

Improved robust model selection methods for a Lévy nonparametric regression in continuous time *

Pchelintsev E.A., [†] Pchelintsev V.A., [‡]
Pergamenshchikov S.M. [§]

Abstract

In this paper we develop the James - Stein improved method for the estimation problem of a nonparametric periodic function observed with Lévy noises in continuous time. An adaptive model selection procedure based on the weighted improved least squares estimates is constructed. The improvement effect for nonparametric models is studied. It turns out that in non-asymptotic setting the accuracy improvement for nonparametric models is more important, than for parametric ones. Moreover, sharp oracle inequalities for the robust risks have been shown and the adaptive efficiency property for the proposed procedures has been established. The numerical simulations are given.

Key words: Improved non-asymptotic estimation, James - Stein procedures, Robust quadratic risk, Nonparametric regression, Lévy process, Model selection, Sharp oracle inequality, Adaptive estimation, Asymptotic efficiency.

AMS (2010) Subject Classification : primary 62G08; secondary 62G05

*This work was supported by the RSF grant 17-11-01049 (National Research Tomsk State University).

[†]Department of Mathematical Analysis and Theory of Functions, Tomsk State University, Lenin str. 36, 634050 Tomsk, Russia, e-mail: evgen-pch@yandex.ru

[‡]Department of Mathematics and Informatics, Tomsk Polytechnic University, Lenin str. 30, 634050 Tomsk, Russia, e-mail: vpchelintsev@vtomske.ru

[§]Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphael Salem, Avenue de l'Université, BP. 12, Université de Rouen, F76801, Saint Etienne du Rouvray, Cedex France and International Laboratory of Statistics of Stochastic Processes and Quantitative Finance of Tomsk State University, e-mail: Serge.Pergamenchchikov@univ-rouen.fr

1 Introduction

Consider the following nonparametric regression model in continuous time

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

where $S(\cdot)$ is an unknown 1 - periodic function, $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$ is an unobserved noise. The problem is to estimate the function S on the observations $(y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$. Note that, if $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$ is a Brownian motion, then we obtain the well-known "signal+white noise" model which is very popular in statistical radio-physics (see, for example, [15, 25, 26, 34]). In this paper we assume that in addition to intrinsic noises in radio-electronic systems, approximated usually by the gaussian white or color noise, the useful signal S is distorted by the impulse flow described by Lévy processes defined in the next section. The cause of a pulse stream can be, for example, either external unintended (atmospheric) or intentional impulse noises or errors in the demodulation and the channel decoding for binary information symbols. Note that, for the first time the impulse noises for the detection signal problems have been studied by Kassam in [18] through compound Poisson processes. Later, such processes was used in [10, 22, 23, 24, 33] for parametric and nonparametric signal estimation problems. It should be noted that such models are too limited, since the compound Poisson process can describe only the large impulses influence with a single fixed frequency. However, the real technical (for example, telecommunication or navigation) systems work under noise impulses having different sizes and different frequencies (see, for example, [35]). To take this into account one needs to use many (may be infinite number) different compound Poisson processes in the same observation model. This is possible to do only in a framework of Lévy processes which are natural extensions for the compound Poisson processes. Moreover, it should be noted also that Lévy models are fruitfully used in the different applied problems (see, for example, [2, 5, 6, 7] and the references therein). In this paper we consider the adaptive estimation problem for the function S i.e. when its regularity properties are unknown. To do this we use the model selection methods. The interest to such statistical procedures is explained by the fact that they provide adaptive solutions for the nonparametric estimation through oracle inequalities which give non-asymptotic upper bounds for the quadratic risks including the minimal risk over chosen the estimators family. It will be noted that for the first time the model selection methods were proposed by Akaike [1] and Mallows [28] for parametric models. Then, these methods have been developed for nonparametric estimation problems by Barron, Birgé and Massart [3] and Fourdrinier and Pergamenshchikov [9] for regression models in discrete time and Konev and Pergamenshchikov [21] in continuous time. Unfortunately,

the oracle inequalities obtained in these papers can not provide the efficient estimation in the adaptive setting, since the upper bounds in these inequalities have some fixed coefficients in the main terms which are more than one. To obtain the efficiency property one has to obtain the sharp oracle inequalities, i.e. the inequalities in which the coefficient at the principal term is close to unity. To obtain such inequalities for general non-Gaussian observations one needs to use the method proposed by Konev and Pergamenshchikov in [19, 20, 22, 23] for semimartingale models in continuous time based on the model selection tool developed by Galtchouk and Pergamenshchikov in [12, 13] for heteroscedastic non-Gaussian regression models in discrete time.

The goal of this paper is to develop a new sharp model selection method for estimating the unknown signal S using the improved estimation approach. Usually, the model selection procedures are based on the least squares estimates. This paper proposes the improved least squares estimates which enable us to improve considerably the non-asymptotic estimation accuracy. For the first time such idea was proposed by Fourdrinier and Pergamenshchikov in [9] for regression models in discrete time and by Konev and Pergamenshchikov in [21] for Gaussian regression models in continuous time. We develop these methods for the non-Gaussian regression models in continuous time. It should be noted that generally for the conditionally Gaussian regression models we can not use the well-known improved estimators proposed in [8, 17] for Gaussian or spherically symmetric observations. To apply the improved estimation methods to the non-Gaussian regression models in continuous time one needs to use the modifications of the well-known James - Stein estimators proposed in [24, 33] for parametric problems. We use these estimators to construct model selection procedures for nonparametric models. Then to study the non-asymptotic accuracy we develop a special analytical tool for the Lévy regression models to obtain sharp oracle inequalities for the improved model selection procedures. Then to study the efficiency property for the proposed estimation procedure we need to obtain a lower bound for the quadratic risks. Usually, to do this one uses the van Trees inequality. In this paper we show the corresponding van Trees inequality for the Lévy regression models and then we derive the needed asymptotic sharp lower bound for the normalized risks, i.e. we find the Pinsker constant for the model (1.1). As to the upper bound, similarly to [20], we use the obtained sharp oracle inequality for the weighted least squares estimators containing the efficient Pinsker procedure. Therefore, through the oracle inequality we estimate from above the risk of the proposed procedure by the risk of the efficient Pinsker procedure up to some coefficient which goes to one. As a result we show the asymptotic efficiency without using the smoothness information of the function S .

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the noise processes in (1.1) and define the main risks for the estimation problem. In Section 3 we construct the improved least squares estimates and study the improvement effect for the Lévy model. In Section 4 we construct the improved model selection procedure and show the sharp oracle inequalities. In Section 5 the Monte Carlo simulation results are given. The asymptotic efficiency is studied in Section 6. In Section 7 we study some properties of the stochastic integrals with respect to the Lévy processes. In Section 8 we prove the van Trees inequality for the model (1.1). In Section 9 we prove all main results and in Appendix we give some technical results.

2 Noise process model

First, we assume that the noise process $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$ in (1.1) is defined as

$$\xi_t = \sigma_1 w_t + \sigma_2 z_t \quad \text{and} \quad z_t = x * (\mu - \tilde{\mu})_t, \quad (2.1)$$

where σ_1 and σ_2 are some unknown constants, $(w_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a standard Brownian motion, $*$ denotes the stochastic integral with respect to the compensated jump measure $\mu(ds dx)$ with deterministic compensator $\tilde{\mu}(ds dx) = ds\Pi(dx)$, i.e.

$$z_t = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} x (\mu - \tilde{\mu})(ds dx).$$

Here $\Pi(\cdot)$ is a Lévy measure, i.e. some positive measure on $\mathbb{R}_0 = \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$, (see, for example, [7, 16] for details) such that

$$\Pi(x^2) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi(x^6) < \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

We use the notation $\Pi(|x|^m) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_0} |z|^m \Pi(dz)$. Note that the Lévy measure $\Pi(\mathbb{R}_0)$ may be equal to $+\infty$. It should be noted that in all papers on the nonparametric signal estimation in the model (1.1) the main condition on the jumps is the finiteness of the Lévy measure, i.e. $\Pi(\mathbb{R}_0) < +\infty$.

The process (2.1) allows us to consider the several independent impulse noise sources with the different frequencies. Indeed, in this case (see, for example, page 135 in [7]) we introduce compound Poisson processes into the model (1.1) as

$$z_t = \sum_{k=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^k} Y_{k,j}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $(N_t^1)_{t \geq 0}, \dots, (N_t^M)_{t \geq 0}$ are independent Poisson processes with the intensities $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M$ and the sizes of impulses $(Y_{1,j})_{j \geq 1}, \dots, (Y_{M,j})_{j \geq 1}$ are independent i.i.d. sequences with $\mathbf{E}Y_{k,j} = 0$ and $\varsigma_k^2 = \mathbf{E}Y_{k,j}^2 < \infty$. In this case the Lévy measure for any Borel set $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}_0$ is defined as

$$\Pi(\Gamma) = \sum_{k=1}^M \lambda_k \mathbf{P}(Y_{k,1} \in \Gamma).$$

Next, note, that if

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k \varsigma_k^2 < \infty, \quad (2.4)$$

then we can introduce the infinite number of the noise jumps setting

$$z_t = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^k} Y_{k,j}. \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, if the total noise intensity $\sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda_k = +\infty$, then $\Pi(\mathbb{R}_0) = +\infty$, i.e. we obtain the observation model with saturated impulse noise.

In the sequel we will denote by Q the distribution of the process $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$ in the Skorokhod space $\mathbf{D}[0, n]$ and by \mathcal{Q}_n we denote all these distributions for which the parameters σ_1 and σ_2 satisfy the conditions

$$0 < \underline{\sigma} \leq \sigma_1^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma = \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 \leq \bar{\sigma}, \quad (2.6)$$

where the bounds $\underline{\sigma}$ and $\bar{\sigma}$ are functions of n , i.e. $\underline{\sigma} = \underline{\sigma}_n$ and $\bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma}_n$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^\epsilon \underline{\sigma}_n > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-\epsilon} \bar{\sigma}_n = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

We also assume that the distribution Q of the noise process $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$ is unknown. We know only that this distribution belongs to the distribution family \mathcal{Q}_n defined in (2.6)–(2.7). By these reasons we use the robust estimation approach developed for nonparametric problems in [11, 22, 23]. To this end we will measure the estimation quality by the robust risk defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_n^*(\hat{S}_n, S) = \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_n, S), \quad (2.8)$$

where \hat{S}_n is an estimate, i.e. any function of $(y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$, $\mathcal{R}_Q(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the usual quadratic risk defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_n, S) := \mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \|\hat{S}_n - S\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|S\|^2 = \int_0^1 S^2(t) dt. \quad (2.9)$$

The first goal in this paper is to develop shrinkage nonparametric estimation methods for S which improve the non asymptotic robust estimation accuracy (2.8) with respect to the well known least squares estimators. The next goal is to provide non asymptotic optimality in the sense of sharp oracle inequalities. Moreover, asymptotically, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, our goal is to show the efficiency property for the proposed shrinkage estimators for the risks (2.8).

