

Multiscale Change-point Segmentation: Beyond Step Functions

Housen Li, Qinghai Guo, and Axel Munk

March 7, 2024

Abstract

Modern multiscale type segmentation methods are known to detect multiple change-points with high statistical accuracy, while allowing for fast computation. Underpinning theory has been developed mainly for models that assume the signal as a piecewise constant function. In this paper this will be extended to certain function classes beyond such step functions in a nonparametric regression setting, revealing certain multiscale segmentation methods as robust to deviation from such piecewise constant functions. Our main finding is the adaptation over such function classes for a universal thresholding, which includes bounded variation functions, and (piecewise) Hölder functions of smoothness order $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ as special cases. From this we derive statistical guarantees on feature detection in terms of jumps and modes. Another key finding is that these multiscale segmentation methods perform nearly (up to a log-factor) as well as the oracle piecewise constant segmentation estimator (with known jump locations), and the best piecewise constant approximants of the (unknown) true signal. Theoretical findings are examined by various numerical simulations.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: 62G08, 62G20, 62G35.

Key words and phrases: Change-point regression, adaptive estimation, oracle inequality, jump detection, model misspecification, multiscale inference, approximation spaces, robustness.

1 Introduction

Throughout we assume that observations are given through the regression model

$$y_i^n = \bar{f}_i^n + \xi_i^n, \quad i = 0, \dots, n-1, \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{f}_i^n = n \int_{[i/n, (i+1)/n)} f(x) dx$, and $\xi^n = (\xi_0^n, \dots, \xi_{n-1}^n)$ are independent (not necessarily i.i.d.) centered sub-Gaussian random variables with scale parameter σ , that is,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{u \xi_i^n} \right] \leq e^{u^2 \sigma^2 / 2}, \quad \text{for every } u \in \mathbb{R}.$$

For simplicity, the scale parameter (i.e. noise level in the Gaussian case) σ in model (1) is assumed to be known, as it can be easily pre-estimated \sqrt{n} -consistently from the data, which does not affect our results, see e.g. Dette and Munk (1998); Aue et al. (2014); Dette and Wied (2016); Tecuapetla-Gómez and Munk (2017).

In this paper we are concerned with potentially discontinuous signals $f : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in (1). As a minimal condition, we always assume that the underlying (unknown) signal f lies in $\mathcal{D} \equiv \mathcal{D}([0, 1))$, the space of càdlàg functions on $[0, 1)$, which are right-continuous and have left-sided limits (cf. Billingsley, 1999, Chapter 3). In (1), we embed for simplicity the sampling points $x_{i,n} = i/n$ equidistantly in the unit interval. However, we stress that all our results can be transferred to more general domains ($\subseteq \mathbb{R}$) and sampling schemes, also for random $x_{i,n}$.

For the particular case that f is piecewise constant with a finite but unknown number of jumps, model (1) has been of particular interest throughout the past and is often referred to as *change-point regression model*. The related problem of estimating the number, locations and sizes of change-points (i.e. its locations of discontinuity) has a long and rich history in the statistical literature, see e.g. Ibragimov and Has'minskii (1981) or Korostelev and Korosteleva (2011) for some selective textbook references on statistical efficient estimation of a *single* change-point. Tukey (1961) already phrased the problem of segmenting a data sequence into constant pieces as the “regressogram problem” and it occurs in a plenitude of applications. From a risk minimization point of view it is well known that certain Bayesian estimators are (asymptotically) optimal (Ibragimov and Has'minskii, 1981); however, they are not feasible from a computational point of view, particularly when it comes to multiple change-point recovery. Therefore, recent years have witnessed a renaissance in change-point inference motivated by several applications which require *computationally fast* and *statistically efficient* finding of potentially *many* change-points in large data sets, see e.g. Olshen et al. (2004), Siegmund (2013) and Behr et al. (2018) for its relevance to cancer genetics, Chen and Zhang (2015) for network analysis, Aue et al. (2014) for econometrics, and Hotz et al. (2013) for electrophysiology, to name a few. This challenges statistical methodology due to the multiscale nature of these problems (i.e. change-points occur at different e.g. temporal scales) due to a potentially large number of change-points, and due to the large number of data points (a few millions or more), requiring computationally efficient methods. Furthermore, it is of great practical relevance to have change-point segmentation methods that provide statistical certificates of evidence for its findings, such as uniform confidence sets for the change-point locations or jump sizes (Frick et al., 2014; Li et al., 2016).

Computationally efficient segmentation methods which provide at the same hand certain statistical guarantees have been lately proposed, which are either based on dynamic programming (Boysen et al., 2009; Killick et al., 2012; Frick et al., 2014; Du et al., 2016; Li et al., 2016; Maidstone et al., 2016; Haynes et al., 2017), local search (Scott and Knott, 1974; Olshen et al., 2004; Fryzlewicz, 2014) or convex optimization (Harchaoui and Lévy-

Leduc, 2008; Tibshirani and Wang, 2008; Harchaoui and Lévy-Leduc, 2010).

Typically, the statistical justification for all the aforementioned methods is given for models which assume that the underlying truth is a piecewise constant function with a fixed but unknown number of changes. For extensions to increasing number of changes of the truth (as the number of observations increases), see e.g. (Zhang and Siegmund, 2012; Fryzlewicz, 2014), or under an additional sparsity assumption (Cai et al., 2012). However, in general, nothing is known for such segmentation methods in the general nonparametric regression setting as in (1) when f is not a piecewise constant function, e.g. a smooth function. Notable exceptions are the jump-penalized least square estimator in (Boysen et al., 2009), and the unbalanced Haar wavelets based estimator in (Fryzlewicz, 2007), for which the L^2 -risk has been analyzed for functions which can be sufficiently fast approximated by piecewise constant functions (in our notation this corresponds to functions in the space \mathcal{A}_2^γ , see section 3.2 for the definition).

Intending to fill such a gap, we provide a comprehensive risk analysis for a range of multiscale change-point methods when f in (1) is not a change-point function. To this end, we introduce in a first step a general class of *multiscale change-point segmentation methods*, with scales specified by general c -normal systems (adopted from Nemirovski (1985), see Definition 1), unifying several previous methods. This includes particularly the simultaneous multiscale change-point estimator (SMUCE), which is introduced by Frick et al. (2014) via minimizing the number of change-points under a side constraint that is based on a simultaneous multiple testing procedure on all scales (length of subsequent observations), and related estimators which are built on different multiscale systems (Walther, 2010), or penalties (Li et al., 2016). These methods can be viewed also as a natural multiscale extension of certain jump penalized estimators via convex duality (see Boysen et al., 2009; Killick et al., 2012). Implemented by accelerated dynamic programming algorithms, these methods often have a runtime $O(n \log n)$, and are found empirically promising in various applications (see e.g. Hotz et al., 2013; Futschik et al., 2014; Behr and Munk, 2017; Killick et al., 2012). In case that f in model (1) is a step function, the statistical theory for these methods is well-understood meanwhile. For example, minimax optimality of estimating the change-point locations and sizes has been shown, which is based on exponential deviation bounds on the number, and the locations of change-points. Furthermore, these methods also obey optimal minimax detection properties (in the sense of testing) of vanishing signals as well, and provide honest simultaneous confidence statements for all unknown quantities (see Frick et al., 2014; Li et al., 2016; Pein et al., 2017).

To complement the understanding of these methods, this work aims to analyze their behavior when the true regression function f is beyond a piecewise constant function. To this end, we derive a) convergence rates for sequences of piecewise constant functions with increasing number of changes (Theorem 1), and b) for functions in certain approximation spaces (Theorem 2), well-known in approximation theory, cf. DeVore and Lorentz (1993), (see Section 3), generalizing the above mentioned results for quadratic risk

to general L^p -risk ($0 < p < \infty$). As a consequence, we obtain the minimax optimal rates $n^{-2/3 \cdot \min\{1/2, 1/p\}}$ and $n^{-2\alpha/(2\alpha+1) \cdot \min\{1/2, 1/p\}}$ (up to a log-factor) in terms of L^p -loss both almost surely and in expectation for the cases that f has bounded variation (see Mammen and van de Geer, 1997), and that f is (piecewise) Hölder continuous of order $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, respectively. Most importantly, the discussed multiscale change-point segmentation methods are universal (i.e. independent of the smoothness assumption of the unknown truth signal), as the only tuning parameter (which can be thought of as a universal threshold) can be chosen as $\eta \asymp \sqrt{\log n}$. We will show that for this choice, these methods automatically *adapt* to the unknown “smoothness” of the underlying function in an optimal way, no matter whether it is piecewise constant or it lies in the aforementioned function spaces. As an illustration, we present the performance of SMUCE (Frick et al., 2014) with universal parameter choice $\eta = 0.42\sqrt{\log n}$, on different signals in Figure 1. It clearly shows that SMUCE, although designed to provide a piecewise constant solution, successfully recovers the shape of all underlying signals no matter whether they are locally constant or not, as suggested by our theoretical findings.




Figure 1: Estimation by the multiscale change-point segmentation method SMUCE (Frick et al., 2014) for Blocks, Bumps, Heavisine, and Doppler signals (Donoho and Johnstone, 1994) with sample size $n = 1,500$, and signal-to-noise ratio $\|f\|_{L^2}/\sigma = 3.5$.




Figure 2: Feature detection by SMUCE with universal threshold $\eta(0.1)$ by (6) (sample size $n = 1,000$, $\text{SNR} = 5$). The solid vertical lines mark significant jumps, while the dashed one marks an insignificant jump; and the arrows at the bottom indicate significant increases and decreases; with simultaneous confidence at least 90%. See Remark 6 in Section 4 for details.

Indeed, the derived convergence rates allow us to derive statistical guarantees for such feature detection, see Section 4. More precisely, we show for general (incl. piecewise constant) signals in approximation spaces that the discussed methods recover no less jumps and modes (or troughs) than the truth as the sample sizes tends to infinity; This statement should be interpreted with the built-in parsimony (i.e., minimization of number of jumps) of these methods, which suggests that the number of artificial jumps and modes (or troughs) is “minimal”; At the same hand, large increases (or decreases) of the discussed estimators imply increases (or decreases) of the true signal with high confidence; (Theorem 3). In Figure 2, based on our theoretical finding, one can claim, for example, that the two *large* jumps (marked by solid vertical lines) are significant with confidence at least 90% (see Remark 6). In the particular case of step signals, we further show the consistency in estimating the number of jumps, and an error bound of the best known order (in terms of sample sizes) on the estimation accuracy of change-point locations (Proposition 1).

Finally, we address the issue how to benchmark properly the investigated methods. To this end, we show that the multiscale change-point segmentation methods perform nearly no worse than piecewise constant segmentation estimators whose change-point locations are provided by an oracle. By considering such oracles, we discover a *saturation* phenomenon (Theorem 4 and Example 2) for the class of all piecewise constant segmentation estimators: only the suboptimal rate $n^{-2/3}$ is attainable for smoother functions in Hölder classes with $\alpha > 1$. From a slightly different perspective, we show that the multiscale change-point segmentation methods perform nearly as well as the best (deterministic)

piecewise constant approximant of the true signal with the same number of jumps or less (Proposition 2).

Besides such theoretical interest (cf. also Linton and Seo, 2014; Farcomeni, 2014), the study on models beyond piecewise constant functions is also of particular practical importance, since a piecewise constant function is actually known to be only an approximation of the underlying signal in many applications. For example, in DNA copy number analysis, for which the change-point regression model with locally constant signal is commonly assumed (see e.g. Olshen et al., 2004; Lai et al., 2005), a periodic trend distortion with small amplitude (known as genomic waves) is well known to be present (Diskin et al., 2008). Thus our work can be also regarded as examination of the robustness of such segmentation methods against model misspecification. We consider a piecewise constant estimator as robust, if it recovers the majority of interesting features of the underlying true regression function with as small number of jumps as possible. For instance, Figure 3 shows the performance of SMUCE on a typical signal from DNA copy number analysis, where a locally constant function is slightly perturbed, in cases of different noise levels. Visually, SMUCE seems to recover the major features, and the recovered signal provides a simple yet informative summary of the data, meanwhile staying close to the true signal, which confirms our theoretical findings. We note that our viewpoint here complements a recent work by Song et al. (2016) who considered a *reverse* scenario: a sequence of smooth functions approaches a step function in the limit.

