arXiv:1711.09200v1 [math.ST] 25 Nov 2017

Submitted to the Annals of Applied Statistics

AN ORACLE PROPERTY OF THE NADARAYA-WATSON KERNEL ESTIMATOR FOR HIGH DIMENSIONAL NONPARAMETRIC REGRESSION

By Daniel Conn and Gang Li

University of California, Los Angeles

The celebrated Nadaraya-Watson kernel estimator is among the most studied method for nonparametric regression. A classical result is that its rate of convergence depends on the number of covariates and deteriorates quickly as the dimension grows, which underscores the "curse of dimensionality" and has limited its use in high dimensional settings. In this article, we show that when the true regression function is single or multi-index, the effects of the curse of dimensionality may be mitigated for the Nadaraya-Watson kernel estimator. Specifically, we prove that with K-fold cross-validation, the Nadaraya-Watson kernel estimator indexed by a positive semidefinite bandwidth matrix has an oracle property that its rate of convergence depends on the number of indices of the regression function rather than the number of covariates. Intuitively, this oracle property is a consequence of allowing the bandwidths to diverge to infinity as opposed to restricting them all to converge to zero at certain rates as done in previous theoretical studies. Our result provides a theoretical perspective for the use of kernel estimation in high dimensional nonparametric regression and other applications such as metric learning when a low rank structure is anticipated. Numerical illustrations are given through simulations and real data examples.

1. Introduction. The Nadaraya-Watson kernel regression estimator (Nadaraya, 1964; Watson, 1964) is a corner stone of nonparametric regression. Assume that one observes n independent and identically (iid) distributed random variables of the form $O_i = (X_i, Y_i), \sim P_0$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, where $X_i \in \mathcal{R}^p$ are p-dimensional covariates and Y_i is a real-valued outcome. The Nadaraya-Watson kernel estimator of the multivariate regression function $\psi(x) \equiv E[Y|X = x]$ is commonly defined as

$$\psi_{H^*}(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K(H^{*-1/2}(X_i - x))Y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n K(H^{*-1/2}(X_i - x))}, \tag{1.1}$$

where H^* is a $p \times p$ symmetric positive definite matrix depending on n, and $K(u)$ is a kernel function such that $\int K(u)du = 1$.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 62G08

Keywords and phrases: low rank model, metric learning, multi-index model, oracle property, rate of convergence, smoothing

It is well-known that the performance of nonparametric regression methods degrades as the number of covariates, p, increases. This degradation in performance is often referred to as the "curse of dimensionality." For kernel regression, the curse of dimensionality can be seen to manifest itself when $H^* = h_n^* I_p$ by considering results such as Theorem 5.2 of Györfi et al. (2006) concerning the rate of the convergence of the kernel regression estimator ψ_{n,h_n^*} to ψ:

$$E \int (\psi_{n,h_n^*}(x) - \psi(x))^2 dP_{0,X}(x) = O(n^{-2/(p+2)}), \tag{1.2}$$

for an appropriately chosen sequence of scalar bandwidths, h_n^*. Also see the discussion at the end of Chapter 4 in Härdle et al. (2012). We highlight that the above result is established under the commonly made assumption that the bandwidth tends to zero at a certain rate as n grows to infinity, which allows the kernel estimator to pick up local features and balance the trade-off between its bias and variance.

In this article, however, we will show that if the bandwidths are allowed to diverge to infinity, then the Nadaraya-Watson kernel regression estimator using a bandwidth matrix has an oracle property when there exists an embedded low dimensional structure in $\psi(x)$. We will show in Theorem 2.2 that if the true regression function is a single or multi-index regression model with index number m, then K-fold cross-validation can be used to produce an estimator with rate of convergence that depends on m rather than p. If m is much less than p, the gain in predictive performance may be substantial.

Specifically, we consider the following reparametrized form of the Nadaraya-Watson kernel estimator

$$\psi_H(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K(H^{1/2}(X_i - x))Y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n K(H^{1/2}(X_i - x))}, . \tag{1.3}$$

Note that (1.3) is equivalent to the classical definition (1.1) with $H^* = H^{-1}$ if H is positive definite, but we will allow H to be positive semidefinite. Letting H be less than full rank, theoretically, allows the above estimator to take advantage of low-dimensional structure in $\psi(x)$. Our theoretical result on the oracle property of the Nadaraya-Watson kernel estimator relies on an extension of an oracle inequality concerning sample splitting and K-fold cross-validation presented in Dudoit and van der Laan (2005) and Györfi et al. (2006), who considered sample splitting or cross-validation for selecting the best model from a discrete collection of models. In practice, for kernel regression with a bandwidth matrix, specifying a discrete set of bandwidth matrices over which the K-fold cross-validation criterion is to be

minimized is likely to be overly burdensome. Our result allows for optimization of the K-fold cross-validation criterion with respect to H to take place over a bounded subset of the space of $p \times p$ positive semidefinite matrices. This fact is important because it provides theoretical justification for the use of general optimization techniques such as gradient descent that rely on selecting the optimal bandwidth matrix over a continuum of positive semidefinite matrices, rather than a discrete grid.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first discuss optimality criteria we use for assessing predictive performance of an estimator and introduce notations for cross-validation schemes. Then we present a general oracle inequality for estimators using K-fold cross-validation. This result is then used to prove an oracle property for the kernel regression estimator defined in (1.3). In Sections 3 and 4, we assess the performance of our cross-validated kernel regression estimator in simulations and on commonly used benchmark data sets from the UC Irvine Machine Learning repository. Our contributions are summarized in the discussion of Section 5. Sections 6 contains an additional result concerning the convergence rate of a kernel regression estimator in which a Gaussian kernel is used and recalls some facts concerning brackets and bracketing numbers. Section 7 contains the proofs of Section 2.

2. Main Results.

2.1. *Preliminaries.*

2.1.1. *Optimality Criteria for Predictive Performance.* Given an estimator $\hat{\psi}$ of ψ based on the observed data, consider the squared error loss, $L(Y, \hat{\psi}(X)) = (Y - \hat{\psi}(X))^2$, for an additional independent observation, $O = (X, Y) \sim P_0$. Define

$$\tilde{\theta}_n(\hat{\psi}) = E_O[L(Y, \hat{\psi}(X))] = \int L(y, \hat{\psi}(x)) dP_0(x, y), \tag{2.1}$$

to be the conditional risk (Keles, Van Der Laan and Dudoit, 2004; Dudoit and van der Laan, 2005), which is also referred to as the test error or generalization error (Friedman, Hastie and Tibshirani, 2001) or the integrated squared error (ISE) (Marron and Härdle, 1986).

Note that the conditional risk is a random variable as $\hat{\psi}$ depends on the observed data. We call $E\tilde{\theta}_n(k)$ the marginal risk, or the expected test error, or the mean integrated squared error ($MISE$).

Define $\psi(X) = E[Y|X]$ to be the true conditional expectation of Y given X and $\theta_{opt} = E_O[(Y - \psi(X))^2]$. Then, for any square integrable estimator

$\hat{\psi}(X)$,

$$\tilde{\theta}_n(\hat{\psi}) \geq \theta_{opt},$$

since $\psi(X) = E[Y|X]$ minimizes $E_O[(Y - \eta(X))^2]$ over all square integrable functions $\eta(X)$ of X (see, e.g., Corollary 8.17 of Klenke (2013)). Hence θ_{opt} is a lower bound for both the conditional risk and the marginal risk. Moreover, we note that selecting the estimator $\hat{\psi}$ that minimizes the conditional risk is equivalent to minimizing the $\tilde{\theta}_n(\hat{\psi}) - \theta_{opt}$ and that $\tilde{\theta}_n(\hat{\psi}) - \theta_{opt} = \int(\hat{\psi}(x) - \psi(x))^2 dP_{0,X}(x)$, where $P_{0,X}$ is the marginal distribution of X. We refer to $\tilde{\theta}_n(\hat{\psi}) - \theta_{opt}$ as the conditional excess risk and $E\tilde{\theta}_n(\hat{\psi}) - \theta_{opt}$ as the marginal excess risk.

Because the true distribution P_0 of the observations is unknown, the conditional risk must be estimated. A natural estimator of the conditional risk would be $\int L(y, \hat{\psi}(x)) dP_n(x, y)$, where P_n is the empirical distribution of the observations. Unfortunately, this estimate may be highly optimistic because the data has been used twice to first produce the estimator, $\hat{\psi}$ and then obtain the estimate of the conditional risk. A sample splitting procedure, whereby a (training) subset of the data is set aside to produce $\hat{\psi}$ and a separate (validation) subset of the data is used to estimate $\tilde{\theta}_n(\hat{\psi})$, would produce an estimate of the conditional risk that is less prone to this negative bias. Cross-validation schemes for estimating the conditional risk are elaborations of the aforementioned sample splitting procedure, in which observations alternate in their role of training and validation as described in the next section.

2.1.2. *A Formal Explication of Cross-Validation.* Let $\{\psi_k(x) : k \in \Xi_n\}$ denote a collection of estimators of $\psi(x)$ indexed by k, where $\Xi_n \subset R^d$ for some positive integer d. For simplicity, we abuse the notation by using k for ψ_k from now on. Below we formally present the concept of cross-validation, giving attention to the case in which the index k runs through a continuous range of values.