3 Improved estimation

Let $(\phi_j)_{j \geq 1}$ be an orthonormal basis in $\mathbf{L}_2[0, 1]$. We extend these functions by the periodic way on \mathbb{R} , i.e. $\phi_j(t) = \phi_j(t + 1)$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

B₁) Assume that the basis functions are uniformly bounded, i.e. for some $\bar{\phi}_n > 0$, which in general case may be depend on n ,

$$\sup_{0 \leq j \leq n} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq 1} |\phi_j(t)| \leq \bar{\phi}_n < \infty. \quad (3.1)$$

For example, we can take the trigonometric basis defined as $\text{Tr}_1 \equiv 1$ and for $j \geq 2$

$$\text{Tr}_j(x) = \sqrt{2} \begin{cases} \cos(2\pi[j/2]x) & \text{for even } j; \\ \sin(2\pi[j/2]x) & \text{for odd } j, \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where $[a]$ denotes integer part of a .

For estimating the unknown function S in (1.1) we consider it's Fourier expansion

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

The corresponding Fourier coefficients

$$\theta_j = (S, \phi_j) = \int_0^1 S(t) \phi_j(t) dt$$

can be estimated as

$$\hat{\theta}_j = \frac{1}{n} \int_0^n \phi_j(t) dy_t.$$

In view of (1.1), we obtain

$$\hat{\theta}_j = \theta_j + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \xi_j, \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$\xi_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} I_n(\phi_j) \quad \text{and} \quad I_n(f) = \int_0^n f(t) d\xi_t.$$

As in [20] we define a class of weighted least squares estimates for $S(t)$

$$\widehat{S}_\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \widehat{\theta}_j \phi_j, \quad (3.4)$$

where the weights $\lambda = (\lambda(j))_{1 \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ belong to some finite set Λ from $[0, 1]^n$ for which we set

$$\nu_n = \text{card}(\Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad |\Lambda|_n = \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} L(\lambda), \quad (3.5)$$

where $\text{card}(\Lambda)$ is the number of the vectors λ in Λ and $L(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)$. In the sequel we assume that all vectors from Λ satisfies the following condition.

B₂) Assume that for any vector $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there exists some fixed integer $d = d(\lambda)$ such that their first d components equal to one, i.e. $\lambda(j) = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq d$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

Remark 3.1. Note that the weight coefficients satisfying the condition **B₂**) was introduced in [32] to construct the efficient estimation for the nonparametric regression model in discrete time.

Now we need the σ - field generated by the jumps of the process (2.1), i.e. we set $\mathcal{G}_n = \sigma\{z_t, 0 \leq t \leq n\}$. To construct the improved estimators we need the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. For any $n \geq 1$ the random vector $\widetilde{\xi}_{d,n} = (\xi_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d}$ is the \mathcal{G}_n - conditionally Gaussian in \mathbb{R}^d with zero mean and the covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{G}_n = (\mathbf{E} \xi_i \xi_j | \mathcal{G}_n)_{1 \leq i, j \leq d}$$

such that

$$\inf_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} (\text{tr} \mathbf{G}_n - \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{G}_n)) \geq (d-1) \underline{\sigma}_n, \quad (3.6)$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ is the maximal eigenvalue of the matrix A .

Now, for the first d Fourier coefficients in (3.3) we use the improved estimation method proposed for parametric models in [33]. To this end we set $\widetilde{\theta}_n = (\widehat{\theta}_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d}$. In the sequel we will use the norm $|x|_d^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d x_j^2$ for

any vector $x = (x_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d}$ from \mathbb{R}^d . Now we define the shrinkage estimators as

$$\theta_{\lambda,j}^* = (1 - g_\lambda(j)) \hat{\theta}_j \quad \text{and} \quad g_\lambda(j) = \frac{c_n}{|\hat{\theta}_n|_d} \mathbf{1}_{\{1 \leq j \leq d\}}, \quad (3.7)$$

where

$$c_n = c_n(\lambda) = \frac{(d-1)\sigma_n}{\left(r_n + \sqrt{d\bar{\sigma}_n/n}\right) n}$$

and the threshold $\bar{\sigma}_n > 0$ is given in the lower bound (3.6). The positive parameter r_n is such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r_n}{n^\epsilon} = 0 \quad (3.8)$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Now we introduce a class of shrinkage weighted least squares estimates for S as

$$S_\lambda^* = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \theta_{\lambda,j}^* \phi_j. \quad (3.9)$$

We denote the difference of quadratic risks of the estimates (3.4) and (3.9) as

$$\Delta_Q(S) := \mathcal{R}_Q(S_\lambda^*, S) - \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_\lambda, S).$$

We obtain the following result.

Theorem 3.2. *Let the observed process $(y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$ describes by the equations (1.1)–(2.1). Then for any $n \geq 1$*

$$\sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \sup_{\|S\| \leq r_n} \Delta_Q(S) \leq -c_n^2. \quad (3.10)$$

Remark 3.2. *The inequality (3.10) means that non-asymptotically, i.e. for non large $n \geq 1$, the estimate (3.9) outperforms in mean square accuracy the estimate (3.4). As we will see later in the efficient weight coefficients $d \approx n^\epsilon$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, in view of the definition of the constant c_n in (3.7) and the conditions (2.7) and (3.8) $nc_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This means that improvement is considerably may better than for the parametric regression when the parameter dimension d is fixed [33].*

4 Model selection

In this section we construct a model selection procedure for the estimation of S in (1.1) on the basis of the weighted shrinkage estimators (3.9). To this end we consider the empirical squared error defined as

$$\text{Err}_n(\lambda) = \|S_\lambda^* - S\|^2.$$

In order to obtain a good estimate, we have to write a rule to choose a weight vector $\lambda \in \Lambda$ in (3.9). It is obvious, that the best way is to minimise the empirical squared error with respect to λ . Making use the estimate definition (3.9) and the Fourier transformation of S implies

$$\text{Err}_n(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda^2(j)(\theta_{\lambda,j}^*)^2 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)\theta_{\lambda,j}^* \theta_j + \|S\|^2. \quad (4.1)$$

Since the Fourier coefficients $(\theta_j)_{j \geq 1}$ are unknown, the weight coefficients $(\lambda_j)_{j \geq 1}$ can not be found by minimizing this quantity. To circumvent this difficulty one needs to replace the terms $\theta_{\lambda,j}^* \theta_j$ by their estimators $\bar{\vartheta}_{\lambda,j}$ defined as

$$\bar{\vartheta}_{\lambda,j} = \theta_{\lambda,j}^* \hat{\theta}_j - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_n}{n}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_n$ is the estimate for the limiting variance of $\sigma = \mathbf{E}_Q \xi_j^2$ which we choose in the following form

$$\hat{\sigma}_n = \sum_{j=[\sqrt{n}]+1}^n \hat{t}_j^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{t}_j = \frac{1}{n} \int_0^n \text{Tr}_j(t) dy_t. \quad (4.3)$$

For this change in the empirical squared error, one has to pay some penalty. Thus, one comes to the cost function of the form

$$J_n(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda^2(j)(\theta_{\lambda,j}^*)^2 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \bar{\vartheta}_{\lambda,j} + \delta \hat{P}_n(\lambda), \quad (4.4)$$

where δ is some positive constant, $\hat{P}_n(\lambda)$ is the penalty term defined as

$$\hat{P}_n(\lambda) = \frac{\hat{\sigma}_n |\lambda|_n^2}{n}. \quad (4.5)$$

We define the improved model selection procedure as

$$S^* = S_{\lambda^*}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^* = \arg\min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} J_n(\lambda). \quad (4.6)$$

It will be noted that λ^* exists because Λ is a finite set. If the minimizing sequence in (4.6) λ^* is not unique, one can take any minimizer. Now, to write the oracle inequality we set

$$\Psi_{Q,n} = (1 + \overline{\phi}_n^4) (1 + \sigma)(1 + c_n^*)\nu_n, \quad (4.7)$$

where $c_n^* = n \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} c_n^2(\lambda)$. It is useful to note that in view of the first condition in (2.7) and the properties (3.8) the constant c_n^* is not large as $n \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_n^*}{n^\epsilon} = 0. \quad (4.8)$$

First we study the non asymptotic properties for the procedure (4.6).

Theorem 4.1. *There exists some constant $\check{\mathbf{I}} > 0$ such that for any $n \geq 1$ and $0 < \delta < 1/2$, the risk (2.9) of estimate (4.6) for S satisfies the oracle inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_Q(S^*, S) &\leq \frac{1 + 5\delta}{1 - \delta} \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{R}_Q(S_\lambda^*, S) + \check{\mathbf{I}} \frac{\Psi_{Q,n}}{n\delta} \\ &\quad + \frac{12|\Lambda|_n \mathbf{E}_Q |\widehat{\sigma}_n - \sigma|}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

In the case, when the value of σ is known, one can take $\widehat{\sigma}_n = \sigma$ and

$$P_n(\lambda) = \frac{\sigma |\lambda|_n^2}{n}, \quad (4.10)$$

then we can rewrite the oracle inequality (4.9) in the following form

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(S^*, S) \leq \frac{1 + 5\delta}{1 - \delta} \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{R}_Q(S_\lambda^*, S) + \check{\mathbf{I}} \frac{\Psi_{Q,n}}{n\delta}.$$

Also we study the accuracy properties for the estimator (4.3).