In summary, we show that a large class of multiscale change-point segmentation methods with a universal parameter choice are *adaptively minimax optimal* (up a log-factor) for step signals (possibly with unbounded number of change-points) and for (piecewise) smooth signals in certain approximation spaces (Theorems 1 and 2) for general L^p -risk. Building on this, we obtain statistical guarantees on feature detection, such as recovery of the number of discontinuities, or modes (Proposition 1 and Theorem 3), which explain well-known empirical findings. In addition, we show oracle inequalities for such multiscale change-point segmentation methods in terms of both segmentation and approximation of the true signal (Theorem 4 and Proposition 2).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce a general class of multiscale change-point segmentation methods, discuss examples and provide technical assumptions. We derive uniform bounds on the L^p -loss over step functions with possibly increasing number of change-points and over certain approximation spaces in Section 3, and present their implication on feature detection in Section 4. Section 5 focuses on the oracle properties of multiscale change-point segmentation methods from a segmentation and an approximation perspective, respectively. Our theoretical findings are investigated for finite samples by a simulation study in Section 6. The paper ends with a conclusion in Section 7. Technical proofs are collected in the appendix.




Figure 3: Estimation by SMUCE for the signal in Olshen et al. (2004) and Zhang and Siegmund (2007) with various signal-to-noise ratios $\|f\|_{L^2}/\sigma$, see also Section 6.

2 Multiscale change-point segmentation

Recall model (1) and let f now in $\mathcal{S} \equiv \mathcal{S}([0, 1])$, the space of right-continuous step functions f on $[0, 1)$ with a finite (but possibly unbounded) number of jumps, that is, for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^k c_i \mathbf{1}_{[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})} \quad \text{with } 0 = \tau_0 < \dots < \tau_{k+1} = 1, \text{ and } c_i \neq c_{i+1} \text{ for each } i. \quad (2)$$

Here $J(f) := \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k\}$ denotes the set of change-points of f . By *intervals* we always refer to those of the form $[a, b)$, $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$. In the following we introduce a general class of multiscale change-point estimators comprising various methods recently developed. To this end, we fix a system \mathcal{I} of subintervals of $[0, 1)$ in the first step. Given \mathcal{I} , we introduce a general class of *multiscale change-point segmentation* estimators \hat{f}_n (see Frick et al., 2014; Li et al., 2016; Pein et al., 2017) as a solution to the (nonconvex) optimization problem

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{S}} \#J(f) \quad \text{subject to } T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) \leq \eta. \quad (3)$$

Here $y^n := \{y_i^n\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ denotes the observational vector, and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ is a universal threshold to be defined later. The side constraint in (3) is defined by a multiscale test statistic

$$T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) := \sup_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I} \\ f \equiv c_I \text{ on } I}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n|I|}} \left| \sum_{i/n \in I} (y_i^n - c_I) \right| - s_I \right\},$$

with $s_I \in \mathbb{R}$ a scale penalty, which can be deterministic or random, and might even depend on the candidate f and the data y^n . Note, that the solution to the optimization problem (3) always exists but might be *non-unique*, in which case one could pick an arbitrary solution.

The side constraint in (3) originates from testing simultaneously the residuals of a candidate \hat{f} with values c_I on the multiscale system \mathcal{I} . In model (1) under a Gaussian error, this combines all the local likelihood ratio tests whether the local mean \bar{f}_I of f on I equals to a given c_I for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence, this provides a criterion for testing the constancy of f on each of its segments in \mathcal{I} (for a detailed account see Frick et al., 2014). The choice of the scale penalties s_I determines the estimator. It balances the detection power over different scales, see Dümbgen and Spokoiny (2001), Walther (2010) and Frick et al. (2014) for several choices, and Davies et al. (2012) for the unpenalized estimators, $s_I \equiv 0$, in a slightly different model. Thus, any multiscale change-point segmentation method amounts to search for the most parsimonious candidate over the acceptance region of the multiple tests on the right hand side in (3) performed over the system \mathcal{I} . The threshold η in (3) provides a trade-off between data-fit and parsimony, and can be chosen such that the truth f satisfies the side constraint with a pre-specified probability $1 - \beta$. To this end, $\eta \equiv \eta(\beta)$ is chosen as the upper $(1 - \beta)$ quantile of the distribution of $T_{\mathcal{I}}(\xi^n; 0)$, which can be determined by Monte-Carlo simulations or asymptotic considerations (Frick et al., 2014; Pein et al., 2017). Then the choice of significance level β provides an upper bound on the family-wise error rate of the aforementioned multiple test. It immediately provides for \hat{f}_n a control of overestimating the number of jumps $\#J(f)$ of f , i.e.

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \#J(\hat{f}_n) \leq \#J(f) \right\} \geq 1 - \beta \quad \text{uniformly over all } f \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Also, with a different penalty, it is possible to control instead the false discovery rate by means of *local* quantiles, see Li et al. (2016) for details. Comprising the above mentioned choices for \mathcal{I} , we will see that, if the system of intervals \mathcal{I} is rich enough, for the asymptotic analysis of all these estimators it is sufficient to work with a universal threshold $\eta \asymp \sqrt{\log n}$ in (3) (see Section 3).

The system \mathcal{I} will be required to be truly *multiscale*, i.e. the multiscale change-point segmentation methods in (3) require the associated interval system \mathcal{I} to contain different scales, the richness of which can be characterized by the concept of *normality*.

Definition 1 (Nemirovski (1985)). A system $\mathcal{I} \equiv \mathcal{I}_n$ of intervals is called *normal* (or *c-normal*) for some constant $c > 1$, provided that it satisfies the following requirements.

- (i) For every interval $I \subseteq [0, 1)$ with length $|I| > c/n$, there is an interval \tilde{I} in \mathcal{I} such that $\tilde{I} \subseteq I$ and $|\tilde{I}| \geq c^{-1}|I|$.
- (ii) The end-points of each interval in \mathcal{I} lie on the grid $\{i/n : i = 0, \dots, n-1\}$.
- (iii) The system \mathcal{I} contains all intervals $[i/n, (i+1)/n)$, $i = 0, \dots, n-1$.

Remark 1 (Normal systems). The requirement (i) in the above definition is crucial, while (ii) and (iii) are of technical nature due to the discrete sampling locations $\{i/n\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ and can be generalized. Examples of normal systems include the highly redundant system \mathcal{I}^0 of all intervals whose end-points lie on the grid $\{i/n\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ (suggested by e.g. Siegmund and Yakir, 2000; Dümbgen and Spokoiny, 2001; Frick et al., 2014) of order $O(n^2)$, and less redundant but still asymptotically efficient systems (Davies and Kovac, 2001; Walther, 2010; Rivera and Walther, 2013), typically of order $O(n \log n)$. Remarkably, there are even normal systems with cardinality of order $O(n)$, such as the *dyadic partition system*

$$\left\{ \left[\frac{i}{n} \lceil 2^{-j} n \rceil, \frac{i+1}{n} \lceil 2^{-j} n \rceil \right) : i = 0, \dots, 2^j - 1, j = 0, \dots, \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor \right\},$$

which can be shown to be 2-normal, see Grasmair et al. (2018).

Definition 2 (Multiscale change-point segmentation estimator). Any estimator satisfying (3) is denoted as a *multiscale change-point segmentation estimator*, if

- (i) the interval system \mathcal{I} is c -normal for some constant $c > 1$;
- (ii) the scale penalties s_I satisfy almost surely that

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} |s_I| \leq \delta \sqrt{\log n} \quad \text{for some constant } \delta > 0.$$

Remark 2 (Some multiscale segmentation methods). For sub-Gaussian error ξ^n

$$\sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n|I|}} \left| \sum_{i/n \in I} \xi_i^n \right|$$

is at most of order $\sqrt{\log n}$ (see e.g. Shao, 1995), so Definition 2 (ii) is quite natural. In particular, Definition 2 (ii) includes many common scale penalties. For instance, SMUCE (Frick et al., 2014) and FDRSeg (Li et al., 2016) are special cases. More precisely, for SMUCE, it amounts to select $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^0$, the system of all possible intervals, and $s_I = \sqrt{2 \log(e/|I|)}$, and for FDRSeg, the same system $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^0$ but a different scale penalty $s_I = \sqrt{2 \log(e|\tilde{I}|/|I|)}$ with \tilde{I} being the constant segment, which contains I , of the candidate solution. The case $s_I \equiv 0$ is also included and has been suggested by Davies et al. (2012).

3 Asymptotic error analysis

This section mainly provides convergence rates of the multiscale change-point segmentation methods for the model (1) with equidistant sampling points. We stress, that the subsequent results can be easily generalized to non-equidistant (and random) sampling points $x_{i,n}$ under appropriate conditions on the design (see Munk and Dette, 1998); this is, however, suppressed to ease presentation.

3.1 Convergence rates for step functions

We consider first locally constant change-point regression, i.e. the underlying signal $f \in \mathcal{S}$ in model (1). We introduce the class of uniformly bounded piecewise constant functions (recall (2)) with up to k jumps

$$\mathcal{S}_L(k) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{S} : \#J(f) \leq k, \text{ and } \|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq L \right\},$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $L > 0$. If the number of change-points is bounded, i.e. k is known beforehand, the estimation problem is, roughly speaking, parametric, by interpreting change-point locations and function values as parameters. A rather complete analysis of this situation is provided either from a Bayesian viewpoint (see e.g. Ibragimov and Has'minskiĭ, 1981; Hušková and Antoch, 2003) or from a likelihood viewpoint (see e.g. Yao and Au, 1989; Braun et al., 2000; Siegmund and Yakir, 2000; Boysen et al., 2009; Korostelev and Korosteleva, 2011). However, in order to understand the increasing difficulty of change-point estimation as the number of change-points gets larger, i.e. the nonparametric nature of change-point regression, we allow now the number of change-points to increase as the number of observations tends to infinity.

Theorem 1 (Adaptation I). *Assume model (1). Let $0 < p, r < \infty$, and $k_n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be such that $k_n = o(n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then:*

- (i) *If \hat{f}_n is a multiscale change-point segmentation estimator in Definition 2 with constants c and δ , and threshold*

$$\eta := a\sqrt{\log n} \quad \text{for some } a > \delta + \sigma\sqrt{2r+4}, \quad (4)$$

then the following upper bound holds

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}} \left(\frac{n}{2k_n + 1} \right)^{\min\{1/2, 1/p\}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{S}_L(k_n)} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r \right]^{1/r} < \infty.$$

The same result also holds almost surely if we drop the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$.

(ii) If noise ξ_i^n in model (1) has a density $\varphi_{i,n}$ such that for some constants σ_0 and z_0

$$\max_{i,n} \int \varphi_{i,n}(x) \log \frac{\varphi_{i,n}(x)}{\varphi_{i,n}(x+z)} dx \leq \frac{z^2}{\sigma_0^2} \quad \text{for } |z| \leq z_0 \quad (5)$$

then the following lower bound holds

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{n}{2k_n + 1} \right)^{\min\{1/2, 1/p\}} \inf_{\hat{g}_n} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{S}_L(k_n)} \mathbb{E} [\|\hat{g}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r]^{1/r} > 0,$$

where the infimum is taken over all estimators \hat{g}_n .

Proof. See Appendix A.1. □

Remark 3. Note that condition (5) is a typical assumption for establishing lower bounds (see e.g. Tsybakov, 2009). In particular, if $\exp(-c_1 x^2) \lesssim \varphi_{i,n}(x) \lesssim \exp(-c_2 x^2)$ with constants c_1, c_2 , then condition (5) holds for any $z_0 > 0$, e.g. a Gaussian density. Theorem 1 states that multiscale change-point segmentation estimators are up to a log-factor adaptively minimax optimal over sequences of classes $\mathcal{S}_L(k_n)$ for all possible k_n and L . A common choice of k_n is $k_n \asymp n^\theta$, $0 \leq \theta < 1$, which in particular reproduces the convergence results in Li et al. (2016). It also includes the case $\theta = 0$, where, by convention, $k_n \equiv k$ is bounded. Note that the universal threshold η in (4) is independent of the specific loss function, provided that a is large enough. Furthermore, one can relax such choice of η by allowing $a = \delta + \sigma\sqrt{2r+4}$ in (4), and even select

$$\eta = \eta(\beta) \quad \text{with } \beta = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r}), \quad (6)$$

see Appendix A.1. By Shao's theorem (Shao, 1995), it is clear that $\eta(\beta) \leq (\delta + \sigma\sqrt{2})\sqrt{\log n}$. A more refined analysis is even possible, although not necessary for our purposes. For instance, in case of no scale penalization and \mathcal{I} consisting of all intervals, it follows from Siegmund and Venkatraman (1995) and Kabluchko (2007) that

$$\eta(\beta) \sim \sqrt{2 \log n} + \frac{\log \log n + \log \frac{\lambda}{4\pi} - 2 \log \log(1/\beta)}{2\sqrt{2 \log n}} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

with constant $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$. Note, finally, that the restriction $p < \infty$ in Theorem 1 is necessary and natural, because L^∞ -loss is not reasonable in change-point estimation problems (as no estimator can detect change-point locations at a rate faster than $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$, see Chan and Walther, 2013, which leads to inconsistency of any estimator with respect to L^∞ -loss).