We denote a split of the data into training and validation sets via the binary vector $S_n = (S_{n1}, \ldots, S_{nn})^T \in \{0, 1\}^n$, where

$$S_{ni} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if observation } i \text{ is in the training set,} \\ 1, & \text{if observation } i \text{ is in the validation set,} \end{cases}$$

and the set $\{0, 1\}^n$ represents all possible splits of the data into training and validation sets. Define P^0_{n,S_n} and P^1_{n,S_n} as the empirical distribution of the observations in the training and validation set, respectively. Let

$\psi_k = \psi_k(X|P^0_{n,S_n})$ be an estimator produced by applying an estimation procedure to observations in the training set determined by S_n. Define the conditional expectation, given the observations in the training set, of a function $f(O, \psi_k(X|P^0_{n,S_n}))$ by $E[f(O,\psi_k)|P^0_{n,S_n}]$, where f is a function depending on an independent observation $O \sim P_0$ and the estimator $\psi_k(X|P^0_{n,S_n})$.

From now on, we will assume that all data splits devote the same proportion of observations, $1-\pi$, to training. A cross-validation scheme is defined by assigning a set of $nsplit$ probability weights $w_1, \ldots, w_{nsplit}$ such that $w_j > 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{nsplit} w_j = 1$ to a subset of $nsplit$ elements of $\{0,1\}^n$. The corresponding cross-validation criterion is then defined as

$$\hat{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(k) = E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_k(x|P^0_{n,S_n}))dP^1_{n,S_n}(x,y) \tag{2.2}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{nsplit} w_j \int L(y, \psi_k(x|P^0_{n,S^{(j)}_n}))dP^1_{n,S^{(j)}_n}(x,y). \tag{2.3}$$

The K-fold cross-validation scheme is defined by splitting the n observations into K distinct subsets. This partition of the observations results in K binary vectors $S^{(1)}_n, \ldots, S^{(K)}_n$ where $S^{(j)}_n$ is created by letting observations in the jth element of the partition serve as the validation set. After minor modification, we may take $\pi = \lfloor n/K \rfloor / n$. The K-fold cross-validation scheme then puts a probability weight of $w_j = 1/K$ on each of these K binary vectors.

A natural benchmark for a cross-validation scheme is

$$\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(k) = E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_k(x|P^0_{n,S_n}))dP_0(x,y) \tag{2.4}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{nsplit} w_j \int L(y, \psi_k(x|P^0_{n,S^{(j)}_n}))dP_0(x,y), \tag{2.5}$$

which is referred to as the cross-validation benchmark, or the "commensurate optimal benchmark" (Dudoit and van der Laan, 2005)). The cross-validation benchmark $\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(k)$ can be regarded as a cross-validation criterion when an infinite number of observations are available for validation. Although minimization of the cross-validation benchmark is not equivalent to minimization of the conditional risk over estimators that use all n observations, for K-fold cross-validation, the following relationship holds: $E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(k) = E\tilde{\theta}_{n(1-\pi)}(k)$, where $\tilde{\theta}_{n(1-\pi)}(k)$ denotes the conditional risk of ψ_k. Thus, the cross-validation benchmark has mean equal to the marginal risk based on approximately $n(1-\pi)$ observations rather than n observations.

If minimization of the cross-validation criterion is carried out over a continuous range Ξ_n of $\mathcal{R}^d$, there may not exist a $\hat{k}_n \in \Xi_n$ such that $\hat{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{k}_n) = \inf_{k\in\Xi_n} \hat{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(k)$. For this reason, we will consider a γ-suboptimal point $\hat{k}_n \in \Xi_n$ as in Boyd and Vandenberghe (2004) such that $\hat{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{k}_n) \leq \inf\{\hat{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(k) : k \in \Xi_n\} + \gamma$, for some pre-specified $\gamma > 0$. Note that a γ-suboptimal point is not necessarily unique. If a minimizer exists in Ξ_n, then it can be considered as a γ-suboptimal point with $\gamma = 0$.

2.2. *An Oracle Property of the Kernel Regression Estimator.* Our main theoretical result relies on an extension of an oracle inequality presented in Dudoit and van der Laan (2005) and Györfi et al. (2006), who considered sample splitting or cross-validation for selecting the best model from a discrete collection of models. Our extension below allows for optimization of the K-fold cross-validation criterion to take place over a continuous bounded subset of the space of $p \times p$ positive semidefinite matrices and consequently enables selecting the best model from a continuum of models.

2.2.1. *An Oracle Inequality for K-Fold Cross Validation.* We now present an oracle inequality that demonstrates that K-fold cross-validation produces an estimator that has near optimal performance according to the cross-validation benchmark.

Let $\hat{k}_n$ and $\tilde{k}_n$ be the γ-suboptimal minimizers of the K-fold cross-validation criterion $\hat{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(k)$ and its cross-validation benchmark $\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(k)$, respectively, over Ξ_n.

The following assumptions will be needed.

(A1) There exists a constant $M > 0$ such that $Pr(|Y| < M) = 1$ and $sup_X|\psi_k(X|P_n)| \leq M < \infty$ almost surely for all $k \in \Xi_n$, where M does not depend on n and the supremum is over the support of the marginal distribution of X.

(A2) Ξ_n is a bounded set.

(A3) Assume that with probability 1, $L(Y, \psi_k(X|P_n)) - L(Y, \psi(X))$, as a function of k, is Lipshitz continuous with Lipshitz constant C. This Lipshitz constant, C, does not depend on the training set, P_n.

(A4) Let $c_1(n\pi, d, \Xi_n, M, \delta) = \log\left\{\left(\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}\right)^d 4(4\sqrt{d}C^2 4(1+2\delta)\text{diam}(\Xi_n))^d\right\}$ and let $c_2(M,\delta) = 8(1+\delta)^2(\frac{M_2}{\delta} + \frac{M_1}{3})$, where $M_1 = 8M^2$ and $M_2 = 16M^2$. Assume $\delta > 0$ is such that $1/c_2(M,\delta) \leq M_1 8(\frac{1}{(1+2\delta)} + \frac{1}{3})$ and take n large enough that $c_1(n\pi, d, \Xi_n, M, \delta) > 1$.

The derivation of our result in the theorem below requires that terms of the form $L(Y, \psi_k(X|P_n)) - L(Y, \psi(X))$, where P_n depends on the split, converge

to their expectation uniformly over $k \in \Xi_n$. Intuitively, if $L(Y, \psi_k(X|P_n)) - L(Y, \psi(X))$ converges to its expectation uniformly in k, then the K-fold cross-validation criterion will converge to the K-fold cross-validation benchmark uniformly in k. Assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A3) ensure this occurs. Assumption (A4) is a technical condition primarily serving to simplify the result.

THEOREM 2.1. *Assume the above assumptions (A1)-(A4) hold. Then,*

$$0 \leq E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{k}_n) - \theta_{opt} \leq (1+2\delta)(E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\tilde{k}_n) - \theta_{opt}) + \tag{2.6}$$

$$\frac{4c_2(M,\delta)}{n\pi} c_1(n\pi, d, \Xi_n, M, \delta) + \tag{2.7}$$

$$(1+\delta)\gamma. \tag{2.8}$$

REMARK 1. *Our finite sample result in Theorem 2.1 suggests a trade-off with regard to the choice of what proportion of observations to use for validation versus training for the upper-bound of the above inequality. The expression on the right hand side of the above inequality depends heavily on the number of observations used for validation: $n\pi$. If π is too small, the number of observations used for validation will be small and the term in (2.7) will be large, which signals difficulty in identifying the model that minimizes the cross-validation benchmark. If π is large, the expectation of the optimal cross-validation benchmark based on training sets of size $n(1-\pi)$ may be a poor approximation for the expectation of the optimal conditional risk based on a training set of size n. A similar trade-off has been observed with regard to the choice of K in (Kohavi et al., 1995; Friedman, Hastie and Tibshirani, 2001; James et al., 2013). Arlot et al. (2010), perhaps providing a more refined discussion of this issue, suggest that the choice of K should depend, in part, on the signal-to-noise ratio.*

REMARK 2. *Because $E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\tilde{k}_n) - \theta_{opt})$ is less than $E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{k}_n) - \theta_{opt}$, the above inequality states that on average cross-validation selects an estimator with close to optimal performance if $n\pi$ large, where, once again, performance is measured by the cross-validation benchmark. Note that the tightness of the above inequality depends on n, π, d, and $diam(\Xi_n)$. The bound becomes looser for larger values of d and $diam(\Xi_n)$. As $n\pi$ grows, the bound becomes tighter.*

The above oracle inequality in Theorem 2.1 is derived for any collection of estimators indexed by k that ranges over a continuous bounded subset Ξ_n of R^d, satisfying (A1)-(A4). In the next section, we apply Theorem 2.1

to the Nadaraya-Watsion kernel regression estimator defined in (1.3) with a Gaussian kernel $K(u) = \exp(-||u||^2)$, indexed by a bandwidth matrix H. We also show that for this Nadaraya-Watson kernel regression estimator, a minimizer (corresponding to $\gamma = 0$) exists for both the K fold cross-validation criterion and the K-fold cross-validation benchmark.