Proposition 4.2. *Let in the model (1.1) the function $S(\cdot)$ is continuously differentiable. Then, there exists some constant $\check{\mathbf{I}} > 0$ such that for any $n \geq 2$ and S*

$$\mathbf{E}_Q |\widehat{\sigma}_n - \sigma| \leq \check{\mathbf{I}} \frac{(1 + \|\dot{S}\|^2)}{\sqrt{n}}, \quad (4.11)$$

where \dot{S} is the derivative of the function S .

Remark 4.1. *It should be noted that to estimate the parameter σ in (4.2) we use the equality (3.3) for the Fourier coefficients $t_j = (S, \text{Tr}_j)$ with respect to the trigonometric basis (3.2), since, as is shown in Lemma A.6 in [19] for any continuously differentiable function S and for any $m \geq 1$ the sum $\sum_{j \geq m} t_j^2$ can be estimated from above in an explicit form. Therefore, through the trigonometric basis we can estimate the variance σ uniformly over the functions S , when we will study the efficiency property for the proposed procedures.*

To obtain the oracle inequality for the robust risk we impose the following additional conditions.

C₁) *Assume that the upper bound for the basic function defined in (3.1) is such that for any $\epsilon > 0$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{\phi}_n}{n^\epsilon} = 0.$$

C₂) *Assume that the set Λ is such that for any $\epsilon > 0$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_n}{n^\epsilon} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|\Lambda|_n}{n^{1/2+\epsilon}} = 0. \quad (4.12)$$

We note that Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.2 directly imply the following inequality.

Theorem 4.3. *If the conditions **C₁**) – **C₂**) hold for the distribution Q of the process ξ in (1.1), then for any $n \geq 2$ and $0 < \delta < 1/2$, the robust risk (2.8) of estimate (4.6) for continuously differentiable function S satisfies the oracle inequality*

$$\mathcal{R}_n^*(S^*, S) \leq \frac{1 + 5\delta}{1 - \delta} \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{R}_n^*(S_\lambda^*, S) + \frac{B_n(1 + \|\dot{S}\|^2)}{n\delta}, \quad (4.13)$$

where the term B_n is independent of S and for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_n}{n^\epsilon} = 0.$$

Remark 4.2. *Note that sharp oracle inequalities similar to (4.9) and (4.13) was obtained earlier by Konev and Pergamenshchikov in [19, 22, 23] for model selection procedures based on the weighted least squares estimates (3.4). Unfortunately, we can not use such oracle inequalities for the model selection procedures, based on the weighted shrinkage estimates (3.9) since they depend*

non linearly on the coefficients λ . This is main technical difficulty which doesn't allow us to use the obtained oracle inequalities. Moreover, in all these papers the oracle inequalities are obtained under condition that the Lévy measure is finite. The inequalities (4.9) and (4.13) are obtained without conditions on the impulse noises.

Now we specify the weight coefficients $(\lambda(j))_{j \geq 1}$ in the way proposed in [12] for a heteroscedastic regression model in discrete time. Consider a numerical grid of the form

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \{1, \dots, k_n\} \times \{r_1, \dots, r_m\},$$

where $r_i = i\rho_n$ and $m = [1/\rho_n^2]$. Both parameters $k_n \geq 1$ and $0 < \rho_n \leq 1$ are the functions of n such that for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n = +\infty, & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{k_n}{\ln n} = 0, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho_n = 0 & \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^\epsilon \rho_n = +\infty. \end{cases} \quad (4.14)$$

One can take, for example,

$$\rho_n = \frac{1}{\ln(n+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad k_n = \sqrt{\ln(n+1)}.$$

For each $\alpha = (\beta, r) \in \mathcal{A}_n$ we introduce the weight sequence $\lambda_\alpha = (\lambda_j(\alpha))_{j \geq 1}$ as

$$\lambda_j(\alpha) = \mathbf{1}_{\{1 \leq j \leq d\}} + (1 - (j/\omega_\alpha)^\beta) \mathbf{1}_{\{d < j \leq \omega_\alpha\}} \quad (4.15)$$

where $d = d(\alpha) = [\omega_\alpha / \ln(n+1)]$,

$$\omega_\alpha = (\tau_\beta r v_n)^{1/(2\beta+1)}, \quad \tau_\beta = \frac{(\beta+1)(2\beta+1)}{\pi^{2\beta}\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad v_n = \frac{n}{\bar{\sigma}_n}.$$

We set

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda(\alpha), \alpha \in \mathcal{A}_n\}. \quad (4.16)$$

It will be noted that in this case $\nu_n = k_n m$. Therefore, the conditions (4.14) imply the first limit equality in (4.12). Moreover, in view of the definition (4.15) and taking into account that $\tau_\beta \leq 1$ for $\beta \geq 1$ the function $L(\lambda)$ defined in (3.5) can be estimated for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$ as

$$\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} L(\lambda) \leq \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \omega_\alpha \leq v_n^{1/3} \rho_n^{-1/3}.$$

Therefore, using here the conditions (2.7) and (4.14) we get the last limit in (4.12), i.e. the condition \mathbf{C}_2) holds for the set Λ defined in (4.16).

Remark 4.3. *It will be observed that the specific form of weights (4.15) was proposed by Pinsker [34] for the filtration problem with known smoothness of the regression function observed with an additive gaussian white noise in continuous time. Nussbaum [32] used such weights for the gaussian regression estimation problem in discrete time.*

5 Monte Carlo simulations

In this section we give the results of numerical simulations to assess the performance and improvement of the proposed model selection procedure (4.6). We simulate the model (1.1) with 1-periodic function S of the form

$$S(t) = t \sin(2\pi t) + t^2(1 - t) \cos(4\pi t) \quad (5.1)$$

on $[0, 1]$ and the Lévy noise process ξ_t is defined as

$$\xi_t = 0.5 w_t + 0.5 z_t.$$

Here z_t is a compound Poisson process with intensity $\lambda = \Pi(x^2) = 1$ and a Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ sequence $(Y_j)_{j \geq 1}$ (see, for example, [23]).

We use the model selection procedure (4.6) with the weights (4.15) in which $k_n = 100 + \sqrt{\ln(n+1)}$, $r_i = i / \ln(n+1)$, $m = \lfloor \ln^2(n+1) \rfloor$, $\bar{\sigma}_n = 0.5$ and $\delta = (3 + \ln n)^{-2}$. We define the empirical risk as

$$\mathcal{R}(S^*, S) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \widehat{\mathbf{E}} (S_n^*(t_j) - S(t_j))^2,$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{E}} (S_n^*(\cdot) - S(\cdot))^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N (S_{n,l}^*(\cdot) - S(\cdot))^2,$$

where the observation frequency $p = 100001$ and the expectations was taken as an average over $N = 1000$ replications.

Table 1 gives the values for the sample risks of the improved estimate (4.6) and the model selection procedure based on the weighted LSE (3.15) from [22] for different numbers of observation period n . Table 2 gives the values for the sample risks of the the model selection procedure based on the weighted LSE (3.15) from [22] and it's improved version for different numbers of observation period n .

Table 1: The sample quadratic risks for different optimal λ

n	100	200	500	1000
$\mathcal{R}(S_{\lambda^*}^*, S)$	0.0118	0.0089	0.0031	0.0009
$\mathcal{R}(\hat{S}_{\hat{\lambda}}, S)$	0.0509	0.0203	0.0103	0.0064
$\mathcal{R}(\hat{S}_{\hat{\lambda}}, S)/\mathcal{R}(S_{\lambda^*}^*, S)$	4.3	2.3	3.3	7.1

Table 2: The sample quadratic risks for the same optimal $\hat{\lambda}$

n	100	200	500	1000
$\mathcal{R}(S_{\hat{\lambda}}^*, S)$	0.0237	0.0103	0.0041	0.0011
$\mathcal{R}(\hat{S}_{\hat{\lambda}}, S)$	0.0509	0.0203	0.0103	0.0064
$\mathcal{R}(\hat{S}_{\hat{\lambda}}, S)/\mathcal{R}(S_{\hat{\lambda}}^*, S)$	2.1	2.2	2.5	5.8




Figure 1: Behavior of the regression function and its estimates for $n = 100$.

Remark 5.1. Figures 1–4 show the behavior of the procedures (3.4) and (4.6) depending on the values of observation periods n . The bold line is the function (5.1), the continuous line is the model selection procedure based on the least squares estimators \hat{S} and the dashed line is the improved model selection procedure S^* . From the Table 2 for the same λ with various observations numbers n we can conclude that theoretical result on the improvement effect (3.10) is confirmed by the numerical simulations. Moreover, for the proposed shrinkage procedure, Table 1 and Figures 1–4, we can conclude that the benefit is considerable for non large n .




Figure 2: Behavior of the regression function and its estimates for $n = 200$.




Figure 3: Behavior of the regression function and its estimates for $n = 500$.




Figure 4: Behavior of the regression function and its estimates for $n = 1000$.

6 Asymptotic efficiency

In order to study the asymptotic efficiency we define the following functional Sobolev ball

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

where $r > 0$ and $k \geq 1$ are some unknown parameters, $\mathbf{C}_p^k[0, 1]$ is the space of k times differentiable 1 - periodic $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ functions such that for any $0 \leq i \leq k - 1$

$$f^{(i)}(0) = f^{(i)}(1).$$

In order to formulate our asymptotic results we define the Pinsker constant which gives the lower bound for normalized asymptotic risks

$$l_k(r) = ((1 + 2k)r)^{1/(2k+1)} \left(\frac{k}{\pi(k+1)} \right)^{2k/(2k+1)}. \quad (6.1)$$

It is well known that for any $S \in W_{k,r}$ the optimal rate of convergence is $n^{-2k/(2k+1)}$ (see, for example, [34, 32]). On the basis of the model selection procedure we construct the adaptive procedure S^* for which we obtain the following asymptotic upper bound for the quadratic risk, i.e. we show that the parameter (6.1) gives a lower bound for the asymptotic normalized risks. To this end we denote by Σ_n the set of all estimators \hat{S}_n of S measurable with respect to the process (1.1), i.e. measurable with respect to σ -field $\sigma\{y_t, 0 \leq t \leq n\}$.

Theorem 6.1. *The robust risk (2.8) admits the following asymptotic lower bound*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\hat{S}_n \in \Sigma_n} v_n^{2k/(2k+1)} \sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\hat{S}_n, S) \geq l_k(r).$$

We show that this lower bound is sharp in the following sense.