3.2 Robustness to model misspecification

As discussed in the Section 1, in practical applications, it often occurs that the underlying signal f in model (1) is only approximately piecewise constant. To address this issue, we next consider the L^p -loss of the multiscale change-point segmentation methods for more

general functions. In order to characterize the degree of model misspecification, we adopt from nonlinear approximation theory (cf. DeVore and Lorentz, 1993; DeVore, 1998) the *approximation spaces* as

$$\mathcal{A}_q^\gamma := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{D} : \sup_{k \geq 1} k^\gamma \Delta_{q,k}(f) < \infty \right\}, \quad \text{for } 0 < q \leq \infty, \gamma > 0,$$

where the approximation error $\Delta_{q,k}$ is defined as

$$\Delta_{q,k}(f) := \inf \left\{ \|f - g\|_{L^q} : g \in \mathcal{S}, \#J(g) \leq k \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Introduce the subclasses

$$\mathcal{A}_{q,L}^\gamma := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{D} : \sup_{k \geq 1} k^\gamma \Delta_{q,k}(f) \leq L, \text{ and } \|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq L \right\},$$

for $0 < q \leq \infty$, and $\gamma, L > 0$. The best approximant in (7) exists, but is in general non-unique, see e.g., DeVore and Lorentz (1993, Chapter 12). It follows readily from definition that $\mathcal{A}_q^\gamma = \bigcup_{L>0} \mathcal{A}_{q,L}^\gamma$ and that $\mathcal{A}_{q_1,L}^\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{q_2,L}^\gamma$ for all $q_1 \geq q_2$. Note that \mathcal{A}_q^γ is actually an interpolation space between L^q and some Besov space (see Petrushev, 1988). The order γ of these spaces (or classes) reflects the speed of approximation of f by step functions as the number of change-points increases. It is further known that if f lies in \mathcal{A}_q^γ for some $\gamma > 1$ and if f is piecewise continuous, then f is piecewise constant, see Burchard and Hale (1975) (which is often referred to as a *saturation* result in the approximation theory community). Thus, it is custom to consider \mathcal{A}_q^γ with $0 < \gamma \leq 1$.

The rates of convergence for approximation classes are provided below.

Theorem 2 (Adaptation II). *Let $0 < p, r < \infty$, $\max\{p, 2\} \leq q \leq \infty$, and assume that \hat{f}_n is a multiscale change-point segmentation estimator in Definition 2 with constants c and δ , and universal threshold as in (4). Then*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\log n)^{-\frac{\gamma + (1/2 - 1/p)_+}{2\gamma + 1}} n^{\frac{2\gamma}{2\gamma + 1} \min\{1/2, 1/p\}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{A}_{q,L}^\gamma} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r \right]^{1/r} < \infty.$$

The same result also holds almost surely if we drop the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$.

Proof. See Appendix A.2. □

Remark 4. Similar to Theorem 1, the above theorem shows that any multiscale change-point segmentation method with a universal threshold automatically adapts to the smoothness of the approximation spaces, in the sense that it has a faster rate for larger order γ . Note that such convergence rates are minimax optimal (up to a log-factor) over $\mathcal{A}_{q,L}^\gamma$ for every $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, $2 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $L > 0$, see Example 1 (i) below. Also, we point out that Theorem 2 still holds if one uses the refined rule in (6) for the choice of threshold η , see Appendix A.2 and also Remark 3.

Moreover, note that the convergence rates of the multiscale change-point segmentation methods above generalize the rates reported in Boysen et al. (2009) for jump-penalized least square estimators, and are faster than the rates reported in Fryzlewicz (2007) for the unbalanced Haar wavelets based estimator, with the difference being in log-factors.

Example 1. (i) (*Piecewise*) *Hölder functions*. For $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $L > 0$, we consider the Hölder function classes

$$H_L^\alpha \equiv H^\alpha([0, 1)) := \{f \in \mathcal{D} : \|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq L, \text{ and } |f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \leq L|x_1 - x_2|^\alpha \text{ for all } x_1, x_2 \in [0, 1)\},$$

and the piecewise Hölder function classes with at most κ jumps

$$H_{\kappa, L}^\alpha \equiv H_{\kappa, L}^\alpha([0, 1)) := \left\{f \in \mathcal{D} : \text{there is a partition } \{I_i\}_{i=0}^l, \text{ with } l \leq \kappa, \text{ of } [0, 1) \text{ such that } f|_{I_i} \in H_L^\alpha(I_i) \text{ for all possible } i\right\}.$$

Obviously, the latter one contains the former as a special case when $\kappa = 0$, that is, $H_{0, L}^\alpha \equiv H_L^\alpha$. It is easy to see that $H_L^\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{q, L'}^\alpha$ with $L' \geq L$, $0 < q \leq \infty$, and $H_{\kappa, L}^\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{q, L'}^\alpha$ with $L' \geq L(\kappa + 1)^{\alpha+1/2}$, $0 < q \leq \infty$.

It is known that the fastest possible rate over H_L^α , $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, is at most of order $n^{-2\alpha/(2\alpha+1)\min\{1/2, 1/p\}}$ with respect to the L^p -loss, $0 < p < \infty$, see e.g. (Ibragimov and Has'minskiĭ, 1981). Thus, as a consequence of Theorem 2, the multiscale change-point segmentation method with a universal threshold is simultaneously minimax optimal (up to a log-factor) over $\mathcal{A}_{q, L}^\alpha$, H_L^α and $H_{\kappa, L}^\alpha$ for every $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\max\{p, 2\} \leq q \leq \infty$, $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $L > 0$, that is, adaptive to the smoothness order α of the underlying function.

(ii) *Bounded variation functions*. Recall that the (total) variation $\|\cdot\|_{\text{TV}}$ of a function f is defined as

$$\|f\|_{\text{TV}} := \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^m |f(x_{i+1}) - f(x_i)| : 0 = x_0 < \cdots < x_{m+1} = 1, m \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

We introduce the càdlàg bounded variation classes

$$\text{BV}_L \equiv \text{BV}_L([0, 1)) := \{f \in \mathcal{D} : \|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq L, \text{ and } \|f\|_{\text{TV}} \leq L\} \quad \text{for } L > 0.$$

Elementary calculation, together with Jordan decomposition, implies that

$$\text{BV}_L \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{q, L'}^1 \quad \text{for } L' \geq L \text{ and } 0 < q \leq \infty.$$

Since the Hölder class $H_L^1 \subseteq \text{BV}_L$, the best possible rate for BV_L cannot be faster than that for H_L^1 , which is of order $n^{-2/3\min\{1/2, 1/p\}}$. Then, Theorem 2 implies that the multiscale change-point segmentation method attains the minimax optimal rate (up to a log-factor)

over the bounded variation classes BV_L for $L > 0$.

All the examples above concern functions of smoothness order ≤ 1 . For smoother functions, say H_L^α with $\alpha > 1$ (see e.g. Tsybakov, 2009, for definition), it holds that $H_L^\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{A}_q^1$ but $H_L^\alpha \not\subseteq \mathcal{A}_q^\gamma$ for any $\gamma > 1$. Thus, by Theorem 2, we obtain that multiscale change-point segmentation estimators attain (up to a log-factor) the rates of order $n^{-2/3 \min\{1/2, 1/p\}}$ for H_L^α with $\alpha > 1$ in terms of L^p -loss. Note that such rates are suboptimal, but turn out to be the saturation barrier for every piecewise constant segmentation estimator; As we will see in Example 2 in Section 5.1, piecewise constant segmentation estimators even with the oracle choice of change-points cannot attain faster rates for functions of smoothness order > 1 .

In summary, we find that the multiscale change-point segmentation methods with universal parameter choice (4) or refined choice (6) are minimax optimal (up to log factors) simultaneously over sequences of step function classes $\mathcal{S}_L(k_n)$ ($k_n = o(n)$, $L > 0$), and over approximation spaces $\mathcal{A}_{q,L}^\gamma$ ($0 < \gamma \leq 1$, $2 \leq q \leq \infty$, $L > 0$). This in particular includes sequences of step function classes $\mathcal{S}_L(n^\theta)$ ($0 \leq \theta < 1$, $L > 0$), Hölder classes H_L^α and $H_{\kappa,L}^\alpha$ ($0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $L > 0$), and bounded variation classes BV_L ($L > 0$).

4 Feature detection

The convergence rates in Theorems 1 and 2 not only reflect the average performance in recovering the truth over its domain, but also, as a byproduct, lead to further statistical justifications on detection of features, such as change-points, modes and troughs.

Proposition 1. *Assume model (1) and let the truth $f \equiv f_{k_n} \in \mathcal{S}_L(k_n)$ be a sequence of step functions with up to k_n jumps. By Δ_n and λ_n denote the smallest jump size, and the smallest segment length of f_{k_n} , respectively. Let \hat{f}_n be a multiscale change-point segmentation method in Definition 2 with constants c , δ , interval system \mathcal{I} , and universal threshold η in (4) or (6). If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n \log n / (\lambda_n \Delta_n^2 n) = 0$, then there is a constant C depending only on c , η and k_n such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \#J(\hat{f}_n) = \#J(f_{k_n}), d(J(\hat{f}_n); J(f_{k_n})) \leq C \frac{k_n \log n}{\Delta_n^2 n} \right\} = 1,$$

with $d(J(\hat{f}_n); J(f_{k_n})) := \max_{\tau \in J(f_{k_n})} \min_{\hat{\tau} \in J(\hat{f}_n)} |\tau - \hat{\tau}|$.

Proof. By Theorem 1 and Lin et al. (2016, Theorem 8) it holds almost surely that $d(J(\hat{f}_n); J(f_{k_n})) \leq C_1 k_n \log n / (\Delta_n^2 n)$, and thus $\mathbb{P}\{\#J(\hat{f}_n) \geq \#J(f_{k_n})\} \rightarrow 1$. This, together with the fact that $\mathbb{P}\{\#J(\hat{f}_n) > \#J(f_{k_n})\} \leq \mathcal{O}(n^{-r}) \rightarrow 0$, completes the proof. \square

Remark 5. Proposition 1 concerns step functions, and is a typical consistency result in change-point literature (e.g. Boysen et al., 2009; Harchaoui and Lévy-Leduc, 2010; Chan and Chen, 2017). It in particular applies to SMUCE (Frick et al., 2014) and FDRSeg (Li

et al., 2016), where the same error rate on the accuracy of estimated change-points is reported, and is of the fastest order known up to now (see also Fryzlewicz, 2014).

Assume now $f \in \mathcal{D}$, an arbitrary (not necessarily piecewise constant) function. We consider a similar concept of change-points as for step functions. To this end, we define, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the jump locations of f as $J_\varepsilon(f) := \{x : |f(x) - f(x-0)| > \varepsilon\}$, and the jump sizes as $\Delta_f^\varepsilon := \min\{|f(x) - f(x-0)| : x \in J_\varepsilon(f)\}$. Note that they are well-defined, since it follows from Billingsley (1999, Lemma 1 in Section 12) that $\#J_\varepsilon(f) < \infty$ and $\Delta_f^\varepsilon > 0$. In addition, we introduce the local mean of f over an interval I as $m_I(f) := \int_I f(x)dx/|I|$. Such local means $m_I(f)$ on different intervals I actually shed light on the shape of f , such as pieces of increases and decreases, and thus modes and troughs.

Theorem 3. *Assume model (1), and the truth $f \in \mathcal{D}$. Let \hat{f}_n be a multiscale change-point segmentation method in Definition 2 with constants c , δ , and interval system \mathcal{I} .*

(i) *If $f \in \mathcal{A}_{2,L}^\gamma$ with $\gamma, L > 0$, and the threshold η of \hat{f}_n is chosen as in (4) or (6), then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \# \text{modes}(\hat{f}_n) \geq \# \text{modes}(f); \# \text{troughs}(\hat{f}_n) \geq \# \text{troughs}(f) \right\} = 1, \quad (8)$$

$$\text{and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ d(J(\hat{f}_n), J_\varepsilon(f)) \leq \frac{C}{(\Delta_f^\varepsilon)^2} \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\frac{2\gamma}{2\gamma+1}}; \#J(\hat{f}_n) \geq \#J_\varepsilon(f) \right\} = 1, \quad (9)$$

where C is a constant depending only on η , c and L .