2.2.2. *An Oracle Property for a Nadaraya-Watson Estimator with a Matrix Valued Bandwidth.* As in Boyd and Vandenberghe (2004), we represent the set of symmetric positive semidefinite matrices, S_+^p, as elements in $\mathcal{R}^{p(p+1)/2}$. Explicitly, we represent a particular matrix H as $(h_{1,1}, h_{2,2}, \ldots, h_{p,p}, h_{2,1}, h_{3,1}, \ldots, h_{p,p-1})'$. The Frobenius norm of a symmetric matrix, H, viewed as an element in $\mathcal{R}^{p(p+1)/2}$, is defined as $||H||_F = (\sum_{i=1}^p h_{ii}^2 + 2\sum_{j<i} h_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$. To ensure that Ξ_n is bounded (A2), we will let Ξ_n consist of the elements of $S_+^p \subset \mathcal{R}^{p(p+1)/2}$ with Frobenius norm less than or equal to λ_n for some $\lambda_n > 0$.

THEOREM 2.2. *Consider the class of kernel regression estimators ψ_H, defined in (1.3), where $K(u) = \exp(-||u||^2)$ is the Gausian kernel function and H is selected via K-fold cross-validation. Assume that $P(|Y| < M) = 1$ and that $(A4)$ holds. Assume further that there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that $P(||X|| < B) = 1$. Then, we have the following finite sample result.*

(a) Minimizers of the K-fold cross-validation criterion and the K-fold cross-validation benchmark with respect to H exist in Ξ_n.

(b) Denote by $\hat{H}_n \in \Xi_n$ a minimizer of the K-fold cross-validation criterion and $\tilde{H}_n \in \Xi_n$ a minimizer of the K-fold cross-validation benchmark. Then, the assumptions $(A1)$, $(A2)$, and $(A3)$ are satisfied and consequently the inequality of Theorem 2.1 holds, with $\gamma = 0$, $d = p(p+1)/2$ and $C = 64\sqrt{p(p+1)/2}B^2M^2$.

(c) Let $\psi_{n(1-\pi),\hat{H}_n}(x|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})$ be the kernel regression estimator obtained by using $\hat{H}_n$ from part (b) and the jth training sample for any $1 \leq j \leq K$. Assume $\psi(X) = \phi(Tx)$ is a multi-index model defined such that $\phi : \mathcal{R}^m \to \mathcal{R}$ is Lipshitz continuous with Lipshitz constant R and T is an $m \times p$ orthogonal matrix. Let $\lambda_n = \sqrt{p}V(\log(n)n)^{1/3}$, where $V > 0$ is a positive constant. Then, as $n \to \infty$,

(2.9)
$$E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{H}_n) - \theta_{opt} =$$

(2.10)
$$E\int(\psi_{n(1-\pi),\hat{H}_n}(x|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}) - \psi(x))^2 dP_{0,X}(x) = O(\log(n(1-\pi))^{\frac{m}{m+2}}(n(1-\pi))^{\frac{-2}{m+2}}).$$

REMARK 3. *The result of part (c) is an analogue to the result (1.2). In contrast to the result (1.2), the rate of convergence of the above estimator depends on* $m \leq p$.

REMARK 4. *If*

$$\frac{c_1(n\pi, d, \Xi_n, M, \delta)}{(n\pi)\{E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\tilde{k}) - \theta_{opt}\}} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty, \tag{2.11}$$

then it follows, by dividing both sides of the oracle inequality in Theorem 2.1, that

$$\frac{E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{k}) - \theta_{opt}}{E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\tilde{k}) - \theta_{opt}} \to 1 \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{2.12}$$

This implies that the estimator produced by K*-fold cross-validation estimator has asymptotically optimal predictive performance as measured by cross-validation benchmark.*

Assuming that λ_n *grows at the rate specified in Theorem 2.2, the above condition will then be satisfied if* $n\pi(E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\tilde{H}_n) - \theta_{opt})$ *increases at a polynomial rate,* n^{γ}*, where* $0 < \gamma < 1$*. As* n^{-1} *is a "parametric rate" of convergence we would expect* $E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\tilde{H}_n) - \theta_{opt}$ *to decrease at a rate slower than* n^{-1}*. Thus, we expect the condition to hold in many circumstances. In fact, Remark 4 of Antos, Györfi and Kohler (2000) provides an example of a class of distribution within which distributions can be found such that it holds.*

REMARK 5. *The* K*-fold cross-validation criterion is differentiable with respect to* H *for the Nadaraya-Watson estimator we consider. The derivative is presented in the Supplementary material. To find* $\hat{H}_n$*, we have implemented a variant of the gradient descent algorithm presented in Weinberger and Tesauro (2007). Our simulation results and the data analysis demonstrate that this algorithm is capable of finding acceptable local minimizers. Development of more sophisticated algorithms for finding global minimizers as well as improvement of computational speed warrants further research.*

3. Simulations. In this section, we present the results of a simulation study to illustrate the performance of the kernel regression estimator using a matrix valued bandwidth when the true regression model is single or two-index. We also compare it with a kernel regression estimator using a scalar valued bandwidth and an oracle kernel regression estimator that is

derived by calculating the true indices and carrying out kernel regression using these indices as covariates. We use 10-fold cross-validation to estimate the optimal scalar-valued and matrix-valued bandwidth parameter. To find the matrix-valued bandwidth, we applied gradient descent algorithm to minimize the 10-fold cross-validation criterion. A grid search was used to find the scalar-valued bandwidth. For the oracle estimator, a grid search was used to determine its optimal smoothing parameter, $\tilde{h}_n$, with the goal of minimizing the conditional risk $\tilde{\theta}_n(h)$, where $\tilde{h}_n$ is scalar for the single-index model and a 2-dimensional vector for the 2-index model. We also demonstrate how the performance of kernel regression, parametrized by a bandwidth matrix, degrades as the number of covariates increases.

In all simulations, the covariates are independent and standard normal random variables. For the single index regression model we set

$$Y = 2X_1 + 2X_2 + X_3 + X_4 + \epsilon, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. The standard deviation of the error term, σ, has been set to 0.15 and 0.3. Additional "noise" covariates (covariates with coefficient equal to 0) have been added such that p varies from 5, 10, to 20. For the two-index regression model, we set

$$Y = T_1 \sin(\sqrt{5}T_2) + T_2 \sin(\sqrt{5}T_1) + \epsilon, \tag{3.2}$$

which was explored previously in Polzehl and Sperlich (2009), where the two indices are defined as $T_1 = X_1/\sqrt{5} + 2X_2/\sqrt{5}$ and $T_2 = -2X_1/3 + X_2/3 + 2X_3/3$, and $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. Once again, additional noise covariates have been added such that p varies from 5, 10, to 20 and σ takes the values 0.15 and 0.3.

The performance of these estimators is measured by taking the square root of the mean squared error (RMSE) on a test set of size 10,000. Each simulation scenario was repeated 100 times. The mean of the RMSEs over the 100 simulations as well as 95% confidence intervals for each simulation scenario are presented in Table 1.

The kernel regression estimator using the matrix-valued bandwidth outperforms the kernel regression estimator using a scalar-valued bandwidth over all simulation scenarios. The rate of convergence of the kernel regression estimator using a scalar-valued bandwidth is slow enough that the RMSE changes by very small amounts as the sample size increases. We found that the scalar bandwidth selected by 10-fold cross-validation led to significant over-smoothing for all simulation scenarios.

The performance of the kernel regression estimator using a matrix-valued bandwidth does indeed degrade as additional noise covariates are included,

however, its performance is substantially improved as the sample size increases. For a sample size of 1,000, even when $p = 20$, this estimator is comparable to that of the oracle kernel regression estimator.

4. Data Analysis. In this section we demonstrate the estimated predictive performance of kernel regression using a bandwidth matrix versus kernel regression using a scalar bandwidth with the goal of understanding whether the asymptotic results presented in this article are indicative of finite sample performance on commonly explored data sets. For reference, we also compare the predictive performance of these kernel regression estimators to that of a linear regression estimator with no interactions and no nonlinear terms. Large differences in estimated prediction accuracy between the nonparametric kernel regression methods and the linear model may provide an indication of whether the linear model is failing to account for any interactions or nonlinearities although this comparison does not constitute a formal test.

To estimate the predictive accuracy of each method we used testing sets of approximate size $n \times 0.25$. Observations were split into 4 groups. This yielded 4 splits of the data into a set of size $n \times 0.75$ for training and a set of size $n \times 0.25$ for estimating the RMSE via a testing set. A final estimate of the RMSE was obtained by averaging the 4 estimates of the RMSE associated with each split. Within each training set 10-fold cross-validation was used to select the bandwidth matrix and scalar bandwidth for the two regression estimators.