Theorem 6.2. *The quadratic risk (2.8) for the estimating procedure S^* has the following asymptotic upper bound*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n^{2k/(2k+1)} \sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_n^*(S^*, S) \leq l_k(r).$$

It is clear that Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 6.1 imply

Corollary 6.3. *The model selection procedure S^* is asymptotically efficient, i.e.*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (v_n)^{\frac{2k}{2k+1}} \sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_n^*(S^*, S) = l_k(r). \quad (6.2)$$

Remark 6.1. Note that the equality (6.2) implies that the parameter (6.1) is the Pinsker constant in this case (cf. [34]).

Remark 6.2. It should be noted that the equality (6.2) means that the robust efficiency holds with the convergence rate

$$(v_n)^{\frac{2k}{2k+1}}.$$

It is well known that for the simple risks the optimal (minimax) estimation convergence rate for the functions from the set $W_{k,r}$ is $n^{2k/(2k+1)}$ (see, for example, [34, 32, 15]). So, if the distribution upper bound $\bar{\sigma}_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain the more rapid rate, and if $\bar{\sigma}_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain the more slow rate. In the case when $\bar{\sigma}_n$ is constant the robust rate is the same as the classical non robust convergence rate.

Remark 6.3. The property (6.2) means that the model selection procedure (4.6) asymptotically has the same efficiency property as the LSE model selection (see, [13, 20]). So, it means that the proposed shrinkage method non-asymptotically has benefit with respect to LSE and asymptotically the shrinkage methods keep the efficiency property.

7 Stochastic calculus for the Lévy processes

In this section we study the process (2.1). First we recall the Novikov inequalities, [31], also referred to as the Bichteler–Jacod inequalities, see [4, 30], providing bounds of the moments of the supremum of purely discontinuous local martingales for $p \geq 2$ and for any $n \geq 1$

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |\Upsilon * (\mu - \tilde{\mu})_t|^p \leq C_p \left(\mathbf{E} (|\Upsilon|^2 * \tilde{\mu}_n)^{p/2} + \mathbf{E} (|\Upsilon|^p * \tilde{\mu}_n) \right), \quad (7.1)$$

where C_p is some positive constant. Further for any two functions f and g from $\mathbf{L}_2[0, t]$ with $t > 0$ we use the following notations

$$(f, g)_t = \int_0^t f(s)g(s)ds \quad \text{and} \quad \|f\|_t^2 = \int_0^t f^2(s)ds. \quad (7.2)$$

Proposition 7.1. For any nonrandom function f and g from $\mathbf{L}_2[0, t]$

$$\mathbf{E} I_t(f)I_t(g) = \sigma(f, g)_t, \quad (7.3)$$

where the noise variance σ is given in (2.6).

Now we set

$$\tilde{I}_t(f) = I_t^2(f) - \mathbf{E} I_t^2(f) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{M}_t(f) = \mathbf{M}_t^{f,f}. \quad (7.4)$$

For any $[0, n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ function f we introduce the following uniform norm

$$\|f\|_n = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} |f(t)|.$$

Proposition 7.2. *Let f and g be two borel $[0, n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ functions such that $\|f\|_n \leq \bar{\phi}_n$ and $\|g\|_n \leq \bar{\phi}_n$. Then for any $0 < t \leq n$*

$$\left| \mathbf{E} \tilde{I}_t(f) \tilde{I}_t(g) \right| \leq \sigma^2 \left(2(f, g)_t^2 + \bar{\phi}_n^4 \Pi(x^4)t \right). \quad (7.5)$$

Proof. Using (A.2) with $f = g$ we can obtain that the process $(\tilde{I}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the following stochastic equation

$$d\tilde{I}_t(f) = d\widetilde{M}_t(f), \quad \tilde{I}_0(f) = 0.$$

Note that from the definition of $M_t(f, f)$ in (A.2) we can represent $\tilde{I}_t(f)$ as

$$\tilde{I}_t(f) = \tilde{I}_t^c(f) + \tilde{I}_t^d(f), \quad (7.6)$$

where $\tilde{I}_t^c(f) = 2\sigma_1 \int_0^t I_s(f) f(s) dw_s$ and

$$\tilde{I}_t^d(f) = 2\sigma_2 \int_0^t I_{s-}(f) f(s) dz_s + \sigma_2^2 \int_0^t f^2(s) dm_s.$$

Moreover, by the Ito formula

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{I}_t(f) \tilde{I}_t(g) &= \int_0^t \tilde{I}_{s-}(f) d\tilde{I}_s(g) + \int_0^t \tilde{I}_{s-}(g) d\tilde{I}_s(f) \\ &\quad + 4\sigma_1^2 \int_0^t f(s) g(s) I_s(f) I_s(g) ds + \check{J}_t^{f,g}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\check{J}_t^{f,g} = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} \Delta \tilde{I}_s^d(f) \Delta \tilde{I}_s^d(g)$. Using the last in condition (2.2) and the inequality (7.1) we can obtain that for any bounded measurable $[0, n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ function h

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^t h(s) dz_s \right)^6 < \infty. \quad (7.7)$$

From this and the Hölder inequality we obtain that

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \mathbf{E} I_t^4(g) I_t^2(f) \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \left(\mathbf{E} I_t^6(g) \right)^{2/3} \left(\mathbf{E} I_t^6(f) \right)^{1/3} < \infty.$$

Therefore, in view of Proposition (7.1)

$$\mathbf{E} \tilde{I}_t(f) \tilde{I}_t(g) = 4\sigma\sigma_1^2 \int_0^t f(s)g(s)(f,g)_s ds + \mathbf{E} \check{J}_t^{f,g} = 2\sigma\sigma_1^2(f,g)_t^2 + \mathbf{E} \check{J}_t^{f,g}.$$

From the definition of the discrete part of $\tilde{I}_t^d(f)$ in (7.6) we can represent the jumps term $\check{J}_t^{f,g}$ as

$$\check{J}_t^{f,g} = 4\sigma_2^2 \check{J}_{1,t}^{f,g} + 2\sigma_2^3 \check{J}_{2,t}^{f,g} + \sigma_2^4 \check{J}_{3,t}^{f,g}, \quad (7.8)$$

where $\check{J}_{1,t}^{f,g} = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} I_{s-}(f)I_{s-}(g)f(s)g(s)(\Delta z_s)^2$,

$$\check{J}_{2,t}^{f,g} = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} (I_{s-}(f)f(s)g^2(s) + I_{s-}(g)(f^2(s)))(\Delta z_s)^3$$

and $\check{J}_{3,t}^{f,g} = \sum_{0 < s \leq t} f^2(s)g^2(s)(\Delta z_s)^4$. In view of Proposition 7.1 and the upper bound (7.7) and taking into account that $\Pi(x^2) = 1$ we calculate

$$\mathbf{E} \check{J}_{1,t}^{f,g} = \int_0^t \mathbf{E} I_s(f)I_s(g)f(s)g(s)ds = \sigma \int_0^t (f,g)_s f(s)g(s)ds = \frac{\sigma}{2} (f,g)_t^2.$$

Similarly, we obtain that

$$\mathbf{E} \check{J}_{2,t}^{f,g} = \Pi(x^3) \int_0^t f(s)g(s)(g(s)\mathbf{E} I_s(f) + f(s)\mathbf{E} I_s(g))ds = 0.$$

and $\mathbf{E} \check{J}_{3,t}^{f,g} = \Pi(x^4) \int_0^t f^2(s)g^2(s)ds$. So,

$$\mathbf{E} \check{J}_t^{f,g} = 2\sigma_2^2\sigma(f,g)_t^2 + \sigma_2^4\Pi(x^4)(f^2, g^2)_t,$$

and, therefore,

$$\mathbf{E} \tilde{I}_t(f) \tilde{I}_t(g) = 2\sigma^2(f,g)_t^2 + \sigma_2^4\Pi(x^4)(f^2, g^2)_t.$$

Taking into account here that $\sigma_2^4 \leq \sigma^2$ and the conditions of the proposition we obtain the upper bound (7.5). Hence Proposition 7.2. \square

Now for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we define the following function

$$\bar{I}_t(y) = \sum_{j=1}^n y_j \tilde{I}_t(\phi_j). \quad (7.9)$$

For this we show the following property.

Proposition 7.3. *For any $n \geq 1$*

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|y\| \leq 1} \mathbf{E} \bar{I}_n^2(y) \leq (2 + \bar{\phi}_n^4 \Pi(x^4)) \sigma^2 n^2. \quad (7.10)$$

Proof. From Proposition 7.2 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \bar{I}_n^2(y) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^n y_i y_j \mathbf{E} \tilde{I}_n(\phi_i) \tilde{I}_n(\phi_j) \\ &\leq 2\sigma^2 \sum_{i,j=1}^n |y_i| |y_j| (\phi_i, \phi_j)_n^2 + n \bar{\phi}_n^4 \sigma^2 \Pi(x^4) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |y_i| \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account here that the functions $(\phi_j)_{j \geq 1}$ are orthonormal, and the fact that $(\sum_{i=1}^n |y_i|)^2 \leq n$, we obtain the bound (7.10). \square

8 The van Trees inequality for the Lévy processes

In this section we consider the following continuous time parametric regression model (1.1) with the function S defined as

$$S(t, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^d \theta_i \psi_i(t),$$

with the unknown parameters $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d)'$. Here we assume that the functions $(\psi_i)_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ are 1-periodic and orthogonal functions.