(ii) *If the threshold η of \hat{f}_n is chosen as $\eta = \eta(\beta)$, then it holds with probability at least $(1 - \beta)$ that for any $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$, where \hat{f}_n is constant,*

$$m_{I_1}(\hat{f}_n) > m_{I_2}(\hat{f}_n) + r_{I_1} + r_{I_2} \quad \text{with } r_I = \frac{2(\eta(\beta) + s_I)}{\sqrt{n|I|}}, \quad (10)$$

implies $m_{I_1}(f) > m_{I_2}(f)$, simultaneously over all such pairs of I_1 and I_2 .

Proof. See Appendix A.3. □

Remark 6. Since step functions lie in \mathcal{A}_2^γ for all $\gamma > 0$, assertion (9) “formally” reproduces Proposition 1 partially for the case that the step function f is fixed, by letting γ tend to infinity. Moreover, the statistical justifications of Theorem 3 (i) are of one-sided nature. Note that statistical guarantees for the reverse order are in general not possible, as long as an arbitrary number of jumps / features on small scales cannot be excluded, see e.g. Donoho (1988). However, multiscale change-point segmentation methods will not include too many artificial features (e.g., jumps, modes or troughs), due to their parsimony nature by construction, namely, minimization of the number of jumps, see (3).

More importantly, Theorem 3 (ii) states that large increases (or decreases) of multiscale change-point segmentation estimators imply increases (or decreases) of the true signal. This is actually a finite-sample inference guarantee, and holds simultaneously for many

intervals, which thus provides inference guarantee on modes and troughs. In this way, we can discern a collection of genuine features among all the detected features, with controllable confidence. To be precise, let $\hat{f}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{k}} \hat{c}_i \mathbf{1}_{[\hat{\tau}_{i-1}, \hat{\tau}_i)}$ with $0 = \hat{\tau}_0 < \dots < \hat{\tau}_{\hat{k}} = 1$ and $\hat{c}_i \neq \hat{c}_{i+1}$ be a multiscale change-point segmentation estimator with threshold $\eta(\beta)$.

(i) *Increase or decrease.* Let $\hat{\tau}_{i+1/2} = (\hat{\tau}_i + \hat{\tau}_{i+1})/2$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^R &= \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}, I \subseteq [\hat{\tau}_i, \hat{\tau}_{i+1/2})} (\hat{c}_{i+1} + r_I), & l_i^R &= \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}, I \subseteq [\hat{\tau}_i, \hat{\tau}_{i+1/2})} (\hat{c}_{i+1} - r_I), \\ \text{and } u_i^L &= \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}, I \subseteq [\hat{\tau}_{i-1/2}, \hat{\tau}_i)} (\hat{c}_i + r_I), & l_i^L &= \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}, I \subseteq [\hat{\tau}_{i-1/2}, \hat{\tau}_i)} (\hat{c}_i - r_I). \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Theorem 3 (ii), there is at least an increase (or a decrease) of f on interval $[\hat{\tau}_{i-1/2}, \hat{\tau}_{i+1/2})$ if $u_i^L < l_i^R$ (or if $l_i^L > u_i^R$) with confidence level no less than $(1 - \beta)$. Further, because of the simultaneous confidence control, the inferred increases and decreases on non-overlapped intervals $[\hat{\tau}_{i-1/2}, \hat{\tau}_{i+1/2})$ leads naturally to inference on modes and troughs.

(ii) *Change-point.* Let $m \ll n$. Consider intervals

$$[\hat{c}_i - r_{[\hat{\tau}_i - m/n, \hat{\tau}_i)}, \hat{c}_i + r_{[\hat{\tau}_i - m/n, \hat{\tau}_i)}] \text{ and } [\hat{c}_{i+1} - r_{[\hat{\tau}_i, \hat{\tau}_i + m/n)}, \hat{c}_{i+1} + r_{[\hat{\tau}_i, \hat{\tau}_i + m/n)}].$$

If both intervals are disjoint, we call $\hat{\tau}_i$ a significant change-point. Strictly speaking, in such a case, it follows from Theorem 3 (ii) only that

$$m_{[\hat{\tau}_i - m/n, \hat{\tau}_i)}(f) \neq m_{[\hat{\tau}_i, \hat{\tau}_i + m/n)}(f) \quad (11)$$

with confidence level at least $(1 - \beta)$. However, for a fixed f , when n is large enough, (11) will imply $f(\tau_i) = f(\tau_i + 0) \neq f(\tau_i - 0)$, i.e., a jump of f at τ_i , for some τ_i . Thus, a significant change-point in most cases leads to a true change-point. In practice, we recommend $m = \lfloor \log n \rfloor$ as the default choice.

See Figure 2 (in Section 1) for an illustration. The SMUCE has detected 3 change-points, 1 mode and 1 trough. By the method described above, we can claim that the truth has at least 1 mode (in region $[0.36, 0.88)$), 1 trough (in region $[0.1, 0.63)$) and 2 change-points (at 0.5 and 0.75), with probability at least 90%. Such inference is nicely confirmed by the underlying truth.

5 Oracle properties

This section focuses on the oracle properties of multiscale change-point segmentation methods. For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to \mathcal{A}_2^γ and L^2 -topology.

5.1 Oracle segmentation

It is well-known that the crucial difficulty in change-point segmentation problems is to infer the locations of change-points; Once the change-point locations are detected, the height of each segment can easily be determined via any reasonable estimator, e.g. a maximum likelihood estimator, locally on each segment (see e.g. Killick et al., 2012; Fryzlewicz, 2014). In line of this thought, we define

$$\Pi_n := \left\{ (\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_k) : \tau_0 = 0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_k = 1, k \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and } \{n\tau_i\}_{i=1}^k \subseteq \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

For each $\tau \equiv (\tau_0, \dots, \tau_k)$, we introduce the piecewise constant segmentation estimator $\hat{f}_{\tau,n}$, conditioned on τ , for model (1) as

$$\hat{f}_{\tau,n} := \sum_{i=1}^k \hat{c}_i \mathbf{1}_{[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)} \quad \text{with } \hat{c}_i := \frac{\sum_{j \in [n\tau_{i-1}, n\tau_i)} y_j^n}{n(\tau_i - \tau_{i-1})}.$$

Theorem 4. Assume model (1), and sub-Gaussian noises s.t. $\mathbb{E}[(\xi_i^n)^2] \asymp \sigma_0^2$, i.e., for some constants c_1, c_2 it holds that $c_1 \sigma_0^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[(\xi_i^n)^2] \leq c_2 \sigma_0^2$ for every possible i and n . Let \hat{f}_n be a multiscale change-point segmentation method in Definition 2 with threshold as in (4) or (6). Then, there is a universal constant C such that for every f in $\cup_{\gamma > 0} \mathcal{A}_2^\gamma \cap L^\infty$

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^2}^2] \leq C \log n \inf_{\tau \in \Pi_n} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\tau,n} - f\|_{L^2}^2] \quad \text{for sufficiently large } n.$$

Proof. See Appendix A.4. □

Remark 7. Theorem 4 states that multiscale change-point segmentation methods perform nearly (up to a log-factor) as well as the piecewise constant segmentation estimator using an oracle for the change-point locations.

We next consider the *saturation phenomenon* of piecewise constant segmentation estimators via a simple example.

Example 2. Assume model (1) with the truth $f(x) \equiv x$ and the noise ξ_i^n being standard Gaussian. For simplicity, let $n = 6m^3$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Elementary calculation shows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\tau_*,n} - f\|_{L^2}^2] = \inf_{\tau \in \Pi_n} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\tau,n} - f\|_{L^2}^2] = \frac{6^{2/3} + 6^{-1/3}}{12} n^{-2/3}$$

and $\tau_* = (0, 1/m, \dots, (m-1)/m, 1)$. Note that $f(x) \equiv x$ lies in every Hölder class H_L^α with $0 < \alpha < \infty$ and $L \geq 1$, and that the minimax optimal rates in terms of squared L^2 -risk for H_L^α is of order $n^{-2\alpha/(2\alpha+1)}$. Thus, it indicates that the piecewise segmentation estimator even with the oracle choice of change-points saturates at smoothness order $\alpha = 1$. This in turn explains why multiscale change-point segmentation methods cannot achieve faster rates for functions of smoothness order ≥ 1 .

Note that such saturation phenomenon for piecewise constant segmentation estimators is by no means due to the discontinuity of the estimator. In fact, one could discretize a smooth estimator (i.e., wavelet shrinkage estimators, Donoho et al., 1995) on the sample grids $\{i/n\}_{i=0}^n$ into a piecewise constant one: the discretized version performs equally well as the original estimator in asymptotical sense, since the discretization error vanishes faster than statistical estimation error. In contrast, the underlying reason for the aforementioned saturation is because piecewise constant segmentation estimators aim to segment data into constant pieces, rather than approximate the truth as well as possible. The purpose of segmentation into constant pieces provides an easy interpretation of the data, but it turns out to be less sufficient if the complete recovery of the truth is the statistical task. To overcome this saturation barrier, one could smoothen each segment based on detected change-point locations (see Boneva et al., 1971), which is, however, beyond the scope of this paper.

5.2 Oracle approximant

Here we examine the performance of multiscale change-point segmentation methods \hat{f}_n by comparing it with the best piecewise constant approximants of f with up to $\#J(\hat{f}_n)$ jumps. By means of compactness arguments and the convexity of L^2 -norm, we can define

$$f_k^{\text{app}} \in \underset{g \in \mathcal{S}, \#J(g) \leq k}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|f - g\|_{L^2} \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (12)$$

which might be non-unique, as mentioned earlier in Section 3.2.

Proposition 2. *Assume model (1). Let \hat{f}_n be a multiscale change-point segmentation method in Definition 2 with threshold as in (4) or (6), and $\hat{K}_n := \#J(\hat{f}_n)$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{A}_{2,L}^\gamma} \|f - f_{\hat{K}_n}^{\text{app}}\|_{L^2} \geq C \sup_{f \in \mathcal{A}_{2,L}^\gamma} \|f - \hat{f}_n\|_{L^2} \right\} = 1 \quad \text{for some constant } C.$$

Proof. Following the proof of Theorem 2 and Remark 4, one can see that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{A_n\} = 1, \quad (13)$$

where the event A_n is defined as

$$A_n := \left\{ \hat{K}_n \leq k_n, \sup_{f \in \mathcal{A}_{2,L}^\gamma} \|f - \hat{f}_n\|_{L^2} \leq C_2 \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2\gamma+1}} \right\} \quad \text{with } k_n := C_1 \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2\gamma+1}}.$$

On the event A_n , it holds that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{A}_{2,L}^\gamma} \|f - f_{\hat{K}_n}^{\text{app}}\|_{L^2} \geq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{A}_{2,L}^\gamma} \|f - f_{k_n}^{\text{app}}\|_{L^2} \geq C_3 k_n^{-\gamma} \geq C_4 \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2\gamma+1}} \geq C_5 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{A}_{2,L}^\gamma} \|f - \hat{f}_n\|_{L^2}.$$

This, together with (13), concludes the proof. \square




Figure 4: Performance of a particular multiscale change-point segmentation method \hat{f}_n (SMUCE, Frick et al., 2014) as oracle approximants for the signal in Olshen et al. (2004), Zhang and Siegmund (2007). The bottom panel shows the best approximant $f_{\hat{K}_n}$, defined in (12), of the truth with up to \hat{K}_n jumps. Here $\text{SNR} = 3$ and $\|f - \hat{f}_n\|_{L^2} = 1.3\|f - f_{\hat{K}_n}^{\text{app}}\|_{L^2}$.

Remark 8. Note that $\|f - f_{\hat{K}_n}^{\text{app}}\|_{L^2} \leq \|f - \hat{f}_n\|_{L^2}$, and that Proposition 2 implies

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{A}_{2,L}^\gamma} \frac{\|f - f_{\hat{K}_n}^{\text{app}}\|_{L^2}}{\|f - \hat{f}_n\|_{L^2}} \geq C \right\} = 1.$$

This indicates that \hat{f}_n performs almost (up to a constant) as well as the best approximants $f_{\hat{K}_n}^{\text{app}}$ of f over all step functions with up to \hat{K}_n jumps, see Figure 4 for a visual illustration.