We tested these methods on 3 data sets: the Boston housing data set obtained via the R package MASS and the concrete compressive strength, and the auto-mpg data sets, with the latter two being available from the UC Irvine Machine Learning Repository (https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml). Continuous covariate were centered and scaled to have variance equal to 1. Discrete variables were coded using the usual dummy coding, thus, a discrete valued variable with v levels contributes $v - 1$ covariates. The results are presented in Table 2.

The kernel regression estimator indexed by a bandwidth matrix yielded a smaller estimated RMSE than both the kernel regression estimator indexed by a scalar and the linear regression estimator. The kernel regression estimator indexed by a scalar bandwidth had the highest RMSE for all 3 data sets. 10-fold cross-validation led to over-smoothed estimates of the regression function. The improvement in performance from using a bandwidth matrix over a scalar bandwidth suggests that there is lower-dimensional structure which the bandwidth matrix is able to take advantage of. The kernel regres-

n	p	SD	Index #	Scalar Bandwidth	Matrix Bandwidth	Oracle Estimator
250	5	0.15	1	1.835 (1.833,1.838)	0.165 (0.164,0.167)	0.164 (0.162,0.165)
250	10	0.15	1	1.837 (1.834,1.839)	0.171 (0.169,0.173)	0.167 (0.165,0.169)
250	20	0.15	1	1.835 (1.833,1.837)	0.175 (0.173,0.177)	0.166 (0.164,0.168)
500	5	0.15	1	1.834 (1.831,1.836)	0.158 (0.157,0.158)	0.157 (0.156,0.158)
500	10	0.15	1	1.834 (1.831,1.836)	0.158 (0.158,0.159)	0.157 (0.156,0.158)
500	20	0.15	1	1.834 (1.831,1.836)	0.161 (0.16,0.162)	0.157 (0.157,0.158)
1000	5	0.15	1	1.832 (1.83,1.835)	0.154 (0.154,0.154)	0.153 (0.153,0.154)
1000	10	0.15	1	1.832 (1.829,1.834)	0.154 (0.154,0.155)	0.153 (0.153,0.154)
1000	20	0.15	1	1.833 (1.83,1.835)	0.155 (0.154,0.155)	0.153 (0.153,0.153)
250	5	0.30	1	1.852 (1.849,1.854)	0.318 (0.316,0.319)	0.313 (0.312,0.315)
250	10	0.30	1	1.853 (1.851,1.855)	0.325 (0.323,0.327)	0.314 (0.312,0.315)
250	20	0.30	1	1.854 (1.852,1.857)	0.369 (0.363,0.376)	0.313 (0.312,0.314)
500	5	0.30	1	1.852 (1.85,1.855)	0.309 (0.309,0.31)	0.307 (0.307,0.308)
500	10	0.30	1	1.851 (1.848,1.853)	0.311 (0.311,0.312)	0.307 (0.306,0.307)
500	20	0.30	1	1.854 (1.852,1.856)	0.338 (0.331,0.345)	0.307 (0.307,0.308)
1000	5	0.30	1	1.852 (1.849,1.854)	0.305 (0.304,0.305)	0.304 (0.303,0.304)
1000	10	0.30	1	1.852 (1.85,1.855)	0.306 (0.305,0.306)	0.304 (0.303,0.304)
1000	20	0.30	1	1.852 (1.849,1.854)	0.312 (0.309,0.314)	0.304 (0.303,0.304)
250	5	0.15	2	0.787 (0.786,0.788)	0.189 (0.188,0.19)	0.187 (0.186,0.188)
250	10	0.15	2	0.789 (0.788,0.79)	0.196 (0.195,0.197)	0.187 (0.186,0.188)
250	20	0.15	2	0.788 (0.787,0.789)	0.228 (0.222,0.234)	0.187 (0.186,0.189)
500	5	0.15	2	0.788 (0.786,0.789)	0.172 (0.172,0.173)	0.172 (0.172,0.173)
500	10	0.15	2	0.788 (0.787,0.789)	0.174 (0.174,0.175)	0.172 (0.172,0.173)
500	20	0.15	2	0.788 (0.787,0.789)	0.183 (0.182,0.184)	0.172 (0.172,0.173)
1000	5	0.15	2	0.788 (0.787,0.789)	0.163 (0.162,0.163)	0.162 (0.162,0.163)
1000	10	0.15	2	0.788 (0.787,0.789)	0.164 (0.163,0.164)	0.162 (0.162,0.163)
1000	20	0.15	2	0.786 (0.785,0.787)	0.166 (0.166,0.167)	0.162 (0.162,0.162)
250	5	0.30	2	0.831 (0.83,0.832)	0.339 (0.338,0.341)	0.333 (0.332,0.334)
250	10	0.30	2	0.831 (0.829,0.832)	0.356 (0.353,0.358)	0.332 (0.331,0.334)
250	20	0.30	2	0.831 (0.829,0.832)	0.404 (0.401,0.408)	0.333 (0.332,0.335)
500	5	0.30	2	0.83 (0.828,0.831)	0.323 (0.322,0.324)	0.32 (0.319,0.321)
500	10	0.30	2	0.829 (0.828,0.83)	0.329 (0.328,0.329)	0.319 (0.318,0.32)
500	20	0.30	2	0.83 (0.829,0.831)	0.359 (0.355,0.362)	0.32 (0.319,0.32)
1000	5	0.30	2	0.829 (0.828,0.83)	0.313 (0.312,0.313)	0.312 (0.312,0.313)
1000	10	0.30	2	0.829 (0.828,0.83)	0.315 (0.315,0.316)	0.312 (0.311,0.313)
1000	20	0.30	2	0.829 (0.828,0.83)	0.324 (0.323,0.325)	0.312 (0.312,0.313)

TABLE 1

RMSEs and 95% CIs for kerned regression estimator with scalar bandwidth, bandwidth matrix and oracle kernel regression estimator under a single index model (Index # =1) and a two-index model (Index # =2).

Data Set	n	p	Bandwidth Matrix	Scalar Bandwidth	Linear Regression
Boston housing	506	13	4.05	9.04	4.87
concrete	1030	8	6.29	16.67	10.47
auto-mpg	398	11	2.69	7.72	3.32

TABLE 2
Estimated RMSEs for three commonly used data sets

sion estimator indexed by a bandwidth matrix may be performing better than linear regression because there is nonlinear structure or there are interactions that the linear regression estimator fail to account for.

5. Discussion. To the best of our knowledge, the performance of K-fold cross-validation for Nadaraya-Watson kernel regression estimator, indexed by a bandwidth matrix has not previously been investigated. We proved a finite sample oracle inequality for this estimator and demonstrated that lower-dimensional rates of convergence can be achieved if the true regression model is single or multi-index. The performance of cross-validation for the Nadaraya-Watson estimator has been investigated extensively in the literature (Wong et al., 1983; Hall, 1984; Hardle and Marron, 1985; Härdle and Kelly, 1987; Walk, 2002; Györfi et al., 2006). The results on cross-validation and kernel regression presented in Hall (1984); Hardle and Marron (1985); Härdle and Kelly (1987), and Walk (2002) concern leave-one-out cross-validation and all consider the case when $H^* = h^* I_p$, where $h^* = 1/h$. The results of these papers are distinguished by the optimality criterion they consider, assumptions about the distribution of the data, properties of the kernel, and assumptions about the range over which the bandwidth is varied, which are detailed below.

Our main result provides an upper-bound on the rate of convergence of the marginal excess risk. Compared to the results in Hall (1984); Hardle and Marron (1985); Härdle and Kelly (1987), and Walk (2002) we make the fairly strong assumption that both Y and X are almost surely bounded, although we do not assume that $p_{0,X}(x)$ is bounded as in Hardle and Marron (1985) and Härdle and Kelly (1987). We also do not assume that $p_{0,X}(x)$ satisfies a smoothness condition such as Hölder continuity, as in Härdle and Kelly (1987). Härdle and Kelly (1987) assume that $p_{0,X}(x)$ is known. Hall (1984); Hardle and Marron (1985); Härdle and Kelly (1987) and Walk (2002) assume the kernel has bounded support. In contrast, we assume the use of the Gaussian kernel, a kernel with unbounded support. Unlike Hall (1984) and Hardle and Marron (1985), we do not require that the bandwidth parameters converge to 0. Walk (2002) does not require that the scalar bandwidth converge 0, however, the result does assume the bandwidth parameter varies

over a discrete grid. Our result allows the bandwidth matrix to range over a bounded subset of the space of positive semidefinite matrices and these subsets grow at an appropriately fast rate.

The results presented in Dudoit and van der Laan (2005) and Györfi et al. (2006) apply to a wide variety of estimation procedures. The results of Hall (1984); Hardle and Marron (1985); Härdle and Kelly (1987), and Walk (2002) are specific to kernel regression. Our extension, as in Dudoit and van der Laan (2005) and Györfi et al. (2006), can be applied to regression estimators other than kernel regression. However this generality has theoretical drawbacks. Our proof requires that the number of folds, K, be constant or grow slowly as a fraction of the sample size. In particular, this excludes leave-one-out cross-validation. The upper-bound from Theorem 2.2 may be loose and the rate of convergence may be substantially smaller. In particular, the result does not imply that leave-one-out cross-validation is inconsistent for the Nadaraya-Watson estimator, indexed by a matrix bandwidth.