Let us denote by ν_ξ the distribution of the process $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$ on the Skorokhod space $\mathbf{D}[0, n]$. From Proposition A.2 it follows that in this space for any parameters $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the distribution \mathbf{P}_θ of the process (1.1) is absolutely continuous with respect to the ν_ξ and the corresponding Radon-Nikodym derivative, for any function $x = (x_t)_{0 \leq t \leq n}$ from $\mathbf{D}[0, n]$, is defined as

$$f(x, \theta) = \frac{d\mathbf{P}_\theta}{d\nu_\xi}(x) = \exp \left\{ \int_0^n \frac{S(t, \theta)}{\sigma_1^2} dx_t^c - \int_0^n \frac{S^2(t, \theta)}{2\sigma_1^2} dt \right\}, \quad (8.1)$$

where

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

and for any measurable set A in \mathbb{R} with $0 \notin A$

$$\mu_x([0, t] \times A) = \sum_{0 \leq s \leq t} \mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta \xi_s \in \sigma_2 A\}}.$$

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

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

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

$$\lim_{|\theta_j| \rightarrow \infty} g(\theta) u_j(\theta_j) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |g'_j(\theta)| U(\theta) d\theta < \infty, \quad (8.2)$$

where $g'_j(\theta) = \partial g(\theta) / \partial \theta_j$. For any $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable integrable function $H = H(x, \theta)$ we denote

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

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

Lemma 8.1. *For any \mathcal{F}_n^y -measurable square integrable function \hat{g}_n and for any $1 \leq j \leq d$, the following inequality holds*

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}(\hat{g}_n - g(\theta))^2 \geq \frac{\eta_j^2}{n \|\psi_j\|^2 \sigma_1^{-2} + I_j},$$

where

$$\eta_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g'_j(\theta) U(\theta) d\theta \quad \text{and} \quad I_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\dot{u}_j^2(z)}{u_j(z)} dz.$$

Proof. First of all note that, the density (8.1) on the process ξ is bounded with respect to $\theta_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any $1 \leq j \leq d$

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

Now, we set

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

Taking into account the condition (8.2) and integrating by parts yield

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

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

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}(\hat{g}_n - g(\theta))^2 \geq \frac{\eta_j^2}{\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\tilde{U}_j^2}.$$

To study the denominator in the left hand of this inequality note that in view of the representation (8.1)

$$\frac{1}{f(y, \theta)} \frac{\partial f(y, \theta)}{\partial \theta_j} = \frac{1}{\sigma_1} \int_0^n \psi_j(t) \, dw_t.$$

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

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

and

$$\mathbf{E}_\theta \left(\frac{1}{f(y, \theta)} \frac{\partial f(y, \theta)}{\partial \theta_j} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} \int_0^n \psi_j^2(t) dt = \frac{n}{\sigma_1^2} \|\psi\|^2.$$

Using equality

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

we get

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}\tilde{U}_j^2 = \frac{n}{\sigma_1^2} \|\psi\|^2 + I_j.$$

Hence Lemma 8.1. \square

9 Proofs

9.1 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Consider the quadratic error of the estimate (3.9)

$$\begin{aligned}
\|S_\lambda^* - S\|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^n (\lambda(j)\theta_{\lambda,j}^* - \theta_j)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^d (\lambda(j)\theta_{\lambda,j}^* - \theta_j)^2 + \sum_{j=d+1}^n (\lambda(j)\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_j)^2 \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n (\lambda(j)\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_j)^2 + c_n^2 - 2c_n \sum_{j=1}^d (\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_j) \frac{\hat{\theta}_j}{\|\tilde{\theta}_n\|_d} \\
&= \|\hat{S}_\lambda - S\|^2 + c_n^2 - 2c_n \sum_{j=1}^d (\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_j) \iota_j(\tilde{\theta}_n),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\iota_j(x) = x_j/\|x\|_d$ for $x = (x_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore, we can represent the risk for the improved estimate S_λ^* as

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(S_\lambda^*, S) = \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_\lambda, S) + c_n^2 - 2c_n \mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \sum_{j=1}^d (\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_j) J_j,$$

where $J_j = \mathbf{E}(\iota_j(\tilde{\theta}_n)(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_j)|\mathcal{G}_n)$. Now, taking into account that the vector $\tilde{\theta}_n = (\hat{\theta}_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d}$ is the \mathcal{G}_n conditionally gaussian vector in \mathbb{R}^d with mean $\tilde{\theta} = (\theta_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d}$ and covariance matrix $n^{-1}\mathbf{G}_n$, we obtain

$$J_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \iota_j(x)(x - \theta_j) \mathbf{p}(x|\mathcal{G}_n) dx.$$

Here $\mathbf{p}(x|\mathcal{G}_n)$ is the conditional distribution density of the vector $\tilde{\theta}_n$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{p}(x|\mathcal{G}_n) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} \sqrt{\det \mathbf{G}_n}} \exp \left(-\frac{(x - \theta)' \mathbf{G}_n^{-1} (x - \theta)}{2} \right).$$

Recall, that the $'$ denotes the transposition. Changing the variables by $u = \mathbf{G}_n^{-1/2}(x - \theta)$, one finds that

$$J_j = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \sum_{l=1}^d \mathbf{g}_{j,l} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\iota}_j(u) u_l \exp \left(-\frac{\|u\|_d^2}{2} \right) du,$$

where $\tilde{\iota}_j(u) = \iota_j(\mathbf{G}_n^{1/2}u + \theta)$ and \mathbf{g}_{ij} denotes the (i, j) -th element of $\mathbf{G}_n^{1/2}$. Furthermore, integrating by parts, the integral J_j can be rewritten as

$$J_j = \sum_{l=1}^d \sum_{k=1}^d \mathbf{E} \left(\mathbf{g}_{jl} \mathbf{g}_{kl} \frac{\partial \tilde{\iota}_j}{\partial u_k}(u) \Big|_{u=\tilde{\theta}_n} \Big| \mathcal{G}_n \right).$$

In view of the inequality $z'Az \leq \lambda_{\max}(A)\|z\|^2$ and Proposition 3.1 we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_Q(S) &= c_n^2 - 2c_n n^{-1} \mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \left(\frac{\text{tr} \mathbf{G}_n}{\|\tilde{\theta}_n\|_d} - \frac{\tilde{\theta}'_n \mathbf{G}_n \tilde{\theta}_n}{\|\tilde{\theta}_n\|^3} \right) \\ &\leq c_n^2 - 2c_n (d-1) \underline{\sigma}_n n^{-1} \mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \frac{1}{\|\tilde{\theta}_n\|_d}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using the Jensen inequality we can estimate the last expectation from below as

$$\mathbf{E}_{Q,S} (\|\tilde{\theta}_n\|_d)^{-1} = \mathbf{E}_{Q,S} (\|\tilde{\theta} + n^{-1/2} \tilde{\xi}_n\|_d)^{-1} \geq (\|\theta\|_d + n^{-1/2} \mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \|\tilde{\xi}_n\|_d)^{-1}.$$

From Proposition 7.1 and the condition (2.6) we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \|\tilde{\xi}_n\|_d^2 \leq \bar{\sigma}_n d.$$

So, for $\|S\| \leq r_n$

$$\mathbf{E}_{Q,S} \|\tilde{\theta}_n\|^{-1} \geq \left(r_n + \sqrt{d\bar{\sigma}_n/n} \right)^{-1}$$

and, therefore,

$$\Delta_Q(S) \leq c_n^2 - 2c_n \frac{(d-1)\underline{\sigma}_n}{\left(r_n + \sqrt{d\bar{\sigma}_n/n} \right) n} = -c_n^2.$$

Hence Theorem 3.2. \square

9.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Using the definitions (4.1), (4.2) and (4.4), we obtain that for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Err}_n(\lambda) &= J_n(\lambda) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \left(\theta_{\lambda,j}^* \hat{\theta}_j - \frac{\hat{\sigma}_n}{n} - \theta_{\lambda,j}^* \theta_j \right) \\ &\quad + \|S\|^2 - \delta \hat{P}_n(\lambda).\end{aligned}\tag{9.1}$$

Now we set

$$\begin{aligned}B_{1,n}(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) g_\lambda(j) \hat{\theta}_j \xi_j, & B_{2,n}(\lambda) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \tilde{\xi}_j \\ \text{and} \quad M(\lambda) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \theta_j \xi_j,\end{aligned}\tag{9.2}$$

where $g_\lambda(j) = (c_n(\lambda)/|\tilde{\theta}|_d) \mathbf{1}_{\{1 \leq j \leq d\}}$ and $\tilde{\xi}_j = \xi_j^2 - \mathbf{E}_Q \xi_j^2$. Taking into account the definition (4.5), we can rewrite (9.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\lambda) &= J_n(\lambda) + 2 \frac{\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_n}{n} L(\lambda) + 2 M(\lambda) \\ &\quad - 2B_{1,n}(\lambda) + 2\sqrt{P_n(\lambda)} \frac{B_{2,n}(\bar{\lambda})}{\sqrt{\sigma n}} + \|S\|^2 - \delta \hat{P}_n(\lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (9.3)$$

where the function $L(\lambda)$ is defined in (3.5), $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda/|\lambda|_n$. Let $\lambda_0 = (\lambda_0(j))_{1 \leq n}$ be a fixed sequence in Λ and λ^* be as in (4.6). Substituting λ_0 and λ^* in (9.3), we consider the difference

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\lambda^*) - \text{Err}_n(\lambda_0) &\leq 2 \frac{\sigma - \hat{\sigma}_n}{n} L(\varpi) + 2M(\varpi) - 2B_{1,n}(\lambda^*) + 2B_{1,n}(\lambda_0) \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{P_n(\lambda^*)} \frac{B_{2,n}(\bar{\lambda}^*)}{\sqrt{\sigma n}} - 2\sqrt{P_n(\lambda_0)} \frac{B_{2,n}(\bar{\lambda}_0)}{\sqrt{\sigma n}} \\ &\quad - \delta \hat{P}_n(\lambda^*) + \delta \hat{P}_n(\lambda_0), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varpi = \lambda^* - \lambda_0 \in \Lambda_1$ and

$$\Lambda_1 = \Lambda - \lambda_0 = \{\lambda - \lambda_0, \lambda \in \Lambda\}. \quad (9.4)$$

Note that $|L(\varpi)| \leq 2|\Lambda|_*$. Moreover, note also that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n g_\lambda^2(j) \hat{\theta}_j^2 = c_n^2(\lambda) \leq \frac{c_n^*}{n}, \quad (9.5)$$

where c_n^* is defined in (4.7). Therefore, through the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality we can estimate the term $B_{1,n}(\lambda)$ as

$$|B_{1,n}(\lambda)| \leq \frac{|\lambda|_n}{\sqrt{n}} c_n(\lambda) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{\lambda}^2(j) \xi_j^2 \right)^{1/2} = \frac{|\lambda|_n}{\sqrt{n}} c_n(\lambda) \left(\sigma + B_{2,n}(\bar{\lambda}^2) \right)^{1/2},$$

where $x^2 = (x^2(j))_{1 \leq j \leq n}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. So, applying the elementary inequality

$$2|ab| \leq \varepsilon a^2 + \varepsilon^{-1} b^2 \quad (9.6)$$

with some arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$, we get

$$2|B_{1,n}(\lambda)| \leq \varepsilon P_n(\lambda) + \frac{c_n^*}{\varepsilon \sigma n} (\sigma + B_2^*).$$