6 Simulation study

Note that in the definition of multiscale change-point segmentation methods, we consider only the local constraints on the intervals where candidate functions are constant. This ensures the structure of the corresponding optimization problem (3) to be a directed acyclic graph, which makes *dynamic programming* algorithms (cf. Bellman, 1957) applicable to

such a problem (see also Friedrich et al., 2008). Moreover, the computation can be substantially accelerated by incorporating *pruning* ideas as recently developed in Killick et al. (2012), Frick et al. (2014) and Li et al. (2016). As a consequence, the computational complexity of multiscale change-point segmentation methods can be even *linear* in terms of the number of observations, in case that there are many change-points, see Frick et al. (2014) and Li et al. (2016) for further details.

We now investigate the finite sample performance of multiscale change-point segmentation methods from the previously discussed perspectives. For brevity, we only consider a particular multiscale change-point segmentation method, SMUCE (Frick et al., 2014), and stress that the results are similar for other multiscale change-point segmentation methods of type (3) (which are not shown here), see e.g. Li et al. (2016) for an extensive simulation study. For SMUCE, we use the implementation of an efficient pruned dynamic program from the CRAN R-package “stepR”, select the system of all intervals with dyadic lengths for the multiscale constraint, and choose $\eta(\beta)$ as the threshold, which is simulated by 10,000 Monte-Carlo simulations. In what follows, the noise is assumed to be Gaussian with a known noise level σ , and SNR denotes the signal-to-noise ratio $\|f\|_{L^2}/\sigma$.

6.1 Stability

We first examine the stability of multiscale change-point segmentation methods with respect to the significance level β , i.e. to the threshold η . The test signal f (adopted from Olshen et al., 2004; Zhang and Siegmund, 2007) has 6 change points at 138, 225, 242, 299, 308, 332, and its values on each segment are -0.18, 0.08, 1.07, -0.53, 0.16, -0.69, -0.16, respectively. Figure 5 presents the behavior of SMUCE with threshold $\eta = \eta(\beta)$ for different choices of significance level β . In fact, for the shown data, SMUCE detects the correct number of change-points, and recovers the location and the height of each segment in high accuracy, for the whole range of $0.06 \leq \beta \leq 0.94$ (i.e. $0.47\sqrt{\log n} \geq \eta \geq -0.04\sqrt{\log n}$). Only for smaller β (< 0.06 , i.e. $\eta > 0.47\sqrt{\log n}$), SMUCE tends to underestimate the number of change-points (see the second panel of Figure 5 for example, where the missing change-point is marked by a vertical line), while, for larger β (> 0.94 , i.e. $\eta < -0.04\sqrt{\log n}$), it is inclined to recover false change points (as shown in the last panel of Figure 5). Note that in either case the estimated locations and heights of the remaining segments (away from the missing/spurious jumps) are fairly accurate. This reveals that SMUCE is remarkably stable with respect to the choice of β (or η), in accordance with the assumptions (4) and (6) of Theorem 1, Remark 3 and Proposition 1 (i).

6.2 Different noise levels

We next investigate the impact of the noise level (or equivalently SNR) on multiscale change-point segmentation methods. We consider the recovery of the Blocks signal (Donoho and Johnstone, 1994) for different noise levels. The results for SMUCE at significance




Figure 5: Estimation of the step signal in Olshen et al. (2004) and Zhang and Siegmund (2007) by SMUCE with $\eta = \eta(\beta)$ for different β (sample size $n = 497$, and $\text{SNR} = 1$).

level $\beta = 0.1$ are summarized in Figures 6. It shows that SMUCE recovers the signal well for low and medium noise levels, while misses one or two small scale features for small SNR.

6.3 Robustness

To study the robustness of multiscale change-point segmentation methods in case of model misspecification, we introduce a local trend component as in Olshen et al. (2004) and Zhang and Siegmund (2007) to the test signal f in Section 6.1, which leads to the model

$$y_i^n = (\bar{f}_i^n + 0.25b \sin(a\pi i)) + \xi_i^n, \quad i = 0, \dots, n-1. \quad (14)$$

Weak background waves: We simulate data for $a = 0.025$ and $b = 0.3$, and apply SMUCE again with various choices of β , see Figure 7. In accordance with the previous simulations and Proposition 1 (ii), SMUCE captures all relevant features of the signal again for a wide range of β ($0.08 \leq \beta \leq 0.29$).




Figure 6: Blocks signal: SMUCE for various noise levels (sample size $n = 1,023$).

Strong background waves: When the parameter b becomes larger, i.e., the fluctuation is stronger, SMUCE captures the fluctuation by inducing additional change-points according to Theorems 2, 4 and Proposition 2. Figure 8 illustrates the performance of SMUCE for the signal in (14) with $b = 1.0$ and $b = 1.2$ under different noise levels. With high probability (see Section 4) it recovers the pieces of increases and decreases and hence the relevant modes and troughs.

6.4 Empirical convergence rates

Lastly, we empirically explore how well the finite sample risk is approximated by our asymptotic approximations. The test signals are Blocks and Heavisine (Donoho and Johnstone, 1994). In Figure 9, we display the average of L^2 -loss of SMUCE with significance level $\beta = 0.1$ over 20 repetitions for a range of sample sizes from 1,023 to 10,230. From Figure 9 we draw that the empirical convergence rates are quite close to the minimax optimal rates (indicated by slopes of the red straight lines), which confirms our theoretical findings in Theorems 1 and 2.




Figure 7: Estimation of the signal in (14) ($a = 0.025, b = 0.3$) by SMUCE with $\eta = \eta(\beta)$ for different β (sample size $n = 497$, and $\text{SNR} = 1$).

7 Conclusion

In this paper we focus on the convergence analysis for multiscale change-point segmentation methods, a general family of change-point estimators based on the combination of variational estimation and multiple testing over different scales, in a nonparametric regression setting with special emphasis on step functions while allowing for various distortions. We found that the estimation difficulty for a step function is mainly determined by its number of jumps, and shown that multiscale change-point segmentation methods attain the nearly optimal convergence rates for step functions with asymptotically bounded or even increasing number of jumps. As a robustness study, we also examined the convergence behavior of these methods for more general functions, which are viewed as distorted jump functions. Such distortion is precisely characterized by certain approximation spaces. In particular, we have derived nearly optimal convergence rates for multiscale change-point segmentation methods in case that the regression function is either a (piecewise) Hölder function or a bounded variation function. Remarkably, these methods automatically adapt




Figure 8: Estimation of the signal in (14) with $a = 0.025$ and $b = 1$ or 1.2 by SMUCE for various noise levels (sample size $n = 497$).




Figure 9: Convergence rates of SMUCE for Blocks and Heavisine signals ($\text{SNR} = 2.5$).

to the unknown smoothness for all aforementioned function classes, as the only tuning parameter can be selected in a universal way. The convergence rates also provide statistical justification with respect to the detection of features, such as change-points and modes (or

troughs). In addition, the multiscale change-point segmentation methods \hat{f}_n are shown perform nearly as well as the oracle piecewise constant segmentation estimators, and the best piecewise constant (oracle) approximants of the truth with less or the same number of jumps as \hat{f}_n .

The multiscale change-point segmentation methods, however, cannot attain faster rates for functions of stronger smoothness than above, which is indeed a common saturation shared by all piecewise constant segment estimators. This can be improved by considering piecewise polynomial estimators (see e.g. Spokoiny, 1998), but the proper combination with multiscale methodology needs further investigation (see the rejoinder by Frick et al., 2014, for a first attempt). Alternatively, certain smoothness penalty can be selected instead of the number of jumps in the formulation of multiscale change-point segmentation, see e.g. Grasmair et al. (2018), where the nearly optimal rates are shown for higher order Sobolev/Besov classes. In addition, extension of our results to models with general errors beyond sub-Gaussian, such as heavy tailed distributions, and stationery Gaussian processes (see e.g. Cheng and Schwartzman, 2015), would be interesting for future research.

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

We first consider Part (i), and structure the proof into three steps.

a) *Good noise case.* Assume that the truth f lies in the multiscale constraint,

$$T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) \leq a\sqrt{\log n}.$$

In particular, $T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) \leq a\sqrt{\log n}$, so $\#J(\hat{f}_n) \leq \#J(f) \leq k_n$. Let intervals $\{I_i\}_{i=0}^m$ be the partition of $[0, 1]$ by $J(\hat{f}_n) \cup J(f)$ with $m \leq 2k_n$. Then

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^p = \sum_{i=0}^m |\hat{\theta}_i - \theta_i|^p |I_i| \quad \text{with } \hat{f}_n|_{I_i} \equiv \hat{\theta}_i \text{ and } f|_{I_i} \equiv \theta_i.$$

If $|I_i| > c/n$, then by c -normality of \mathcal{I} , there is $\tilde{I}_i \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $\tilde{I}_i \subseteq I_i$ and $|\tilde{I}_i| \geq |I_i|/c$. It follows that

$$|\tilde{I}_i|^{1/2} \left| \theta - \frac{1}{n|\tilde{I}_i|} \sum_{j/n \in \tilde{I}_i} y_j^n \right| \leq (a + \delta) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \quad \text{for } \theta = \theta_i \text{ or } \hat{\theta}_i,$$

which, together with $|\tilde{I}_i| \geq |I_i|/c$, implies

$$|I_i|^{1/2} |\hat{\theta}_i - \theta_i| \leq 2(a + \delta) \sqrt{\frac{c \log n}{n}}.$$

If $|I_i| \leq c/n$, then we have for some i_0

$$|\hat{\theta}_i - \theta_i| \leq |\hat{\theta}_i - y_{i_0}^n| + |y_{i_0}^n - \bar{f}_{i_0}^n| + 2\|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2(a + \delta) \sqrt{\log n} + 2L.$$

Thus, by combining these two situations, we obtain that

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^p \leq \sum_{i:|I_i|>c/n} |I_i| \left(2(a+\delta) \sqrt{\frac{c \log n}{n|I_i|}} \right)^p + \sum_{i:|I_i|\leq c/n} \frac{c}{n} \left(2(a+\delta) \sqrt{\log n} + 2L \right)^p.$$

Note that for $0 < p < 2$, by the Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i:|I_i|>c/n} |I_i| \left(2(a+\delta) \sqrt{\frac{c \log n}{n|I_i|}} \right)^p &\leq \left(\sum_{i:|I_i|>c/n} |I_i| \right)^{1-p/2} \left(\sum_{i:|I_i|>c/n} 4(a+\delta)^2 \frac{c \log n}{n} \right)^{p/2} \\ &\leq \left(4(2k_n+1)(a+\delta)^2 \frac{c \log n}{n} \right)^{p/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and for $2 \leq p < \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i:|I_i|>c/n} |I_i| \left(2(a+\delta) \sqrt{\frac{c \log n}{n|I_i|}} \right)^p &\leq \sum_{i:|I_i|>c/n} \left(2(a+\delta) \sqrt{\frac{c \log n}{n}} \right)^p \left(\frac{c}{n} \right)^{1-p/2} \\ &\leq \frac{(2k_n+1)c}{n} (4(a+\delta)^2 \log n)^{p/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $k_n = o(n)$, we have as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r \leq 2^{r/p} \left(\frac{(2k_n+1)c}{n} \right)^{\min\{r/2, r/p\}} (4(a+\delta)^2 \log n)^{r/2} (1+o(1)). \quad (15)$$

b) *Almost sure convergence.* For each $I \in \mathcal{I}$, note that $(n|I|)^{-1/2} \sum_{i/n \in I} \xi_i^n$ is again sub-Gaussian with scale parameter σ , so $\mathbb{P}\{(n|I|)^{-1/2} |\sum_{i/n \in I} \xi_i^n| > x\} \leq 2 \exp(-x^2/2\sigma^2)$ for any $x > 0$. Then, by Boole's inequality, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left\{T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) > a\sqrt{\log n}\right\} &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n|I|}} \left| \sum_{i/n \in I} \xi_i^n \right| > (a-\delta)\sqrt{\log n}\right\} \\ &\leq 2n^{-\frac{(a-\delta)^2}{2\sigma^2}+2} \leq 2n^{-r} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

This and (15) imply the almost sure convergence assertion for $\eta = a\sqrt{\log n}$.

