov A.P., Kharin A.V., Chernoyarov O.V., Kalashnikov K. S. (2015) Determining the number of radio signals with unknown phases. *International Journal on Communications Antenna and Propagation*, **5** (6), 367–374.
- [29] Trifonov, A.P. and Shinakov, Yu. S. *Joint distinction of signals and estimation of their parameters on the background noise*, Radio i Svyaz', Moscow, 1986. (in Russian)
- [30] Trifonov, A.P. and Kharin, A.V. (2013) Estimating the number of signals with unknown amplitudes . *Nelineinyi Mir*, **11** (12), 853 – 866 (in Russian)
- [31] Trifonov A.P. and Kharin, A.V. (2015) Estimation of the Number of Radio Signals with Unknown Amplitudes and Phases. *Radiophysics and Quantum Electronics*, **58** (1), 57–70.
- [32] Trifonov A.P. and Kharin A.V. (2015) Estimation of the number of orthogonal signals with unknown non-energy parameters. *Radioelectronics and Communications Systems*, **58** (8), 362 – 370.