Moreover, by the same method we estimate the term $B_{2,n}$, i.e.

$$2\sqrt{P_n(\lambda)}\frac{B_{2,n}(\bar{\lambda})}{\sqrt{\sigma n}} \leq \varepsilon P_n(\lambda) + \frac{B_{2,n}^2(\bar{\lambda})}{\varepsilon \sigma n} \leq \varepsilon P_n(\lambda) + \frac{B_2^*}{\varepsilon \sigma n},$$

where

$$B_2^* = \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left(B_{2,n}^2(\bar{\lambda}) + B_{2,n}^2(\bar{\lambda}^2) \right).$$

Note that from Proposition 7.3 we obtain that

$$\mathbf{E}_Q B_2^* \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \left(\mathbf{E}_Q B_{2,n}^2(\bar{\lambda}) + \mathbf{E}_Q B_{2,n}^2(\bar{\lambda}^2) \right) \leq 2(2 + \bar{\phi}_n^4 \Pi(x^4)) \sigma^2 \nu_n. \quad (9.7)$$

Using the bounds above, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\lambda^*) &\leq \text{Err}_n(\lambda_0) + \frac{4|\Lambda|_n |\hat{\sigma}_n - \sigma|}{n} + 2M(\varpi) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \frac{c^*}{n\sigma} (\sigma + B_2^*) + \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \frac{B_2^*}{n\sigma} \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon P_n(\lambda^*) + 2\varepsilon P_n(\lambda_0) - \delta \hat{P}_n(\lambda^*) + \delta \hat{P}_n(\lambda_0). \end{aligned}$$

The setting $\varepsilon = \delta/4$ and the estimating where this is possible δ by 1 in this inequality imply

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\lambda^*) &\leq \text{Err}_n(\lambda_0) + \frac{5|\Lambda|_n |\hat{\sigma}_n - \sigma|}{n} + 2M(\varpi) \\ &\quad + \frac{16(c_n^* + 1)(\sigma + B_2^*)}{\delta n \sigma} - \frac{\delta}{2} \hat{P}_n(\lambda^*) + \frac{\delta}{2} P_n(\lambda_0) + \delta \hat{P}_n(\lambda_0). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, taking into account here that

$$|\hat{P}_n(\lambda_0) - P_n(\lambda_0)| \leq \frac{|\Lambda|_n |\hat{\sigma}_n - \sigma|}{n}$$

and that $\delta < 1/2$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\lambda^*) &\leq \text{Err}_n(\lambda_0) + \frac{6|\Lambda|_n |\hat{\sigma}_n - \sigma|}{n} + 2M(\varpi) \\ &\quad + \frac{16(c_n^* + 1)(\sigma + B_2^*)}{\delta n \sigma} - \frac{\delta}{2} P_n(\lambda^*) + \frac{3\delta}{2} P_n(\lambda_0). \quad (9.8) \end{aligned}$$

Now we examine the third term in the right-hand side of this inequality. Firstly we note that

$$2|M(\varpi)| \leq \varepsilon \|S_\varpi\|^2 + \frac{Z^*}{n\varepsilon}, \quad (9.9)$$

where $S_\varpi = \sum_{j=1}^n \varpi_j \theta_j \phi_j$ and

$$Z^* = \sup_{x \in \Lambda_1} \frac{nM^2(x)}{\|S_x\|^2}.$$

We remind that the set Λ_1 is defined in (9.4). Using Proposition 7.1 we can obtain that for any fixed $x = (x_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\mathbf{E} M^2(x) = \frac{\mathbf{E} I_n^2(S_x)}{n^2} = \frac{\sigma \|S_x\|^2}{n} = \frac{\sigma}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2 \theta_j^2 \quad (9.10)$$

and, therefore,

$$\mathbf{E}_Q Z^* \leq \sum_{x \in \Lambda_1} \frac{nM^2(x)}{\|S_x\|^2} \leq \sigma \nu_n. \quad (9.11)$$

Moreover, the norm $\|S_\lambda^* - S_{\lambda_0}^*\|$ can be estimated from below as

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_\lambda^* - S_{\lambda_0}^*\|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^n (\varpi(j) + \beta(j))^2 \widehat{\theta}_j^2 \\ &\geq \|\widehat{S}_\varpi\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \varpi(j) \beta(j) \widehat{\theta}_j^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta(j) = \lambda_0(j)g_j(\lambda_0) - \lambda(j)g_j(\lambda)$. Therefore, in view of (3.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_\varpi\|^2 - \|S_\lambda^* - S_{\lambda_0}^*\|^2 &\leq \|S_\varpi\|^2 - \|\widehat{S}_\varpi\|^2 - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \varpi(j) \beta(j) \widehat{\theta}_j^2 \\ &\leq -2M(\varpi^2) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \varpi(j) \beta(j) \widehat{\theta}_j \theta_j - \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \Upsilon(\varpi), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Upsilon(\lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j) \beta(j) \widehat{\theta}_j \xi_j$. Note that the first term in this inequality we can estimate as

$$2M(\varpi^2) \leq \varepsilon \|S_\varpi\|^2 + \frac{Z_1^*}{n\varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_1^* = \sup_{x \in \Lambda_1} \frac{nM^2(x^2)}{\|S_x\|^2}.$$

Note that, similarly to (9.11) we can estimate the last term as

$$\mathbf{E}_Q Z_1^* \leq \sigma \nu_n.$$

From this it follows that for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_\varpi\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \left(\|S_\lambda^* - S_{\lambda_0}^*\|^2 + \frac{Z_1^*}{n\varepsilon} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \varpi(j) \beta(j) \hat{\theta}_j \theta_j - \frac{2\Upsilon(\varpi)}{\sqrt{n}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (9.12)$$

Moreover, note now that the property (9.5) yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \beta^2(j) \hat{\theta}_j^2 \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^n g_\lambda^2(j) \hat{\theta}_j^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^n g_{\lambda_0}^2(j) \hat{\theta}_j^2 \leq \frac{4c^*}{\varepsilon n}. \quad (9.13)$$

Taking into account that $|\varpi(j)| \leq 1$ and using the inequality (9.6), we get that for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$2 \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \varpi(j) \beta(j) \hat{\theta}_j \theta_j \right| \leq \varepsilon \|S_\varpi\|^2 + \frac{4c^*}{\varepsilon n}.$$

To estimate the last term in the right hand of (9.12) we use first the Cauchy – Schwarz inequality and then the bound (9.13), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} |\Upsilon(\lambda)| &\leq \frac{2|\lambda|_n}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \beta^2(j) \hat{\theta}_j^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{\lambda}^2(j) \xi_j^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \varepsilon P_n(\lambda) + \frac{c^*}{n\varepsilon\sigma} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{\lambda}^2(j) \xi_j^2 \leq \varepsilon P_n(\lambda) + \frac{c^*(\sigma + B_2^*)}{n\varepsilon\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} |\Upsilon(\varpi)| &\leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} |\Upsilon(\lambda^*)| + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} |\Upsilon(\lambda_0)| \\ &\leq \varepsilon P_n(\lambda^*) + \varepsilon P_n(\lambda_0) + \frac{2c^*(\sigma + B_2^*)}{n\varepsilon\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

So, using all these bounds in (9.12), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{\varpi}\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)} \left(\frac{Z_1^*}{n\varepsilon} + \|S_{\lambda^*}^* - S_{\lambda_0}^*\|^2 + \frac{6c_n^*(\sigma + B_2^*)}{n\sigma\varepsilon} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \varepsilon P_n(\lambda^*) + \varepsilon P_n(\lambda_0) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using in the inequality (9.9) this bound and the estimate

$$\|S_{\lambda^*}^* - S_{\lambda_0}^*\|^2 \leq 2(\text{Err}_n(\lambda^*) + \text{Err}_n(\lambda_0)),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 2|M(\varpi)| &\leq \frac{Z^* + Z_1^*}{n(1-\varepsilon)\varepsilon} + \frac{2\varepsilon(\text{Err}_n(\lambda^*) + \text{Err}_n(\lambda_0))}{(1-\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + \frac{6c_n^*(\sigma + B_2^*)}{n\sigma(1-\varepsilon)} + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{1-\varepsilon} (P_n(\lambda^*) + P_n(\lambda_0)). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing here $\varepsilon \leq \delta/2 < 1/2$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 2|M(\varpi)| &\leq \frac{2(Z^* + Z_1^*)}{n\varepsilon} + \frac{2\varepsilon(\text{Err}_n(\lambda^*) + \text{Err}_n(\lambda_0))}{(1-\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + \frac{12c_n^*(\sigma + B_2^*)}{n\sigma} + \varepsilon (P_n(\lambda^*) + P_n(\lambda_0)). \end{aligned}$$

From here and (9.8), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\lambda^*) &\leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-3\varepsilon} \text{Err}_n(\lambda_0) + \frac{6|\Lambda|_n |\widehat{\sigma}_n - \sigma|}{n(1-3\varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + \frac{28(1+c_n^*)(B_2^* + \sigma)}{\delta(1-3\varepsilon)n\sigma} + \frac{2(Z^* + Z_1^*)}{n(1-3\varepsilon)} + \frac{2\delta P_n(\lambda_0)}{1-3\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing here $\varepsilon = \delta/3$ and estimating $(1-\delta)^{-1}$ by 2 where this is possible, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\lambda^*) &\leq \frac{1+\delta/3}{1-\delta} \text{Err}_n(\lambda_0) + \frac{12|\Lambda|_n |\widehat{\sigma}_n - \sigma|}{n} \\ &\quad + \frac{56(1+c_n^*)(B_2^* + \sigma)}{\delta n\sigma} + \frac{4(Z^* + Z_1^*)}{n} + \frac{2\delta P_n(\lambda_0)}{1-\delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation and using the upper bound for $P_n(\lambda_0)$ in Lemma A.1 with $\varepsilon = \delta$ yields

$$\mathcal{R}_Q(S^*, S) \leq \frac{1+5\delta}{1-\delta} \mathcal{R}_Q(S_{\lambda_0}^*, S) + \frac{\check{\mathbf{U}}_{Q,n}}{n\delta} + \frac{12|\Lambda|_n \mathbf{E}_Q |\hat{\sigma}_n - \sigma|}{n},$$

where $\check{\mathbf{U}}_{Q,n} = 56(1+c_n^*)(2(6+\bar{\phi}_n^4 \Pi(x^4))\sigma\nu_n + 1) + 2c_n^*$. The inequality holds for each $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$, this implies Theorem 4.1. \square