c) *Convergence in expectation.* It follows from (15) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r; T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) \leq a\sqrt{\log n}\right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r; T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) > a\sqrt{\log n}\right] \\ &\leq 2^{r/p} \left(\frac{(2k_n+1)c}{n} \right)^{\min\{r/2, r/p\}} (4(a+\delta)^2 \log n)^{r/2} (1+o(1)) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r; T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) > a\sqrt{\log n}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

We next show the second term above asymptotically vanishes faster.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r; T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) > a\sqrt{\log n} \right] \\
&= \int_0^{2n^{p/2}} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^p \geq u; T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) > a\sqrt{\log n} \right\} \frac{r}{p} u^{r/p-1} du \\
&\quad + \int_{2n^{p/2}}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^p \geq u; T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) > a\sqrt{\log n} \right\} \frac{r}{p} u^{r/p-1} du \\
&\leq 2^{r/p} n^{r/2} \mathbb{P} \left\{ T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) > a\sqrt{\log n} \right\} + \int_{2n^{p/2}}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^p \geq u \right\} \frac{r}{p} u^{r/p-1} du \\
&\leq 2^{r/p+1} n^{-r/2} + \int_{2n^{p/2}}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^p \geq u \right\} \frac{r}{p} u^{r/p-1} du, \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (16). Introduce functions $g = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} y_i^n \mathbf{1}_{[i/n, (i+1)/n)}$ and $h = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(i/n) \mathbf{1}_{[i/n, (i+1)/n)}$. Then, with notation $\xi^n := \{\xi_i^n\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$, $(x)_+ := \max\{x, 0\}$ and $s := (2r - p)_+$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^p &\leq 3^{(p-1)+} \left(\|\hat{f}_n - g\|_{L^p}^p + \|g - h\|_{L^p}^p + \|h - f\|_{L^p}^p \right) \\
&\leq 3^{(p-1)+} \left((a + \delta)^p (\log n)^{p/2} + n^{-1} \|\xi^n\|_{\ell^p}^p + (2L)^p \right) \\
&\leq 3^{(p-1)+} \left((a + \delta)^p (\log n)^{p/2} + n^{-p/(p+s)} \|\xi^n\|_{\ell^{p+s}}^p + (2L)^p \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for large enough n , i.e. if $n^{p/2} \geq 3^{(p-1)+} ((a + \delta)^p (\log n)^{p/2} + (2L)^p)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{2n^{p/2}}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left\{ \|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^p \geq u \right\} \frac{r}{p} u^{r/p-1} du \\
&\leq \int_{2n^{p/2}}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left\{ 3^{(p-1)+} \left((a + \delta)^p (\log n)^{p/2} + n^{-p/(p+s)} \|\xi^n\|_{\ell^{p+s}}^p + (2L)^p \right) \geq u \right\} \frac{r}{p} u^{r/p-1} du \\
&\leq \int_{n^{p/2}}^\infty \mathbb{P} \left\{ 3^{(1+s/p)(p-1)+} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |\xi_i^n|^{p+s} \geq u^{1+s/p} \right\} \frac{r}{p} 2^{r/p} u^{r/p-1} du \\
&\leq 2^{r/p} 3^{(1+s/p)(p-1)+} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |\xi_i^n|^{p+s} \right] \int_{n^{p/2}}^\infty \frac{r}{p} u^{-(s-r)/p-2} du = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by the fact $s \geq 2r - p$ and

$$\mathbb{E}[|\xi_i^n|^{p+s}] \leq (p+s) 2^{(p+s)/2} \sigma^{p+s} \Gamma\left(\frac{p+s}{2}\right) = \mathcal{O}(1) \quad \text{for each } i.$$

Thus, by (17) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r; T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) > a\sqrt{\log n} \right] &= \mathcal{O}(n^{-r/2}) \\
&= o\left((n^{-1}(2k_n + 1))^{\min\{r/p, r/2\}} (\log n)^{r/2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of Part (i).

Moreover, we stress that for the choice of threshold $\eta = \eta(\beta)$ the assertions of Part (i) still hold, which follow readily from the proof above, by noting the facts that $\eta(\beta) \leq$

$a\sqrt{\log n}$ for some constant a , due to (16), and that $\mathbb{P}\{T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) > \eta(\beta)\} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r})$ by the choice of $\beta = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r})$.

Finally, we consider Part (ii). The lower bound can be proven similarly as Li et al. (2016, Theorem 3.4), by means of standard arguments based on testing many hypotheses (pioneered by Ibragimov and Has'minskiĭ, 1977; Has'minskiĭ, 1978). More precisely, we consider two collections of hypotheses

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{2k_n+2} \frac{(-1)^i \tilde{z}_0}{2} \mathbf{1}_{[\frac{i-1}{2k_n+2} + c_{i-1}, \frac{i}{2k_n+2} + c_i)} : c_i = \pm \frac{\sigma_0^2 \log 2}{32n\tilde{z}_0^2}, c_0 = c_{2k_n+2} = 0 \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_L(k_n)$$

with $\tilde{z}_0 := \min\{z_0, L\}$, and

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k_n+1} \frac{(-1)^i L + c_i}{2} \mathbf{1}_{[\frac{i-1}{k_n+1}, \frac{i}{k_n+1})} : c_i = \pm \frac{\sigma_0}{4} \sqrt{\frac{k_n \log 2}{2n}} \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_L(k_n).$$

Elementary calculation together with Fano's lemma (cf. Tsybakov, 2009, Corollary 2.6) concludes the proof.

Parts (i) and (ii) imply that \hat{f}_n is minimax optimal over $\mathcal{S}_L(k_n)$ up to a log-factor. Now the adaptation property follows by noting further that the choice of the only tuning parameter η in (4) is universal, i.e. completely independent of the (unknown) true regression function. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The idea behind is that we first approximate the truth f by a step function f_{k_n} with $\mathcal{O}(k_n)$ jumps, and then treat f_{k_n} as the underlying “true” signal in model (1) (with additional approximation error). In this way, it allows us to employ similar techniques as in the proof of Theorem 1. To be rigorous, we give a detailed proof as follows.

Since $\mathcal{A}_{q,L}^\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\infty,L}^\gamma$, it is sufficient to consider $q < \infty$.

a) *Good noise case.* Assume for the moment that the observations $y^n = \{y_i^n\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$ from model (1) are close to the truth f in the sense that the event

$$\mathcal{G}_n := \left\{ y^n : \sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n|I|}} \left| \sum_{i/n \in I} (y_i^n - \bar{f}_i^n) \right| - s_I \leq a_0 \sqrt{\log n} \right\} \quad (18)$$

holds with $a_0 = \delta + \sigma\sqrt{2r+4}$. Now let

$$k_n := \left\lceil \left(\frac{4L}{a - a_0} \right)^{2/(2\gamma+1)} \left(\frac{n}{\log n} \right)^{1/(2\gamma+1)} \right\rceil.$$

Since $f \in \mathcal{A}_{q,L}^\gamma$, for every n there exists a step function $\tilde{f}_{k_n} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\#J(\tilde{f}_{k_n}) \leq k_n$ such that $\|f - \tilde{f}_{k_n}\|_{L^q} \leq Lk_n^{-\gamma}$, by means of compactness argument. Based on the continuity of $\int_{[0,x)} f(t)dt$, one can find $\tau_0 \equiv 0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_{k_n} \equiv 1$ satisfying $\int_{[\tau_{i-1}, \tau_i)} |f(t) - \tilde{f}_{k_n}(t)|^2 dt = \|f - \tilde{f}_{k_n}\|_{L^2}^2 / k_n$ for each i . By including such τ_i 's as change-points, one can construct another step function \check{f}_{k_n} with $\#J(\check{f}_{k_n}) \leq 2k_n$, $\|f - \check{f}_{k_n}\|_{L^q} \leq 2Lk_n^{-\gamma}$, and $\|(f - \check{f}_{k_n})\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^2} \leq 2Lk_n^{-\gamma-1/2}$ for every segment I of \check{f}_{k_n} . Moving each change-point of \check{f}_{k_n} to the closest point in $\{0, 1/n, \dots, (n-1)/n\}$ but leaving the height of segments

unchanged, one obtains a step function f_{k_n} such that $\#J(f_{k_n}) \leq 2k_n$ and $\|f - f_{k_n}\|_{L^q} \leq 2Lk_n^{-\gamma} + 2L(k_n/n)^{1/q}$. Since $q \geq 2$, it holds that $\|(f - f_{k_n})\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^2} \leq 2Lk_n^{-\gamma-1/2} + 2Ln^{-1/2}$ for every segment I of f_{k_n} . Then for sufficiently large n

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f_{k_n}) &\leq \sup_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I} \\ f_{k_n} \equiv c_I \text{ on } I}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n|I|}} \left| \sum_{i/n \in I} (\bar{f}_i^n - c_I) \right| + \sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n|I|}} \left| \sum_{i/n \in I} (y_i^n - \bar{f}_i^n) \right| - s_I \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I} \\ f_{k_n} \equiv c_I \text{ on } I}} \sqrt{\frac{n}{|I|}} \int_I |f(t) - f_{k_n}(t)| dt + a_0 \sqrt{\log n} \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I} \\ f_{k_n} \equiv c_I \text{ on } I}} \sqrt{n} \|(f - f_{k_n})\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^2} + a_0 \sqrt{\log n} \\ &\leq 2n^{1/2} k_n^{-\gamma-1/2} L + 2L + a_0 \sqrt{\log n} \leq a \sqrt{\log n}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, f_{k_n} lies in the constraint of (3). Thus, by definition, $\#J(\hat{f}_n) \leq \#J(f_{k_n}) \leq 2k_n$. Let intervals $\{I_i\}_{i=0}^m$ be the partition of $[0, 1)$ by $J(\hat{f}_n) \cup J(f_{k_n})$ with $m \leq 4k_n$. Then

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f_{k_n}\|_{L^p}^p = \sum_{i=0}^m |\hat{\theta}_i - \theta_i|^p |I_i| \quad \text{with } \hat{f}_n|_{I_i} \equiv \hat{\theta}_i \text{ and } f_{k_n}|_{I_i} \equiv \theta_i.$$

If $|I_i| > c/n$, there is $\tilde{I}_i \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $\tilde{I}_i \subseteq I_i$ and $|\tilde{I}_i| \geq |I_i|/c$. Then,

$$|\tilde{I}_i|^{1/2} \left| \theta - \frac{1}{n|\tilde{I}_i|} \sum_{j/n \in \tilde{I}_i} y_j^n \right| \leq (a + \delta) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \quad \text{for } \theta = \theta_i \text{ or } \hat{\theta}_i,$$

which, together with $|\tilde{I}_i| \geq |I_i|/c$, implies

$$|I_i|^{1/2} |\hat{\theta}_i - \theta_i| \leq 2(a + \delta) \sqrt{\frac{c \log n}{n}}.$$

If $|I_i| \leq c/n$, then we have for some i_0

$$|\hat{\theta}_i| \leq |\hat{\theta}_i - y_{i_0}^n| + |y_{i_0}^n - \bar{f}_{i_0}^n| + \|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq 2(a + \delta) \sqrt{\log n} + L \text{ and } |\theta_i| \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq L,$$

which lead to

$$|\hat{\theta}_i - \theta_i| \leq |\hat{\theta}_i| + |\theta_i| \leq 2(a + \delta) \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} + 2L.$$

Thus, by combining these two situations, we obtain that

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f_{k_n}\|_{L^p}^p \leq \sum_{i: |I_i| > c/n} \left(2(a + \delta) \sqrt{\frac{c \log n}{n|I_i|}} \right)^p |I_i| + \sum_{i: |I_i| \leq c/n} \left(2(a + \delta) \sqrt{\log n} + 2L \right)^p \frac{c}{n}.$$

Then, with a similar argument as for (15), we obtain as $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f_{k_n}\|_{L^p}^p \leq 2 \left(4(a + \delta)^2 \log n \right)^{p/2} \left(\frac{(4k_n + 1)c}{n} \right)^{\min\{1, p/2\}} (1 + o(1)),$$

which together with a triangular inequality leads to

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r \leq 2^{(2/p+1)r} \left(4(a+\delta)^2 \log n\right)^{r/2} \left(\frac{(4k_n+1)c}{n}\right)^{\min\{r/p, r/2\}} (1+o(1)). \quad (19)$$

b) *Rates of convergence.* The rate of almost convergence is a consequence of (19) and the fact that, due to (16),

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}_n^c\} \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n|I|}} \left|\sum_{i/n \in I} \xi_i^n\right| > (a_0 - \delta)\sqrt{\log n}\right\} = 0.$$

Similar to the proof step (iii) of Theorem 1, we drive from (19) that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r; \mathcal{G}_n\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r; \mathcal{G}_n^c\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^r; \mathcal{G}_n\right] + 2^{r/p} n^{r/2} \mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}_n^c\} + \int_{2n^{p/2}}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^p}^p \geq u\right\} \frac{r}{p} u^{r/p-1} du \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}\left((\log n)^{r/2} (n^{-1} k_n)^{\min\{r/p, r/2\}}\right) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-r/2}) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left((\log n)^{r/2} (n^{-1} k_n)^{\min\{r/p, r/2\}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which shows the rate of convergence in expectation.