While the focus of the article is on K-fold cross-validation. Our results easily generalize to other cross-validation schemes. For example, a cross-validation scheme that may lead to more stable model selection could be obtained by specifying more than just K splits in which approximately $n\pi$ observations are used for validation. Repeated K-fold cross-validation (Burman (1989)), wherein K-fold cross-validation is carried out repeatedly by using a different partition of the observations each time, is such a scheme. Our results also hold for repeated K-fold cross-validation.

It is of interest to investigate other settings in which Theorem 2.1 can be applied. For example, consider the ridge regression estimator defined as $\psi_\lambda(X|P_n) = \text{argmin}_\beta\{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i'\beta)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j^2\}$ (Hoerl and Kennard (1970)). An alternate estimator is defined by penalizing each covariate to a different degree: $\psi_\lambda(X|P_n) = \text{argmin}_\beta\{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i'\beta)^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j \beta_j^2\}$. For this estimator, covariates with no effect or a weak effect on Y should be penalized more heavily. For both estimators, the K-fold cross-validation criterion may also be minimized via a gradient descent algorithm. It may be possible to apply Theorem 2.1 to both estimators, allowing for some modification of these ridge regression estimators to ensure that the estimators are bounded.

6. Proofs.

6.1. *Rate of Convergence of a Kernel Regression Estimator with Unbounded Support.* In this section, we present a result extending Theorem 5.2 of Györfi et al. (2006) on the rate of convergence of the kernel regression

estimator to handle the case where a Gaussian kernel is used. This result is used in the proof of Theorem 2.2.

In the following lemma, we restrict our attention to the special case where a single bandwidth parameter, $h > 0$, is used. Therefore, instead of $k_{i,H}(x) = \exp(-(X_i - x)'H(X_i - x))$, we have $k_{i,h}(x) = \exp(-h(X_i - x)'(X_i - x)) = \exp(-h||X_i - x||_2^2)$, where $||X_i - x||^2$ is the squared Euclidean distance between X_i and x. With h fixed, we denote the resulting kernel estimator as ψ_n.

Györfi et al. (2006) consider a class of kernel regression estimators of the form

$$\psi_n(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K((X_i - x)h)Y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n K((X_i - x)h)}, \tag{6.1}$$

where $K : \mathcal{R}^d \to [0, \infty)$ is the kernel function. Theorem 5.2 of Györfi et al. (2006) provides an upper-bound on $E_O[(\psi_n(X) - \psi(X))^2]$ when $K(x)$ is a type of kernel with bounded support called a "boxed" kernel. Letting $S_{x,r}$ be a ball of radius r, centered at x, $K(x)$ is a boxed kernel if there exists $0 < r < r'$ and $b > 0$ such that $I_{\{x \in S_{0,r'}\}} \geq K(x) \geq bI_{\{x \in S_{0,r}\}}$. In the case of a Gaussian kernel, there does exist b and $r > 0$ such that $K(x) \geq bI_{\{x \in S_{0,r}\}}$. However, the Gaussian kernel has unbounded support, therefore, there exists no r' such that $I_{\{x \in S_{0,r'}\}} \geq K(x)$. The proof of Lemma 6.1 is given in the supplementary materials Conn and Li (2017).

LEMMA 6.1. *Assume X has support such that there exists $B > 0$ such that $P(||X|| < B) = 1$. Assume the true regression function, $\psi(x)$ is Lipshitz continuous over the support of X, with Lipshitz constant R, and that $Var(Y|X = x) \leq \sigma^2$ over the support of X. Under these assumptions we have*

$$E[(\psi_n(X) - \psi(X))^2] \leq \frac{R^2 \log(n)}{h} + \frac{2R^2B^2\tilde{c}h^{p/2}}{nb} + \frac{2\sigma^2\tilde{c}h^{p/2}}{nb}, \tag{6.2}$$

where $\tilde{c}$ depends on p and B. Furthermore, if we let the bandwidth h increase to infinity as

$$h_n^* = \left(\frac{A_1 \log(n)n}{A_2 \frac{p}{2}}\right)^{\frac{2}{p+2}}$$

where $A_1 = R^2$ and $A_2 = \frac{2\tilde{c}}{b}(R^2B^2 + \sigma^2)$, then the above bound yields

$$E[(\psi_n(X) - \psi(X))^2] \leq A \log(n)^{\frac{p}{p+2}} n^{\frac{-2}{p+2}},$$

where $A = A_1^{\frac{p}{p+2}} A_2^{\frac{2}{p+2}} ((p/2)^{\frac{2}{p+2}} + (p/2)^{\frac{p}{p+2}})$.

6.2. *Additional Definitions and Results Regarding Brackets.* We briefly introduce the concept of brackets and bracketing numbers. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a collection of functions $f(O)$. An L_2 ϵ-bracket determined by a pair of functions, l and u, such that $l(O) \leq u(O)$ and $E[|l(O) - u(O)|^2] \leq \epsilon^2$, is defined as the set of functions $f(O) \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $l(O) \leq f(O) \leq u(O)$. Such a bracket will be denoted as $[l, u]$. A minimal ϵ-covering of $\mathcal{F}$ with brackets is a collection of brackets such that each element of $\mathcal{F}$ is in at least one bracket and there exists no collection of ϵ brackets of smaller cardinality. The minimum number of brackets required to cover $\mathcal{F}$ is denoted by $N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F})$.

By Jensen's inequality, we have $\epsilon^2 \geq E[|u - v|^2] \geq (E[|u - l|])^2$ which implies that $E[|u - l|] \leq \epsilon$.

Let $f_1, f_2 \in [l, u]$. We show that f_1 and f_2 have variances that are close to one another for small values of ϵ. This result is used in Theorem 2.1.

LEMMA 6.2. *Let f_1 and f_2 be elements of an L_2 ϵ-bracket, $[l, u]$. Then*

$$|\sigma_{f_1}^2 - \sigma_{f_2}^2| \leq \epsilon(\sigma_{f_1} + \sigma_{f_2}) \tag{6.3}$$

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\Big\{\big[(f_1(O) - E[f_1(O)]) - (f_2(O) - E[f_2(O)])\big]^2\Big\} \\
&= E\Big\{\big[f_1(O) - f_2(O) - E[f_1(O) - f_2(O)]\big]^2\Big\} \\
&\leq E\Big\{\big[(f_1(O) - f_2(O)) - (E[f_1(O) - f_2(O)])\big]^2\Big\} + (E[f_1(O) - f_2(O)])^2 \\
&= E[(f_1(O) - f_2(O))^2] \leq \epsilon^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\sqrt{E\Big\{\big[(f_1(O) - E[f_1(O)]) - (f_2(O) - E[f_2(O)])\big]^2\Big\}} \leq \epsilon.$$

By the reverse triangle inequality, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\sqrt{E[(f_1(O) - E[f_1(O)])^2]} - \sqrt{E[(f_2(O) - E[f_2(O)])^2]}\Big| \\
&= \Big|\sigma_{f_1} - \sigma_{f_2}\Big| \leq \epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_{f_i}^2$ is the variance of $f_i (i = 1, 2)$.

Then $|\sigma_{f_1}^2$ - $\sigma_{f_2}^2| = |(\sigma_{f_1} - \sigma_{f_2})(\sigma_{f_1} + \sigma_{f_2})| \leq \epsilon(\sigma_{f_1} + \sigma_{f_2})$. □

7. Appendix B: Proofs for Section 2.

7.1. *Proof of Theorem 2.1* .

PROOF. To simplify notation, for this finite sample result, we suppress the dependence of $\hat{k}_n$ and $\tilde{k}_n$ on the sample size, thus, let $\hat{k}_n = \hat{k}$ and $\tilde{k}_n = \tilde{k}$. We begin with the same decomposition as Dudoit and van der Laan (2005).

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &\le \tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{k}) - \theta_{opt} \\
&= E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\hat{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP_0(x,y) \\
&\quad - (1+\delta) E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\hat{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP^1_{n,S_n}(x,y) \\
&\quad + (1+\delta) E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\hat{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP^1_{n,S_n}(x,y) \\
&\le E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\hat{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP_0(x,y) \\
&\quad - (1+\delta) E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\hat{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP^1_{n,S_n}(x,y) \\
&\quad + (1+\delta) E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP^1_{n,S_n}(x,y) \\
&\quad + (1+\delta)\gamma \\
&= E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\hat{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP_0(x,y) \\
&\quad - (1+\delta) E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\hat{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP^1_{n,S_n}(x,y) \\
&\quad + (1+\delta) E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP^1_{n,S_n}(x,y) \\
&\quad - (1+2\delta) E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP_0(x,y) \\
&\quad + (1+2\delta) E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y,\psi(x)) dP_0(x,y) \\
&\quad + (1+\delta)\gamma
\end{aligned}
$$

As in Dudoit and van der Laan (2005), denote the sum of the first and second terms above by $R_{n\hat{k}}$. Denote the sum of the third and fourth term as $T_{n,\tilde{k}}$. The fifth term is the cross-validation benchmark. Therefore, we have

$$
0 \le \tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{k}) - \theta_{opt} \le (1+2\delta)\{\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\tilde{k}) - \theta_{opt}\} + R_{n\hat{k}} + T_{n,\tilde{k}} + (1+\delta)\gamma. \tag{7.1}
$$

The objective is then to find upper bounds for $ER_{n\hat{k}}$ and $ET_{n,\tilde{k}}$. We will show that the same bound applies for both $ER_{n\hat{k}}$ and $ET_{n,\tilde{k}}$. At present, we find an upper bound for $R_{n\hat{k}}$.