9.3 Proof of Theorem 6.1

Firstly, note, that for any fixed $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$

$$\sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\hat{S}_n, S) \geq \sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}_n, S). \quad (9.14)$$

Now for any fixed $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ we set

$$d = d_n = \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{k} v_n^{1/(2k+1)} l_k(r_\varepsilon) \right\rceil \quad \text{and} \quad r_\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon)r. \quad (9.15)$$

Next we approximate the unknown function by a trigonometric series with $d = d_n$ terms, i.e. for any array $z = (z_j)_{1 \leq j \leq d_n}$, we set

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

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

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

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

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

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

$$\mathbf{p}(f) = \Pr_{W_{k,r}}(f).$$

Since $W_{k,r}$ is a convex set, we obtain

$$\|\hat{S} - S\|^2 \geq \|\hat{\mathbf{p}} - S\|^2 \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{p}(\hat{S}).$$

Therefore,

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

Using the distribution μ_κ we introduce the following Bayes risk

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

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

$$\sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_Q(\hat{S}, S) \geq \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_Q(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) - 2\mathbf{R}_{0,n} \quad (9.16)$$

with

$$\mathbf{R}_{0,n} = \int_{\{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : S_z \notin W_{k,r}\}} (r + \|S_z\|^2) \mu_\kappa(dz).$$

Therefore, in view of (9.14)

$$\sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\hat{S}_n, S) \geq \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_Q(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) - 2\mathbf{R}_{0,n}. \quad (9.17)$$

In Lemma A.3 we studied the last term in this inequality. Now it is easy to see that

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

where $\hat{z}_j = \int_0^1 \hat{\mathbf{p}}(t) \phi_j(t) dt$. So, in view of Lemma 8.1 and reminding that $v_n = n/\bar{\sigma}_n$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_Q(\hat{\mathbf{p}}) &\geq \sup_{0 < \sigma_1^2 \leq \sigma^*} \sum_{j=1}^{d_n} \frac{1}{n\sigma_1^{-2} + v_n (s_j^*)^{-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{v_n} \sum_{j=1}^{d_n} \frac{s_j^*}{s_j^* + 1} = \frac{1}{v_n} \sum_{j=1}^{d_n} \left(1 - \frac{j^k}{d_n^k}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using now the definition (9.15), Lemma A.3 and the inequality (9.17) we obtain that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\hat{S} \in \Pi_n} v_n^{\frac{2k}{2k+1}} \sup_{S \in W_{k,r}} \mathcal{R}_n^*(\hat{S}_n, S) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2k+1}} l_k(r_\varepsilon).$$

Taking here limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we come to the Theorem 6.1. \square

9.4 Proof of Theorem 6.2

This theorem follows from Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 3.1 in [20]. \square

10 Conclusion

In the conclusion we would like to emphasize that in this paper we develop a new model selection method based on the improved versions of the least squares estimates. It turns out that the improvement effect in the nonparametric estimation given in (3.10) is more important than for the parameter estimation problems since the accuracy improvement is proportional to the parameter dimension d which goes to infinity for nonparametric models. Recall that, the improved estimation methods was usually used for the parametric estimation problem only, where the parameter dimension d is always fixed (see, for example, [8]). Therefore, the benefit in the non-asymptotic quadratic accuracy from the application of the improved estimation methods is more significant in statistical nonparametric signal processing. Moreover, for the proposed improved model selection procedures we obtain the sharp oracle inequalities. It should be emphasized that in this paper we obtain these inequalities without conditions on the jumps, i.e. without assumption that the Lévy measure is finite. To this end we developed a special analytical tool in Proposition 7.2 to study the non-asymptotic properties for the corresponding stochastic integrals with respect to the process (2.1). Moreover, asymptotically, as n goes to infinity, we shown the adaptive efficiency for the improved model selection procedures. This is the meaning, that the proposed shrinkage model selection procedures have the benefit with respect to the least squares estimator in the non-asymptotic accuracy and asymptotically they possess the same efficient properties as the least squares methods. Moreover, the behavior of the constructed procedures is illustrated by the numerical simulations in Section 5.

Acknowledgements. This work was partially supported by the research project no. 2.3208.2017/4.6 (the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation), RFBR Grant 16-01-00121 A and "The Tomsk State University competitiveness improvement programme" Grant 8.1.18.2018. The work of the last author was partially supported by the Russian Federal Professor program (project no. 1.472.2016/1.4, the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation) and by the European research project XterM - Feder, University of Havre (France).

11 Appendix

A.1 Proof of Proposition 3.1

Using (2.1) we put for any square integrated functions f

$$I_t^{(1)}(f) = \int_0^t f(s)dw_s \quad \text{and} \quad I_t^{(2)}(f) = \int_0^t f(s)dz_s.$$

From here and (3.3) we can see that the vector $\tilde{\xi}$ has the conditionally Gaussian distribution with respect to \mathcal{G}_n with zero mean and its covariance matrix \mathbf{G}_n can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{G}_n = \sigma_1^2 I_d + \sigma_2^2 \mathcal{D}_n,$$

where I_d is the identity matrix and the (i, j) -th element of the matrix \mathcal{D}_n is defined as $\mathbf{E}(I_n^{(2)}(\phi_i)I_n^{(2)}(\phi_j)|\mathcal{G}_n)$. Using the celebrated inequality of Lidskii and Wieland (see, for example, in [29], G.3.a., p.334) we obtain

$$\text{tr} \mathbf{G}_n - \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{G}_n) \geq \sigma_1^2(\text{tr} I_d - \lambda_{\max}(I_d)) \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Now, using (2.6) we come to desire results. \square

A.2 Proof of Proposition 4.2

We use here the same method as in [19]. Using the equality (3.3) for the trigonometric basis, we get

$$\widehat{t}_j = t_j + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\xi_j,$$

where

$$t_j = \int_0^1 S(u) \text{Tr}_j(u) du \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_0^n \text{Tr}_j(u) d\xi_u.$$

Therefore, the estimator (4.3) can be represented as

$$\widehat{\sigma}_n^2 = \sum_{j=[\sqrt{n}]+1}^n t_j^2 + 2\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}M_n + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=[\sqrt{n}]+1}^n \xi_j^2, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $M_n = \sum_{j=[\sqrt{n}]+1}^n t_j \xi_j$. Note that for the continuously differentiable functions (see, for example, Lemma A.6 in [19]) the Fourier coefficients (t_j) for any $m \geq 1$ satisfy the following inequality

$$\sum_{j=m+1}^{\infty} t_j^2 \leq \frac{4}{m} \left(\int_0^1 |\dot{S}(t)| dt \right)^2 \leq \frac{4}{m} \|\dot{S}\|^2$$

and $\dot{S} = dS/dt$. The second term in (A.1) can be estimated through the equality (9.10), i.e.

$$\mathbf{E}_Q M_n^2 = \frac{\sigma}{n} \sum_{j=[\sqrt{n}]+1}^n t_j^2 \leq \frac{4\sigma}{n\sqrt{n}} \|\dot{S}\|^2.$$

Moreover, taking into account that the expectation $\mathbf{E}_Q \xi_j^2 = \sigma$ we can represent the last term in (A.1) as

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=[\sqrt{n}]+1}^n \xi_j^2 = \sigma \frac{n - [\sqrt{n}]}{n} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} B_{2,n}(x'),$$

where the function $B_{2,n}(x')$ is defined in (9.2) for $x'_j = 1/\sqrt{n} \mathbf{1}_{\{\sqrt{n} < j \leq n\}}$. Therefore, similarly to (9.7) we find

$$\mathbf{E}_Q \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=[\sqrt{n}]+1}^n \xi_j^2 - \sigma \right| \leq \frac{\sigma \left(1 + \sqrt{2 + 4\Pi(x^4)} \right)}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbf{E}_Q |\widehat{\sigma}_n - \sigma| \leq \frac{4\|\dot{S}\|^2 + 2\sqrt{\sigma}\|\dot{S}\| + \sigma \left(1 + \sqrt{2 + 4\Pi(x^4)} \right)}{\sqrt{n}}$$

and, therefore, we obtain the bound (A.2). Hence Proposition 4.2. \square

A.3 Proof of Proposition 7.1

Proof. Taking into account the definition of $I_t(f)$ in (3.3) and (2.1) we obtain through the Ito formula that

$$I_t(f) I_t(g) = \sigma(f, g)_t + \mathbf{M}_t^{f,g}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where

$$\mathbf{M}_t^{f,g} = \int_0^t \Upsilon_{s-}^{f,g} d\xi_s + \sigma_2^2 \int_0^t f(s) g(s) dm_s,$$

$\Upsilon_s^{f,g} = f(s)I_s(g) + g(s)I_s(f)$ and $m_t = x^2 * (\mu - \tilde{\mu})_t$. Using now the inequality (7.1) with $\Upsilon = xf$ and $p = 2$ we obtain that for any $f \in \mathbf{L}_2[0, t]$

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\int_0^t f(s) dz_s \right)^2 \leq C \|f\|_t^2 < \infty.$$

Therefore, taking the expectation in (A.2) we obtain (7.3). Hence Proposition 7.1. \square

A.4 Property of Penalty term

Lemma A.1. *For any $n \geq 1$, $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$*

$$P_n(\lambda) \leq \frac{\mathbf{E} \text{Err}_n(\lambda)}{1 - \varepsilon} + \frac{c_n^*}{n\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where c_n^* is defined in (4.7).