We note, in addition, that for the choice of threshold $\eta = \eta(\beta)$, the proof follows in the same way as above, based on the facts that $\eta(\beta) \leq a\sqrt{\log n}$ for some constant a , due to (16), and that $\mathbb{P}\{\mathcal{G}_n^c\} = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r})$ by the choice of $\beta = \mathcal{O}(n^{-r})$. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

The proof relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Under model (1) with the truth $f \in \mathcal{D}$, let \hat{f}_n be a multiscale change-point segmentation method in Definition 2 with constants c, δ , interval system \mathcal{I} , and universal threshold η in (4) or (6).*

a) *Let \mathcal{I}_n be an arbitrary collection of (possibly random) intervals. If further $f \in \mathcal{A}_{2,L}^\gamma$ for some $\gamma, L > 0$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\max\{|I|^{1/2}|m_I(\hat{f}_n) - m_I(f)| : I \in \mathcal{I}_n\} \leq C\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)^{\gamma/(2\gamma+1)}\right\} = 1,$$

where C is a constant depending only on η, c and L .

b) *If further $\mathcal{I}_n \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, and on each $I \in \mathcal{I}_n$ we have \hat{f}_n is constant, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{|I|^{1/2}|m_I(\hat{f}_n) - m_I(f)| \leq \frac{2(\eta + s_I)}{n^{1/2}} \quad \text{for all } I \in \mathcal{I}_n\right\} \geq \mathbb{P}\{T_{\mathcal{I}}(\xi^n; 0) \leq \eta\},$$

where the right hand side converges to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Part a): Note that for each $I \in \mathcal{I}_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} |I|^{1/2} |m_I(\hat{f}_n) - m_I(f)| &\leq \frac{1}{|I|^{1/2}} \int_I |\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)| dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{|I|^{1/2}} |I|^{1/2} \left(\int_I |\hat{f}_n(x) - f(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the assertion follows from Theorem 2.

Part b): Assume $T_{\mathcal{I}}(\xi^n; 0) \leq \eta$. Then $T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; f) \leq \eta$. Since $T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; \hat{f}_n) \leq \eta$ by definition, we obtain for either $g = f$ or $g = \hat{f}_n$

$$|I|^{1/2} \left| m_I(g) - \frac{1}{n|I|} \sum_{j/n \in I} y_j^n \right| \leq s_I + \eta \quad \text{for any } I \in \mathcal{I}_n.$$

Thus, by triangular inequality it holds $|I|^{1/2} |m_I(\hat{f}_n) - m_I(f)| \leq 2(s_I + \eta)$. This shows

$$\{T_{\mathcal{I}}(\xi^n; 0) \leq \eta\} \subseteq \left\{ |I|^{1/2} |m_I(\hat{f}_n) - m_I(f)| \leq \frac{2(\eta + s_I)}{n^{1/2}} \quad \text{for all } I \in \mathcal{I}_n \right\},$$

which shows the assertion. By the choice of η , it holds $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}\{T_{\mathcal{I}}(\xi^n; 0)\} = 1$. \square

Part (i): We select \mathcal{I}_n as a fixed collection of intervals that capture the modes and troughs of f . That is, $\mathcal{I}_n := \{I_1, \dots, I_m\}$ for some m such that $I_1 < I_2 < \dots < I_m$ and $m_{I_1}(f) \neq m_{I_2}(f) \neq \dots \neq m_{I_m}(f)$. By Lemma 1 a) we have

$$\max\{|I|^{1/2} |m_I(\hat{f}_n) - m_I(f)| : I \in \mathcal{I}_n\} \rightarrow 0.$$

It implies $m_{I_1}(\hat{f}_n) \neq m_{I_2}(\hat{f}_n) \neq \dots \neq m_{I_m}(\hat{f}_n)$ for sufficiently large n , and thus (8).

Now we set $\mathcal{I}_n := \{[x, x + \lambda_n^\varepsilon), [x - \lambda_n^\varepsilon, x) : x \in J_\varepsilon(f)\}$ with

$$\lambda_n^\varepsilon := \min\{d(J(\hat{f}_n), J_\varepsilon(f)), \delta_n\} \quad \text{for some positive } \delta_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ arbitrarily slow.}$$

For $x \in J_\varepsilon(f)$, note that \hat{f}_n is constant on $[x - \lambda_n^\varepsilon, x + \lambda_n^\varepsilon)$, which in particular implies $m_{[x - \lambda_n^\varepsilon, x)}(\hat{f}_n) = m_{[x, x + \lambda_n^\varepsilon)}(\hat{f}_n)$. Moreover, as $\lambda_n^\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, from the definition of Δ_f^ε and $f \in \mathcal{D}$ it follows for sufficiently large n

$$|m_{[x - \lambda_n^\varepsilon, x)}(f) - m_{[x, x + \lambda_n^\varepsilon)}(f)| \geq \frac{1}{2} \Delta_f^\varepsilon \quad \text{for all } x \in J_\varepsilon(f). \quad (20)$$

We claim that for each $x \in J_\varepsilon(f)$ there exists $I_x = [x, x + \lambda_n^\varepsilon)$ or $[x - \lambda_n^\varepsilon, x)$ such that $|m_{I_x}(f) - m_{I_x}(\hat{f}_n)| \geq \Delta_f^\varepsilon/4$. Otherwise, if $|m_{I_x}(f) - m_{I_x}(\hat{f}_n)| < \Delta_f^\varepsilon/4$ holds for both $I_x = [x, x + \lambda_n^\varepsilon)$ and $[x - \lambda_n^\varepsilon, x)$, then it leads to $|m_{[x - \lambda_n^\varepsilon, x)}(f) - m_{[x, x + \lambda_n^\varepsilon)}(f)| < \Delta_f^\varepsilon/2$, which contradicts with (20). Thus, by Lemma 1 a), it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ \frac{\Delta_f^\varepsilon}{4} \leq |m_{I_x}(f) - m_{I_x}(\hat{f}_n)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\lambda_n^\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{\gamma/(2\gamma+1)} \quad \text{for all } x \in J_\varepsilon(f) \right\} = 1.$$

It implies $\lambda_n^\varepsilon \leq 16C^2(\Delta_f^\varepsilon)^{-2}(\log n/n)^{2\gamma/(2\gamma+1)}$ almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By letting $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$

slower than $(\log n/n)^{2\gamma/(2\gamma+1)}$, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left\{ d(J(\hat{f}_n), J_\varepsilon(f)) \leq \frac{16C^2}{(\Delta_f^\varepsilon)^2} \left(\frac{\log n}{n} \right)^{2\gamma/(2\gamma+1)} \right\} = 1,$$

and thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \{ \#J(\hat{f}_n) \geq \#J_\varepsilon(f) \} = 1$. Therefore, (9) holds.

Part (ii): By Lemma 1 b), we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ |I_i|^{1/2} |m_{I_i}(\hat{f}_n) - m_{I_i}(f)| \leq \frac{2(\eta + s_{I_i})}{n^{1/2}} \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \right\} \geq \mathbb{P} \{ T_{\mathcal{I}}(\xi^n; 0) \leq \eta(\beta) \} \geq 1 - \beta.$$

Note that $|I_i|^{1/2} |m_{I_i}(\hat{f}_n) - m_{I_i}(f)| \leq \frac{2(\eta + s_{I_i})}{n^{1/2}}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and (10) imply

$$\begin{aligned} m_{I_1}(f) - m_{I_2}(f) &\geq m_{I_1}(\hat{f}_n) - m_{I_2}(\hat{f}_n) - \sum_{i=1}^2 |m_{I_i}(\hat{f}_n) - m_{I_i}(f)| \\ &> \frac{2(\eta(\beta) + s_{I_1})}{\sqrt{n|I_1|}} + \frac{2(\eta(\beta) + s_{I_2})}{\sqrt{n|I_2|}} - \sum_{i=1}^2 |m_{I_i}(\hat{f}_n) - m_{I_i}(f)| \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

For simplicity, we assume that the noise ξ_i^n has homogeneous variance σ_0^2 , since for the general case it is obvious to modify the following proof accordingly. For every $\tau \equiv (\tau_0, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_k) \in \Pi_n$, we define $\#\tau := k$, and by elementary calculation obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\tau,n} - f\|_{L^2}^2] = \|s_\tau - f\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\#\tau}{n} \sigma_0^2$$

where s_τ is the best L^2 -approximant of f with change-points specified by τ . Define $\tau_* \equiv \tau_*(n) \in \Pi_n$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\tau_*,n} - f\|_{L^2}^2] = \inf_{\tau \in \Pi_n} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\tau,n} - f\|_{L^2}^2]$. Now we claim that there exists a constant C satisfying

$$\|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C \frac{\#\tau_*}{n} \sigma_0^2 \quad \text{for sufficiently large } n. \quad (21)$$

To prove the claim (21), we, anticipating contradiction, assume that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n \|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2}{\#\tau_* \sigma_0^2} = \infty.$$

One can choose $m \equiv m(n)$ such that $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} n \|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2 (m \#\tau_* \sigma_0^2)^{-1} = \infty$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} m = \infty$. Define v_* as $\|s_{v_*} - f\|_{L^2} = \inf_{v \in U_{\tau_*,m}} \|s_v - f\|_{L^2}$ with

$$U_{\tau_*,m} := \left\{ v \in \Pi_n : v \equiv (0, v_1^1, \dots, v_m^1 \equiv \tau_*^1, \dots, v_1^k, \dots, v_m^k \equiv \tau_*^k) \text{ if } \tau_* \equiv (0, \tau_*^1, \dots, \tau_*^k) \right\}.$$

It follows from $m \rightarrow \infty$ and $f \in \mathcal{A}_2^\gamma \cap L^\infty$ for some γ that $\|s_{v_*} - f\|_{L^2} / \|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0$.

Then we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\tau_*,n} - f\|_{L^2}^2]}{\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{v_*,n} - f\|_{L^2}^2]} \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2}{\|s_{v_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2 + m\#\tau_*\sigma_0^2/n} = \infty,$$

which contradicts the definition of τ_* .

Denote $L := \|f\|_{L^\infty}$. Similar to part a) in the proof of Theorem 2, one can construct a step function \tilde{s}_{τ_*} , by adding another $\#\tau_*$ change-points to s_{τ_*} and later shifting all the change-points to the grid points i/n , such that $\#J(\tilde{s}_{\tau_*}) \leq 2(\#\tau_* - 1)$, $\|\tilde{s}_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2\|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2 + 2n^{-1}\#\tau_*L^2$, and $\|(\tilde{s}_{\tau_*} - f)\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2(\#\tau_*)^{-1}\|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2 + 2n^{-1}L^2$ for each segment I of \tilde{s}_{τ_*} .

Assume now the “good noise” case, namely, event \mathcal{G}_n in (18) holds true, and that η is defined in (4). Then we have for sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mathcal{I}}(y^n; \tilde{s}_{\tau_*}) &\leq \sup_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I} \\ \tilde{s}_{\tau_*} \equiv c_I \text{ on } I}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n|I|}} \left| \sum_{i/n \in I} (\bar{f}_i^n - c_I) \right| + \sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n|I|}} \left| \sum_{i/n \in I} (y_i^n - \bar{f}_i^n) \right| - s_I \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I} \\ \tilde{s}_{\tau_*} \equiv c_I \text{ on } I}} \sqrt{n} \|(f - \tilde{s}_{\tau_*})\mathbf{1}_I\|_{L^2} + a_0 \sqrt{\log n} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2n(\#\tau_*)^{-1}\|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2 + 2L^2} + a_0 \sqrt{\log n} \\ &\leq \sqrt{2C\sigma_0^2 + 2L^2} + a_0 \sqrt{\log n} \leq a \sqrt{\log n}, \end{aligned}$$

where C is the constant in (21). Again following similar lines of part a) in the proof of Theorem 2, one can obtain that

$$\|\hat{f}_n - \tilde{s}_{\tau_*}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 32(a + \delta)^2 c \log n \frac{\#\tau_*}{n} (1 + o(1)).$$

It further follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq 2\|f - \tilde{s}_{\tau_*}\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\|\hat{f}_n - \tilde{s}_{\tau_*}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq 4\|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2 + 4L^2 \frac{\tau_*}{n} + 64(a + \delta)^2 c \log n \frac{\#\tau_*}{n} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, under event \mathcal{G}_n , we obtain for large enough n

$$\|\hat{f}_n - f\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \tilde{C} \log n (\|s_{\tau_*} - f\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\#\tau_*}{n} \sigma_0^2) \leq \tilde{C} \log n \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{f}_{\tau_*,n} - f\|_{L^2}^2],$$

where \tilde{C} is a constant independent of f .