Fixing our attention on a particular split into training and validation sets, say the jth split $S_n^{(j)}$, let $Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}} = Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}(Y_i, X_i) = L(Y_i, \psi_k(X_i|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})) - L(Y_i, \psi(X_i))$, where i is such that $S_{ni}^{(j)} = 1$. Let $Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}} = Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}}(Y, X) = L(Y, \psi_k(X|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})) - L(Y, \psi(X))$ have the same distribution as $Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}$. Note that $|Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}| \leq M_1$ $a.s.$ We also have $\int Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}}(x,y)dP_0(x,y) = E[Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}] - \theta_{opt} \geq 0$.

For any k, let

$$R_{nk} = \frac{1}{K}\sum_{j=1}^{K} R_{nk}(S_n^{(j)}),$$

where

$$R_{nk}(S_n^{(j)}) = \int Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}}(x,y)dP_0(x,y) - (1+\delta)\{\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}(X_i, Y_i)\}.$$

After adding and subtracting $\delta \int Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}}(x,y)dP_0(x,y)$, we have

(7.2)

$$R_{nk}(S_n^{(j)}) = (1+\delta)\Big\{\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}(\int Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}}(x,y)dP_0(x,y) - Z_{ki})\Big\} - \delta\int Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}}(x,y)dP_0(x,y).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\Big(R_{n\hat{k}}(S_n^{(j)}) > s|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Big)\\
&= P\Big((1+\delta)\{\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} E[Z_{\hat{k}i}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}] - Z_{\hat{k}i}^{S_n^{(j)}}\} - \delta E[Z_{\hat{k}i}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}] > s|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Big)\\
&\leq P\Big(\sup_{k\in\Xi_n}\Big\{(1+\delta)\{\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} E[Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}] - Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}\} - \delta E[Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]\Big\} > s|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Big)\\
&\leq P\Big(\sup_{k\in\Xi_n}\Big\{(1+\delta)\{\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} E[Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}] - Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}\} - \delta\frac{Var(Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}{M_2}\Big\} > s|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the inequality

$$Var(Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})/M_2 \leq E[Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]$$

(see Lemma 3 of Dudoit and van der Laan (2005)). We will find an exponential bound for the previous probability via bracketing numbers.

Let $\mathcal{F}_{P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}} = \{Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}} = Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}}(X,Y) : k \in \Xi_n\}$. Set $\epsilon = s/(4(1+2\delta))$. Let $[l_v, u_v]$ $(v = 1, \ldots, N(\epsilon))$ be a minimal L_2 ϵ-bracketing of $\mathcal{F}_{P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}}$ where $N(\epsilon) = N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}_{P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}})$. By $A1$ we may assume without loss of generality that $|l_v| \leq M_1$ and that $|u_v| \leq M_1$.

Note that $N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}_{P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}})$ depends on the training set defined by $S_n^{(j)}$. Given the training set used in split $S_n^{(j)}$, $N(\epsilon) = N_{[]}(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}_{P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}})$ is a fixed number rather than a random variable. We will find a bound for $N(\epsilon, \mathcal{F}_{P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}})$ that is independent of the training set. Choose a representative, $f_v \in [l_v, u_v]$ from each bracket and let $f_{vi} = f_v(O_i)$. Similarly, let $l_{vi} = l_v(O_i)$ and $u_{vi} = u_v(O_i)$. If $Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}} \in \mathcal{F}_{P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}}$ such that $Z_k^{S_n^{(j)}} \in [l_v, u_v]$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n\pi} \sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} (Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}} - E[Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}} | P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}])$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n\pi} \Big| \sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} f_{vi} - E[f_{vi} | P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}] \Big| + \tag{7.3}$$

$$\frac{1}{n\pi} \Big| \sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} (Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}} - f_{vi}) - E[(Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}} - f_{vi}) | P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}] \Big|. \tag{7.4}$$

Consider the term in (7.4). By the triangle inequality and the fact that

$[l_v, u_v]$ is an ϵ bracket we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}(Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}-f_{vi})-E[(Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}-f_{vi})|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|\\
&\leq\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}|Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}-f_{vi}|+E[|Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}-f_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]\\
&\leq\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}|u_{vi}-l_{vi}|+E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]\\
&=\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}|u_{vi}-l_{vi}|-E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|+2E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]\\
&\leq\frac{1}{n\pi}(\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}|u_{vi}-l_{vi}|-E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|)+2\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Replacing the term in (7.4) by the final term in the above series of inequalities yields the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}(Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}-E[Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}])|\\
&\leq\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}f_{vi}-E[f_{vi}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|+ \qquad (7.5)\\
&\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}(|u_{vi}-l_{vi}|-E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|)+2\epsilon. \qquad (7.6)
\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 6.2 and the fact that $\sqrt{Var(Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}\leq M_2$ and $\sqrt{Var(f_v|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}\leq M_2$, we have

$$Var(Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})\geq Var(f_v|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})-2M_2\epsilon. \qquad (7.7)$$

Combining (7.5), (7.6), and (7.7), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(1+\delta)\{\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} E[Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}] - Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}\} - \delta\frac{Var(Z_{ki}^{S^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}{M_2} \\
&\leq (1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} (|u_{vi}-l_{vi}| - E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|) \\
&+ (1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} f_{vi} - E[f_{vi}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]| - \delta\frac{Var(f_v|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}{M_2} \\
&+ 2(1+\delta)\epsilon + 2\delta\epsilon.
\end{aligned}
$$

Making use of the fact that $s - 2(1+\delta)\epsilon - 2\delta\epsilon = s/2$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P\Big(\sup_{k\in\Xi_n}\Big\{(1+\delta)\{\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} E[Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}] - Z_{ki}^{S_n^{(j)}}\} - \delta\frac{Var(Z_{ki}^{S^{(j)}}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}{M_2}\Big\} > s|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Big) \\
&\leq P\Big(\sup_{v\in\{1,\ldots,N(\epsilon)\}}\Big\{(1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} (|u_{vi}-l_{vi}| - E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|) + \\
&\qquad (1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} f_{vi} - E[f_{vi}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]| - \delta\frac{Var(f_v|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}{M_2}\Big\} > \frac{s}{2}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Big) \\
&\leq N(\epsilon)\max_{v\in\{1,\ldots,N(\epsilon)\}} P\Big(\Big\{(1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} (|u_{vi}-l_{vi}| - E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|) + \\
&\qquad (1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} f_{vi} - E[f_{vi}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]| - \delta\frac{Var(f_v|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}{M_2}\Big\} > \frac{s}{2}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Big)
\end{aligned}
$$

Fixing a particular value of v, we use the general inequality that for any

pair of random variables A and B, $P(A+B>a+b) \leq P(A>a)+P(B>b)$:

$$P\Bigg(\Big\{(1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}(|u_{vi}-l_{vi}|-E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}])+$$

$$(1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} f_{vi}-E[f_{vi}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|-\delta\frac{Var(f_v|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}{M_2}\Big\}>\frac{s}{2}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Bigg)$$

(7.8)

$$\leq P\Bigg((1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}}(|u_{vi}-l_{vi}|-E[|u_{vi}-l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}])>\frac{s}{4}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Bigg)$$

(7.9)

$$+P\Bigg((1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} f_{vi}-E[f_{vi}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|-\delta\frac{Var(f_v|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})}{M_2}>\frac{s}{4}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Bigg)$$

First we obtain an upper-bound for (7.9). For simplicity let $Var(f_v|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})=\sigma^2_{f_v}$. By Bernstein's inequality we have,

$$P\Bigg((1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} f_{vi}-E[f_{vi}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|-\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}>\frac{s}{4}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Bigg)$$

$$=P\Bigg(\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} f_{vi}-E[f_{vi}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|>\frac{1}{1+\delta}(\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}+\frac{s}{4})|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Bigg)$$

$$=2\exp\Bigg(-\frac{n\pi}{2(1+\delta)^2}\frac{(\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}+\frac{s}{4})^2}{\sigma^2_{f_v}+\frac{M_1}{3(1+\delta)}(\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}+\frac{s}{4})}\Bigg)$$

We simplify the following expression in the exponent:

$$\frac{(\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}+\frac{s}{4})^2}{\sigma^2_{f_v}+\frac{M_1}{3(1+\delta)}(\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}+\frac{s}{4})}=\frac{(\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}+\frac{s}{4})}{\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{(\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}+\frac{s}{4})}+\frac{M_1}{3(1+\delta)}}\geq\frac{(\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}+\frac{s}{4})}{\frac{M_2}{\delta}+\frac{M_1}{3(1+\delta)}}\geq\frac{1}{4}\frac{s}{\frac{M_2}{\delta}+\frac{M_1}{3}}$$