Proof. By the definition of $\text{Err}_n(\lambda)$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Err}_n(\lambda) &= \sum_{j=1}^n (\lambda(j)\theta_j^* - \theta_j)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\lambda(j)(\theta_j^* - \theta_j) + (\lambda(j) - 1)\theta_j \right)^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)^2 (\theta_j^* - \theta_j)^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)(\lambda(j) - 1)\theta_j(\theta_j^* - \theta_j). \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the condition \mathbf{B}_2) and the definition (3.7) we obtain that the last term in the sum can be replaced as

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)(\lambda(j) - 1)\theta_j(\theta_j^* - \theta_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)(\lambda(j) - 1)\theta_j(\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_j),$$

i.e. $\mathbf{E} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)(\lambda(j) - 1)\theta_j(\theta_j^* - \theta_j) = 0$ and, therefore, taking into account the definition (4.10) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \text{Err}_n(\lambda) &\geq \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)^2 \mathbf{E} (\theta_j^* - \theta_j)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)^2 \mathbf{E} \left(\frac{\xi_j}{\sqrt{n}} - g_\lambda(j) \hat{\theta}_j \right)^2 \\ &\geq P_n(\lambda) - \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{E} \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda(j)^2 g_\lambda(j) \hat{\theta}_j \xi_j \\ &\geq (1 - \varepsilon) P_n(\lambda) - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathbf{E} \sum_{j=1}^n g_\lambda^2(j) \hat{\theta}_j^2. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality (9.5) implies the bound (A.3). Hence Lemma A.1. \square

A.5 The absolute continuity of distributions for the Lévy processes

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

$$dy_t = S(t)dt + d\xi_t, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $S(\cdot)$ is any arbitrary nonrandom square integrated function, i.e. from $\mathbf{L}_2[0, T]$ and $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ is the Lévy process of the form (2.1) with nonzero constant σ_1 . We denote by \mathbf{P}_y and \mathbf{P}_ξ the distributions of the processes $(y_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ and $(\xi_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ on the Skorokhod space $\mathbf{D}[0, T]$. Now for any $(x_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ from $\mathbf{D}[0, T]$ we set

$$\Upsilon_T(x) = \exp \left\{ \int_0^T \frac{S(u)}{\sigma_1^2} dx_u^c - \int_0^T \frac{S^2(u)}{2\sigma_1^2} du \right\}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where x^c is the continuous part of the process x defined in (8.1). Now we study the measures \mathbf{P}_y and \mathbf{P}_ξ in $\mathbf{D}[0, T]$.

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

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

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

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

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

$$\mathbf{E} \exp \{ i b (y_t - y_s) \} = \mathbf{E} \exp \{ i b (\xi_t - \xi_s) \} \frac{\Upsilon_t(\xi)}{\Upsilon_s(\xi)}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

To check this equality note that the process

$$\Upsilon_t(\xi) = \exp \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{S(u)}{\sigma_1} dw_u - \int_0^t \frac{S^2(u)}{2\sigma_1^2} du \right\}$$

is the gaussian martingale. From here we directly obtain the squation (A.6). Hence Proposition A.2. \square

A.6 Properties of the term $\mathbf{R}_{0,n}$

Lemma A.3. *For any $m > 0$ the term $\mathbf{R}_{0,n}$ introduced in (9.16) satisfies the following property*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^m \mathbf{R}_{0,n} = 0. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Proof. First, setting $\zeta_n = \sum_{j=1}^{d_n} \kappa_j^2 a_j$, we obtain that

$$\{S_\kappa \notin W_{k,r}\} = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{d_n} \kappa_j^2 \sum_{l=0}^k \|\phi_j^{(l)}\|^2 > r \right\} = \{\zeta_n > r\}.$$

Moreover, note that one can check directly that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \zeta_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{v_n} \sum_{j=1}^{d_n} s_j^* a_j = r_\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon)r.$$

So, for sufficiently large n we obtain that

$$\{S_\kappa \notin W_{k,r}\} \subset \{\tilde{\zeta}_n > r_1\},$$

where $r_1 = r\varepsilon/2$,

$$\tilde{\zeta}_n = \zeta_n - \mathbf{E} \zeta_n = \frac{1}{v_n} \sum_{j=1}^{d_n} s_j^* a_j \tilde{\eta}_j \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\eta}_j = \eta_j^2 - 1.$$

Through the correlation inequality from [14] we can get that for any $p \geq 2$ there exists some constant $C_p > 0$ for which

$$\mathbf{E} \tilde{\zeta}_n^p \leq C_p \frac{1}{v_n^p} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d (s_j^*)^2 a_j^2 \right)^{p/2} \leq C v_n^{-\frac{p}{4k+2}},$$

i.e. the expectation $\mathbf{E} \tilde{\zeta}_n^p \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, using the Chebychev inequality we obtain that for any $m > 1$

$$n^m \mathbf{P}(\tilde{\zeta}_n > r_1) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence Lemma A.3. \square

References

- [1] Akaike H. A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control* **19** (1974) 716–723.
- [2] O. E. Barndorff-Nielsen and N. Shephard. Non-Gaussian Ornstein-Uhlenbeck-based models and some of their uses in financial mathematics. *J. Royal Stat. Soc.* **B 63** (2001) 167–241.
- [3] Barron A., Birgé L. and Massart P. (1999) Risk bounds for model selection via penalization. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **113**, 301–415.
- [4] Bichteler K., Jacod J. *Calcul de Malliavin pour les diffusions avec sauts: existence d'une densité dans le cas unidimensionnel*. Séminaire de probabilité, XVII, Lecture Notes in Math., **986**, Springer, Berlin, 1983, 132–157.
- [5] J. Bertoin. *Lévy Processes*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [6] Comte, F. and Genon-Catalot, V. (2011) Estimation for Lévy processes from high frequency data within a long time interval. *The Annals of Statistics*, **39**(2), 803 – 837.

- [7] Cont R., Tankov P. *Financial Modelling with Jump Processes*. Chapman & Hall, 2004.
- [8] Fourdrinier D., Strawderman W. E. (1996). A paradox concerning shrinkage estimators: should a known scale parameter be replaced by an estimated value in the shrinkage factor? *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 59(2), 109–140.
- [9] Fourdrinier D., Pergamenshchikov S. (2007) Improved selection model method for the regression with dependent noise. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **59**(3), 435–464.
- [10] Flaksman, A.G. (2002) Adaptive signal processing in antenna arrays with allowance for the rank of the impulse-response matrix of a multipath channel *Radiophysics and Quantum Electronics*, **45** (12), 977 – 988.
- [11] Galtchouk L.I., Pergamenshchikov S.M. (2006) Asymptotically efficient estimates for nonparametric regression models. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **76** (8), 852–860.
- [12] Galtchouk L.I., Pergamenshchikov S. M. (2009) Sharp non-asymptotic oracle inequalities for nonparametric heteroscedastic regression models. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* **21** (1), 1 - 16.
- [13] Galtchouk L., Pergamenshchikov S. (2009) Adaptive asymptotically efficient estimation in heteroscedastic nonparametric regression. *Journal of Korean Statistical Society*, **38**(4), 305–322.
- [14] Galtchouk L., Pergamenshchikov S. (2013) Uniform concentration inequality for ergodic diffusion processes observed at discrete times. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, **123**, 91109
- [15] Ibragimov I. A., Khasminskii R. Z. *Statistical Estimation: Asymptotic Theory*. Springer, New York, 1981.
- [16] Jacod J., Shiryaev A.N. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*. 2nd edition, Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [17] James W., Stein C. (1961). Estimation with quadratic loss. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium Mathematics, Statistics and Probability*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1, 361380
- [18] Kassam S.A. Signal detection in non-Gaussian noise. New York: Springer-Verlag Inc., IX, 1988.

- [19] Konev V. V., Pergamenshchikov S. M. Nonparametric estimation in a semimartingale regression model. Part 1. Oracle Inequalities. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics of Tomsk State University* **3** (2009) 23–41.
- [20] Konev V. V., Pergamenshchikov S. M. Nonparametric estimation in a semimartingale regression model. Part 2. Robust asymptotic efficiency. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics of Tomsk State University* **4** (2009) 31–45.
- [21] Konev V. V., Pergamenshchikov S. M. General model selection estimation of a periodic regression with a Gaussian noise. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **62** (2010) 1083–1111.
- [22] Konev V. V., Pergamenshchikov S. M. Efficient robust nonparametric estimation in a semimartingale regression model. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, **48** (4), 2012, 1217–1244.
- [23] Konev V. V., Pergamenshchikov S. M. Robust model selection for a semimartingale continuous time regression from discrete data. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, **125**, 2015, 294 – 326.
- [24] Konev V., Pergamenshchikov S. and Pchelintsev E. (2014) Estimation of a regression with the pulse type noise from discrete data. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **58** (3), 442–457.
- [25] Kutoyants Yu. A. Estimation of the signal parameter in a Gaussian Noise. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 1977, vol. 13 (4), p. 29 – 36.
- [26] Kutoyants Yu. A. *Parameter Estimation for Stochastic Processes*. Heldeman-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [27] Jacod J., Shiryaev A. N. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*. Vol.1, Springer, New York, 1987.
- [28] Mallows C. Some comments on C_p . *Technometrics* **15** (1973) 661–675.
- [29] Marshall A.W., Olkin I. *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer, Academic.
- [30] Marinelli C., Röckner M. (2014) On maximal inequalities for purely discontinuous martingales in infinite dimensions. *Séminaire de Probabilités*, Lect. Notes Math., **XLVI** , 293–315.

- [31] Novikov A.A. (1975) On discontinuous martingales. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **20**, 1, 11–26.
- [32] Nussbaum M. (1985) Spline smoothing in regression models and asymptotic efficiency in \mathbf{L}_2 .- *Ann. Statist.* **13**, 984–997.
- [33] Pchelintsev E. (2013) Improved estimation in a non-Gaussian parametric regression. *Stat. Inference Stoch. Process.*, **16** (1), 15 – 28.
- [34] Pinsker M.S. (1981) Optimal filtration of square integrable signals in gaussian white noise. *Problems of Transimission information* **17**, 120–133.
- [35] Proakis J. G. *Digital Communications*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1995.