The assertion of the theorem is then followed by applying the same technique as in the part b) of the proof of Theorem 2. Again, as in Theorem 2, the above argument remains valid if we set $\eta = \eta(\beta)$ as in (6). \square

References

Aue, A., Cheung, R. C. Y., Lee, T. C. M., and Zhong, M. (2014). Segmented model selection in quantile regression using the minimum description length principle. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 109(507):1241–1256.

- Behr, M., Holmes, C., and Munk, A. (2018). Multiscale blind source separation. *Ann. Statist.*, 46(2):711–744.
- Behr, M. and Munk, A. (2017). Identifiability for blind source separation of multiple finite alphabet linear mixtures. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 63(9):5506–5517.
- Bellman, R. (1957). *Dynamic Programming*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA.
- Billingsley, P. (1999). *Convergence of Probability Measures*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, second edition. A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- Boneva, L. I., Kendall, D., and Stefanov, I. (1971). Spline transformations: Three new diagnostic aids for the statistical data-analyst. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B*, 33:1–70.
- Boysen, L., Kempe, A., Liebscher, V., Munk, A., and Wittich, O. (2009). Consistencies and rates of convergence of jump-penalized least squares estimators. *Ann. Statist.*, 37(1):157–183.
- Braun, J., Braun, R., and Mueller, H.-G. (2000). Multiple changepoint fitting via quasi-likelihood, with application to DNA sequence segmentation. *Biometrika*, 87(2):301–314.
- Burchard, H. G. and Hale, D. F. (1975). Piecewise polynomial approximation on optimal meshes. *J. Approximation Theory*, 14(2):128–147.
- Cai, T. T., Jeng, X. J., and Li, H. (2012). Robust detection and identification of sparse segments in ultrahigh dimensional data analysis. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 74(5):773–797.
- Chan, H.-P. and Chen, H. (2017). Multi-sequence segmentation via score and higher-criticism tests. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.07586*.
- Chan, H. P. and Walther, G. (2013). Detection with the scan and the average likelihood ratio. *Statist. Sinica*, 23:409–428.
- Chen, H. and Zhang, N. (2015). Graph-based change-point detection. *Ann. Statist.*, 43(1):139–176.
- Cheng, D. and Schwartzman, A. (2015). Multiple testing of local extrema for detection of change points. *arXiv:1504.06384*.
- Davies, L., Hönenrieder, C., and Krämer, W. (2012). Recursive computation of piecewise constant volatilities. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, 56(11):3623 – 3631.
- Davies, P. L. and Kovac, A. (2001). Local extremes, runs, strings and multiresolution. *Ann. Statist.*, 29(1):1–65. With discussion and rejoinder by the authors.
- Dette, H. and Munk, A. (1998). Testing heteroscedasticity in nonparametric regression. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.*, 60(4):693–708.
- Dette, H. and Wied, D. (2016). Detecting relevant changes in time series models. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 78(2):371–394.

- DeVore, R. A. (1998). Nonlinear approximation. In *Acta numerica, 1998*, volume 7 of *Acta Numer.*, pages 51–150. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- DeVore, R. A. and Lorentz, G. G. (1993). *Constructive Approximation*, volume 303 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Diskin, S. J., Li, M., Hou, C., Yang, S., Glessner, J., Hakonarson, H., Bucan, M., Maris, J. M., and Wang, K. (2008). Adjustment of genomic waves in signal intensities from whole-genome snp genotyping platforms. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 36(19):e126.
- Donoho, D. L. (1988). One-sided inference about functionals of a density. *Ann. Statist.*, 16(4):1390–1420.
- Donoho, D. L. and Johnstone, I. M. (1994). Ideal spatial adaptation by wavelet shrinkage. *Biometrika*, 81(3):425–455.
- Donoho, D. L., Johnstone, I. M., Kerkycharian, G., and Picard, D. (1995). Wavelet shrinkage: asymptopia? *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 57(2):301–369. With discussion and a reply by the authors.
- Du, C., Kao, C.-L. M., and Kou, S. C. (2016). Stepwise signal extraction via marginal likelihood. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 111(513):314–330.
- Dümbgen, L. and Spokoiny, V. G. (2001). Multiscale testing of qualitative hypotheses. *Ann. Statist.*, 29(1):124–152.
- Farcomeni, A. (2014). Discussion of “multiscale change-point inference”. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 76(3):546–547.
- Frick, K., Munk, A., and Sieling, H. (2014). Multiscale change point inference. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 76(3):495–580. With 32 discussions by 47 authors and a rejoinder by the authors.
- Friedrich, F., Kempe, A., Liebscher, V., and Winkler, G. (2008). Complexity penalized M-estimation: fast computation. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, 17(1):201–224.
- Fryzlewicz, P. (2007). Unbalanced Haar technique for nonparametric function estimation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 102(480):1318–1327.
- Fryzlewicz, P. (2014). Wild binary segmentation for multiple change-point detection. *Ann. Statist.*, 42(6):2243–2281.
- Futschik, A., Hotz, T., Munk, A., and Sieling, H. (2014). Multiresolution DNA partitioning: statistical evidence for segments. *Bioinformatics*, 30(16):2255–2262.
- Grasmair, M., Li, H., and Munk, A. (2018). Variational multiscale nonparametric regression: Smooth functions. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 54(2):1058–1097.
- Harchaoui, Z. and Lévy-Leduc, C. (2008). Catching change-points with lasso. *Adv. in Neur. Inform. Processing Syst.*, 20:161–168.
- Harchaoui, Z. and Lévy-Leduc, C. (2010). Multiple change-point estimation with a total variation penalty. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 105(492):1480–1493.

- Has'minskiĭ, R. Z. (1978). A lower bound on the risks of nonparametric estimates of densities in the uniform metric. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 23:794–798.
- Haynes, K., Eckley, I. A., and Fearnhead, P. (2017). Computationally efficient changepoint detection for a range of penalties. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, 26(1):134–143.
- Hotz, T., Schütte, O. M., Sieling, H., Polupanow, T., Diederichsen, U., Steinem, C., and Munk, A. (2013). Idealizing ion channel recordings by jump segmentation and statistical multiresolution analysis. *IEEE Trans. Nanobiosci.*, 12:376–386.
- Hušková, M. and Antoch, J. (2003). Detection of structural changes in regression. *Tatra Mt. Math. Publ.*, 26(part II):201–215. Probastat '02. Part II.
- Ibragimov, I. A. and Has'minskiĭ, R. Z. (1977). On the estimation of an infinite- dimensional parameter in gaussian white noise. *Sov. Math. Dokl.*, 18:1307–1309.
- Ibragimov, I. A. and Has'minskiĭ, R. Z. (1981). *Statistical Estimation*, volume 16 of *Applications of Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin. Asymptotic theory, Translated from the Russian by Samuel Kotz.
- Kabluchko, Z. (2007). Extreme-value analysis of standardized Gaussian increments. *Unpublished preprint*. Available at <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/0706.1849>.
- Killick, R., Fearnhead, P., and Eckley, I. A. (2012). Optimal detection of changepoints with a linear computational cost. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 107(500):1590–1598.
- Korostelev, A. and Korosteleva, O. (2011). *Mathematical statistics*, volume 119 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI. Asymptotic minimax theory.
- Lai, W. R., Johnson, M. D., Kucherlapati, R., and Park, P. J. (2005). Comparative analysis of algorithms for identifying amplifications and deletions in array cgh data. *Bioinformatics*, 21(19):3763–3770.
- Li, H., Munk, A., and Sieling, H. (2016). FDR-control in multiscale change-point segmentation. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 10(1):918–959.
- Lin, K., Sharpnack, J., Rinaldo, A., and Tibshirani, R. J. (2016). Approximate recovery in changepoint problems, from ℓ_2 estimation error rates. *arXiv:1606.06746*.
- Linton, O. and Seo, M. H. (2014). Discussion of “multiscale change-point inference”. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 76(3):548.
- Maidstone, R., Hocking, T., Rigai, G., and Fearnhead, P. (2016). On optimal multiple changepoint algorithms for large data. *Stat. Comput.*, pages 1–15.
- Mammen, E. and van de Geer, S. (1997). Locally adaptive regression splines. *Ann. Statist.*, 25(1):387–413.
- Munk, A. and Dette, H. (1998). Nonparametric comparison of several regression functions: exact and asymptotic theory. *Ann. Statist.*, 26(6):2339–2368.
- Nemirovski, A. (1985). Nonparametric estimation of smooth regression functions. *Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSR Tekhn. Kibernet. (in Russian)*, 3:50–60. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 23:1–11, 1986 (in English).

- Olshen, A. B., Venkatraman, E. S., Lucito, R., and Wigler, M. (2004). Circular binary segmentation for the analysis of array-based dna copy number data. *Biostatistics*, 5(4):557–572.
- Pein, F., Sieling, H., and Munk, A. (2017). Heterogeneous change point inference. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 79(4):1207–1227.
- Petrushev, P. P. (1988). Direct and converse theorems for spline and rational approximation and Besov spaces. In *Function spaces and applications (Lund, 1986)*, volume 1302 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 363–377. Springer, Berlin.
- Rivera, C. and Walther, G. (2013). Optimal detection of a jump in the intensity of a Poisson process or in a density with likelihood ratio statistics. *Scand. J. Stat.*, 40:752–769.
- Scott, A. J. and Knott, M. (1974). A cluster analysis method for grouping means in the analysis of variance. *Biometrics*, 30(3):507–512.
- Shao, Q. M. (1995). On a conjecture of Révész. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 123(2):575–582.
- Siegmund, D. (2013). Change-points: from sequential detection to biology and back. *Sequential Anal.*, 32(1):2–14.
- Siegmund, D. and Venkatraman, E. S. (1995). Using the generalized likelihood ratio statistic for sequential detection of a change-point. *Ann. Statist.*, 23(1):255–271.
- Siegmund, D. and Yakir, B. (2000). Tail probabilities for the null distribution of scanning statistics. *Bernoulli*, 6(2):191–213.
- Song, R., Banerjee, M., and Kosorok, M. R. (2016). Asymptotics for change-point models under varying degrees of mis-specification. *Ann. Statist.*, 44(1):153–182.
- Spokoiny, V. G. (1998). Estimation of a function with discontinuities via local polynomial fit with an adaptive window choice. *Ann. Statist.*, 26(4):1356–1378.
- Tecuapetla-Gómez, I. and Munk, A. (2017). Autocovariance estimation in regression with a discontinuous signal and m -dependent errors: a difference-based approach. *Scand. J. Stat.*, 44(2):346–368.
- Tibshirani, R. and Wang, P. (2008). Spatial smoothing and hot spot detection for CGH data using the fused lasso. *Biostatistics*, 9(1):18–29.
- Tsybakov, A. (2009). *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer-Verlag New York.
- Tukey, J. W. (1961). Curves as parameters, and touch estimation. In *Proc. 4th Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Prob., Vol. I*, pages 681–694. Univ. California Press, Berkeley, Calif.
- Walther, G. (2010). Optimal and fast detection of spatial clusters with scan statistics. *Ann. Statist.*, 38(2):1010–1033.
- Yao, Y.-C. and Au, S. T. (1989). Least-squares estimation of a step function. *Sankhyā Ser. A*, 51(3):370–381.

- Zhang, N. and Siegmund, D. (2007). A modified Bayes information criterion with applications to the analysis of comparative genomic hybridization data. *Biometrics*, 63(1):22–32.
- Zhang, N. and Siegmund, D. (2012). Model selection for high-dimensional, multi-sequence change-point problems. *Statist. Sinica*, 22:1507–1538.