As $c_2(M,\delta)=(1+\delta)^2 8(\frac{M_2}{\delta}+\frac{M_1}{3})$, we therefore have

$$P\Bigg((1+\delta)\frac{1}{n\pi}|\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} f_{vi}-E[f_{vi}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}]|-\delta\frac{\sigma^2_{f_v}}{M_2}>\frac{s}{4}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}\Bigg)$$

(7.10) $$\leq 2\exp\Bigg(-\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}s\Bigg).$$

Now consider the term in (7.8). Using Bernstein's inequality and the fact that $Var(|u_{vi} - l_{vi}|) \leq E|u_{vi} - l_{vi}|^2 \leq E|u_{vi} - l_{vi}|M_1 \leq M_1\epsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\Big(\frac{1}{n\pi}\Big(\sum_{\{i:S_{ni}^{(j)}=1\}} |u_{vi} - l_{vi}| - E[|u_{vi} - l_{vi}||P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}, S_n^{(j)}]\Big) > \frac{s}{4}|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}, S_n^{(j)}\Big) \\
&\leq 2\exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{n\pi(\frac{s}{4})^2}{M_1\epsilon + M_1\frac{s}{4}\frac{1}{3}}\Big) \\
&= 2\exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{n\pi(\frac{s}{4})^2}{M_1\frac{s}{4(1+2\delta)} + M_1\frac{s}{4}\frac{1}{3}}\Big) \\
&= 2\exp\Big(-\frac{1}{M_1 8}\frac{n\pi}{\frac{1}{(1+2\delta)} + \frac{1}{3}}s\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

By $A4$, δ is taken small enough so that $1/(c_2(M,\delta)) \leq M_1 8(\frac{1}{(1+2\delta)} + \frac{1}{3})$ and, in this case, the upper bound for (7.9) (Inequality 7.10) is larger than the upper bound for (7.8) (Inequality 7.11) and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(R_{n,\hat{k}}(S_n^{(j)}) > s|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}) \\
&\leq N(\epsilon)4\exp\Big(-\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}s\Big) \\
&\leq N\Big(\frac{s}{4(1+2\delta)}\Big)4\exp\Big(-\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}s\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

By assumption $\mathcal{F}_{P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}} = \{Z_k : k \in \Xi_n\}$ are Lipshitz, with Lipshitz constant C independent of $P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}$. Therefore, by Example 19.7 in van der Vaart (2000) and Example 27.1 of Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David (2014),

$$N\Big(\frac{s}{4(1+2\delta)}\Big) \leq \Big(\frac{4\sqrt{d}C^2 4(1+2\delta)diam(\Xi_n)}{s}\Big)^d.$$

Thus,

$$P(R_{n,\hat{k}}(S_n^{(j)}) > s|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}) \leq 4\Big(\frac{4\sqrt{d}C^2 4(1+2\delta)\mathrm{diam}(\Xi_n)}{s}\Big)^d \exp\Big(-\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}s\Big)$$

and this implies that

$$P(R_{n,\hat{k}}(S_n^{(j)}) > s) \leq 4\Big(\frac{4\sqrt{d}C^2 4(1+2\delta)\mathrm{diam}(\Xi_n)}{s}\Big)^d \exp\Big(-\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}s\Big)$$

Note that $ER_{n,\hat{k}} = ER_{n,\hat{k}}(S_n^{(j)})$. In general, for any random variable Z, $EZ \leq EI(Z > 0)Z = \int_0^\infty P(Z > z)dz \leq u + \int_u^\infty P(Z > z)dz$ $(u > 0)$. If we assume $u > (\frac{c_2(M,\delta)}{n\pi})$, we obtain the following upper bound:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&ER_{n,\hat{k}} = ER_{n,\hat{k}}(S_n^{(j)}) \leq u + \int_u^\infty 4\Big(\frac{4\sqrt{d}C^2 4(1+2\delta)\mathrm{diam}(\Xi_n)}{s}\Big)^d \exp(-\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}s)ds \\
&\leq u + \Big(\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}\Big)^d 4(4\sqrt{d}C^2 4(1+2\delta)\mathrm{diam}(\Xi_n))^d \int_u^\infty \exp(-\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}s)ds \\
&= u + \Big(\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}\Big)^d 4(4\sqrt{d}C^2 4(1+2\delta)\mathrm{diam}(\Xi_n))^d \frac{c_2(M,\delta)}{n\pi} \exp(-\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}u)
\end{aligned}
$$

If we let

$$
u = \frac{c_2(M,\delta)}{n\pi} \log\Big\{\Big(\frac{n\pi}{c_2(M,\delta)}\Big)^d 4(4\sqrt{d}C^2 4(1+2\delta)\mathrm{diam}(\Xi_n))^d\Big\},
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
ER_{n,\hat{k}} &\leq \frac{c_2(M,\delta)}{n\pi} c_1(n\pi, d, \Xi_n, M, \delta) + \frac{c_2(M,\delta)}{n\pi} \\
&\leq 2\frac{c_2(M,\delta)}{n\pi} c_1(n\pi, d, \Xi_n, M, \delta)
\end{aligned}
$$

(by $A4$, u is indeed larger than $(c_2(M,\delta)/n\pi)$). The last inequality also follows by $A4$ as $c_1(n\pi, d, \Xi_n, M, \delta)$ is assumed to be larger than 1.

The same bound also holds for $ET_{n,\tilde{k}}$ as $T_{n,\tilde{k}}$ has the same form as $R_{n,\hat{k}}$. This is seen by noting that

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{n,\tilde{k}} &= (1+\delta)E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y, \psi(x))dP^1_{n,S_n}(x,y) \\
&\quad - (1+2\delta)E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y, \psi(x))dP_0(x,y) \\
&= (1+\delta)E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y, \psi(x))dP^1_{n,S_n}(x,y) \\
&\quad - (1+\delta)E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y, \psi(x))dP_0(x,y) \\
&\quad - \delta E_{S_n} \int L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n})) - L(y, \psi(x))dP_0(x,y)
\end{aligned}
$$

Noting that $Z^{S_n^{(j)}}_{\tilde{k}}(x,y) = L(y, \psi_{\tilde{k}}(x|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}})) - L(y, \psi(x))$, and comparing the above expression with that in (7.2), we see that the upper bound obtained for $ER_{n,\hat{k}}$ also holds for $ET_{n,\tilde{k}}$.

Thus, we have

$$0 \leq E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{k}) - \theta_{opt} \leq (1+2\delta)\{E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-p)}(\tilde{k}) - \theta_{opt}\} + \frac{4c_2(M,\delta)}{n\pi} c_1(n\pi, d, \Xi_n, M, \delta) + (1+\delta)\gamma$$

□

7.2. *Proof of Theorem 2.2.*

PROOF. The K-fold cross-validation criterion is continuous as a function of H (the choice of Gaussian kernel is important for this purpose). Note that Ξ_n is closed and bounded, therefore Ξ_n is compact. As Ξ_n is compact and the cross-validation criterion is continuous, there exists a minimizer of the K-fold cross-validation criterion in Ξ_n. The cross-validation benchmark for K-fold cross-validation is proportional to the sum of conditional risks for K kernel regression estimators each based off of a training set of size $n(1-\pi)$. If we can show that one of these conditional risks is continuous as a function of k, it will follow that the cross-validation benchmark is continuous. Fixing, say, the jth split, $\int L(y, \psi_H(x|P^0_{n,S^{(j)}_n}) dP_0(x,y)$, is continuous as a consequence of the dominated convergence theorem (see Theorem 6.27 of Klenke (2013)), therefore the cross-validation benchmark is continuous. Again, because $\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(H)$ is continuous and Ξ_n is compact, there also exists a minimizer of $\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(H)$ in Ξ_n. Thus, part (a) of Theorem 2.2 holds.

$A1$ holds because the kernel regression estimator is bounded by M. $A2$ is satisfied because Ξ_n is bounded. $A4$ holds by assumption. This leaves us to show that $A3$ holds.

Let $k_{i,H} = K(H^{1/2}(X_i - x))$. Consider the partial derivative of $L(y, \psi_H(x|P_n)) - L(y, \psi(x))$, where $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_p)'$ is in the support of X. We have for $u \neq v$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{\partial L(y, \psi_H(x|P_n)) - L(y, \psi(x))}{\partial H_{uv}}\right| \\
&= \left|4(\psi_H(x|P_n) - y)\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (\psi_H(x|P_n) - Y_i) k_{i,H}(x)(X_{iu} - x_u)(X_{iv} - x_v)}{\sum_{i=1}^n k_{i,H}(x)}\right| \\
&\leq 64M \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{k_{i,H}(x) MB^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n k_{i,H}(x)} = 64M^2B^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where, for the inequality, we have used the fact that $|(\psi_H(x|P_n) - y)| \leq 2M$, $|(X_{iu} - x_u)| \leq 2B$, and $|(X_{iv} - x_v)| \leq 2B$.

When $u = v$ we have the same expression as above with the 4 replaced by 2. Thus, the above derivative is bounded above by a constant and the constant is independent of the training set. As a function of H, $L(y, \psi_H(x|P_n)) - L(y, \psi(x))$ is continuously differentiable and has derivative bounded by $64M^2B^2$, therefore by Duistermaat and Kolk (2004) (Exercise 2.15) it is Lipshitz continuous with Lipshitz constant $C = 64\sqrt{p(p+1)/2}B^2M^2$. Thus, condition $A3$ is satisfied and part (b) is proven.

Finally, we prove part (c). Let $\tilde{H}_n$ be a bandwidth matrix that minimizes the cross-validation benchmark $\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(H)$. By definition, for any other fixed bandwidth matrix, $\breve{H}_n \in \Xi_n$, the below inequality holds:

$$E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\tilde{H}_n) - \theta_{opt} \leq E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\breve{H}_n) - \theta_{opt}.$$

In addition, because the cross-validation technique being utilized is K-fold cross-validation and by the properties of conditional risk discussed in the introduction, it is the case that for $\breve{H}_n$ we have,

$$E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\breve{H}_n) - \theta_{opt} = E_{O_1,\ldots,O_{n(1-\pi)},X}[(\psi_{n(1-\pi),\breve{H}_n}(X) - \psi(X))^2]$$

where the expectation is taken over a training set of size $n(1-\pi)$, $O_1, \ldots, O_{n(1-\pi)} \sim P_{0,X}$, and a newly observed covariate, $X \sim P_{0,X}$. The conditions of Theorem 2.2 will be met for sufficiently small δ and for sufficiently large n. In this case, we have the following upper bound for $E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{H}_n) - \theta_{opt}$:

$$E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{H}_n) - \theta_{opt} \leq (1+2\delta)(E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\breve{H}_n) - \theta_{opt}) + \frac{4c_2(M,\delta)}{n\pi} c_1(n\pi, d, \Xi_n, M, \delta). \tag{7.12}$$

Given our choice of λ_n, we will show there exists a sequence of bandwidth matrices $\breve{H}_n \in \Xi_n$ that yields the desired result. Furthermore, λ_n must go to ∞ at a rate slow enough such that the second term on the right-hand side of the inequality in (7.12) is of smaller order than the first term.

Define

$$h_n(q) = V(\log(n)n)^{1/(q+2)},$$

where $V > 0$ is positive constant. Note that

$$\lambda_n = \sqrt{p}V(\log(n)n)^{1/3} = \sqrt{p}\max_{q\in\{1,\ldots,p\}} h_n(q)$$

Choose $\breve{H}_n = T'\Lambda T$, where Λ is a diagonal matrix with its m diagonal entries equal to $h_n(m)$. Let $||\breve{H}_n||_O$ be the operator norm or the largest eigenvalue of

the matrix $\breve{H}_n$. As the largest eigenvalue of $\breve{H}_n$ is $h_n(m)$, $||\breve{H}_n||_O = h_n(m)$. We have $||\breve{H}_n||_F \leq \sqrt{p}||\breve{H}_n||_O = \sqrt{p}h_n(m) \leq \lambda_n$. Therefore, $\breve{H}_n \in \Xi_n$.

The kernel regression estimator $\psi_{n(1-\pi),\breve{H}_n}(X)$ is equivalent to the kernel regression estimator obtained by regressing the m-dimensional covariate vector TX_i on Y_i, using the bandwidth matrix $h_n(m)I_m$. Denote this equivalent estimator as $\phi_{n(1-\pi),h_n(m)}(TX)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\breve{H}) - \theta_{opt} &= E_{O_1,\ldots,O_{n(1-\pi)},X}[(\psi_{n(1-\pi),\breve{H}_n}(X) - \psi(X))^2] \\ &= E_{O_1,\ldots,O_{n(1-\pi)},X}[(\phi_{n(1-\pi),h_n(m)}(TX) - \phi(TX))^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by using Inequality (6.2) from Lemma 6.1:

$$E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\breve{H}) - \theta_{opt} \leq A' \log(n(1-\pi))^{\frac{m}{m+2}}(n(1-\pi))^{\frac{-2}{m+2}}, \tag{7.13}$$

where $A' = (A_1 V^{-1} + A_2 V^{\frac{m}{m+2}})$. Note that in the application of Lemma 6.1, there exists σ^2 such that $Var(Y|X=x) \leq \sigma^2$ because Y is a.s. bounded.

Next consider the rate at which $diam(\Xi_n)$ grows. If $H \in \Xi_n$ then $||H|| \leq ||H||_F \leq \lambda_n$ ($||H||$ is simply the Euclidean norm of the unique elements in H). Thus, $diam(\Xi_n)$ grows at rate $O(\lambda_n)$. Therefore, the second term on the right-hand side of the inequality (7.12) is indeed of smaller order than the first.

By the properties of the conditional risk discussed in the introduction,

$$E\tilde{\theta}^{CV}_{n(1-\pi)}(\hat{H}_n) - \theta_{opt} = E\int(\psi_{n(1-\pi),\hat{H}_n}(x|P^0_{n,S_n^{(j)}}) - \psi(x))^2 dP_{0,X}(x). \tag{7.14}$$

The desired result then follows by (7.12).

□

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplementary materials for An Oracle Property of the Nadaraya-Watson Kernel Estimator for High Dimensional Nonparametric Regression

(doi: COMPLETED BY THE TYPESETTER; .pdf). We present the proof of Lemma 6.1 in this supplementary article as well as the derivative of K-fold cross-validation criterion with respect to H.

References.

Antos, A., Györfi, L. and Kohler, M. (2000). Lower Bounds on the Rate of Convergence of Nonparametric Regression Estimates. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **83** 91–100.

Arlot, S., Celisse, A. et al. (2010). A Survey of Cross-Validation Procedures for Model Selection. *Stat. Surv.* **4** 40–79.

Boyd, S. and Vandenberghe, L. (2004). *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge university press.

Burman, P. (1989). A Comparative Study of Ordinary Cross-Validation, v-Fold Cross-Validation and the Repeated Learning-Testing Methods. *Biometrika* **76** 503–514.

Conn, D. and Li, G. (2017). Supplement to "An Oracle Property of The Nadaraya-Watson Kernel Estimator for High Dimensional Nonparametric Regression".

Dudoit, S. and van der Laan, M. J. (2005). Asymptotics of Cross-Validated Risk Estimation in Estimator Selection and Performance Assessment. *Stat. Methodol.* **2** 131–154.

Duistermaat, J. J. and Kolk, J. A. (2004). *Multidimensional Real Analysis I: Differentiation* **86**. Cambridge University Press.

Friedman, J., Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (2001). *The Elements of Statistical Learning* **1**. Springer Series in Statistics New York.

Györfi, L., Kohler, M., Krzyzak, A. and Walk, H. (2006). *A Distribution-Free Theory of Nonparametric Regression*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Hall, P. (1984). Asymptotic Properties of Integrated Square Error and Cross-Validation for Kernel Estimation of a Regression Function. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **67** 175–196.

Härdle, W. and Kelly, G. (1987). Nonparametric Kernel Regression Estimation-Optimal Choice of Bandwidth. *Statistics* **18** 21–35.

Hardle, W. and Marron, J. S. (1985). Optimal Bandwidth Selection in Nonparametric Regression Function Estimation. *Ann. Statist.* 1465–1481.

Härdle, W., Müller, M., Sperlich, S. and Werwatz, A. (2012). *Nonparametric and Semiparametric Models*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Hoerl, A. E. and Kennard, R. W. (1970). Ridge Regression: Biased Estimation for Nonorthogonal Problems. *Technometrics* **12** 55–67.

James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (2013). *An Introduction to Statistical Learning* **112**. Springer.

Keles, S., Van Der Laan, M. and Dudoit, S. (2004). Asymptotically optimal model selection method with right censored outcomes. *Bernoulli* 1011–1037.

Klenke, A. (2013). *Probability Theory: a Comprehensive Course*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Kohavi, R. et al. (1995). A Study of Cross-Validation and Bootstrap for Accuracy Estimation and Model Selection. In *Ijcai* **14** 1137–1145. Stanford, CA.

Marron, J. S. and Härdle, W. (1986). Random Approximations to some Measures of Accuracy in Nonparametric Curve Estimation. *J. Multivariate Anal.* **20** 91–113.

Nadaraya, E. A. (1964). On Estimating Regression. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **9** 141–142.

Polzehl, J. and Sperlich, S. (2009). A Note on Structural Adaptive Dimension Reduction. *J. Stat. Comput. Simul.* **79** 805–818.

Shalev-Shwartz, S. and Ben-David, S. (2014). *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge university press.

van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic Statistics* **3**. Cambridge university press.

Walk, H. (2002). On Cross-Validation in Kernel and Partitioning Regression Estimation. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **59** 113–123.

Watson, G. S. (1964). Smooth Regression Analysis. *Sankhya A* 359–372.
Weinberger, K. Q. and Tesauro, G. (2007). Metric Learning for Kernel Regression. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics* 612–619.
Wong, W. H. et al. (1983). On the Consistency of Cross-Validation in Kernel Nonparametric Regression. *Ann. Statist.* **11** 1136–1141.

Department of Biostatistics
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90095
USA
E-mail: djconn17@gmail.com

Department of Biostatistics
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90095
USA
E-mail: vli@ucla.edu